Talking Difference:

Discourses about the Gypsy / Roma in Europe since 1989

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Adina Alexandra Giurgiu Schneeweis

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Adviser: Catherine R. Squires

August 2009

© Adina Schneeweis 2009

Acknowledgements

All blessings are divine in origin but none can be compared
with this power of intellectual investigation and research
which is an eternal gift producing fruits of unending delight.
'Abdu'l-Bahá

I have been going to school for twenty-two years – a time blessed with unending delight, indeed. In this process, I cannot count the people that have helped me and shaped me. Suffice to say that I am grateful for the opportunities I have been offered, from family members, mentors, teachers, friends, and staff that have taken the time to know me and share a smile with me every day. The University of Minnesota and especially the School of Journalism and Mass Communication have been so generous in their support.

My academic life has been marked by several mentors to whom I am forever indebted. For supporting my beliefs and pushing them forward, I thank my advisor, Dr. Catherine Squires. Stepping into this process at a key point, Catherine, you have taught me how to be my own critical reader. More importantly, our conversations have encouraged me to keep going and have confirmed that this matters! Dr. Brian Southwell has served as my advisor for many months and his encouragement and guidance I must acknowledge. The faculty that has joined my doctoral committee at a variety of different moments – Dr. Raymond Duvall, Dr. Hazel Dicken-Garcia, Dr. Mark Pedelty, Dr. Dona Schwartz, Dr. Michael Goldman, and Dr. TK Chang – I thank you for your continued excitement in my ideas. Bud, for turning my life upside down by exposing me to

postcolonial scholarship; Hazel, for guiding my first article to publication; Mark, for your joy while discussing methodological reflexivity with me; Dona, for challenging my use of method; Michael, for also inviting Gramsci and Foucault to the dinners at your home; and TK, for seeing the scholar in me during the first day of orientation.

For my commitment to a doctoral education, I have to thank again Dr. Hazel Dicken-Garcia. There is no other like her. From the first course I took with her, until the most recent walks around the Minneapolis parks, Hazel has been a believer that I am on the right path. She has taught me more about graduate school and becoming a scholar than I thought possible. I can only hope that I can somehow do justice to her commitment to me by trying to model her love for her students in my own career.

For my dedication to teaching, I thank the faculty in Murphy Hall for their patience, especially my dear friend Dr. Kathy Forde, whose energy has been an inspiration. I am most grateful to my students, for sharing their interests with me as I embarked on my own teaching adventures. I also thank the many teachers in my family, who have instilled a love for learning in my heart since I was in primary school and started teaching math to my friends in the neighborhood.

My friends of the past seven years, where would I be without your humor and your wit? Dr. Katie Foss, Becky Bolin-Swenson, Madhavi Murty, Jen Moore, Nahid Khan, Soyoen Cho, Sumi Kim, Dong Dong, and all the other office mates – you have made my life sweeter. The many friends outside the academic ranks, thank you for the repeated "yes, you can!" posts on my blog and Facebook pages. The Bahá'í community of Minneapolis, every single hug and prayer mattered.

I am deeply grateful for the unwavering love my parents and my parents-in-law have shown me, both in fun times and in hard times. Your devotion has never faltered and it inspires me in my life every day. My mother and my mother-in-law in particular, you have earned my eternal gratitude for caring for my son so that I could produce the work that this dissertation has become, without having to worry about his emotional safety. Mom and dad, your desire to support me, even as I cringed at every "have you scheduled your defense yet?" question, has been a gift. Dad, no one supports me as unconditionally as you do! Mom, I hope you know where I get my desire for excellence and my passion for teaching – I am where I am, because of you.

For my deep love for words, I thank my grandmother, Iulia Vlasa. As a high school Romanian teacher, my grandma Lia has shared with me her books, her notes, her love for literature and grammar, and her time, engaging my interest at a time when teenage activities should have distracted me.

Above all else, I thank my dearest Kian and Bob. Kian, my little boy, your genuine curiosity for this world continues to move me to keep asking questions and looking for answers in trying to understand how this world can be better for you. Your snuggles have peppered my work with necessary silliness. My husband Bob is a special case. Your brilliance, your edits, your help with choppy translations from Romanian, your patience as my thoughts developed into ideas worth reading, your exemplary parenting of our son, and your cooking – none can compare to your deep commitment to me as a person. Without it, I would not be as complete as I am today. Thank you for reminding me what is most important.

Dedication

To Dzavit Berisha,

who reminded me of the real world

- and of the possibilities

Abstract

This dissertation is a study of discourses about the Gypsies / Roma in contemporary Europe. It is positioned at the intersection of the disciplines of mass communication, cultural studies, postcolonial studies, and Romani studies. It seeks to explain the construction, development, and social treatment of Gypsy difference in Western and Eastern Europe since 1989. The research, therefore, focused on discourses in the press, in Romania and the United Kingdom at critical conjunctures between 1990 and 2006, and in publications of non-governmental organizations of the emerging movement for Roma rights. The analysis asked what press and activist discourses contribute to what European cultures mean by Gypsy / Roma. How and why have these discourses changed – at a historical time of increased attention to human rights and minority political representation, of European Union enlargement and opening of borders, of politico-economic transformations and democratization processes throughout Western, Central, and Eastern Europe?

Press discourses constructed "the Gypsy," whereas activist discourses formulated "the Roma." The analysis of newspapers identified competing representations of discrimination against the Gypsy, of deploring the Gypsy's perpetual victim status, and, to a smaller degree, of attempting to recognize the minority culture in its own right. Differently, the activist publications contributed and formulated discourses that recognize the discrimination against the Roma, the state's role in this process, the rights of the Roma, the need for integration of the Roma, the role of tradition in contemporary process of inter-ethnic living, and, in few rare cases, the inferiority of Roma cultures. Tensions, hesitations, and changes were inherent in each of these constructions of the Gypsy /

Roma. While discriminating against the Gypsy / Roma and lamenting racism are both rather self-explanatory in post-World War II and post-Communist Europe, press and activist discourses illustrate that such communication institutions play their part in the dominant ideology-counter-ideology dance that maintains an anti-Gypsyist system in place – by over-ethnicizing the Roma peoples, by intentionally shying away from formulating a cohesive Roma identity, and by continuing to find solutions *for* the Roma instead of *with* the Roma (yet an improvement from earlier eras of solution-finding *against* the Roma).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

> *Stereotypes largely come from two types of source: 1) reality; 2) resentment / fear / hatred. In my experience I have found that anywhere gypsies have been there have been a much higher level of problems. Whilst I agree that it is unfair to badge all gypsies together, there is a big problem with criminality (I will not comment on hygiene as this is a rather distasteful and unnecessary aspect of this debate). Anywhere even the good examples of these groups of people go, they are accompanied by a larger proportion of thugs, criminal and scammers and that's why they get the reputation. The big problem is they use land illegally, they leave a mess and they can easily evade the law by moving on. THE ONLY WAY TO CHANGE PEOPLE'S OPINION IS TO CHANGE THE BEHAVIOUR OR HELP ROOT OUT YOUR BAD ELEMENTS.*
>
> – Don, 1Xtra BBC: Gypsies and Travellers: What You're Saying[1]

This statement – posted on the BBC website in response to a BBC documentary about Gypsies and Travellers in East Anglia – stands as suggestive example of the intersection of complex discourses about the Gypsies / Roma in the contemporary context. The testimonial illustrates "common sense" descriptions of Gypsies as criminal, unclean scroungers, and, above all, unwanted. They elicit fear and hatred. They are trouble-makers. Furthermore, contemporary talk about Gypsies recognizes the generalizing potential of stereotypes, as it is politically correct to speak of racism, to try acceptance or understanding. But in today's Europe, it is also politically tolerated to want to change deviant behavior, through integration, towards a harmonious, united, enlarged Europe. The combinations and contradictions that tie such different strands of talking and representing the Gypsies / Roma make the focus of this dissertation.

In recent decades, public manifestation of any type of discrimination against groups and individuals has been frowned upon, and in many societies legally penalized. Nonetheless, groups of Gypsies / Roma are one of the most ignored, misinterpreted, or mistreated cultural groups, as documented by scholars in a variety of disciplines and recognized by human rights organizations.[2] Representations of Gypsies / Roma are sites of multiple strands of stereotyping and contradiction, in nearly all communities and nations where they reside, in Eastern and Western European and American contexts, as well as within local political and economic discourses and in popular culture artifacts. "Negative" imagery of Gypsies as criminals, alongside nomadic and bohemian Gypsy representations, coexists with "positive" representations of tradition and collectivity.[3] Both approaches signify difference nonetheless. The common denominator shared by scholarly and popular literature about Roma groups around the world is that they are one of the most excluded cultures from dominant public discourses. The complexity of this omission lies in the continuous reproduction of a process of double exclusion, one that is hegemonic, established by the dominant, non-Roma majority, and another as counter-hegemony that is self-asserted by the Roma themselves. In the words of Gypsy scholar Robert E. Koulish, the Roma "are symbolically privileged and socially marginalized," whereas non-Roma "are symbolically democratized and socially privileged."[4]

In the European context, since the fall of Central and Eastern European Communist regimes in the 1990s, the social treatment and representation of Roma in Western and Eastern Europe have been continuously changing, guided by, and expressed as, overt discrimination and violence[5] or public outrage in the face of such

continued intolerance,[6] often manifested in conjunction with policy changes funneled by concerns raised by international human rights organizations.[7] The thesis of this dissertation is that, paradoxically, both approaches to dealing with Roma groups are powerfully drawing on a discourse that continues to reinforce images of difference and backwardness.[8] The theoretical and empirical challenge becomes, then, to inquire into, and explain, this apparent contradiction as the two approaches stand by each other and continue to evolve. While they are not identical, the two discursive strategies share a foundation of difference. The research objective becomes to investigate the paradoxical moment of sharedness even while working towards different goals.

Focused on the time frame since 1989, this dissertation confronts head-on the sensitive issues of social and institutional discrimination against Gypsies / Roma, the validity and appropriateness of the concepts of integration and assimilation, the role of institutional discourses in challenging and at the same time maintaining social hierarchies, and finally – and most generally – the process of living with, and in, difference in contemporary European societies. In the tradition of postcolonial theory, this dissertation has two major purposes. The first is to continue to monitor how the institutions of the press and international activist organizations represent and deal with Gypsy / Roma difference. Beyond this commitment, the second purpose is to examine and explain recent changes that concern what is termed in the postcolonial literature the discourse of difference. Primary sources – newspaper coverage in the United Kingdom (UK from here forward) and Romania and European non-governmental organizations (NGOs from here onward) documents – inform this examination.

The present research is necessary for several reasons. First, political and social treatment of the Roma is a highly timely concern visible in the media and in international and national organizations' attention since 1989 – as the evidence in support of this dissertation shows. Second, the politico-economic developments of the last 17 years have gradually led to an increased sensitivity to the migration and presence of Roma communities in both Eastern and Western European contexts. The democratization processes in Eastern Europe alongside the gradual opening of borders in the European Union (EU from here forward) space have led to easier labor migration towards Western Europe (and also to the American continent), which has further brought the issues of integration and assimilation to the forefront of political agenda. Minority rights and protection have also gained political significance. Yet more than a concern of human resources relocation, the opening of borders has also allowed migration of the poorer population segments – including Roma groups. Thus, criminality, homelessness, and begging – often associated with Gypsies / Roma in Western and Eastern European countries alike, but with exclusion, poverty, and ghetto lifestyles more generally[9] – have become social concerns of nationwide proportions.

Third, scholars of postcolonial theory call for a sustained critique of perpetuation of hierarchical representations, in the attempt to change such oppressive political and social patterns.[10] Although numerous recent postcolonial analyses do focus on problems of hierarchy, power, and representation in former colonies, "few works have dealt with the more complex genealogy of contemporary culture and ideology," remarks Edward Said.[11] This dissertation attempts to fill that gap.

Finally, a sustained study of discourses about Gypsies / Roma is lacking in academia, especially in the discipline of mass communication. Some studies do discuss media coverage or the issue of Gypsy / Roma representation, but without discursively contextualizing the practice.[12] Moreover, an inter-institutional approach to discourses about Gypsies / Roma is also absent in academic research – and public discussion alike – yet necessary in the process of building a societal-level understanding of social discrimination. This dissertation seeks to address these theoretical and empirical gaps, and, in doing so, will contribute to knowledge about the problematic representation and treatment of Gypsies / Roma in the European space. Thus, the research gathered here seeks to expand knowledge that can help in the fight against global discrimination.

An analytical comment must be made at this point regarding the nature of this research. Although significantly informed by postcolonial theory, this dissertation is not a study of subalternity or of "the other" per se. For that matter, it can be criticized for using postcolonial concepts to address issues taking place outside colonial contexts. It thus must be noted, nevertheless, that colonial domination – material and / or discursive – manifests itself through ideological oppression. What matters is less the actual political domination; rather, the experience of being dominated, oppressed, colonized, is more relevant. As authors Brian A. Belton and Lou Charnon-Deutsch show, Gypsy stories can be viewed therefore through colonial and postcolonial perspectives by nature of their political situation of being, as often termed, a people without a country.[13] This point is further elaborated in Chapter Two.

Most studies to date on Gypsies / Roma, produced in a variety of academic disciplines, are positioned in the stereotype literature[14] and reproduce the very social

practices they seek to critique. In other words, sociological focus on backwardness, overemphasizing distinctions and limits to identity, and analyzing mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion continues to make the Gypsies / Roma seem like a closed ethnic system and at the same time exaggerates group differences.[15] The terms in which Gypsy studies have been cast are problematic. Recent writing in postcolonialism and poststructuralism begs for a critical reassessment of such scholarly tendencies, pointing to their hierarchical and ethnocentric underpinnings.

Differently than previous scholarship, this dissertation adopts an explanatory attitude towards (media and NGOs) representations of the Gypsies / Roma (and changes in such representation), by combining institutional discourses to explicate the contemporary "Gypsy problem" – often identified as such in anti-Gypsy legislation, activist terminology, and political assessments. Drawing on the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, the "Gypsy problem" (and sometimes the "Roma problem") is here understood to refer to contemporary European societies' (historical) social and political concern in regards to, and attempt to control, the lifestyle of Gypsy / Roma communities, including nomadic or semi-nomadic existence, poverty, inadequate literacy and education, sanitation, unemployment and the handling of illegal affairs, and a general disinterest to be involved in the social system of the host country. Historians Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon more concisely refer to it as the administrative attempts at "mopping up the left-over socially inadequate Gypsies."[16] The concept of the "Gypsy problem" is most often used in this dissertation to also refer to the problematic political and practical handling of the different Gypsy / Romani lifestyle.

Discourse is here understood to mean ways of seeing the world, frameworks for defining what is "real" and "true" and that permeate talk, text, institutional attitudes and policies (Chapter Two further details this concept and the theory and method of discourse analysis). Where previous scholarship explains discrimination against Gypsies / Roma because of ingrained stereotypes – most often defined as a "natural," instinctual categorization[17] – or lack of education about cultural pluralism (the argument of activists), or, worse, Gypsy backwardness itself, the present research explains both overt discrimination and integration projects through ideological, discursive habits of seeing Gypsies as less civilized. It is a deeply ingrained *belief system* about the superiority of dominant cultures that motivates both hatred and violence, on the one hand, and assimilation through changing Gypsies into non-Gypsies, on the other.

The fear of difference – and the construction and perpetual justification that the Roma are different *humans* than mainstream cultures – has its foundations in the same discourse that motivated imperial genocides in colonialism, and the Holocaust against Gypsies and Jews in modern times.[18] While studies of postcolonial societies explain contemporary discriminatory practices through difference,[19] the preponderance of the discourse of difference across national and cultural borders is not directly investigated. Rather, its quasi-universality is manifested as a theoretical and empirical *assumption*, not very often nor rigorously analyzed at a theoretical level.[20] Ultimately, the cross-national focus of this dissertation seeks to contribute to this analytical concern.

The centrality and significance of exposing and explaining the underlying hegemonic *system of beliefs* that continues to motivate treatment of Gypsies / Roma as difference cannot be overstated. The analysis must certainly accommodate for

exceptions and developments (as addressed presently). But a study seeking explanation of social and historical developments cannot overemphasize the risk that is taken by ignoring the root of the problem – that is, the perpetual fear of difference – as seen in contemporary examples of the discourse and culture of fear in the contemporary war on terror.[21] This discursive – and practical – fear of difference motivates communication gestures and real life interactions alike, and is entrenched in a historical ideological structure with roots going back to Enlightenment concepts of rationality and civilization / civility.[22] Thus, the discourse of fear is deeply ingrained in modern concepts – for example, state, nationality, citizenship, economic and political structures (such as capitalist democracies), science, and deviance, to name but a few. What is at stake in the absence of serious acknowledgment of difference (and what it practically entails in contemporary societies) is perpetuating a global culture of fear. In the proclaimed age of globalization, one can no longer ignore minorities, migrant, immigrant, displaced populations, and diasporas, and label them as exceptions, as the world is increasingly challenged to live in close proximity and intimacy with difference.

Theoretically, this dissertation is a synthesis of interest in the disciplines of (international) mass communication, postcolonial and subaltern studies, as they intersect with Gypsy / Romani studies. Most centrally, it uses a postcolonial approach to difference and representation to examine communication products (that is, media coverage of Gypsy / Romani groups and NGO reports and publications concerning the Roma). This theoretical position entails thorough contextualization of contemporary trends as legacies of colonial, hierarchical social relations. Beyond this positioning, however, it is here argued that a critical attitude is not sufficient, nor theoretically and

practically productive. A posture of perpetual critique risks a negativity that can be paralyzing and demoralizing. More importantly, it risks neglecting important changes – even when subtle – that may take place at various conjunctures. As regards the Roma, an overly critical and / or unsympathetic analytical attitude towards social relations and institutional treatment of the minority groups might overlook potential changes in light of recent European developments. Yet more than a question of negativity or analytical neglect, a contemporary study of difference must start from the premise that a world order cannot be changed unless and until old structures erode, collapse, and are replaced by new value systems, at the individual, institutional, and social levels. Critiquing social discrimination recognizes what is problematic about existing systems, yet, especially in an age of global difference, scholarly attention to the matter must recognize developments. The mere presence in public debates of issues concerning living with difference – global community, trans-national organizations, human rights, and global environmental impact,[23] to name a few – signifies change.

It emerges that two simultaneous research objectives must be kept in balance – one of sustained critique of practices that maintain a discourse of difference, and another that theoretically and empirically allows for alternatives. The difficulty of this balancing act becomes apparent in the realization that such practices occur simultaneously and are intimately interlinked. Ultimately, the research endeavor is to adequately and sufficiently analyze, contextualize, and recognize difference both as *legacy* of a previous system of relations and as *possibility* towards a new paradigm of living.

This dissertation most generally seeks to contribute knowledge to understanding the problem of the Gypsies / Roma in contemporary Europe – more specifically, to the broad questions of *what we know* and *how we know what we know* about Gypsies / Roma in today's Europe. This research is concerned with the discourses and ways of talking proliferated and challenged by the institutions of the media and the activist NGOs of Europe. In this vein, this research asks, how and why have (press and activist) institutional discourses about Gypsies / Roma changed in European countries since 1989?

Theoretically, this research seeks to grapple with the paradoxical co-existence of two seemingly divergent systems of beliefs – one that is discriminatory, and one actively centered on integration. How do these stand by each other, while contradicting each other? And significantly, what are the possibilities and limitations for discursive transformation? Under what conditions might they arise? The aim, then, is to explain the contemporary status of the discourse on Gypsies / Roma in post-Communist Europe. Discursive change (discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two) is here assumed to arise at the intersection of known, traditional experiences with contradictions originating in institutions and society as a whole.[24] The growing concern about integrating the Roma – the "Gypsy problem," that is – is an evident example of discursive change.

As follows, this dissertation includes analysis of the social construction of what a "Gypsy" / "Roma" is, as represented at the intersection of various public discourses – political, economic, educational, social, cultural, and academic – and as contrasted to "non-Gypsy" / "non-Roma." Further, it examines the changing "talk" about Gypsies / Roma through thorough contextualization of the factors affecting and shaping public

discourses, as called for by the last of the above questions. Media and NGOs are critical institutional sites to answer these questions, consistent with Dipesh Chakrabarty's call to explore the conjunctural in its minute expressions – "thinking the fragment," in his words[25] – rather than the social system as totality. The sociopolitical changes since 1989 are most prominently visible at the level of political discourse within organizations tackling the sensitive issues of difference – via race, ethnicity, identity, and nationality, as is the specific case of Romani groups. Media representation about Gypsies / Roma is not only a moment of reflection and coverage of events related to these groups, but of essential active construction of talk about them.

The particular sites of investigation for the above conceptual research concerns – that is, how the institutions of the media and of international activist organizations represent and deal with Roma difference, and how and why this treatment has changed post-1989 – are Romania and the UK. These countries are selected as representative and critical cases of Western and Eastern Europe, respectively. While the UK is one of the founding members of the EU community, occupying leadership positions since its beginnings,[26] Romania is situated at the polar opposite of the European political spectrum. Romania is one of the last countries to be accepted in the EU (along with Bulgaria, on 1 January 2007), although talks of European integration were prompted by the political changes of the 1990s.

Both countries share history with Roma migrant populations, both are faced with contemporary challenges of emigration and immigration, respectively, in light of EU policy changes. In most countries where the Roma groups live, the actual population is difficult to assess. Nonetheless, recent estimates in the UK document 100,000-300,000

Gypsies and Travellers – approximately .16-.5% of the entire UK population.[27] The 2002 Romanian census identifies over 530,000 Roma, representing approximately 2.4% of the entire population.[28] Both countries are challenged by integration projects regarding school and health education, housing, political and civic participation, crime and poverty, and social interactions between the Roma and non-Roma communities. The UK is also faced with assessing nomadism and finding solutions for the tensions between the dominant, settled communities and the Gypsy Travellers.[29]

Within these countries, as a first critical locus where public debate intersects with political and social discourses, media "talk" about Gypsies / Roma has central prominence in the "European" social construction and imagination. As a tool of social imagination of otherness, media are the site that socializes audiences with unknown cultures.[30] In their turn, audiences rely on journalists as trusted professionals to translate real-world events in the interest of the public, making issues relevant to their every day existence, as well as comprehensible and interesting.[31] News stories have come to be not just a collection of events, but an indication of "whether what happened meant something and, if so, what," write Betty Houchin Winfield and colleagues.[32] Roger Fowler treats newspaper content as ideas, beliefs, values, theories, propositions, and, in the broader sense, as ideology.[33] Through their interpretive and gatekeeping powers, newspapers, as the oldest form of mass communication, are generally perceived by the public at large as the voice of legitimacy and authority. Yet the voice of the press is a selective one, incorporating selection, emphasis,[34] and transformation[35] of the perceived events into deliverable media content. In this process, the ideological standpoint – especially regarding sensitive and / or taboo issues, as is Gypsy / Roma-related

coverage[36] – discursively shapes and constructs the truth of the reported events. Scholars of communication, linguistics, political science, and sociology have come to consider discourse – and communication texts as elements of discourse – constructed knowledge that is far from a neutral collection of facts and events. In Fowler's words, for example, "news is a *practice*: a discourse which, far from neutrally reflecting social reality and empirical facts, intervenes in … the 'social construction of reality' … without [being] a conspiracy."[37] Similarly, David Wilson draws on Jean François Lyotard when describing discourse as a "knowledge-ensnaring cage."[38]

In this vein, media coverage arguably had particular agency in the 1997-1998 refugee panics – when hundreds of Roma emigrated from Central and East European countries, including Romania, to Britain (and Canada) – both as catalyst for migration (through favorable media reports about integrated Romani communities) and as public forum throughout the crises.[39] Thus, for the purpose of research, social constructions must be explored via media coverage and talk.

The second crucial site of investigation are reports and publications of European transnational NGOs directly concerned with, and active on, Roma issues in light of political changes triggered by the integration policy of the European Union. Such NGOs are the Project on Ethnic Relations, the European Roma Information Office, the European Roma Rights Center (that has consultative status with the EU), the European Roma and Travellers Forum (in partnership agreement with the Council of Europe), and the European Committee on Romani Emancipation (formed under the EU, with equal status in all EU countries). The selection criteria for these NGOs are (1) the degree of influence and recognition in the European space, as well as (2) having an explicit

agenda to work with Roma issues (rather than the rights of minorities in general). These NGOs collectively attempt to represent, "give voice" and stand guard to, human and Gypsy rights in the European continent (in EU member-states or otherwise). Importantly for the explanatory purposes of this dissertation, these NGOs have started forming in relatively recent years, coinciding with EU attempts at formulating human rights regulations regarding national political treatments of Romani groups. Investigation of reports and publications put forth by these NGOs is necessary for this reason, in order to seek out and expose the relationships between human rights policies (as put forth by the EU super-body), (Romanian and British) governmental policies, and international Roma activism. This institutional site (pieced from the workings of each NGO, seen in itself and in conjunction with the others) and that of press discourse provide insights into the workings of European discourses about Gypsies / Roma. The methodological task is to uncover the ideological underpinnings of these discursive loci, as argued above.

Positioning Gypsy / Roma Discourses in Mass Communication Research

In the last century, mass communication research emerged and became established as a discipline of the social sciences. The crossing of disciplinary boundaries, borrowing from psychological, sociological, socio-psychological, anthropological, and political sciences – to name but a few central influences – marks its history. The two paradigms that have influenced the study of the media belong to the social scientific tradition, on the one hand – a "transmission" model, as named by James W. Carey[40] – distinguished from the humanistic tradition, what some call the

"culturalist" approach,[41] on the other hand. Carey highlights the ritualistic aspects of communication of the latter, wherein communication and culture create meaning rather than transmitting and imparting information. They are *social processes*, collective expressions and representations of the system of beliefs and traditions of the members of that society. Some scholars, especially those rooted in a British culturalist tradition, such as Stuart Hall, Peter Golding and Graham Murdock, focus on the critical and cultural approach to (mass) communication,[42] which tackles questions of discourse and ideology, hegemony and power (defined below).

This dissertation draws especially on the culturalist view of communication. It is assumed here that "meaning is variable and depends crucially on the contexts"[43] in which it is created and circulated. Ideology is here used in the tradition of cultural studies (and less in its Marxist definition) and is defined as a "function of the discourse and of the logic of social processes, rather than an intention of the agent."[44] That is, ideology refers to the ways of talking and their inter-connections in particular socio-historical contexts. *Systems of meaning* – that is, ideologies – are not disconnected from their historical and social surroundings, shows Hall.[45] Rather, people make sense of their world within pre-established sets of rules, norms, roles, and traditions – within mainstream ideologies, that is. Critics of Marxism have often interpreted such an approach to culture and communication as deterministic, although later readers of Marx view this interpretation as a misreading and false separation between the material and the immaterial (such as consciousness and meaning-making) aspects of life.[46] Hall re-articulates the relationship between ideology and culture as fluid, in which ideology is the realm of the lived and is visible and manifest, because it represents the obvious

formulation of beliefs. What is hidden, Hall argues, is the realm of the unconscious, the common sense – defined as the "consensual wisdoms … the spontaneously available, thoroughly recognizable, widely shared, taken for granted" aspect of one's culture.[47]

Further developing the concept of ideology, Antonio Gramsci reframes it in the arena of the practical and the structural.[48] In this sense, ideology becomes the system of beliefs, whereas hegemony – and counter-hegemony – is the mechanism by which ideologies are kept in place, via domination or consent.[49] While readers of Gramsci disagree on the latter's specific use of hegemony – sometimes taken to mean consent alone and other times the organization of coercion and consent – cultural studies scholars have most often appropriated the concept to draw attention to the non-coercive aspects of hegemony, those that operate at the level of the unconscious.[50] The ideological role of the media is thus to hegemonically emphasize certain systems of truth and knowledge while concealing others, classifying the world through a construction of particular versions of reality – and not others. In doing so, the media ideologically maintain a status quo and reproduce existent structures of domination.[51] Michel Foucault's conception of power – and power / knowledge[52] – is also useful in the analysis of media hegemony. Foucault conceives of systems of knowledge in the service of power as relations and interdependencies, systems of (tacit or spoken) agreements and influences – rather than causal influences, domination and subservience.[53] In Foucault's terms, power – and thus the role of hegemonic discourses – is

> … the multiplicity of force relations … which constitute their own organization; … the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; … the support which these force

> relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, … the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies.[54]

Gramsci's hegemony and Foucault's power, even though conceptualized within different approaches to the study of human existence, agree on the inherent fragility of, and difficulty of maintaining, the status quo – thus the permanent struggle to preserve certain ways of seeing the world.

As the basis of communicating public discourses, language is the place where difference is expressed and (re)produced. Language produces knowledge by giving meaning to "both material objects and social practices,"[55] and herein lies its power.[56] As a social product, media are the vehicle for representational practices and thus for imagery of otherness. It is in the mediated "talk and text"[57] that identities and their social and cultural meanings are played out. Whether by making issues salient, or by selection and emphasis of certain beliefs,[58] media "delegitimate alternative constructions and assist in maintaining a dominant discourse," writes Giovanna Dell'Orto.[59] Consensus on a dominant perspective is created by "colonization of common-sense language (such as, 'We all know …') [which] naturalizes the dominant definitions of the world and … actively contributes to the continuing dominance of those definitions," writes Karmen Erjavec.[60] Foucault and Wilson further write that alternatives are made to fit the mainstream – or they are "purged" from "reality" so that preferred discourses appear logical, rational, and normal.

A note of caution is necessary when using the concept of ideology to explain communication texts and their role in global situations. Communication and mass

communication have been conceived and analyzed either in their watchdog role (in the models of public journalism and social responsibility of the press) or as government tools to legitimate the hegemony of the dominant group (in the tradition of Marxist base-superpower structure). Relevant to the point of this dissertation is an approach to communication that combines the two models, in which communication is a site of struggle over definitions of "real" and "reality" that shape common-sense. A point of common scholarly concern for both disciplines of mass communication and international relations, communication is here assumed to be a perpetual site for power struggles and negotiation across national and cultural borders.[61] In other words, press and NGO texts are critical discursive communication tools that, far from being neutral and objective conveyers of meaning about what "Gypsy" and "Roma" mean, possibly "fix" identities and knowledge about Gypsy-ness / Roma-ness.

Communication scholars (and especially scholars of media studies) as well as activist groups have periodically raised critiques against journalistic practices that do not treat sensitive issues – such as, race, gender, class, and social practices of discrimination based on these constructs – comprehensively enough.[62] This critique is especially powerful in the context that media have the privileged role of introducing unknown cultures to one another, and – through this function – of constructing versions and stories of the world for society at large.[63] The theory of social responsibility of the press should be sufficient reason for in-depth and consistent coverage of minority groups, exposed and contextualized as systemic problems (as are those of housing, education, and employment). Old and recent media practices and values favor news

about conflicts and lighter, soft news, however, despite criticism and calls for causal explanations and inclusion of alternative perspectives.[64]

An important aspect of the critique to mass communication content, and to news in particular, refers to the absence and need of substantial inclusion of excluded groups into mainstream media coverage. Scholars, such as, Tony Bennett, Graeme Burton, and Karmen Erjavec, show how media ideologically construct reality for their audiences, by slicing the world into good / bad, normal/deviant, and insider / outsider. As a group perpetually constructed as the deviant *other*, the Roma have suffered from the same discrimination in media discourses as in social interactions. Deviance, however, is not an inherent property; rather, it is, in Bennett's words,

> a label which is attached, via a series of complex social processes, to those types of behaviour which transgress either legally codified rules or normatively enshrined codes of behaviour. It is thus … a term whose use reflects the relative power of certain social groups to impose the label – and, of course, the punitive practices of the legal and penal systems – on those whose behaviour is incompatible with the socially dominant concepts of legality and normality which are ideologically buttressed and sustained by those groups.[65]

Bennett further exemplifies his understanding of deviance with the social construction of Jews during the Holocaust – and thus of Gypsies, too, who were victims of ethnic cleansing and genocide together with Jews. This social construction, however, encompassed the institutional sites of the media *alongside* those of political and economic power and social strata themselves.[66] Media discourses must be seen in conjunction with political discourses, as social sites that depend on each other in a symbiotic relationship – one that is "collusive," moreover, says Burton.[67]

As discussed in Chapter Three, studies of media coverage of Gypsies / Roma – although not a satisfactorily substantial resource – document that stories about this

minority are sensational, exaggerated, and imbued with stereotypes (identifying the ethnicity of perpetrators or suspects in crime-related news, for instance). Such blatant reinforcement of othering while ignoring alternative aspects of Romani life culminates in unambiguous observations about media coverage – as is, for instance, the one offered by a delegate of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) that "anti-Roma violence was the result of racial discrimination in the media, which then became institutionalised in people's minds."[68] In this context, attention to, and study of, media representation of the Roma in the European space seems urgent. A literature review of media coverage and representation of Gypsies / Roma is included in Chapter Three.

It must be noted that it is not the purpose here to suggest a direct causal relationship between press coverage or NGO communication about Gypsies / Roma and foreign policy. Rather, the point of analysis is to contextualize historical and cultural developments around Romani groups and issues and to highlight the political projects such developments are part of. Press coverage and NGO talk about Gypsies / Roma are parts of a larger whole, yet they are *critical* parts in the social understanding of Gypsy-ness / Roma-ness and Gypsy / Roma difference. Relevant for the point of this dissertation, knowledge about Gypsies / Roma infiltrates folk wisdom and common sense, which is assumed to play a crucial part in the shaping of political discourse and legislature.

Gypsies / Roma in Historical Context

Various discourses in different cultures, including scholarly writing, use different definitions and labels for the Roma – some of which with locally constructed derogatory connotations. In regards to what to call the Roma, scholars record different popular labels, such as Rom, Romany, Gypsy, and Traveller.[69] Others break down the terminology based on individual groups.[70] For example, among the British group known as Gypsy-Travellers are the English Romanichels, the Welsh kale, the Scottish Travellers (Nawken), and the Irish Travellers (Minceir). Angus Bancroft identifies the Roma as the Gypsies of Continental Europe, including the groups of Roma, Sinti and others.[71] Alaina Lemon, for instance, explains her preference for the terms Roma (plural) – with its Romni, the feminine singular, Rom, the masculine singular, and Romani, the adjective – as a group identifier used by Gypsies themselves in post-Communist societies. For Lemon, Roma connotes the culture as a whole while Gypsy reflects stereotypy.[72]

Paloma Gay Y Blasco argues that the European NGO activist approach, which celebrates and pushes for the politically correct term "Roma," draws on dominant ideology and discourses that represent the ethnic groups as one culture. To Blasco, this discursive (and thus political) gesture glances over group and tribe differences.[73] Lemon's analysis itself finds that the Roma see themselves as many things simultaneously – for instance, Roma, Russian, Soviet, "black" (in Lemon's specific analytical focus). Blasco critiques positions that claim that Roma can refer to, and should encompass, the Gypsy culture *as a whole* as problematic strategies of homogenizing or "lumping," and ultimately as a political tactic – as Lemon herself

recognizes. As Chapter Three explains, this project uses both terms ("Roma" in Lemon's example and "Gypsy" to suggest the use of difference) in an effort to be mindful of the implications of each of the two terms current in contemporary European vocabulary.

In spite of the disputes over label choices, most scholars of Roma cultures recognize the existence of derogatory terminology coined in various societies for the groups. In England, "pikeys" is often used. The more familiar European "tsygane" (with its German form of "Zigeuner," the Hungarian "Cigany," the French "tsigane," or the Romanian "țigan") comes from the Greek "atsinganoi" – a derivation from the name of a heretic sect to which the "Gypsies" might have been likened. Especially in Eastern Europe, "tsygane" and its linguistic versions have, however, much stronger derogatory meanings than the English term "Gypsy" – which some even think to be romantic.[74] In the 15th century, on the groups' migration path from Northern India to the European continent through Egypt, the term "Gypsy" was coined as a derivation from "Egyptians." This label is as unsuitable as "tsygane" because it signifies ignorance of the specific cultural history of the Roma.

Rather than insisting on particular terminologies and group names, this dissertation stresses the prevalence of similar social practices of discrimination – institutional representations including name-calling and history-writing – that cross national and cultural boundaries. Drawing on Gramsci, as interpreted by Hall and Gillian Patricia Hart, the conjunctural social construction of Gypsies / Roma – that is, attending to "how diverse forces come together in particular ways to create a new political terrain"[75] – as they are constructed and imagined, must be placed into its larger

historical, social, and global context at the same time. This research rests on the assumption that the discourse of otherness in its various embodiments crosses arbitrary national boundaries although local differences may exist.

In defining the Gypsy / Roma, scholarly and activist representations attempt a "racialization" and "ethnicization" of the Gypsy other through very specific descriptions and identifiers. Scholars such as Colin Clark, Jean-Pierre Liegeois and Nicolae Gheorghe define "Gypsy" to be the "ethnic groups formed by the dispersal of commercial, nomadic and other groups from within India from the tenth century, and their mixing with European and other groups during their diaspora."[76] Other authors describe Gypsies to be "dark-skinned Romany-speaking nomads of Hindu origin" – a definition that glances over the facts that not all Roma are dark-skinned, nor do all Roma speak Romany.[77] Conversely, the "Roma" signify:

> A broad term used in various ways, to signify: (a) Those ethnic groups (e.g., Kalderash, Lovari etc.) who speak the "Vlach", "Xoraxane" or "Rom" varieties of the Romani language. (b) Any person identified by others as "Tsigane" in Central and Eastern Europe and Turkey, plus those outside the region of East European extraction. (c) Romani people in general.[78]

In other words, "Gypsy" to these authors identifies the original migrant, whereas "Roma" recalls contemporary ethnic and racial constructions. Culturally, Gypsies / Roma are often described as patriarchal families living in tribes or clans – but they are "never a nation."[79] British legislation since the 1968 Caravan Sites Act defines Gypsies to be "persons of nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin, but does not include members of an organised group of showmen, or of persons engaged in travelling circuses, travelling together as such"; since the late 1970s, however, self-ascription is more significant than a general definition.[80]

Scholars of Romani studies identify the origin of the Roma and their migration as Northern India.[81] This migrant and linguistic affiliation leads many historians to trace, and to attempt to explain, the uniqueness and separateness of Romani traditions and practices by connection with Indic origins.[82] Yet this association, while well intended for explanatory purposes, risks restricting Romani groups to that of *a* culture – a *homogeneous* culture, moreover.[83] Numerous different groups of Gypsies / Roma exist, partly due to living in a variety of established nation-states, from Russia and Eastern Europe, to Western Europe and North America, and partly due to various forms of local adaptation. The attempt to isolate Northern Indic origins as *the origins* of the Roma and thus the creation of "an ethnic whole … meets sentimental and emotional needs connected to notions of belonging," Belton shows, that contribute to the "marketing of Gypsies" as ethnically and racially different – the different other.[84]

The European migration narrative places the Roma in European locations since the 14th and 15th centuries. The economic developments of the time towards agrarian capitalism contributed to a spread of homelessness and begging, leading to some of the first legislative actions against the Roma, who risked being "tortured, flogged, branded, … banished," and punished with death once caught. Margaret Brearley (2001) argues that this early discrimination originated from the kings and religious authorities rather than from common folk, who appreciated Romani skills, crafts, and services.[85] As Enlightenment concepts spread, country leaders started integration and assimilation projects, accompanied by attempts at eradicating Gypsy otherness – that is, their language and identity.

With the rise, however, of Aryan notions of racial purity, Gypsies were an easy target of the Holocaust, especially given the lack of community organization into political (or politicized) minorities. The Holocaust led to the murder of between 200,000 and 1,500,000 Roma in Nazi extermination camps.[86] The European Communist regimes further enforced Gypsy / Roma as a non-identity, banning Romany languages and forbidding nomadism – denials that brought nonetheless the benefits of some security, such as some health care, education, housing and some employment. Acts in the years after 1989, by contrast, removed this security, placing the Roma in conditions of "unprecedented financial insecurity, food shortages, and unemployment" connected to "large-scale crime, corruption, and fraud."[87]

The way in which difference as otherness is constructed in the media, or in the public discourse (e.g., via policy), is intimately tied to the cultural context. The need to subjugate *the other* discursively or practically arises from a need to control the unknowable, the different, *the other* within,[88] and is particularly imperative in contexts of living in intimacy – that is, in physical closeness. Compared to other regions of the world, the European Roma are "a much larger, much more visibly impoverished minority."[89] It is in Europe where the most overt and covert stereotyping and discriminatory practices are in place.[90] Michael Stewart explains this continued discrimination by emphasizing the close relationship between Roma and non-Roma. In this author's words, "the Gypsies are a part of ourselves, a part that we have difficulty acknowledging."[91] At the same time, the continued oppression of Roma is unnoticed by non-Roma who assume their privilege "on merit," and who are oblivious to racism and discrimination against Roma.[92] Within Europe, Brearley documents racism,

discrimination and hate crimes in Western Europe in recent decades. In Eastern Europe, the Roma live in much harsher conditions, marked by institutionalized poverty, stigma, stereotyping (as "blacks" or mentally handicapped), and low life expectancy.[93] It is also the case that, in Eastern Europe, Romani groups make up an intrinsic part of the local social fabric as a sizeable minority.[94] Arguably, it is living in proximity that forces the construction of difference in place, making it more imperative and urgent. Ironically, Western discourses about Eastern Europeans use the more overt forms of racism and discrimination in the countries of the former Eastern Block as justification for further constructing Eastern Europeans as backward and less civilized. Bauman uses the law of optical perspective to explain the process of othering and living in proximity; the closer difference is to the eye, the more it overwhelms the vision; the larger the physical distance, the more the moral responsibility for the other diminishes.[95] As a result, Bancroft suggests that, "Western European nations use evidence of racism in Central and Eastern Europe to 'orientalize' racism, in an analogous manner to the way Roma and Gypsy-Travellers are orientalized."[96]

In recent decades, focus on the Roma has surfaced as a key humanitarian concern, often phrased as the "Gypsy problem," especially in light of the genocide against Romani communities in the Second World War, as well as media reports of "ethnic crime" and hate crimes especially in South-Eastern European countries.[97] In the years following the Cold War, governmental policy efforts focused on restricting population relocations among European countries, a political move with powerful effects on the Roma.[98] With increased interest in issues of human rights and population movements manifested by the EU since the 1990s, governments part of, or aspiring to

be included in, the EU have begun formulating policies and regulations about Romani groups (and minorities in general). Yet concern remains regarding the language employed in such policies (to the point of interest of this research), and more generally regarding the institutionalization of Roma issues. Nonetheless, the work of international humanitarian organizations – such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, Project on Ethnic Relations, and the European Roma Rights Centre – contributed to raising awareness of increased "ethnic crime" against groups of Roma, leading to stronger attention from the EU, the Council of Europe, the OSCE, and the United Nations. However, as some scholars show, the project of safeguarding ethnic and national minorities has led to explicit rules of selection and exclusion that continue to discriminate against the Roma.[99] Numerous activists, among them Romani studies scholar Ian Hancock,[100] have spoken about Gypsy / Roma persecution, initiating and gradually consolidating organizations, such as the International Roma Union (IRU, functioning since the 1970s towards "a cohesive political Roma identity"[101]), the European Roma Information Office (ERIO), the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), and the European Committee on Romani Emancipation.

In addition to political, legislative, and humanitarian changes, in the years since 1989, international crises have involved Roma groups. In the period of 1997-1998, following media coverage of Roma communities in Canada and the United Kingdom, hundreds of Roma migrated to these countries, giving rise to media and public discourse panics and increased racial discrimination.[102] Howard documents a rise in anti-immigration attitudes in Western Europe since the 1990s, prompted, according to this author, by increased racism and xenophobia, hostility "against foreigners, Gypsies,

Jews, asylum-seekers, and refugees," and electoral mobilization for anti-immigrant populist parties.[103]

The EU attempts at formulating a constitution applicable for all European citizens (in the years of 2002-2004) have further led to constructions of what it means to be of "European" nationality and recognized as having rights within the EU. The Roma, some non-territorial and often not associating themselves with national identities, are problematically excluded. Andrzej Mirga notes, for instance, that the drafting of the EU Constitution systematically leaves out mention of "minority protection or positive minority rights,"[104] even though candidate countries for membership in the EU are required to include and integrate Roma minorities politically, economically and socially.

Furthermore, only in recent years have former Communist countries (such as Romania and Hungary) recognized their direct involvement with the genocide against Gypsies during the Second World War. For instance, only in 2003 did the Romanian government admit that Jews and other minorities, including Roma, died in death camps between 1940 and 1945.[105] This gesture was arguably prompted by the need to be accepted in European and world organizations.[106] Different than the Holocaust, in the years since 1989, talk about Gypsies / Roma has been positioned in the forefront of public debates, largely due to the work of activist and human rights NGOs (including EU committees), thus raising humanitarian attention to the social treatment and exclusion of Roma groups – even while overt discrimination against them has continued.[107]

In conclusion, overt discrimination and exclusion have followed the Roma throughout their history and physical relocations. This research is most interested in the contemporary European manifestations of treatment of the Roma as expressed in, and contributed by, media representations and NGO reports and publications. Ethnographic scholars, however, often add that the Roma assert their difference by isolating themselves from dominant cultures, and by constructing non-Roma as different. This dual process of exclusion is further addressed in Chapter Three.

Chapter Plan

This dissertation seeks to explain the construction, development, and social treatment of Gypsy / Roma difference in Western and Eastern Europe since 1989. As institutional practices, representations cannot be abstracted from their social and historical context. What presents interest here is the precise *system of beliefs* underlying, and motivating treatment of, Gypsy / Roma difference. Chapter Two of this project offers the theoretical framework that informs the questions and analysis of this work. Chapter Three reviews the literature on writing about Gypsy / Roma groups (with focus on the European space), including stories of migration and early and contemporary media portrayals. This review of literature is positioned in the ethnic studies approach because it problematizes the conceptualization of Gypsies / Roma as racially and ethnically different than mainstream populations in the countries where they live. This Chapter also includes a contextualization of Gypsy / Roma difference through a historical and cultural critical look at the Romanian and British contexts before and after 1989, as well as a description of the rise of NGO activism.

Chapter Four delineates the methodological task of this dissertation to closely investigate the power structures guiding, and embedded in, language and communicative strategies, which are seen as hegemonic tools that reproduce and / or challenge difference. The research questions and methods used are also explicated, as well as the primary sources examined in this project. The interpretation of materials and their contextualization are presented in Chapters Five and Six. Discourses about Gypsies / Roma, emerging from press coverage in selected Romanian and British newspapers post-1989, constitute the focus of Chapter Five, whereas Chapter Six describes and explains ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma in NGO communication, in reports and publications since 1990 through 2006; significant observations about the Roma rights movement are included. Finally, Chapter Seven engages the interpretations and analysis comparatively and cross-culturally, but more importantly it offers speculations that seek to explain the discursive trends and changes documented in the project as a whole. The question of significance and further application of this research, theoretically and empirically, as well as suggestions for further analysis are also presented here.

CHAPTER TWO

Thinking and Conceiving the Gypsy / Roma: Theoretical Framework

The purpose of this research is to investigate press and NGO representation of Gypsies / Roma in order to explain the construction, development, and social treatment of difference in the European space since 1989. This research highlights the centrality of the social and political conjunctures[1] surrounding Roma issues, without which discursive representation – and their transformations – cannot be fully explained. Socially and historically positioning (press and NGO) institutional discourses about Gypsies / Roma raises contemporary issues of integration and appropriation[2] – issues that are more fully addressed in Chapter Three.

As a study of ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma, the theoretical and methodological framework is built upon Foucault's conceptualization of discourse and genealogy,[3] here reviewed, as well as the cultural studies approach to talk and text and discourse.[4] Historically explicating institutional discourses about the Roma requires investigating the power struggles and shifting hegemonic representations of Roma groups, as they intersect with ideologies about identity, ethnicity, race, gender, and class (as critical components of the concept of difference) in Western and Eastern European arenas. This dissertation does not offer historical research as a mode of inquiry. However, contextualizing the present in light of the past is imperative for understanding how constructions of Gypsies / Roma have come to be what they are. For this purpose, an explication of Gramsci's original theorization of the subaltern[5] is necessary in order to ground both postcolonial and cultural studies scholars' appropriation of the concept.

Although this dissertation is not a subaltern project in itself, this research theoretically draws on the conceptualization of the discourse of difference within subaltern studies and postcolonial theory, framed within a critical and cultural approach to mass communication. A brief discussion regarding the absence of postcolonial theory perspectives within the discipline of mass communication follows.

Discourse and Discursive Practices

The concept of discourse emerged from textual scholarship traditions in Western humanistic research[6] and continues to receive substantial attention and use in a wealth of disciplines. Most generally, discourse is an institutionalized way of talking (and thinking), composed of a system of rules, codes, and limits to communication, leading inevitably to a process of myth-making[7] that guides and constrains understanding of social phenomena.

A study of discourse entails study of language, assumed to be the primary means of inter-human exchange. Language communicates – and creates – knowledge and "truths."[8] Some scholars focus on language, verbal texts and communicated stories, in a structuralist semiological tradition, where discourse refers to the complex systems of signs that organize social thought.[9] Others emphasize socio-cognitive aspects embedded in communication.[10] As Klaus Bruhn Jensen notes, a common approach to discourse is to view text and talk as drawing on a relatively fixed repertoire of linguistic strategies.[11]

In contrast, other scholars – using post-structuralist theories and especially Foucault's contribution to the understanding of the relationships between discourses and power[12] – broaden the study of discourse to include structures and systems of

knowledge that dominate certain social and cultural groups. This approach reframes the possibilities of discourse beyond linguistic, textual and communicative restraints[13] to a relatively limited social and cultural repertoire guiding dominant views and representations of social life and events, of knowledge and truth.

Discourse is not static; it is a dynamic process of production at all levels of society,[14] a site of perpetual struggles and contradictions.[15] To Foucault, discourse is different than text alone, in that it is related to *con*text, shifting the focus from what is said, according to what formal rules, and preferred over what other possible statements[16] – towards "how *what* is said fits into a network with its own history and conditions of existence."[17] Thus, an analysis of discourse cannot be separated from questions of truth, knowledge, and power[18] or from its historical and cultural location.[19]

To Foucault, discourse is not reactive, nor is it merely descriptive; rather, it is productive. "By talking, or writing, about a particular entity it is possible to recreate it," says Joanna Richardson.[20] For this reason, discourses are politicized gestures, statements of the political projects that discourses shape, because they represent the deployment of both subjects and objects. In Michael Shapiro's reading of Foucault, discursive practices are

> … interpretations of conduct that produce and affirm actions and their concommitant subjects and objects that are institutionalized because the interpretation is oft repeated and accepted … Discursive practices … delimit the range of objects that can be identified, define the perspectives that one can legitimately regard as knowledge, and constitute certain kinds of persons as agents of knowledge, thereby establishing norms for developing conceptualizations that are used to understand the phenomena which emerge as a result of the discursive delimitation.[21]

In other words, discourses are systems of knowledge that people and institutions fit into. Discourses thus offer possibilities of communication – out of the range of rules and boundaries that they set in place in a particular historical conjuncture. "Rather than thinking of subjects using language, we can think of forms of speaking (various discursive practices) as offering places for various kinds of subjects," writes Shapiro.[22] This point is of particular interest here because it highlights the significance of investigating ways of talking in order to understand the political projects in which representations and communicative acts are engaged. Richardson, similarly, describes the cycle of representation and construction (of difference). The centrality of language to discourse ensures that the mediated "reality" becomes internalized – by speaking, writing, and reading it – as "subjective reality" and further re-produced into "objective reality" reported / constructed in public discourse.[23]

This project set out to contribute understanding about Gypsies / Roma. What do we *know* about them and how do we *know* what we *know*[24]? *Knowledge* – that is, collections of social constructions knit within dominant ideologies – must, in this sense, be problematized in order to understand its inner workings and potentialities. Similarly to Foucault's power / knowledge dynamic, Lyotard also emphasizes the faux neutrality of the concept of knowledge.[25] To this author, knowledge is produced by the use of discourse to construct "reality" and "truths."[26]

The concept of discourse fits into the framework of ideology and hegemony in that discourse is not here assumed to belong to a certain class, to come from a dominating class, to be imposed by ruling classes onto its subalterns,[27] or to be a mere reflection of the dominant ideologies. In the words of Terry Threadgold and colleagues,

"'ideology' is not 'out there,' imposed as it were from above, but rather, is part of the signification itself. Ideologies are constructed in language as contextualized social discourse."[28] The hegemonic power of discourses belonging to the ideologies of the moment comes from the impossibility of conceiving truth or reality (or what is perceived to be as such at a certain historical moment) in the absence of a vocabulary to describe that truth / reality – that is, in the absence of established ways of seeing and talking.[29] Or, in Foucaultian terminology, the cultural meaning of any event or object is determined by the system of rules in which the event or object belong. These (ideological) rules "do not regulate behavior so much as create the *possibility* of particular forms of behavior."[30] Discourses thus produce knowledge, "reality," "truths," and gain legitimacy only through their circulation in social institutions[31] and by their power over alternative ways of seeing the world. Dominant discourses articulate the cultural fabric – ideas, beliefs, fears, traditions, and goals – of the dominant class, of the mainstream, preferred "reality." Connecting the realm of the ideological with the workings of discursive practices, Ranajit Guha says – referring to his context of analysis of colonial India – that,

> A bourgeois discourse par excellence … helped the bourgeoisie to change or at least significantly to modify the world according to its class interests in the period of its ascendancy, and since then to consolidate and perpetuate its dominance. As such, this historiography may be said not only to share, but actively to propagate, all the fundamental ideas by which the bourgeoisie represents and explains the world both as it is and as it was.[32]

Guha also concludes by saying that the limitation of such bourgeois discourse is that it cannot see what is outside its own limits. Wilson reframes this limitation as a more purposeful project. This author discusses dominant discourses and their annihilation of

counter- / alternative discourses – by force / coercion or by reshaping preferred / common sense "reality" – as "symbolic cages that build bars around senses of reality, placing gazes within discrete and confining visions." This approach to discourses and ideology seems limiting, but, drawing on Foucault, Wilson explains it as a bounded relationship. While people can choose to use various discourses, they nonetheless "always submit to [their] boundedness … Discourse is thus a communicative instrument that enables but also disables. Every time we grasp the world through discourse … we gain and lose."[33]

From this intimate connection between ideologies and discourses – that is, between "reality" and ways of conceiving, talking about, and thinking, that "reality" – emerges also an epistemological and methodological difficulty. How can counter-ideologies and counter-discourses be (a) created – and (b) depicted? In Guha's words,

> … no discourse can oppose a genuinely uncompromising critique to a ruling culture so long as its ideological parameters are the same as those of that very culture. Where does then criticism come from? From outside the universe of dominance which provides the critique with its object, indeed, from another and historically antagonistic universe …[34]

If Guha – and Gramsci – settles the first question on the origins for counter-ideology occurring with the rise of a new class that speaks against the grain, Wilson emphasizes the struggle that new discourses have to undertake in order to dominate and become established. Successful discourses, to Wilson, become "reality," whereas alternative ones are popularly seen as opinions and allegations.[35]

Regarding the second aspect that Guha calls into question, the challenge for the researcher seeking to uncover counter-discourses remains on the methodological plane. First, how can resistance / counter-ideology / alternative voices be identified in

mainstream texts (as is press coverage)? And second, how can the reader know to interpret the significance of this coverage, as well as the significance of what is not covered about the Roma? In other words, how adequate are representations / interpretations of Gypsies / Roma to address questions of social construction, discrimination, or institutional discursive practices – in the context where such questions borrow from the same language and ideology as the texts investigated? This challenge borders empirical impossibility. Guha's recommendation is to seek for answers by perpetually negotiating the complexity of these questions. Chapters Four and Seven offer further suggestions.

A central influence on studies of media discourse, Norman Fairclough conceptualizes first discourse as language (seen in a certain way) and, second, how language is used as a social practice. To this author, linguistic choices express not only hegemonic, established "truths," but also identities and relationships for those involved in text production (reporters, their sources, and the reading audiences).[36] Wilson similarly suggests that the power of discourse comes from its role as mediator of "reality" for people. "Whether people know it or not, their understandings always reflect the influence of discourse," writes Wilson.[37] Discourse analysis is, to Fairclough, a perpetual interrogation of the relationships between representations, identities, and the systems of knowledge emerging from these interrelations. Language expresses embedded hierarchies and power struggles. Fairclough proposes an analysis of discourse at the levels of (a) texts, (b) discursive practices (production, distribution, and reception), and (c) socio-cultural practices (situational, institutional, and societal).[38] Even though Foucault does not expansively specify his methodological understanding

of the workings of discourse, his approach to discourse parallels Fairclough's definition of discursive practices *and* socio-cultural practices.

Two comments are needed here in regards to Fairclough's proposed discourse analysis. First, several authors further separate texts from discourses and contexts for the purpose of isolating discourse analysis from textual and linguistic analyses.[39] Discourses often find their expression in texts. Any one text, however, is not the expression of only one discourse at a time; rather, it can draw on a multitude of discourses, similar or competing, says Kress. Further, texts can only be understood in their intertextual relation[40] to other texts – relationships that give clues to the discourses they belong to, Dell'Orto shows.[41] Modeling Foucault,[42] the importance of utterance or speech, thus of communication, is that language can and should be regarded to be representation – that is, language *is* political because of how language shapes subjects and objects.[43]

A common misreading of the concept of discourse – as defined and used here – manifests itself in discourse analyses that tend to over-focus on recurring themes, patterns and rhetorical structures.[44] The details do matter, but their significance becomes apparent only when contextualized within the ideologies of the moment. Accordingly, for the purpose of the present research, the analysis moves beyond linguistic and textual choices – such as wording, order of information, selection of cited sources, etc. – to investigating the larger practices that link minute details in larger frames of social construction. The rules shaping discursive practices matter in the attempt of retrieving the political projects justifying and informing the belief system that motivates ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma. Communication therefore

expresses not only information about events, but also clues as to what is not expressed and how that is tied into relations of power. In Shapiro's words, "Language … operates with rules of exclusion, providing boundaries invested with institutional support and correlated with a variety of social, political, and administrative practices."[45]

Second, Fairclough also separates discourse from genre – where he defines genre as a set of specific conventions and texts, with their respective processes of production, distribution, and consumption. While this separation may be useful for analytical purposes, it enforces a false distinction between what is said and the context in which it is said. As Mowitt shows, discourse cannot be separated from its paradigm specifically from its institutional or disciplinary or cultural context.[46] Similarly, Bove's reading of Foucault's genealogical approach sees discourse as creation of knowledge through the interrelations between and among the objects talked about, which cannot be understood in the absence of these relationships.[47] Thus, a study of discourse – or of the multiplicity of discourses, rather, "produced by a whole series of mechanisms operating in different institutions"[48] – entails a study of institutions, disciplinary approaches, and intellectuals, and it necessarily entails contextualizing how things have come to be as they are.[49]

When using Foucault's notion of discourse in the context of difference and subaltern representation, it is important to note that Foucault's development of the concept of power / knowledge (as defined in Chapter One) defies the stark symmetrical opposition between self / other, ideology / science, master / slave etc. To Foucault, people are caught in multiple relations of power and domination.[50] Bhabha settles this analytical contradiction through attention to representation as a site that articulates

"truth" and fantasy, "true" representation and misrepresentation. The articulation, within the relation of power / knowledge, is, to Foucault, a strategic response to an urgent need in a specific historical moment.[51]

As Dell'Orto points out, the constructionist model of communication as well as Foucault's theorization of discourse both lack sufficient attention to the question of agency and subject[52] – although it can be argued that in Guha's exposition of colonial India,[53] discursive "agency" is clearly attributed to the British rule and to the Indian bourgeoisie alike, where the Indian peasant is the classic example of subject / subaltern. Outside the realm of colonialism and pertinent to patterns of contemporary global communication, media professionals also tend to criticize models that subvert journalistic values such as objectivity and social responsibility that guide, in their view, communication content.[54]

Even though an analysis of discourse moves beyond the particular (i.e., textual and linguistic choices) to the level of the general and all-encompassing (i.e., contexts and ideologies), communication analysts, such as David Domke or Janet M. Cramer, and cultural studies scholars, such as Hall, position media and communication agents within the larger frame of hegemony and ideology.[55] These authors argue that media play a central role in the process of common-sense and consensus building – that is, media play their part in the construction of hegemony through discourse. In this tradition, communication texts (be they news or reports and publications) must be seen – and therefore analyzed – as significant discursive practices given that they belong to frameworks of thinking, to the ideologies of the moment. To illustrate this point, S. Elizabeth Bird and Robert W. Dardenne write, "the totality of news as an enduring

symbolic system 'teaches' audiences more than any of its component parts, no matter whether these parts are intended to inform, irritate, or entertain."[56] Not only does this critical and cultural approach stand in contrast to Foucault's apparent neglect of media professionals and their role in ideology maintenance and construction of meaning, but it also challenges the initial Marxist-inspired top-down model of communication, as well as the social scientific transmission model of communication in which texts (i.e., messages) transmit fixed meanings.

News – and news discourses – is not an objective, exact replica of reality. Rather, it is a system of symbols and codes that translate and construct perceptions of reality according to specific agreed-upon categories (professionally termed "news values," such as sourcing, objectivity, timeliness, relevance, schedules, etc.). It shapes and reflects understandings of what is considered significant and normal in a society – thus playing a pivotal role in the production and solidification of common sense. As an established mode of communication, news actively participates in the dominant construction of reality and the dominant ideology in a particular socio-historical context. As such, news – and media communication as a whole – is a political project because it "denies any major structural discrepancies between different groups or between very different 'maps of meaning' in a society," writes Erjavec drawing on Hall.[57] Significantly, communication gestures – news and reports – about groups considered outside the norm "appear only when there is a supposition of a basic social consensus, which they threaten."[58]

Erjavec further offers an analysis of the journalistic construction of common sense in regards to the Roma minorities. She contends that mainstream press typically

reports on minorities when they confirm existing stereotypes because this positioning presents familiarity and consistency with established ways of reporting on the groups falling outside the social norm. Reporting about difference "serves to establish social, political and economic practices that preclude certain groups from material and symbolic resources," says Erjavec. What results are representations of a stable and predictable non-Roma majority contrasted to a dangerous ethnic Gypsy minority to be controlled.[59] Specific professional tools and strategies in the process of stereotype construction are

> … naming and labeling, … citing implicit and explicit prejudices[,] … denial or mitigation, … understatement of harmfulness / overstatement of non-harmfulness, rationalization of evidently intolerant attitudes, transfer of guilt, the interchanging of the victim and the protagonist[,] … denial of … discrimination[,] … selective use and misuse of information[,] … what is there, but also … what is absent, not selected and discursively repressed.[60]

Such practices of (mis)representation and avoidance of discrimination construct dominant media discourses about Gypsies / Roma as other that are practically justified with (selected and altered) "facts" about the world. The preferred meaning of news is thus ensured, argues Erjavec. The significance of such practices is that media ways of talking serve as legitimization of real-life discrimination, which in turn serves to justify discriminatory media discourses.[61]

One of the purposes of this dissertation is to describe, contextualize, and explain how discourses about Gypsies / Roma have changed in the post-1989 era. As suggested in Chapter One, discursive change is here conceived drawing on Fairclough's conceptualization. Discursive change, therefore, is assumed to arise out of social contradictions at particular historical times. Change comes to pass when societies

problematize conventions for social interactions based on contradictions originating in institutions and society as a whole. The contradictions, or dilemmas, lead to innovative and creative solutions – that is, to change. What characterizes the moment of change, Fairclough writes, is its intertextuality "and therefore historicity of text production and interpretation … Change involves forms of transgression, crossing boundaries, such as putting together existing conventions in new combinations, or drawing upon conventions in situations which usually preclude them."[62] This approach to discursive change is particularly useful for the purpose of this research, because it opens the possibility for both communication gestures that contribute to preserving traditional ways of representing the Roma, and modes of talking that seek to transform those representations. Contradictions become further naturalized as new hegemonies, and cumulatively contribute to structural changes in discourses,[63] as further discussed in Chapter Four.

Finally, the theory of discourse and the method of discourse analysis take different shapes under the pen of, and put to use by, different authors. The important contributions of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, Michel Foucault, and Edward Said are here addressed, as they significantly contribute to the methodology adopted in the present research.[64] To begin, Goldhagen's book, *Hitler's willing executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, needs mention, even though it is not a study of discourse identified as such. Similar to the point of this dissertation, Goldhagen addresses the social construction of reality and its roots in particular systems of belief in certain historical conjunctures. This author's purpose was to uncover and describe the ideologies and culture in the time of Nazi Germany that justify how ordinary Germans

became "Hitler's willing executioners." In his attempt, he recognizes the difficulty of the task, given that discourses and ideologies – for Goldhagen, the anti-Semitic belief system – are intrinsically taken for granted and commonplace, whether articulated or not. When they are not, texts often do not and cannot point to such discourses – making the task of the researching historian all the more difficult.[65]

Foucault's concept of the *episteme* captures the simultaneity of discourses. The episteme represents the aggregation of all discourses, alike or competing, that coexist at a particular historical moment in a certain cultural location. This concept is relevant for the point of this dissertation in as much as it explains why a linear analysis of discourses in time is not always necessary – or illuminating. To Foucault, a history of ideas is a collection of "epistemic breaks"[66] that mark shifts in systems of representation, which are "ultimately affected by the mechanisms that keep discourses in existence, although they rarely represent an alteration of all discursive elements."[67]

A similar point to Foucault's, Said's method of *contrapuntal reading*[68] offers a means to investigate discourses comparatively and achronologically – a significant contribution to the conceptualization of method for the present research. Borrowing from music theory, a contrapuntal reading interprets "experiences … co-existing and interacting with others" while at the same time being "discrepant, each with its particular agenda and pace of development, its own internal formations, its internal coherence and system of external relationships."[69] To Said, discourses, texts, experiences, or events can be read contrapuntally, that is "across temporal, cultural and ideological boundaries in unforeseen ways to emerge as part of a new ensemble *along with* later history and subsequent art."[70] Said attempts to explain the past by reading the

present – and this is a particular locus of concern for his critics. Nouri Gana, for example, challenges the achronology of the contrapuntal method because of its extrapolation of meanings from their historical context.[71] Said seems to suggest, nonetheless, that he is not oblivious to ideology – nor to historical conjunctures. Rather, he seeks to find the links and constraints among discourses intimately tied with each other by reason of their geographical location, historical or narrative continuity, or ideological conditioning. In the context of imperialism, a contrapuntal reading seeks expressions of both domination and resistance, "of the metropolitan history that [a text] narrates and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourses acts."[72] Discourses are part of a larger system in which histories of various spaces overlap, even though they may be different or antagonistic.[73]

In conclusion, discourse is here interpreted as ways of seeing the world, all-pervading structures of knowledge that shape and inform notions of "reality" and "truth." Texts and events do not hold meaning in themselves (a more positivist approach to meaning); rather, discourses generate common sense and can be uncovered in language, texts and contexts and the interrelations among these. Discourses change over time. Multiple discourses holding contradictory versions of "reality" can coexist in the same socio-historical space – some in support and some in opposition to the existing power structures. Although theories of discourse do not always address questions of agency, subject and object as regards discourse, scholars of subaltern and postcolonial studies often regard the subaltern as the object of discursive practices – in various contexts. An examination of the concept of the subaltern thus requires comment here.

The Gypsy Subaltern

The Subaltern in Gramsci's Project. The concept of the subaltern is a recent adoption into the postcolonial and cultural studies vocabulary, yet its origins lie in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*.[74] Within Gramsci's project, the subaltern is one actor among others – that is, the state and the intellectuals – engaged in the changing processes of hegemony and counter-hegemony. The state as central actor encompasses the political domain of government and institutions, as well as civil society, which it regulates and dominates. The state, through institutions (via dominance) and through intellectuals (via hegemony), exercises power. In Gramsci's words, "The State is the entire complex of practical and theoretical activities through which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its dominance, but manages to win the active consent over those whom it rules."[75] Gaining and maintaining consent – the crux of the hegemonic process[76] – takes place within the space of civil society, thus a space not of freedom, but of struggle. Between the private sphere of the civil society and the public, political sphere, two types of relationships exist, in a negotiated relationship with each other: (a) hegemony, as exercised by the elite class throughout society, and (b) domination and coercion of the masses, implemented via the state and the judicial system.[77]

Gramsci's conception of the elite class (always used in the singular by Gramsci) is relevant to the emergence of the concept of the subaltern. The chief purpose of the elite class is to dominate the rest of society (the subaltern classes – always in the plural) "because of the need to create the conditions most favorable to the expansion of their own class."[78] The elites depend on their capacity of social dominance, which in turn is dependent on the existence of the subaltern classes to dominate. Between the elites and

the masses are the intellectuals, a vehicle of domination for the elites, and at the same time a vehicle for the masses to resist hegemony. Gramsci conceptualizes the intellectuals in the same unstable stage of fragility and contestation as hegemony. Hierarchy entails, and cannot exist without, its hierarchical layers, and thus each layer must be understood in its web of relationships with the others. Social change demands replacing old with new layers and it is born at the moment when "the old is dying and the new cannot be born."[79]

Hall, who drew from Gramsci the concept of hegemony depending on a combination of force and consent, also wrote that a ruling class *leads* – through its intellectuals, as the Italian thinker shows – a subordinate class.[80] This lower group is to conform to the interests of the elites who exert a "total social authority"[81] over it. Nadia Urbinati interpreted Gramsci's hegemony as subordination of individuals and groups through depriving them of their individuality, power, self-reliance, and a predictable future. She argued that Gramsci wanted to "square the circle" in order to solve the conflict between coercion and consent, "instead of making those two extremes negotiating and confronting each other."[82] However, Gramsci is clear in his assertions about the dominating intentions of the elite class while allowing the intellectuals the possibility of dissent. The fragility of hegemony bears witness to the reliance on consent, and not on force. Nonetheless, Gramsci sees the subaltern classes as void of autonomy and political voice – which is a statement about the masses' powerlessness, as described by Urbinati. The great masses do participate in the hegemonic process via their "spontaneous" consent to

> … the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is "historically" caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production.[83]

The erosion of prestige and credibility, alongside education and technical-industrial civility, emerges as a key aspect of how consent fades in the process of "replacing" the traditional intellectuals (typically overlords, clerics, teachers, and civil servants) by the "new," organic intellectuals. As regards the latter, James Curran highlights the contemporary significance of media institutions that have the same social roles as the medieval church.[84] In this sense, the media – be they anchors, news writers, entertainers, or advertising professionals – are today's intellectuals.

In Gramsci's conception of the subaltern classes, traditional leaders must be "educated" – presumably, in the mainstream educational system. If participation in social life "as constructor, organizer, 'permanent persuader' and not just simple orator"[85] represents the possibility for visibility, expression, and social influence, does an emphasis on education – *as understood and structured by the elite in the mainstream educational system* – maintain the institutional focus on the elite-centered instruments? Most Roma groups, for instance, educate their young through oral traditions – a system labeled tradition rather than education. The emphasis Gramsci places on the school – an institution of the elite – seems problematic in perpetuating the hegemony of the traditional intellectuals. The struggle in Western and Eastern European countries to integrate Romani children into the school system is evidence that perhaps a transformative educative system is to be preferred – that is, a system in which diversity and self-empowerment is chosen.[86]

In sum, Gramsci conceptually positions the subaltern masses opposite the elite class and under the influence of the intellectuals. The subalterns are in a state of complete powerlessness – the Italian peasants (Gramsci's specific focus) have no political autonomy, and their relation to the upper levels of decision-making is through the rural intellectuals (such as the school teacher or the priest). To Gramsci, the only possibility for escaping subordination is through the revolutionary (organic) intellectuals. Chakrabarty writes, "Once the subaltern could imagine / think the state, he transcended, theoretically speaking, the condition of subalternity."[87] This position of incapability – unless and until the intellectuals translate reality to the subalterns – is one of the most critiqued Gramscian positions by the scholars of subaltern studies. This group of thinkers, originally from South-East Asia, appropriate and reconfigure Gramsci's subaltern, and explore the resistance of the other through searching for the voice of the subaltern.

From Gramsci's Subaltern to Subaltern Studies. Even though Gramsci did not explicitly address slavery or colonialism – that have led to concerns about racism or Eurocentrism and to Said's unveiling of the discourse of otherness[88] – Michael Burawoy shows how the Italian thinker's analysis of North and South can be taken to the analysis of the "third world" other.[89] Hall also considers Gramsci's "preoccupation with the question of regional specificity, social alliances and the social foundations of the state" as applicable concepts for today's North / South and East / West questions.[90]

South-East Asian subaltern studies emerged in the early 1980s in reaction to "a depressing half-century of decolonization," in both popular and academic discourses, and to claim that "struggles against colonialism were fought on the unseen marshes of

Western ideology."[91] Frustrated with the conceptualization of decolonization or liberation from above – in fact a modernization from above – the subaltern studies historians were led by Ranajit Guha, Gayatri C. Spivak, Partha Chatterjee, and Dipesh Chakrabarty,[92] to name but a few. These scholars appropriated Gramsci's concept of the subaltern and his argument that true resistance rests on the reorganization of the social blankets (that is, the great masses) by themselves. Instead of studying the colonizer, generally from a Western perspective, these voices call for "immersion" in the world of the colonized in order to uncover the alternative visions that have existed there all along. The initial mission of the subaltern studies was not to *give* voice to the subalterns; rather, the focus was on digging up and uncovering their resistance in the archives of the colonizer, as a counter-hegemony that has been present from the outset while its contribution silenced. Said shows how the racial classification of otherness served to constitute whiteness, both as a reality and as an idea,[93] stripping *the other* of his / her humanity, and thus of agency. The intended outcome of the research avenues opened by subaltern scholars was thus historical analyses in which the subalterns are subjects of their own histories.[94]

The subaltern studies conceptualization of the subaltern moves away from Gramsci's peasantry class in several ways. Guha's chief attempt is to regard the subaltern as *autonomous*, and to emphasize the possibility of studying the contribution of the subalterns to making history *on their own*, independent of the elite class' guidance.[95] Gramsci's peasant is not, however, an autonomous subject, but an object without political autonomy and voice, without the possibility of revolution. The scholars of subalternity rightfully question this approach, as deeply hierarchical. Are

not, then, in Gramsci's view, the organic intellectuals merely replacing the traditional intellectuals as "leaders" – that is, the hegemons – of the "backward" subalterns? Guha expropriates the concept of the (Italian) peasant to the Indian context, conceptualizing the peasant as a critical part of the project of modernity and one who is acutely aware of societal contemporary structures.[96] Whereas Gramsci positions the subalterns in the struggle for consent – at the same time as they are facilitated by the organic intellectuals – Guha and his colleagues recognize that the peasant has independent consciousness and agency. Chakrabarty also critiques Gramsci's "undemocratic" understanding of the subaltern. In his words,

> … the imagination of the state (and other forms of the whole) has to be *brought to* the subaltern classes from *outside themselves*, for they are, 'by definition,' as Gramsci put it, incapable of such imagination, being always kept divided by the ruling classes.[97]

Instead of perpetuating this conceptualization, the subaltern studies scholars conceive the subalterns as active negotiators of meaning in all historical moments of political life. In other words, the masses *do imagine* the state and the whole (regardless of whether the state acknowledges this imagination).

Relevant for the purpose of research here, questions of hegemonic representations cannot be abstracted from both their embedded ideologies and the resistance against them. The moment of conjuncture for Gramsci consists of subaltern thinking intersecting with elite ideology translated by intellectuals. To draw a parallel to the Roma problem, the intellectuals (Roma and non-Roma activists alike) leave their mark in constructing resistance to the discriminatory dominant system, by advocating and "speaking" for the illiterate Roma, at the same time as they attempt to resist

"speaking" for them. It is evident, then, that subaltern autonomy is not – and cannot – be conceived outside Gramsci's "terrain of the conjunctural." This systemic interconnection raises "conceptual difficulties," nonetheless, as one attempts "to recover consciousness and memory outside of a literate elite."[98]

Postcolonial Theory and Difference

Postcolonial literature is a relatively recent scholarly development, emerging out of the complex interaction among colonial, imperial culture and moments of indigenous, local resistance.[99] As a point of concern, postcolonial theories focus on "phenomena, and effects and affects, of colonialism that accompanied, or formed the underside of, the logic of the modern, and its varied manifestations in historical and contemporary times," write Radha S. Hegde and Raka Shome.[100] Yet, as Bill Ashcroft and colleagues show, restricting postcolonial questions to after-colonialism over-simplifies real-life experiences and conjunctures. Rather, post-colonialism should be seen as "a continuing process of resistance and reconstruction … of imperial suppressions and exchanges throughout … [the] diverse range of societies, in their institutions and their discursive practices[,] … a series of linkages and articulations without which the process cannot be properly addressed."[101]

Edward Said, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Homi Bhabha are recognized as central scholars in raising the banner of postcolonialism.[102] Said's initial project was to expose colonial discursive practices at the root of constructing Oriental difference. Robert J. C. Young suggests that Said's *Orientalism* has the following theoretical contributions: (a) It offers discourse as an ideological, alternative construction of

reality; (b) it uncovers the "complicity between politics and knowledge"; and (c) the constructed knowledge about the other has little to do with a "real" "Orient"[103] – given that "the Orient is itself an Orientalist concept."[104] Bhabha and Spivak have shifted the analytical focus from reading otherness in other, Oriental, spaces to listening to the voice of the other. Bhabha draws on psychoanalytic theory to introduce the realm of the unconscious in the analysis of the postcolonial moment.

The initial purpose of postcolonial scholarship was to expose the failings of colonial scholarship – written around Western and imperial ideology, explicitly or implicitly – and to react against the institutionalization and perpetuation of colonial discourses in modern day phenomena (for instance, in development and modernization projects). More recently, postcolonial scholars have cautioned against contemporary writing that neglects to take into account the way the past is written as strategically colonial.[105] Scholars of postcolonialism call for a serious interrogation of power struggles embedded in social constructs in their particular historical location. The present day scope of postcolonialism therefore extends well beyond any critique of colonial projects in ex-colonial societies to global developments as after-effects of empire and colonialism.[106] Such concepts as nation, migration, diaspora, first vs. third worlds, suppression, resistance, difference, ethnicity, identity, race, gender, place, subject, agency, empire and violence, to name but a few, come under the close scrutiny of the postcolonial lens.[107] Henry Schwarz shows that postcolonial scholarship is "not merely a theory of knowledge, but a 'theoretical practice,' a transformation of knowledge from static disciplinary competence to activist intervention."[108]

Hegde and Shome point out, however, that "rigorous postcolonial scholarship" cannot depart entirely from the context of colonialism, because it would lose its particular critical and contextual stance.

> Taking postcolonial theories that emerged out of a study of a particular context of modernity or a particular historical time and mechanically applying them to other contexts and times can be problematic … because this can reproduce a dangerous acontextualism that is sometimes seen in postcolonial studies (especially, scholarship that comes out of literary studies where the "text" and "narrative" of colonialism become everything while the historical context disappears in the background). Additionally, such acontextualism can flatten the story of modernities by implicitly denying any change in its relations from one time to another, from one context to another.[109]

In agreement with this point, Frederick Cooper further cautions against a generalization of "coloniality" that would risk stripping the self-other dyad of its contextual conjunctures, and would focus solely on the mutual confrontation.[110]

At the same time as recognizing this imperative, postcolonial scholarship is not limited to physical former colonies. As Belton and Charnon-Deutsch show, the colonial experience can be applied to Roma experiences.[111] The colonial narrative is one that places a certain group in an oppressed position and another group in one of dominance. Drawing on Franz Fanon,[112] Belton argues that "this relationship becomes part of the mentality of the oppressed to the extent that they are only able to perceive themselves as they are portrayed or understood to be by the oppressing group."[113] Charnon-Deutsch also emphasizes the "*internal colonization* that parallels (inter)cultural colonization"[114] in the process of constructing Gypsy difference as disease and abnormality. In Charnon-Deutsch's specific research interest, the historical moments of rising nationalism in Spain are such moments of active construction of difference, as the progress and patriotism of the dominant culture are contrasted to the backwardness of the minorities.

In contemporary Europe, EU membership and citizenship and nation-states' projects of integration arguably elicit the same mechanisms – as this research attempts to explore. At the same time as recognizing the advantages of, and necessity for, the postcolonial critical lens, Young also cautions against essentializing the concepts of "the other" (and Young's method of colonial-discourse analysis itself). In this author's words, "Can we assume that colonial discourse operates identically not only across all space but also throughout time?"[115] Young's concern is certainly of relevance to the point of this dissertation. Stories and experiences of the Roma cannot – and should not – be generalized across socio-historical contexts. The task at hand thus becomes to methodologically allow for alternative forms of "truths" while theoretically exploring moments of similarity and positioning them in their global and inter-national framework. Otherwise, "we run the risk of imposing our own categories and politics upon the past without noticing its difference, turning the otherness of the past into the sameness of the today," says Young.[116]

This social construction of the other is a dehumanizing process[117] that lies at the root of the discourse of difference that has been constructed and used to justify conflicts and wars – imperial projects to colonize, "liberation" missions in the recent past, and the present "war on terror" alike[118] – as well as discrimination, prejudice, and phobias. Critical to Gypsy / Roma-related discursive practices, otherness, writes Bhabha, is "an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity."[119] Belton substantiates this point in suggesting the centrality of colonial practices of subjugation and discrimination that become intrinsic to Gypsy / Roma identity – as perceived from within and outside the minority groups.[120]

The intellectual roots of the concept of difference can be traced, on the one hand, to Jacques Derrida's notion of différance,[121] Jacques Lacan's or Claude Lévi-Strauss' psychoanalytic approach,[122] and most famously, on the other hand, to Said's conceptualization of the other in the discourse of Orientalism.[123] Yet other scholars trace the emergence of the concept of difference even further back in time – for example, to Enlightenment concepts that underscored the envisioning of the white Western world as rational and as standard against which all other forms of difference were contrasted.[124] As Hall shows, the Enlightenment concept of the self was homogeneous, rational, and stable, and the other, by contrast, was constructed as backward and uncivilized, needing the intervention of the self.

Some scholars see difference – and stereotyping – as justifiable practices, born out of arbitrary, rudimentary categorizations that are useful for diminishing everyday uncertainty.[125] Such practices separate the *self*, the ingroup with which the individual is familiar and comfortable ("the we-group") from the outgroup that consists of the outsiders, the foreigners, *the other*.[126] The distinctions are subjective and constructed, but the created categories of *self* and *other* become, and are treated as, fixed. Difference renders the unfamiliar and the foreign as *other*, but this is not a useful representation in itself for the *other*; rather, difference is constructed to represent otherness for the *self*.[127] With this distinction are born, on the one hand, the Westerner, the powerful, the "rational, peaceful, liberal, logical, capable of holding real values, without natural suspicion," "virtuous, mature, 'normal'" *self*,[128] and, on the other hand, the Oriental, the Indian, the Native, which are conceptualized as the opposite and backward versions of the Westerner. *The other* is thus "irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, 'different,'"[129]

an object[130] – and thus disempowered – "non-white," distanced from the *self* in location, "out there," in "other worlds"[131] even if the physical distance is minimal.

The chief tools used in the construction of difference have been the suppression of communication, including interchange of ideas. The effect has been the silencing of *the other* into a non-human state that the civilized Westerner has to either rule or come to the rescue of, by deciding *the other*'s history, past, traditions, and beliefs.[132] Mechanisms of "knowing" the other – such as stereotypical knowledge, racialized theories of origin, and / or the administrative experience of colonialism – have, paradoxically, allowed an institutionalization of such knowledge about the subaltern other into "a range of political and cultural ideologies that are prejudicial, discriminatory, vestigial, archaic, 'mythical,' and, crucially, are recognized as being so," says Bhabha.[133] Embodiments of difference have been, in different social, political, and historical conjunctures, the familiar social constructs of race, gender, sexuality, class, disability, and ethnicity. Significantly, these constructs have not been used in isolation one from another. Rather, difference operates through complex discursive and intertextual associations among these constructs.[134]

"Set in motion and made meaningful through cultural practices,"[135] the constructing of difference is often framed as essential to human interaction, especially from a psychological standpoint.[136] Problematically, though, the traditions of psychology, social-psychology, and to some degree the tradition of intercultural communication teach that meaning depends on the opposition between objects, thus on distinguishing between, and categorizing, individual items, people, and constructs.[137]

These views most commonly explain stereotypes as normal and necessary to human interaction and individual categorization of incoming stimuli.

Charnon-Deutsch objects to this approach that describes "natural compulsion to estrange oneself from the other, … xenophobia and the demonizing of the other" as "universally characteristic of kinship relations," arguing that it "cannot tell us all we need to know to combat inequity and understand its structural complexities."[138] Significantly, Bhabha further shows that stereotypes are the "major discursive strategy" of colonial discourse,[139] and thus cannot be seen outside and apart from the hierarchical relations in which they are entangled. Stereotypes, according to Bhabha, impede the articulation of difference as anything other than as fixed entity. Angela McRobbie also suggests that "justifying" stereotypes in this manner allows reproduction of stereotypical – and discriminatory – practices.[140] In Bhabha's words,

> Stereotyping is not the setting up of a false image which becomes the scapegoat of discriminatory practices. It is a much more ambivalent text of projection and introjection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies, displacement, over-determination, guilt, aggressivity; the masking and splitting of 'official' and phantasmatic knowledges to construct the positionalities and oppositionalities of racist discourse.[141]

This insight is particularly useful in conceptualizing stereotypical representations, beyond their positive or negative qualities, towards an acknowledgement of the more complex mechanisms that keeps stereotypes in place and rooted in habits of othering. The continued antagonism between *self* and *other* allows for cultures to interpret, represent, and ultimately dominate and control one another.[142] Ambivalence is central to stereotyping the other, because it describes wanting one thing, at the same time as

rejecting or being repulsed by it, Young explains. The dynamic is central to the conceptualization of difference.[143]

From a Foucaultian perspective,[144] such academic "justifications" and "explanations" of stereotypes operate within larger social and historical discursive practices – ideologies, in Hall's or Raymond Williams' terms[145] – in the system in which they are constructed. It is perhaps at this precise moment that Michelle Fine's call to question the hyphen between *self* and *other* can be reiterated – where she critiques academic writing that merely reproduces the distinction between *self* and *other* without interrogating the relations of power embedded in the distinction.[146]

The concept of difference is ambivalent. Necessary in its positive outcomes of producing meaning, forming language, culture, and identities, it is simultaneously treacherous in its negative consequences of splitting between *the self* and *the other*.[147] Difference is born of a form of control of *the other* who must be dominated and isolated from *the self* – an isolation never fully achieved since difference resides within the mere constitution of *the self*.[148] This irony is apparent in colonialism, where intimate closeness arises from household management and raising the master's children by the slaves, while at the same time the colonial project is rooted in the desire to isolate and dominate the slaves. The deep consequential paradox is that *the other*, and thus difference, is necessary for *the self*, while *the self* continues to desire to eradicate it. "Diversity," writes Lévi-Strauss, "is less a function of the isolation of groups than of the relationships that unite them."[149] It can only be understood through dialogue with *the other*, as *the other* is "fundamental to the constitution of *the self*, to us as subjects."[150]

Or, in Sinéad ní Shuinéar's words, "Gaujos need Gypsies to *personify* their own faults and fears."[151]

It must be noted, nonetheless, that, as critical as this point is, the explanation of the construction of otherness – in various cultural contexts – does not adequately explain why certain groups are "chosen" to be constructed as *the other* over others (with minority status as well).[152] For instance, in Romanian medieval history, the Roma had inferior status to other migrant communities, such as the Saxons or the Szeklers.

In Bhabha's terms, in the imperial context, the colonial *other* is a mimicry of *the self*, always "almost the same, but not quite."[153] To Bhabha, "in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference … mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal."[154] The contemporary global world of post-colonial difference continues to be characterized by the "not quite / not white"[155] mimicry discourse. Applied to the Roma, the Gypsy is thus represented both as different, constructing his / her own world, and as appropriated, integrated and integrating into the non-Gypsy world that defines its difference. In Lacan's words, "the effect of mimicry is camouflage, in the strictly technical sense. It is not a question of harmonizing with the background but, against a mottled background, of being mottled."[156] In this view, the Roma must fit in with (integrate within) dominant societies, not by becoming entirely the same, but by becoming sufficiently so to dampen their *too different* traits.

Several postcolonial authors raise an epistemological critique to the theorization of the subaltern other, as done in the tradition of Guha's approach to the Indian peasant. Cooper, for example, objects to Guha's theoretical recognition of the peasant's

intellectual freedom, while maintaining the peasant in the category of the subaltern.[157] This paradox constitutes a point of theoretical departure for postcolonial theorists who recognize "agency" (that is, intellectual freedom and resistance) and hegemonic ideological reproduction of subalternity at the same time. Mary Louise Pratt also questions defining the other "from the standpoint of dominance, subordinated subjects … wholly defined by their subordination, … monopolized by their relation to the dominant."[158] The argument is that this theorization traps the dominated other conceptually into a fixed category – in as much as the context of colonialism itself does – that cannot be known historically or relationally. Yet the construct of an *other* in itself *is* about subordination, colonization, power, and ultimately hierarchy. Perhaps the question of representation and Pratt's point can be reframed, as in Cooper's case, to a specific context. And therefore, the methodological effort should be to allow space for discourses to speak outside the otherness box. The Gypsy / Roma is not wholly defined by his / her subordination – and this dissertation seeks to explore the degree of visibility and location of those moments.

For some scholars, there are no such moments – the heritage of colonialism has rendered them unattainable. In Radhakrishnan's words, "the other is *there*, irreducibly, historically there, while at the same time the other is not knowable to us and by us."[159] Spivak, similarly, describes the possibility of a community where difference no longer fulfills a hegemonic function, yet she notes the impossibility of the project of conceiving the community without embedding alterity into it.[160] In actual fact, the intersection of the need to conceptualize the subaltern as agent, with the impossibility of isolating the other from the self precisely constructs the moment of hegemony. The

struggle between these two aspects reflects, and is part of, the process of contradicting, while creating, consent; of social stability, while resisting it; of hegemony, while creating counter-hegemony. Chapter Seven, in response to the evidence gathered in Chapters Five and Six, further develops this struggle.

Postcolonialism, Communication, and Mass Communication

From a cultural perspective, communication and postcolonialism scholars are concerned with similar issues – power relations, their creation, maintenance, transformation, and establishment as dominant ideology. As discussed above, postcolonial and subaltern studies scholars centrally focus on uncovering the (colonial and post-colonial) mechanisms of constructing difference, as it is engaged in contemporary hierarchies of power. Communication scholars – particularly cultural studies authors – suggest that media texts play a significant part in the construction and negotiation of common sense as regards difference (in its particular constructs, such as race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, etc.). Therefore, mass communication analyses can assist in the study of the postcolonial – globalizing – world by providing attention to the specific textual and discursive tools that (re)produce difference. And vice versa, postcolonial work can enrich media studies by problematizing and contextualizing social constructs often taken as such in the mass communication discipline, as shown below.

Even while postcolonial approaches and theories receive substantial attention and use in disciplines like English, anthropology, literary studies, history and women's studies,[161] communication studies, journalism and mass communication research have

been slow to recognize the intellectual developments introduced by postcolonial scholarship and analysis. To name but a few, authors such as Raka Shome, Radha S. Hegde, Vamsee Juluri, or more recently Radhika Parameswaran have begun promoting "the transformative possibilities that postcolonial theories and approaches offer."[162] As Lawrence Grossberg argues, the communication scholar must position communication and mass communication processes in their historical context, as well as investigate them among the multiple sites where power and ideology are enforced and challenged.[163] Exploring "the particular involvements and investments of communication in real historical social formations"[164] becomes not only imperative, but an unavoidable task of postcolonial contextualization.

In his postcolonial analysis of nationality, Stephen B. Crofts Wiley remarks that media theory and mass communication research often take for granted problematic concepts (one of which is nationality, in Wiley's example) "as ontological grounding."[165] This assumption allows overlooking the historical development of such concepts and their reliance on hegemonic processes, says Wiley. Mass communications as a discipline can no longer avoid tackling and reconfiguring the traditional understanding of the concepts of stereotype and difference, because they are deeply embedded in issues of media representation. As Chris Barker, Hall, McRobbie, David J. Scholle (1988), and John B. Thompson show,[166] media play a hegemonic role in creating ways of seeing and in legitimating those ways as dominant, giving "voice to some discursive positions while silencing others."[167]

In modern times, means of mass communication have been studied as having the role of creating, maintaining, challenging, and changing the talk of the time.[168] Yet

media are one institution of many discursive sites in a social system (as further discussed in the following subchapter). Cultural studies scholarship emphasizes the interrelations between and among these various sites, highlighting the need for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of media.[169] Media representation is an important institutional site that continues to portray difference as either a natural site of stereotyping (in a psychological or social-psychological tradition, as shown above) or as an anomaly that must be integrated into normalcy. In exploring mediated representations of difference, one must comprehensively place images of otherness into their specific historical, political, economic, and social contexts, as well as interrogate them in their hierarchical discriminatory legacy. A deconstructive stance[170] towards communication (media and NGO) constructs allows a critical attitude towards discursive practices.[171] At the same time, "postcolonial theories of representation empower media critics to disrupt and denaturalize the subtle hegemony of the discursive myths that constitute the logic of globalization," says Parameswaran.[172] Postcolonial theory thus relocates problematic concepts and projects within geopolitical structures that shape those very concepts.[173] To the point of this dissertation, investigating and explaining institutional press and NGO discourses about the Gypsy / Roma is a study of conjunctures, as argued above[174] – delving into (and deconstructing) intersecting newspaper coverage, activist movements, politico-economic developments, socio-cultural traditions, "talk" on immigration, health, education, and religious beliefs and behavior. All these sites are further complicated by Europe's colonial past,[175] as well by constructs such as race, gender, disability, nationality, and citizenship.

Discourses about Gypsies / Roma cannot be investigated by approaching the groups as a monolithic "ethnic," "racial," or "minority" group, even though the literature is divided on this matter. As a nodal point around which identities are fixed[176] and social relations are shaped, race is a key dimension of difference,[177] as are gender, sexuality, disability, or class.[178] As a mechanism of oppression, the discourse of difference crucially binds together these various forms of difference to inform "racial and cultural hierarchization," argues Bhabha.[179] Particular to the Roma, as shown in Chapter Three, discourses combine issues of ethnicity, race, gender, class (economic and political interests), nationality and citizenship – all embodiments of difference in how these concepts have been deployed to discriminate against, and objectify, Roma peoples. The advantage of the postcolonial theoretical approach for studying the struggles of both representing and negotiating meanings of "Gypsy-ness" and "Roma-ness" is that these struggles are exposed as "multiple realities collapsing over time and space dimensions."[180] Questions of subaltern representation – who can speak and who can represent, with what hierarchical consequences – may never have been more necessary.

Finally, both as a call for re-configuring media research about minority groups, and as a reflective stance as regards colonial discourse, Bhabha suggests that "the point of intervention should shift from the ready recognition of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the *process of subjectification* made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse."[181] This remark is especially significant in the context of disrupting existing research about the Roma that tends to over-emphasize stereotypical representation.[182] Applying the vocabulary of postcolonial critique and

deconstruction to media and NGO representations allows "disrupt[ing] the hegemony of dominant discourses that shape conversations over key cultural and economic developments in the global public sphere."[183] As suggested, the dominant discourses about the minority groups are infused with focus on stereotypes, criminality, bohemian or nomadic imagery – representations that continue to reproduce backwardness and difference, in the guise of projects of integration and assimilation. In Parameswaran's words, "traditional approaches based in the identification of blatantly sexist and racist stereotypes in media content" that characterize scholarship about the Roma "may not be equipped to deconstruct the subtle mechanisms of Othering that structure the neocolonial discursive regimes of globalization."[184]

Drawing on Said,[185] Bhabha sees discursive practices as the means of constructing the other "as a social reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible." This process "employs a system of representation, a regime of truth, that is structurally similar to realism."[186] Thus, the social construction of the Oriental, different other that is the Gypsy rests on media representations, as they fit into larger discursive practices that establish certain ways of defining "Gypsy" and the reality of "being a Gypsy" in society. It is as impossible as it is imperative to attempt to escape the constructed regimes of truth, the knowledge paradigms guiding the representation of Gypsies / Roma – and thus the paradox of the postcolonial moment. Theoretically and methodologically, this dissertation attempts to walk the fine line between exposing the established ideological ways of talking about Gypsies and actively seeking to evade them while being open to the possibilities of discursive transformations.

To summarize this chapter, this dissertation is a synthesis of (international) mass communication, postcolonial and subaltern studies, as they intersect with Gypsy studies. The guiding questions posed in the course of this project (as outlined in Chapter Four) are framed in a critical and cultural studies approach, which entails explanation and interpretation of communicative gestures, and especially a concern for the power relations guiding, and embedded in, communication. Ultimately, this dissertation hopes to contribute to the current understanding within the mass communication discipline regarding the role media and NGOs play in the maintenance and transformation of difference as a social construct. Specifically, this work builds on recent approaches to (Gypsy / Roma) representation that view it as a moment of intersecting institutional influences – social, communicative, political, economic, and cultural. This study is not a historical analysis per se. Nor does it favor a political economy perspective alone. This research starts from the Foucaultian-inspired premise that knowledge about Gypsies / Roma is constructed by public discourse – which is a political project. This study reveals how public talk about, and treatment of, Gypsy / Roma communities come to be what they are in contemporary Western and Eastern Europe. It is here argued that a complex machinery of discourses, interlocked in a politics of reality-making, is at work across cultural and national boundaries. Before the contemporary moment, however, historically contextualizing Gypsy / Roma histories, stories, and peoples must be first done.

CHAPTER THREE

How Do We Know What We Know about the Gypsies / Roma?

A Review of the Literature

Telling the story of the origins, language, travels, lifestyles, traditions, and practices of Gypsy groups around the world has its complications due to several reasons. First, historical writing about Roma is generally done by non-Roma writers. The school of postcolonial studies cautions against such writing due to the various objectives and motivations that might lie behind this type of historical records – an analytical concern explored below. Second, representations of Gypsies / Roma vary greatly from Eastern and Western European to North American contexts, but also within local cultures, in political and economic discourse, as well as in popular culture artifacts. And third – and perhaps the most unknown fact about Roma groups in non-Roma folk wisdom – populations of Roma worldwide do not share the same language, traditions, and practices, even within consanguineous groups.[1] In other words – and in spite recent attempts at homogenization into one "Gypsy people" – Roma minority groups are as diverse as any other culture from another. Gypsy studies have gradually embraced this diversity. If early writings describe, for instance, North American Gypsy groups as a homogeneous community,[2] recent analysis sees American Gypsies as complex historically, socially and economically as in Europe. Belton clarifies, however, that American Gypsies' story is often distorted and incomplete because of lack of contextualization.[3]

With that in mind, the story of migration and representation told here draws on a variety of previous writing about Roma in order to show this diversity; at the same time,

it questions the validity of some of the analysis and interpretation previously done. The focus of this chapter is to paint a larger picture, within which sit the more specific stories of Gypsies / Roma in Great Britain and in Romania. The narrative of Roma history and representation is not meant to be a complete description of migration; nor is it intended to exhaustively describe all Roma groups worldwide or to offer a comprehensive list of Gypsy imagery; rather, the focus is on what is written about migration, and how representations are read and re-worked into writing about Gypsies / Roma.

Chapter One included a brief discussion of terminology. As justified there, this dissertation leans towards the term "Roma" – rather than "Gypsy" to refer to the groups living across Europe (and throughout the rest of the world). Yet at the same time, this research is mindful of the implications of homogenization that "Roma" conveys.[4] Romanian scholar Viorel Achim is one of the few using the term "Roma" while recognizing the diversity of ethnic groups this term denotes.[5] The High Commissioner on National Minorities – of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) – testified in the early 2000s to the variety among Gypsy / Roma groups, acknowledging that Roma live in exceptionally heterogeneous communities that should be seen in their own specific circumstances.[6] To lump Gypsy groups into one people (or, more problematically, into one nation) risks glossing over the historical discrimination conducted against "Gypsies," minimizing that experience, and further neglecting the social construction and political use of Gypsy difference. It ignores what the minorities themselves choose to consider themselves to be. Some ethnographic scholars respect group differences and allow for local specificity of the various groups.[7] However, it is more common for scholarly work to try to isolate "fairly clean-cut and generally accepted

criteria" to determine "who is and who is not a Gypsy"[8] (such as, in Werner Cohn's take, the ethic of business, disregard for authority, and a strong sense of integrity[9]). Identifying such norms and suggesting that they allow for a "sacred separation" between the Gypsies and the rest of the world, as they reject "our everyday world and the values of our culture"[10] – where "our" evidently signifies the non-Gypsy – is problematic because of its deterministic approach reminding of colonial practices of delimiting difference.[11]

Responding to an inquiry about work practices and terminology in Romania, in an e-mail message to the author, the Interim Head of the Department of Public Health of a northern county said that, in her experience working with health education projects with minority women, "Roma" is mostly used in legislation and official conversations. The mediators working directly with Roma refer to them as "Gypsies" (that is, "țigani"). She also said that the intellectuals call themselves "Roma."[12] This separation of terms may be indicative both of current trends towards political correctness and of persistent social practices to talk to "Gypsies." Simultaneously, the health mediators are Roma women themselves.[13] Their choice of terminology is more interesting as a possible testimony of internalized othering.

That said, the primary point here is not to depict or defend the variety of Gypsy / Roma communities. This dissertation, instead, is concerned with "the problem of the Roma" / "the Gypsy problem" – which is a politicized project of lumping all into one. In referring to the "Roma," the writing invokes here the issues and implications embedded in the process of socially constructing one minority group (a project of the Roma rights activism and of the international and national governments as well). Similarly, in using "Gypsy," this dissertation makes reference to the processes of othering sustaining the

term “Gypsy” in the European imaginary. Logistically moreover, telling stories of migration necessitates a slight generalization simply because of lack of specificity in the historical record of those journeys (recognizing that any attempt to a typology of relations automatically excludes others[14]). In telling the story of Gypsy groups in Great Britain or in Romania, group particularities are taken into account. This research does not attempt generalization, nor does it expect inevitable similarities of treatments of various Gypsy / Roma groups.

Gypsy / Roma History

A Migration Story

Throughout the centuries, descriptions of Gypsy / Roma groups have ranged from romanticized stories of nomadism, to more sober acknowledgements of enslavement of the racially different Gypsies, to the tragedy of the Holocaust genocide, to the contemporary Roma political minority. Stressing one story over another, or overemphasizing the construction of racial / ethnic difference when telling the story of migration risks overlooking the social and economic disparities between Roma and non-Roma. The story told here takes different myths of origin and migration into account, attempting not to lose sight of the important socio-politico-economic implications of the systems of discrimination against the Roma that have been in place for several centuries.

Scholars generally agree that the initial homeland of the Roma was Northern India. Linguistic studies confirm this assertion.[15] There is hardly any documentation about the Indic communities – period sometimes referred to as the “prehistory of the Gypsies” (known at the time as “the Zott, the Jat, the Luli, the Nuri, or the Dom”[16]). Radu

P. Ioviță and Theodore G. Schurr explain that the work of 19th century German scholar Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann to demonstrate the historic connection to Northern India has served as basis for recent activist efforts at constructing a unified Gypsy / Roma (national) identity. Grellmann explained the concept of national character based on language and customs.[17] It is this view that has informed most studies to date, pioneered and institutionalized by the collection of work gathered in the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society* founded in 1888 (currently the *Romani Studies*).[18] Authors such as Ioviță and Schurr, Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar are concerned with the practice of historically constructing the Gypsy / Roma nation as a unitary ethnic group with common origins, language, and cultural practices. They see it as a justification already used in the Holocaust and that can continue to motivate ethnic hate. Ioviță and Schurr in particular relate the "Gypsy-lorist" paradigm to Said's Orientalist discourse that informs a Western world about the pariah Gypsy other.[19] In this vein, Donald Kenrick suggests that the Gypsies did not leave India as one people; rather, while in the Persian Empire, they intermixed and intermarried, coagulating into the group called Dom, later becoming the Rom.[20]

It emerges that, since the 19th century, the migration story commonly told in scholarship traces the Roma migrating from the Indian regions of Punjab and Rajasthan, through the Persian Empire, Northern Africa (Egypt), the Byzantine Empire, to Eastern and Western Europe. Activist Ian Hancock explains that,

> … the latest research indicates that the original Gypsies were a mix of Indian ethnic groups assembled in the early 11th century as a military force to resist Islamic incursions. Romany developed in India as a military *lingua franca* with heavy Persian influences, as did Urdu; the Romany word for a non-Gypsy, *gadje*, is derived from the Hindi word *gajjha*, meaning civilian. The first record of

> Gypsies in the west is in Constantinople in 1054; their first appearance in Europe proper came as military attachments to Ottoman armies.[21]

Historians describe the migration of Gypsy groups throughout the centuries; Kenrick focuses on living in the Persian empire, under Arab rule, in the Byzantine Empire, and in Europe since the 14th century[22]; conversely, Ioviță and Schurr describe more recent migration flows, attesting that "molecular genetic studies … unambiguously support … historical data for three major recent migrations of Gypsies in Europe": (1) Initial migrations into North / West Europe, (2) 17th-18th century expansions from Moldo-Wallachia and Hungary, and (3) 19th-early 20th century exodus from the southern part of present-day Romania (the Romanian Old Kingdom) following the abolition of slavery.[23]

By the 15th and the 18th centuries, all European countries were home to Gypsy communities.[24] Although historical writing is not consistent on this matter, documents describe communities living in Romania as far back as the 11th century, others only to the 14th century.[25] More recently, the Roma have traveled to, and settled in, other continents, too. Roma minorities today live in Europe, Asia, North America (most prominently Canada and the United States of America), South America, and Australia.[26]

Reasons for migration are a blurry and contested topic. Poverty, political oppression, enslavement, and "cultural" inclination for nomadism are some of the more common explanations given to migration. More specifically, several authors associate Gypsies in India with the caste of the Untouchables – the most inferior of classes in traditional Indian society. Such pariah status may have constituted impetus to migrate, given the typical negative governmental, judicial, and social, treatment of the Untouchables.[27] Barany argues that war and economic hardship served as initial impetus

to emigrate from India[28]; Charnon-Deutsch offers the changes in the political and social stability of the Byzantine Empire to explain the migration to the Balkans[29]; whereas François de Vaux de Foletier describes Gypsy groups being sent as slaves from Spain, Portugal, Scotland, and France into the colonies, especially the Americas.[30]

Aside from the general route, more detailed migration narratives present further complications because of the variety of myths of origin coexisting worldwide – in conjunction with the authorship of these myths. Historical writing has come under some scrutiny; writing done by non-Roma about Gypsies / Roma may speak more about the ideologies of the regime when the writing was done – than about the minority groups themselves. Recognition of authorship ideology is not to be taken lightly. "[M]yths are susceptible to striking reversals depending on the ruling classes to which their spokespersons owe allegiance," writes Charnon-Deutsch,[31] who contextualizes stories of origin and migration in their political environment, acknowledging the necessary construction of otherness in the process of writing history:

> [M]yths of origin assigned by dominant groups to marginalized groups who have never risen to positions of great political or economic power should seem so unremarkable or even ignominious, for how else could the pedigree of the dominant peoples who fashioned them be contrasted with that of subjugated groups?[32]

In this context, medieval chronicles about Gypsies explain and position their origins and migration within a Christian framework. Charnon-Deutsch offers several Christian-inspired interpretations that reflected racism embedded within early biblical readings:

> [Gypsies] were descendants of Ham, forever marked by the sins of Cain; they had denied succor to the Holy Family as it fled into Egypt and so were cursed to wander the world to atone for their refusal; they were the Egyptians of the old Testament, who, Ezekiel prophesized, would be dispersed among the nations; they had denied their Christian faith and were being punished by forced

> pilgrimage for five years, or ten, or forever; they were survivors of the Pharaoh's armies that had driven the Hebrews out of Egypt; or, finally, they were a people forever cursed after they participated in the death of the Christ by making the nails with which he was crucified.[33]

The religious stories gradually transitioned into racial discourses that consistently "othered" Gypsies as racially different – and inferior to dominant populations – discursively and politically. Enlightenment rhetoric[34] facilitated the transformation of the non-Christian Gypsy into the non-white Gypsy, further justifying Gypsy subjugation and enslavement.[35] Historians describe a wealth of popular sayings, proverbs, and beliefs about the "black Gypsies" dating back to 10th century Persia ("No washing ever whitens the black Gypsy"), to 15th century German chronicles, to old Russian Yiddish proverbs ("The same sun makes the linen white and Gypsy black"), or to more recent Italian and Dutch expressions, such as "black as a Gypsy." Blackness in this context became associated with dirtiness (a belief preserved and reconfigured into contemporary myths of un-cleanliness – "Gypsies only look black because they don't wash," writes an English newspaper in the late 1960s).[36] Kenrick and Puxon further show the discursive links between the supposedly unclean habits and the stereotype of dirty sex life.[37]

From Slavery to Ethnic Cleansing

Historical accounts describe the various groups to maintain their "cultural distinctiveness and identities during the Austrian, Ottoman, Prussian and Russian empires' dominations of the region" – and, more recently, in "the East European nation-states that succeeded the break-up of these empires."[38] Despite their cultural stability –

and possibly *because* of it – the racially different Gypsies were typically enslaved in Eastern European countries between the 14th to the second half of the 19th century.[39]

The Centre for Documentation and Information about Minorities in South-East Europe offers a survey of historical records that explain slavery of the Gypsies in the Romanian Principalities from different perspectives. Some historians explain it as inherent to the pariah status in Northern India; some write about Gypsy slaves brought by the Tartars; other authors describe Gypsies having to sell themselves as slaves in order to pay debts.[40] Roma scholar Gheorghe suggests that groups arriving in an agrarian Romanian society, struggling to subsist following the devastation of the Crusades and migrations of earlier centuries, brought technological tools and skills that were needed in the Medieval Romanian Principalities; enslavement became a solution for land owners (aristocracy and monasteries) to safeguard the technological advancements that Gypsies introduced.[41] Kenrick adds that Gypsies settling on vacant land as peasants became the serfs of the land owners, nobles or monasteries.[42] Enslavement included a system of treatment and punishments that were worse than for lower class Romanian serfs. Gradually, laws and regulations were created to support the existing subjugation system.

Once the Southern and Eastern Romanian Principalities of Walachia and Moldova were conquered by the Ottoman Empire in the 15th-16th centuries, the number of Gypsy slaves reportedly increased; further, Gypsies became categorized in groups based on their skills and owners; thus, there were Gypsies serving in homes vs. Gypsies working the land, court Gypsies (serving the nobility) vs. farmstead Gypsies, as well as bear leaders / tamers, spoon-makers (denominations still associated with Gypsy tribes today). Similarly to the treatment of African slaves in the United States,[43] Romanian Gypsies were beaten

or killed for a variety of reasons; someone marrying a Gypsy slave also became a slave; theft, running away, and rape were severely punished. The Roma in the Western Principality of Transylvania (under Austro-Hungarian rule since the 11th century) faced comparable discrimination. Gypsy slaves could not speak their language, wear their traditional attire, practice nomadism, or even call themselves "Roma." Social discrimination mounted to such a degree, that Gypsies were accused of cannibalism and vampirism (although some of these accusations were later disproved).[44]

Slavery became condemnable and disappeared in most of Europe by the 13th century,[45] as modern concepts of nation and national identity surfaced. In the Romanian context, Gypsy slavery ended in Transylvania by the 14th century, because of sufficient serf work force.[46] In the other two Principalities, the 19th century liberation movements led to the formation of Romania in 1857 (by uniting Walachia and Moldova), which also prompted public debates about citizen rights. Starting with the groundbreaking acts of Moldovan slave owners that freed their Gypsy slaves around 1842,[47] Gypsy enslavement officially ended in 1864. About 600,000 Roma were allowed to continue to live where they previously had been enslaved and worked.[48] However, they were not allocated land. The Roma resorted to making a living in more modest ways, such as selling glass bottles and fortune-telling, or further developing wood and metal manufacturing skills.

Following travels and settlements in Central and Western Europe, migration across the English Channel into Britain dates back to the 1500s. A Spanish dancer and a fortune teller on the shores of Thames were among the first descriptions in Britain.[49] Other groups, such as the Irish Travellers, constitute a more recent immigrant population; bigger immigration waves were reported during the 19th century, around the potato

famine, and in the 20th century, from the 1960s onward.[50] Although historians record a warmer welcome by the local population who appreciated the services and entertainment provided by the newcomers, the authorities of the time rejected the new immigrants: The Church resented fortune-telling; the Guilds feared the competition triggered by the immigrants' lower prices; likewise, the State was challenged by nomadism and the Gypsies' disinterest to occupy specific and fixed positions in the British system.[51] Upon their arrival, the groups were received with strict eviction laws (copied from one country to another from the 15th century onward[52]) and instatement of the death penalty. Anti-Gypsy regulations gradually disappeared, but it was not until the 20th century, at the outbreak of the Second World War, that they started being seen as a "useful source of labor for the war effort."[53]

Modern European thinkers contributed to the social construction of difference by associating Gypsy traditions and cultural practices with nature – a lost link in an era of industrialization, urbanization, and increasing individualism.[54] Persisting Enlightenment concepts of civilization vs. barbarism and backwardness[55] were deployed to contrast the nature-lover Gypsy to modern Europeans. Léon Poliakov frames this construction within a Judeo-Christian project to establish the civilized – Christian – people apart from nature – that is, *above* nature[56] (certainly a project of modernity). Post-Enlightenment, Gypsy otherness was constructed as scientific difference, as physiological backwardness, and justified practically by the establishment and institutionalization of physical anthropology. Nineteenth century European thinking further married notions of Gypsy inferiority and barbarism with emerging concepts of national identity and racial superiority of the non-Gypsy groups, sustaining continued domination over Gypsy

minorities; Charnon-Deutsch offers economic conditions to explain discrimination. Such explanations should be taken together rather than individually (as some scholars do[57]) in order to illuminate the ideological framework that has supported anti-Gypsyism.

Robbie McVeigh documents changes in the attitude towards, and treatment of, British groups (the Gypsy Travellers, the English Romanichals, the Irish Travellers, and more recently the quasi-Gypsy New Age Travellers). He explains the anti-nomadic attitude of the dominant, sedentary population by linking it to how ethnicity and the vagrant communities of the 16th and 17th centuries were perceived. Drawing on Beier, McVeigh suggests that the distinctions between the Gypsy nomads and the English vagrant groups were historically lost to the sedentary British – and still are to this day.[58] Thus, Gypsy nomads became associated with danger. As nomadism was gradually collapsed with ethnicity, attempts at "sedentarizing" the Gypsies have been, in effect, attempts to destroy the ethnicity as a whole, McVeigh argues. With the arrival of modernity and the nation-state, borders became more protected than in previous history. Nomad Gypsies – perceived as an element of the pre-modern – grew to be "increasingly problematised and controlled and repressed within nation-states intent on the centralisation and consolidation of power and surveillance."[59] Discursively, Gypsies were constructed as the permanent exile other, even in cases where these communities had been local residents for many generations.[60]

The Romanian economy enjoyed a significant economic growth between the two World Wars. The Centre for Documentation and Information about Minorities in South-East Europe suggests that, in the years following the First World War, the Roma community in Romania became more organized and attempted political and social

lobbying. The first Roma organization, Asociația Generală a Romilor din România,[61] was founded in 1933, followed by Roma newspapers – the first of which were *Neamul Țigănesc*,[62] *Glasul Romilor*,[63] and *O Rom* – and other organizations working for equal rights. The World Roma Congress was held in 1933, with partial support of the Uniunea Generală a Romilor din România.[64] (The emergence of the term "Roma" is noteworthy.)

The need to control and eliminate nomadism as an element of racial and ethnic difference reached its peak during the Holocaust. McVeigh explains the Holocaust as a natural progression to the existing historical forms of discrimination against Gypsies in Europe. Racism against the Gypsies – comparable to the racism against the Jewish population – emerges out of the intrinsic need of the dominant group to control the different other through cultural assimilation or ethnic cleansing.[65]

German Roma had been the focus of strict surveillance exercised scientifically since the beginning of the 19th century. For example, the *Zigeuner-Buch* sought to document all Gypsies found in Bavaria, with pictures and biographical detailed descriptions.[66] Discursively, they were documented as non-Aryans – even if they originated in the Aryan land.[67] The Romanian Fascist regime of the time, led by Marshal Ion Antonescu, supported the Nazi Holocaust. It was during this time that the concept of the "Gypsy problem" appeared in Romanian political discourse. In the context of a collapsing economy (under the Fascists) and territorial losses to the Soviets in 1940, nationalism started to overlap with xenophobia. Any non-Romanians were persecuted, in an effort to "Romanianize" the country.[68] Around 25,000 nomad and sedentary Romanian Roma were deported to Transnistrian concentration camps (on the territory of the current Republic of Moldova),[69] using Aryan ideology – and the political alliance with Nazi

Germany – as chief explanation and justification. However, some Roma continued to live freely on Romanian land, whereas others served in the Romanian army.[70]

During the *O Baro Porrajmos* ("The Great Devouring") or the Gypsy Holocaust,[71] Gypsies and those assessed to be part-Gypsies became the target of "sterilisation, deportation and murder," as well as medical and genetic experiments,[72] resulting in the killing of 500,000-1,500,000 European Roma. Some accounts deny the Holocaust against the Roma altogether, whereas others inflate the death roll to over three million.[73] Actual figures are difficult to estimate, due to the system of ethnic cleansing and deportation, the absence of census organization within Roma communities, and the fear of self-identification as Gypsies. Moreover, some writing today recognizes that local police units massacred many Gypsies without taking them to concentration camps. Significantly, the Nuremberg Trials – meant to prosecute the political, military, and economic leadership during the Nazi regime – did not include witnesses on behalf of Gypsies, nor were the Roma paid war crimes reparations.[74]

The Gypsy / Roma Political Minority

After the end of the Second World War, the Romanian Roma surviving the *Porrajmos* and the deportations returned to their homes. The activities of the General Union of Roma in Romania resumed as well. With the establishment of several Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe, an unprecedented form of tolerance came: the Roma were enlisted in the Romanian Communist Party, employed in the militia, the army, and security services, and appointed as village mayors. Since

Communism favored the ascension of the poor, many Roma (who often denied their ethnic origin) climbed the social ladder and gained political and cultural recognition.[75]

After the first years of the regime, persecution of Gypsies resurfaced, marked by a slight change in attitude. De Vaux de Foletier notes that, on the one hand, Roma groups no longer traveled in large groups and no longer "terrorized the countryside"; on the other hand, the effects of the Holocaust on the European public roused a fear of being considered accomplices to the Nazi *Porrajmos* and judged as racist.[76] Nevertheless, in Communisty Eastern European countries, racially motivated attacks, although frowned upon, persisted. They now took the shape of banishments and prohibitions to maintain a nomadic lifestyle (particularly in Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and less frequently in the former Yugoslavia).[77]

A number of historians argue that the Communist regime and its leveling ideology positively contributed to the economic stability of Roma communities, as it offered compulsory employment, housing (in the new neighborhoods of blocks of flats built during the systematization of towns), and education (all children had to enroll in school and obtain graduating degrees).[78] Writing about the European Roma in the early 1980s, de Vaux de Foletier also describes a new social attitude towards this group, according to which Gypsies are no longer the "thief of the chickens" and the child abductor, but talented artists and musicians that have come to symbolize freedom.[79]

Most scholars, however, are less optimistic about the Communist era. The dictatorships sanctioned social segregation by controlling all aspects of Roma life, including Roma organizations and collectivities. Erika Schlager documents, there was "segregation in housing and employment; repression of the Romani language and

repression or manipulation of Romani cultural organizations; confiscation of private property including horses and wagons; and . . . child abduction and forced sterilization."[80]

The Communist rhetoric wedded to nationalist ideology required party membership as requisite for worthy citizenship (and patriotism). The regime also discursively worked towards the unitary state, with equal citizens – a doctrine that substantiated the initial attempts at assimilating the Roma into mainstream society. Any community standing outside the norm, outside the ordinary, needed to be "corrected" or eliminated. Roma groups were already treated as deviant (unless they cooperated and relinquished their otherness by becoming true Communists). Communist oppression followed a systematic process of ignoring Gypsy difference by forcing it in a non-Gypsy mold.[81] Practically, the Roma were forbidden to practice their traditional commercial occupations (with some exceptions in the branches manufacturing brick, wooden tools, and copper goods[82]); instead, they were incorporated into the new Communist (agrarian and industrial) institutions by being given jobs and thus forced to work for a living. A dual project of mandatory settlement, on the one hand, and ignorance and disregard for Roma cultural and ethnic difference, on the other hand, emerged.

Most generally, Communist Romanian treatment of the Roma was less harsh than in the other Eastern European countries, says Achim. This author also notes a shift in the occupational habits of Roma communities, from traditional manufacturing to professional occupations, marking a disappearance of occupational distinction between the Roma and the non-Roma populations; nonetheless, the groups still occupied the lowest social and economic class, as they continued to be characterized by "a paucity or absence of professional training … with all the consequences that follow from this (poverty,

unemployment etc.)."[83] Achim comments that the transformation of Roma communities – professional reorientation and housing stability – is not an indicator of an inclusive social policy; rather, in the 1950s and 1960s, each case was seen as an individual occurrence and not a trait of the ethnic group; only since the late 1970s did political projects specifically attempt to assimilate the growing Gypsy communities, with little to no success. Achim explains this failure in part because of the lack of substantial financial state support for projects attempting to deal with the "Gypsy problem" and because of the ideological belief that Gypsies could "only be 'civilised' if they give up their cultural heritage and become 'Romanians' or 'Hungarians.'"[84] Certainly such attitude is common throughout the historic construction of Gypsy difference. The economic crisis of the 1980s deepened the socio-economic gap between Roma and dominant groups even more, leading to an increased activity of the Roma on the black market.[85]

In the British context, the ethnically motivated attempts to settle the nomads "re-invents 'Gypsies' and Travellers as 'itinerants' and explains their oppression in terms of a 'subculture of poverty.'"[86] This served as basis for the new solution to the problem of the nomads – the politics of assimilation, approached from the perspective that "they must become sedentary in order to be helped."[87] Politically, it was only in the 1960s that the British government passed the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act, meant to provide and manage sites for the nomad Gypsies.[88] Once initiatives to settle the Roma in towns were established, attempts to give Roma children elementary education ensued. Nevertheless, settling attempts have most often failed, as they excluded the traveling communities themselves from the solution-finding process, argues Bancroft.[89]

Following the end of the Cold War, European countries tightened border policies, in order to restrict population flows. Some scholars see the establishment of the EU as an organization to monitor and most evidently *control* immigration. Bancroft suggests that the EU was formed "as a trans-national system of migration control aimed at the exclusion of excluding [*sic*] most potential mobile subjects … in contrast to its aim of creating a regime of free movement for objects, capital and services within the EU."[90] The 1981 British Nationality Act – that reconfigured the notion of "British citizenship" and the right to reside in the UK – served as basis for EU (and US) immigration policies in the 1990s.[91] Concepts such as "citizen," "immigrant," "refugee" and "asylum seekers" – as political constructs – have become political and politicized tools to include and exclude, to construct normalcy and acceptance vs. deviance and intolerance. The migrant / immigrant Roma communities are obvious target to these policies.[92]

A considerable wave of immigration to Western European countries followed the fall of Communism. Some documents record almost 180,000 Roma asking for political asylum in Germany and France between 1992 and 1996.[93] Nonetheless the immigration trend amongst Roma mirrors immigration of Eastern European youth from non-Roma dominant populations seeking better employment and living standards in Western Europe (and the USA). The 1997-1998 wave of immigration from Eastern Europe to the UK and Canada raised considerable media attention, because it followed televised programs detailing stable and positive living conditions in those Western countries. Regarding the refugee panic, scholars Ivan Leudar and Jiří Nekvapil write that the controversy in British mediated public discussion centered on whether Gypsy immigrants were to be considered political migrants escaping persecution, or economic migrants seeking a better lifestyle.[94]

In the post-communist era in Eastern Europe, national policy – driven by human rights interventionist lobbying campaigns and international pressures to integrate into supra-national bodies such as the EU – has been more rigorous to eliminate discrimination. For example, university scholarships are reserved for Roma students.[95] Nonetheless and in spite of increased apparent political tolerance, Gross says that,

> The end of Communism … brought high unemployment and even greater poverty, a curtailment in [Roma] access to education, a rise in crime rates and homelessness and the rebirth of often virulent, overt discrimination and violence against them in countries where nationalism and ethnocentrism resurfaced after Communism.[96]

Brearley documents forced evictions from homes, expulsions from towns and villages, physical assault and killings by skinheads, police officials, and neighbors, segregation in public spaces (such as restaurants, shops, swimming pools, and clubs[97]), and legal discrimination (such as prison sentences and fines).[98] Marek Kohn describes sterilization programs (Roma women being sterilized after going into hospital for minor interventions) aimed at handling non-Roma panic of allegedly rising Gypsy birth rates.[99] In addition, Jonathan Fox writes about Roma children separated from their parents,[100] whereas Stewart notes that "more Gypsies had their houses burned, were expelled from their villages, and were killed in racist attacks between 1989 and 1996 than in all the time that has passed since World War II."[101]

Recent depictions of the Roma construct poverty-stricken communities that are forced to emigrate. Politically, the poor become the potential immigrant Gypsy – a reason for concern for modern nations and international bodies. James F. Brown significantly notes that, local governmental focus "still centers not on what can be done *for* them, but

what can be done *about* them."[102] This marks continuity in the institutional discursive attitude towards the Roma pre- and post-Communism. Bancroft similarly comments that,

> The apparent discontinuity between the treatment of Roma under Communism and the post-Communist era may hide a deeper continuity, explicable in terms of the way in which the modern nation state functions as a social-engineering state, focusing its energies on 'out of place' peoples.[103]

Contemporary anti-Gypsy attitudes are further complicated by economic relations of capitalist societies. In Britain, the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act – a piece of "draconian legislation," in Sally Kendall's words[104] – was aimed at "those groups who transgress spatial boundaries, especially that between urban and rural spheres … [and] turned out to be often unworkable in practice."[105] The Act cancels parts of the 1968 Caravan Sites Act, especially those that had required local governments to provide sites for Gypsies and Travellers; local councils can also close sites.[106] Some scholars interpret the Act as a symbolic political gesture of protecting "boundaries of decency," and not a thought-out legislative tool.[107] Since these policy changes, European Community citizens have seen more severe social treatment. (For example, although Income Support can still be obtained, Housing Benefit is more difficultly gained. Rent property is typically high for the Gypsy and Traveller communities, and therefore settling is made more complicated for these groups.[108])

Nomadism raises feelings of ownership and intimate bonding with owned land. McVeigh explains the stark difference between how sedentary populations live on and exploit the land – "in an individualised, privatised and capitalised way" – and nomad practices. As a consequence, earlier attitudes toward nomad Gypsies are strengthened by association to sedentary notions of property, ownership, and work.[109] Ultimately, Gypsies

become a threat to mainstream identity; anti-Gypsyism turns into a "moral crusade," not to just scapegoat Gypsies, but to project unto them the flaws that non-Gypsies internally fear.[110] This explains, in McVeigh's analysis, why "both 'liberal' and 'reactionary' sedentarisms have posited 'final solutions' to the 'problem of nomads' which actively seek their annihilation."[111] Practically, Roma freedom is restricted to such degree that it is the government deciding who occupies a particular site.[112]

Significantly for the present analysis, McVeigh suggests that both attempts at repression and extermination of nomadism *and* concepts of "sympathetic assimilation" draw on a discourse "committed to a 'final solution' to the 'problem of nomads.'"[113] He argues that assimilation – understood as attempts at "sedentarizing" nomad Gypsies, in McVeigh's focus – is hardly new; it resembles genocidal Nazi Holocaust; and it is a twin of earlier efforts to exterminate, evict, and exclude, framed as doing something *for* the Gypsies, rather than against them. McVeigh recognizes this discursive change, but also acknowledges that the assimilation attempts continue to address non-Gypsy concerns and interests and have as final outcome the goal of eliminating "the Gypsy problem." Thus, assimilation is a more politically correct phrasing for genocide. This point is eloquently explained by McVeigh, also concerned with the social and political annihilation implications of the latest assimilation projects:

> The efforts of well-meaning politicians, social workers and educationalists and health workers who adopt a sedentarist and assimilationist paradigm *vis-à-vis* Travellers and other nomads is equally genocidal in effect. Forcing nomads into houses is – at a social, cultural and spiritual level – no different from forcing nomads into gas chambers. … [P]erversely, it has sometimes been the case that sympathetic welfarism has proved *more* successful in the obliteration of nomadic people. Repression may simply lead to the expulsion of nomads from an area with their identity intact while assimilation insists on their absorption. … Genocide and

> assimilation carry with the same ruthless imperative – the relentless sedentary colonisation of nomadic space.[114]

McVeigh predicts an even stronger trend to "re-integrate" and "assimilate" in the coming European history. His point is significant for this research, as it forewarns concern about "integration" policies and efforts – a recent replacement of "assimilation" language.

Since the fall of Communism, former members of the Eastern Bloc have been striving to consolidate their democracies and to strengthen, in this process, their national identities. At the same time, the establishment of the European Community rendered borders between EU members less significant politically and economically and, as such, the Roma (alongside other migrant populations) can travel freely between most European countries.[115] Similarly to when the nation-state emerged and Gypsies were associated with border-threat, in the contemporary context, the minorities continue to stand for threat to the nation, to national identity, and to the concepts of "citizen," "home," and "belonging." They are therefore constructed as "strangers" and "outsiders" who "do not belong."[116] With their uncontrolled, free movement, they challenge the perception that free travel is a privilege of the classes that have power, says Kendall.[117] Moreover, a nomad lifestyle is taxable with more difficulty (where paying taxes is considered fundamental to citizenship). Consequently, state benefits cannot be provided for – traveling, non-tax-paying, and therefore non-citizen – nomad communities.[118]

Statistically, the Roma rank the highest in polls monitoring the public's (and not just extremists') negative opinions towards different race and ethnicity.[119] Speaking to the particular cases of the Czech Republic and Slovakia, Kohn lists "reasons" that justify anti-Gypsyism, such as perceived higher birth rates than those of the majority population,

the "unwillingness and / or inability" to adapt socially, "poor physical and mental health," and a general viewpoint that Gypsies are a burden to society."[120] Criminologist Chris Powell explained the folk perception that Gypsies are inherently criminals by emphasizing the institutional discrimination against Roma communities. Similar to the understanding of gangs in the USA, Powell explains that living in a context of high unemployment (often due to racism), "poor accommodation and social exclusion" nurtures survival solutions such as petty crime – to which Gypsies are often linked.[121]

Different approaches label Roma practices as stability, stubbornness, inflexibility, or disinterest to integrate. Regardless of terminology, the Roma's rejection of the non-Roma way of living brings about further exclusion and denial of citizenship rights – both nationally and more broadly by the EU.[122] Among British governmental policies, for instance, the system of social security and welfare celebrates a definition of work and labor that automatically penalizes a nomad way of life. David Gillborn shows that legal language (in immigration law, specifically) discursively makes no reference to race and ethnicity, allowing for fluid interpretation and institutional practices of exclusion,[123] even though a 1988 Court of Appeal rule recognized Gypsies as an ethnic group.[124]

British and Romanian Gypsy / Roma Communities Today

Scholarly and public sources record different names and numbers to describe European Roma communities. Accurately "keeping track" of the Roma is complicated by the power struggles embedded in Roma-non-Roma relations. Not all Roma register themselves with identification cards in the countries where they reside; not all Roma children go to (public) schools; not all Roma have a stable residence; not all participate in

census monitoring procedures – and therefore census data tends to underestimate actual numbers; not all Roma identify themselves as Roma (for fear of discrimination and because of the fresh memory of the Holocaust[125]); some Roma register as being part of other minorities, with better social and political status (a testimony to Gypsy adaptation, on their own terms[126]). Such difficulties have been politically handled by sometimes leaving out the Roma minority from census results and – symbolically – classifying them as "other." Colin Clark explains the "inconsistent, misleading and just plain wrong figures" as symptoms of discrimination, deeply related to politics:

> Prior to 1989 this was largely due to ideological reasons, in the 1990s it is [*sic*] much more to do with finances … If the figures do not show the Roma to 'exist' then why fund specific social policies directed at them?[127]

Although vehement criticism to census estimates is still voiced (Kohn, for instance, compares them to Nazi efforts to estimate the populations to be exterminated and labels them as positivistic and essentialist in their attempt to quantify a group of people perceived as a problem to be controlled and solved[128]), the emerging activist movement has been collecting more realistic figures. The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), the Project on Ethnic Relations, and analysts affiliated with European universities (to name a few) have offered such more credible accounts (even while they have been criticized to be inflated, for higher political attention, Clark suggests[129]). The NGO argument is that having realistic numbers is necessary in order to document and fight anti-Gypsyism.[130] It follows that some accounts of Roma record six million in Europe,[131] others acknowledge eight million in Europe (of ten million worldwide), with five-to-six million residing only in Eastern Europe.[132] Data of Romanian Roma population ranges from 535,250 according to the latest Romanian Census (the second

largest minority group after the Hungarians),[133] to 2,150,000 as recorded by Liegeois and Gheorghe[134] (representing 2.4-9.9% of the Romanian population). British Roma are believed to amount to 105,000,[135] whereas other records identify up to 300,000 in the UK (roughly .16-.5% of the entire British population).[136]

In the specific case of Britain, scholars write about different Roma groups, most often included under the term "Gypsy-Travellers." Such groups include the English Romanichels / the English (Romany) Gypsies, the Irish Travellers (Minceir), the quasi-Gypsy New Age Travellers, and the smaller factions of the Welsh kale / Gypsies and the Scottish Travellers (Nawken). (Bancroft suggests that the term "Roma" refers to the Gypsies of Continental Europe, including Roma and Sinti and others.[137]) The New Age Travellers are particularly challenging to describe and identify, given that some traditional Gypsy Travellers describe themselves to be New Age Travellers, whereas most social descriptors identify the latter to represent a subculture originally non-Gypsy, yet borrowing Gypsy traditions in order to formulate an alternative way of life (such as nomadic caravan living, for instance).[138] The New Age Travellers have been known for organizing illegal summer festivals to express their counter-culture and disapproval of the mainstream society and values. (As discussed later in Chapter Five, Gypsies problematically have been "confused" with New Age Travellers and socially ostracized and discriminated against.) Finally, there are also smaller Gypsy communities, as is the Kalderash or Coppersmith, who originated in Romania and migrated to Britain in the mid-1800s as Romanian serfdom ended; as an older British community, the Kalderash have British citizenship status and have been less of a political concern.[139]

In regards to the popular belief that all British Gypsies and Travellers are always, indiscriminately nomads, Pat Niner describes different groups to be

> … full-time Travellers who travel more or less throughout the year; seasonal Travellers who travel all or most of the summer but return to a base in winter; holiday Travellers who are … settled but travel in caravans for a few weeks in the summer; special occasion Travellers who are … settled but travel in caravans for family or other occasions; and settled Travellers who travel little or at all but still regard themselves as Gypsies or Travellers.[140]

Group sizes are difficult to estimate, although Niner describes trends of decreased nomadism and increased settlement. The UK Government predicates the right of Gypsies and Travellers to have a nomadic lifestyle, although activists, some politicians, and scholars alike recognize that such legislative statement do not have substantial practical support. A 2002 report of the Council of Europe identifies insufficient political and administrative support for nomadism: The planning system does not support temporary settlement because there are not sufficient sites; administrative measures inhibit nomadism (as seen in the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act); and, significantly, local populations resist the idea of sites for Gypsies and Travellers, through lobbying and overt acts of discrimination.[141] Several scholars comment on the discriminatory nature of the majority populations' attitudes. Donald Kenrick and Sian Bakewell, for instance, offer several examples of media reports, Court cases, official (police) prejudice, and employment issues around racial and ethnic discrimination and attempts at segregation.[142]

In the Romanian context, a report by the Centre for Documentation and Information about Minorities in South-East Europe makes mention of over 40 different Roma tribes and groups currently living in Romania.[143] Some of the more famously known are Căldărari (the Braziers), Fierari (the Blacksmiths), Grăstari (the Horse-

Sellers), Lăutari (the Fiddlers), Spoitori (the Tinkers), Argintari (the Silverers), Ursari (the Bear-Leaders), Lingurari / Băieşi (the Spoon-Makers).[144] The report also notes that some groups, such as the Lăutari, have a more traditional lifestyle and traditions (regarding work, marriage, education, music, etc.), whereas others are more integrated into the mainstream Romanian population. It also comments on the political advantages of integrating – and denying Roma affiliation – from the standpoint of being better treated in the fields of employment, housing, health services, and education.[145]

Different than British Gypsy communities, most Romanian (and Eastern European) Roma are settled (in part as consequence of Communist forced settling). Some live in towns, owning their own property; other urban Roma live in utter poverty, living on the street; other groups live in rural areas, sleeping in carts or dilapidated homes, working for hourly pay, or collecting and selling food (such as berries and mushrooms); and still others live in separate villages, with non-Roma-like infrastructure.[146] A 1992 study conducted by the University of Bucharest and the Research Institute for Quality of Life reports that two thirds of the Roma have no profession or low qualified positions; only about a fourth are employed and a sixth of the total population are self-employed; while the income level is comparable to national figures, Roma families are, on average, twice the size of non-Roma families; living conditions (that is, the quality of the dwellings, goods, clothing, and food) are reported to be below the standards of mainstream; the illiteracy rate is about 27%, where under 4% have completed secondary education, and under 1% have studied in higher education; the average life expectancy is the lowest and infant mortality rates are the highest in the country; finally, the level of

criminality is reported to be the highest among the minority and majority groups; the study concludes that Roma lifestyle is worsening.[147]

This report must be seen in conjunction with inter-ethnic conflicts (reported by local and international media) and with political attempts at dealing with the "Gypsy problem." In his analysis of contemporary communities in Romania, Achim notes an "evident … rising intolerance of the Roma and of racist attitudes on the part of the majority population,"[148] as well as "a tradition of *laissez-faire* attitude when it comes to the Roma, leaving their problems to resolve themselves."[149] Achim also documents a revitalization of the traditional community living, in which the Roma leaders (the bulibaşi) have more authority than the non-Roma officials. This author concludes, nevertheless, that the contemporary moment presents opportunities for change, as a (gradual and slow) process of modernization of the ethnic groups *from within* – that is, maintaining ethnic identity and specificity.[150]

Describing tribes and community life in detail is beyond the scope of this chapter. Some comments about Roma traditions must be made, nonetheless, in light of how these affect inter-ethnic relations. Ethnographer Isabel Fonseca writes about the self-isolation of Roma communities who do not *want* to interact with, and be known by, non-Roma,[151] whereas Stewart describes everyday life to be characterized by "careful disregard and attentive disdain for the non-Gypsy way."[152] The isolation is preferred and enforced, even if inter-group communication may ensure dispelling some stereotypes. For example, Lemon suggests that the Roma "are and speak of themselves as connected to local places and pasts."[153] Patrick Williams also describes Roma silence as chosen, because Romani ways are conceived as pure, "incorruptible," and "unassailable," for the Roma alone –

and not for outsider non-Gypsies.[154] This insight must be judged against recent attempts on the part of "officials, support organizations, and the media" who "are asking [Gypsies] to say who they are, to 'make themselves better known,' to 'speak up.'"[155] To Williams, silence (and the physical absence / removal from dominant community life) does not equal having nothing to say, nor does it excuse discourses that construct the "exotic," "marginal," and "deviant" Gypsy because they assume a knowable and homogeneous Gypsy identity and because they deny Gypsy creativity[156] – and subjectivity.

Politically, self-isolation signifies rejection of the mainstream, non-Roma values and traditions. As an example, whereas non-Roma reports identify British Gypsy children as "the most at risk in the education system," Gypsies themselves seemingly are suspicious of non-Gypsy schooling, which "is likely to inculcate youngsters with values and social behaviours that are incompatible with traditional Gypsy life," write scholars Martin P. Levinson and Andrew C. Sparkes.[157] Schools often do not recognize, nor capitalize on, the cultural difference that Romani children bring to the education environment. As a result, Romani children become aware of, and act out, their ethnic identity and their difference through gestures of defiance against the spatial and temporal boundaries imposed by the non-Roma structure.[158] At the same time, the mainstream school system clashes with the lifestyle of nomad and semi-nomad populations residing in Britain (that still comprise a fraction of the Gypsies and Travellers in the UK).[159]

The Rise of NGO Activism

At present, the "Gypsy problem" fits into a larger European framework of discourses about minorities that can only be understood in relation to both the activist

movement and EU's treatment towards minorities, in general, and Roma communities, in particular. Activist organizations (such as the General Union of Roma in Romania) existed in Romania in the 1930s, but were banned and dissolved under the Communist regime. In the UK, different associations and lobbying groups have worked for Gypsy and Traveller rights since the 1960s.[160] At a global level, the Communauté Mondiale Gitane[161] was formed in the late 1950s in Paris (and banned by the French government in 1965), taking the later shapes of the Comité International Tzigane[162] and the Comité International Rom.[163] World Congresses were held through the 1970s and 1980s, with more and more numbers attending. The Council of Europe has been striving since the late 1960s to encourage national governments to concentrate on Roma issues, yet with few practical results. Although it has no power to enforce its proposals, the Council has made specific recommendations regarding the safeguarding of Romani lifestyle, the building of caravan sites, and encouraging the education of Romani children.[164] In the mid-1980s, the European Committee (today the EU) has responded to the call made by the World Romany Union and made further recommendations, which include awareness of the need to involve Roma culture (and agency) in managing inter-ethnic interactions.[165] However, the political construction of the Roma minority has started more evidently in the early 1990s, when international organizations (such as OSCE and the Council of Europe) began formulating legal instruments to deal with minorities and Roma groups.[166]

Activism for Roma rights has also coincided with sustained efforts at democratization in former Communist countries. In this context, the power of the EU in shaping national and international minority policies is evident. The EU has the ability and financial resources to exert pressures for aspiring member-countries in terms of their

political agenda in dealing with minorities and their accountability in this respect.[167] Although historically the EU has traditionally been silent regarding its members' treatment of minorities, in the last decade (coinciding with the opening of EU borders to former Communist nations), a political discourse of inclusion / exclusion of immigrants and minorities has solidified. It follows that, Eastern European countries have worked on their policies regarding minorities most arduously – a precondition for accession to the EU since the 1993 Copenhagen Council of Europe.[168] One related outcome is that most constitutions of Eastern European countries acknowledge the right to free speech and press and have laws and regulations regarding ethnic media.[169]

In recent decades, EU's political attention has focused more on Eastern Europe (and its politics of expansion alike) than on countries of Western Europe. The ethnic conflicts in Northern Ireland have raised less attention and concern than those in the Balkans, for instance. Peter Vermeersch explains this imbalance as a testimony of historic myths about the "ethnic" East that is backward, more prone to disregard human rights, and therefore needs more political assistance – vis-à-vis the "civic" West.[170]

Political attention to the Roma as a minority of concern for all of Europe has surfaced in the later part of the 1990s. Vermeersch explains that the practical difficulty of including Roma minorities in EU citizenship projects is because the Roma have difficulties in identifying and organizing themselves as a "national minority." (This is also one of the issues that complicates national governments' task to monitor population census.) In Vermeersch's words, the Roma "… could not easily replace a stigmatised identity with the political identity of a clearly defined ethnic group on a certain territory with clear and well-publicised claims."[171] (This difficulty is also a testimony of cultural

diversity among Romani groups.) Moreover, Roma tribes do not put forward the kinds of leaders that the non-Roma community expects and demands. Where families and clans are reportedly organically tight-knit and typically organized around a "King," politically they are "weak, divided and often corrupt," reports *The Economist*. Furthermore, Gypsies are "worse off even than ghetto blacks in America … they have almost no middle-class to aspire to and no political consciousness" – an issue that increases the skepticism of the non-Roma officials.[172] Roma leaders are the object of media scrutiny and prejudice, who frequently report on Roma political party members' difficulty to agree among themselves on their political agenda.[173]

In the second half of the 1990s, Roma issues could no longer go unnoticed. What changed, Vermeersch argues, was (1) media attention to overt acts of discrimination and (2) NGO lobbying. In part as a result of the fall of Communism but also due to the strengthening of the discourse of universal human rights since the Holocaust,[174] many NGOs dealing with Roma issues have emerged, locally and internationally, as well as Roma political parties. For example, the Romanian Social Democrat Rom Party[175] is presently represented in the Romanian Parliament, in the Chamber of Deputies.[176] Stewart reads this possibility of political freedom (as well as the emerging Romani media) as a step towards more fair interaction with minority communities. Regarding the contemporary European landscape, Stewart argues – rather uniquely in the literature – that contemporary Eastern European governments have "abandoned" their attempts at assimilation.[177]

Joining efforts with the NGO movement, Roma intellectuals – namely, Ian Hancock, Rudko Kawczynski, and Nicolae Gheorghe – have increasingly publicly

spoken in human rights assemblies, such as the Council of Europe, the OSCE, and the United Nations. Since the introduction to the Council of Europe in 1996 of one of the first significant documents detailing the discrimination against the Roma European communities – "The Roma – A Truly European People" (drafted at the Roma Round Table in 1996) – the "Gypsy problem" has gained political attention and legitimacy.[178] This turning point coincided with increasing EU pressure for aspiring member states.

On a global, international scale, even though communities differ from country to country (and within countries as well), the most obvious effort of the emerging NGOs has been to coagulate a discourse for Roma rights and to decrease discrimination against them. Scholars also note that the NGO activities have pushed for a collective Romani identity, by emphasizing the migratory origin in Northern India and the common language Romany shared by most Gypsy groups. Politically, the Roma have begun behaving like a national – and supra-national – minority.[179] Lemon suggests, however, that this strategy can also backfire because the association with Indian origins both signifies statelessness and recalls the Western oriental discourse. As a result, the media and political officials themselves tend to belittle activist attempts by offering justifications that draw on a discourse of othering. For instance, some arguments deem Romani political organization as "impossible," because of using different languages / dialects (and therefore they cannot arguably properly communicate with one another) and because of clannish tendencies (vs. modern forms of community organizations), further associated with inherent predispositions to infighting.[180] Such generalized internal fragmentation is mirrored by external distrust: An article in *The Economist* says, "Governments are keen to involve Gypsies in solving their own problems, but are

frustrated by the lack of leadership. Privately, EU officials say they do not trust Gypsy leaders enough, yet, to let them administer a single euro."[181]

Whether the activist discursive move signifies a unity of thought and cultural practice among Gypsy groups, or a political discursive strategy to help gain political recognition and attention to the issues raised, remains to be evident (and is investigated in Chapter Six). Achim notes that the 1993 Resolution 1203 of the Council of Europe acknowledges the Roma as a "true European Minority" – reinforcing the transnational character of the community. In other words, "the Gypsy problem" is politically perceived to extend beyond national borders and to be a challenge of the global community, not just a local, isolated one.[182] As already argued, however, any attempt at homogenization is problematic – whether it is initiated by dominant groups or, in this case, by the elite Roma intellectuals of the NGO movement. Blasco argues that the European NGO activist approach – that also promotes the politically correct "Roma" – discursively draws on non-Roma ideology[183] (an assertion further discussed in Chapters Six and Seven). Others also critique that the attempts at a collective, homogeneous identity is counter-productive for intercultural and inter-ethnic relations.[184] Similarly to the issue of labeling Gypsies, acknowledgement of the status of "one ethnic minority" is a matter of ascription – rather than one of self-identification.[185]

NGO activism is commendable for its vigorous and sustained efforts to bring Roma issues to the fore and discursively relate them to contemporary political agenda. This link must be made in order to ensure political visibility. Constructing a Romani identity and the concept of the Roma people / peoples is necessary in order to frame the "Gypsy problem" as a human rights concern. This step ensures attracting the attention of

significant super-national bodies, such as the EU and the Council of Europe. At the same time, though, activist efforts coincide with moral panics and socio-economic and political changes in Europe, that (as discussed above) trigger fears of foreigners and immigrants. The increased attention to Roma issues in both Western and Eastern Europe, therefore, is due to a combination of factors.[186]

Internationally, the EU, through the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, alongside NGO activism, has initiated global campaigns for the recognition of Roma minority rights, in the form of institutional, educational and training programs, health, media projects, voting awareness, and the development of litigation instruments for the protection of Roma rights.[187] In the same historic moment, acts of outright discrimination and exclusion have flourished in the post-Communist era.[188] International campaigns resemble an active social construction of an identity, without historical basis (in some views), but with contemporary political implications. Its failings (i.e., limited Roma access to information about these projects) testify to the gap between the political venture and everyday community living. The EU matrix of rules and regulations for its member countries and candidates simply ensures political attention to Roma as a European minority, rather than specific, local application of these policies. Local racism and discrimination is generally left unaddressed. Bancroft explains that times when the Roma have been more explicitly targeted as outsiders "seem to be associated with major developments in the emergence and consolidation of the modern, centralized bureaucratic nation-state in Europe" – such as after the First World War.[189] The argument can be similarly made for today's context of consolidating democracies in the post-1989 era. Libor Stepanek further shows that the advocacy approach is done from a negative

perspective of remedying intolerance, rather than from a positive approach to nurture living in diversity,[190] confirming postcolonial studies observations that the production of global imagery "never really engages the Other."[191]

Media Representations: Caught between Crime and Romance

Examining the social construction of the Gypsy / Roma is often absent in communication scholarship, a gap this research seeks to fill; studies of Gypsy representation are few in number, and even fewer address media discourses of this minority.[192] Scholars document, nonetheless, that news stories about Roma groups (most often produced by non-Romani media) are typically stereotypical[193] and fit into a larger, "ambiguous" discourse on equality and diversity in contemporary Europe (and globally).[194] Representations range from images of poverty and crime, to romanticizing the Gypsy other as inherently nomadic or bohemian. Clark explains stereotypes – as well as political prejudicial projects – because of "press misrepresentations, generalizations and … simplifications."[195] Although discrimination against the Roma covers a wide spectrum of political projects and social gestures (as shown above), only the most overt expressions of violence attract media attention – and even in those cases, it is a sparse attention, argues Clark. Different than in previous history, acts of violence "are increasing but are at least now being recorded and monitored if not always followed up by the appropriate authorities."[196] Film scholar Dina Iordanova notes, however, that so much recording of "death and destruction" makes it easy to forget the suffering behind media texts.[197] As regards scholarship on the Roma, Ágnes Kende argues that they "are often rewordings of the prejudices of a hundred years ago,"[198] even as they raise

awareness about anti-Gypsyism – a worrisome observation given the discussion offered in Chapter Two.

Two major branches of stereotypes are identified in contemporary mediated popular discourse. Both are initiated and maintained by dominant groups and both share the foundation of the discourse of difference, in which the Gypsy is maintained in a representational mode of different, apart, and less civilized than the non-Gypsy subject. One type of discourse depicts Gypsies as thieves, beggars, poor, unclean, unreliable, dangerous, dirty, dishonest and untrustworthy, lazy, irresponsible, genetically inclined to crime, immoral and amoral, and with unstable lifestyles.[199] Cohn documents the habit of parents especially in Eastern Europe warning their children to stay away from Gypsies for fear of kidnapping.[200] Hancock adds accusations of idleness, theft, witchcraft, and parasitism to the list of common representations.[201]

In contemporary Britain, outright hostility in the press is relatively commonplace, without raising much governmental objection. Tabloids are typically sensationalized (for instance, stories related to social security policies[202]), but daily news stories also misrepresent Roma communities, stressing their ethnicity and difference; stereotypes also infuse children's books.[203] For example, New Travellers can be depicted as "drunken, drug-taking, bone-idle scroungers who are living it up at the expense of the hardworking tax-payers.[204] Images of Gypsies surrounded by garbage and waste reinforce this stereotype. Some scholars argue that such imagery is generally introduced in the media without offering the context that sites for Gypsies are not kept in good conditions, nor do news include information about some Romani communities' "high code of cleanliness, without which they would never have been able to survive in such unfit conditions."[205] In

Romania, likewise, Gypsies are most often depicted as criminals; but overt discriminatory representation extends well beyond news stories to ads and humorous publications. Information in an ad for an apartment includes "No Gypsy on the block," whereas the witty and satirical *Academia Cațavencu* – although a pillar for freedom of the press and investigative journalism – systematically mocks and ridicules Gypsies.[206]

Studies reporting this stereotyping approach – common in sociological studies – draw on images of determinism, depravation, and victimization. They often discuss the size and fabric of Roma communities and (descriptive) issues of belonging to, and exclusion from, the ethnic groups. Such studies do not further the understanding of minority-majority inter-ethnic relations. In Kende's analyis, they "represent the uncertainty of experts and often their stereotypical views"[207] and merely reproduce the same construction of backwardness. Images of poverty and crime become a repetitive story of a problem; "their poverty … becomes an ethnic issue, their fate is determined." In contemporary Europe, the "Gypsy problem" is almost over-"ethnicized" to the effect that any Roma-related event or story is suspected to be "ethnic conflict," whereas the same event about a non-Roma would go unnoticed, argues Kende.[208]

The other stereotyping approach draws on a long tradition of literature and art representation dating from Romanticism. Common images in this vein are Gypsy singers, flamenco dancers, "dark-eyed" fortune-tellers, circus athletes, horse traders, and colorful wagons,[209] portrayed through a musical, artistic, free-spirited, romantic, and bohemian character, often described to be in touch with nature. This approach has its roots in idealized depictions of the historical trail from Northern India through Egypt to Eastern and Western Europe in Western literature, art, and music.[210] Originating in the European

era of Romanticism, Charnon-Deutsch suggests that "the Carmen myth"[211] (telling the story of passionate love, jealousy, and betrayal between a Gypsy woman and a non-Gypsy man) is a recurrent image of nomadic Gypsiness in European – and more obviously in American cultures in contemporary popular culture. Images of contemporary exclusion build on this romantic vision of Gypsy traveling "in a bow-top wagon" – minimizing the complexity of migration today – appear in stark contrast to the "problem Gypsy," that is, to today's vagrant, decaying Gypsy communities.[212]

The power struggles around the social construction of gender in European societies complicate the myth of the bohemian Gypsy. Whereas initial gendered portrayals depicted the sexualized and appealing Carmen, contemporary images of Roma women range from representations of subjugation to both Roma and non-Roma men, to depictions of sexual predators, prostitution, low morals, and dirty sex. Conversely, Roma men – similar to portrayals of black men in the United States – have historically been constructed as molesters of non-Roma women, and more generally as sexually hyperactive (both in terms of quantity and quality of sex life). Kenrick and Puxon dispel such stereotypes by explaining that the social organization of traditional Roma communities is much tighter than that of non-Roma; young unwed Roma are generally chaperoned when in the presence of the other sex, and courtship is considered a serious commitment; prostitution is forbidden by Roma law.[213] Even though Kenrick and Puxon's historical narrative does not identify specific tribes and communities, their points offer valuable insights; if not historically or socially accurate, at least their analysis offers an alternative to dominant folk wisdom.

Charnon-Deutsch explains the Western fascination with the Carmen myth – and romanticized Gypsy representations in general – by highlighting Gypsies' "important role in the evolution of Western myths of origin and being"[214] – or, in Belton's interpretation, because of the emotional and sentimental associations connected to stories of belonging and community.[215] Gypsy migration thus represents the perpetual longing for a home, for a community, for family, as seen for example in Tony Gatlif's 1998 musical documentary *Latcho Drom*.[216] The film includes numerous references to lonely, dislocated Gypsy communities that long to be reunited with far away kin. One of the songs describing an Egyptian Gypsy community, for instance, narrates: "The fire which burns inside of me / makes my soul wild / when I think / of those I love … / which are far … / I cry."[217]

Oftentimes, the discourse of romanticism overlaps with that of poverty and stealth. Post-Communism, when Roma communities became the focus of public attention – after years of being discursively and politically ignored – the minority's ways of living also came under fire. Lemon suggests that "media claimed that Gypsies had become wealthy at the expense of society" and that this textual strategy "invoked the mysticism of Gypsy theatricality, song, and hypnotic power by naming their 'dark eyes'"[218] rather than offering economic and social grounding. Similarly, Stewart comments that any sign of Roma success in the 1990s has invoked immoral explanations – such as "cunning, simultaneous manipulation of both the market and the state benefit system."[219]

There are also "positive" stereotypes of the Roma, such as family-centeredness, attachment to children, high fertility, easier labor, and lengthy breastfeeding.[220] These images, however, do not necessarily aid in bridging difference. Rather, they reinforce otherness given the social context in which they are employed. For instance, the

presumed high fertility is often connected in popular discourse with an increase in Roma population, which is perceived to be to the detriment of the dominant group whose natal rates are decreasing by comparison.[221] This type of talk is strikingly similar to distorted Western understandings of primitive cultures in general.[222]

Furthermore, and more ambiguously, the Roma are often depicted in the media and in the literature as inherently nomads – regardless of their occupational specifics and of the fact that in Eastern Europe most Roma communities settled down centuries ago.[223] Nomads are considered peoples who lead a mobile way of life, and are often "hunters and gatherers, pastoral nomads, commercial nomads and … individual travellers (tramps or vagrants)."[224] The image of nomadism belongs to both stereotyping patterns, depending on how it is framed and employed. It can take the shape of the underprivileged migrants caught in a "cycle of nomadic impoverishment,"[225] or the dangerous and unstable nomads who unsettle non-migrant populations (a common discourse in contemporary UK); or, nomadism is approached through the lens of the passionate and romantic Gypsy nomad – a typical artistic representation in contemporary film and music. The latter interpretation, however, is less prevalent in Europe and more common in American popular culture. Stories of nomad Gypsies are sometimes told in the media from a historical perspective, yet not as context for social relations or political policies; rather, they serve to mark and reinforce political concepts such as borders, state, and nation, instead of tracing Roma memory and culture.[226] In spite of the ubiquity of the nomad representation, some scholars report that groups of Roma do not see themselves as guests, but as part of the place where they live.[227] Kende explains that gestures of nomadic lifestyle can sometimes signify "an escape (e.g. during socialism, an escape from state wage labor), or … a way

to cope with impossible living conditions (e.g. in the case of traveling craftsmen), rather than something rooted in their frequently mentioned otherness."[228]

From a historical perspective, McVeigh links the former representation – that of the dangerous nomad Gypsy – to repetitive attempts within modern democratic contexts "to control the 'dangerous classes.'" Regarding nomadism – and the stereotypes of the unstable, criminal Gypsy – this author argues that such constructions

> … draw on a long history of establishment fears about the traveling dispossessed and the threat they pose to the moral and political order. There are obvious parallels with historic discourse about vagrancy and itinerancy. More particularly there are parallels with the old notion of 'dangerous classes': New Travellers[229] are seen to be more dangerous than individual 'tramps' or 'vagrants' precisely because they are a class (or at least a community) – they travel together in numbers.[230]

(British) State attempts to convert nomads into sedentary communities are, to McVeigh, undemocratic and brutal in their utter ignorance and lack of understanding of the Gypsies.

In an analysis of Czech televised debates around the 1997-1998 refugee panic, Leudar and Nekvapil offer a list of descriptors and stereotypes that inform both public and political discourses of Roma issues (in the Czech Republic, as their focus of investigation). The discourse of difference is the common thread throughout these: Gypsies look, express, and behave themselves differently, and have a different mentality, than non-Gypsies or "normal people" – and should strive to live like "us," according to the "normal" rules; they "create hassles everywhere"; Gypsies do not like to work, but are interested in money, sex, and enough food; Gypsies "pimp," steal, rob, and commit murder in large percentages (in Britain); and finally, Gypsies are incompetent, illiterate, and unintelligent. Leudar and Nekvapil suggest that, beyond a list of stereotypes, these

descriptors suggest a way of thinking and talking about Gypsies that is used to continue to reject them and that is firmly rooted into common sense, into common knowledge.[231]

Significant for the purpose of this dissertation, some authors note that the discourse of the backward Gypsy coexists in public speech with that of the discourse of diversity and human (and minority) rights. "Harrassment and assimilation now become facets of the same policy," write Kenrick and Puxon,[232] while Richardson says,

> The government is keen to promote concepts of citizenship and community within a 'British' identity, and it 'cracks down' on those seen to be anti-social. However, a parallel discourse includes diversity of culture and the need to address institutional racism in public institutions.[233]

Richardson's observations capture the global moment in which activism pushing for Roma rights as a political project coexists with discriminatory and racist historical understanding and treatment of Gypsy communities worldwide (but particularly in the European context). This author offers evidence of the former discourse "positive" discussion in British press coverage – issues of discrimination, site provisions for nomadism, and the election of the first Gypsy / Roma MEP to the European Parliament. By contrast, she notes a rise in "negative" discursive strategies, such as the issue of the cost of dealing with Gypsy and Traveller groups.[234]

Difference operates through lack of specificity in depicting the Roma. The groups' cultural specificity is often collapsed with racial and ethnic difference,[235] a telling yet problematic discursive move. Lifestyles (such as jewelry and clothing, settlements or nomad caravans), occupations, or artistic talents become a matter of race. Lemon describes Communist media discourses that frame occupations – such as trading, metal work, weaving, or selling horses – to be "in their blood" – just as musical or artistic talent

is "in their blood."[236] Furthermore, the Roma are often "confused" with blacks[237] – even if the contemporary discursive treatment of Roma would not be tolerated against black groups and other ethnic minorities.[238] Nonetheless, blackness – as otherness – is an attribute *given to* Gypsies, yet Lemon suggests that it is also internalized and re-appropriated into a positive of Romani life. This author writes,

> "Blackness" being so broad and contextually dependent … pointed to *relations* among "us" and "them" more than it referenced a stable group. Roma could choose to define themselves as "black" among other blacks, widening the inclusive indexicality of the term, to share being lumped together, as "us."[239]

This overlap of discourses – Gypsiness and blackness – is particularly theoretically intriguing, suggesting a potential continuity of the discourse of difference across local, cultural, ethnic or racial specificity. Certainly an interesting conjecture to explore, this assertion raises concerns of homogenization across the experience of being *othered* – if not the process of othering itself.

McVeigh makes a similar case when he argues that anti-nomadism in Britain cannot be simply collapsed with racism – although different activist groups have opted for this discursive association; rather, McVeigh sees "sedentarism" the driving force against nomadism, where he defines "sedentarism" as the "system of ideas and practices which serves to normalise and reproduce sedentary modes of existence and pathologise and repress nomadic modes of existence."[240] The discourse of sedentarism is intentional and actively works against groups of Roma. The conceptualization of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act of 1994 is an instance where the moral concern against nomad Gypsies played a significant political part, argues McVeigh.[241]

Ethnographic investigations have led some scholars to treat the "Gypsy problem" in greater depth than as a stereotype-listing exercise. Such studies place the discourse of otherness in the context of Romani life – "a sort of positive approach to the stranger" – and detail issues of Romani (heterogeneous) identity, Roma-non-Roma relations, and internal cultural division.[242] One of the noted cultural practices – generalized to the entirety of minority groups – is a self-asserted exclusion from the non-Roma mainstream culture. Different explanations are offered to explain this self-exclusion. For one, traditional ethnographers like Cohn see it as a lack of desire for interaction with the dominant populations, enforced through social and cultural practices.[243] This approach, however, fails to grasp Roma *in relation to* non-Roma. It misses the interconnections between the historical construction and treatment of difference, on the one hand, and Roma groups' reactions to this discrimination, on the other hand. Cohn's approach views Roma groups willingly separating themselves from the mainstream of their own accord. The point here is not to argue the "accuracy" or "falseness" of such analysis; rather, the scholarly concern should regard the absence of investigating the relationship between discrimination and reactions (as is self-isolation) to such practice.

Other scholars, by contrast, discuss self-exclusion as empowerment, as long as it a chosen attitude (rather than a form of banishment, for instance). Any alteration towards a centre or a mainstream – which coincidentally is the purpose of the project of assimilation – threatens this stance of power. Self-positioning themselves as margins can suggest Roma resistance, as well as protection of the marginalized groups from within. On a practical level, Kendall explains the space of power by describing the physical

arrangement of trailers and dogs that safeguard settlements, chosen also in connection to what the space means for non-migrant populations.[244]

Self-Other Inversions as the Paradox of Difference

An important analytic development has occurred within Gypsy studies since the early ethnographic depictions of the Gypsy other. Stewart, for instance, acknowledges that understanding the construction of the Gypsy other can only occur by investigating the perpetual "negotiation of identity and interest, *in conflict with* hostile non-Gypsies."[245] Understanding the relationship and the social construction of difference concerns both the Roma and the non-Roma, both equally engaged in creating "a systematically distorted sense of the other."[246] Not only do the dominant, non-Gypsy group construct the Gypsy / tsygane, but the Gypsies in turn construct the Gadzo / gaźo / Gaujo / Gauje / Gadzhe / Gorgio / Buffer / Busnés / Payos.

Similarly to the history of abundant stereotypes about the Roma, ethnographers uncover a deep foundation of Gadzo stereotypes within a variety of minority groups – equivalent to the Mexican "gringo" or the Jewish "gentile."[247] Stewart says that Gadzo means a social category usually less human than the Roma (who take on here the role of *the self* in a position of authorship), stupid, and ignorant of the right way to lead a good life.[248] Evident from the discussion of difference elaborated in Chapter Two, constructing the non-Roma as other is as necessary for the constitution of the Roma self as subjects to their world, as it is for the non-Roma to construct the Gypsy other.[249]

In the dual dance of othering, the Roma and non-Roma cultures coexist in the same space, however, only because of constant adaptation. Although the dominant

population seeks to integrate the Roma by expecting them to adapt and desire integration, some ethnographers, such as Stewart, record an inverted form of adaptation. This author writes of Roma adaptation not as surrender but as re-appropriation in which meanings of the Gadzo world are transformed and inverted into Romani meanings.[250]

Scholars describe the isolation of ethnic groups outside and apart from the majority groups in terms of silence, indifference, or outright resentment towards the Gadzo. Correspondingly, the ingroup-outgroup interactions include the range from friendliness and cooperation to hostility to apathy.[251] Silence has been more recently interpreted to be "played out within a fundamental withdrawal, but a withdrawal that is an actual taking possession of oneself."[252] This approach to Roma silence stands in sharp contrast to more traditional writing that over-focuses on non-Roma sovereignty. For instance, writing about the Mānuš (the Roma group of Germanic origin living in France), Williams says, "It is the Mānuš reclaiming of the self, of the world, but a reclaiming that makes it appear that Mānuš presence is no more a breach of Gadzo sovereignty than Gadzo omnipotence troubles the integrity of the Mānuš."[253] And further, silence means "I do not disturb anything, I do not signal, but also there is nothing that can disturb me, I am not vulnerable"[254] – a self-empowering stance that allows for the construction of the Gadzo as the other.

Learning from the Past

This chapter narrated a story of Roma migration and settlement into Eastern and Western Europe, as well as an overview of European media representations of Romani life, as gathered from scholarly analyses of such representations. The premise underlying

this chapter is that the discourse of difference informs the social construction and political treatment of Roma communities locally and globally. With the birth and rise of the NGO activist projects, Roma are today conceived as a European political minority whose rights must be protected. At the same time, overt discrimination against Roma groups continues into the 21st century, supported by institutional forms of discrimination in the realms of employment, housing, education, health, and media representation. Authors such as McVeigh, Richardson, and Kenrick and Puxon eloquently note a paradox of coexisting discourses – one against discrimination and another of overt manifestations of prejudice.[255]

Media images range from depictions of criminality and impoverished nomads, to those of bohemian fortune-tellers and circus athletes. Scholars report and confirm repeatedly that contemporary media representations are stereotypical and therefore participate in a continued construction of the Gypsy backward other. Problematically, scholarship on Roma cultures ignores the call of postcolonial writing to interrogate its own role in this construction that often merely rewords established prejudices. Attention to communicative forms about the Roma is frequently brief and not very detailed. It generally is limited to identifications of – and disagreement with – media stereotypes and political discourse. Discourses about Gypsies / Roma in media and activist communication therefore compose the subject of the following chapters in an effort to fill this gap in the literature.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discourse Analysis in Mass Communication and Postcolonial Studies Research: Methodology and Methods

This dissertation investigates (media and NGO) institutional discourses about Gypsies / Roma, as they are constructed, circulated, and changing in the context of social and political developments in Romania and the UK since 1990. Broadly, this project is interested in *what* we know about Gypsies / Roma in the European space, *how* we have come to have that knowledge – that is, what institutional discourses inform and shape that knowledge. What keeps this knowledge in place? How and why is it evolving? This dissertation set out to explain (1) Gypsy / Roma difference in the Western and Eastern European space since 1989, (2) the apparent contradiction between the systems of belief underpinning both overt discrimination and projects of integration, and at the same time (3) to theoretically explore the possibilities and limitations for discursive transformations regarding difference and its social treatment. The primary question necessary before all others was to clarify what discourses about Gypsies / Roma are created and circulate in the post-1989 European space. It is here assumed that the answer to this question, in conjunction with the historical contextualization of Roma-non-Roma relations (overviewed in Chapter Three), would help to explain social and political attitudes and treatment of Gypsies / Roma in Europe. To address this question, newspapers and NGO publications were analyzed for discourses. The following specific questions were asked:

> What do press and activist discourses contribute to what European cultures mean and understand by Gypsy / Roma?

> What discourses about Gypsies / Roma appear in Romanian and British newspapers and in selected NGO publications between January 1990 and December 2006?
>
> How have discourses about Gypsies / Roma changed in press and activist writing between 1990 and 2006?

Comparative questions follow naturally from these three, so as to understand the politics of legitimizing certain truths over other, certain groups over others.

> How are Gypsies / Roma represented differently, if at all, than non-Gypsies / non-Roma in press and activist writing?
>
> How are Gypsies / Roma represented differently, if at all, in Romanian newspapers than in British newspapers?
>
> How are Gypsies / Roma represented differently, if at all, by different NGOs?

The last two questions are significant inasmuch as their answers might testify to institutional *and* cultural practices and rules. The purpose is not to compare news stories and publications about Gypsies / Roma vs. those about non-Gypsies / non-Roma, nor is it to compare and contrast Romania to the UK. Rather, the focus is on the construction of difference as it is implicated in the European imaginary in inter-ethnic relations. The research traces the construction of Gypsies / Roma across and among multiple sites. As a rule, comparative studies must be methodologically wary of, and explicate, cross-national comparisons by taking into account diffusion of practices and traditions among interacting countries – a concern commonly known as Galton's problem.[1] For the purpose of this research, diffusion need not be avoided, given the conceptual interest in the theoretical and empirical possibility that discourses of otherness cross arbitrary national boundaries – even though local differences may exist. The focus is on

representation of Gypsies / Roma beyond local specificity, and not on independence of these portrayals one from another.[2]

Approaching representations as discourses can help contextualize what is commonly seen and treated as stereotypes (and discussed in this way in much literature across disciplines) and expose such stereotypes, as they are embedded in larger hierarchical social structures, as "complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation."[3] As a social construct, "Gypsy" can never completely mean any one thing, nor can "Roma." As suggested in Chapter Two, the tradition of post-structuralism has moved towards de-emphasizing questions of *what* discourses are; rather, discursive practices are positioned in their complex socio-historical context, investigating changes and moments of resistance to the dominant systems.[4] Merely describing (in this dissertation) what discourses about Gypsies / Roma circulate in the post-1989 European space arguably enforces a normalcy that gives these discourses power and legitimacy and further maintains them in the realm of social common sense, says Bove.[5] Shapiro's reading of Foucault[6] offers a bridge between the structuralist "what are discourses …?" and the post-structuralist "how do discourses … change?," describing the analysis of discursive practices as a model of political inquiry. A first step is, to Shapiro, to still ask "what are discourses …?" But if the answer is sufficiently complex, it can inform about

> … the political culture of a society, that is about the set of rules which allocate responsibility for [Gypsy / Roma-ness], which constitute it in a particular way, and which allocate various control procedures that conform to the way [Gypsy / Roma-ness] is supposed to be constituted. … So if we regard What is [Gypsy / Roma-ness]? As partly a question about where the concept is located in the network of human relations, we learn something about who has authority to speak about the kind of wellbeing referred to.[7]

Accordingly, aside from investigating ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma, this dissertation pursues to study the institutional discursive *changes* prompted by, and in conjunction with, socio-political developments in post-1989 Europe. *How* do we know what we know about Gypsies / Roma – that is, meanings associated with "Gypsy" and "Gypsiness," with "Roma" and "Romaness" – in the European context, as reflected and created in time in different institutional sites, and as contrasted to dominant "non-Gypsy" and "non-Roma" ways?

Discourses about Gypsies / Roma were identified in (1) daily newspaper coverage in Romania and the UK between January 1990 and December 2006 and in (2) European NGO documents released in the same time frame. These primary sources are assumed to be sites of critical institutional discourses that participate in the social construction of a Gypsy / Roma in contemporary Europe.

On Methodology

Methodologically, this dissertation is a study of discourse, defined as ways of talking about a subject at particular historical and social conjunctures (see Chapter Two). The focus was on communication about Gypsies / Roma as understood and interwoven into common sense.[8] Representations were explored at the level of "content and construction of meaning and the organization of knowledge in a particular realm."[9] Discourse analysis is used to answer the research questions posed in this dissertation by seeking the meanings of "Gypsy-ness" / "Roma-ness" at multiple points in time and space (rather than in regards to one event alone). It is assumed that such meanings are constructed, fluid, and changing. In the words of Yoshiko M. Herrera and Bear F.

Braumoeller, in discourse analysis "the researcher must … investigate where the beliefs or ideas come from and how they changed, rather than just accepting them as they are at a particular time."[10] Taken alone, each institutional discourse does not have meanings in itself, separate from its broader context.[11] Furthermore, discourse analysis is especially useful to answer relations of power and hierarchy. The explanatory focus of this dissertation addresses such relations, seeking to corroborate evidence from media coverage with reports and publications discourses, in order to explain the system of beliefs underlying living with Roma difference in Romania and the UK.

The discourse analysis here conducted models Fairclough's method (discussed in Chapter Two), at the same time as it draws on Foucault's guidelines for revealing discursive practices. Whereas Foucault's genealogical method of discourse analysis is useful to contextualize discourses and their interrelations within the power / knowledge framework, and to remind about the political nature of discourses,[12] Fairclough focuses on text and its relations to discursive practices and socio-cultural practices.[13] Discourse practices refer to the institutional ways of producing, distributing, and to the manners in which audiences receive texts. Socio-cultural practices mean, to Fairclough, the wider matrix – the broadest of contexts – situational, institutional, and also societal.[14]

Regarding the treatment of the text itself (such as newspaper stories and NGO reports), as Fairclough suggests – and in the tradition of semiotics and structuralism – it was here assumed that linguistic choices are not accidental. Rather, they reflect underlying assumptions rooted in discursive – professional or occupational, organizational, and ideological – practices.[15] The approach here treats talk and text as vastly complex and interrelated with series of formal rules, and not just as linguistic and

formal structures.[16] Assumptions about Gypsies / Roma are further expressed as discussions of social norms and deviances. For example, sedentary living may be seen as a social norm, and as such Gypsies and Travellers, and homeless people, fall outside of the boundaries of this norm, as outsiders, Richardson shows.[17]

This dissertation primarily analyzed texts. The analysis sought for themes (implicit and explicit) and linguistic choices (such as vocabulary, metaphors, grammar choices where applicable, descriptions and images)[18] particularly depicting Roma communities, individuals, and Roma-non-Roma relations. Themes were identified by observing the journalistic practices of organizing and prioritizing information, by highlighting some key elements, generalizing others, and leaving others out.[19] "Text structure," as described by Fairclough, was also investigated.[20] A story's positioning within the newspaper as a whole, within a page, as well as its visual representation (an image or a photograph), was taken into account. Discursive practices – as they are linked to texts – were explored by noting, at the level of text *production*, authorship, sourcing (as illustrated below), pagination, as well as journalistic values. From the wealth of journalistic values professionally endorsed or academically established, notions such as objectivity (an example of which follows below), professionalism, conflict reporting, personalization, and interpretation were deemed relevant to the textual representation of stories about Gypsies / Roma.[21] *Distribution* and audience *reception* were not the main focus of analysis (unless noted in the primary sources themselves).

An example of a concern regarding reporting objectivity is a news story from *Adevărul* about a conflict between a snowplowing crew in the Romanian city of Iaşi and the local Roma community.[22] The snowplowing crew refused to clear the streets in the

Roma neighborhood, resulting in an open fight initiated by the minority inhabitants. The article chiefly focuses on the attack instigated by the Gypsies, yet it fails to describe and / or explain the initial refusal by the snowplowing personnel to enter the streets of the Gypsy neighborhood. Good journalism necessitates thorough sourcing and citation; not including Roma sources in stories directly concerning them is a more common reporting failure – that represents only a non-Roma perspective on the narrated events.[23] An article in *The Times*, employing an integrationist approach to Roma-non-Roma relations, denies race as a basis for discrimination and admonishes prejudice, at the same time as it cynically comments on nomadism:

> The Conservative MP for Monmouth, David Davies … has … applied to the heritage lottery fund asking for money to make a film to show to gypsy children "the ancient traditions and communal practices" of another group of people whom we might call "settled folk". Such practices, according to Mr Davies, would include "their rigid adherence to an ancient code which they refer to as 'planning regulations' and the time-honoured custom of clearing up one's rubbish".
> As you might expect, Mr Davies has been vilified for this. The Gypsy Council says his comments are distasteful and Hampshire county council has said they "make a mockery of attempts to build bridges between gypsies and non-gypsies". *Difficult to build a bridge, of course, when one bank is always moving, but we'll let that pass*.[24]

This example illustrates how the discourse of difference subtly informs the integrationist approach. The implication is that the Gypsy Travellers, subjects of this story, should change in order to alleviate social discrepancies and explicitly quit traveling, settle down, and abide by "normal rules" (such as, paying taxes) as all British citizens do.[25]

Regarding the investigation of images associated with print stories, basic semiotic analysis was conducted. Visual representations show how individuals internalize social relations and processes, and therefore a semiotic analysis assumes that any phenomenon in a culture – as a sign – has an ideological dimension. As argued elsewhere, "images

carry meanings that are not always immediately present in verbal speech because they encompass attitudes, emotions, and physical reactions."[26] Communication scholar John Fiske identified the different elements that non-verbal communication conveys – of which body language, proximity, orientation, appearance, facial expression, gestures, posture, and eye contact were relevant for the present semiotic analysis of non-moving images.[27] Indicators of what this author termed norms and deviations were also sought. Norm was here defined as common practice, what is accepted, shared, expected, and therefore predictable, by the majority, based on consensus among all members. Further, any movement away from the norm is assumed to be a deviation. The semiotic analysis sought what norms are observed and being deviated from.[28]

Both Fairclough and Foucault recognize the centrality of the property of intertextuality – that is, the relations between and among texts – which constituted the subsequent analytical step. While Fairclough describes intertextuality as it relates to the discursive practices (of production, distribution, and reception), Foucault deems it a signifier of political projects and larger societal trends. A text's intertextual properties historically and socially connect the plethora of ways of talking and representing the world to their cognitive, historical,[29] material (in a newspaper or NGO report), environmental, social (that is, at the level of conventions), experiential (the audience's background in reading texts), and ideological contexts.[30] Intertextuality is generally taken for granted, as the assumed presuppositions embedded in ways of talking[31] – making its study the more significant. As cultural products, news has been treated as orienting, communal, and ritualistic, expressing more about the cultural group creating and interpreting it than about the events narrated themselves. Bird and Dardenne write that

the accuracy of news is less important; what matters is the mythical and folk value of the communication project.[32] Further, to explore texts' intertextual links to socio-cultural practices, NGO reports and publications were analyzed for evidence of potential discursive continuities across genres of texts and modes of talking. Media and activist texts were analyzed to answer the research question, on the assumption that they each – and together – illustrate the larger framework of Gypsy / Roma representation in contemporary Europe. Conversely, dissimilarities between the two sites might signify different institutional approaches, or different socio-historical conjunctures. As suggested earlier, this dissertation made no attempt to suggest cause-and-effect relationships between the analytical sites – that is, between media coverage and NGO activism.

To answer questions concerning discursive changes in media and NGO institutional ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma, Fairclough's conceptualization of change was used. To summarize earlier comments on this scholar's view, in communication acts discursive change takes the shape of contradictions – that is, of a co-existence of both hegemonic, traditional discursive events that draw from established ways of talking, and non-hegemonic (emerging new hegemonies, in Fairclough's terms) representational modes that contribute to transforming the traditional discourses. Practically, discourse analysis here includes tracing moments of change at the level of textual contradictions, both in the same text, and intertextually across texts. Fairclough explains:

> Change leaves traces in texts in the form of the co-occurrence of contradictory or inconsistent elements – mixtures of formal and informal styles, technical and non-technical vocabularies, markers of authority and familiarity, more typically written and more typically spoken syntactic forms, and so forth.[33]

For example, press articles adopted a politically correct vocabulary in depicting Gypsies / Roma, at the same time as some journalists still casually referenced derogatory terms, as in the following example from *The Times*: "We're so on the outer fringes of previously observed behaviour that there isn't yet a term invented for getting your kicks from a combination of tiling tips and watching middle-aged women berate pikeys for wearing leggings."[34]

In sum, the purpose of this discourse analysis was to investigate ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma in newspapers in Romania and the UK since 1990 and in European NGO reports dealing with Roma issues. The discourse analysis proceeded with identifying themes and linguistic choices, followed by an analysis of the intertextual properties of texts. As Teun A. van Dijk writes, the analysis of the "unsaid" must be incorporated with the analysis of the said and the overt – just as significantly as the analysis of the "now" must be contextualized within its discursive episteme[35] and its cultural and historical location. Drawing on Goldhagen, Dell'Orto explains that "commonsensical constructions are often left unsaid precisely because they are so common that there is no need to articulate them."[36] A study of the "unsaid," therefore, gets at the assumptions and stereotypes that characterize systems of beliefs.

On Method

The research proceeded in several stages, the first of which consisted of analysis of newspaper coverage of Gypsies / Roma in Romania and the UK between January 1990 and December 2006. News, editorials, and opinion pages were investigated. Again, discourse analysis allows not only an exploration of how print media makes sense of

Gypsy / Roma groups and issues, but it also provides a historical record of the tumultuous post-1989 time. As a testimony to the double-exclusion of the Roma around the world (both self-asserted and hegemonically imposed), uncovering discursive construction in the media cannot necessarily follow a positivist, random-sampling approach – nor does a comprehensive analysis across the expanse of time. Rather, moments of talk about Gypsies were sought out and exposed in their momentary or semi-frequent occurrence. As Foucault argues, discourses are by definition discontinuous and momentary, as well as often similar across time[37] – a significant point to a historical study of discourse.

Most generally, the events and developments here chosen were selected for their appropriateness to answer certain research questions. The events themselves were not the focus of inquiry; the task at hand is explanatory and theoretical (rather than descriptive). The newspaper coverage of the following events (see Appendix A) was selected for analysis because they drew national and international media and foreign policy attention, triggering public discussion around the "Gypsy / Roma problem." Further, it was assumed that the characteristics of the events might have affected the discourse. The analysis focused both on the description of the noteworthy events as indicators of societal and mediated reactions in times of moral panic, and on the mundane, daily reporting of happenings unrelated to the central events. Drawing from Stanley Cohen, moral panics occur when a "condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests." Such a conjuncture generally generates "stylized and stereotypical" representation on the part of the moral figures in a society, be they the media, politicians, opinion leaders or experts, as well as a series of offered solutions.[38]

To begin, (1) the months following the dissolution of the Central and Eastern European Communist regime (January-February 1990) were investigated. This period was marked by continental social unrest. Romania in specific went through explosive socio-politico-economic changes. The analysis includes UK coverage for these months, given the UK's historic public and political immigration concerns. Also, the UK has played a significant role in pioneering immigration policy for the EU member-states, specifying selection and exclusion criteria for citizenship.[39] Such times of uncertain population movement are bound to raise governmental – and, accordingly, media – attention.

In addition, (2) press articles about the Gypsy / Roma were read from August through October 1992 – a time period when two moral panics can be identified in Europe. The first was characterized by an outburst of overt violence against groups of Romanian Roma refugees in Rostock, Germany, in late August 1992. The other was sparked by summer festivals held in the UK, organized by New Age Traveller, feared by locals and officials, and described in the media as unwanted, devastating, and interfering with the peace of the majority population. Further, (3) the 1997 refugee panic presented research interest. This panic overwhelmed the British public, as hundreds of Roma emigrated from Central and East European countries to Britain (and Canada) following the broadcast of favorable media reports about integrated Roma communities in those countries. Local and international media attention was given to the (unwelcome) flows of immigrants.[40] Analytically, only UK coverage for the months of August-November 1997 is explored, as a site receiving immigrants (Romanian coverage is not of primary concern in this case);

media and public concern was at a peak at this time; by 1998, the refugee panic settled into more established ways of talking and dealing with Gypsies / Roma.[41]

Moreover, (4) a 2001 incident of an official attempt at segregating a Romanian Roma community apart and away from the non-Roma population was analyzed. In one of the North-East towns of Romania, Piatra Neamț, the City Hall, led by the mayor Ion Rotaru, initiated a plan to relocate the local Roma community to a "District of Hope" – a former chicken farm outside the town and surrounded by a barbed wire fence. This episode drew considerable media coverage, which brought public attention and national and international condemnation.[42] Nonetheless, it also drew supporters in other Romanian towns (e.g., Deva, Baia Mare, and Slatina) that attempted similar initiatives.[43] Only Romanian media coverage (and not British) was investigated in this case for the months of October-November 2001.

Included in the analysis were also (5) the process of drafting the EU Constitution for the entire European community. This site was assumed to offer investigation into the political talk around Roma issues at a time of significant construction of regulations. The analysis focused on the months of June-July 2003, June 2004, and October 2004. (The first draft of the Constitution was released by the European Convention in June-July 2003; in June 2004, the current version of the Constitution was elaborated following the Intergovernmental Conference, using the initial 2003 draft; in October 2004, it was formally signed by leaders of the member states.[44])

Finally, (6) the last months of 2006 were also monitored, as they constitute an essential moment both for Romania, as a future EU member (at the time), and for the UK where public discussion centered on issues of immigration. Similar to the first site of

investigation (January-February 1990), this last analytic locus captures a time of continental social turmoil.

Newspapers for study were selected on the basis of specific criteria. First, two newspapers were selected from each of the two countries, in an effort to assess media coverage and discourse across political spectra. To answer the research questions, study of divergently politically positioned news media is required to ascertain potential differences and nuances in talk about Gypsies / Roma. Discourses, as ascertain in Chapter Two, cut across political ideologies in regards to matters of Gypsy / Roma social construction.[45] From the UK, the selected newspapers were *The Times* of London and *The Guardian*.[46] From Romania, *Adevărul* and *România Liberă* were studied.[47] Second, all newspapers are dailies with highest national circulation figures and headquartered in the capital of each country. It is assumed that these criteria mean that these newspapers bear political, economic, and legitimacy significance. Both Romanian newspapers meet the criteria to be considered newspapers of record (both are long-established national dailies, recording the present drawing on authoritative sources, and abiding by journalistic standards.

Subaltern studies historians have questioned the use of records, such as state archives, for the writing of history as a problematic and limited resource especially when historical retelling is conducted without questioning the initial purpose and authorship of the archives.[48] The authorship of mainstream media venues in the representation of the Roma raises similar concerns, especially because two of the four selected media venues (see below) are considered newspapers of record for the respective countries. Newspaper of record have been historically associated with high standards of journalism, seen as an

"archival chronicle of the important events of the day[,] … reliable records of the past, … papers with a certain reputation for consistent attention to accuracy and depth in reporting local as well as international news," write Shannon E. Martin and Kathleen A. Hansen.[49] These authors further explain that historians and librarians have come to view newspapers of record as reference sources. Such social recognition suggests that newspapers of record are often associated with conformity to dominant political and legal standards. Their reputation and circulation in each national context suggest their prominence, legitimacy, and authority[50] – even in the proclaimed age of digital media.[51]

While such media perspectives on Gypsies / Roma may be associated with the dominant political angle, they nonetheless constitute important moments of social construction and are a necessary analytic site in light of the unquestioning attitude with which dominant / mainstream media content is often received. Foucault emphasizes the need to investigate such discursive practices in order to recover the political projects within which we are unconsciously enmeshed.[52] There are certain advantages[53] to investigating dominant modes of talking, such as exposing the dominant hierarchical structure with its institutions and official organs that coordinate the "Gypsy / Roma problem," as well as identifying the contradictions between different modes of conceiving Roma-non-Roma relations, dominant and resistant.

The oldest of the selected newspapers, *The Times* is the UK's newspaper-of-record,[54] founded in 1785 as *The Daily Universal Register* (the name changed to *The Times* in 1788).[55] Its average daily circulation was 664,712 copies as of March-August 2006.[56] Its political orientation used to be right wing. Its contemporary competitor, *The Guardian* has a liberal to left-wing orientation, and has traditionally been widely

respected as an intellectual and international authority.[57] *The Guardian* has been a national daily since 1821 (its original name was *The Manchester Guardian* and was initially published as a weekly until 1836 and as a biweekly until 1855, when it became a daily[58]). *The Guardian*'s average daily circulation was 378,738 copies as of June-November 2006,[59] ranking third in UK circulation after *The Times* and *The Daily Telegraph*.

Regarding the Romanian newspapers, according to the Romanian Audit Bureau of Circulations, the Romanian national daily *Adevărul*, founded in 1888, has an average daily circulation of 40,245, while its competitor, *România Liberă*, founded in 1877, averages a daily circulation of 70,188.[60] *Adevărul* was known to represent the voice of the left in the years before the Second World War, then the Communist voice, whereas today it operates on modern journalistic standards. Similarly, *România Liberă* was the second Communist Party newspaper. Both media venues reached the incredible circulation rates of 1.8 million copies for *Adevărul* and 1.5 million copies for *România Liberă* in the years following the Revolution of 1989.[61]

The collection of primary materials combined a Lexis Nexis digital search with the reading of microfilm archives. The Lexis Nexis search used the following search terms: "gyps!," "traveler*," "romany," and "pikey"[62] – but not the more obvious "roma." Conducting a more general, "open search,"[63] by using the term "roma" yields more results than those sought by this study. (For instance, news about the capital of Italy, Rome, even if there is a spelling difference, and Vatican stories are picked up by this search, as well as sports news about the football / soccer teams in Rome, such as the prestigious S. S. Lazio and A. S. Roma.) Articles related to art, music, or fashion were

discarded from the analysis in situations where the references merely mentioned popular culture elements such as "gypsy jazz," fashion style (i.e., wearing colorful dresses), Suzanne Vega's 1986 song "Gypsy," the band "Gypsy Kings," or theatric reproductions that include Gypsy characters. Although important to common sense and cultural representations, such stories were not directly related to the research questions. References to the nomad lifestyle popularly associated with Gypsies / Roma were noted, in contexts such as:

> [Fergie's] status for the rest of her life would be decided at Balmoral, either as a fully restored, albeit mistrusted, member of the team or as a rootless super-celebrity roaming the world like a gypsy on a multi-million-pound royal pay-off.[64]

The Romanian newspapers are not indexed in Lexis Nexis or ProQuest. Therefore, these newspapers' digital archives – where available on their own webpages – were compared to the microfilm archives. In the case of *Adevărul*, online articles date back to 2001, whereas on the *România Liberă* webpage, articles date back to 2005 only. The search terms for the Romanian newspapers were "ţigan" and "rrom." Searching by the key term "rom" yielded too many unrelated results because the *Adevărul* archive is not as specific in its search terms. (An open search using "rom" included results that mention words such as "român" / "românesc" / "româneşte"[65] and were subsequently discarded from the results list.) Where online archives were unavailable, the newspaper hard copies were read and stories directly related to, or including reference to, Gypsies / Roma were selected for analysis.

The second stage of this research consists of discourse analysis of reports and publications issued by international NGOs directly working on Gypsy / Roma issues.[66]

Significantly for the explanatory purposes of this dissertation, Roma rights activism has gained momentum post-1989. Its beginnings coincide with EU attempts at formulating human rights regulations (regarding national socio-political treatments of the minority groups) and with moments of overt discrimination – manifested as official violence or as individual initiatives.[67] The chief purpose of the emerging NGOs has been to call for international support for the protection of Roma human and civil rights. However, Blasco argues that the activist approach of most NGOs – including the language and terminology variation Gypsy / Roma – is borrowed from non-Roma ideology and discourses,[68] an assessment worth further pursuing. As delineated above, one of the central concerns of this research is to grapple with the theoretical underpinnings of the activist movement, centered on integration – yet here assumed to be rooted in the same discourse of difference as overt discrimination.

Reports and publications issued by the following NGOs were analyzed: (1) the Project on Ethnic Relations; (2) the European Roma Information Office; (3) the European Roma Rights Centre; (4) the European Roma and Travellers Forum; and (5) the European Committee on Romani Emancipation.

To begin, the Project on Ethnic Relations (PER), founded in 1991, is dedicated to preventing ethnic conflict in Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the countries of the former Soviet Union. PER conducts intervention and dialogue programs, as well as training, education, and research at international, national, and community levels. PER is financially supported by the United States Agency for International Development, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Government of Switzerland, the Government of Great

Britain, the Government of Romania, the Balkan Trust for Democracy, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, NCH Capital Inc., the Alfred and Carol Moses Family Fund, and the People Technology Foundation, Inc. In regards to PER's focus on Roma issues, the NGO has traditionally organized trans-national meetings of national officials and Roma leaders. Currently, PER offers leadership and communication skills training and education programs for Roma leaders and activists, political and social engagement programs, meetings towards national policy making, as well as media programs to raise awareness regarding reporting on ethnic minority groups.[69]

The mission of the European Roma Information Office (ERIO), founded in 2003, is to promote "political and public discussion on Roma issues," drawing on "factual and in-depth information on a range of policy issues to the European Union institutions, Roma civil organizations, governmental authorities and intergovernmental bodies."[70] Working in conjunction with other NGOs, ERIO has participated in the drafting of series of reports documenting discrimination against minorities, in particular the Roma, and making policy suggestions to local governments and supranational bodies such as the EU that would address the noted inequality and discrimination. Currently, the NGO is involved in anti-discrimination policies in the fields of education, employment, health care and housing.[71]

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), formed in 1996, is "an international public interest law organisation" that aims to combat "anti-Romani racism and human rights abuse of Roma." Specifically, ERRC approaches and projects involve "strategic litigation, international advocacy, research and policy development, and training of Romani activists," according to their self-proclaimed agenda.[72] ERRC is a member of the

International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights and has consultative status with the Council of Europe and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. From the collaboration with the Council of Europe and the EU, a significant report on the role of the Gypsy / Roma community in the growing European community was created, "Roma in an Enlarged European Union."[73]

The European Roma and Travellers Forum (ERTF) is yet another NGO working in direct partnership with the Council of Europe, having its Secretariat located in Strasbourg, in close proximity to this institution. Established in 2004, ERTF aims to facilitate an environment of communication and collaboration between different institutions and organizations concerned with Roma human rights. To this effect, this NGO is "unique" in its diversity, because it is "the only international Roma and Traveller organization which unites NGOs, political parties, religious institutions and other types of leadership in one organisational structure."[74]

Finally, the European Committee on Romani Emancipation (ECRE), headquartered in the UK, was formed in 1999 under the EU, with equal status in all EU countries. Its chief work is to maintain a permanent presence in the European Parliament in Brussels.[75] ECRE's objectives are to protect and improve the treatment of Roma in Europe. It primarily strives against "the enforced exclusion, dependency and poverty of the Roma" through research, reviews of, and recommendations on, policy proposals, as well as monitoring local, national, and international media and political representation of the Roma, to name but a few of its operations.[76]

The following criteria inform the selection of NGOs. A first decisive factor is the degree of influence and recognition an NGO holds in the European space – evident in the

types of organizational funding received, the degree of involvement with prestigious bodies, such as the EU and the Council of Europe, and the amplitude of the projects they take on. An example is a subdivision of PER's working as a think-tank to design Roma policy recommendations to the international community and to local governments.[77] A second, equally significant, criterion is the NGO having an explicit agenda to work with Roma issues (rather than minority rights in general). Investigation of reports and publications put forth by these NGOs is necessary in order to seek out and expose the relationships between human rights policies (as released by the EU super-body), (Romanian and British) governmental policies, and international Roma activism. The activist institutional site – pieced together from the workings of each NGO, seen in itself and in conjunction with that of the other NGOs, the EU, and the Council of Europe – and that of media discourses provide insights into the workings of European discourses about Gypsies / Roma. The methodological task is to uncover its ideological underpinnings.

Spanning the 1990-2006 time-period, most documents were collected from the NGOs' own websites or were sent directly to the author by NGO staff. They were selected based on their significance and direct reference to Romanian and British Roma groups. Reports about specific projects in, for instance, Hungary, Bulgaria, Slovakia, or Russia – where the analysis did not seek trans-national discussion or application – were excluded from the analysis. However, reports pertaining to continental or regional projects that include direct reference to Romanian and British Gypsies / Roma were included in the sample. It follows that some read publications were regional in nature, addressing Central and Eastern Europe Roma groups, while others referred to the Roma in Europe in general (as were PER's Bulletins, ERIO's Country Reports, ERTF's Press

Releases, ERRC's *Roma Rights Quarterly*, or ECRE's Correspondence, to name some examples). For a detailed list of selected reports, see Appendix B. Consistency and differences of discourses identified in the NGO documents with those identified in the newspaper articles were noted in Chapter Seven.

In sum, discourse analysis was conducted to identify how Gypsies / Roma have been talked about in the post-1989 Western and Eastern European space. It was here assumed that ways of talking in media and NGO international communication efforts can reveal meanings about Gypsies / Roma in the globalizing European space. Moreover, they can help explain social and political attitudes and treatment of the Roma in Europe. The next two chapters present the findings of the analysis, beginning with a discussion of British and Romanian press discourses, followed by activist ways of talking about Gypsies / Roma. Quotations are given from both newspapers and reports; all translations of Romanian newspaper articles from Romanian into English were done by the author. Where no page numbers are indicated, the specific articles were retrieved from the newspapers' websites and no page numbers could be identified.

CHAPTER FIVE

"Slumped in His Flea-Infested Armchair, Filling out Incapacity Benefit Forms … and Beaming Proudly Afterwards": The Newspapers' Gypsy

The quote in the title describes an "urban pikey," to which a character in the British TV show *EastEnders* is compared. It signifies the intersection of the discourses active in the media coverage of 1990-2006: The Gypsy is an unwanted other, a parasite feeding on the non-Gypsy system, a "pikey" that "deserves," and is reproached, his name and lifestyle. This chapter describes and explains this construction and its connections to the political world of an enlarging Europe. It examines discourses about Gypsies / Roma, as they are imagined and engaged in the European imaginary in British and Romanian press coverage between the start of 1990 and the end of 2006 (Appendix C shows a complete list of discourses). The analysis offered here begins to address the question of what the British and Romanian cultures mean and understand by "Gypsy." Continuities and changes are explained in connection to local and international events and politico-economic developments, as are comparisons between the newspapers' representations. As expected, the Roma were constructed in sharp contrast to the non-Gypsies – that is, the educated, civilized, literate, hard-working, majority populations. Although the Roma are EU's largest minority, they are the black sheep of the European family. The representations of the "non-Gypsies" are, in this context, not surprisingly consistent, with few exceptions of dominant voices speaking on behalf of the plight of the Roma or striving for collaboration and mutual cultural respect.

There are two ways that discourses about the Gypsy / Roma could be addressed and delineated. One would be to describe discourses focusing less on their momentary flutters, but rather on their timelessness. This chapter would be organized differently, from this perspective. The other – favored here – is to emphasize discourses as they shift and are enunciated in intimate connection to time and space, to events and policy-making. In other words, this dissertation purposefully asked how Europe has been conceiving the Gypsy / Roma in a very specific historical conjuncture. It did not ask only what the Gypsy / Roma is – but how that meaning has shifted and been mobilized in harmony, or conflict, with socio-political European events, policy-making, international relations, economic recessions, inter-ethnic violence, organizational and institutional initiatives and failures, and the birthing of the activist movement for Roma rights.

News about the Roma occupied various locations in the newspapers. Most featured in "Home," "Internal News," "Latest News," "Overseas" and "Foreign News" (stories about the Eastern European Gypsies / Roma in the British press), others in "Opinion" / "Diary" / "Comment and analysis" / "Features" sections, as well as in sections for tourism and book reviews. The closer to 1990, the more difficult it was to hold the Romanian press to dominant (Western) standards of journalism writing. For instance, in the early months of 1990, the papers lacked an obvious page categorization and the news about Gypsies / Roma appeared in columns dedicated to crime – and indicatively labeled "Inadmissible" or "From trusted sources" (in *Adevărul*). Both Romanian newspapers had transitioned from the official voice of the Romanian Communist Party[1] and celebrated the newly acquired freedom of speech by publishing philosophical analyses, political essays, and more generally opinion writing. While some

journalistic values were upheld – story structure (e.g., most important information first), temporal and spatial proximity, or source-citing – others, such as objectivity and specificity (e.g., explanation of numbers), were sacrificed to the benefit of the type of content included. Titles were more focused on sensationalizing the news or using the hot phrases of the time, rather than on accurately describing the story content.

Overt discrimination was common place in the early 1990s, both in terms of language, terminology, and tone, as well as in regards to inferences, assumptions, and associations – and continues throughout the time period analyzed, with varying degrees of directness. Similarly, sourcing was problematic in the early 1990s in both Romanian and British press – and gradually improved towards the mid-2000s –especially in news that depicted conflict around Gypsy / Roma issues. Crime stories quoted only official sources (such as police officers or state prosecutors) and not the Gypsy / Roma suspects or witnesses. Although the post-Communist recovering Romanian environment or the non-existing NGO movement (at the time) to protect Romani voices may explain the trends in Romanian press coverage, the explanation does not stand in a British context, where journalism has long been a respectable institution.

The Gypsy of 1990: The Unlawful Brunet

The two months immediately following the dissolution of the Central and Eastern European Communist regimes constituted a time of continental social unrest and uncertainty. For Romania, it was a time of politico-economic change, reflected in the press as a range from explosive enthusiasm and confidence about the budding democracy, to fearful, tentative, and cautious statements about the transition. At the other

end of the European political spectrum, the UK favored caution altogether. Political news analyses about Eastern Europe (or Romania in specific) testified to UK's skepticism about this region's political stability. There was not yet a clear economic focus, as there were no talks of integration at that moment. Europe was barely starting to process the political changes. In this context, three discourses about Gypsies were identified in the two nations' press in January and February 1990: The Gypsy as the other; the Gypsy as victim of discrimination; and the Gypsy as civilized.

TABLE 5.1 Discourses identified in the 1990 newspapers

	The Times		*The Guardian*		*Adevărul*		*România Liberă*	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	6	**60**	4	**80**	6	**85.7**	5	**83.3**
The Gypsy as victim of discrimination	4	**40**	1	**20**	0	**0**	1	**16.6**
The civilized Gypsy	4	**40**	0	**0**	1	**14.2**	2	**33.3**
Total number of docs.	10		5		7		6	

The first noted discourse in the press was that of the Gypsy as the other, contrasted, predictably, to the non-Gypsy that is *normal*, living in legality, and respecting authority. The Gypsy was discussed to be outside the law, living and working illegally, raising children in the same immoral and unethical tradition. In response to this (construction of the) Gypsy, the authorities and the majority population are resigned that this is *how they are*; this is Gypsy nature, genetically inferior to the non-Gypsy, intellectually and socially. The discourse contributed knowledge that continued to justify discrimination, embodied in the early months of 1990s as both "tolerance" towards the

Gypsies (it is their cultural way) and a mocking attitude (it is their "different," other way). Significantly, this discourse contrasted the different ways of the Gypsies to the non-Gypsy, majority cultures (British or Romanian) by highlighting some information over others. For example, newspaper readers were told that the Romanian Gypsies elect and are led by a "bulibaşă," sometimes assisted by a vice-bulibaşă[2]; they speak a different language; women become mothers at a typically younger age than non-Gypsies; Gypsy mothers nurse their children in public; Gypsy children are depicted "holding their mother's skirt."[3] Such indicators recall what the literature termed as "positive" stereotypes that nonetheless have stood for cultural difference, distorted into othering.[4]

Different themes played a role in the discourse of the Gypsy as the other. One theme corresponds to classic tropes noted in the literature (reviewed in Chapter Three) and predictably constructed a Gypsy population that steals, begs, robs, is involved in illegal affairs, is insincere and conniving, and constantly works towards cheating the non-Gypsies. One *Adevărul* reporter described a crime committed by two 16-year-old "sons of gypsies" in considerably more detail than other crimes mentioned in the story on daily thefts occurring in markets.[5] In the same newspaper, ethnicity and unemployment were sole descriptors of perpetrators of criminal acts.[6] The majority population appeared justified to *expect* the Gypsies to live outside the law, as well as to assume criminality to mean "Gypsy." In the case of a "gypsy type" fortune teller that allegedly left with a client's money,[7] the author of the story concluded, "She might have seen it coming, don't you think?"[8] Similarly, "hundreds of [British] gypsies" were *expected* to "take the road to avoid paying the community charge" and paying caravan sites taxes; the police therefore gave out an "exodus warning."[9]

The Gypsy other was also depicted to be chronically unemployed – and unemployment in this discourse is a precondition for criminal behavior (such as rape, robbery, and hooligan acts). Gypsy criminals were explicitly identified by ethnicity and as unemployed. The phrasing and framing of unemployment was poignant: It is the Gypsies' *choice*; it is their *preference* not to work; they are *blamed* for not having a job. Under Communism, Gypsies were given jobs by the regime; they had to work. The mentality persisted at the outset of 1990: The fact that, in post-Communism, there are Gypsy criminals becomes attributable to unemployment.

The construction of the bohemian Gypsy contributed knowledge to the Gypsy other by invoking traditional stereotypes of musicality, of beautiful and attractive Gypsy women (sexually desired by non-Gypsies), of fortune telling and occult practices, and of horse herding. The theme of the horse herder merged dark skin, horse trade, and speaking Romany into the complex bohemian image of the Gypsy commonly seen in fiction literature, art, and music. The same Gypsy was a nomad – in a different sense than the British Travellers who break land and tax laws (see above); rather, the bohemian Gypsy wanders from land to land, free-spirited ("ease with which … [the] family moved across the countryside with no seeming problems of accommodation").[10] This discourse constructed nomadism as a flawless, romanticized way of life – and not a difficult migration issue. It is so familiar a representation in the public sphere, to the point that nomadism became a common linguistic expression (*The Times* reporters were "to be seen, like a troop of gypsies, wandering around … from briefing to briefing"[11]). Most generally, they social problems facing the Roma were minimized through this rhetorical strategy as choices made by the Roma – whether they have a nomadic way of life or live

in poverty ("we knew that gypsies have always passionately loved their babes, and they never got stingy in counting them in their yard, whether the state gave them child care benefits or not"[12]).

The literature explains the need to control such an *other* social actor.[13] For the press, it is clear that the Gypsy can only be controlled by authority interference, "only [by] the prompt intervention of police officers and their appeal to respecting the law"[14] – and, for this purpose, police officers and officials were subsequently celebrated figures in the community. Alongside authority intervention, the public and the journalists considered themselves *entitled* to interfere and help control the inferior Gypsies. In situations of conflict, the press did not hide its disapproval of, and fury against, the Gypsy others; commenting on the Gypsies' presumed guilt of murder ("the whole locality was a volcano of indignation,"[15] in *Adevărul*'s words), stealth, or abduction. An important factor, in the press coverage of 1990, journalists' writing about the Gypsies was not in any way veiled. Discrimination was explicit in numerous stories. Romanian coverage, in particular, used informal tone and language, sarcasm, overt derogatory terms and labels, the most common of which being "the brunets"[16] – a transparent reference to racial and cultural difference. Even when the story narrative was straightforward (noting the location, date, and participants to the first post-Communism Gypsy gathering in Romania), the author's name – Gh. Țigănele – raised derogatory connotations, as it distinctly resembles the Romanian word for "Gypsy" (that is, "țigan").[17]

A necessary counterpart to the discourse of the Gypsy as the other was the discourse of the Gypsy as victim of discrimination. Unsurprisingly, arguing against anti-Gypsyism and ethnic wars was necessary given the geopolitical context of the second

half of the 20th century Europe. *The Times* in particular dedicated attention to discrimination, reporting discrimination against the Gypsy minorities both in the context of the Holocaust (victims because of their alleged "racial difference" and inferiority – in contrast to the "master race"[18]) and of Communist ethnic cleansing (victims to the dictator Nicolae Ceaușescu's "Orwellian, nightmarish drive"[19] to "Romanianize" Romania).

The Guardian interestingly noted that the Roma have grown accustomed to not complain about being victims of racial prejudice.[20] Such realization – even if momentary – renders apparent that othering the Gypsy allows the press to treat the minority groups more lightly in regards to their position as victims of discrimination. Not only have the Gypsies supported a perception of self-isolation and accepted invisibility (by not complaining), but the non-Gypsies also have ignored them. Numerous examples reinforce this absence. For instance, most journalists writing about the Holocaust (in 1990 and in later years) ignored the Gypsies and solely centered on the Jews. Likewise, the Romanian post-Revolution press politically disregarded the Roma. Stories about (political or educational) minority rights referred to (a) the Hungarian and German minorities (even though the Gypsy group outsized the German one, according to the 2002 Census[21]) or to (b) a general concept of minorities, sometimes detailed to be ethnic or racial (one story mentioned other "marginals," such as the Greeks, Serbs, Jews, Ukrainians, and Slovaks[22]).

Furthermore, *The Guardian* constructed victimization of, and called for pity towards, non-Gypsies alone – in stories that included or should have included Gypsies. In an article on the emerging AIDS epidemic in Romania, the British correspondent from

Bucharest interviewed the one non-Gypsy mother in a hospital room, and not the other two Gypsy mothers present. As a mark of emphasis, the same author noted that the "two young gypsy women nurse their [AIDS-infected] babies,"[23] without any related remark about the non-Gypsy mother. The photograph accompanying the story significantly showed a close-up of a sick-looking baby – "a wizened little victim of the AIDS epidemic"[24] – being fed by a bottle: The baby to arouse the reader's concern is not a Gypsy. This example merges otherness (embodied in the women's ethnicity and age and by invoking the "positive" stereotype of the fertile and nursing Roma women) with sexualization and with issues of privacy in an interesting package that emphasizes the Roma women's distinct difference – as well as their muteness. The Roma may be suffering like the majority population, yet they blend with the background; it is easy – and comfortable – to miss them; they are silently invisible, irrelevant, and expendable. Moreover, the visual choice is significant as a story about Romania put together for a British audience at the fall of Communism: Gypsy children may be ill (in the story), but they do not, and cannot, visually represent Romanian children.

The partnership of otherness-victimization and absence of the Gypsy increases the significance of the emerging discourse of the civilized Gypsy. The beginning of the 1990s included few but essential such representations. One example was a letter-to-the-editor published in *România Liberă* and written on behalf of several *Gypsy* community leaders (the Roma term was not introduced at the time) about the Gypsy culture in Romania and current and past discrimination. This letter distinguished between the educated Gypsies (framed in the story as "we" – "we have become part of the civilized people" and "we were born on this land and we have been living from time immemorial

with the Romanians"[25]) and the poor and uneducated groups (phrased to be "they"). (This latter point consistently resurfaced throughout the following years – sometimes constructed as reproached disunity, other times as a defining element of the ethnic groups' otherness.)

Europe in 1990 understood the implications of Holocaust-like and ethnic cleansing projects; yet it also understood Gypsy otherness. In order to allow the Gypsy to be Roma, the press (among other key institutions) needed to start building a vocabulary and framework for living with difference (an ongoing process to this day). The discourse of the civilized Gypsy began carving this body of knowledge. First, widely common stereotypes had to be dispelled, such as the myth of the Gypsy child thief (*Adevărul* offered psychological research that exposed the fear and magical mentality behind the social construction[26]) and nomadism ("[we are] good workers, honest and hardworking … organized in towns and villages, we have our own homes"[27]). Journalists started speaking up for the Gypsies, historically contextualizing the political strategies of framing Gypsies as the "traditional scapegoats of Eastern Europe."[28] A Romanian writer compared the socially constructed Gypsy scapegoats to other *others* (monks, police officers, and poor people) – all become others in different contexts.[29] *The Times* explained the stereotypical assumption of criminality to be the fault of a discriminatory public expecting Gypsies to be guilty of abduction (of a British maid).[30] The British paper recognized, in this context, the power of mob discrimination as "intolerant and oppressive"[31] and the implications of stereotyping that motivate mob fascination over Gypsies in general.

To close, the discourses of 1990 seem sensible *out of necessity*. Following the December 1989 Revolution, the Romanian newspapers were processing, and adjusting to, their newfound intellectual independence and social responsibility. The Gypsy under Communist rule was effaced, "Romanianized," and "ethnically cleansed" into a non-Gypsy, a non-subject, to be ignored. The Gypsy was absent from public attention. It is thus only logical that the journalists' initial focus would be to conceive and describe the Gypsy as a social topic for news, to give mediated visibility to what was absent from press vocabulary, to formulate into press language the common sense ideologically already there. For the British press, this moment of January-February 1990 was not a beginning, however. In the absence of a rigorous international program of Gypsy rights, the already available representations of the Gypsy were therefore that of the other – at home and everywhere else – and a victim to Nazi ethnic cleansing.

The Gypsy of 1992: The Social Burden

The selected time frame of August-October 1992 was characterized by two incidents of moral panic – the neo-Nazi attacks on Roma refugees in cities of the former East Germany and the British political and public discontent with illegal festivals organized by New Age Travellers. Outside of the two moral panics, the press included mundane stories involving Roma, such as news about local politics, gatherings, American fortune tellers, deforestation, crime, travel pieces, and obituaries. Although the two central events captured the majority of press attention, the discourses identified in this time-period were consistent, regardless of the country discussed (Romania, Germany, or the UK), and regardless of the news focus. Five discourses were identified: The Gypsy as

the other; the Gypsy as an unwanted problem; the Gypsy as victim of discrimination; the Gypsies as an abandoned people; and, finally, the civilized Gypsy. The 1990 discourse of the Gypsy as the other developed, by 1992, to describe a more complex representation of the Gypsy as a social burden – both an other and an unwanted other. The Gypsy, therefore, was constructed static in his / her representation, isolated as foreigners, outsiders, others "out there," not like "us" – and therefore in contrast and conflict with "us" – and synonymous with other *others*, with other social and economic problems that need authorities to control them.

TABLE 5.2 Discourses identified in the 1992 newspapers

	The Times		*The Guardian*		*Adevărul*		*România Liberă*	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	49	**76.5**	36	**53.7**	25	**41.6**	22	**47.8**
The Gypsy as an unwanted problem	53	**82.8**	38	**56.7**	20	**33.3**	14	**30.4**
The Gypsy as victim of discrimination	36	**56.2**	39	**58.2**	40	**66.6**	31	**67.3**
The Gypsies as an abandoned people	15	**23.4**	28	**41.7**	15	**25**	12	**26**
The civilized Gypsy	32	**50**	31	**46.2**	6	**10**	11	**23.9**
Total number of docs.	64		67		60		46	

Building on the description of a moral panic discussed in the previous Chapter, the crisis moments of 1992 developed by constructing the problematic group of the Gypsies (the Romanian asylum-seekers in Germany and the New Age Travellers in Britain) to embody *the* source of public fear and to become *the* threat "to societal values and interests."[32] The literature on moral panics explains the active and necessary

construction of the groups perceived to be a threat – thus, of the Gypsies – in stereotypical ways by the media, by politicians, by opinion leaders, and by experts. There needs to be an other to be blamed for the panic. Moreover, the crisis must be managed and solved – a duty that falls with public figures. As shown below, the politico-economic solutions found to the two moral panics of 1992 both involved scapegoating the Gypsies and sacrificing their (human / minority) rights.

In late August of 1992, angry outbursts of violence against asylum-seeking refugees shook Germany and all of Europe. Groups of neo-Nazis from the former East Germany attacked hostels hosting Romanian, Vietnamese, and African refugees. Press coverage around Europe rallied to chronicle and deplore the extremist attacks, the leftist demonstrations protesting the attacks, the local support shown to neo-Nazis, the police efforts to monitor the attacks, as well as Germany's political reactions to the extremist assaults. Gypsies were at the forefront of the overt racial hatred; they were most commonly described as dirty and immoral foreigners, a "nuisance,"[33] and "professional beggars with aberrant tendencies."[34] The German government came under close international scrutiny and its reactions were particularly waited for, and analyzed, in light of the historical context of half a century earlier. The Helmut Kohl administration objected strongly to the display of xenophobia, yet his decision to deport the Romanian Gypsies to their homeland was labeled in the press as a capitulation to extremists and a "purification process."[35] The government's decision was explained by taking several factors into account: The economic instability due to growing unemployment after the German Unification; booming immigration (encouraged by the liberal provisions for granting asylum supported by Article 16 of the German Constitution established after

Hitler's fall); public and extremist discontent over the asylum-seekers; and international concern regarding Germany's policy to handle internal dissensions. Nonetheless, critical voices in *The Guardian*, for instance, suggested that Germany "washed its hands"[36] of the Gypsies in yet another procedure of ethnic cleansing. Thousands of Gypsies, with or without identification papers or passports to demonstrate their Romanian citizenship, were deported, starting in November 1992, back to Romania, whose government received German financial assistance to handle its returning migrants.

The summer of 1992 brought the issue of Gypsies and New Age Travellers on the British public agenda because of several illegal festivals organized throughout the countryside. A considerable number of letters-to-the-editor were published on this topic (eight in *The Times* and five in *The Guardian*), testifying to the attention paid to the New Age Travellers topic. Differently than the European-wide moral panic about the neo-Nazi xenophobic attacks on Gypsies, the problem of the New Age Travellers concerned only the press in the UK. The social descriptions used to construct the New Age Travellers were confusing and overlapped with more general and older representations of Gypsies. Especially in 1992, the traveling, more traditional Gypsy groups were confused and collapsed in public discourses with the New Age Travellers – who typically have been youth reacting to mainstream cultures, speaking against materialism and in support of socialism, anarchy, idealism, and environmentalism (at least this is common terminology associated with the New Age Travellers in the British press).[37] To complicate matters more, the New Age Travellers were often associated with ravers (who came to festivals, yet did not claim Gypsy or New Age Traveller affiliation). The social concern with illegal festivals was further enhanced by politico-economic dissensions regarding the

distribution of government benefits (dole), in the context of an economic recession in the UK. The British government reacted – similarly to the responses of the German leadership faced with anti-immigrant attacks – by focusing on ways to tighten the regulations affecting the New Age Travellers, such as revising both the Caravan Sites Act (which required local councils to provide sites for traveling Gypsies) and dole distribution. Press critics in *The Guardian* were quick to judge John Major's government reaction to be an easy way out; Gypsies became – in this context, too – a political and economic scapegoat, "for the chop,"[38] or "this year's great discovery."[39] Such assessment confirms *The Guardian*'s political commitments at odds with the Conservative Major administration.

To begin, the first discourse of the Gypsy as the other constructed the difference of the ethnic groups, conceived to be obvious, known, common sense, unquestionable, and stable. In the words of a Romanian proverb cited to discuss Gypsy illegality in *România Liberă*, "The Gypsy stays a Gypsy."[40] The Gypsies *are*, and always *been*, uncivilized and backward (polluting the land with feces and urinating in public), insincere (scheming, cheating, lying, stealing, dealing jewelry), sexually immoral, unemployed and begging – or else owning gold and showing off their wealth of questionable origin – violent and aggressive criminals (contributing to rising crime in the communities where they move), as well as hot-tempered and confrontational. This latter trait was often framed to lead to disunity among the Gypsies, mostly among the Romanian groups. Gypsy immorality and illegality were perhaps best captured by the following Romanian crime report published on the front page in *Adevărul*:

> … rustlers, pickpocketers, the lowest of the low, pilferers and many other nobodies who declare themselves, loud and clear, tradesmen … individuals set on money-making; illegally, of course![41]

Their difference was also apparent in their default nomadism. A Romanian journalist, for example, discussed the return of the Gypsies from Germany (also on the front page of the newspaper) using words such as "taking shelter" and "migrating birds" to describe the immigration attempt, suggesting the unsettled, temporary, and also parasitic characteristic of Gypsy living.[42]

The European Gypsies of Britain, Germany, Romania, or Bosnia – making the subject of press coverage – were represented to be the "filthy Gypsies."[43] That is, they were discursively constructed to be dirty, non-hygienic, bad-smelling, living in, and making, a mess, and disturbing the locals. Their poverty was strikingly different than the living standards of the social burden to society. If poverty was a descriptor of a nostalgic lifestyle in the 1990s, poverty became by 1992 an accusation – Gypsies live in miserable conditions because *they want to* and *like to*. Such neoconservative construction of a "culture of poverty" was backed up by evidence significant only by contrast to the non-Gypsy life. Thus, the ethnic group stood out because of their run-down, "clapped out"[44] living conditions (e.g., their caravans and clothes, their animals and chaotic homes).

The second discourse of 1992 was the unwanted, foreigner, outsider Gypsy. The connection with the first discourse is evident: Because of who they are, Gypsies are not like "us," the majority, non-Gypsy population. Discursively, the Gypsies were unwanted by the host town or country, who publicly expressed its intolerance and racism via the media. The locals' reported fear of having Gypsies around and their helplessness in terms of how the minorities might affect their community contributed to the image of the

unwanted. Socially and politically, non-Gypsies (villagers or politicians) claimed that Gypsies' rights clash and impede upon their own. A feature story in *România Liberă* depicted the intersection of Gypsies' otherness with non-Gypsies' overt condemnation of their difference, which justifies their outsider-status:

> It seemed as if hordes of dark-skinned people had fallen from the sky in the their town. … It was, in fact, the gypsies. … Today the hatred … of the gypsies … is all over Germany. … This is what German citizens who live in the vicinity of camps for gypsy asylum-seekers declared: "I will do anything to move from here. They beg, sing and yell in the street. They have restrooms, but they go on the street or in the downtown plaza. They are dirty. They threaten women with knives they carry at all times. They go through the trash and spread it on the ground." … Police noticed that in towns that have gypsies, crime has increased four times. … Legends or not, it is terrifying what the Germans tell about the gypsies illegally arrived and without a home: "Gypsies sleep out in the open. You can see them at night around a fire by the road. There, they fry dogs and cats that they stole from us. We are neighbors with the devil."[45]

Gypsies brought about "nuisance, damage and ecological disturbance … no sanitation … [and] public health risk," and therefore "local residents were adamant they never wanted to experience such a nightmare again."[46]

Like other outsiders and foreigners, the Gypsies take away resources meant for non-Gypsies – in the British context of an economic recession and in recovering, post-unification Germany. The Gypsy groups and other asylum-seekers received government benefits (or support from evangelist religious groups), yet in the German context, the public and neo-Nazi extremists alike blamed the government for not controlling immigration, so that government help could focus on the German nationals. From a Roma perspective, the impossibility of their lives is striking: The Gypsies migrate to Germany because of economic reasons and discrimination, looking for economic stability, yet they contribute, arguably, to more economic unsettlement (and are met with

further xenophobia); for these reasons, they are deported, back to a context of poverty and prejudice. The cycle of racism is complete – and inescapable.

In general, the minority groups were constructed to be not worthy of state aid. The Gypsies are willingly unemployed; they do not want jobs, nor do they look for jobs (consistent with the larger picture of a social burden). Moreover, the Gypsies take advantage of, and undeservingly demand, government dole, EU assistance, and locals' good will. A *Times* article suggested that any form of government assistance encouraged and validated an abnormal lifestyle:

> … some taxpayers loathe the idea of giving these people their social security payments *as if their lifestyle was deeply desirable* … if there is one thing worse than hoards of smelly travellers, it's smelly travellers dying of starvation. *Imagine the inconvenience*, if they started pegging out all over your fields."[47]

Government help was preferred to the burden that Gypsies *could become*. This passage is consistent with other modes of talking about difference in other cultural contexts.[48] As a more traditional paper, *The Times* here surrendered the neoconservative critique in the face of the danger perceived to overcome majority societies if Gypsies were left unaided.

The discourse of the Gypsy as an unwanted problem further constructed the minority group synonymous with other problematic groups. This discursive strategy was consistent with public reaction, and adjustment, to the moral panics. Most obviously, the Gypsies became synonymous with the New Age Travellers – and with ravers. The distinctions between Gypsy Travellers and New Age Travellers were difficult to pin down because they are first and foremost socially constructed; second, they are changing (in public discourses), depending on the moral panic or current events and concerns associated with the groups. Gypsy Travellers expressed (through published letters-to-the-

editor) the distinctions to lie with the role that traveling has for the community, as described in a *Times* report on a statement from the National Gypsy Council:

> A gypsy is a travelling person who is born and bred on the road, and whose family has been on the road for generations, and for whom travelling is an economic matter. New Age travellers have no proper family structure and travel around in old buses looking for leafy glades to do their own thing.[49]

Press reports did not clarify a distinction between the two groups, but contributed to their anti-social representation. The New Age Travellers were perceived as a counter-culture, organizing illegal festivals, traveling in rugged caravans, disturbing the peace, parking on, and polluting, the property of the locals, being monitored and evicted by police forces, using drugs and alcohol, and more generally conducting "a direct assault on the structure of social life."[50] Reporters and politicians described the New Age Travellers to be socialists, anarchists, green idealists, environmentalists, and anti-materialists.[51] A letter-to-the-editor signed by a New Age Traveller defended the festivals, arguing they are "a rite of passage," whose "harmfulness … is exaggerated."[52] Ultimately, the power of the discourse did not depend on its clarity. Rather, the coexistence of the different modes of talking about the New Age Travellers – on one hand, journalists' and politicians' skepticism and irony towards the "so-called travellers,"[53] on another, the association with a hippy-type rebellion – and the contradictions between the two enhanced the significance of the discourse. In the end, the (British) Gypsy is a social problem – an unwanted other – regardless of his / her actual lifestyle, values, and traditions.

The almost instinctual, knee-jerk reaction once the other was conceived to be the source of societal peril – and therefore can only be unwanted – was to control the Gypsy.

Specific evidence was offered in order to sustain fear-based xenophobia. The illegality of the traveling lifestyle had to be highlighted – that is, both illegal parking on someone else's land and not paying taxes for occupying state-owned or public land. The other's barbarism and aggression was framed as immutable, resilient, and thus threatening (for example, the Secretary of State for Social Security, Peter Lilley, described the Gypsies as "spongers descending like locusts, demanding benefits with menaces"[54]). Non-Gypsy locals complained against the assignment of camp sites for Gypsies / New Age Travellers, as well as against the larger concept of traveling. In this sense, Gypsies and New Age Travellers did not respect the (non-Gypsy) law of the land – either by crossing private property, by engaging in deforestation ("leaving behind them a desolate view, deep wounds, which will not heal for many years to come"[55]), or by continuing to return to places they were evicted from. As a result of their illegality, authorities were called upon – by the media, by the public, and by politicians themselves – to intervene and control the Gypsies.

A third discourse depicted the Gypsy as victim of discrimination. The press documented and labeled acts of racism, discrimination, and prejudice in Germany, Romania, and the UK, at the same time as they presented complaints brought up by non-governmental international institutions fighting for the protection of the Gypsies. In the Romanian context, Gypsies were victims of institutional discrimination and police apathetic protection. *Adevărul* reported about attacks on Gypsy booths in the public market where "the police did not or could not intervene, although they were in the area."[56]

In the British landscape, the press message was that Gypsies were unwanted and their presence was inconvenient and embarrassing for the locals. Nationalism became distorted into outright racism, to the point that Gypsies were hunted down and "hounded out" by police and extremists in a game of cat and mouse.[57] *The Guardian*'s cynicism towards, and critique of, the Conservative regime breaths through stories that recognize the political project of isolating the Gypsies as the sources of moral panic. As a political topic, Gypsies were "this year's great discovery,"[58] something to blame when politicians did not, could not, or would not solve the pressing international, political, and / or economic issues. The discourse rested upon the social responsibility of the media because, in this case, the journalists pointed to political discrimination.

In the German context, newspapers described xenophobic and racial attacks initiated by neo-Nazi youth in Germany, encouraged by German locals, and institutionally supported by slow police intervention,[59] as well as public discrimination in every day life outside racial attacks. The role of the press in covering the attacks in Germany was to offer substantial evidence meant to explain the local atmosphere around the inter-ethnic conflict. The extremist assaults, although frowned upon by political leaders in the context of Germany's history with the Holocaust, were discursively justified in the media by the numerous testimonies gathered from locals (given directly to journalists or on German public television), skinheads, and police officers in charge of defending the asylum-seekers' hostels. The examples abounded, from extremist slogans of "foreigners out," "Germany belongs to the Germans," "We don't want these pigs that demand asylum," and "Germany must live,"[60] to declarations such as:

> [The] fake asylum-seekers – the Romanians and the gypsies … were defecating in the grass … stealing from the supermarket … [They] relieve themselves … behind the vegetable stall.[61]
>
> They are not people, they are swine. They fornicate on the grass and piss in our doorways … *I have nothing against foreigners but these are gypsies* … They are infringing German morality. They make our society dirty and they have to be shown the way out – with the boot if necessary.[62]
>
> [W]e've been trying to get them out by democratic means for months. We wrote letters … about the terrible mess they make. … camping on the green … all the nuisance we had to endure. Nobody listened to us. And then the 'skins' came. They got them out. … *We are not racist. We don't hate foreigners*.[63]

Locals thus legitimize their xenophobia by emphasizing the barbarism of the Gypsies. The emphasized quotes, both from *The Times*, express more than the intended purpose of the discourse (that is, to highlight the victimization of the Gypsy). Such mode of talking is in fact a disclaimer, an excuse, and at most an apology ("[*I*]*s that being unreasonable?* … a properly organized and licensed festival is one thing. A mass invasion of private or common land is very different"[64]). It reminds of Europe's fierce desire to not repeat, or be associated with, ethnic cleansing. Not hating outsiders – refugees or other ethnics – speaks to one's strong morality, but the Gypsy's own barbarism renders it impossible for locals to want them. And thus, the discourse of otherness is once again necessary.

Featured most strongly in *The Guardian*, as the most liberal of the press voices analyzed, the discourse of the Gypsies as an abandoned people continued the story narrated in 1992. Despite being unwanted and persecuted, the Gypsies continued to be politically ignored. Authorities either did not do anything about the Gypsy problem – or they "wash[ed] their hands of the Gypsies"[65] by deporting them. Only out of fear of Gypsies (organizing illegal festivals and manipulating government assistance), under international scrutiny, and under national pressure to settle immigration, unemployment,

and social discontent – must they be controlled. When brutally discriminated against and under attack, however, the authorities were more lax to intervene. Political intolerance and police brutality (both noted by journalists or Gypsies themselves) were tolerated or ignored.

Such state abandonment was possible because of institutionalized discrimination against Gypsies. Here, the press reported and noted such anti-Gypsyism. In the UK, the government manifested its racism through legislation and, more obviously, through its leaders' statements. For example, both *The Times* and *The Guardian* cited the Conservative Prime Minister John Major on New Age Travellers' deviance: "New Age travellers? Not in this age. Not in any age. They say that we don't understand them. Well, I'm sorry, but if rejecting materialism means destroying the property of others then I don't understand."[66] Romanian officials were similarly politically incorrect, as shown in both Romanian and British newspapers quoting a deputy mayor who publicly declared that "*those* Gypsies never integrated" [67] and

> Those gypsies in Germany do not want to work and they went there for an easy life … If the ones who come back behave like those who left, we would not accept them. But if they do not, we would give them a second chance.[68]

Reporters and political analysts from the UK and from Romania, as well as interviewed NGOs and human rights organizations cited in the press, recognized that Gypsies were a scapegoat used by the Kohl and Major governments to show a response – the easy response – to the two countries' distress in the face of economic instability, unemployment, growing immigration, and neo-Nazi and popular xenophobia and racism. Press coverage also deplored authorities' incapability to directly deal with racism. This discourse drew from the more general attitude of deploring the Great Pogrom (the Gypsy

Holocaust), fascist and Communist discrimination, and Gypsies' continued victimization. It also recognized that Gypsies' lack of employment was also a contemporary economic consequence of institutionalized discrimination.

Finally, the discourse of the civilized Gypsy unapologetically constructed the Gypsy culture, historically persecuted, yet with minority and human rights that are well deserved – rather than tolerated. The history of migration and contemporary myths of nomadism were explained, contextualized, and even dispelled[69]; settled communities and employment, spirituality and religion (for instance, the French Gypsies' devotion to a black Madonna[70]) were not treated as unusual exceptions; furthermore, some articles recognized the institutionalization of racism and explained non-social behavior in the context of poverty and classism (for example, some Gypsies resorting to prostitution or drugs in the context of their marginal status[71]); finally, some articles recognized that Travellers in Britain contributed to local communities, despite public perception of their uselessness, inconvenience, and burdensome presence. The tone of this discourse was different than that employed by the discourse that deplored victimization. The discourse of the civilized Gypsy was positioned within cultural relativism and positively allowed the Gypsies to be as they are (mostly misunderstood). Most significantly, British journalists spoke against ideologies that constructed the deviance of the "Gypsy problem"[72] (term actually used in *The Times*) in contrast to the normalized non-Gypsy lifestyle.[73]

The frequency of this last mode of talking highlights important differences between the read papers. The discourse was invoked in roughly half of both *Times* and *Guardian* articles, barely in a quarter of *România Liberă*'s stories, and only in 10% of

Adevărul's coverage. It is not surprising that the British press most strongly contributed to this talk, given Romania's slower process of acknowledging institutional racism and recognizing the validity of Gypsy cultures. After all, only Romanian newspapers employed derogatory terms to refer to Gypsies for this time-frame (even if British stories were discriminatory in content). *România Liberă*'s mission statement itself emphasized opinion first, followed by information and reporting (framed in tabloid style). It also spoke critically of the Ion Iliescu Presidency, different than *Adevărul*, which sided more often with the social-democrat political leadership. *Adevărul* also had less news about Gypsies. These indicators might suggest that, at this time, *România Liberă* may be both less conservative in its political views[74] and more progressive in its attitude towards minorities than *Adevărul*.

In closing, the period of August-October 1992 started to show indications of activist interest in defending the minority and human rights of the Gypsies. Although not a discourse per se, this interest constituted an important theme in the context of the moral panic and more general European debates. National and foreign concern towards Gypsy discrimination was voiced by two German NGOs, the Romany Union in Berlin[75] and the Roma National Congress,[76] fighting against deportation of the Gypsies, a European Roma Parliament founded in Budapest, Hungary,[77] a local NGO project of assistance for the health of the New Age Travellers,[78] and various Gypsy international organizations quoted to speak about racism, including the Helsinki Watch and Amnesty International.[79]

The Gypsy narrated in 1992 opens the floor for a powerful dynamic of othering-victimization, deeply rooted in the necessity of colonizing and controlling the difference of the Roma. The non-Roma can continue to discriminate against the Gypsy / Roma only

by constructing the victim role – and deploring it as a redeeming gesture (in cases of racial attacks, for instance). This binary develops further in later years, with the increased attention given by international organizations such as the EU to human / Roma rights.

The Gypsy of 1997: Someone Else's Problem

> Municipal magistrates in many towns, eager to be rid of their "problem citizens," have been giving them the 17,500 crowns (£320) needed for a plane ticket. Some are said to be paying the airlines directly. "We're only helping our fellow citizens fulfill their wishes," said Liana Janackova, the mayor of Marianske Hory. "What can be wrong with that?"[80]

The Czech mayor of Marianske Hory explained local authorities' involvement in supporting the immigration of Gypsies from their town to Canada and the UK in the late summer and early fall of 1997. This quote illustrates the prevalent construction identified in the British press coverage in the months of August-November 1997. It identifies Gypsies as a problem – but a problem for someone else to solve. Consistent with earlier discourses, the Gypsy was conceived as a social problem, an economic burden, of a race and ethnicity lower than the non-Gypsy majorities – an other. This representation was enhanced by the moral panic of 1997 that affected Britain and Canada and that led Western societies (the British, French, German, and Belgian countries discussed in the newspapers) to look for answers – mostly quick-fixes that fit within the cultural comfort-level. Press coverage for this period further drew from, explored, and contributed to a counter-discourse that exposed racism and called for a more sober treatment of Gypsy groups. Of the 114 articles analyzed, a little more than a half was dedicated to the moral panic, whereas 50 stories were about other issues surrounding the Gypsies. Sterilization and eugenics in Europe, news about an abortion trial involving an Irish traveller family,

Princess Diana's visit to a medium of Romany origin and subsequent media attention to the topic of predicting the future, an Italian Gypsy's brief career as a beauty contestant, crime, community projects, musical talent, travel, and book and film reviews – these were some of the mundane topics that made newspapers' focus for the four studied months.

The panic of 1997 occupied media and politicians' agenda and raised lay folks' concerns (quoted in the press and expressed in published letters-to-the-editor). What was described as an "exodus," an "influx," a "flood,"[81] "an 'invasion' (Daily Telegraph) … by 'Giro Czechs' (Evening Standard) 'looking for a hand-out' (Independent),"[82] was, in fact, an attempted relocation / immigration of hundreds of Gypsies – families with children – from Central and East European countries, especially the Czech Republic and Slovakia, to Canada and the UK. Most of the Roma were denied asylum and returned home. The process of immigration had been in gradual development since the fall of Communism; what made the late summer and early fall of 1997 unique was the suddenly large numbers coming into Toronto and Dover claiming asylum. Whereas the press identified a Czech television program to be the leading factor in the rise in immigration, the Gypsies themselves invoked racism and discrimination in the home country – and the hope for a better future – to be their motivation to move.

Three different installments of the documentary *Na Vlastni Oci*,[83] broadcast on the commercial station Nova, described immigrant Gypsies settled in Canada and the UK in somewhat idyllic representations – enjoying picnics, visiting the Niagara Falls, urging relatives from home to join them, and throwing pebbles in the ocean. Josef Klima, the producer of the program, as well as a Gypsy protagonist in the documentary were both

later interviewed and denied having the intention to arouse other minority families to immigrate; rather, both stated that that they had described "life as it is"[84] – which for the Czech Gypsy did mean less institutional discrimination in the UK than in his home country. The press and politicians quibbled over implied statements in the show about the degree of openness of the immigration and asylum procedures, which contributing to the overwhelmed socio-political reaction to the refugees' arrival.

Regardless of the confluence of factors, in the context of the UK, the result was the attempted relocation of hundreds of Gypsy families, assessed around 600-800. The asylum procedures led to the separation of many Gypsies families, the men being held in detention centers, while women and children were hosted in hostels. Many were denied asylum and deported. Those that remained in Dover were to face a long and bureaucratic process. As regards the British locals, *The Times* depicted the magnitude of the panic in the words of its Home correspondent, Richard Ford: "The outcome was chaos for local authorities that have been faced with the burden of dealing with hundreds of people who wait months for their applications to be processed."[85]

As the panic increased, France refused to allow reentry for the refugees, fearing the Gypsies would claim asylum in France. Such change led to increased complications regarding the cost of deportation for the British ferry owners and the cost of continued hosting of the Gypsies by the local government in Dover. EU regulations at the time allowed asylum-seekers to claim asylum status in the country of their choice, rather than in the first country of the Union that they entered – a reason for complain by British locals who would have rather sent the Gypsies to France and Germany rather than deal with the refugees themselves. Gradually, the conflict tapered off and, by 1998, the topic

faded from public agenda and the refugees had either been returned to their home country or dealt with within the UK.

The four discourses identified as principal modes of constructing the Gypsy were: the Gypsy as the other; the Gypsy as an unwanted problem; the Gypsy as someone else's problem; and the Gypsy as a European problem. To begin, the first two discourses were consistent with representational modes from earlier years. The Gypsy as the other was familiarly different, marginal, and non-legitimate. Examples of perceived deep-rooted difference included reports of unlawful activities (such as begging, theft, or cheating), having culturally different norms (such as having many children), being – supposedly – all nomads, poor, dirty, loud and therefore disturbing to have around, as well as being inherently bohemian and mystical.[86] This was not a new story.

TABLE 5.3 Discourses identified in the 1997 newspapers

	The Times		*The Guardian*	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	25	**37.8**	16	**29.1**
The Gypsy as an unwanted problem	41	**62.1**	31	**64.5**
The Gypsy as someone else's problem	25	**37.8**	18	**37.5**
The Gypsies as a European problem	34	**51.5**	35	**72.9**
Total number of docs.	66		48	

The discourse of the Gypsy as the other from the early 1990s was less of a focus in itself; instead, press attention fell heavily on the rejection of the Gypsies. The social construction of the other motivated, in the context of 1997, the strong and wary socio-

political reactions to the wave of refugees. The asylum-seekers were, therefore, unwanted, unwelcome, and greeted with fear and contempt. *The Sunday Times* quoted Mike O'Brien, the Home Office immigration minister, to describe the coming of the refugees as "*a deliberate attempt* to breach Britain's immigration controls and abuse the asylum system."[87] In the same newspaper, parents in Dover were cited to say "It's disgusting. They should send them home. They have got to learn somewhere, but I don't see why our children should suffer. … all this money is being spent and they could just say goodbye and disappear in a year. … We feel we have been *dumped on*."[88]

Racism and discrimination were both implicit and explicit in scores of articles – and reinforced by politicians' stance on the asylum seekers. The language ranged from terms that *suggested* racism to *unambiguous* and *specific* prejudice. As regards the former, hints of anti-Gypsyism operated as journalistic strategies to express judgment and still be (somewhat) politically correct. Some articles emphasized in quotations that refugees were "tourists,"[89] others framed migration reasons as "claimed" discrimination in the home country,[90] mocking the living conditions that have led to poverty, begging ("even their babies have learnt to stretch out their hands"[91]), and ultimately to the migration of "this huddle of nomads."[92] Overt prejudice was present in, for example, *The Guardian*, when a Slovak embassy statement was offered as official stance on handling the problem at home:

> We warn everyone who is planning to come to the UK and apply through the asylum system to think twice. *You won't be welcome* and we will *deal strictly and quickly* with you so we could return you where you came from as soon as possible.[93]

The most overt discrimination was present in *The Times* as the more conservative of the four papers, in quotes rather than in the journalistic writing. The fact that it can be identified in the framing, however, was another testimony of the expectation that Gypsies can be spoken down without social or legal consequences. Political correctness was, in these cases, a façade. This last quote also suggests that the official stance (embodied by the Slovak embassy and British immigration officers) was that asylum-seekers had no reason to immigrate, other than to "milk the system," as insinuated by a letter-to-the-editor from *The Times*.[94] They were "bogus refugees,"[95] who "claim" they have been discriminated against – despite evidence offered by Roma activists.[96]

The third discourse of 1997 constructed Gypsies as someone else's problem. As discussed earlier, a moral panic is reason for great social and political upheaval that necessarily must be accompanied by solution-finding mechanisms. This second discourse accomplished that task. Its goal was to construct solutions by emphasizing that the asylum-seekers must inevitably be denied stay and deported ("send them back"[97]; "Return to sender"[98]). Further, regulations about asylum had to change – the appeal time for denied claims was therefore changed from 28 days to five working days, regardless of the time needed to gather evidence in support of one's case.[99] In the rush to fix the Gypsy problem, different (regional and national) institutions came into conflict. Internal conflicts aroused between the local Kent county council and the government, the latter blamed for not intervening financially to aid Dover with the newly arrived Gypsies; between the government and the "understandable"[100] frustration of ferry owners who refused to take the Gypsies back to France, or else who refused to pay for air fare when France denied re-entry to the Gypsies. Internationally, the British and French

governments clashed when trying to deal with refugees denied stay in the UK; EU and UK leaders, who would have preferred the "first country" rule to stay in effect, were also in dissent (a *Times* feature referred to this latter conflict as an "appalling mess which the European Union has made of asylum policy"[101]); finally, the West laid the blame on the East for the migration: "[A] weary French immigration official said: '… We get the clear impression that it suits their Government to get rid of these people,'" wrote *The Times*.[102]

Discursively, the immediacy with which a solution was needed was palpable in reports, political statements, and locals' reactions alike. The Gypsies were, of necessity, (a) the problem of their home country, be it the Czech Republic or Slovakia; (b) the problem of the French who did not accept those denied asylum to return home across their land and therefore caused more damage to the ferry businesses; (c) the problem of the European Union whose regulations impeded financially and emotionally on British citizens and government. They were not, however, a British problem; they were not "our" problem. The same attitude was noted in the Central European states where the Gypsies came from, as explained by the documentary maker Josef Klima, who declared having been "congratulated by rightwingers for precipitating the departure" of the Czech Gypsies.[103] If the Gypsies were not taken care of by someone else, the implication was that the "tax payers" – "we" – had to cover the costs of their stay. The moral panic was thus amplified by locals' feelings of being "swamped," "overwhelmed," "at crisis point," and "on a knife-edge."[104] As was seen with earlier 1992 moral panics, the Gypsies must be controlled – as a measure to ensure the safety of the non-Gypsy majority.

The first three discourses identified in the press coverage of 1997 testified to the continuity of a mode of representing the Gypsies well-established in the European

imaginary (as they carried on the legacy of the two most prevalent discourses evident in 1992 – the Gypsy as the other and the Gypsy an unwanted problem). The other three discourses of 1992 (the Gypsy as victim of discrimination, the Gypsies as an abandoned people, and the civilized Gypsy) have merged and developed into a more complex representational mode – that of the Gypsy as a European problem. This last discourse of 1997 constituted a sober construction, realistically identifying racism and actively promoting the necessity of realizing that the Gypsy / Romany culture has its validity just as much as the British or French cultures do.

Whereas *The Times* favored a more traditional and conservative voice to disapprove of the intruding Gypsies, *The Guardian* dedicated three quarters of its writing on Gypsy issues to a rather activist mission. In the midst of the moral crisis, a few days after the first refugees attracted attention with their arrival in Dover, the paper started publishing features, journalist commentaries, and letters-to-the-editor that spoke for the Gypsies, in their defense. The press coverage formed a solid, well-argued cry against the racism with which the refugees were treated, by authorities in their home country, by France and the UK, by local citizens in Britain, business-owners and residents alike, as well as by media coverage.

At first, reports framed discrimination as *claimed* racism, *speculated* to be reason for the Gypsies to emigrate from the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The tone and content gradually shifted as the panic developed to expose, not only extremist prejudice, but social and institutional discrimination to which the asylum-seekers were subjected. It also significantly recognized that distrusting and questioning asylum requests contributed to discrimination. The following, from *The Guardian*, explained:

> … coverage has been both cynical and sceptical, with some reports implying they are here only for the apparent ease of obtaining benefits, whilst others have concentrated on the drain on resources such appeals for asylum create. It is easy to forget that gypsies were persecuted by the Nazis. But today … gypsies are being openly discriminated against, by individuals and the state; they are forced from their homes and their jobs, and they are attacked in the street.[105]

The discourse called for reassessment of racism at the level of the entire continent, to "shar[e] the burden more widely within the EU."[106] Several articles drew attention to police brutality against the Gypsies in Eastern European countries, whereas others denounced media stereotyping, alongside right-wing extremist attacks, for minimizing not only the Gypsy plight, but the culture itself, simplifying it to a nomad ethnicity, criminally inclined to exploit the majority non-Gypsies.

Thematically, this discourse positioned the Gypsies at the heart of the European civilization. They not only have been a large European population, but many have migrated to the American continent as well. They have been historically constructed into scapegoats whose identity had to be, not only well defined and known, but well fixed in the imaginary of the non-Gypsies. *The Guardian* contextualized this mechanism as "especially racist."[107] It went on to connect the moral crisis of 1997 to that of 1992, when the ideological apparatus was doing similar work to control the Gypsy other:

> … a couple of years ago when the Tories started to make life harder for travellers, some backbenchers and tabloids were anxious to point out that they liked *genuine Romanies*. *Real gypsies* were deserving people, with well-kept horses, pretty caravans and an ability to predict the future. Other travellers were drunken Irish tinkers, hippies and itinerant circus-type folk. Now bigots want to draw a clear distinction between *genuine gypsies* and *genuine asylum-seekers*. … Hostility to migrants is always wrong and it usually leads to people getting hounded or killed.[108]

The agenda guiding the discourse of the Gypsy as a European problem was to highlight the risk of perpetuating a discourse that fixes the Gypsy identity – and that can be used to

justify ethnic cleansing projects, as were the Holocaust and the eugenics politics that lasted well into the 1970s ("recognisable Gypsy features" were "grounds for recommending sterilisation"[109]). Instead, contemporary definitions of democracy, freedom, human rights, and political correctness must be applied to all minority groups, including the Gypsies. It was apparent at this point in history that the British press – most visibly in *The Guardian* – borrowed from the discourse of human rights to defend the plight of the Gypsies.

For this purpose, the discourse contextualized, on the one hand, the Gypsy problem, explaining conditions of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, and poor health, tracing them to the status of "stigmatized" and "quintessential outsiders of the European imagination."[110] More recently, "after the 1989 Velvet revolution, Romanies were the first to lose their jobs and to confront a new, hostile bureaucracy,"[111] wrote *The Guardian*. On the other hand, the fascination with the bohemian Gypsy continued to guide the non-interference social policy ("Romanies are stock figures of the romantic imagination"[112]). The chief contribution of the discourse – a theme that was unique by comparison the earlier years – was that it powerfully used the reality of dire living conditions to justify the appeal that Western countries had to offer the discriminated against Eastern European Gypsies. The West (the UK and Canada) emerged as an idyllic construction, free of racism, welcoming and uncomplicated for the Gypsies.

> Avdi, 26 [said:] "England, Germany, America, [I'll go] anywhere as long as it is free. I like it there and I want to live there … The people here have been very good to us." … [Another father said:] "The children … will get a better education and a better life. As a young boy, I never had these possibilities." [113]
>
> Ivan Conka, aged 33 … says he would have liked to go to Britain too. "It's a tolerant country, without racial prejudice. Here we are frightened to send our

> children to school because of the skinheads. My girlfriend is Czech and her family condemn her for living with a gypsy. Under communism, at least we had work and a much better life. We don't want communism back because we have freedom of expression now, but what does that mean? We go for a job and when you get there, and they see you, there's no job."[114]
>
> [One Slovak] said yesterday: "With all I get here as an immigrant I can live better than working at home."[115]

A final theme of the discourse of the Gypsy as a European problem emphasized "one important trend from history"[116] – and that is, the contribution that Gypsies bring to adoptive countries: "Refugees have also clearly benefited Britain. … But where are the British politicians and newspapers talking about the skills and contribution refugees could make to this country?"[117] The comparison between immigrants to the UK and immigrant populations in the US, Australia, and Canada – depicted to have played a powerful role in the birth of these nations – was significant. *The Guardian*, in this pronouncement, was most liberal.

To close, the British moral panic of 1997 can be described as an outburst of racial prejudice, countered by emerging Western European activist support of the Gypsy culture. The words of deported Czech and Slovak Gypsies asylum-seekers best conclude the analysis of this time period, capturing otherness, unwantedness, scapegoating and empathy to the Roma problem:

> Milan, 34 … said: "All we want is to work freely and for our kids to be able to go to school without being afraid." … Natasha, 46, a street cleaner … said: "… Nobody in our lives has treated us as well as the people here in England. People used to shout at us, 'You go to the gas chambers.' We want to work here, *I don't want to be rich, I want to be like the poor of England*."[118]

The Gypsy of 2001: Moving in

The Romanian press coverage for October-November 2001[119] can be characterized as a step back in the discursive construction of the Gypsies – or rather, as no change. Although the 1992 coverage showed minor indications of acknowledging the Gypsy culture in its own right, nine years later, the Romanian press voice was aggressively discriminatory and prejudicial. The main representation of the Gypsies of 2001 was the construction of the Gypsy as the other, supported by two other discourses, those of the Gypsy to be changed and of the politically tolerated Gypsy, respectively.

TABLE 5.4 Discourses identified in the 2001 newspapers

	Adevărul	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	36	**63.1**
The Gypsy to be changed	20	**35**
The Gypsies as politically tolerated	32	**56.1**
Total number of docs.	57	

The predominant discourse – the Gypsy as the other (evident in almost two thirds of the stories about the ethnic group) – was a faithful reiteration of the 1990 discourse of otherness. It narrated the story of the Gypsy that is a criminal, perpetually engaged in illegal affairs.[120] Poverty was no longer a tormented terrain for the press – instead, the claim that the Gypsies were directly responsible for their poverty was laid bare. Poverty was cultural, it seemed, and always spoke of the contrast to non-Gypsy living standards. For example, the Dwelling Gypsies, a Gypsy subgroup, were described to have made

themselves abodes in the hills, with newspapers for windows and rickety beds, "crippled chairs and, where possible, a kitchen range received for free"[121] for furniture. In close connection to poverty, the ethnic group was constructed to be backward, uncivilized, and non-hygienic. Poverty did not justify what was perceived as unhealthy lifestyle (living in a "center of infection and epidemy"[122]); rather, the Gypsies were held responsible for, and shunned because of, their backward lifestyle and their cultural choices. Several stories judged the patriarchic Gypsy family cell (more so than Romanian society is patriarchic) that has too many children – as well as the traditional "bulibaşa" leader and especially the Gypsy King Cioabă, portrayed to be avid for gold and admiration.[123] Domestic abuse and male aggression contributed to the array of truths constructing the Gypsy of 2001. Business successes were framed with skepticism, whereas cases of financial retribution following Nazi and Communist discrimination became further press accusations alongside public disapproval. The Gypsies can only be in the wrong.

Otherness and marginality were collapsed into the need to physically control where the Gypsy can be allowed to live – that is, where the Gypsy can *be kept*. In the Romanian landscape of 2001, Roma residences posed legal problems; most of them did not appear to have building approval forms, nor documentation of permission to build on public / private land; therefore, a number of these homes were demolished, in a public display arousing social unrest. Officials intervened and filed legal action, at the same time as they engaged police forces to manage and supervise demolition procedures. Locals felt entitled to ban Gypsies from their neighborhood and therefore comfortably expressed their prejudice. In reaction, the Roma threatened in their turn not to leave their homes. Further intervention from authorities and the police ensued.

The press discursively celebrated authority intervention as a means to legitimize efforts to settle the Gypsies down. At the same time, the coverage offered thick descriptions of Gypsy living. When they do not live in appalling, run-down, squalid conditions, the Gypsies build themselves "palaces" hosting a conglomeration of Gypsies living together in chaos and illegality. For example, the Gypsies have "such a building that the Romanians thought the City Hall is moving to the slums"[124] of the city, decorated with "all sorts of turrets or fences with *typical* patterns."[125] The cycle of disagreements and threats allowed press commentary about Gypsy difference to center on the minority's constructed innate violence and aggression, as well as its stubbornness and resilience to ignore the non-Gypsy law of the land and settle where they wish.[126]

It is in this context that the second identified discourse constructed the minority group as Gypsy to be changed. The more the Gypsies are an other, the more they need to be controlled – that is, the more they *must be* controlled to ensure social stability. The procedures of relocating the Roma into a specifically remodeled neighborhood for the minority group constituted the chief reason this time frame was selected for analysis; however, *Adevărul* only reported on it in 13 of its 57 articles. The mayor Ion Rotaru of Piatra Neamț led an initiative to develop a former chicken farm, surrounded by barbed wire at the town's outskirts, into a modern "District of Hope." Initial press reaction was torn between supporting the initiative – after all, the Gypsies were constructed to devastate property and live non-hygienically[127] – and labeling the initiative as fascist, chauvinistic, and xenophobic. The latter was necessary in light of the mayor's rationale; the City Hall intended to offer these homes to the Gypsies

> … because they destroy things! … If they pay from their own pocket, they will not destroy! … The Roma will be obligated to maintain the peace and public order and will be supervised by patrol officers."[128]

International public opinion[129] and Romanian officials, such as President Ion Iliescu and Prime Minister Adrian Năstase, expressed their discontent and disapproval of the project, deemed as "unwise."[130] However, other leadership from Romanian towns initiated similar projects,[131] at the same time as locals opposed the relocation projects closer to their homes "because many of [the Gypsies] are second-time offenders and would cast an unfavorable light on our community,"[132] wrote *Adevărul*. Although beyond the scope of the analysis here, the conflict between local Roma NGOs attempting to protect the rights of the Roma and the City Hall in Piatra Neamț continued throughout the following years.[133] Later news reported that the District of Hope project went through, involved considerable public funds, and ended with property destruction by the newly moved in Gypsies. The press condoned their otherness and backwardness.[134]

The third and final discourse of 2001 constructed the Gypsy to be politically tolerated. This way of talking used the theme of Gypsies' (socially constructed) argumentative nature to justify disunity among and within the ethnic groups and to justify the intolerance and impatience characteristic of the non-Gypsy political system (that the media contribute to). By 2001, the Roma minority had begun forming its own political parties, local associations, and lobbying groups – framed by the press to be a formality for political correctness. The newspaper emphasized the non-Gypsy locals' attitude towards the emerging NGOs – both mediating locals' skepticism and contributing to it. Discursively, the Roma intellectuals and leaders that were active politically became subject to ridicule and sarcasm. Gypsy difference was further employed to justify this

judgment – as it is in their nature for Gypsies to argue and fight among themselves. *Adevărul* offered to following descriptors to depict the NGO representatives, in a wholly non-transparent anti-Gypsyist language:

> The cool guys got out of … the swank Mercedes, as if they had come here for leisure, to throw their money on the whores of Pietricica … they brought their trunks here … the barbed wire scratches only their tiny brains … the gypo women from the respective NGOs … The activists from "Romani Criss" ramble …[135]

The evolution of the Romanian (and European) political landscape towards the rising movement for rights, equalitarian politics, and integration efforts (even more evident in later years) rendered this final discourse possible.

Although a smaller number of articles covered Roma issues by comparison to earlier years (57 stories), they consistently told the same stories. The power of the discourses of 2001, therefore, was their homogeneous message. Increasingly, the content of the coverage used politically correct terms, yet the tone itself was rarely politically correct. The development of activist NGOs to speak for Gypsy issues was notable in an international context of minority and human rights (see Chapter Six); yet the media straggled in their acceptance of the activist cause. To the contrary, the press did not take the activists seriously and, instead, assumed the construction of the Gypsy other as an active mission. Specifically, Roma sources were rarely included in stories about the ethnic group. Word choices suggested the press' ideological commitments to constructing Gypsy deviance. For example, Roma rights were hardly ever treated seriously; rather, Gypsies "claim," "pretend," and "moreover want" assistance or specific facilities[136]; Gypsy difference was "typical," "out of pride only,"[137] and improperly confrontational[138]; difference was also gendered – whereas men made threats, were aggressive, and "rip into

each other,"[139] women "whine," "scream" while "hanging by the gate,"[140] "yell," pull their hairs, and collapse into "a pseudo-nervous breakdown."[141]

A more obvious stylistic device was the use of derogatory terms to refer to the Gypsies. The degree of overt discrimination ranged from using "tuciuriu,"[142] which has the connotation of "colored people," "dark-skinned," and "grimy-like," to listing prejudicial descriptors. The words of *Adevărul* strikingly remind of the 1992 Gypsy other, in complete ignorance of the political changes that had occurred in the meantime:

> … swindlers, monkeys, frauds and honest folk, paid street cleaners, temp workers, dealers, card players, fortune tellers, fugitives, prostitutes for next to nothing, dangerous whores and virgins, with eyes like burning coals.[143]

Attention-grabbing devices, such as exclamation marks, also drew readers to note Gypsy difference and the implied ridiculousness of the groups' claims. Finally, the journalists often imitated what was constructed to be "Gypsy talk," a form of Gypsy-Romanian jargon, peppered with poor grammar and terms incorrectly used, sometimes highlighted in bold in the articles, and commonly understood to represent "how Gypsies talk." Some examples appeared in stories from *Adevărul*, which used the "Gypsy" form of address "bre" (a type of "you," serving approximately similar functions to "bro'" or "cuz'") and the inverted structure of "mâncați-aş"[144] (roughly meaning "I could eat you up") to make the point of Gypsy cultural difference. Such examples cannot be directly translated into English, losing both denotation and prejudicial connotations. The Romanian words, nonetheless, are identifiable in the local cultural context as indicators of "Gypsy talk."

The Gypsy of 2003 and 2004: "The Big Economic Headache" and the Nimbies

Newspaper coverage during the months of June-July 2003, June 2004, and October 2004 was read in order to investigate constructions about Gypsies in a time period when political Europe was preoccupied with the historic drafting of EU's first Constitution. A first draft was crafted in June 2003 and approved on June 14, 2003; a final text was accepted at the EU Convention meeting in Brussels on June 18, 2004, and ceremoniously signed by all 25 EU members on October 29, 2004. During this time, the Gypsies continued to be vilified into unwanted others, albeit in more politically correct terms and acknowledgement of their cultural validity, at the same time as they raised more political attention. Discrimination and racism in general were socio-political topics more heavily discussed and engaged with during this time. In this context, the different newspapers approached the Gypsies with slightly different agendas. The British press took on the "Nimby" (Not In My Back Yard) Gypsy, a social problem assumed to be bound to dramatically intensify as the EU opened its borders to ten more countries in May 2004. Asylum-seekers were back on the day's agenda, supported by local examples of the Traveller community's illegality and obtrusiveness. The Romanian press, on the other hand, was faithful to its discursive construction of the local, deviant Gypsy, at the same time as it documented victimization. Before the discourses of this time-period are detailed, further context on the newspapers' understanding of the Constitution phenomenon is necessary, as a stage upon which the Gypsies were displayed.

During the months of 2003 and 2004, the European Union found itself in the middle of its negotiations for a first draft of the Constitution. The language employed by the different national presses reflected the two countries' positions and degrees of

enthusiasm towards the document. The Romanian press described the "future Constitution"[145] – without a doubt, there would be one – and largely focused on the difficult steps Romania would have to take towards its own integration into the EU, scheduled for 2007. Also presented were the points of debate that still needed to be settled before approving a final draft. Stories detailed whether Christian values were to feature in the European document, immigration and security issues, the presidency of the EU, changes in the voting system, and, ultimately, smaller vs. larger countries' influence in decision-making. (The same topics were discussed once the first draft was approved in June 2004.) The European Council meeting in Salonic, Greece, in June 2003, was constructed in the Romanian press in positive and optimistic tones of solidarity and collaboration, built upon values of "democracy, tolerance, respecting alterity, absolute refusal of ethnic and religious hatred, and recourse to violence."[146] Romanian coverage also recognized Britain's firm, "no concessions" attitude towards the Constitution draft, in Tony Blair's words, cited in *România Liberă*.[147] In addition, Romanian newspapers granted considerable attention to the political drama caused by Italian leader Silvio Berlusconi's undiplomatic statements towards and about a German politician, detailing Berlusconi's political persona and the international conflict ensuing.[148] Of the two newspapers, *Adevărul* was more critical of the Italian leader than *România Liberă*, framing his statements as insults that unsettled an integration-prone European landscape.

Overall, Romanian coverage paid more attention to news of EU's assurance that Romania (and Bulgaria) were set for accession in 2007. The release of the Country Report for Romania in early fall 2004 occupied press attention, with resulting analyses of Romania's dark spots – as were weak economic competition, unstable political system,

corrupt judiciary system, traffic in persons, freedom of the press and of expression, as well as child protection issues. Both papers published only one article each, at the end of October 2004, to note the signing of the Constitution in Rome.

In contrast with the Romanian press, the British papers discussed the Constitution in skeptical terms, often referencing the possibility of a no-vote in the referendum for the ratification of the document. On the one hand, government officials representing Britain in the negotiations were quoted to make a case for a "United States of Europe"[149] and for the protection of Britain's interests. On the other hand, commentary and analyses, letters-to-the-editor, and opposition leaders constructed a clear image of "Euroskepticism." This term has been so widely used, that it emerged as its own representational mode testifying to Britain's overall political position and objectives within the EU. Consequently, the May 2004 EU enlargement (when Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia joined the Union) was constructed using tones of concern.

Although the British coverage discussed the same unresolved issues regarding the Constitution as the Romanian press, the UK journalists were more preoccupied with the country's international power and regional safety – an attitude that has not been unique in British history. In the 2003-2004 moment, *The Times* (especially) focused on the possibility of Britain losing its decision-making role in the EU, as voting and veto regulations would change, particularly on topics such as immigration, foreign policy, border control, citizenship, and the economy. Ultimately, this was a national vs. federal debate. The language used in the more conservative *Times* testified to the skepticism towards, and concern about, a stronger Europe and a weaker Britain ("Deadline looms for

constitution," "Valery Giscard D'Estaing … was frantically trying to forge a consensus"[150]; "the EU isn't working"[151]). *The Times* reporting differed from the more liberal *The Guardian*'s, which trusted Blair and his potential to adequately represent British interests within the EU. *The Guardian* coverage, therefore, constructed a British leader that was firm at EU negotiations, defending the country's best interests. It framed an "upbeat" EU, strong in the unity of its members.[152] "Euroskepticism" was virtually absent in the pages of *The Guardian*, even if it notes Blair's uneasiness and discomfort at the official signing.[153] Despite the pomp describing the "defining moment"[154] and the "historic deal"[155] of approving the draft and, later, of signing the Constitution, EU citizens were reported to be uninvolved and apathetic. The low voting turnout for the European Parliament (held in June 2004) spoke to the gap between the political and the social European strata and was constructed by the press as a "statistics of indifference" and as politicians' failure to "become closer to its citizens."[156]

Immigration constituted the central theme of the British press. EU enlargement was equated with a rise in asylum-seekers, framed to be probable instead of possible, to lead to high cost of dealing with, and deporting, the refugees (reflecting an underlying assumed illegality of *any* asylum request), and to impact the job and housing markets. There were countering voices that highlighted the contribution of foreign-born labor, yet press focus was largely on anti-enlargement and its implications ("Western Europe will be overwhelmed by a wave of low-skilled immigration from the East"[157]). Immigration therefore must lead to more economic instability and to more others "in my back yard" – a fear which struck home and engaged the discourse of the Gypsy as unwanted, discussed later. *The Guardian* significantly noted a rise in xenophobia and racism in Ireland,

against potential immigrants. Similarly, *The Times* devoted several stories that stood against EU's integrationist trend, distrusting Blair's representation of the UK, and dwelling on the potential impact of growing immigration on Britain. The conclusions formulated here do not imply that *The Times* subjectively and unconditionally was against the EU, its Constitution, or, broadly, against immigrants. The paper did cover both viewpoints. Notably, however, *The Guardian* documented xenophobia *critically*, rather than as *justified*, and dedicated fewer fearful stories than *The Times* to the potential increase in refugee numbers. That said, above and beyond the two papers' political slant, the country climate as a whole denoted fear of asylum-seekers. An indication to this effect was UK's commitment to a policy proposal to create safe havens for refugees closer to their home country, with the hope that such locations would decrease the number of immigrants coming into the UK (and the EU space).[158]

Five discourses were identified in the materials read in 2003 and 2004: the Gypsy as the other; the Gypsy as an unwanted problem; the Gypsy as someone else's problem; the Gypsy as victim of discrimination; and the Gypsy as political project of social integration. The discourse of the Gypsy as the other continued modes of talking about the ethnic groups from earlier years. The press constructions were by now familiar to their audience – and to the Gypsies themselves: Gypsy difference took, once again, the shape of innate criminality, illegality, immorality,[159] backwardness, laziness, illiteracy, poverty or, conversely, questionably earned wealth, unhygienic and unhealthy living conditions, and public drama and bickering. Gypsy groups were accused of their cultural difference, whether it took the shape of poverty, poor health, or traditional family structures. The following passages captured both the difference, reproached to the Gypsies, and the tone

of disrespect evident in the mode of coverage (discussed in more detail below): "The misery in which they *indulge* is notorious"[160]; an "urban pikey" "*obviously* spends all day slumped in his flea-infested armchair, filling out incapacity benefit forms, watching Sky TV, scratching, burping and beaming proudly afterwards"[161]; and also:

> [The Gypsies] resided there illegally [and were] evicted. … [W]orkers … sanitized the temporary constructions, then scoured the land, cleaning the whole area [of] mountains of garbage and manure. [The Gypsies] started shouting at each other: "Jump, bre, they came from the city hall to get us out of here! Come, you, Floareo, tell the ol' man to wake the little ones, this is no good," wailed an old gypsy woman, which slept next to 5-6 other gypsies in a tent of roughly 10 square meters.[162]

TABLE 5.5 Discourses identified in the 2003-2004 newspapers

	The Times		*The Guardian*		*Adevărul*		*România Liberă*	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	38	**65.5**	21	**77.7**	41	**64**	30	**61.2**
The Gypsy as an unwanted problem	22	**37.9**	11	**40.7**	16	**25**	13	**26.5**
The Gypsy as someone else's problem	21	**36.2**	7	**25.9**	23	**35.9**	22	**44.8**
The Gypsy as victim of discrimination	30	**51.7**	13	**48.1**	36	**56.2**	24	**48.9**
The Gypsy as political project of social integration	4	**6.8**	5	**18.5**	6	**9.3**	9	**18.3**
Total number of docs.	58		27		64		49	

Otherness also constituted a gendered terrain. Bridging the familiar image of the bohemian Gypsy with sexuality, the Gypsy woman was constructed as a voluptuous object of desire: "[T]he beautiful gypsy woman with wide skirts … with her shirt bursting over unsupported curves."[163] This construction was preferred in the Romanian pres; the

bohemian Gypsy was less appealing to a British community working through its repulsion towards their own Travellers – hardly bohemian or romantic in that context.

The British press revived the deviant representation of the Gypsies of 1992, the "unwashed"[164] New Age Travellers collapsed with all other social deviants (ravers, anarchists, socialists, hippies, and drug-users). However, the 2001 Gypsy raised more concern as backward caravan Travellers – the "gypsy encampments with its yapping dogs and ringing oaths"[165] – disturbing the locals and ruining property value. *The Times* wrote:

> Residents of a sleepy Somerset village say that their lives have been *shattered* after 19 gypsy families constructed a settlement in their midst over the weekend. … Councilor John Williams, Conservative leader of Taunton Deane district council, said yesterday: "People living nearby who enjoyed a green field outlook have had their lives *shattered* in a few hours." … Hilary Harris, 59, who lives next to the field … said: "I couldn't sell it tomorrow because of this. I have got nothing against gypsies but *they have sullied all the planning laws*."[166]

All – and any – Gypsy traits, within this discourse, were reason to reprimand the minority for *what they are*. More problematically, *what they are* is obvious, known, fixed, static, and common sense – and in sharp contrast to "us," the non-Gypsies.

As press coverage became more refined and relied increasingly on intertextuality and common-sense understandings of otherness, institutional discrimination against the Gypsies was more evident. Such othering was richer and more complex in 2001 than in earlier writing. The papers reflected more problematic institutional dynamics, without attaching criticism against discrimination. The Gypsy other was, in consequence, shaped by politicians' gestures and statements; *The Times* cited Conservative leader, Member of the Parliament, Tim Yeo, to say: "We just cannot accept the situation where obscure bits of human rights legislation are allowed to approve development that damages the rural environment."[167] Clerks' discriminatory service to ethnic customers, physicians' racism

against their Gypsy patients, educators' lack of enthusiasm towards minority students – as well as the media's prejudicial reporting about the Gypsies itself – all were marks of institutional othering. Vocabulary choices such as "țigănie" (a word initially referring to a Gypsy colony and used nowadays with racial connotations of dirty trick, fight, or bargaining) and "ciordeală" (that means pinching and scrounging), derogatory terms, sarcastic tone, use of language imitating assumed "Gypsy talk," suggesting guilt before proven – such reporting strategies and tools signified media discrimination, mockery, and disrespect towards the Roma.

The power of the discourse of the Gypsy as the other has been its seeming naïveté and self-denial. Over and over again, the stories read testified to excuses to racism, thematically framed and phrased as honest explanations of Gypsies' difference. To illustrate, two right-wing extremists, in police custody for racial slurs on the Roma, argued that "We have nothing against the gypsies, but we criticize the fact that they embarrass us at home and abroad," wrote *România Liberă*.[168] Discrimination was downplayed, tolerated, and ignored by the majority populations – and dismissed when Gypsy groups suggested it, as seen in the following:

> The squatters can manipulate law and "political correctness" to full advantage. They can plead homelessness, racial discrimination, even "ethnic cleansing." … [The] clear intention of the squatters is to terrorise the local population until it supports permits for housing, when they will go elsewhere.[169]

As seen in earlier analyses, the Gypsy as the other has been by and large unwanted. The coverage of 2003-2004 was no exception. This second discourse, of the Gypsy as an unwanted problem, often accompanied the reporting contributing to othering. An important theme depicted the Gypsies and Travellers of Britain as

"Nimbies." The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order restricted Travellers' ability to travel[170] and repealed Part II of the Caravan Sites Act of 1968 that required local councils to provide camp sites for "gipsies."[171] As a result, Gypsies started buying private land in order to transform it into camping sites for their caravans; some sites are, therefore, occupied year-round, others, only parts of the year. Local authorities retained the right to evict caravans if they observed illegal behavior (sometimes reported by neighbors). In this context (as well as following the moral panic over the illegal festivals of the early 1990s), British society adopted the "Nimby" attitude drawing from the "Not In My Back Yard" slogan used since the 1980s to object to development projects. The Gypsies and the Travellers have often been subject to an attitude of outright ("Nimbyist") rejection of the Travellers. The term has become widely spread to the point that it has been used in any context that entails exclusion.[172] Applied to the Travellers, the "Nimbyist" attitude included disrespect and superiority towards the Gypsy others, as well as fear and helplessness at the same time; the locals found themselves panicking and feeling taken advantage of at the arrival of the caravans that arguably destroy the community and the green space. The locals enacted the "Nimbyist" fear into lobbying projects for the removal of the Travellers, protests, public statements, and outright prejudice towards their outsider Gypsy neighbors.

Related, talks about the EU Constitution triggered "Nimby" fears. Press coverage depicted British politicians' concern about EU enlargement by ten members and then by two more (in January 2007), a move which would turn millions of foreigner Gypsies into EU citizens, free to circulate and relocate in search for a better life, if they so wished. Voting for an acceptable Constitution draft became more problematic, complicated by the

UK's interpretations of losing some of its decision-making authority. The Constitution was equated in part to immigration, with its economic implications discussed earlier, and in part to the UK's loss of power within the European public sphere. To the British (politicians, locals, and press), neither of the two signifieds could have positive consequences. Predictably, the Gypsies – refugees or local Travellers – could only be accepted as long as they *integrated* into the non-Gypsy culture by settling down and if they contributed to the local economy by working the jobs that needed foreign labor – and not others: "Immigrants can relieve labour shortages in crucial areas … Imposing [immigration] restrictions would let *people with skills, health and talent* head West, but *not those unprepared to contribute*," wrote *The Times*.[173]

Continuing the mid-1990s constructions, the third identified discourse was that of the Gypsy as someone else's problem. Its function was to blame someone else – *anyone*, really – for the Gypsy problem. The press (and the non-Gypsy local / political voices it spoke for) blamed the authorities for not intervening to settle and control the Gypsies, as well as for intervening incorrectly or allowing an "indolent"[174] legal system that permits the Gypsies to escape responsibility and legal consequences.

> "… I'm extremely angry, but my anger is not directed at the people on that site. What makes me so angry is the complete stupidity of government and the local council. The planning regulations are inadequate. Why can't the government get its act together?" … other locals "understand the government aren't looking out for Gypsies."[175]

> … 'some situations' … could have been avoided if [the Roma] had permanent representatives in city halls.[176]

Further, the coverage blamed the government for how they managed – or did not manage – the allocation of Gypsy sites, adopting a human rights discourse to side with the European Court of Human Rights' decision in favor of the Travellers.[177]

Aside from holding local governments responsible, the media blamed the EU for its policies that might contribute to increased immigration at home – "in my back yard." The fear was very specific – immigrants in general helped the country; *Gypsy* immigrants and "low-skilled immigration from the East" did not and were expected to overwhelm the West[178]; the Gypsies were "Europe's fastest growing ethnic minority" and, at the same time, "a big economic headache for the European Commission."[179]

Most forcefully, however, the press – and the officials – accused the Gypsies themselves for their own difference, poverty, and illegality. The Gypsy are their own problem. *Adevărul* wrote:

> … as with every check-up, the local authorities were accompanied by representatives of the Roma Party … Over 50 gypsies, small and large, young and old, had scraped together temporary homes from bungling, brick, and carton, where they took shelter, disrupting the peace of the surrounding buildings. The children slept outside in the few wagons, covered with blankets, or in the back of the Dacia station wagons. … [The Roma Party leaders said:] "How many times has the city hall showed you mercy? I don't even know." … "For three years you come and you go, you steal and trash the city, after we ourselves took you to Bolintin where you are from. This time, you don't get your wagons back," also shouted [the mayor] Piedone. … [The arrested youth said:] "You idiots, bins filled with s**t, I went to professional skills school, not like all these other people, I take the human rights and put you in jail, bre!"[180]

Different discourses intersected in this quoted passage. The difference in tone constructed the authorities, firm, defending the law, politically correct (intervening to evacuate the Gypsies, accompanied by Roma leaders) – in contrast to the minorities, deviant, living in filth, disturbing the peace, dramatic, and aggressive. The elements of the story – the

selected quotes, the choice of adjectives, and the focus of the conflict – constructed the Gypsies as deviant and unwanted other, blamed for his / her condition.

The discourse of the Gypsy as victim of discrimination, the fourth essential mode of talking about the minority group carried on earlier representations evident in 1992 and 1997. Most clearly in the 2003-2004 time frame, this discourse drew from a language of human rights and tolerance, recognizing its historic roots (in the "old, guilty white fear: that black people are going to steal their beautiful blond children"[181]), at the same time as it unapologetically recognized a Gypsy culture in its own right. It was an obvious reaction to the other discourses delineated here. The press acknowledged social and institutional racism and at last included more substantial counter-ideological positions:

> "These people are being chivvied from pillar to post as they have been in Europe for centuries," [a war veteran] said. … Gypsies fear the problem is more deep-rooted … "We are not accepted anywhere in England. The criteria is we've got to be sustainable, … we've got to be near a bus stop, we've got to be screened so people can't see us, we can't live in a site of outstanding natural beauty. *There is no piece of land in the country that is perfect in councils' eyes or villagers' eyes*" … said Ms Smith-Bendell.[182]
>
> [O]ne of the aunts says: "… No matter how much we have, *we are still dirty Gypsy bastards*. No matter how good you can be to people, they still treat us the same way." … Another family member said: "… They don't want to know you. It's just like being a racist against a black person. You can't blame everyone for what someone else has done. *It's all true hatred*. But if you cut one another you will bleed and we all bleed the same stuff."[183]
>
> Romanians stole the money destined to fund the schooling of the Gypsies.[184]
>
> Landowners now exploit local fears by flogging to villagers otherwise worthless fields for big sums … if you don't buy, they threaten, I will sell to the pikeys.[185]
>
> [A Gypsy woman said:] "[W]hen the doctors heard … I was from Modruzeni, they didn't even look at me. When they operated, they threw me like a rag. They said that 'there would be one less gypsy.'"[186]

The journalists pro-actively exercised their role to "watchdog" Roma interests, but more than that, they took a step forward towards validating and safeguarding minority rights and recognize how systemic racism affects the Roma. For instance, *The Times* illustrated how Travellers had to navigate a system that has not supported nor protected them, prolonging court battles on rights to residence and preventing involvement in the education system while being without a domicile.[187] Another example contextualized the gridlock Travellers found themselves in, having

> [the] choice of assimilation into an alien and hostile settled society, or pitching on unofficial sites where they would always be at risk of prosecution. Their close and very supportive extended family communities were therefore broken up. This can only be described as ethnic cleansing.[188]

This counter-discourse constructed racism to be an endemic disease of contemporary (and past) societies, to the point that Roma themselves testified to being ashamed to admit to their ethnicity and therefore hide it.[189] Their difference was reframed as a cultural reality, explained positively and historically contextualized:

> [M]ost of [the asylum-seekers] don't want to be here. It's no holiday and the years and years spent waiting to be processed by the system aren't much fun either … [they] try to survive, keep hold of tradition and marvel at things the rest of us take for granted.[190]

The discourse of the Gypsy as victim of discrimination was possible in the first half of the 2000s because of the predominance of global discourses of human and minority rights. Chapter Six further delineates this topic; nonetheless, the final discourse identified in the studied press of 2003-2004 – the discourse of the Gypsy as political project of social integration– drew from this theme. Once international and national political spheres identified and problematized racism (against the Gypsies), the Gypsy problem was conceived as *realistic* and *manageable*. The press, unsurprisingly led in this

effort by *The Guardian* and *România Liberă*, offered convincing evidence to this effect. It quoted the World Bank's, the Romanian government's, and activists' and Roma leaders' concerns regarding poverty, poor health, infant mortality, low life expectancy, and unemployment – all characterized by rates higher than those defining the non-Gypsy populations. As a consequence, projects to help and integrate the Gypsies ensued. To name a few, the Romanian government created a National Council to Combat Discrimination, "the first in Central and Eastern Europe"[191]; the British Home Office offered refugees immediate access to welfare, housing, schooling, and healthcare[192]; Romanian Public Health Directions initiated programs of Roma health mediators to inform and work directly with minority communities towards vaccination campaigns[193] and AIDS information plans; the Ministry for Education assigned high school and college spots and scholarships for minorities[194] and offered free warm meals to Roma students, a decision that arguably led to a decrease in school drop-out rates for the minority[195]; city halls used EU funds to remodel residences for Gypsy locals[196] and to finance skills training programs[197]; NGOs initiated projects for peace and conflict resolution,[198] anti-discrimination high school workshops and camps,[199] whereas the European Commission for Human Rights passed judgment in favor of the Gypsies and criticized the British government for its institutional discrimination and lack of support for the Travelling communities.[200] The press reported such developments with welcoming tones.

The literature on human rights details the dilemma facing activists to negotiate between cultural relativism, on the one hand – defending cultural difference and distinction embodied in tradition – and the discourse of universal human rights, to be applied to all peoples on earth, on the other. Roma human rights in contemporary Europe

engaged the same questions. Press coverage sent a mixed message to readers, as it included both NGO voices speaking for the Gypsies, defending the legitimacy of their culture, and offered values that challenged tradition. Contradictions were left unaddressed, allowing a vocabulary of integration to speak with more clarity instead. To illustrate, *The Guardian* quotes the European Commissioner for Social Affairs to say "When fundamental human rights and certain past traditions collide, it is the traditions that must adapt and human rights that must prevail."[201] In this view, the Gypsies must integrate; they must work with the non-Gypsy community and their Roma leaders to solve inter-ethnic issues.

To conclude, the coverage of 2003-2004 continued to construct the Gypsy as the other, unwanted, and someone else's problem. The press mediated these discourses, contributing to them. At the same time, the media – following politicians' and activists' lead – picked out social and institutional racism and transformed it into socially conscious political projects. The complexity of the discourses lied in their interconnection. The same article may identify prejudice against the Gypsies, deplore it and contribute to it at the same time. Most generally, journalists found the problem of the Gypsies to be a good story, and not much more than that; it was politically correct to complain about racism against the ethnic group; the EU may be pleased to see press attention to human rights; and also, the paper may gain publicly and politically from attention to the current international agenda of minority rights. Whether the political projects – and the press' attitude towards the rights of the Roma – has constituted a solution offered to a general(ized) moral panic about the Gypsies or actually advanced the Roma cause in its own right is the topic of the next two Chapters.

The Gypsy of 2006: Abandoning the "A**nachronistic, Indefensible and Ludicrous Existence"**

The discourses of 2006 fit into earlier strands of representation, at the same time as they refined Western and Eastern European's societies' commitment to solving the Gypsy problem. On one hand, the construction of the Gypsy – vis-à-vis the non-Gypsies and the issues of the time – remained that of an other, feared, and discriminated against. On the other hand, the focus on the unwanted Gypsy waned, as talk of the Gypsy as a *political project of integration* strengthened. The more political correctness and political attention to racism, the less focus on Gypsies' otherness. The discourses identified in the read press articles for November-December 2006 were: The Gypsy as the other; the Gypsy as an unwanted problem; the Gypsy as victim of discrimination; the Gypsy as political project of *cultural integration*; and the Gypsy as political *integration-through-change* project. This time period was included in the analysis because it marked both the historic moment of Romania's (and Bulgaria's) formal accession to the EU and – in contrast – the UK's (and other member states') unsettled emotions about this last wave of accession. Immigration, legal and illegal, took center-stage in public sphere discussions.

The discourse of the Gypsy as the other was the most prevalent discursive construction, roughly equally frequent in all four papers. In the imaginary of the British press, the Gypsies – of the UK, of Romania and of Eastern Europe in general – were different in their illegality, poverty, and backwardness – and about to impede even more on the British taxpayer's wallet and living standards ("straggly bunch of New Age travellers disrupt the peace"[202]). For the Romanians, the Gypsies were especially violent and aggressive criminals involved in illegal affairs and pickpocketing ("the gypsy always

hunting for barter and bargains"[203]), stuck in poverty attributed to their innate laziness, turbulence ("turbulent crowd"[204]), drama ("a large bellied gypsy with bushy mustaches … too big for his boots"[205]), and confrontational nature. *Adevărul* wrote,

> The people, aware of the patriotic activity of the Roma of Botoşani [marching downtown for Roma Day], discretely covered their wallets and cell phones as the demonstrators walked by. If many Botoşanians went abroad to pick oranges, the Roma stayed back to pick wallets.[206]

TABLE 5.6 Discourses identified in the 2006 newspapers

	The Times		*The Guardian*		*Adevărul*		*România Liberă*	
Discourses	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total	No of docs.	% of total
The Gypsy as the other	22	**84.6**	12	**80**	30	**76.9**	11	**78.5**
The Gypsy as an unwanted problem	4	**15.3**	2	**13.3**	11	**28.2**	4	**28.5**
The Gypsy as victim of discrimination	10	**38.4**	9	**60**	11	**28.2**	5	**35.7**
The Gypsy as political project of cultural integration	2	**7.6**	1	**6.6**	7	**17.9**	1	**7.1**
The Gypsy as political integration-through-change *project*	3	**11.5**	1	**6.6**	6	**15.3**	1	**7.1**
Total number of docs.	26		15		39		14	

The press mediated public racism against the ethnic group. For instance, *The Guardian* wrote about Romanian locals' public prejudice and racial attacks on Gypsy homes: "'We would have torched the place, but we were too late. The police got there before us,' bragged one Ambrus villager"; "Subject to entrenched harassment, discrimination, and ghettoisation, the Roma are liberty's losers in the transformation

wrought by recent free elections and free markets"[207]; and also, "One rather spooky woman, who has set up a charity for the English as an ethnic minority, threatens to sue on the discovery that she's basically a gypsy."[208] *The Times* published an outright attack on British Travellers' lifestyle, followed by a series of letters-to-the-editor inferring that the minority perpetually made human rights claims and unjustifiably complained about being discriminated against. Authors of letters-to-the-editor wrote, "What a pity most people won't challenge these groups for fear of being called racist"[209]; "Surely the biggest annoyance is having to listen to travellers constantly complaining of discrimination without any acknowledgement of their antisocial behaviour."[210] Further, the press mediated authorities' prejudice (quoting Romanian city hall representatives to say, "They want state aid, but they don't work for the community, as it is written in the law, to get their money"[211]) and politicians' discrimination ("[British conservative politician Nigel] Farage [visiting Romania] jokes with a cheerful woman of Roma ethnicity who is trying to sell a Christmas tree taller than herself: 'See you in London!'"[212]).

The reporting itself, however, was also discriminating, as seen in Romanian press ("They have all the rights in the world, but they only make demands. For them, the requirement to work has long been abolished"[213]; "some [Gypsies] live in exorbitant luxury, of poor taste, as a matter of fact"[214]) and British writing alike ("an Irish traveller … proudly demonstrated her flushing toilet"[215]). Prejudicial coverage included lack of attention to balanced reporting, leaving out implications for the Gypsy groups, disregarding the disadvantages of evicting and relocating the minorities, or overtly objectifying the Gypsies into a good story to mock ("personally I think everyone rather enjoyed being on TV," wrote a review of a TV show that featured Travellers[216]).

Stylistically, *The Times*' continued commitment to conservative political values were suggested by the fact that all the derogatory terms used in the British press (terms such as pikey, gypo, the "thieving gyppo,"[217] and hippy) featured in this paper.

The European release of the film *Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan* contributed to the discourse of the Gypsy as the other. All four newspapers focused on the success of the film, as an unexpected box office sensation in the US and in Europe. British newspapers explained the film's smart humor and commended Americans for laughing at themselves. Once the film was banned in Kazakhstan, whose President raised concerns about the racist portrayal of the Kazakhs, and once trials were on course against 20th Century Fox and Sacha Baron Cohen, the newspapers paid increased attention to the controversy surrounding the production. The British press noted the Gypsies as a group discriminated against, alongside women, Jews, and homosexuals. It framed the film's discrimination matter-of-factly, nothing surprising, confirming common sense constructions of Gypsies as others to be treated prejudicially; after all, they are the other. The Romanian papers identified the villagers filmed in *Borat* as pretend-Kazakhs to be Gypsies. They contributed to the same construction of otherness, yet, differently than their British counterparts, Romanian journalists cynically documented two Romanian villagers' suit against Baron Cohen and 20th Century Fox. Gypsies' expectations for respect and financial retribution represented reason for mockery – again, as others, what could they want?

The second discourse of 2006 was that of the Gypsy as an unwanted problem. As suggested above, this discourse was less prevalent in this time-period compared to earlier coverage when either a moral panic guided strong xenophobia or the prospect of granting

Gypsies European citizenship was still debated and uncertain. *Adevărul* and *România Liberă* dedicated more attention (over a quarter of their articles) to the unwanted Gypsy than did the British papers. The Romanian Gypsies were evicted (framed as "winter cleaning"[218]), passed from one authority figure to another, scapegoated, and left to accept officials' decisions about their lives, as seen in *Adevărul*'s coverage of 50 evacuated Romanian Gypsy families. The mayor was quoted to say that:

> … he does not have better solutions. "In the 20 containers … there is electricity, water, and a toilet. We will guarantee heat with electric radiators. … This winter, they have to accept the conditions offered, to sleep under the sky, or find their own homes", maintained mayor Florea.[219]

Following previous patterns of representation, this second discourse constructed the Gypsy immigrant, seeking asylum and ready to take advantage of the British Europeans. Particularly in *The Times*, the Romanian and Bulgarian Gypsies were invasive, to be feared, and on the verge of ruining UK's economic and emotional stability. The British logic saw immigration to be "set to explode"[220]; even though predictions at the time of the 2004 enlargement did not come true, "huge influx of migrants from Eastern Europe … thousands of extra migrants" are projected[221]; low-skilled incoming workers would take away local jobs; at the same time, increase in crime, child and sex trafficking, and fraud was expected. British minorities, migrants once themselves, joined public and political mass complaint against the East Europeans.[222] Rarely did the papers offer credible sources to back up the immigration fear; instead, "*most observers* expect that the problem will worsen after the accession of Romania and Bulgaria into the EU next year"[223] and "*[t]here are signs* Britain will become an increasingly popular draw for migrants."[224] The Romanian press rallied against the

British (and Western European) attitude towards the potential Romanians migrants; the Romanian reporters defended the country as a whole, without distinguishing the Gypsies as a different category of migrants. National cohesiveness had grown stronger, it seemed.

The 2003-2004 discourse of the Gypsy as someone else's problem was not a central mode of talking in 2006. It only featured as part of the fear of the unwanted Gypsies. The EU certainly still was the institution to blame for the potential unwanted immigrants – Romanian, Bulgarian, or Gypsy. Euroskepticism was, in a sense, comparable to earlier years as the UK continued to have a nationalist (and not a federalist) approach to integration and power distribution within the EU. However, *EU's role* in the potential rise in immigration was not as much the focus of press coverage as it had been in 2003 and 2004, given Romania and Bulgaria's imminent and no longer questionable accession. That said, the British newspapers still documented Euroskeptic attitudes in the political and public arenas, and *The Times* most forcefully signaled alarm in regards to the "wildly varying estimates of the numbers of Romanians who would come to Britain."[225] *The Guardian*, differently, included more sober assessments of immigration, of the contribution foreign labor might bring to local businesses relying on migrant workers,[226] and of the fact that "enlargement has been a huge success, promoting prosperity and stability for new and old members alike."[227]

The binary of othering-victimization was just as necessary in November-December 2006. Therefore, the third discourse of the Gypsy as victim of discrimination used human rights paraphernalia. *The Guardian* positioned itself at the liberal end of the political spectrum once again, contributing the most to constructing knowledge about victimization. It thus noted that "[t]he growing trend of forced evictions of Roma in

Europe is becoming a human rights crisis,"[228] in *The Guardian*'s writing. *The Times*, similarly, published a letter-to-the-editor that commented "We are highlighting discrimination – so virulent that the majority do not want travellers working alongside them, as shown in a 2004 survey."[229] This discourse of victimization was significant for acknowledging the systemic institutionalization of racism. Different stories brought evidence to show the socio-economic and political structures contributing to maintaining the Gypsies in a lower class and in a status of poverty. To name a few, *The Guardian* traced the cause of baby trafficking in Eastern Europe to poverty and mothers being "desperate for money"[230]; the Romanian press explained political apathy towards the "unpopular" cause of the Gypsies to be one factor in slow integration[231]; *The Times* cited letters sent to the editors:

> [M]uch traveller nomadism is now involuntary … [E]victions must … severely disrupt education, access to health and social welfare services or employment … We, the settled community, have clearly failed in our obligations to provide appropriate accommodation, identified by the 1995 Task Force on the Travelling Community. … [B]laming the patient for being ill isn't going to achieve much.[232]

> Is there no chance that we might respect them as they are? Many travellers have adopted settled lives but are treated just as badly as those with nomadic lifestyles. This is scapegoating the victim and ignoring the problem.[233]

These statements were significant for the manner in which they raised awareness of the role that settled communities have played into the current colonization[234] of the Roma.

An important representational trend developed in the mid-2000s. Over the analyzed years, overt and subtle xenophobia against the Gypsy populations has taken the shape of Gypsy difference (throughout the 1990s), of abandonment of the Gypsies (in 1992), and most generally of rejection, unwantedness, and assignment of the minority to be someone else's problem (since 1997 until the mid-2000s). By the end of 2006, these

discursive strands evolved into specific, well articulated and well implemented political projects. By 2006, the European community was well aware of what the Gypsy problem was (constructed or problematized in daily socio-economic interactions). Moreover, emphasizing the centrality of the Gypsy minority in the new Europe became a press theme ("after the integration of the two states to the EU, the Roma population will become the largest ethnic minority in the Community bloc, with ten million people living in dire poverty"[235]). Alongside the increase in (the perception of the) size of the Roma groups, newspapers noted the rising lobbying efforts for Roma interests evident across Europe.[236] The European society – through its institutional international and national representatives – constructed solutions to control and fix the problem. Simply put, the solution has become integration. More complexly, however, integration may take different shapes for different actors, depending on the context, and with different implications for the Roma groups.

Two discourses were identified that attempted to construct integration approaches in two very distinct ways. The first – that of the Gypsy as a political project of *cultural integration* – coincided with an international call for rights, solidly founded upon a global discourse[237] of human rights; it fit into a universalist movement to protect the rights of all, irrespective of culture, formulated as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and ratified by all nations.[238] The other – that of the Gypsy as a political *integration-through-change* project – was employed by political leaders, trying (and failing, here argued) to be politically correct in their approach to, and interaction with, the minority group.

The discourse of *cultural integration* conceived solutions for improved social inter-ethnic relations, economic advancement of the Gypsy communities, decreased

crime, increased literacy and education, and improved health education and behavior to be respectful alliances. The Gypsies and the non-Gypsies must work together in order to solve community problems. Instances of such partnership were evident in reporting describing Romanian-Roma projects, part of the government's plan for improving the living conditions of the Gypsy groups over the duration of a ten-year period.[239]

The ideology of integration was complex, often incorporating references to the minority's human rights, as well as a disregard for the cultural specificity. For instance, introducing ideas of partnership ("'You shouldn't give to the gypsy, but open the door for him, *treat him nicely, and then he will know to treat you nicely, too*,' Roma Representative to the Parliament Nicu Păun revealed"[240]) was done in a sarcastic context; a local project in Romania to modernize commercial street-flower selling engaged the construct of the law-evading (other) Gypsy merchants (who might not be paying their taxes). The discursive construction of the Gypsy as a political integration-*through-change* project was more forceful in the press coverage – that is, it was more apparent and less apologetic than the human rights-inspired integration discourse. Different themes supported this discourse, all of them potent signifiers of a generalized institutional attitude towards integrating the Gypsies at both ends of the European map.

The strongest of themes was summarized by the following from *The Times*:

> [I]f travellers really wanted jobs, rather than victimhood, they'd make one simple lifestyle change. *They'd stop travelling*.
>
> If they did this it would mean accepting the houses that the local authorities provide for them, maintaining them to a habitable standard, and making an effort to get on with the neighbours. They'd stay in one place long enough for the next generation to get the education that is available to them. *They'd abandon their anachronistic, indefensible and ludicrous existence* in order to give their kids the chance to enjoy the rights, services and respect they demand for themselves.

> … A shiftless, transitory way of life is incompatible with the sort of work that offers prospects and potential.
>
> … If they have a culture worth preserving, it has to be based on more than an itinerant existence. Their language, folklore, customs and traditions can be fostered just as well in a settled environment.[241]

This passage encapsulated the discourses of the Gypsy other that justified racism and xenophobia – and called for a transformation of the Gypsy into, virtually, a non-Gypsy as the only way to acceptance by the majority group. Locally in the UK, the Gypsy and Travellers were subject to a manipulative project of integration – stop traveling and neighbors would then be accepting; in the specific Romanian context, Gypsy difference was constructed to be embedded, innate, genetic, and thus racism was at the foundation of integrationist talk that sought Gypsy transformation; internationally, the same fear of difference (embedded in the fear of rising immigration) motivated xenophobia in the context of EU enlargement; it followed, that Gypsies (and other immigrants), out to take advantage of the tax-payer British, would only be accepted if they offered good services and complied to UK employment standards. (Certainly, the coverage reflected a doubting attitude towards the possibility to surpass such low-skills status.)

Out of fear of the unwanted Gypsy, various action-projects surfaced to handle the potential panic. The UK discussed imposing employment restrictions for Romanian and Bulgarian workers, instituting an identification card system, biometric visas, permanent resident cards, establishing a system of fines both for illegal workers and for their employers, and initiating an anti-immigration campaign in Romania. As regards the latter, the campaign involved opening a toll-free phone line to offer information about immigration and living costs in the UK, along television and radio advertisements to

clarify the difficulty and risks of immigration. In this context, another theme contributing to the discourse of *integration-through-change* depicted officials' overt lack of enthusiasm and skepticism towards integration. Helping the Gypsies and working with their representatives was framed in the press to be a nuisance, a discomfort, and a difficult exertion, in the words of journalists, political leaders, and NGO speakers alike.[242] Because of Gypsy otherness, "we" fear them. Because "we" fear them, "we" must control or integrate them. Because of Gypsy otherness, however, "we" fear that any intervention is doomed to fail. Pessimism thus permeated the impossible project of *integration-through-change* ("no party has manifested the willingness to promote an objective as unpopular as is [Gypsy] integration"[243]).

To summarize, during the analyzed months of November-December 2006, Europe prepared itself for Romania's and Bulgaria's joint accession to the EU on 1 January 2007. The four newspapers adopted different tones towards the historic moment and a few interesting trends were noted when comparing the newspapers' preference for the different discourses identified in this time-period, as evident from the Table 5.6. These differences speak to the construction of Gypsy difference, as well as to the political implications of this difference. Most significantly, by the end of 2006, the Gypsies have become a human rights issue – whether framed as an object of discrimination (to which *The Guardian* most frequently spoke), as a project for interethnic and international respect and harmonious living (most prevalent in *Adevărul*), or as a systematic project of integration through change and assimilation into the mainstream non-Gypsy culture (a mode of talking evident in all four papers, most clearly in *Adevărul* and *The Times*). It must be noted that, even at the end of 2006, the two types of political projects that

attempted to fix and control the Gypsy problem still featured considerably less in press talk than other discursive modes (most evidently that of the Gypsy as the other).

Being a Gypsy in Western and Eastern European Press

To conclude this chapter meant to describe and explain ways of talking about Gypsies in Western and Eastern European press since the fall of the Communist regimes, a few comments are delineated in this section, comparing discourses across time. Continuities between modes of talking were here taken to suggest larger orders of discourse and ideologies. The construction of Gypsy difference extended beyond the coverage of an individual event, moral panic, or certain time period. Gypsy otherness is an ideology. An order of discourse refers to the way discourses are related, networked, and organized together, where some are dominant and others alternative, marginal, or counter-hegemonic.[244] As evidenced above, some discourses presented sufficient ideological support to have persisted and strengthened with the passing of time, whereas others constituted instances of resistance manifested against established modes of talking. Some detail about the workings of the discourses at different analytic levels (reviewed in Chapter Two[245]) is, in addition, necessary.

To begin, at the *textual* level, all four papers marked the Gypsy as the other, using derogatory terms, poor grammar and wording to suggest the ethnic groups' backwardness, illiteracy, and difference: They are, in sum, "the lowest of the low."[246] Thematically, articles about Gypsies overwhelmingly centered on antisocial behavior, illegal activities, poverty, and immorality; they triggered fearful political and social commentaries in contexts of economic recession and unemployment, rising immigration,

and potential living proximity. The purpose of this research was not to dismantle or disprove commonly-held representations of criminality and immorality among the Gypsy ethnicity. Rather, the goal was to investigate the constructions themselves and to contextualize them in the socio-economic-political European landscape. Edward Said, commenting on representations of Arabs in American media, similarly noted that there most certainly are Arabs that fit stereotypes[247] – just as there must be Gypsies that confirm prejudicial images. However, the discourses identified here were noted to be quantitatively unidirectional in portraying the Gypsies *chiefly* as others, that the coverage becomes problematic in how it transforms minority people's lives into a spectacle to be displayed, fixed, repeatedly enforced, left unchallenged, and used to justify human rights violations, racist attacks, institutional discrimination, and social prejudice. The dominant order of discourse – that is, the dominant media voice – argued, loud and clear, that there is no other representational mode; they *all* are the other: "The Gypsy stays a Gypsy."[248]

Second, the analysis recognized discourses drawing from, and playing a part in, *socio-cultural practices*[249] in the process of constructing Gypsy vs. non-Gypsy representations. Situational concerns allowed slight shifts in the construction of Gypsiness, evident in the 1997 alterations of the more stable unwantedness to a focus on laying blame (the Gypsy as someone else's problem). In times of moral panic in 1992, 1997, and 2001, the press tried different solutions. In 1992, the illegal New Age Travellers and the German Gypsy asylum-seekers were politically dealt with by changing policies and through deportation. National and international opposition voices recognized such attempts to signify desperate forms of control and more generally a process of scapegoating on the part of authorities "washing their hands"[250] of the Gypsy problem. In

1997, the quick fix for the social burden of the Gypsy refugees was to "[r]eturn to sender"[251] and "get rid of these people"[252]; that is, the asylum seekers were passed between countries – be it the country of origin, a neighboring EU member-country, or Europe most generally. In 2001, the Gypsies were to be changed, settled (that is, integrated), and "supervised"[253] in order to fix their otherness. In the mid-2000s, in the face of a growing European community, politically committed to work together or, in others' view, "frantically trying to forge a consensus,"[254] the press demonstrated, and added to, state institutions' desperation to find solutions for the Gypsy problem, blaming, in turn, the government, the locals, other countries, the EU, and most obviously the minority groups themselves. However hard each institutional body tried, "[t]here is no piece of land in the country that is perfect" for the Gypsies, confirmed *The Guardian*.[255]

The identified discourses drew from, and contributed to, *institutional relations and constraints*. Repeatedly, coverage in *The Times* stood in sharp contrast to *The Guardian*'s stance on Gypsy, policy, and political issues. Both newspapers showed serious commitment to journalistic standards and objectivity, yet each paper's political preferences were obvious. *The Times*' leniency in using derogatory terms towards the end of 2006, its less enthusiastic engagement to describe and support the Gypsy and Traveller cultures, and its ignorance of the local, political, and institutional discrimination against them spoke about the paper's more conservative and traditional viewpoints. *The Guardian* showed overt commitment to liberal values in its dedication of almost two thirds of its Gypsy stories to exposing racism and xenophobia against the minority groups throughout Europe (most evident in 2006). Broadly speaking, the British press changed its attention to various communities of Gypsies across Europe and at home, depending on

the day's agenda (describing the Gypsies to be illegal criminals, illegal festival-holders and non-conformists, foreign refugees, potential immigrants, vandals moving in next door, and low-skilled workers taking over Britain). The Romanian press most evidently constructed the Gypsy other who is unwanted. Activists and Roma leaders did feature in the pages of *Adevărul* and *România Liberă*, but as exceptions, isolated voices of the minority, strongly ridiculed by the reporting style and tone.

Beyond institutional constraints, *societal constraints* affected the four papers' discursive constructions, evident especially in the last two time-periods analyzed, that of the 2003-2004 Constitution draft and the 2006 Romanian accession to the EU. Whereas Romanian press was encouraging and supporting of Romania's progress and democratization, the UK press as a whole led a considerable attack on the potential Romanian and Gypsy immigrants. Of the two British newspapers, *The Times* most forcefully stood within the bounds of the discourse of Euroskepticism. Even though it published a variety of balanced opinions, its coverage showed preference for a representational mode centered on fear and disapproval of the low-skilled *other* migrants.

Some of the discourses identified by the analysis – as they fit in with socio-cultural reactions and solutions found to address the problems attributed to Gypsies' physical or anticipated presence – were motivated by racial hatred; some were not. These changing trends also reflected the interconnections between the predominant orders of discourse, at the same time as they were challenged by other, resistant discourses. As argued above, the discursive construction of *the Gypsy as the other* is ideological and has contributed to the creation and maintenance of the European common sense about the ethnic minority groups. The discourses contributing to this dominant representation were

the discourses of *the Gypsy as the other* (in 1990, 1992, 2001, 2003-2004, and 2006), *the Gypsy as an unwanted problem* (1992, 1997, 2003-2004, and 2006), and the more specifically articulated discourse of *the Gypsy as someone else's problem* (in 1997 and 2003-2004), *the Gypsy to be changed* and *the Gypsy politically tolerated* (in 2001).

Several discursive trends were noticed in the analysis to stand in opposition to the predominant mode of talking. In early 1990, the discourses of *the Gypsy as victim of discrimination* and *the civilized Gypsy* manifested the early signs of the global discourse of human rights, more evidently developed in subsequent years, and evidenced by the thematic political tolerance towards the ethnic minority establishing itself as a community in Eastern Europe. These early buds of cultural recognition became transformed into difference to be colonized, permeating European press writing to the contemporary moment, or developed into the human rights-based discursive constructions resisting othering. The discourse of victimization strengthened in 1992, in the face of serious racist attacks. The press initiated a cry for Gypsy rights and against xenophobia, fulfilling media's role of social responsibility. The 1997 Romanian coverage drew from both the larger discourses of rights and of integration; the press engaged with the causes of racism and offered analyses of how non-Gypsies could come together *with the Gypsies* to fix the problem that Europe as a whole has been facing (within the bounds of the discourse of *the Gypsy as a European problem*). By mid-2000s, the human rights discourse took on, once again, the role of highlighting and condemning racism (as evidenced by the 2003-2004 and the 2006 discourse of *the Gypsy as victim of discrimination*). Exposing racism and its sources to be the responsibility of all European nations signaled a counter-hegemonic approach to the Gypsy groups *as they are*,

validating them rather than contributing to formulating their otherness – and was a mark of discursive transformation within a maturing European community.

It should be noted that the British discourse of *the Gypsy as a European problem* in 1997 constituted a first attempt at implementing a political project meant to deal with the Gypsy problem – as were, furthermore, the 2001 discourses of *the Gypsy as politically tolerated* and *the Gypsy to be changed*. The latter two, however, contributed to otherness and strongly drew from a talk of integration identified in the literature as forced assimilation.[256] A similar dynamic characterized later discourses obvious in 2003-2004 (*the Gypsy as someone else's problem* and *the Gypsy as a political project of social integration*). By 2006, the dichotomous integration possibilities became framed as (and polarized into) *the Gypsy as political project of cultural integration* and *the Gypsy as political integration-through-change project*. The coexistence of, and contradictions between, such political projects of assimilation as integration, on the one hand, and a maturing European community validating its citizens and cultures, on the other hand, is undertaken in Chapter Seven.

In sum, this chapter described discourses about the Gypsies in Western and Eastern Europe. It identified and explained the Gypsy as other and as a social burden – sharply contrasted to a normal non-Gypsy – as the discourses established themselves through the 1990s, leading to different solutions to specific moral panics and policy- and politically-led action-plans to fix the Gypsy problem. The press coverage contributed to the political project of integration, gradually formulated and most strongly pushed forward by EU enlargement and Constitution-drafting. The analysis located a project of integration driven by an assimilationist, top-down perspective. Competing with the

discourse of human rights, integration-through-change seemed dreaded by NGO activists, minority leaders, and lay Gypsies alike. These voices pushed for another political project – that of human rights – highlighting the need to recognize Gypsy cultural validity. Potential tensions between the universalist and relativist approaches to constructing human rights are further tackled in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER SIX

"Born Equal and Free, but Denied Equality and Freedom in Today's Europe": The Activists' Roma

> *Who has the right to represent the interests of the Roma? Who speaks in their name?*
>
> *Is it the case that Roma commit more crimes, or that the police are more likely to arrest someone if he's a Rom? When [press] readers are told that a suspect is a Rom, they are being told not only what his ethnicity is but also that his ethnicity is important to the account … And this implies that being a Rom is related to criminality.*
>
> - The Project on Ethnic Relations

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the constructions of Gypsy / Roma in activist documents from the 1990s through the end of 2006. The discussion below seeks to answer the question of what the Gypsy / Roma is in a European setting, started in the previous Chapter – that is, what discourses about Roma / Gypsies appeared in selected international NGO reports and publications between January 1990 and December 2006. Changes in discourses during this time and comparisons between different organizational approaches to representation are also addressed throughout, as is the issue of the representation of Roma / Gypsy vs. non-Roma. Any similarities and contradictions between press discourses and those presented here – in other words, the full answer to the first research question – are addressed in Chapter Seven.

Seven discourses were identified in the analyzed sample of NGO documents: (1) The Roma as victim of discrimination; (2) the discourse of state blame; (3) the discourse of Roma rights; (4) the discourse of ethno-genesis; (5) the discourse of social integration;

(6) the discourse of resistance by safeguarding tradition; and (7) the discourse of the Roma as the Gypsy other. Extensive quotations are offered to illustrate the different discourses, as longer citations allow the text to speak for itself and offer stronger evidence than isolated fragments. A few comments precede the description of the discourses.

To begin, a note on terminology is necessary. As previously discussed, the growing activist movement has favored and promoted "Roma" as the politically correct term for Roma groups across Europe – except in instances where the minorities themselves have chosen a different name (such is the case of the German Sinti, the Irish Travellers, and the Gypsy Travellers of Britain). When referring to activism, therefore, this chapter uses "Roma" to refer to the work of the NGO activists, their writing, or the object of their writing – the communities of "Roma" that they write about. "Gypsy" is here used to denote the stereotypical construction, as delineated earlier in this dissertation.

As was the case with the analysis of newspapers, this chapter involved a certain degree of abstraction. The point was not to overlook organizational, political, temporal, or contextual specificities, but rather to understand the NGO discourses in a larger (European and ideological) context. As a result, similarities between the attention to human rights given, for instance, by a Project on Ethnic Relations (PER) bulletin and an issue of the Roma Rights Quarterly of the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) were here emphasized. The attempt was to identify the common story – the "parallels and the common genealogies that unite … apparently disparate occasions of discourse."[1] At the same time, the discourses isolated here are not absolute; nor are they mutually exclusive

and discrete from one another. As discussed earlier, the power of discourse lies in its interrelations and fluidity, at the same time as it rests on its repetition and changing nature.

The documents of five NGOs were analyzed, as listed in Appendix B. The selected NGOs were the Project on Ethnic Relations (PER), the European Roma Information Office (ERIO), the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC), the European Roma and Travellers Forum (ERTF), and the European Committee on Romani Emancipation (ECRE). (Chapter Four details the reasons for selecting these NGOs.) In brief, PER is an internationally funded organization, functioning since 1991. Its financial sponsors are US governmental agencies and foundations. PER's work is dedicated to preventing ethnic conflict in Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, and the countries of the former Soviet Union; PER's work on Roma is centered on organizing conferences, workshops, and trainings, at international, national, and community levels.[2] Similar to PER in its international visibility and financial support, ERRC conducts work directly pertaining to human rights advocacy, litigation, research, and policy development. Formed in 1996, has consultative status with the Council of Europe and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.[3] PER and ERRC are the largest and most visible internationally; instead of a limitation of this work, the larger number of documents read by PER and ERRC (in contrast to the other NGO's documents) is taken to indicate visibility in the European sphere, as well as financial backing given to the two NGOs to promote their agenda.

The third selected NGO is ERIO, founded in 2003. It conducts anti-discrimination work in the fields of education, employment, health care, and housing, aiming to raise

awareness and provide in-depth information about widespread discrimination against the Roma minority (and others).[4] ERTF, established in 2004, also works in direct partnership with the Council of Europe. It was created in response to public European requests for one single body to represent the European Roma minority. It is arguably "the only international Roma and Traveller organization which unites NGOs, political parties, religious institutions and other types of leadership in one organisational structure."[5] And finally, the goal of ECRE, formed in 1999 under the EU umbrella, is to maintain a permanent presence in the European Parliament in Brussels.[6]

In total, 115 documents were read and analyzed for discursive strategies; of these, 36 were PER documents, specifically identified to be about the Roma, Romania, Central Europe, or yearly PER Bulletins; ten ERIO documents were read – newsletters, press releases, and country reports; seven ERTF documents were analyzed – press releases and the ERTF Charter; 44 ERRC position papers, pamphlets, fact sheets, country reports, and the ERRC periodic publication, *Roma Rights Quarterly* (34 issues), were included in the analysis; 20 documents were ECRE reports and correspondence. Two of the documents had both ERIO and ERRC as authors.[7]

Most generally, PER documents were summaries and policy papers concerned with international workshops and trainings bringing together Roma and non-Roma activists and political leaders working on minority rights and identity issues. PER's documents focused the least on the discourse of state blame of the five selected NGOs. As Table 6.1 shows below, PER's chief focus, other than commenting on discrimination, was with the more productive discourses of social integration, identity-making, the discourse about rights, and resistance.

ERIO's newsletters detailed ethnic conflict in the Central-Eastern European region, especially in a context of EU enlargement and integration of all (future and present) EU citizens. ERTF's agenda in their press releases lied with emphasizing the unique, historic creation of the Forum as a moment of Roma unity across the continent. The ERTF Charter detailed the plight of the Roma as a European minority. ECRE's correspondence consisted primarily of letters to the European Ombudsman, the President of the EU, and the Petitions Committee of the European Parliament. In both correspondence materials and reports, ECRE's chief concerns were school segregation and EU financing governmental initiatives that support "special schools" for Roma children. ECRE's primary interests were to fight discrimination and isolate the state to blame for such racism (see Table 6.1); Roma rights, ethno-genesis, or the solution-oriented discourse of social integration are smaller focus points.

Finally, ERRC's focus for the ten years of activity was the richest. It covered a wide range of topics related to the situation of the Roma in Europe, from public and institutional discrimination, to specific issues of poverty, unemployment, problematic access to health and housing services, violence, and criminality. Given the NGO's primary drive towards an agenda of human rights, every issue of its periodical *Roma Rights Quarterly* reported successful and problematic litigation for rights. ERRC also offered news feeds on Roma issues, written by its staff and gathered from other news sources (such as the Associated Press, France Press, newspapers-of-record and smaller papers from across Europe, and other Roma organizations).

Throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s, European international bodies – both governmental, supra-national, and NGOs – paid increasing attention to human rights and

incorporated the notion in their policies and public statements. For the purpose of clarity, when this dissertation refers to the larger discourse of human rights, it points to the vocabulary and assumptions encoded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and its more recent, updated version accepted by the EU, the Charter of Fundamental Rights.[8] It is here assumed that the European inter-governmental organizations grapple and work with the specific version of human rights encoded in these documents, not so much because of the theoretical implications of the UN's or the EU's accounts of human rights, but because the activists advocating for Roma rights themselves (must) adhere to the most politically acceptable language. The basic tenets of the UDHR regard all human beings to be born free and equal, with rights to be protected against violations.[9] The EU Charter clarifies the "civil, political, economic and social rights of EU residents."[10]

Thus, the construct of human rights was treated most generally as an accepted mode of talking, embodied, and expanded upon within different contexts and with different purposes. It is not a discourse characterizing a way of talking about Gypsies / Roma alone; instead, NGO activists have deployed it to enhance other discursive constructions – in a prime example of discursive intertextual relations.[11] For example, the discourse of Roma rights used the lexicon and tools already established by the human rights movement as justification for (the need to firmly establish) Roma rights in the European context; likewise, the discourse of ethno-genesis used human rights to justify attention to Roma as a minority and / or nation in itself, worthy of political legitimacy. Both the more general human rights discourse and that of Roma rights here identified

borrow from, and contribute to, the same (equality-based) system of knowledge – even though the exact parameters of framing rights looks different depending on the case.

The Roma rights movement has developed in the time period following the fall of Communism. Although Kende suggested in 2000 that Roma activism cannot yet be seen as a *movement per se*,[12] the evidence gathered here suggests the contrary; moreover, the Roma activists' self-proclamation as a movement for rights should bear more relevance to the question than an outsider assessment or de-legitimizing gesture. Throughout the 1990s, the activists focused heavily on legal protection of rights, litigation, and using the "law as a tool for social change."[13] Attention to ethnic violence and racist attacks continued to preoccupy the activists, yet the discourse of rights changed to incorporate issues such as representation (questions of identity developed as ethno-genesis), funding, implications of the EU enlargement for the Roma minorities, and the question of nation-building and territoriality. Around the year 2000, an additional focus to Roma women's rights surfaced. It is too early to evaluate the latter as a movement in its own right (although some activists argue that it is, as seen below) and isolate its discursive strategies as separate from those employed by the Roma rights activists. In this research, the two were treated as one – a movement towards Roma rights using different themes to construct their political and social visibility. However, a European Parliament Resolution, passed in June 2006, said that the situation of Roma women in Europe "should be a key criterion for evaluating 'status of readiness' for accession to the EU."[14] Such statements may lead the way to, and support the growth of, a more articulate Roma women's rights movement.

Serious internal convulsions have characterized the cause of Roma rights as a new, emergent movement, chaotically grasping for a direction, leadership, vocabulary, priorities, an identity, and political legitimacy. The points of agreement amongst the different activist have been the pressing need to fight discrimination against the Roma economically, politically, socially, and culturally. The movement's birth and early years mirrored, to some degree, the wider global debate between universalism and relativism in regards to rights, as delineated below. As is the case with the human rights movement, the Roma rights movement has developed and used discourse to support its agenda and make itself visible in the public arena. Moreover, it has relied on intertextual relations to draw its legitimacy. It follows that, rhetorically, the movement of Roma rights has adopted, and contributed to, the discourses of social integration, identity-making, and resistance.

The Roma as Victim of Discrimination: "The Most Disadvantaged"

The most prevalent of discourses, represented in all (but three) analyzed NGO documents, had the explicit purpose to combat discrimination and anti-Gypsyism across Europe (see Table 6.1). It was the most stable of the noted discourses across the analyzed time period. It noted discrimination, racism, and xenophobia that inform and coalesce as institutional, governmental, and supranational organizational policies, as well as take the shape of extremist and public racial attacks against European Roma. The discourse identified problems that characterize the everyday life of Roma across the continent, at the same time as it formulated the complexity of such problems. For this purpose, different rhetorical strategies were used: First, the discourse primarily exposed and

documented discrimination in all aspects of social life, including institutional racism; second, it used such evidence against a historical picture of discrimination in order to explain contemporary anti-Gypsyism; third, it constructed the Roma as perpetual victims; and fourth, the discourse sought to dispel stereotypes by contextualizing the cycle between discrimination and illegal behavior.

TABLE 6.1 Discourses identified in NGO documents

	Project on Ethnic Relations		European Roma Information Office		European Roma and Travellers Forum		European Roma Rights Center		European Committee on Romani Emancipation	
Discourses	No. of docs.	% of total	No. of docs.	% of total	No. of docs.	% of total	No. of docs.	% of total	No. of docs.	% of total
The Roma as victim of discrimination	36	**100**	10	**100**	7	**100**	44	**100**	17	**85**
State blame	23	**63.8**	9	**90**	5	**71.4**	44	**100**	19	**95**
Roma rights	29	**80.5**	7	**70**	7	**100**	44	**100**	11	**55**
Ethno-genesis	29	**80.5**	6	**60**	5	**71.4**	42	**95.4**	2	**10**
Social integration	36	**100**	9	**90**	4	**57.1**	44	**100**	5	**25**
Resistance by safeguarding tradition	17	**47.2**	2	**20**	1	**14.2**	13	**29.5**	0	**0**
The Roma as the Gypsy other	17	**47.2**	0	**0**	1	**14.2**	5	**11.3**	0	**0**
Total number of documents	36		10*		7		44*		20	

Notes: * Two documents were co-authored by ERIO and ERRC (and others). In this list, they are therefore included twice.
All documents were given equal weight in the analysis, irrespective of length, audience, or time at which created.

Everyday Discrimination. Documenting discrimination was the first thematic focus of the discourse. All the documents analyzed explicitly identified persecution as "long-standing threats to the Romani community in Central and Eastern Europe" and the

habitual use of stereotypes about Gypsies to support a discriminatory system. Discrimination was defined as anti-Gypsyism, anti-Ciganism, Romanophobia, racism, or xenophobia, but the central tenet was the same: The Roma are "the most disadvantaged."[15] This quote illustrates one way to describe discrimination as a general, sweeping European discourse. Activist news headlines often looked like, "Racist attacks and harassment by skinheads and others in Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Serbia and Montenegro,"[16] The content typically described racially motivated violence, from skinhead assaults to mob law, police violence, "war time abuses, killings, beatings, torture, abductions, rape, humiliation, etc.,"[17] and lack of prosecution or light-hearted treatment of cases.[18] Another strategy was to offer specific instances of discrimination to support the general theme. ERRC reported such incidents as "Orthodox priest in Greece refuses to baptize Romani children"[19]; "Abusive removals of Romani children from parental care in Italy"[20]; "Death of Roma as a result of substandard living conditions, including electricity cuts, in Bulgaria"[21]; "Anti-Romani sentiment leading to discrimination, hate propaganda or racist violence in Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, and Sweden, the United Kingdom"[22]; "Austrian campsite has 'No place for Gypsies'"[23]; "Racist game reappears in Internet after removal"[24]; denied entrance in pubs, restaurants, discotheques, and sports centers.[25]

The discourse identified racism and xenophobia as causes of ethnic violence; the Roma have been unwanted, "'foreigners' … outsiders in their own country, a perception that has been based largely on beliefs about 'race'"[26]; it follows that the Roma have been "hunted down"[27] by whatever group arises to do it. The same tone of outrage framed skinhead, neofascist, nationalist, fundamentalist groups attacking Roma communities,

and locals' protests. Mob violence was traced to crime-related motives, an "imagined precipitating event"[28] – or else no motive other than racial hatred.[29] Photographic and written testimonies underscored this theme of violence. Readers of reports were guided through the pain ensuing from racist attacks, and not just told about it.

The NGOs gave considerable attention to Roma refugees across Europe – and most evidently to the "pogrom in Kosovo"[30] and the Roma expatriates following the Kosovo war of the late 1990s. Such attention took the shape of special reports, assigned task forces and offices to directly monitor human rights violations in the former Yugoslavia, frequent news feeds reporting on the refugee situations, lobbying efforts reported in the NGO documents, and testimonials from refugees themselves.

The discrimination and identified stereotypes mimic both the literature and the press discourses discussed in Chapters Three and Five. For instance, ERRC noted, "[a]t best [the Roma] are laughed at as simple-minded musicians and tolerated as beggars"[31] and "stigmatized as 'stupid' and 'retarded.'"[32] Other stereotypes referred to Gypsies as illegal traders on the black market – scapegoated as reason for a slow economy and lack of consumer goods in post-Communist societies, suggested PER.[33] Most often, however, the reports addressed – and challenged – the stereotype of the criminal Gypsy, genetically inclined to commit crime, the Gypsy that must be monitored and controlled. They further related Roma crime to police practices and expectation that a criminal way of life defines "Gypsy" identity[34] (a theme developed more rigorously by the discourse of Roma rights, described later).

All five NGOs dedicated a great deal of human and financial resources to gather and present evidence about the difficult every day life of Roma communities throughout

Europe, as seen in the following examples. To begin, the minority groups are socially excluded by being marginalized and segregated at the outskirts of society in so called *Romani ghettos* – run down areas, without basic utilities, road access, and access to social services. The NGOs depicted a Roma minority treated as a "peripheral, 'socially degraded' stratum of society."[35]

The Roma are trapped in an unremitting and unrelenting "stupefying poverty"[36] that explains unemployment, poor health, child homelessness, crime, and choices sometimes framed as cultural: "They are not nomadic by choice, but because they cannot afford to rent a house"[37]; "our children play in garbage dumps while white children play with computers," said one Roma father cited in a PER report.[38] Unemployment was often contextualized as a consequence of poverty, keeping the Roma "under-educated, unemployed or condemned to low-paying, menial jobs."[39] Unemployment was primarily constructed as a direct outcome of state failure to provide access to jobs. In close connection, the NGOs emphasized institutional and social discrimination that discourages employment opportunities, in the shape of racial animus, exclusion from interviews once ethnicity is identified, abusive treatment once employed, and creating bureaucratic obstacles for crafts practitioners.[40] The following passage highlights connections between unemployment, stereotyping, and social discrimination:

> The massive and disproportionate exclusion of Roma from employment is an undisputed reality in many countries … One reason for governments' failure to undertake proactive measures to challenge the exclusion of Roma from employment is the widespread conviction that the fact that Roma do not work is their fault and is the consequence of poor education and lack of motivation to find work. The presumption is that employment opportunities are equally accessible for everyone, and if Roma are not taking advantage of these it is due to objective reasons – low education, as well as subjective reasons – conscious choices to live from state support rather than work.[41]

Dismal housing opportunities – or, rather, the issue of "unhousing Roma"[42] – were represented in a context of active discrimination and attempt to discourage inter-ethnic living. The NGO materials described segregation ghettoization plans (as official responses to illegal settlements), forced evictions (sometimes violent), threats of eviction, demolitions, uncertain "slum transformation"[43] projects, refusal to rent or sell to Roma, and dire or absent utilities and service for Roma-inhabited buildings ("UN Special Rapporteur finds housing conditions of Romani children in settlements in Greece unacceptable"[44]). The state is the responsible actor for such failings – that sometimes have tragic consequences ("Housing conditions lead to death of Romani baby in Sarajevo"[45]). If officials fail to protect the Roma, locals take the law into their own hands ("Racially motivated attacks on Travellers homes in Northern Ireland … reportedly designed to prevent families from settling in housing estates in the town"[46]).

Issues related to caravan traveling – in the UK and in Scandinavian countries – were not a central focus for the NGOs during this time frame, as they mostly focused on discrimination in Central and Eastern Europe (even though the 2000s showed an increase in news feeds on the British Roma). What interested ERRC in particular were court trials of human rights violations against British Gypsies and Travellers' right to travel and official measures taken towards limiting (as framed here) such rights.

The focus on discrimination in the realm of education gained momentum amongst the NGOs in the later 1990s. The activists reported about (a) school segregation – that is, isolating Roma children into special schools or classrooms separated from the majority non-Roma and over-populating schools for the mentally disabled with Roma children:

> What is special about [the "special schools"] is that they are designed as substandard educational programs for kids with developmental or mental disability. Rather than compensating alleged disability and integrating allegedly handicapped youths, they are a sure and final departure from equal opportunities, an unmistakable stigma for all who have been once referred to them. The fact is that Romani children are hugely over-represented and in some places make up to 95 percent of such institutions.[47]

The reports were clear on the implications of segregated education:

> At a very young age, many Roma and non-Roma are taught that hate, humiliation and even physical abuse on racist grounds is acceptable or at least tolerated.[48]

Furthermore, the reports covered (b) difficult access to schools due to living conditions apart from school-served communities (a consequence of housing segregation); (c) violence and harassment of Roma children by teachers, administrators, parents, and non-Roma students alike; (d) difficult access to education in Romany, in terms of curriculum development and teacher availability; and finally, the NGO documents report about (e) low school attendance as a result of both these factors. This issue is one that has been addressed more frequently by state officials. Therefore, NGO documents have noted improvements, thematically framed as progress towards social integration, as seen below.

Several reports addressed Roma parents' hesitation in traditional communities to send their children to school past-puberty, "worried that their offspring will learn to take drugs, swear and hear about sex from young house-dwellers."[49] Roma women's rights advocates connected parents' unwillingness to send young girls to schools to gender roles within traditional Roma groups. Such topics raised considerable debates – in summaries of workshop and roundtables. NGO advocates spoke for respect for ethnic (and cultural) rights, at the same time as they called for equal education – simultaneously advocating

for social integration and collaboration. None of the documents visibly took one-sided positions on the topic of gender and traditional family roles; opposing voices were left to contradict each other on paper, reflecting both the hesitation of a new movement and the multifaceted aspects of the issue.

Similarly, poor health, low life expectancy, child mortality, lack of or difficult access to health services (such as ambulance and emergency service, and distribution of health care benefits and insurance) contributed to the discursive picture of discrimination against the Roma. The NGOs documented segregation into "Gypsy rooms"[50] as typical hospital practices, as well as denial of health-related services on racist grounds.[51] Some ERRC news headlines illustrated, "Ambulance refuses to enter Romani neighbourhood in Bulgaria" and "Informal and illegal payments for services, most prevalent at public hospitals."[52] A "new example of Romani genocide,"[53] past and present sterilization against Romani women's will or without their knowledge was documented. Again, the NGOs' discursive focus was to provide context for the status quo, identifying racism as the explanation:

> According to the dominant views among researchers and policy-makers, poverty is the central determinant of poor health among Roma. These views oversimplify the issue and tend to ignore or underestimate the particular, independent obstacles posed by racial discrimination … – past and present … Racial discrimination in health care – direct and indirect – magnifies already existing inequities establishing separate and independent barriers for Roma to enjoy the right to the highest attainable standard of health.[54]

Thin social assistance (social welfare and social security) and protection (of ethnic data, for instance) was another rhetorical indicator of the discourse of discrimination. The analyzed documents linked "[d]enial of public services" to sometimes tragic consequences, such as "death and severe injuries to Roma in a

segregated settlement in Slovakia."[55] Real-life testimonies and photographs of mourning grounded the overall advocacy argument against discrimination, giving it an emotional and realistic appeal.

Media coverage of the Roma played its part as discursive evidence for discrimination. NGO reports repeatedly documented press and broadcasting discrimination (some examples from ERRC were, "Roma left out of media coverage surrounding Albanian elections"; "Anti-Romani hate speech on national television"; "Racist hate speech in reaction to Roma winning Big Brother Croatia TV Contest"[56]). Beyond noting discrimination, the NGO discourse emphasized the media role in shaping public perceptions of the Roma ethnic minority. The construction of media institutions was categorical: Media coverage is "incredibly distorted,"[57] misinformed, intentionally discriminatory, characterized by "widespread bad will" and "lack of professionalism"[58] – and directly affects public opinion: "[I]t leads to racist views"[59]:

> Law may not *put an end to racism*, but the media might.[60]
>
> Government restricts benefits for immigrants prior to the accession of 10 new states to the EU after *racist campaign* against Roma in UK media.[61]
>
> The mainstream media have played a *crucial, negative role* in perpetuating the stereotypes of the Roma, arousing mistrust, fear, and sometimes hatred. The media have eagerly reported "Gypsy crimes" and used supposedly objective police statistics about the "Gypsy crime rate" in their coverage of violent incidents involving the Roma. In so doing, *the media helped to justify the violence and convert victims into perpetrators*.[62]

The NGOs have initiated direct action in response to this representational crisis, shaped as dialogue, trainings of non-Roma journalists, inclusion of Roma journalists among mainstream papers' staff, and strengthening Romani media. Such specific action points towards changing media content raised an interesting dilemma, hotly debated

among activists (and reflected in their writing): Should activists continue to support freedom of speech (that has assisted the Roma movement) even when it takes the shape of hate speech? Or should they advocate for some form of censorship that would ensure less discriminatory media representations? The discussion concluded, for instance, in a 1999 issue of *Roma Rights Quarterly*: "This is a *political issue*, in the highest sense of the word. The ultimate meaning of [libel and hate speech] laws is that the maintenance of a minimum of civility in public is a societal good."[63] For the NGOs, the issue is simple: If freedom of speech is used as hate speech, it must be controlled; everything and anything must be done in order to eliminate racism.

To summarize this first theme, the first discursive strategy of the discourse of the Roma as victim of discrimination constructed the Roma in a deplorable state, well articulated by the following *Roma Rights Quarterly* 2002 "Notebook" section on the Albanian Roma:

> Roma have been among the most severely affected in the post-socialist transition … Their destitution is evident in their disproportionately high unemployment figures, miserable living conditions and lack of access to education, health care and social assistance. The mechanisms Roma in Albania use to cope with their desperate situation are seasonal migration, casual work, social capital and heightened cultural identity. The severity of their impoverishment, along with their high birth rate, should make improving education, infrastructure, and social inclusion for the Roma a priority for Albania and the international community.[64]

<u>*Historical Discrimination.*</u> The second rhetorical strategy was to bring in history as evidence for the long-standing practice of excluding the Roma from mainstream societies. To this effect, examples of Holocaust suffering ("We have never recovered from this blow"[65]) and Communist discrimination ("Under … most communist regimes across the region, it was somehow imagined that the very existence of the Gypsy

minority could be 'solved' by dispersing them among reluctant white communities"[66]), along with difficulties related to financial compensation following war crimes ("Swiss fund restricts eligibility for Roma Holocaust survivors"[67]) were offered. One of ERRC's editorials in a *Roma Rights Quarterly* issue on Romani Holocaust eloquently comprises the activists' frustration at the continued suffering of the Roma, invoked so often in the NGO documents:

> This is a difficult issue to read, at least for me. The trouble for me is not so much the concentrated suffering that comes undiluted from the reality of Roma lives, past and present. It is difficult to read because it is monotonous. It is banal. … We may soon become numb and not want to hear more. Please keep in mind: it is not the horror, it is the banality. Banality is more difficult to resist, and whether we choose this kind of resistance is entirely up to us.[68]

What is striking about this fragment is that it powerfully summarizes both the urgency of discrimination and the hopelessness of activism. This is the crux of the NGO discourse of discrimination: Something *must* be done, but not too much *can* be done.

Victimization. The third theme of the discourse of discrimination is the construction of the Roma as perpetual victims. Its paradox is that it is necessary to call against, and document, discrimination, yet by itself, the discourse risks further objectification of the Roma communities. In this sense, this discourse disempowers the Roma (in contrast with the purpose of the ethno-genesis discourse, as seen below) by positioning them at the mercy of whoever is willing to note and do anything about discrimination. The Roma were constructed to be "the less fortunate,"[69] "forgotten minority"[70] – victims of the regime, state officials, criminal justice system, education system, police brutality, extremist attacks, local populations, and international organizations alike ("Neither domestic nor international law could help these people"[71]).

The theme of victimization runs through the majority of documents; few reports analyzed a Roma role in the cycle of discrimination; power is exercised top-down, over Roma lives,[72] with the severe consequence that the Roma *become* victims, experiencing an "[i]nternalized unworthiness, due to system of prejudice and marginalization."[73]

The Cycle of Discrimination. The fourth and final thematic focus of the discourse of discrimination was pro-active and productive: It fights discrimination by contextualizing the cycle between racism and illegal behavior. Racism was therefore framed to be a "cumulative effect" resulting in "the formation of a Romani underclass, with all its negative aspects, including a high degree of exposure to social exclusion, discrimination and victimization,"[74] substandard education[75] and its ensuing problems. The Roma, likewise, were "impoverished, marginalized and politically powerless."[76] This theme was structured to reflect a cause-and-effect relationship: The Roma are discriminated against; as a result, they have a difficult life; consequently, unsupported by the system, they have to resort to other survival means, be they crime or delinquent behavior, or staying outside the system (not attending schools or not voting). "If Roma are criminals, it is because they are unemployed," wrote PER in 1996.[77] ERRC explained low education (as an "effect of a number of decades of segregated inferior education of Roma") and loss of motivation (following years of exclusion from equal employment opportunities) as barriers to employment,[78] as well as demanded not holding all Roma responsible for the gestures of the few. This cycle further justifies Roma fear of, and distrust in, the government, police officials, banks, schools, even NGO leaders, and, most broadly, the system. Lack of political and social involvement, separation, silence, and hopelessness ensue, noted the reports ("Left alone in this situation and often without

money or support, many Roma give up out of distress, despair and resignation rather than taking their problems to court"[79]).

To conclude, the first and most productive discourse visible in the NGO materials – the discourse of the Roma as victim of discrimination – is a straightforward call for attention to the historic racism facing Roma communities in Europe. ERRC in particular (as the NGO most focused on universal human rights) contextualized racial discrimination to be a fundamental part of European culture[80] as seen here:

> Xenophobia, pathological nationalism and racism are … inalienable components of Europe. Once this principle is grasped it becomes clear that the Roma, as a non-territorial minority, as a people who cannot be classified so easily, elicit fear and denial. Roma are seen as a threat to the ethnically pure nation …[81]

Significantly, the NGO discourse exposes denial of discrimination as a powerful tool to perpetuate social inequality,[82] as well as it recognizes Roma communities' internalized victim role. In a sense, it is closely related to, if not a mirror twin of, the repeatedly identified press discourse of the Gypsy as victim of discrimination. The difference in the terminology (the NGOs focus on the "Roma" and not on the "Gypsy" discriminated against) certainly speaks to the larger project that the activists are committed to.

State Blame: "For Them, Nothing Is Available in a Normal Way"

If the discourse of the Roma as victim of discrimination describes the *problem* and *object* of discrimination, the discourse of state blame constructs one of the *subjects* and *agents* of discrimination. The two discourses work in close connection to one another. The state's lax attitude about Roma issues contributes to discrimination, which in turns justifies blaming the state. Constructing the Roma as a victim of state abuse is

discursively necessary in this dynamic. It is the state that must be blamed for not protecting and defending the rights of the minority groups. It is governmental policies that continue to trap the Roma in poverty. This discourse completes the image of the Roma as victims by constructing the villain – a corrupt, failing, and aloof system. Rhetorically, this move is accomplished by leaving out mention of Roma communities' contribution to the cycle of discrimination (differently than the discourse of discrimination). An ERRC position paper illustrates this point:

> [I]n some countries including Greece, Italy, Romania, and Serbia and Montenegro, hundreds of Romani children do not go to school at all. Whole communities of Roma in Romania live on dumpsites, and the efforts of non-governmental organizations to assist Roma in enrolling their children in school have met with *obstruction at nearly every official instance*.[83]

The state does not protect the Roma, nor is it willing to. (The purpose here is not to debate what the role of the Roma may be in a given situation, nor to suggest that there could be something for the Roma to do. Instead, it is the NGO's construction of this role that matters – or, rather, its absence.)

The state – government, its representatives, institutions, agencies, and projects – are to blame for (a) not educating the non-Roma population about discrimination; (b) not interfering with seriousness in cases of extremist attacks; (c) an inadequate legal system that not only delays pursuing cases where Roma are victims or falsely accused, but exhibiting prejudicial court behavior and rulings (documented by the United Nations and the EU's bodies of human rights supervision, not just the NGOs working on Roma issues); (d) not controlling and / or monitoring its own institutions (such as the police). Further, (e) the NGOs built on European organizations' critique of different governments to suggest various countries' opportunist approach to handling human and minority rights

in light of EU integration advantages. Other state failures are (f) improper immigration, refugee, and asylum policies that lead to further justification of racism; (g) inadequate EU policies (where often the EU was treated with the same skepticism and mistrust as any other official body), such as the Race Equality Directive, that fails to serve and protect the Roma community on an equal footing with the other European minority groups. Finally, (h) political figures' improper role-modeling on issues of ethnic conflict was yet another state failing.

Given the NGOs' explicit focus on discrimination against the Roma, it is difficult to isolate a representation of the state outside the topic of Roma issues. That said, constructing state blame is more than a theme in support of the first representational mode; it is a discourse with its own typical structures and restructuring tendencies – that is, using evidence to restructure an argument that fits with the discourse's agenda.[84] For example, instances of community violence – localized incidents – were framed to be the government's failure in prevention, in not properly controlling or reprimanding them. Or, in another case, "Official inactivity creates impunity and tacitly vindicates violence against Roma."[85] The state can always do more to help and protect the Roma. Oftentimes, this goal was discursively enforced by using strong, clear, and unequivocal phrasing: "Lithuanian authorities *forcibly* evict five Romani families in winter" and "Romanian school officials *refuse* enrolment of Romani children," wrote ERRC.[86] Of the five read NGOs, ECRE used the strongest language to judge officials' apathy and corruption. Rhetorically, ECRE assessments resembled propaganda:

> The more recent rise in significance of the Special schools has only intensified the impact of the system in *robbing* the majority of all generations of Roma in Central Europe of an adequate education. … This *tragic and unfortunate outcome* is …

> the result of the covert actions of mainstream society leaders and officials. … This system maintains a *horrendous* annual tradition [of separating Roma children to other schools in front of non-Roma children]. … Special schools are invariably badly kept, ill-equipped and dull. … This system reflects a *failed political leadership* …[87]

Later, the same document critiqued European governments for allocating "a tiny sum," "grossly insufficient funds" to Roma projects that are entangled in "fraudulent accounting and reporting within the governments, ministries of education and local authorities. It is *clearly totally irresponsible* of the European Commission …"[88] ECRE's forceful advocacy was mirrored by ERRC's rhetorical cynicism when it wrote, "equal educational opportunity is a mirage."[89]

Likewise, on the topic of refugees, the discourse relies on a well-defined narrative structure to make the point of Roma and human rights violations and national governments' inability to handle mass migration across Europe. The particular case of Roma refugees from Kosovo (to Western European countries) involved issues of official discrimination, expulsions, extremist and mass violence after the end of the NATO bombing (in a "politically motivated systematic effort to 'cleanse' Kosovo of non-Albanians and to bolster claims for an independent state,"[90] in ERRC's words), and environmental hazards threatening the health of the internally displaced persons (the so-called IDPs). The refugees were mostly denied asylum status and prematurely returned to an instable Kosovo. The NGOs reported on the mass killings, rape, abuse, lynching, and kidnapping that the Kosovo Roma faced. Discursively, the reports identified the problem of expelled refugees, illustrated with candid testimonies and powerful retellings of abuse and violence. They further explained the violence by highlighting the socio-economic implications of Roma migration, along with their historic statelessness. But for the

NGOs, these were justifications to deny Roma refugee status, rather than offer equitable treatment. The Roma are treated as "second class refugees"[91] with "tolerated status"[92] and an "uprooted existence"[93] ("On Serb territory they will be persecuted as Muslims and on Muslim territory as Gypsies"[94]). Part of the discourse's agenda is to emphasize Europe's failing to accept its Roma members. Intentionally, then, the reports contextualized the fear of Roma asylum-seekers as an identity struggle for European citizens. ERRC wrote,

> Europe is held hostage by the spectre of the ethnically pure nation-state. The principle of Blut und Boden ("Blood and Soil") is inextricably connected with the nation-state. A European identity is, at this point, just as much a utopia as the attempt to break through people's national identity in the individual European states. Xenophobia, pathological nationalism and racism are thus inalienable components of Europe.[95]

The ERRC formulated the discursive tool of "Fortress Europe" to depict this struggle. The concept refers to "restrictive laws, policies and practices in Europe aimed at or resulting in the exclusion of non-citizens."[96] It is apparent that the activists to not fool themselves with political correctness and high ideals of human equality (even though such language furthers their work). There is a clear understanding that Europe – despite its political commitments – is anti-Gypsy at its core. The problem must be fixed by either ignoring or eliminating the Roma (through deportation), limiting their rights, or integrating / assimilating them.

As discussed, discourse structures knowledge and transforms it into a science.[97] Constructing the state as a villain against the Roma minority is a contributing factor to the Roma's attitude of fear and distrust in the authorities. Blaming the state transforms officials into fixed enemies that do not care about the Roma (or care only when convenient – in the EU integration context). Agents of this discourse are Roma leaders,

Roma and non-Roma activists contributing to NGO writing, non-Roma politicians complaining about the lack of trust in the state, and the media that accuse officials for not doing enough about "the Roma problem" (often from the point of view that the Roma are an other that must be controlled, as discussed in Chapter Five). The discourse constructs a knowledge of state failure that sustains Roma living and interaction with non-Roma authorities and the wider public – and that is further recycled into the NGO documents documenting Roma "reality."

The discourse of state blame has a complex agenda. On the one hand, it has the explicit purpose of explaining social failures leading to further discrimination against the Roma. For this goal, the writing weaved strong language and emotional examples into the narrative of discrimination. It located direct blame and supported it with eloquent evidence, as is, for instance, the case of coercive sterilizations.[98] On the other hand, however, the discourse cannot be exclusively forceful and accusatory, given that part of the audience of the NGO reports is comprised of state officials, political leaders and heads-of-states, and European organizations that include and work to support, local leaders. It follows that internal tensions characterize the discourse, as can be seen in the following example:

> Projects to bring Romani children back to school do exist. But they are just that: projects. More or less successful yet certainly marginal efforts to overturn a systemic pattern of exclusion and discrimination. Racism in the classroom is a self-fulfilling prophecy, a vicious cycle of reproduction of attitudes and behaviors.[99]

It is evident in this case that the NGO recognized state efforts at the same time as it noted their insufficiency and inefficiency; the abundant evidence for discrimination serves as justification to generally focus on the latter aspect, as most reports blamed the state for its

role in maintaining a racist system and for tolerating Roma poverty, unemployment, dire housing, health, social, and educational services.

That said, different themes emerged as distinct to this discourse. The NGOs identified the state's attempts to escape responsibility towards the Roma communities (as was the case with press discourses of the "Gypsy as an unwanted problem," or the "Gypsy as someone else's problem"). One isolated strategy was the state's blame of other institutions for not properly dealing with the Roma, expecting the private sector to take care of the minority and offer projects and services to their aid.[100] Another tool was state denial that there is a Roma problem. The read reports, especially in the early- and mid-1990s, gave attention to the state's evasive treatment of the minorities by constructing their issues as "social" rather than "ethnic." The implications of recognizing the Roma as an ethnicity would require state intervention, whereas social problems are handled by other institutions, be they the police or locals themselves, controlling or getting along with their Roma neighbors, respectively.

Finally, and most concerning to the activists were the state's attempts to blame the Roma for their own problems. PER illustrated the state's position that the "Roma must walk [the path] themselves," once the government has allocated them resources[101]; it is the Romani "particular value system," their "'aggressive' lack of knowledge of and respect for the law," their "refusal to go to school," and their "'self-marginalization'" that constitute the problem.[102] At the fall of Communism and in the face of the struggles brought about by the democratization processes, the Roma seem to be the cause for social problems in general: "Often the Roma … are blamed for the decline of living standards and other hardships of the current difficult transition," reported PER.[103] Such official

attitude characterizes a discriminatory social system in general and was commonplace in the press discourses as well.

The topic of official violence informed the discourse of state blame. The police is one of the institutions the state does not control properly in their abuse of the Roma. The NGOs, most evidently ERRC, used cases of police abuse, police brutality, or police apathy as fuel for the discourse of Roma rights to suggest violations of human rights (and is detailed below). The activists were also concerned with the issue of identification papers – many Roma lack or have incomplete or illegal, papers. The discourse of state blame constructed officials to be unhelpful and unwilling to assist the Roma to attain proper documentation (in a variety of cases, from refugee-related issues, to birth certificates or property ownership forms). More than that, however, the NGOs detailed the implications of poor documentation for many Roma to fulfill their citizenship duties and rights (such as voting, school enrollment, employment rights, or receiving social security). Again, the concern was that the state constructs the Roma to be at fault for not having proper papers. Being absent in state records is what allows an official absence at national and European tables. They become non-citizens ("The Šarkezi family have been *non-people* for the past nine months"[104]), which allows a slew of ensuing policy-related concerns. For instance, are Roma without identification papers considered national citizens? Do they receive social services and protection? How can they travel freely in the European community without passports? Should their rights be protected? Should they be allowed residence or refugee status without proper identification and forms?

Roma Rights: "Implementing the Principle of Equal Treatment between Persons Irrespective of Racial or Ethnic Origin"

European organizations (governmental or non-governmental) have only begun considering the Roma as an ethnic group to be incorporated in a larger human rights agenda during the last decades of the 20th century. The discourse of Roma rights (and that of discrimination) suggests that such awareness does not mean that there were no human rights violations prior to the 1990s. Nor does it suggest that there were no NGOs to represent the Roma. Rather, the discourse implies a higher political visibility of the Roma communities, an initiative guided by both Roma and non-Roma leaders and activists. Public and political recognition, led by the Council of Europe, that the Roma are citizens of Europe – a transnational, stateless, and "true European minority"[105] – has paved the way towards the establishment of the rights discourse. This representational mode aims to contradict dominant discourses that construct the Roma / Gypsies as a matter of social unrest alone. Evading ethnic and racial aspects of discrimination allows state representatives and police officials to deny the xenophobic and racial justifications for attacks against the Roma – and classify them as social disturbances. Moreover, it reveals the institutional apparatus that avoids dealing comprehensively with the "Roma problem" that has become "very much [a] European problem"[106] since the fall of Communism and the elimination of borders within the EU. Its goal is to introduce a new awareness of rights (both universal and specifically cultural) that apply to the Roma as the center of a new, growing – yet uncertain – civil movement.

Of the five analyzed NGOs, all of ERRC and ERTF's reports drew from, and contributed to, the discourse of Roma rights, compared to about two thirds of PER and

ERIO's documents and a little over half of ECRE's communications. Such distribution confirms each NGO's agenda. ERRC and ERTF are the most committed to the implementation and monitoring of human rights; PER and ERIO have similar commitments, but with a larger training and educational focus, whereas ECRE's efforts have been organized around the discourses of discrimination and state blame (as perhaps most necessary, according to ECRE).

It is necessary to step back for a moment from the NGOs' collected evidence, indubitably framed to construct a supportive audience for Roma rights. The point here is not to analyze and make judgment about whether human rights are indeed violated against the Roma, police raids unjustified, evictions unwarranted, property confiscations unreasonable, or legal systems discriminatory. Rather, the discourse of Roma rights is significant in how it formulates strategies to support its case. And the evidence is compelling. Intentionally, the NGOs certainly used strong statements, adjectives, metaphors, and photographic evidence of injuries, funerals, and devastated homes to tell their story and illustrate the pain and fear that follow racism – tools that are linguistically and stylistically leading, without a doubt. Yet behind the textual strategies, the NGOs offer pages and pages of testimonials, transcripts of court cases, official documents, quotes from newspapers, and direct statements that shed clear light on institutional discrimination. However read at a stylistic level, the activist reports cannot be taken lightly when it comes to their substance.

The NGOs construct a straightforward human rights argument by emphasizing the Roma's humanity: "Whoever the Roma may be, Roma rights are human rights," wrote ERRC in 1999.[107] In addition, the activists pushed for stronger minority rights that must

"draw on common roots and common perspectives beyond citizenship, group affiliation, or country of residence."[108] The NGOs focused on emigration / immigration, refugee-related issues, deportation and expatriation, and discrimination in general. For instance, common activist arguments were constructed as such: The "emigration of Roma from Slovakia is due to the lack of protection for their human rights," in PER's writing[109]; "collective expulsion of aliens is in contradiction of Article 4 of Protocol 4 to the European Convention on Human Rights," commented ERRC[110]; or, in ECRE's stronger tones critiquing "special schools":

> This failure to secure the actual termination of this policy-driven denial of education … is an unmitigated disaster. The [European] Union has permitted these governments to flaunt triumphantly their lack of respect for human rights, equal opportunities in education and of course European law.[111]

Part of the path to rights was to build common terminology (one of PER's first foci in the early 1990s) and establish the term "Roma," connect the problem of the Roma with other social movements – such as the African American civil rights movement and Zionism – in order to support and continue to inspire the new cause. In this sense, ERRC wrote, "[R]acism is not only when you hate the blacks in the US, but also when you hate the Roma in Europe."[112] Similarly, an overly enthusiastic emphasis on the significance of the NGOs' work as a whole and individually is justifiable as a legitimizing factor (PER in particular stood out in its efforts to highlight its own importance).

Once they established that the Roma should be on human rights organizations' and governmental agendas, the NGO reports offered substantial evidence to demonstrate human rights violations against the Roma. Mob violence (e.g., "arson attack on Romani house in Csolnok, Hungary"[113]), extremist violence, and official violence supported –

within the relative bounds of this discourse – the argument. The first two types of violence were noted in press discourses, too. The activist writing contributed similar evidence, enriched by testimonial and photographic stories. More distinctly and unlike the press discourses, the NGOs dedicated concerted efforts to display and prove official violence, which refers to (1) police brutality ("Romani Youth Abused by Police and Teachers in Serbia and Montenegro"[114]) often associated with (2) problematic police raids, (3) excessive use of force ("According to witnesses, a squad of police and carabinieri … violently entered the camp"[115]), (4) torture and ill-treatment while in police custody,[116] sometimes followed by unexplained deaths:

> *Abusive treatment* by police in France, Romania, and Ukraine … including the *suspicious death* of a Romani youth *following police chase* in Macedonia …[117]
>
> [A] police officer *shot and killed an unarmed Romani man* during a police raid on a group of cigarette smugglers in Bucharest.[118]
>
> The previous pattern of community violence has been replaced by a new pattern of police raids systematically conducted in Roma communities. Before, angry mobs of villagers attacked neighboring houses of Roma. This was a form of collective punishment for crimes committed by individuals belonging to the Roma minority. Today, the threat comes from an official institution – the police …[119]

According to official statements, police raids are framed to be preventing crime or to check for illegal domicile cases; the activists, however, questioned such reasons. The activist reports offered evidence that such raids almost always occur in the very early morning hours, between 4 and 5:30 a.m. (instead of the legal window between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m.[120]), and are followed by frightening experiences for the Roma (physical violence, harassment and emotional abuse, unexplained arrests, and / or property confiscations). The following passage exemplifies several of the NGOs' concerns:

> A raid is a massive public event. The police arrive in cars and with dogs. Since they are hostile to Roma and view their communities as sickly anti-social growths, *the raid has many of the same characteristics as an invasion* – pre-conceived tactics, an element of surprise, and grotesque displays of symbolic or real force. The Romanian law enforcement establishment openly states that raids are a conscious strategy on their part … a *necessary preventive action* … to combat the community violence occurring in the country. … It has been pointed out by political scientists that it is almost in the nature of all authorities to overreact to (the specter of) civil disturbance. … The police's message to the Romanian public effectively is, "Leave the Gypsies to us, we will deal with them, in a professional way." The police appear to have taken over the lynching, the job formerly performed by the angry crowd.[121]

Further, official violence and discrimination at the institutional / state level (and on officials' behalf) took the shape of (5) illegal or unjustified property confiscations ("no receipts for confiscated items"[122]), (6) racial profiling ("Russian law enforcement officers continue with racial profiling of Roma"[123]), (7) interference within the family unit, (8) segregation of Romani children:

> With majority children, the state steps into the role of guardian of their best interest only in exceptional circumstances – e.g. in parents' disputes in the context of divorce. But *strangers acting on behalf of the state decide the destiny of children from disadvantaged ethnic groups* far more frequently. For a variety of reasons, Romani children are often removed from their families and placed in "institutions": children's homes, special schools, boarding schools, orphanages, etc. A glance at the plentiful public institutions for children in Europe reveals high numbers of Romani children living out defeated childhoods, branded as juvenile delinquents, mentally deficient, socially weak, developmentally handicapped, behaviourally problematic, with learning disability, retarded, etc.[124]

Finally, official violence was transparent, to the NGOs, (9) in legal systems. Part of ERRC's mission is to offer legal counseling and representation in cases of human rights abuses. This NGO in particular, therefore, extensively wrote about discrimination against the Roma within the judicial system in various Central and Eastern European countries. For instance, ERRC revealed, cases of racial attacks and / or racial discrimination against the Roma have been often improperly investigated, delayed, or canceled. [125]

The discourse of Roma rights has been as internally challenged between a commitment to universalism vs. relativism as is human rights advocacy in general.[126] The debate characterized the rights movement in general and was therefore apparent in the NGO writing and conference summaries. Most often, nonetheless, the NGOs preferred – and recommended – a universalistic discourse (that informs Western-based ideals of human rights litigation in general[127]) to one that emphasizes the supremacy of tradition over rights. The activists recognized the political implications of the choice – and the internal struggle to make a choice. To this effect, ERRC wrote:

> The ERRC seeks to advance the rights and freedoms of the Romani people not because they may contribute in an exotic way to European cultures, nor because they may be skilled musicians or story-tellers, but because they are bearers of the universal potential of development as human beings, born equal and free, but denied equality and freedom in today's Europe.[128]
>
> Romani actors need to accept that "tradition" is not a legitimate excuse (or explanation) to continue practices that may violate the rights of an individual or group within the community.[129]

The fact that the choice was acknowledged in written communication is significant. The ultimate choice to favor universalism can be explained by the newness of the movement and the pressing need to raise awareness about rights, to stop violence, and to eliminate institutional discrimination. In addition, the Roma movement must align with other established, respected, and legitimate movements if they want to maintain international organizations' support. For such reasons, at a discursive level, universal human rights become, therefore, the clear path for activism; at a practical level, talk of measures and projects emphasized *positive discrimination*, choosing special rights, unique and specifically tailored to the needs of the Roma communities over national

minority rights – the same as those of other minorities ("The need for *positive measures* in the case of Roma is irrefutable … to compensate for past discrimination"[130]).

A similar discursive tension was noted in regards to Roma women's rights. Activists' decision to even approach the topic implicates a cohort of issues. Roma women were therefore constructed at the intersection of the discourse of resistance by safeguarding tradition within the family and community spheres, on the one hand, and the pull for a universalistic, Western (and framed as progressive) approach to human rights and women's issues, on the other hand. However, state discrimination (related to health care services, schooling, and employment) and activist concerns about the patriarchic structure of traditional Roma communities (implicated in trafficking, juvenile marriage, and violence against women) both acted as specters that have motivated the issue to come to the fore of NGO agenda, in spite of identity and political implications. Speaking against – or even discussing – issues related to arranged and early marriages, sexual taboos, girls' limited schooling, and traditional disapproval or discouragement of professional / public careers[131] constitutes change. To acknowledge the growing area of Roma women's rights, in late 2003 ERRC started including a section on gender issues in almost every issue of their *Roma Rights Quarterly*. Again, the Hungary-based NGO favored universal rights in the process of politicizing the issue:

> Practices such as early and arranged marriages and certain sexual taboos in Romani communities *restrict the autonomy of individuals, deprive them of their human dignity and prevent them from realising basic human rights*. Romani girls' educational careers are often interrupted at early stages as a result of marriage. Many women are not able to undertake public activities due to pressures exerted by family and community conditioned by traditional perceptions limiting the role of the woman to the family sphere. … Beyond the arguments of the many sides in the debate, however, it is important to see the political implications of this debate.

> Awareness about contradictions between human rights and customary practices has left the private sphere.[132]

Along with documenting human rights violations, the discourse of rights employed two additional thematic strategies: Emphasizing litigation successes and framing litigation failures as matters of discrimination and injustice. For such purposes, the NGOs gave proof of different countries' unsatisfactory legal frameworks to defend the Roma minority, cases of denial of justice for Roma victims of racist attacks,[133] "[p]rosecutorial decisions to cancel proceedings," "[r]etaliatory indictments of Roma," and they criticized "[i]mmunity from prosecution for police officers."[134] Even though critical of existing practices, ERRC in particular was quick to celebrate positivity and change; in news feeds, successes preceded case failures. Here are some instances of human rights triumphs, in different fields, as gathered by ERRC:

> The international press reported on April 14 that Canadian authorities had granted refugee status to a family of twenty Roma who arrived in Toronto in 1997 fleeing persecution in the Czech Republic.[135]
>
> Legal victory in Hungarian Roma school segregation case.[136]
>
> Romani woman wins racial discrimination case in employment.[137]
>
> Skinheads found guilty of racially-motivated attack.[138]
>
> European Court of Human Rights to review mob violence case from Romania.[139]
>
> Bulgaria adopts comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation.[140]
>
> Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians win seats in the Kosovo Assembly.[141]
>
> Roma secure national minority status in Serbia and Montenegro.[142]
>
> Hungarian television station sanctioned for broadcasting a defamatory program.[143]

Other activist issues surfaced less frequently in editorials or interviews. Such topics referred to budget difficulties for the growing rights movement, relationship to donors, or limited human resources. PER for instance, discussed the tension between working on small projects that benefit only a few vs. serving the Roma through larger scale, more significant efforts.[144] PER also captured the NGOs' frustration with how little power their collective voice has: "[A Romani representative] bitterly noted, Romani activists usually do not participate in decision-making but are requested to help implement decisions."[145] Such infrastructure comments only highlight the legitimacy of the Roma movement.

Ethno-Genesis: "Wir Sind Alles Roma"

The quote in the subtitle comes from a 1992 PER conference and paraphrases John F. Kennedy's "Ich bin ein Berliner" statement during the Cold War. At face value, it can be read to be suggestive of the international support offered to Roma minorities at the fall of Communism and serves as a catchy slogan. Yet, it is also illustrative of the fluidity of the concept of a Roma ethnic identity and its superficiality in the political eye, at the same time; anyone can be Roma as long as Roma means an outcry against discrimination; the gesture, however, renders what "Roma" means irrelevant. From this viewpoint, does the international agenda *support the Roma*, or is it more preoccupied with the *problem of the Roma* and the social conflicts to manage?

The discourse of ethno-genesis captures the internal struggle of the Roma civil rights movement. Somewhat similar ambiguities may be found in the discourses that characterized European states' nation-building efforts in the 19th century. Ethno-genesis

relied on, and drew from, the discourses of discrimination and Roma rights to draw vision, motivation, and terminology. However, the discourse of mapping Roma identity focuses on gathering evidence and presenting it in such fashion that audiences (of NGO communication efforts) understand the European Roma minority as an ethnic group, well formed and organized. The themes of the discourse fight against mainstream arguments against the solidity of *a* Roma ethnic group; therefore, its purpose is to form and structure a body of knowledge that argues the opposite. The discourse constructs knowledge of a politically established Roma group, with a political identity, fitting into international political terminology and discourses (such as those of human rights, women's rights, or children's rights). The Roma rights movement has articulated Roma ethnic identity – even though the concept has not been entirely clear to activists themselves. The history of oppression and discrimination, the late arrival in the European continent by comparison to the established national communities, and a relative political disorganization (perceived as weakness by the majority) were some of the factors the NGOs offered to explain "a synergy to preserve the sense of belonging together" of the Roma groups, wrote ERRC.[146] This section details some of the activist struggles to refine what *Roma identity* means, in the context of a newborn and hesitant movement – struggles sometimes evident at the linguistic level, in typographical errors (spelling, grammatical, and stylistic) that add a hint of confusion regarding the NGOs' position.[147]

The discourse changed its focus and repertoire during the analyzed time period. In the beginning, it was ethnic conflicts and riots that most overtly attracted the NGOs' attention. As early as 1991, ethno-genesis was about constructing "the Roma" and positioning the groups in a political conversation about minority status and rights. The

need for common terminology was apparent and emphasized at this early stage. The documents in the early 1990s explained their use of "Rom" and "Roma" and discussed consulting linguistic specialists in the process of deciding the name of the ethnic group. They also explained the lack of connection between "Roma" and the Romanian people.[148] By the end of the studied period, "Roma" has become the political correct term, even though not all "Gypsy" groups recognize "Roma" as their name.[149]

Of the five analyzed NGOs, PER was the first to capture the internal movement- and identity-related struggles – and the most interested to do so. The NGO's US foundation and training reflected an interest in a larger philosophical discussion of identity and rights (different than the other four NGOs' specific, localized, and more urgent interests). PER constructed identity-making as a matter of West-East opposition; "the West," represented by renowned scholars, emphasizes individual, civic, and universal rights, in stark opposition to "the East," embodied by the ethnic groups themselves, which stands for collective, ethnic, and specific rights. It is in this context that PER allowed its writing to slip into constructing otherness (explained below). PER recognized the gap between Western organizations, scholarship, and training – and struggled to reconcile, and restrain, an attitude of superiority embedded in *already knowing how to do human rights activism* with their role to support Central and Eastern European developing countries in their early steps towards *learning rights* and *how to do activism*.

Mirroring the progression of the Roma rights movement, the mid- to late-1990s found the NGOs concerned over legal rights and litigation. Learning from Western democracies was still a priority ("[T]he new democracies in the East could learn from

West European countries with tradition in human rights litigation"[150]). However, the focus of the discourse shifted slightly to emphasize human rights, minority rights, and therefore legal rights.

In the early 2000s, the NGOs recognized the question of identity as a complex one to be still worked upon by activism, Roma peoples, and majority societies, too; the writing about Roma identity captured this complexity, as illustrated by ERRC and PER:

> *Leaving aside the non-Roma Gypsies*, the Roma themselves do not (*yet*) make up a homogeneous ethnic group. Rather, the Roma today are a continuum of more or less related subgroups with complex, flexible, and multilevel identities, with sometimes strangely overlapping and confusing subgroup names. But in the last decade, as was noted, we have been witnessing a process of historic and political *consolidation of a unifying Romani identity* so that the name "Roma" has now become *preferred by most international and national organizations* dealing with various aspects of the "Roma problem."[151]
>
> Romani leaders must grapple with fateful questions about the future of their communities: *tradition versus modernization*; whether, to what extent, and how the Roma should *participate in mainstream society*; how to define, preserve, or restore their *minority cultures* while enjoying access to the benefits and protection that come from *participation in the larger economy and society*; and how to defend themselves against *discrimination and exclusion* while honoring their separate self-identity. Thoughtful and balanced public debate about these problems has been inhibited by the *paucity of educated and articulate Romani spokesmen* who simultaneously command the attention of majority political institutions and have the confidence of traditional Romani communities.[152]

These two passages illustrate competing tendencies within ethno-genesis: First, they suggest the diversity of Roma groups and "non-Roma Gypsies," confusing to the Roma activists themselves; the movement has called for "a united voice," even though "there is no way to combine traditional and modern leadership," PER wrote.[153]

Second, they allude to a strong activist dilemma around the issue of a Roma nation, a delicate topic from an international politics perspective. Some NGOs, such as the Roma National Congress, have stood more visibly for Roma independence and

emancipation – which has meant advocating for nation building and political independence from the Gadje, "who profit greatly from [a 'Gypsy industry'] and employ a few Roma for purposes of legitimization," wrote PER.[154] Other NGOs were more hesitant and positioned themselves as conversation facilitators and merely posed questions. For instance, PER recorded roundtable debates that asked, "Do the Roma want assimilation, integration, separation, or emancipation? If emancipation, do they seek emancipation as citizens, as a minority, or as a nation?"[155] Certainly the idea of a Roma nation is not new (formally, at least, it dates back to the 1970s International Romani Union) as it captures the romantic view of a nomadic Roma population, exiled from land to land, and shattered among the countries. That said, the question of nation-building, stateless or territorial, has involved a certain degree of activist hesitation as the NGOs have stayed away from too much politically controversy, at the same time as they have supported and encouraged grass roots efforts towards empowerment – even at the risk that such empowerment becomes a type of Roma nationalism. "Why Roma need unity"[156] to begin with begs larger historical and socio-political questions that activism as a movement seems unprepared to answer, despite some individual voices. In ERRC's evaluation, "Romani nationalism remains at the present time an emotion, though a poorly-defined one."[157] Regardless of the NGOs' take on nation-building, they have nonetheless agreed on the existence of a Roma identity.

Third, the quoted texts indicate a potential disconnect between "international and national organizations" and the population that makes up "the Roma." Fourth, they recognize the movement must choose between tradition and modernization, closely related to a choice between integration and assimilation, cultural preservation and

participation. Such choices are complex, deeply political, and must be intentional. Interestingly, the NGO activists do not doubt their role in creating identity for the Roma groups; instead, they object their limited power in the public sphere, in non-Roma eyes.

Finally, the passages draw attention to leadership within Roma communities. Even though the activists recognize this paucity among the various Roma groups ("The weakness of the Romani movement stems from the inability of Roma to articulate their own objectives, and from Roma letting others to do their job," in PER's words[158]), their discursive work has become to convince a non-Roma world that Roma leaders are well organized and united to work for Roma rights – and, in the process, empower the same Roma that in other contexts were constructed to be victims (see above). The activists intentionally framed such paucity as a fault of a discriminatory system and not of the Roma themselves:

> The significant under-representation of Roma in elected bodies and public administration at all levels of power throughout the European Union bears witness to the failure of democratic processes and ordinary recruitment procedures to bring about the equal inclusion of Roma.[159]

While both Roma and non-Roma activists recognized the need for political involvement (a topic with a variety of implications, beyond the scope of this work) and especially for more, better educated, and more politically visible Roma leaders, there was an acute awareness of a growing gap between Roma intelligentsia, the poor Roma / Gypsies in European countries, and the traditional male leaders (a statement about gender roles and movement struggle in itself). Factionalism and fragmentation among Roma leaders were criticisms raised by non-Roma politicians – yet the NGOs (PER especially) responded to

the critique by highlighting participation, collaboration, and an attitude of learning on the part of Roma activists.

Other dilemmas involved in identity construction included choices around community development and organization, raising questions about international, governmental, or NGO involvement in local projects, funding, human resources, education, economic and digital divide, and project usefulness. Other documents discussed definitional issues of concepts such as race and ethnicity as they relate to Roma and institutional racial profiling.

These are all political choices facing activists. The discursive contradictions just bear witness to the social change that has been in progress. Such internal debates and struggles are testimonies to the incompleteness of the movement's agenda and the challenge facing a transnational minority to coagulate activists towards a common purpose. Nonetheless, the NGO movement has cleverly involved not only eloquent activists but respected guest speakers and leaders who have used scholarship and political vocabulary to make the case for rights and a Roma identity, and who can navigate the integration-preoccupied European political spectrum: "How to maintain a traditional identity and culture while facing the challenges of modernity?," asked PER.[160] And further:

> Bearing in mind that any identity is partly constructed, the Roma have some options from which to choose. What kind of group identity will the Romani elites attempt to construct, and how will it fit into the legal frameworks and arrangements offered to them by various states and international institutions?[161]

Most NGO writing asserted a need for Roma self-confidence, internal stability, self-determination and self-reliance on its own human resources.

Social Integration: "Doing What Everyone Else Does"

The discourse of social integration was focused on offering solutions towards fixing the socio-political and economic Roma problem. It engaged the question of how the Roma *can* fit and *do* fit within majority populations, and alongside other European and national minorities. A significant theme of the discourse was to offer solutions and to highlight social progresses, successful human rights litigation, collaborations and trainings, legislative and policy changes, and, most broadly, thriving examples of Roma integration. From this perspective, this discourse exposed most clearly (at least some of) the NGOs' intention to mainstream Roma issues towards collaborative integration. What is significant about this discourse are its internal hesitations and convulsions to formulate what integration looks like. The activists branded official efforts to integrate the Roma as assimilation; PER reported a non-Roma workshop participant stating that, "The Roma will not achieve what they intend to without full participation, and that means … *doing what everyone else does*."[162] This approach has been problematic to the NGOs – and they reacted accordingly: "The Roma community should not feel the need to assimilate in order to enjoy their rights as citizens of Europe."[163] Motivated by their human rights commitments, by discrimination against the Roma, and by EU-related developments, the NGOs have felt compelled to construct a different approach to integration.

This representational mode of talking about the European Roma underwent transformation throughout the 1990s and 2000s. It started as an interrogation, hesitation, and confusion regarding the Roma's choice between integration into mainstream societies and preserving group identity.[164] For example, the following passage captures PER's

vacillation in 1997 within the bounds of the assimilation-integration-emancipation triangle:

> Assimilation proved to be an attractive way to improve their social status, or at least to escape the stigma associated with "Gypsy" and the "Gypsy-like" way of life … [T]he Roma face *contradictory perspectives*. The possible solutions are few: to be different and remain apart, indifferent to society and state; to assert those differences taking the risk of fostering attitudes of intolerance and conflict with the majority society, while at the same time struggling for political power and recognition as an ethnic group; or to take the avenue of modernization and assimilation, that is, of altering the Romani identity in order to gain acceptance and equality in society. At the present time, the ethnic mobilization option is the strongest.[165]

Discussions about what would benefit the Roma the most did continue to be featured in the NGO documents throughout the 2000s. By the mid-2000s, as the Roma rights movement has gained momentum and adopted political vocabulary towards integration, there is no more question on whether integration is necessary or has even started. The rhetorical focus is to construct efforts and approaches in this direction. In 2003, ERRC wrote about Roma in Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia facing "numerous economic, social and political challenges that prevent them from fully integrating into society and actively taking part in politics,"[166] whereas ERIO confidently discussed in 2006 "substantial efforts are still needed to promote social inclusion and integration."[167]

The discourse attempted to construct integration of the Roma as a possible reality – and towards this goal, a series of discursive strategies were laid out. First, recognizing the Roma's low level of involvement in public and political life served as impetus to advocate for governmental initiatives in offering employment and public office positions to the Roma, as well as to prepare trainings and educational programs for the Roma themselves to start being involved. As the discourse of ethno-genesis emphasized self-

confidence and self-reliance for the Roma, so did the discourse of social integration promote civic and political self-assurance: In PER's work, "[T]he Romani elite must learn to anticipate developments and must be in a position to lead, and not only to follow other actors."[168]

Second, the activists framed collaborations and workshops that involved non-Roma journalists or police officers as successes towards progress. For example, PER repeatedly and enthusiastically reported on a series of trainings and visits between the Southern Police Institute of the University of Louisville, of the US, and Romanian police officials.[169] Third, they also regarded births of Roma political parties or political partnerships between Roma and non-Roma as instances of progress towards integration – the creation of the ERTF itself was treated by the collection of European NGOs to be of "historic importance" as "a body gathering Roma delegates from about 42 European countries" and with a working partnership with the Council of Europe.[170] Other tools the NGOs put together included texts meant to explain the history of Roma groups towards acceptance of their cultural and ethnic difference (such as memoirs and personal histories, recognized to be "a powerful way to bring the voice of Roma to the ear of the public,"[171] in ERRC's words). Further, media coverage improvements to include representations that were "more accurate … more preoccupied with the real problems and the positive aspects of Romani community life"[172] were additional reasons for the activists to celebrate:

> After visiting the communities and speaking with their representatives, the journalists concluded that Romania's ethnic minorities should be supported to preserve their traditions and cultural identity, and also that it is necessary to stimulate greater dialogue between ethnic minorities and the majority.[173]

PER presented an interesting case to serve as inspiration for Roma activists and Roma people working towards social integration – that is, the case of the Hungarian minority in Romania. The collaborations, political and social, between the Romanian government and legislative structure and the Hungarian minorities groups and political parties have been praised by NGOs, European and US organizations (such as NATO and the US Department of State), framing the partnership as "the most successful … interethnic coalition."[174] However, the comparison slipped into othering the Roma, as discussed below. It seemed to present difficulty for PER to separate praise for, and hope in, a model of interethnic accord from blaming Roma political leaders for their lack of unity or inspiration to follow the example set by the Hungarian minority.

Finally, improvements in any domain, typically infested with discrimination and hierarchy, earned the activists' praise – whether such improvements refer to education and the development of the first textbook to serve as a "Romani-language primer for second grade students,"[175] school desegregation,[176] building sites for Travellers in the UK,[177] recognitions of human rights violations in the field of housing by the Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights,[178] acknowledgments of institutional racism and measures taken to correct such abuse,[179] or a growing Roma media (even as an unsatisfactory presence).[180] Although such progresses were cause to boast, the NGOs maintained their caution and did not lose sight of their larger agenda against discrimination.

What set the NGOs discourse of social integration apart from similar mainstream constructs of integration was a clear focus on the role the Roma (and the NGOs working for Roma rights) could take in the process. The activist documents went at great lengths

to highlight Roma leaders' eagerness to be part of larger social, political, economic, and cultural structures, to guide Roma communities towards a peaceful cohabitation with the non-Roma, and to raise awareness of the non-Roma people and institutions about Roma values and culture. To this effect, PER commended "consciousness-raising and community organization, by the Romani leadership,"[181] while ERRC recognized local communities in Ukraine and Moldova, for instance, for their changing and complex leadership by Roma elders nurturing a desegregated community,[182] leading to a 2004 statement that "There are positive signs that Roma are building power now."[183]

In sum, the evidence presented thus far in this subsection was meant to illustrate the discourse of social integration, as it transitioned from hesitant questions to framing strong Roma communities and leaders, capable to offer realistic solutions towards *integration* into mainstream societies, on – more or less – their own terms. The EU enlargement processes served as jump start to this shift. As the EU pushed its future member countries to adopt policies compatible to EU standards, Central and Easter European governments initiated more projects, some funded by EU organizations and local NGOs. Activism took on a monitoring role of such projects, at the same time as it raised a louder cry against discrimination – certainly motivated by an awareness of a larger listening audience. This significant theme supporting the discourse of social integration heavily drew from (older and contemporary) political and philosophical discourses of democratization.

To the activists, a democratic system is an unquestionable path to, and necessary framework for, eliminating discrimination. Western countries' commitment to democratic systems was rhetorically used to support and justify the NGO's anti-racist and Roma

rights agenda, and, more than that, it was invoked in order to support equitable integration of the Roma. As such, the interest shown by the EU, the Council of Europe, the European Commission, the UN (often through its Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination), the European Court of Human Rights, NATO, OSCE, the US State Department, or organizations such as the Carnegie Corporation of New York – such interests became framed as a testimony of the legitimacy of the NGOs' mission to protect the Roma. Moreover, Central and Eastern European governments' work towards democratization was turned into leverage for policy-lobbying for the Roma; certainly, state support for its minorities would strengthen the democratic system locally, argued the NGOs (as enforced by the discourse of state blame, the NGOs often turned to pressure governments or the EU to take action), as would inter-ethnic, majority-minority collaborations: "In order to systematically take the interests and needs of Roma into account, they should be regularly consulted and involved in policymaking processes, including impact assessment and policy development."[184]

In addition, Western influence was embraced, as long as the Roma benefit ("Under pressure by western governments, Slovak government publishes package of Roma measures"[185]). Whereas uncertainty surrounded the role the US would play in the aftermath of 1989 (still haunting PER to the late 1990s),[186] the EU's integration requirements were more than welcome by the NGO agenda, since they allow visibility for the Roma movement striving for an anti-discriminatory future: "[T]he desire of the [Central and Eastern Europe] countries to join the EU, and the financial support to their governments and NGOs provided by the EC, are important incentives for [policymaking] dialogue," wrote PER.[187] The NGOs, therefore, applauded when the EU set Roma

employment,[188] housing, education, health care,[189] and the issue of Roma women[190] as key criteria for evaluating accession – and most evidently when inter-ethnic peace was framed as tipping "the scale in integration process into NATO and EU"[191] and anti-Gypsyism entered the international agenda. ERRC celebrated the EU for its concern about the Czech Republic:

> Expressing concern over the situation of Roma in the Czech Republic, the European Parliament threatened on March 3 to block the approval of European Union associate members' entry criteria because of the Czech Republic's record on Roma-related issues. It also resolved that criteria such as Romani integration in the Czech Republic should be moved from medium-term to short-term priorities.[192]

Within this discourse, the NGOs allowed themselves a more active role in constructing a visible Roma community. ERRC, for instance, recognized that the Roma have been "generally absent from political, academic, commercial and social life"[193]; yet the activists' attention was focused on officials' lack of interest in involving the Roma – rather than dwelling on what the Roma role might be. From the perspective of the cycle of discrimination the activists seek to publicize, this choice seems justifiable.

Resistance by Safeguarding Tradition: "Do Roma Really Believe that Gadje Will Share Their Power with Them?"

The sixth identified discourse featured most prominently in PER's and ERRC's documents, less frequently in ERIO's and ERTF's publications, and not at all in ECRE's read materials. The latter's direct affiliation with the European Parliament may seem to motivate a conservative take on the more challenging tradition vs. modernization issues. ECRE's documents were direct correspondence and reports addressed to European

institutions and governmental officials, arguing against discrimination and blaming the state for apathetic minority intervention. Accordingly, ECRE's fervent focus has been on discourses that fight racism and considerably less on conceptualizing the Roma communities' involvement and identity struggles.

The discourse of resistance by safeguarding tradition drew its resources from the same problem of anti-Roma discrimination and scapegoating as did social integration. In a sense, the dichotomy of the two NGO discourses of *social integration* / *resistance* recalls the relationship between the identified press discourses of *cultural integration* / *integration-through-change* (see Chapter Five). Both *social integration* and *cultural integration* draw from the universalistic discourse of human rights. However, the activist focus on *resistance* is a struggle against the concept of integration, treated as another word for assimilation and submission,[194] whereas *integration-through-change* was an expression of official stance towards assimilation. It is nonetheless intriguing to note that mainstream media centered on integration (whatever its shape), whereas activist discourses dance between integration and resisting it.

Resistance for the activists implied a strong rhetorical focus on the victimization of the Roma, by the non-Roma; on the imperative of identity-building that maintains tradition and cultural distinction at its core; on protecting the Roma community from too much non-Roma education that may lead to assimilation (an earlier PER report stated, "many Romani-oriented organizations that are not based on Romani membership … sometimes say that if Roma are educated, 'they're not Roma any more.'"[195]); and on the centrality of traditional leaders in safeguarding the best interests of Roma communities. Such foci remind of the emphasis on cultural relativism within the discourse of human

rights. Roma do have rights – but as a special minority, to be protected, to be kept apart from non-Roma interference. The struggle has been fierce; ERRC in 2000, for instance, claimed there was no difference between integration and assimilation as they were both marks for the same European racism.[196] It is not surprising in this context, then, that the rising Roma women's rights movement posed an issue for some of the activists that have sided with tradition, as emancipation of women has seemed to stand in direct contrast to the traditional structure of the Roma family and community.

A significant strategy used by the discourse of resistance was the construction of the Gadje as prejudicial,[197] manipulative and manipulatable – quite differently than how the other discourses represent the non-Roma in a political correct fashion. Although all NGO talk was focused on a discriminatory non-Roma state and populations, not all discourses emphasized the non-Roma otherness as clearly as the discourse of resistance did. The following statements offer such evidence, collected from PER's documents. (PER has been, after all, most dedicated and transparent in its writing about the debates and contradictions surfacing in the workshops it has facilitated.)

> Do Roma really believe that Gadje will share their power with them? What power-holders have ever shared it with those who are powerless?[198]
>
> … to the *Gadje* the Roma remain *Tsigan*. To be accepted by non-Roma—to have them say, "he is like us, he is not like other Gypsies," <u>a Rom has to play a little with the *Gadjo*'s mind</u>.[199]

PER further described the Romani way in contrast to the Gadje way:

> The *Gadje* way, in general, aims to … keep the Roma where they are – under control. Non-Roma define Romani interests as they see them, and this invariably implies integration. They want to solve Romani problems in a *Gadje* way—through policies, programs, and projects, but … this road just does not work. … No one dares ask the Romani masses if such efforts contribute to the improvement of their situation. The Roma are simply told what is good for them.

> … *The "Romani way" basically strives to uphold the level of Romani participation in public life and politics along the principles of non-discrimination and equality*. This is the way to change the existing status quo, which keeps the Roma in a disadvantaged position. The Roma essentially face the problems of discrimination and insecurity, but there is no proper action against it.[200]
>
> To be clear and short, for now, *in the eyes of the gadje you are not a girl or a woman first, you are a GYPSY*.[201]

The last two emphasized sections make apparent that resistance has more readily been a critique of the Gadje and their influence over the Romani world than an adequate formulation and / or expression of what the Romani way very specifically might entail.

Accounting for the overall lower presence of the discourse of resistance may be the NGOs' overall caution not to severely critique dominant efforts towards integration – even when these were perceived as evident assimilation (in the realm of education, for instance). Reasons for such prudence are somewhat obvious, as the NGOs must consider their conversation partners in, and their audience to, lobbying efforts, alongside their own funding and sponsor commitments. Moreover, the activists' own serious allegiance to social integration as a project (and its sustaining discourse, so often employed by the NGOs, as seen above) may contribute to their caution to express counter-ideological opinions. The fact that NGO writing cited voices that adhere to resistance (and sometimes allowed their own staff to pronounce or imply it) demonstrates that taking a counter-hegemonic stance is still significant within the dynamics of the Roma rights movement, as activists are still in search of locating their own position pro- or con-integration (and thus pro- and con-dominant European ideologies of inter-ethnic accord).

The Roma as the Gypsy Other: "They … Need to Be Educated"

Indications of constructing the different, other, inferior Gypsy were significantly fewer when compared to representations identified in the mainstream press – in terms of numbers, as well as qualitative indicators. The NGOs clearly stood against discrimination and against cultural supremacy of one group over another, as the above analysis suggested. That said, however, there were some instances where the NGOs *slipped* into more common, dominant approaches to constructing the Romani communities. PER especially, in almost half of their published work, and seldom ERTF and ERRC, encrypt an attitude of superiority towards the Romani leaders and participants and towards the Roma problem. The discourse had more visibility in the earlier studied time-frame and fades out towards the mid-2000s. The fact that it has been fading is encouraging – and, still, its lingering presence should be reason for continued vigilance.

The term *slipping* seems necessary here, for several reasons. First, what the NGOs have stood for – their agenda, vision, projects, and lobbying efforts – seems to be in contrast with such cases of othering. Slipping also carries the connotation of making a mistake, of accidental lack of attention. Slipping is unintentional, but not always unforeseeable. It also has a smoothness and an imperceptibility about it. Constructing the Roma as the Gypsy other is an aside to PER and the other NGOs. It may be accidental or excusable by the fact that it is present in quotations from a variety of activists – and not framed as the NGO's voice itself. But othering also surfaces as a hint, a casual stylistic addition to a sentence that invites the reader to think about the Roma's Gypsyness, their abnormality, their backwardness, and their barbarism.

As suggested earlier, some situations described by the NGOs lend themselves more easily to slippage, as were, for example, the cases of the Romanian Hungarian minority or the very first inter-ethnic conversations to which the Roma were invited. The former was an instance of high international attention to the Romanian political and social scene; in the early 1990s, violent ethnic conflict exploded between the Hungarian minority and the Romanian locals; following a series of police interventions and public consultations, the government introduced strategies and facilitated the entry of the Hungarian minority representatives into Parliament; violent conflict subsided, and international voices commended the model of inter-ethnic collaboration. As the Roma became more involved in similar models of political participation – and as attacks against the Roma increased – international actors (including NGOs) demanded a similar level of political maturity and leadership *from the Roma communities*. In this case, PER took the familiar road – blaming the Roma for not being more like the non-Roma.

In this context of the early 1990s inter-ethnic conferences, a surprised PER reported a higher number of submitted papers for a panel than expected; PER appeared astonished at the literacy level and academic interest in the conference topics.[202] PER further noted that Romani leaders did not know what they had to do or how to lobby for Roma issues, how to communicate with media differently in order to better represent their communities,[203] and were politically immature, siding with easy political party alternatives rather than doing what was right for the Roma.[204] Further, Roma leaders did not follow the meeting's agenda and were intimidated by modern communication tools:

> It was a standard presentation, but for some of the participants it proved extremely useful because *they were never exposed to such information presented in such an organized and articulate manner*.[205]

Unsurprisingly, the dichotomy constructed by this discourse was the pair Gypsy-non-Roma – or, rather, Roma-non-Roma. The non-Roma were recognized to hold a position of superiority and knowledge, and therefore one of cultural advantage. In such instances, PER's tone was not detached, informative, nor was it compassionate; rather, it was an amazed voice that the Roma could not organize themselves, did not know how to navigate the seas of democracy, and were prone to dissension. Further, the comparison between the Hungarian and Roma minorities did not offer the specific context of discrimination as explanation for political apathy, nor did it ever suggest a probable cultural distinction of a group that organizes itself differently, in fragmented groups, than the majority European cultures. Other times, PER's writing reflected a judgment about the unusualness of, and at the same time a pity towards, the poverty in which some of the Roma live. The discourse spoke powerfully through the word choice:

> In some communities, the Romani individuals or groups did not *even* have IDs. They were non-citizens. Without birth certificates they were not able to go to school, they had no access to health care, *normal* workplaces, pensions, etc. In these and other communities like these, there was no electricity, no clean water, no *normal* life conditions. Children had neither clothes nor shoes, walking barefoot and naked, and some of the journalists were in shock on the first day, looking for excuses not to come back the second day.[206]

The repeated use of "normal" here reminds the reader of the Roma's Gypsyness, of their abnormality, confirming their outsider status.

As supported by the ample evidence gathered here, the NGOs do not subscribe to assimilationist interventions designed to fix the Roma problem. Yet the surfacing of the discourse of the Roma as the Gypsy raises an important question. Does the support the NGOs offer the Roma communities, including lobbying for their rights and free litigation

services for their protection, suggest a *discourse of difference*-based, modernization approach to development[207] – one in which the Roma need help / must have help because of their backwardness? The movement for Roma rights certainly is not a top-down model of assimilation, but are all activists committed to a thorough change of mind-frame necessary in order to truly advocate for the rights of the diverse Roma groups? PER answered negatively to such question, in its minutes of a 1999 meeting, where one activist emphasized the need for the Roma to change in order to be accepted by a non-Roma society:

> Another participant suggested that if democracy is the vision, it should not be taken for granted that Romani leaders are necessarily democratic. *They*, like others in society, *need to be educated*.[208]

One can speculate about the reasons why PER in particular was discursively productive of othering. One recalls that of the five NGOs, PER has had the most Western financial support and resources. PER is an example of a well-established first / developed world organization working on third world / developing countries' issues. One may speculate that, despite its Western commitments to eradicate discrimination, the process to reframe and assist inter-ethnic collaborations takes time in order to be stripped of – perhaps – engrained assumptions about the peoples PER has sought to help. At the same time, one may have the highest of expectations from PER to stand sharply against discrimination and not reproduce dominant constructions – which makes PER's slipping all the more problematic and disappointing. The power of the discourse also lies in its self-denial. The NGOs, PER included, embed moments of othering among political correctness, anti-Gypsyism arguments, and within context of debate and opinion exchange. The NGOs cannot afford to slip nor openly admit to a modernization ideology.

Being a Roma According to European NGOs

This chapter grappled with the commitments and strategies of the Roma activist movement. The main goal of the Roma rights cause was to construct the "Roma" – that is, to formulate an ethnic and cultural group different than the popular and politicized "Gypsy." In this process, the analysis presented here described seven projects that the NGOs have undertaken in their outreach communication. The first three discourses were explicit and unequivocal: (1) The Roma are the "most disadvantaged"[209] victims of discrimination for which (2) the state is to blame and (3) the Roma have rights that need to be politically recognized and protected. Activist communication provides well organized and supported arguments to make these three discursive claims. In addition, other ways of constructing the Roma emerged, more complex and reflecting competing NGO loyalties. In the context laid out by the first three discourses, it emerges that the activists must (4) build an identity – a Roma identity – worthy of political visibility, in order to adequately fight against discrimination and for rights in the current European political context. As shown above, the discourse of ethno-genesis is profoundly shaped, not only by the cultural specificity of various Roma communities, not only by activists' struggle to settle their own concerns over representation and authenticity, but also by the necessity to be seen as politically competent – in order to make the first three discourses transmittable, heard.

The same pressures shape (5) the discourse of social integration, explaining the multivalence of the discourse, as well as its coexistence alongside the discourses of (6) resistance and of (7) objectifying the Roma into the Gypsy other. The activists must formulate solutions to the problem of the Gypsy / Roma – (a) in harmony with their

commitment to the grassroots and to traditional and cultural stability (the solution must, therefore, not be assimilation, and in some cases it must mean separation / resistance by safeguarding tradition); (b) in agreement with their own organizational mission for social collaboration and participation (suggested also by some of the NGOs' funding pressures); and, third, (c) in accord with national and international official political stance on integration. The dance between such dynamics, pressures, loyalties create the fabric within which activist discourses exist as they do. In PER's own words,

> "The ideology of integration of the Roma, which is so prominent in political discourse nowadays, entails costs that society is not ready to pay."[210]

Likewise, beyond a fight against discrimination, serious formulation of Roma-ness and of an integration that serves the interests of all Roma entails costs that the NGOs are not ready to pay.

Although the NGOs intended to structure a politically strong Roma identity, well prepared to take on its European citizenry roles, the activists instead suggested an uncertain identity, torn between modernization (sometimes collapsed with democratization) and tradition. Why is this the case? Is the fact that the activists do not formulate a Roma identity with more clarity merely a stylistic error, a writing mishap? Or is it deliberate? Perhaps it is in part due to disorganization within the movement (there certainly was evidence of *unintentionally muddy* points, arising from typographical errors or statements that appeared not editor-proofed), but, viewing the larger geopolitical context, another possibility emerges to explain the *intentionally muddy* projects. This possibility must, firstly, be framed in the larger framework of the movement for Roma rights. It is evident, then, that the way NGO activists handle (or, one could say, do not

handle) the question of ethno-genesis similarly to how they hesitate around a cohort of issues (such as nation-building, integration, women's rights, education, hygiene, etc.). And therefore, put differently, what can account for the fact that, in general, the NGO writing appeared torn between, on the one hand, deliberate, strong claims (*intentionally un-muddy* proclamations, expected in the context of a cause dedicated to its purpose) and, on the other hand, vague statements, lacking explicitness? The coexistence of these opposing trends in constructing the Roma reflects larger commitments and struggles of the movement for Roma rights as a whole. Table 6.2 captures some of the consensus and hesitations embedded in the activist movement, as they became evident from the analysis done here (and the discourses it uses).

First, the *definition of the movement* is based on the understanding, among all activists, that the cause for rights undeniably must raise awareness and visibility of the discrimination against the Roma across Europe – this is undisputed. Yet what does / should the movement look like? Who should speak for the Roma? Should there be a movement strategy, formulated by (mostly) non-Roma activists, or should change happen from the grassroots? There is no single agreed upon answer the activists offer to these questions. To illustrate, the questions of representing the Roma and of who should assume leadership of the movement are wrought with both consensus and hesitations. The NGOs repeat time and again that Roma do not have a voice that can be heard; this is a fact, agreed upon by all activists, and documented with substantial evidence such as repeated and unacknowledged human rights violations. In contrast to such consensus, discursive hesitations become palpable as some writing (of the same organization, ERRC, for this example) comments, at the same time, on (a) the necessity of giving the Roma a

voice,[211] but (b) without aspiring to *speak for* the Roma or "to represent the views or priorities of Romanian Roma, or *Țigani*,"[212] and most broadly asking, (c) "*Who has the legitimacy to be the voice* of the rank and file Roma, to represent their interests and to be also capable of tackling the issues affecting Roma in the European framework?"[213] It follows that leaving questions of representation unanswered is intentional – and politically correct.

TABLE 6.2 Consensus and hesitations marking the Roma rights movement

	The Roma Rights Movement		
	Definition of Movement	Purpose of Movement	Movement Strategy
Consensus	A Roma rights movement is necessary in the fight against discrimination The Roma need a voice	The Roma are discriminated against The state is to blame for discrimination Roma have (human / minority) rights	Politically correct to leave politically charged questions unanswered (e.g., nation)
Hesitations	What should the Roma rights movement look like? Who should speak for the Roma? Should there be a movement strategy or should change happen from the grassroots?	What is / are / should be Roma identity / identities? Integration and political visibility vs. separation from mainstream societies and traditional leadership Roma women's rights vs. traditional gender / community / family roles	Which topics should the movement emphasize and which should it ignore / postpone?

Second, the *purpose of the movement* is both clear and complicated. It is clear in that the activists, of agreement, can formulate and document that the Roma are discriminated against, that the state is the principal actor to blame for anti-Gypsyism, and that the Roma have (human and minority) rights (the unequivocal first three discourses discussed in this chapter). Yet what does / should Roma identity mean? Should the Roma movement work towards integration of the Roma and political involvement or towards

separation and isolation of the Roma, upholding traditional leadership? Should the Roma movement advocate for Roma women's rights or should it safeguard traditional gender / community / family roles?

Finally, the *movement strategy*, as debated by various activists and suggested by different documents, reflects consensus over the fact that it is politically correct to leave politically charged questions unanswered (the topic of Roma nation-building, to name one of the most obvious quasi-taboos of activist discourse); conversely, the activists hesitate as to which such questions exactly are.

Returning to the question of identity construction, it is evident from the framework laid out in Table 6.2 – and the various commitments described above – that the NGOs do not have a choice at this point but to be *intentionally muddy* and hesitant in their ethno-genesis discourses. The successful NGO (that has political and social legitimacy to sit at the European table) must be then utterly cautious in navigating their competing loyalties – (a) to the elements of the movement that consider themselves closer to the grassroots and criticize activists for their elitism and dominant ideologies (in this view, how could intellectual activists comprehend the illiterate Roma and construct an identity to include them?); (b) to public and activist voices that assert, in the tradition of postcolonial scholarship, that no identity is, or can be, a true representation of the Roma cultures; and (c) to national governments and the EU, who might view ethno-genesis as a push for nationalism.

Caught in socio-cultural practices, the activists have fulfilled various roles for different audiences. They have tried to function as the watchdog for Roma rights (their expected and most public role), as strong political partners in the European community

(working alongside official authorities towards inter-ethnic accord), as the good neighbor (ready to serve locally with social justice projects), as the intellectual guide (helping the Roma articulate themselves), and even as the counter-culture activist protecting the traditions of Roma communities. As regards the latter, some of the NGO writing raised doubts about integration efforts heavily financed by national governments and supranational bodies. Such statements stand against the tidal wave of EU democratization, although they are still developing as the movement formulates itself and its loyalties.

As delineated in earlier chapters, an initial reason for the closer analysis of activist communication was based on postcolonial studies scholars' questioning of the underpinnings of the Roma rights movement and their projects, suggesting that such efforts are rooted in a discourse of difference. This chapter confirmed this criticism when it noted the discourse of othering the Roma into a rowdy, less civilized, and pre-modern Gypsy; in this case, there was evidence of the dominant ideologies shaping some of the NGO work. Also, the difficulty of formulating the project of social integration – and especially the instances where the activists avoid seeing integration as assimilation – is another testimony to the fact that the discourse of difference motivates to some degree the activists' intervention to help the Gypsies. But this chapter provided evidence that offers a more complex picture, as explained here, recognizing at the same time, what was termed here, *intentionally un-muddy* agenda, alongside *unintentionally muddy*, and, most interestingly, *intentionally muddy* propositions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

How Invisible Are They?

Conclusions on Press and Activist Communication

> *Racist beliefs allow the majority to justify practices that keep Roma out, and to deny responsibility for their results. Racism is a tool in the fight for wealth and privilege. Racists have used it well enough over generations to have effectively turned Roma into something less than full citizens of the countries in which they live.*
>
> - The European Roma Rights Centre

This work was not written by a Romani. The purpose was not to speak for the Roma or to advocate for their rights. Instead, the author spoke as a member of a world culture challenged to live in proximity and intimacy with difference and as an observant to social and political dynamics developing alongside, and interlaced with, ethnic relations. The initial plan was to analyze and speak critically and objectively. For better or worse, the commitment to objectivity faltered; in the face of appalling discrimination and prejudice, both documented and contributed to by press coverage, I found myself hesitating in regards to the purpose of this work. How should this research read, for whom, and with what purpose? My hope is that this work opens a door to communication, instead of being read solely as a narrative of discrimination, a complaint, or a cynical review of impossibilities. Beyond telling and explaining stories of anti-Gypsyism and pro-Roma rights, it is also meant as a reflection on power relations implicated in European systems of discrimination and change, and on the specific roles that writing about our *selves* and our *others* might play in this system.

From the beginning, this dissertation narrated tragic stories of continued reproduction of hatred and unwantedness, regrets towards the sustained victimization, moments of recognition that we are all human and deserving of harmony, and political gestures to encapsulate and control "the Gypsy problem." It also meant to explain the ideologies maintaining such discriminatory systems. Yet this dissertation is also laden with the difficulty – but not the impossibility – of a project of cultural concord. In this sense, it became a more complex story of denial and objectification, a story of colonization that has not yet ended in contemporary Europe, that, most generally, press discourses contribute to and activist discourses seek to fight. At the same time, the press looks for alternative representations; at the same time, the activists become enrolled in the hegemonic project sustaining a hierarchical European society, while they simultaneously try to, but cannot fully, escape the monotony, the banality, and the numbness that come from telling the same story over and over again.[1]

This project was about how contemporary Europe conceives the Gypsy / Roma. It set out to contribute to understanding about, not so much the Gypsy / Roma per se in the contemporary European space, but the way current institutional communication practices construct such a social actor. It particularly focused on press and activist discourses in Europe, since the fall of Communism in 1989, seeking to clarify the hegemonic roles of, and changes within, such discourses. It became clear that any discussion of a dominant understanding of the Gypsy / Roma would – and must – also entail a discussion of the contrasting mechanisms between the minority and the majority populations. Only by defining the system of beliefs that motivates dominant constructions and coordinates those that are counter-dominant, in order to sustain its own hegemony, can such questions

be addressed. For these purposes, the first four chapters of this dissertation set the stage for the research, explaining the necessary theoretical and methodological framework, as well as exploring previous scholarship and contributions. Chapter Five discussed British and Romanian press discourses between 1990 and 2006, whereas Chapter Six addressed the modes of talking preferred by European activists. This last chapter summarizes the answers to which the previous two chapters contributed evidence, organized by research questions and the two institutional foci (press politics, followed by NGO politics). It also offers speculation as to why such evidence is possible in the contemporary historical moment. Finally, it highlights the contribution of this project to theorizing the possibility of constructing and challenging difference in the European belief system. In reviewing and explicating the interpretations offered in earlier chapters, the conclusions delineated here weave in and out of contradictory modes of talking, as they connect and influence each other in the materials analyzed (rather than setting them as distinctly opposite one another).

A comment on the nature of this research is necessary. A comprehensive response to postcolonial theorists' call for inclusive scholarly descriptions of the problem of difference entails attention to, not only institutional discourses and the historical conjunctures that shape and reshape self-other relations, but also study of non-Roma audiences engaged in processes of negotiation and creation of meaning, as well as, most importantly, resistance and self-representation by the perceived other. The voice of the other should be, in regards to this study, Roma representations produced by the Roma. Roma negotiations of both non-Roma, dominant media constructions and Roma representations merit attention. However, this was not a study of "Gypsy / Roma voice"

per se. This research contributes nonetheless to the study of otherness (in the specific post-1989 European context) by highlighting the significance of institutional discourses that continue to define Gypsy / Roma subalternity constructed by and for dominant cultures. This perspective is necessary given its absence thus far in international mass communication, Gypsy studies, and postcolonial studies alike.

This dissertation was not a study of audience interpretations either. While it cannot suggest cause-and-effect relations, the evidence offered explains an important piece of the puzzle (the specific mechanisms of constructing difference, done by dominant newspapers and the Roma rights movement), connecting public perception of Gypsy / Roma communities and systems of discrimination. Future research should further such observations (and the stereotype literature summarized in Chapter Three), seeking links between public opinion and the press and activist communication processes investigated here. As discursive transformations emerge and solidify within the different institutions, the question arises whether popular understanding follows.

Press Politics

What do press discourses contribute to what European cultures mean and understand by Gypsy / Roma? For the newspapers, the Gypsy was a nebulous category, thick with contradictions and feared for its political implications. Three distinct orders of discourse formulated what the Gypsy / Roma is – one that is objectifying, another that is empathetic and deplores the condition of the Roma victim, and yet another that tries to recognize the Roma in their own right. The first discursive trend consistently constructed the Gypsy as the other (different, unwanted, someone else's problem, to be changed, and

politically tolerated). The Roma was thus *the Gypsy* – backward, uncivilized, a social burden (and a headache), outside legitimacy and legality, ludicrous, and biologically inferior. The construct of the Gypsy was only possible to understand by positioning it in sharp contrast to the non-Gypsies. The Gypsies' backwardness and cultural difference both served to legitimize the normalcy of dominant cultures, their democratic structure, their political strength, their cleanliness, good health, and exemplary education, their commitment to fight crime, and ultimately their superiority that justifies their power.

The other representational mode, the twin of the first, was the construction of the Gypsy as the perpetual victim of discrimination. This particular Gypsy needed to be rescued from a system both oppressive and abandoning (that is, the Gypsy is no one's problem). Although the press blamed the state for its failures, it rarely truly engaged with the cycle of discrimination that marginalizes the Roma (unlike the activist movement). In this view, the non-Gypsy was merciful and empathetic, responsible and committed to solving society's problems.

How do these two orders of discourse coexist? How can they be simultaneous and contradict each other at the same time? How can discourses (especially press representations) both contribute to and perpetuate discrimination – and recognize and deplore racism at the same time? Theoretically, both Foucault's episteme[2] and Said's contrapuntal reading method[3] explain the possibility of competing discourses to coexist, allowed by specific historical factors. Practically, Chapter Five showed how the process of othering the Gypsy has been intrinsically fear-based, panic-based. The unswerving consistency of representing the Gypsy as the other only feeds into the fear and thus makes controlling the other obligatory. Yet controlling the other must be a careful

project; sheer ethnic cleansing is frowned upon, and thus states must find synonyms for colonization that are politically legitimate. One tool to legitimize efforts to assimilate, deport, or ghettoize the Roma was to construct the victim Gypsies. This is how the powerful redeem themselves: "We" deplore the plight of the Roma, even though there is not much to be done. But what could "we" do, given that they are the other, after all? What could we do, when they are willingly different, including in their refusal to become like "us"? Othering, control, and assimilation thus make even more sense as the only way to live with their difference.

The literature reviewed in Chapter Three has suggested that the media can only conceive the Gypsy other trapped in stereotypes and backwardness. Put through the sieve, press discourses can be reduced to the powerful dichotomy of othering-victimization. One may indeed read the press and only see this binary. The evidence offered here suggested that dominant media rarely conceive the Gypsy / Roma outside his / her *Gypsy* status (confirming concerns delineated in Chapter Two against always defining the other by its subaltern status[4]). However, Chapter Five suggested there was more to the narrative than such a simplistic (or pessimistic) approach – the construct of Gypsy is wrought with more complexity and contradiction than that. Moments of conceiving a *non-other* became increasingly evident, as discourses of human rights and minority status permeated the Central and East European geopolitical imaginary after the fall of Communism. Such tropes have contributed to resisting, and reacting to, the first order of discourse described here – that is, othering the Gypsy – by using the truths established by the second order of discourse – that of the Gypsy as victim. The third representational strand took the shape of a civilized Gypsy (sometimes "Roma") and of a Gypsy as a

European problem. These discourses constructed the Roma as a victim at the same time as a culture, valid, and worthy of attention. Here, the non-Roma were allowed to become the enemy, the unfair powerful actors in charge, and dismissive at the same time, of a minority in need of protection. The internal fissures characterizing the discourse of human rights is also apparent in the various projects of integration – projects born out of the need to do something about the Roma problem that would take the Roma themselves into account. Discursively, such projects manifested themselves as the Gypsy as political project of cultural integration and of integration-through-change. These two trajectories draw not only from human rights paraphernalia, but also from the history of Gypsy colonization and discrimination.

To summarize, the analysis of post-1989 British and Romanian press coverage identified (a) media discrimination and legitimization of an attitude of political ignorance towards the Gypsy / Roma communities; (b) a language of rights and political correctness, in tune with the times and the European climate of integration; and (c) efforts to recognize the Roma cultures in their own right, dispelling stereotypes (more and more evident in the later years of the analysis). While media discrimination is not new (and was expected after the review of the literature), what this project offered was a more comprehensive argument about how the construction of difference is possible and achieved in specific contexts and guided by, and justified in, particular socio-historical conjunctures. This dissertation exposed how the press as an institution objectifies the Gypsy, in times of moral panics and in everyday inter-ethnic cohabitation. It also suggested that the British and Romanian mainstream newspaper coverage follows authorities' lead in identifying the Gypsy communities as social problems – and

exacerbates and amplifies the *process* of finding fault into a (politicized) *project* of constructing Gypsy difference. This is not to say that the press operates exclusively as a governmental tool for official propaganda. But the analysis illustrated how – *in the specific case of the Gypsy / Roma peoples* – the press is a hegemonic instrument of oppression, in that it is discriminatory just as the state apparatus is. Press independence seemed more of an illusion than it is popular to accept. Part of how the press fits into the status quo is, in addition, by articulating counter-ideologies (of the Roma as a culture in its own right): The third discursive trend reflects a journalistic practice that suggests that communication based on inter-cultural / inter-ethnic / inter-difference listening is possible – or, rather, thinking about how to conceive such communication is beginning to be seen in the press. Anti-Gypsyist coverage *and* resistant writing – both contribute to, and articulate, a perfectly harmonized system.

The identification of meaning about the Gypsies / Roma in the press as national and international communication texts has certainly just begun. The selected newspapers here do not speak, of course, to each of the two countries' diversity of opinions: How do, alternatively, non-mainstream media conceive the Gypsy / Roma and in what ways do such, perhaps, alternative voices contribute to the larger European conversation about Roma difference? One way to explore questions of representation and authenticity is to turn to online (news) communication created by, and targeting, ethnic minorities. Another is to engage the realm of interpersonal communication (such as "Gypsy" blogs, MySpace profiles, or BBC virtual forums), documentary work (for instance, what does the BBC's *Gypsies and Travellers* contribute to the British talk about difference?), and entertainment media (film and television imagery) to investigate accounts of Gypsy /

Roma ethnicity, identity, culture, and integration. How do such different sites stand together with press discourses?

Furthermore, exploring discourses of other Western European countries (perhaps less conservative than the UK, especially in their relationship to the EU) and Central and Eastern European growing democracies would offer more complexity, context, and specificity to the European problem of the Roma and countries' specific ways of conceiving minorities. The connection between communication strategies and projects geared towards change merit study (a line of inquiry already begun elsewhere[5]).

NGO Politics

What do activist discourses contribute to what European cultures mean and understand by Gypsy / Roma? The activist project was unquestionably to construct *the Roma* – and not the *Gypsy*. To the activists "the Roma" means a past and a present suffocated with discrimination. In order to clearly and eloquently construct this argument, the activist publications documented anti-Gypsyism and human rights violations; they exposed the failures and faults of national governments and international bodies; they identified, explained, and protected Roma rights, using the terminology and litigation tools established by human rights discourse and organizations; they structured arguments against cultural assimilation; and they offered integration as solution to social problems and as alternative to assimilation.

Whereas press writing contrasted the Gypsy to the non-Gypsy, the activists focused on the Roma, sometimes contrasted to the non-Roma, and other times to the Gadje. Yet, different than the press, defining a new construct of Roma was the priority,

instead of engaging in contrasting; for this reason, the non-Roma received less attention than did the non-Gypsy in the press coverage of Gypsies. As discussed in Chapter Six, the movement for Roma rights is wrought with fragilities and uncertainties, at the same time as it seeks to be well-organized and cohesive in its mission. Therefore, the discourses (and projects) of ethno-identity and of social integration were marked by complications. It seemed it was easier for the activists to proclaim what the Roma are not and even what they should not be – instead of what they are or try to be.

The movement's hesitations can be attributed to the various commitments, pressures, and loyalties the activists must keep in balance – (a) some, exerted by the political world intent on integrating the Roma and rallying the NGOs' support to implement official policies and projects; (b) others, expressed by those parts of the movement more committed to the grassroots, seeking to resist what they see as assimilation efforts, to uphold tradition and the centrality of a culture traditionally shy to mingle with the mainstream, and to remain critical of elitism within a community that has been historically disadvantaged; (c) and yet other pressures and commitments coming from public figures, thinkers, scholars, and activists themselves that question the movement's role in formulating an identity, an agenda, a path to harmonious inter-ethnic coexistence – in other words, questioning the activists' role in constructing a project that speaks for the Roma in order to gain political visibility. The writing of any successful NGO must, therefore, very intentionally reflect and navigate all such factors – especially as activism must overcome the banality of repeating the same story report after report, newsletter after newsletter, press release after press release; as shown in Chapter Six, the

activists see the argument against discrimination dying out, as it is spoken, because of its repetitiveness.

The most interesting conversations among the activists revolved around questions of representation, authenticity, and voice – a progressive view of inter-ethnic relations. As much as the NGOs try to recover and conceive an "authentic Roma," the project is doomed to fail – not only because of the cultural differences among the various groups, but especially because of the politics of representation that complicate any attempt at a unified articulation. The quest for an identity was wrought with uncertainty, as a collective Roma identity implicates first settling choices between modernization and tradition, between the mainstream and resistance. Such issues still constitute, for the moment, ambiguous territory – "the key question for any group is not 'What don't we have?' but rather, 'What do we want?,'"[6] wrote ERRC. Examples of activist reflexivity (demonstrating the third commitment listed above) were seen in the writing of feminists arguing for Roma rights, of OSCE liaison, Nicolae Gheorghe, and of ERRC's editor for many years, Dimitrina Petrova, to name a few.

Another example of inherent contradictions and hesitations was the discourse of social integration that sought to formulate a satisfying approach to *integration* – intended to be in stark contrast to the states' attempts toward *assimilation*. The activists' understanding and traits of integration were exceedingly muddy. The activists had a more difficult time specifying what integration may look like – beyond collaborations, partnerships, and alliances that legitimize and draw attention to the movement. It was less complicated to note the birth, evolution, and political partnerships that raise the visibility of the Roma rights cause than it was to write about how to accomplish what the

represented Roma want. In this process, democracy, EU policy-making, and its regional and local effects were generally constructed positively. It can be speculated that, in fact, it has been easier (and politically preferred) to *adopt* the language of integration from EU policy, than it might be do *adapt* the norms and rituals, and possibly the needs and wants of communities characterized by varying degrees of traditionalism, to the contemporary European climate (and vice versa). The over-emphasis on, and celebration of, successes of "historic importance"[7] that match EU definitions were suggestive in this sense, as was the framing of Roma political leaders' failure to organize themselves (the way the Romanian Hungarian minority does, for instance).

The relationship between activists and the Roma, on one side, and the state, on the other side, was additionally confused by the sheer evidence offered by NGO publications about the state's fault in the Roma's underprivileged conditions. The continuous back-and-forth dance between consenting to, and struggling against, the system reflects the complexity of discursive practices – which in fact sustains their hegemony (and thus their power).[8] The NGOs are both committed to critique of institutional discrimination, necessary and urgent, at the same time as they must recognize and praise successes and changes in the systems. They position the Roma, therefore, anywhere and everywhere along the continuum between agency and subalternity, between resistance and being assimilated, depending on the individual context and all at the same time. One example of this dual tension is the different analyses the activists give the 2000 EU Race Equality Directive (2000/43/CE, commonly referred to as the Race Directive). Sometimes documents praised the legislation for its essential prohibition of discrimination (in light of the Race Directive, "the barriers to access to a court for lack of a legal remedy should be

lowered in the near future," commended ERRC [9]); conversely, other times the writing was less optimistic and more critical of the Directive's lack of specificity when it comes to groups traditionally excluded, such as the Roma.[10] It is evident that different discourses need each other in order to construct *together* the knowledge system around the Roma problem. No discourse is complete without the tension brought about by its connections to another; each is a bit hesitant and complicated by the proximity and pressure of another.

The activist movement for Roma rights positions itself as resistance, seeking to dismantle dominant ideologies that dominate the Roma and objectify the Gypsy. To this effect, it uses a cohort of tools, made up of thick evidence of human rights violations and racism, legitimate terminology, case-studies, and testimonials, backed up by publicly trusted opinion leaders and political figures. The activist resistance plays its part in the hegemonic project of controlling the Gypsy. Most evidently, the EU has somewhat incorporated the activist efforts into its own processes of *integration*. (EU Phare funds are locally implemented with the assistance of NGOs fighting for Roma rights.) At the same moment that the NGOs attempt to position themselves as resistance, the dominant system incorporates the movement for Roma rights, it keeps it close to home, in order to use it in support of its integrationist (assimilationist at times) agenda – and in order to control the degree of its rebellion at the same time. As explained in Chapter Two, learning from Gramsci's theorization of hegemony,[11] it is evident that the NGO struggle to resist is legitimized in contemporary Europe by the EU's and most governments' blessing. The discourse of social integration identified in activist writing suggests this new, recent

partnership that maintains a status quo, as it seeks to adjust it to the needs of the times at the same time.

How will the NGO movement for Roma rights fair in light of the sweeping economic recession and tightening of employment opportunities? Studies of activist discourses should continue. They should also engage the activists themselves in an effort to better understand and verify the speculations offered here about the movement's balancing acts between representing consensus and hesitations. Whether Roma or non-Roma, how do European activists see their role in contemporary geopolitics around the problem of the Roma? More comparative work needs to be further done in order to better illuminate the similarities, connections, or disparities between NGOs located in specific national contexts (such as the Romanian Romani CRISS) and transnational organizations. An interesting line of research would also engage the theoretical framework of affirmative advocacy that Dara Z. Strolovitch has developed for American advocacy organizations,[12] to examine European NGOs working for the Roma; her attention to "intersectionally disadvantaged" groups[13] may be interesting to apply to the Roma, who indeed face marginalization economically and based on race, ethnicity, and gender.

Enduring Talk

From a comparative standpoint, how do press and activist discourses contribute *together* to what Europe understands by the Gypsy / Roma? What is the relationship between the two institutional modes of representation? The differences are numerous and evident by looking at the different commitments and practices of each of the two institutions; most generally, the press contribute to a dominant approach to the Gypsy,

whereas activism positions itself as counter-dominant (with varying degrees of success, as discussed in Chapter Six and above). The similarities between the discourses are more interesting, as they suggest necessary enduring and overlapping constructions in the European mind. (For a summary look at press and activist discourses, see Appendices C and D.) To start with, the press discourse of *the Gypsy as victim of discrimination* finds its partner, to some degree, in the activist discourse of *the Roma as victim of discrimination*. Both discourses seek to document racism and deplore the eternal status of the Gypsy / Roma as a victim. The difference in terminology is significant, of course, as it reflects the two institutions' divergent commitments: On the one hand, the press ultimately contributes to a project of victimization, conducted from a privileged position, necessary as counter-part to the continued stereotypical representation, as discussed above. On the other hand, the NGO writing deplores *the Roma*'s disadvantaged status as its main and most fervent purpose, and not as secondary observation as the press constructs it.

Second, the press' *the Gypsies as an abandoned people* and *the Gypsy as someone else's problem* have their counterpart – a much stronger and better articulated counterpart – in the NGOs' discourse of *state blame*. The NGOs' work takes press observations to a different level, not just identifying the failures of the system, but engaging its resources to document, to the best of their abilities, how deep discrimination marks governmental and public infrastructures in European countries.

Third, the newspapers' *the Gypsy as political project of social and cultural integration* (discourses evident in 2003-2004 and 2006) is both similar to, and draws its inspiration at the same time from, the activist construction of *social integration*. By the

early- to mid-2000s, the press recognizes and engages the language rights advocated by Roma leadership – and by the omniscient EU and the Council of Europe. Nonetheless, these press discourses are still too infrequent and atypical (at least, for the activists' taste) to be judged as significant change.

And fourth, the activists' discourse of *the Roma as the Gypsy other*, as delineated in Chapter Six and above, builds upon the same construction of difference as the prevalent press talk of *the Gypsy as the other*. As strong as the NGOs' commitment to social justice and elimination of discrimination has been, the writing slipped into othering the Roma into the Gypsy other. Within the movement for Roma rights, othering was a counter-discourse, rare and most often hidden (whereas for the press, the Gypsy other is the main character). The fact that a field and organizations so dedicated to seeing change in the global culture has allowed difference to permeate its work is deemed here as problematic. It is also disappointing, as it continues to fuel some scholars' critique that the movement for rights uses dominant ideologies to fix the Gypsy problem,[14] that it may be a thinly veiled attempt at assimilation – and not a true movement for rights, for emancipation, or for empowerment.

Talking Difference: Theorizing the Gypsy / Roma

In explaining the representations of Gypsy-ness and Roma-ness, several issues stir up theoretical implications for the projects that both the press and the activists actively contribute to and reproduce. Some comments are necessary on the process of identity-making / identity-elucidating. In addition, this section offers some explications and

speculations regarding the belief system that maintains discrimination in place and yet allows change, in one shape or another.

First, it should be noted that ethnicity, race, class, and gender were married within the definition of the Gypsy / Roma. Class difference was apparent, for instance, in descriptions of poverty, of Roma activists, and of mediated distinctions between Roma leaders and politicians vs. the people they represent. Press discourses implicated and / or specifically addressed the construct of gender in the construction of otherness: The Gypsy woman – fertile, nursing, or dominated by her husband and community – and the patriarchic Gypsy man, abusive, aggressive, boisterous, and self-centered, were both different others. NGO discourses recalled similar gender roles, but deployed them at the center of the tradition vs. modernization struggle. Yet most discursive efforts grappled with the tension between race and ethnicity. Are the Gypsy / Roma an ethnic group or a different race? On the surface, in the time period analyzed, a shift was evident, from newspapers' initial construction of racial inferiority – their brownness, blackness, brunetness, and genetic inclination to violence – to the gradual implementation into the public sphere of political and human rights vocabulary, which corner the minority as an ethnicity. Politically, it is easier, after all, to serve the interests and protect the rights of the Gypsy / Roma *as an ethnic group*. Accordingly, the press adopted the ethnic category[15] – and continued constructing otherness as a cultural difference (as the more recent examples of the 2000s showed). The activists embraced the ethnicity paradigm as well (in their discourse for rights and for ethno-genesis) – even though they continued using the term "racism" to describe the process of discrimination against the groups. In agreement with Michael Omi and Howard Winant's assessment of ethnicity, activists

were heavily preoccupied with settling identity issues between integration into the mainstream and preserving group traditions, as well as with political participation positioned between traditional and modern leadership.[16]

Despite such politically correct efforts, othering the Roma involved more than ethnic, class, national, or gender difference. One side-effect of emphasizing the ethnicity card is that the problem of the Gypsies / Roma becomes over-"ethnicized"[17] and labeled, too often, *only* a matter of ethnic conflict; although the NGO writing notices the socio-political habit of reducing anti-Gypsyism to ethnic (and social) conflict, the role their own efforts may play towards this effect escapes the activists.

More significantly, Omi and Winant also suggest that focusing on ethnicity disregards racially based exclusions.[18] In the case of the Roma, overlooking race means disregarding a history of migration and enslavement – made possible throughout the centuries precisely by the conceptualization of the groups as racially inferior. Moreover, leaving out race contributes to a system of explanations that allows justifying "the Gypsy problem" as *their fault*, blaming the victims for their troubles, attributing their plight to their cultural distinction.[19] Indeed, those press voices that have moved beyond the biological now construct the Gypsies as culturally different; it is their way, their choices, their traditions that position them to be insurmountably against, and incompatible with, the non-Gypsies. It is evident, then, that the construction of the Gypsy as identified in this research is not *post-race* or *outside-of-race* – despite political arguments to the contrary, despite activist efforts to conceptualize and discuss (one) ethnic identity, and despite press voices that ignore racism and focus on ethnic conflict alone. Belton offers an important and compelling theorization of the ethnic narrative sustaining the construct of

Gypsy identity (for Belton), which this dissertation does not wish to repeat. To end this discussion, however, Belton's argument that oftentimes ethnicity is, in fact, *analytically* another word for race[20] is significant in evaluating press and NGO discourses' contribution to an ideology of otherness.

Not only othering is not outside the constraints of race, but even when one reads representations as marks of ethnicity alone – of a distinguished, special ethnic group learning to integrate and be politically present, as the activist movement advocates – the Gypsy / Roma is still disfavored. Sartre comments on the similarities between the anti-Semite and the democrat, where both attempt to strip the Jew of, in one case, his / her humanity and leave only *difference* to justify a pariah-treatment, or, in the other case, his / her Jew-ness and expose an abstract, universal humanity. In both cases, Sartre argues, the Jew is stripped, not allowed to be complete.[21] The argument can similarly be made about the political projects that implicate and build upon ethnicity. The press and activists capitalize on the new, acceptable vocabulary of Roma's ethnicity – their "Roma"-ness which can be formulated into rights, anti-discrimination, and democratizing policies. Not only this project is wrought with contradictions, but it also does the Roma peoples the disservice of forcing them into categories that can be handled – politically and socially. Alongside discourses of othering and unwantedness, the press discourses of abandonment in 1992, to be changed in 2001, and the political project of integration-through-change of 2006 all speak to the dominant newspapers' contribution to the politicized attempt to turn the Gypsy into a controllable pariah to be integrated / assimilated. The same purpose is accomplished by the activist discourse of the Roma as the Gypsy other. Conversely, Chapters Five and Six offered support of Sartre's critique to the overly zealous attempt to

democratize the Gypsy / Roma and turn him / her into a human rights projects; the activists most clearly advocated towards this purpose, as evidenced by the overwhelming presence of the discourse of Roma rights in the majority of NGO publications; the press offered its contribution through the discourses of the Gypsy as political project of social and cultural integration in 2003-2004 and in 2006.

Constructing and sustaining an ideology of othering draws from more than Romani *racial* or *ethnic difference* – or their class and gender difference. It is misleading to locate difference exclusively as a socio-political *reaction* to the characteristics of a specific group. Instead, the internal functioning of the European society as a whole plays its part. Certainly, each individual society, culture, or nation is characterized by specific contexts that may contribute to both "the problem of the Roma" and official and public treatment towards the minority communities. In the Romanian case, for example, the past of slavery, fascism, and Communism ideologies of racial superiority still permeates every social stratum and is reflected in current democratizing and modernizing projects.

Yet more than an aggregate of individual societies, the European reality allows the Gypsies to symbolically occupy a space that is not post-colonization, nor post-racism. The space of ethnicity is one of silence and marginality – a space left by the Jews.[22] New synonyms for the older, preferred terms of ethnic cleansing, sterilization, and eugenics today are "fortress Europe," "Euroskepticism," deportations, denials of racism, institutional discrimination (in employment, education, health services, and housing), and more obviously racial attacks and killings (necessary interventions[23]). Silencing the Roma communities (by downplaying their pain, by ignoring, segregating, or expatriating them) is a key aspect of contemporary Europe – of migration, of official violence, of

extremist attacks. Silencing and marginal-construction is a strategic tool of power. What has contributed to this status quo? How can it still be?

To answer, one need not look too far into the past. The system of explanations sustaining the ideology of otherness is not hidden. Indeed, the Roma groups have always been treated as outsiders; indeed, they have always been perceived to be inferior and enslaved; indeed, they have "deserved" their outcast status. But the middle of the 20th century offered the possibility of a radical change – one that was possible in the case of the Jewish population, with sufficient international and public support. The international and inter-governmental political spheres have condemned the Holocaust *against the Jewish people* with such fervor, that it has become unimaginable to still denigrate the Jews (not to the extent that the Roma are still discriminated against). The Roma population featured in the conversation, modestly, symbolically, and superficially. Roma activists still call for recognition and retribution for the horrors lived through the Pogrom.

At the fall of the Nazi regime, the difference between the paths followed by the two "ethnic" groups (for lack of a better term), the Jewish and the Gypsy peoples, was complicated by politics. Both cultures had been stateless and conflicted about their space and role in the larger world. Yet the Jews were not as *othered* – globally – as the Gypsies have been; they were not quite as "brown" or as "black." It was only reasonable that the Jews (for a variety of reasons beyond the scope of this argument) rallied an international political support that made their redemption possible. In contrast, the Roma have always lacked a unified political voice (at least, until recently), or even a cohesive language or shared collective history, a nation-state with its own a military force, devotion to one religion, or (public) consciousness of one ethnic identity. Without a serious protector at

the fall of the Nazi regime, they were consequently left to waver in a space of acceptable / unacceptable discrimination. The activists themselves recognize the inherent "extraordinary historically rooted structural weakness" of the Roma.[24] Europe, and the world along with it, has learned that ethnic cleansing should not be tolerable; but when it comes to the Gypsies, is it *really* not acceptable, when the Roma continue to signify, as Gypsies, a parasitic existence, "alien to the principle of productivity," as ERRC suggested[25]?

As Europe started adjusting to the post-Nazi era, where did the Roma belong? If they could not be eliminated per se, how to handle them became the pressing question. Economically, the problem of the Roma has posed serious conceptualization issues. Both sides of the Iron Curtain attempted to make sense of the Roma communities in their own way. Post-World War II, the Roma communities became, for the West, the embodiment of Eastern (Balkan, Oriental, barbaric) chaos and lack of discipline and, for the Communist East, the dangers of uncontrolled capitalist philosophy, identified in the Gypsies' speculations and trade. The Protestant ethic could not be applied directly to the Roma groups – and how could it? Dominant structures were at a loss as to how to hold the minority groups to the same socio-economic standards, given their difference and the perceived Roma little or lack of involvement with the workings of the systems. One could ask, equally, how the Protestant ethic could be applied to a community consistently held at bay by the very system that complains about their outsider status – or, at best, enslaved under the workings of capitalism (and Communism as well, for that matter). More recently, it has become politically correct for governments to try to *integrate* the Roma. Although beyond the scope of this dissertation, evidence surfaced throughout

earlier chapters that oftentimes projects of "integration" rest on official efforts to minimize Roma difference – in ways that were here shown to discursively resemble Nazi and Communist projects of ethnic cleansing. "Integration" still looks a lot like assimilation.

There have been instances that have tried to redeem such pessimistic views. For example, cries against sterilization and eugenics politics, anti-discrimination (and pro-Roma) judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, or the introduction of educational resources in Romany in Central and Eastern Europe may be seen as marks of change. The future will tell whether such developments indicate change or are short-term solutions that continue to miss the essential problems. The NGOs, at least, are skeptical – PER documented one conference participants to say, "With the slogans … 'death to the Roma' one can gain votes and an audience" and another to proclaim that, "We have to admit that the type of democracy we have here it is not capable of controlling" anti-Gypsyism, which belongs to a culture "that feeds the stupid."[26]

But theorizing the Gypsies to be different *by their own choice* is not necessarily progressive, as was indicated by the analysis of the dominant press voice, which has shown that the neoconservative approach to the Gypsies is alive within the political spheres of Europe; Gypsy poverty, unemployment, poor health, and illiteracy are traced to the ethnic group themselves; they do not try hard enough. Their culture has become the distraction necessary in order to not engage the Roma politically towards more harmonious continental affairs. Hence, anti-Gypsyism is both a *reason* for contemporary politics and a *response* of the political world to the problem of the Roma. In this project, the Gypsies are blamed for all of European society's ills – whether they are economic

crises and rising unemployment, growing immigration, problematic border control and foreign policy struggles, crime, political instability and slow democratization processes, skewed distribution of international aid, or even extremist outbursts of violence. Overt (and covert) racism makes sense when social stress is complicated by a culture's lack of responsibility and willingness to change and / or to integrate into the mainstream. And thus, it continues to make sense why Europe *should* fear the Gypsy. The ideology of otherness, of difference, has in addition conflated politics, history, cultural reasoning, and specific incidents to all contribute to one understanding of the Gypsy. The power of discourse thus emerges undeniable – the overwhelming majority of the knowledge exchanged in public spheres has contributed to the same, fixed, inescapable Gypsy other.

This dissertation used and explored the Gypsy-non-Gypsy / Roma-non-Roma pairs. Perhaps this is a limitation of this research, given that some scholars caution today about the dangers of reproducing the binary by its narration. This work, however, set out to dismantle and explain current rules and boundaries that shape the understandings of these pairs, rather than offer alternatives for their use and reproduction. It was here rendered evident that the constructed Gypsy is moreover necessary for the construction of the legitimate non-Gypsy. In the European mind – as it was suggested here – the Gypsy has become the embodiment of anti-*European-ness* (and thus the activists' insistence that the Roma are a *European people* themselves). As shown in Chapter Two, the self-other binary is inseparable. In this sense, the clarity, determination, and the sheer quantitative dominance of arguments that other the Roma make sense. In the words of an activist:

> … discrimination and its attendant dynamics are so deeply embedded in many European societies that its insidious, mendacious and pernicious effects are concealed beneath a veil of "racism", "bigotry", "xenophobia" and other forms of

> "cultural ascription" that explains [away] acts of hate by the broader public and therefore sequester these abhorrent acts and practices as something apart from culture. … Simply put, if we look at the broader patterns of discrimination, we would have to come to the ineffable conclusion that *racial discrimination is a fundamental part of mainstream culture* …[27]

Both the press and the Romani movement as institutions contribute knowledge to such European belief system that allows the Roma to stay a Gypsy. This dissertation offered evidence about how the identified discourses have structured and perpetuated such knowledge of a Gypsy other, victimized, and sometimes in his / her own right, transforming it into the science of *knowing* the *real Gypsy* – a science that motivates political projects of integration and segregation at the same time.

This dissertation was limited to its particular use of the specific method of discourse analysis. As shown in Chapters Two and Four, discourse and discourse analysis were here treated as embedded in larger ideological structures, making the expressions of discourse therefore limited to draw from a certain repertoire of representations guiding dominant constructions and truth.[28] At the same time, discourse was treated as perpetually dynamic and wrought with contestations.[29] This specific methodological understanding allowed the analyses presented here to be open to possibilities of discursive transformations and internal contradictions (noted in the majority of discourses reviewed in Chapters Five and Six) – instead of finding only what was expected. The fact that de Blasco's assessment of an overly elitist activist movement[30] was laid out early in this dissertation and yet later contradicted and complicated by evidence that suggested a complex NGO terrain, torn between diverse loyalties, demonstrates the present methodological approach. Although theoretically and empirically the research was grounded in, and connected to, bodies of literature from the disciplines of international

mass communication, cultural studies, postcolonial studies, and Gypsy / Romani studies, the *use* of method was not a simple confirmatory exercise. And yet the *choice* of method did come with its inherent limitations of exploring the research questions at the level of communication texts across institutions. Yet again, to repeat what was laid out earlier, this method was specifically chosen in order to highlight the science of creating truth about the Gypsies / Roma, to show "how *what* is said [about the minorities] fits into a network with its own history and conditions of existence."[31]

The analysis was not meant to gloss over cultural differences and political significances associated with the Romanian Gypsy, the British Gypsy Traveller, or the Gypsy foreigner (or other localized communities). Generalizations were only important insofar as they were driven by the representations themselves. And, as was discussed here, the certainty with which the public, politicians, and media voices spoke about the Gypsy that stays the Gypsy made such instances the norm rather than the exception. It follows that, the analysis unveiled those discursive moments of similarity, where the other can be nothing outside his / her otherness. While the socio-economic-political contexts affect the rationale and political outcomes of the problem of the Roma, the discourses of othering are powerful because of their trapping the Roma in inescapable constructions. And therefore, this dissertation predominantly narrated the Roma trapped as a Gypsy.

Changes in the system may be described by such examples as the formation of the International Romani Union in 1979 and its recognition by the UN to hold consultative status since 1993 – but how does the IRU fare politically *and* in the eyes of the local Roma? In 1994, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum first commemorated the

Gypsy victims – but how does such recognition trickle down to inter-ethnic respect at the grassroots level, in the produce market, or even more generally in media coverage? The growing Roma elite is composed of Romani diaspora and academics, people in significant functions able to reach policy-makers in significant ways – but how does the repeatedly reported fragmented Roma leadership affect lobbying and advocacy? (Even Fonseca's narrative stops to note the boisterous and yet apathetic leaders participating in the early- to mid-1990s conferences – "[s]cattered, vain, egomaniacal, ignorant, power-mad, back-stabbing."[32]) What difference does it make who speaks for Roma, when there is no listening ear, when they are not treated seriously? This work hopes to not follow the same path and, for this reason, it asks the reader to pause and consider the connections between various projects rather than strictly appreciate causes and effects – the Roma problem as cause and, for example, EU's Phare funding projects as consequence. How would Roma poverty look if it were not for anti-Gypsyism? Would there be a need for "special" schools and neighborhoods if society accepted itself and all its members? Would there be a judgment of the Roma elite if it was not as uncommon for non-mainstream leaders to have political visibility? Would there be a need for activism and litigation training if legal systems provided equally for all citizens?

Such questions are above and beyond the scope of this dissertation (and perhaps next research questions); they crop up, nonetheless, as one revisits the discursive constructions of the Roma as they are implicated in political issues of EU enlargement, economic issues of resources allocation, social issues of inter-ethnic neighboring, or "cultural" lifestyle matters. Such questions continue to be necessary in light of the conjectures offered in this chapter in response to the discussed discourses observed in

dominant and activist modes of representing and talking about the Gypsies / Roma. They continue to be absolutely urgent in the context of institutional ignorance of the specific implications of policy-making, as suggested by the following statement of one refugee law practitioner in the UK:

> On the basis of seven years experience in refugee law in the United Kingdom, I can say that … [a] typical "Home Office refusal letter" repeats the account of events given by the asylum seeker and then copies the same paragraphs to refuse the claim as for every other Romani case. … Sometimes even the name and country of the claimant are wrongly inserted. … The British government simply has no idea of the life of a Rom in Central and Eastern Europe. … Anyone who has worked with the Romani people and understands the 1951 Convention will know that members of this ethnic group qualify as genuine refugees. From the point of view of most decision-makers in Britain, however, this fact is irrelevant.[33]

Such observations remind of "the real world," knit together of a variety of hierarchical threads that construct a knowledge about the Gypsies / Roma – a knowledge often reflected, and contributed to, by the work of the press; a knowledge fought against and expanded at the same time by the work of the European NGOs; a knowledge constructed by current institutional practices of discrimination that, unexpectedly, this research has ultimately become a cry against. It is imperative to see the connection between the various strands that tell Gypsy / Roma stories, in different times and locations, in order to move beyond blame, as well as beyond local, isolated projects that often miss the bigger picture of entrenched, institutionalized anti-Gypsyism. In filling a gap in scholarly writing about contemporary European culture and ideology, this dissertation has offered evidence that the Roma should be treated as deeply political projects. It has shown press and activist discourses to be following alongside EU policy-making, national governmental projects, and local efforts to tolerate or banish the

Gypsies. It has also speculated on the role of the media in initiating and nurturing moral panics that objectify and scapegoat the Roma. It has argued that both press and NGO initiatives towards integration and inter-ethnic collaborations are wrought with complications and are not unidirectional. "Helping" the Roma or fixing "the Gypsy problem" can no longer be done without engaging what the Gypsy / Roma means for dominant societies – institutional discrimination and projects to save them included. Denial of the depth of the rift will assuredly only keep the complications in place.

As was repeated here, critical theorists of mass communication have recognized the relationship between discourse, language, power, ideology, and hegemony – a relationship well entangled in maintaining the status quo and dominance of established systems. This dissertation illuminated aspects of this relationship (or, rather, relationships). It described a minority group constructed by the institutions of the EU, national governments, administrative, and judicial systems, NGO activism, human rights advocacy, and mainstream newspapers. It has emphasized and explained such institutions' use and production of discourse in the process of maintaining their own legitimacy and the supremacy and validity of their projects of integration / dealing with the Gypsy / Roma problem. As regards press discourses, this project highlighted that the newspapers communicate within a very constrained system of representations, generally following the official lead. Their watchdog role is exercised by critiquing the political system and alliances – and not by challenging institutional discrimination against the Gypsies / Roma (with specific exceptions that most often fit within a hegemonic system of contradicitons, in the end, well balanced). The most evident discursive change marking press talk has been a shift from post-Communist overt discriminatory portrayals (caught

in the othering-victimization pair) to a 2006 more politically correct representation, attentive to a political rhetoric of integration evident continent-wide.

As regards NGO discourses, the 17 years analyzed period coincided with the birth and establishment of the movement for Roma rights. Beyond such obvious change, the activist communication processes themselves have not been that innovative, as suggested here, as they have sometimes reinforced dominant ideologies, whereas other times they have been predictably resistant. What presented theoretical interest, however, was the dance in which the NGOs found themselves caught – to communicate within a dominant system and yet just a little bit outside of it, in order to advance their resistance. Praising activist communication for resisting or blaming it for following dominant ideologies would each be an incomplete assessment. It became evident, here, that the communication challenge for an NGO wishing to be successful in its work is to navigate different commitments and challenges – and that there is no other way when seeking change at societal levels.

In closing, one might ask what else is possible. This research identified moments of dominance and resistance – but also instances of transformation. It explicitly did not offer solutions or an outline to a different model of communication; such projects belong at the most minute level, in the community, at the tangency between local and global, between the grassroots and the institutional, blurring the lines between what such constructs stand for in the first place. Chapters One and Three noted the overemphasis in the literature on the Gypsy / Roma as one closed ethnic group. In this regard, the present research did not attempt to do justice to the various, changing nature, contradictions, and fragilities of the Roma culture / cultures – but, rather, it investigated discourses in

specific expressions of communication. One of the hopes of the reading here offered is to remind of the possibility of alternatives to representations that trap the Roma (into the other, into the victim, or into the traditionalist). For now, it was more important to reflect on the politicization of the Gypsy / Roma into the "Gypsy" and, alternatively, into the "Roma," where both constructs at various times took the meaning of otherness and of resistance. What stands in between might be labeled empowerment, or might be labeled "just is." This project sometimes used the term "culture in its own right" to try to depict the embryonic, and hesitant at the same time, nuance identified in discourses (and much needed in the European and global imaginary) of the possibility of non-difference, of legitimate living without a stigma and without a savior. The fact that the discourses discussed here often intertwine and are difficult to separate or delineate individually and independently demonstrates this very fact. It is also illustrative of a world that is beginning to consider anti-racism. Race-, ethnicity-, and most broadly difference-related issues cannot be expected to go in any other way but the difficult way. The findings of this dissertation are no surprise, from this perspective. Muddiness, complications, uncertainty, pauses, silences, *and* numbness are expected and desired if one is to hope for an alternative, for change.

Notes

CHAPTER ONE

[1] Don, comment on "1Xtra BBC: Gypsies and Travellers: What You're Saying," comment posted in 2006. http://www.bbc.co.uk/ 1xtra/tx/documentaries/gypsies_travellers.shtml (accessed October 24, 2006); emphasis in the original. The name of the author of the comment has been changed to preserve anonymity. Minor grammatical errors were corrected from the original. There was no posting date associated with the comment or the section in which posted.
[2] Karmen Erjavec, "Media Representation of the Discrimination Against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia," *Discourse & Society* 12 (6) (2001): 699-727; United Nations, "Multi-Ethnic States and the Protection of Minority Rights," United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. Durban, South Africa: 31 August – 7 September 2001, http://www.un.org/WCAR/e-kit/minority.htm (accessed December 5, 2005).
[3] Werner Cohn, *The Gypsies* (Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1973); David M. Crowe, "Muslim Roma in the Balkans," *Nationalities Papers* 28 (1) (2000): 93-128; György Csepeli and Dávid Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity in Eastern and Central Europe: Perception and Self-Identification," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (1) (2004): 129-50; Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia"; Ágnes Kende, "The Hungary of Otherness: The Roma (Gypsies) of Hungary," *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 8 (2) (2000): 187-201; Alaina Lemon, *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Postsocialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Alaina Lemon, "Telling Gypsy Exile: Pushkin, India, and Romani Diaspora," in *Realms of Exile: Nomadism, Diasporas, and Eastern European Voices*, ed. Domnica Radulescu, 29-48 (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002).
[4] Robert E. Koulish, "Attitudes towards Roma Minority Rights in Hungary: A Case of Ethnic Doxa, and the Contested Legitimization of Roma Inferiority," *Nationalities Papers* 31 (3) (2003): 342.
[5] Margaret Brearley, "The Persecution of Gypsies in Europe," *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (4) (2001): 588-99; Dimitris Papadimitriou, "The EU's Strategy in the Post-Communist Balkans," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 1 (3) (2001): 69-94.
[6] Angus Bancroft, *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005).
[7] Paloma Gay Y Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas. A Comparative Perspective," *Social Anthropology* 10 (2) (2002): 173-88; Peter Vermeersch, "Ethnic Mobilisation and the Political Conditionality of European Union Accession: The Case of the Roma in Slovakia," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28 (1) (2002): 83-101.
[8] See also Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas"; Peter Gross, "A Prolegomena to the Study of the Romani Media in Eastern Europe," *European Journal of Communication* 21 (4) (2006): 477-97.
[9] Loïc J. D.Wacquant and William Julius Wilson, "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501 (1989): 8-25.
[10] See, for instance, Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); Lemon, "Telling Gypsy Exile."
[11] Edward Said, "Discrepant Experiences," in *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, ed. Gregory Castle, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 35.
[12] For discussions of the role played by media representation in discrimination against Gypsies, see Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*; Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study." Also, for discussion of issues of mis-representation more generally, see Lou Charnon-Deutsch, "Travels of the Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," in *Constructing Identity in Contemporary Spain*, ed. Jo Labanyi, 22-40 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002); Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia"; Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Michael Stewart, *The Time of the Gypsies* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997).

[13] Brian A. Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity: Ethnic Narratives in Britain and America* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2005); Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[14] See, for instance, Cohn, *Gypsies*.
[15] Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity"; Kende, "Hungary of Otherness."
[16] Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (London: Sussex University Press, 1972). The school of Gypsy / Roma studies is associated with the journal *Romani Studies* (continuing the initial *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*), even though authors publish outside the Gypsy Lore Society.
[17] David Joe Schneider, *The Psychology of Stereotyping* (New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2004).
[18] See Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996).
[19] Gillian Patricia Hart, *Disabling Globalization: Places of Power in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2002); Naeem Inayatullah and David L. Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004); Walter D. Mignolo, *Local Histories / Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 2003); Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999).
[20] Also see Robert J. C. Young, "Colonialism and the Desiring Machine," in *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, ed. Gregory Castle, 73-98 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).
[21] Derek Gregory, *Colonial Present* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004).
[22] Uday Singh Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study of Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1999).
[23] Even though some of the practical uses and implementation of these concepts through trans-national projects have raised scholarly concern – see Michael Goldman, *Imperial nature: The World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalization* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005); Hart, *Disabling Globalization*), their advent attests to social changes at a global scale.
[24] Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004).
[25] Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 36.
[26] European Union, "Why the European Union?," http://europa.eu/abc/12lessons/lesson_1 /index_en.htm (accessed February 5, 2007).
[27] Commission for Racial Equality, "Gypsies and Irish Travellers: The Facts," http:// www.cre.gov.uk/gdpract/g_and_t_facts.html (accessed February 4, 2007); Pat Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism? An Examination of Accommodation Options for Gypsies and Travellers in England," *Housing Studies* 19 (2) (2004): 141-59; The World Factbook, "United Kingdom," https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications /factbook/print/uk.html (accessed February 4, 2007).
[28] Recensământ 2002 (Census 2002), http://www.recensamant.ro/ (accessed December 26, 2006).
[29] Martin P. Levinson and Andrew C. Sparkes, "Gypsy Children, Space, and the School Environment," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 18 (6) (2005): 751-72; Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism?"
[30] Tony Bennett, "Media, 'Reality', Signification," in *Culture, Society and the Media*, ed. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 287-308 (London: Methuen, 1982).
[31] Graeme Burton, *Media and Society: Critical Perspectives* (New York, NY: Open University Press, 2005); Betty Houchin Winfield, Barbara Friedman, and Vivara Trisnadi, "History as the Metaphor through Which the Current World is Viewed: British and American Newspapers' Uses of History Following the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks," *Journalism Studies* 3 (2) (2002): 289-300.
[32] Winfield et al., "History as the Metaphor," 290.
[33] Roger Fowler, *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press* (London: Routledge, 1991).
[34] Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980).
[35] Fowler, *Language in the News*.
[36] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia."

[37] Fowler, *Language in the News*, 2; emphasis in the original.
[38] David Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence: Discourse, Space, and Representation* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005), 10; drawing from Jean François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).
[39] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[40] James W. Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1992).
[41] Ellen Wartella, "The History Reconsidered," in *American Communication Research: The Remembered History*, ed. Everette E. Dennis, and Ellen Wartella, 169-80 (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996).
[42] Stuart Hall, "Culture, the Media and Ideological Effect," in *Mass communication and society*, ed. James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 315-48 (London: Edward Arnold in association with The Open University Press, 1977); Peter Golding and Graham Murdock, "Culture, Communications and Political Economy," in *Mass Media and Society*, ed. James Curran and Michael Gurevitch, 70-92. 3rd ed. (London: Arnold, 2000).
[43] Golding and Murdock, "Culture, Communications and Political Economy," 71.
[44] Stuart Hall, "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Oppressed in Media Studies," in *Culture, Society and the Media*, ed. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, (London: Methuen, 1982), 88.
[45] Hall, "Culture, the Media and Ideological Effect."
[46] Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977).
[47] Hall, "Culture, the Media and Ideological Effect," 325.
[48] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (New York, NY: International Publishers, 1971).
[49] Hart, *Disabling Globalization*.
[50] Michèle Barrett, *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991).
[51] Hall, "Culture, the Media and Ideological Effect."
[52] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1990).
[53] Paul A. Bove, "Discourse," in *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 50-65 (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
[54] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 92-93.
[55] Chris Barker, *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities* (Buckingham, PA: Open University Press, 1999), 26.
[56] Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence*.
[57] Geneva Smitherman-Donaldson and Teun A. van Dijk, eds. *Discourse and Discrimination* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1988).
[58] Selection, inclusion, and emphasis are central strategies – specifically identified by framing theory and analysis – that reproduce established ways of seeing the world (Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia"; Gitlin, *Whole World Is Watching*).
[59] Giovanna Dell'Orto, *Giving Meanings to the World: The First U.S. Foreign Correspondents, 1838-1859* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002), 8.
[60] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia," 702.
[61] Giovanna, Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans': The Discourse about America in the Western European Press at the Dawn of the 20th and the 21st Centuries" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2004).
[62] Peter Braham, "How the Media Report Race," in *Culture, Society and the Media*, ed. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 268-86 (London: Methuen, 1982).
[63] Bennett, "Media, 'Reality', Signification."
[64] Braham, "How the Media Report Race"; Burton, *Media and Society*; David R. Croteau and William Hoynes, *Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2003).
[65] Bennett, "Media, 'Reality', Signification," 296.

[66] See also Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*.
[67] Burton, *Media and Society*, 21.
[68] The Project on Ethnic Relations, "The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions," 1996, http://www.per-usa.org/rommedia.htm (accessed December 27, 2006).
[69] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*.
[70] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Lemon, "Telling Gypsy Exile."
[73] Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas."
[74] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*.
[75] Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left* (London: Verso, 1988); Hart, *Disabling Globalization*, 27.
[76] Jean-Pierre Liegeois and Nicolae Gheorghe, "Roma/Gypsies: A European Minority," Minority Rights Group International Report, London, 95/4, 1995, 6; also see Colin Clark, "Counting Backwards: The Roma 'Numbers Game' in Central and Eastern Europe," *Radical Statistics* 69 (1998): 35-46, *The Patrin Web Journal: Romani Culture and History*, http://www.geocities.com/~Patrin/countingback.htm (accessed November 21, 2007).
[77] "Europe's Spectral Nation," *The Economist*, May 10, 2001, http://www.uwec.edu/geography/Ivogeler/w111/articles/roma.htm (accessed November 21, 2007).
[78] Liegeois and Gheorghe, "Roma/Gypsies," 6.
[79] "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[80] Don Kennington, *Gypsies and Travelling People: A Select Guide to Documentary and Organisational Sources of Information*, 3rd ed. (Stamford, Lincs: Capital Planning Information, 1986).
[81] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe"; Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*.
[82] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*.
[83] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness."
[84] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*, 7-8.
[85] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe," 589.
[86] Exact numbers are difficult to estimate. Different scholars report different figures. See, for instance, Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe" or Robbie McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism: The Roots of Anti-Nomadism," in *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 7-25 (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997).
[87] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe," 592.
[88] Helen Bassett Hornby, ed. *Lights of Guidance* (New Delhi: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1994); Inayatullah and Blaney, *International Relations*.
[89] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*, 32.
[90] Cohn, *Gypsies*; Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity."
[91] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 237.
[92] Koulish, "Minority Rights in Hungary," 338.
[93] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe"; also see Andrzej Mirga, "Making the EU's Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments Work for Romani Communities in the Enlarged European Union," based on a paper presented at the European Parliament's Public Seminar "Promoting EU Fundamental Rights Policy: From words to deeds or how to make rights a reality?" organized by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, April 2005.
[94] Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity."
[95] Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press), 192.
[96] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 3-4.
[97] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe"; Papadimitriou, "EU's Strategy."
[98] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[99] Ibid.; also see McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism."
[100] For instance in Ian Hancock, "The Struggle for the Control of Identity," *Transitions*, http://www.tol.cz/look/Transitions/article.tpl?IdLanguage=1&IdPublication=7&NrIssue=4&NrSection=1&

NrArticle=4233&search=search&SearchKeywords=hancock&SearchMode=on&SearchLevel=0 (1997) (accessed November 5, 2007).
[101] See Vermeersch, "Ethnic Mobilisation," 87.
[102] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[103] Marc Morjé Howard, "Can Populism Be Suppressed in a Democracy? Austria, Germany and the European Union," *East European Politics and Societies* 14 (2) (2000): 21.
[104] A renown scholar and activist of Gypsy issues, Andrzej Mirga is also Chair of the Council of Europe Specialist Group on Roma and Travellers, and Chair of the Project on Ethnic Relations Romani Advisory Council, Princeton, U.S.A. See Mirga, "Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments," 1.
[105] BBC News, "Romania Holds First Holocaust Day," October 12, 2004, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3736864.stm (accessed on 30 November 2006).
[106] Romania's case of integration is part of a larger category of nation-states that experience the competitive pressure to democratize and restructure their economies – see Jurgen Habermas, "Beyond the Nation-State? On Some Consequences of Economic Globalization," in *Democracy in the European Union: Integration through Deliberation?*, ed. Erik Oddvar Ericksen and John Erik Fossum, 29-41 (London: Routledge, 2000) – a pressure with still questionable effects, as well as motivating force (*need* vs. only choice in the face of international economic exclusion).
[107] Brearley, "Persecution of Gypsies in Europe."

CHAPTER TWO

[1] Hall, *Hard Road to Renewal* (see chap. 1, n. 75); Hart, *Disabling Globalization* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[2] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study" (see chap. 1, n. 8).
[3] Michel Foucault, "Nietzche, Genealogy, and History," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 76-100 (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1984).
[4] Bove, "Discourse" (see chap. 1, n. 53); Norman Fairclough, *Media Discourse* (London: Blackwell, 1995); Diane Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction* (Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1986); Richard Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985); Teun A. van Dijk, "The Interdisciplinary Study of News as Discourse," in *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*, ed. Klaus Bruhn Jensen and Nicholas W. Jankowski, 108-20 (London, Routledge, 1999).
[5] Gramsci, *Selections* (see chap. 1, n. 48).
[6] Klaus Bruhn Jensen, "Humanistic Scholarship as Qualitative Science: Contributions to Mass Communication Research," in *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*, ed. Klaus Bruhn Jensen and Nicholas W. Jankowski, 17-43 (London: Routledge, 1999).
[7] Burton, *Media and Society* (see chap. 1, n. 31).
[8] Jensen, "Humanistic Scholarship."
[9] Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse*; Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse*.
[10] van Dijk, "News as Discourse."
[11] Jensen, "Humanistic Scholarship."
[12] Foucault, *History of Sexuality* (see chap. 1, n. 52).
[13] Barrett, *The Politics of Truth* (see chap. 1, n. 50).
[14] Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse*.
[15] Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse*.
[16] Also see Fairclough, *Media Discourse*.
[17] Barrett, *The Politics of Truth*, 126; emphasis in the original.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans'" (see chap. 1, n. 61); Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (London: Tavistock, 1972).
[20] Joanna Richardson, "Talking about Gypsies: The Notion of Discourse as Control," *Housing Studies* 21 (1) (2006): 82.

[21] Michael J. Shapiro, *Language and Political Understanding: The Politics of Discursive Practices* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 130.
[22] Ibid., 146.
[23] Richardson, "Discourse as Control," 82.
[24] "We" here is used to denote a generalized common sense, rather than the academia only or the "we" from the self-other binary.
[25] Lyotard, *Postmodern Condition* (see chap. 1, n. 38).
[26] Also see Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence* (see chap. 1, n. 38).
[27] Bove, "Discourse."
[28] Terry Threadgold, E. A. Grosz, Gunther Kress, and M. A. K. Halliday, eds., *Semiotics, Ideology, Language* (Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, 1986), 29, quoted in Margery Fee, "Who Can Write as Other?," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2006), 171.
[29] Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse*.
[30] Jonathan D. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975), 5; emphasis added.
[31] Bove, "Discourse."
[32] Ranajit Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 6-7.
[33] Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence*, 12.
[34] Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony*, 11.
[35] Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence*.
[36] Fairclough, *Media Discourse*; Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (see chap. 1, n. 24).
[37] Wilson, *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence*, 10.
[38] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[39] Ibid.; also see Gunther Kress, "Ideological Structures in Discourse," in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Vol. 4. Discourse Analysis in Society*, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 27-42 (London: Academic Press, 1985).
[40] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[41] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[42] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*.
[43] Shapiro, *Language and Political Understanding*.
[44] Janet M. Cramer, "Woman as Citizen: Race, Class, and the Discourse of Women's Citizenship, 1894-1909," *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs* (1998).
[45] Shapiro, *Language and Political Understanding*, 152.
[46] John Mowitt, *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992).
[47] Bove, "Discourse."
[48] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 33.
[49] Bove, "Discourse."
[50] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*.
[51] Bhabha, *Location of Culture* (see chap. 1, n. 10).
[52] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[53] Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony*.
[54] See, for example, Burton, *Media and Society*, or Croteau and Hoynes, *Media/Society* (see chap. 1, n. 64).
[55] David Domke, "The Press and 'Delusive Theories of Equality and Fraternity' in the Age of Emancipation," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 228-50; Cramer, "Woman as Citizen"; Hall, "Rediscovery of 'Ideology'" (see chap. 1, n. 44).
[56] S. Elizabeth Bird and Robert W. Dardenne, "Myth, Chronicle, and Story: Exploring the Narrative Qualities of News," in *Media, Myths, and Narratives: Television and the Press*, ed. J. W. Carey, (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988), 69.

[57] Stuart Hall, "The Social Production of News," in *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and the Law and Order*, ed. Stuart Hall, Charles Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts (London: Macmillan), quoted in Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia" (see chap. 1, n. 2), 702.
[58] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia," 702.
[59] Ibid., 702-703.
[60] Ibid., 703; see also Teun A. van Dijk, *Racism and the Press* (London: Routledge, 1991).
[61] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia."
[62] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 96.
[63] Ibid., 97.
[64] Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (see chap. 1, n. 18); Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*; Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York, NY: Knopf, Inc., 1993).
[65] Also see Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[66] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*, 173.
[67] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans,'" 19.
[68] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*; Said, "Discrepant Experiences" (see chap. 1, n. 11); Edward Said, *Freud and the Non-European* (New York, NY: Verso, 2003); Said, *Orientalism* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[69] Said, "Discrepant Experiences," 28.
[70] Said, *Freud and the Non-European*, 24; emphasis in the original.
[71] Nouri Gana, "Of Contrapuntology: Said's Freud," *Theory & Event* 7 (2) (2004), http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.2gana.html (accessed on 2 October 2007).
[72] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 51.
[73] Bruce Robbins, Mary Louise Pratt, Jonathan Arac, R. Radhakrishnan, and Edward Said, "Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism*: A Symposium," *Social Text* 40 (1994): 11.
[74] Gramsci, *Selections*.
[75] Ibid., 244.
[76] Barrett, *The Politics of Truth*.
[77] Perry Anderson, "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci," *New Left Review* 100 (1977): 5-78.
[78] Gramsci, *Selections*, 5-6.
[79] Ibid., 32-33.
[80] Stuart Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity," in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 411-40 (London: Routledge, 1996).
[81] Gramsci, *Selections*, 332.
[82] Nadia Urbinati, "From the Periphery of Modernity: Antonio Gramsci's Theory of Subordination and Hegemony," *Political Theory* 26 (1998): 373.
[83] Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, ed. with Introduction Joseph A. Buttigieg, trans. Joseph A. Buttigieg and Antonio Callari, vol. 1 (New York: Columbia University Press., 1992), 12.
[84] James Curran, "Communications, Power and Social Order," in *Culture, Society and the Media*, ed. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 202-35 (London: Methuen, 1982).
[85] Gramsci, *Selections*, 10.
[86] Hristo Kyuchukov, "Transformative Education for Roma (Gypsy) Children: An Insider's View," *Intercultural education* 11 (3) (2000): 273-80.
[87] Chakrabarty, *Habitations of Modernity* (see chap. 1, n. 25), 34.
[88] Said, *Orientalism*.
[89] Michael Burawoy, "For a Sociological Marxism: The Complementary Convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi," *Politics & Society* 31 (2) (2003): 193-261.
[90] Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance," 417.
[91] Burawoy, "Sociological Marxism," 247.
[92] Ranajit Guha, "The Prose of Counter-Insurgency," in *Selected Subaltern Studies*, ed. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 45-86 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1988); Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason*; Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World* (London: Zed Books,

1986); Dipesh Chakrabarty, "A Small History of Subaltern Studies," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 467-85 (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000).
[93] Doty, *Imperial Encounters*.
[94] Burawoy, "Sociological Marxism."
[95] Guha, "Prose of Counter-Insurgency"; also see Burawoy, "Sociological Marxism"; Frederick Cooper, "Conflict and Connection: Rethinking Colonial African History," in *The Decolonization Reader*, ed. James D. Le Sueur, 23-44 (New York, NY: Routledge, 2003).
[96] Chakrabarty, "Small History."
[97] Chakrabarty, *Habitations of Modernity*, 35; emphases added.
[98] Cooper, "Conflict and Connection," 30.
[99] Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, "General Introduction," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 1-4. 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2006).
[100] Raka Shome and Radha S. Hegde, "Postcolonial Approaches to Communication: Charting the Terrain, Engaging the Intersections," *Communication Theory* 12 (3) (2002): 258.
[101] Ashcroft et al., "General Introduction," 2-3.
[102] Said, *Orientalism*; Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason*; Bhabha, *Location of Culture*. Also see Bart Moore-Gilbert, "Spivak and Bhabha," in *A companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 451-66 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005); Jenny Sharpe, "Postcolonial Studies in the House of US Multiculturalism," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 112-25 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
[103] Young, "Desiring Machine" (see chap. 1, n. 20), 74.
[104] Said, *Orientalism*, 95.
[105] Henry Schwarz, "Mission Impossible: Introducing Postcolonial Studies in the US Academy," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 1-20 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
[106] Ato Quayson, "Postcolonialism and Postmodernism," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 87-111 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
[107] Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain"; Quayson, "Postcolonialism and Postmodernism."
[108] Schwarz, "Mission Impossible," 4.
[109] Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain," 256-257.
[110] Cooper, "Conflict and Connection."
[111] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity* (see chap. 1, n. 13); Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy" (see chap. 1, n. 12).
[112] Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York, NY: Grove Press, 1963); Franz Fanon, *Black Skins, White Masks* (New York, NY: Grove Press, 1967).
[113] Brian A. Belton's own life experience and research emerge from this type of Gypsy narrative. See Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*, 138.
[114] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," 22; emphasis added.
[115] Young, "Desiring Machine," 78.
[116] Ibid., 90.
[117] Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*.
[118] Gregory, *Colonial Present* (see chap. 1, n. 21).
[119] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 67.
[120] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*.
[121] Derrida, *On Grammatology*; also see Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance."
[122] Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis* (New York, NY: Norton, 1978); Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, vol. 2. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983). Also see Bhabha, *Location of Culture*.
[123] Said, *Orientalism*.

[124] See Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire* (see chap. 1, n. 22); Mignolo, *Local Histories* (see chap. 1, n. 19); Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2003); Todorov, *Conquest of America* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[125] See, for instance, Schneider, *Psychology of Stereotyping* (see chap. 1, n. 17); Henri Tajfel, "Cognitive Aspects of Prejudice," *Journal of Social Issues* 25 (1969): 79-97.
[126] Barker, *Television, Globalization* (see chap. 1, n. 55); Stuart Hall, "New Ethnicities," in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 441-49 (London: Routledge, 1996); Stuart Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other,'" in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall, 223-90 (London: Sage Publications in association with The Open University, 1997); Mignolo, *Local Histories*; Said, *Orientalism*; Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain"; Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Ethics*. 2 vols. (New York, NY: Appleton, 1892).
[127] Said, *Orientalism*.
[128] Ibid., 10, 49.
[129] Ibid., 40.
[130] Todorov, *Conquest of America*.
[131] Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain," 175.
[132] Mignolo, *Local Histories*; Todorov, *Conquest of America*; Said, *Orientalism*; Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason*; David Spurr, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999). Also see Bahá'í International Community, Office of Public Information, (Wilmette, IL: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1989).
[133] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 83.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Gregory, *Colonial Present*, 18.
[136] Hall, "Spectacle of the 'Other.'"
[137] William B. Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim, *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication*. 4th ed. (New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 2003); Schneider, *Psychology of Stereotyping*; Tajfel, "Cognitive Aspects."
[138] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," 10.
[139] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 66.
[140] Angela McRobbie, *The Uses of Cultural Studies: A Textbook* (London: Sage, 2005).
[141] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 81-82.
[142] Spurr, *Rhetoric of Empire*.
[143] Young, "Desiring Machine."
[144] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*; Foucault, *History of Sexuality*.
[145] Hall, *Hard Road to Renewal*; Raymond Williams, *The Sociology of Culture* (New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1995).
[146] Fine, "Working the Hyphens."
[147] Hall, "Spectacle of the 'Other.'"
[148] Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*.
[149] Ibid., 328.
[150] Hall, "Spectacle of the 'Other,'" 237; emphasis added. Also see Bhabha, *Location of Culture*; Inayatullah and Blaney, *International Relations* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[151] Sinéad ní Shuinéar, "Why Do Gaujos Hate Gypsies So Much, Anyway?" in *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, ed. Thomas Acton (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997), 27; emphasis in the original.
[152] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[153] Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," *October* 28: *Discipleship: A special issue on psychoanalysis* (1984): 126.
[154] Ibid.
[155] Ibid., 133.

[156] Lacan, *Four Fundamental Concepts*, 99. Also see Homi Bhabha, "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1): *"Race," Writing, and Difference* (1985): 144-65.
[157] Cooper, "Conflict and Connection."
[158] Robbins, Pratt, Arac, Radhakrishnan, and Said, "A Symposium," 9.
[159] Ibid., 17; emphasis in the original.
[160] Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason*.
[161] Radhika Parameswaran, "Local Culture in Global Media: Excavating Colonial and Material Discourses in *National Geographic*," *Communication Theory* 12 (3) (2002): 287-315.
[162] Parameswaran, "Local Culture in Global Media," 311; Also see Raka Shome, "Caught in the Term 'Post-Colonial': Why the 'Post-Colonial' Still Matters," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 203-12; Hegde, "View from Elsewhere"; Vamsee Juluri, "Globalizing Audience Studies: The Audience and Its Landscape and Living Room Wars," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 85-90.
[163] Lawrence Grossberg, *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).
[164] Lawrence Grossberg, "The Ideology of Communication: Post-Structuralism and the Limits of Communication," *Man and World* 15 (1982): 84.
[165] Stephen B. Crofts Wiley, "Rethinking Nationality in the Context of Globalization," *Communication Theory* 14 (1) (2004): 82.
[166] Barker, *Television, Globalization*; Hall, "Spectacle of the 'Other'"; McRobbie, *Uses of Cultural Studies*; David J. Scholle, "Critical Studies: From the Theory of Ideology to Power / Knowledge," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 5 (1988): 16-41; John B. Thompson, *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990).
[167] Jensen, "Humanistic Scholarship," 19.
[168] Curran, "Communications, Power and Social Order."
[169] Jensen, "Humanistic Scholarship."
[170] Deconstruction is here used in Derrida's conception of the term, as a process of taking apart, undoing, and decomposing – see Jacques Derrida, "Letter to a Japanese Friend," in *Derrida and Différance*, ed. David Wood and Robert Bernasconi, 1-5 (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988), http://www.hydra.umn.edu/derrida/letter.html (accessed February 22, 2007). In this research, a deconstructive stance signifies a perpetual moment of interrogation of the assumed understandings and uses of the self-other – Gypsy-non-Gypsy – binary, of the concept of stereotype or media representation. Derrida does not intend deconstruction to connote negative resistance or contradiction for the sake of contradicting; rather, the French linguist uses deconstruction as a gesture of active investigation into the underpinnings and inner mechanisms of an "ensemble." Derrida further clarifies that deconstruction is not an analysis (with an intended outcome), a critique, or a method. It is, instead, a process occurring "everywhere … in our world, in modernity." It thus serves as a reflexive stance that this research adopts in order to explain the underpinnings and potential discursive transformations within media and NGO "talk."
[171] See Shome, "Caught in the Term."
[172] Parameswaran, "Local Culture in Global Media," 289.
[173] Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain"; Wiley, "Rethinking Nationality."
[174] See Gramsci, *Selections*; Hall, *Hard Road to Renewal*; Hart, *Disabling Globalization*.
[175] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*.
[176] Doty, *Imperial Encounters*.
[177] Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other.'"
[178] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*.
[179] Ibid., 67.
[180] Shome and Hegde, "Charting the Terrain," 262.
[181] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 67; emphasis in the original.
[182] See Cohn, *Gypsies* (see chap. 1, n. 3); Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity" (see chap. 1, n. 3); Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia"; Lemon, *Between Two Fires* (see chap. 1, n. 3).

[183] Parameswaran, "Local Culture in Global Media," 312.
[184] Ibid., 312; also see Fine, "Working the Hyphens."
[185] Said, *Orientalism*.
[186] Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 70-71.

CHAPTER THREE

[1] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy" (see chap. 1, n. 12).
[2] See Cohn, *Gypsies* (see chap. 1, n. 3).
[3] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity* (see chap. 1, n. 13), 4.
[4] See Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas" (see chap. 1, n. 8).
[5] Viorel Achim, *The Roma in Romanian History* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004).
[6] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study" (see chap. 1, n. 8).
[7] For instance, Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity" (see chap. 1, n. 3); Lemon, *Between Two Fires* (see chap. 1, n. 3); Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies* (see chap. 1, n. 12); Patrick Williams, *Gypsy World: The Silence of the Living and the Voices of the Dead* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2003).
[8] Cohn, *Gypsies*, 17.
[9] Ibid., 66, 68.
[10] Ibid., 68.
[11] Also see Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Said, *Orientalism* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[12] Anca Andrițoiu, e-mail message to the author, November 28, 2007.
[13] Adina Schneeweis and Brian Southwell, "Constructing 'the Disadvantaged Roma' Audience: Public Health Communication and Politics in Contemporary Romania," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May 21-25, 2009.
[14] Williams, *Gypsy World*.
[15] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy." Others identify Romany to draw from Sanskrit and from the living languages of Kashmiri, Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi and Nepali – see for instance François de Vaux de Foletier, "Their World Their Homeland – Gipsies," *UNESCO Courier*, October, 1984, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1310/is_200202/ai_3455603 (accessed December 17, 2007).
[16] de Vaux de Foletier, "Their World."
[17] Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb Grellmann, *Die Zigeuner: Ein historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge* (Göttingen: Johann Christian Dieterich, 1787), quoted in Radu P. Ioviță and Theodore G. Schurr, "Reconstructing the Origins and Migrations of Diasporic Populations: The Case of the European Gypsies" (*American Anthropologist* 106, 2004), 267.
[18] Gypsy Lore Society, The, http://www.gypsyloresociety.org/ (accessed December 10, 2007).
[19] Ioviță and Schurr, "Reconstructing the Origins"; Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar, eds., *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998).
[20] Donald Kenrick, *Gypsies: From the Ganges to the Thames* (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2004).
[21] Hancock, quoted in "Europe's Spectral Nation" (see chap. 1, n. 77).
[22] Kenrick, *Ganges to the Thames*.
[23] Ioviță and Schurr, "Reconstructing the Origins," 279.
[24] de Vaux de Foletier, "Their World."
[25] "Romii din România" ("The Roma in Romania"), Centrul de Documentare şi Informare despre Minoritățile din Europa de Sud-Est (CEDIMR-SE), http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/Romii_din_Romania.pdf (accessed November 26, 2007).
[26] "Multi-Ethnic States and the Protection of Minority Rights," United Nations, 2001, http://www.un.org/WCAR/e-kit/minority.htm (accessed December 10, 2007).

[27] Wim Willems, "Ethnicity as a Death Trap: The History of Gypsy Studies", in *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach*, ed. Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 19; also see Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[28] Zoltan Barany, "Orphans of Transition: Gypsies in Eastern Europe," *Journal of Democracy* 9 (3) (1998): 142-156, http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v009/9.3barany.html#REF1 (accessed November 21, 2007); Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[29] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[30] de Vaux de Foletier, "Their World."
[31] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," 4.
[32] Ibid., 4-5.
[33] Ibid., 5.
[34] Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire* (see chap. 1, n. 22).
[35] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[36] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (see chap. 1, n. 16), 19-20.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study," 478.
[39] Ibid.
[40] "Romii din România."
[41] Nicolae Gheorghe, "Originea Sclaviei Romilor în Principatele Române" ("The Origins of Roma Slavery in Romanian Principalities"), *Roma* 7 (1983), quoted in "Romii din România."
[42] Kenrick, *Gypsies: From the Ganges to the Thames*, 48.
[43] "Romii din România," 49.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Kenrick, *Gypsies: From the Ganges to the Thames*.
[47] "Romii din România."
[48] Ibid.; also see "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[49] Kenrick, *Gypsies: From the Ganges to the Thames*.
[50] Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism?" (see chap. 1, n. 27).
[51] Donald Kenrick and Sian Bakewell, *On the Verge: The Gypsies of England*, 2nd ed. (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1995), 12.
[52] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*.
[53] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*.
[54] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[55] Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire*.
[56] Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe*, trans. Edmund Howard (New York: Meridian, New American Library, 1975).
[57] See, for instance, Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[58] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism" (see chap. 1, n. 78). See A. L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England 1560-1640* (New York, NY: Methuen, 1985).
[59] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 18.
[60] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy."
[61] The General Association of Romanian Roma.
[62] *The Gypsy People*.
[63] *The Voice of the Roma*.
[64] The General Union of Roma in Romania.
[65] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism."
[66] François de Vaux de Foletier, *Le Monde des Tsiganes* (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1983).
[67] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*.
[68] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*.
[69] Ibid.

[70] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*, 128-130.
[71] Clark, "Counting Backwards" (see chap. 1, n. 76); "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[72] de Vaux de Foletier, *Monde des Tsiganes*.
[73] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 19. Also see Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[74] "Europe's Spectral Nation"; Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*, 189. Some recent court proceedings throughout Central and Eastern European countries seek to remedy this situation.
[75] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*.
[76] de Vaux de Foletier, *Monde des Tsiganes*.
[77] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[78] See, for example, Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*.
[79] de Vaux de Foletier, *Monde des Tsiganes*.
[80] Erika Schlager, "The Plight of the Roma in Eastern Europe: Free at Last?" *East European Studies Newsletter* 226 (2001), http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?topic_id=1422&fuseaction=topics.publications&doc_id=8548&group_id=7427 (accessed November 14, 2007).
[81] "Romii din România."
[82] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*, 194.
[83] Ibid., 195.
[84] Ibid., 199.
[85] Ibid., 195-199.
[86] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 17.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Kennington, *Documentary and Organisational Sources* (see chap. 1, n. 80).
[89] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space* (see chap. 1, n. 6).
[90] Ibid., 109.
[91] Ibid., 115.
[92] As are other minority populations, such as Hong Kong-born Chinese citizens.
[93] "Romii din România."
[94] Ivan Leudar and Jiří Nekvapil, "Presentations of Romanies in the Czech Media: On Category Work in Television Debates," *Discourse & Society* 11 (4) (2000): 487.
[95] "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[96] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study," 479.
[97] "Multi-Ethnic States."
[98] Margaret Brearley, *The Roma/Gypsies of Europe: A Persecuted People*, Institute for Jewish Policy Research, London, Research Report 3, December 1996; also see "Romii din România."
[99] Marek Kohn, *The Race Gallery: The Return of Racial Science* (London: Vintage, 1996), 200.
[100] Jonathan Fox, "Patterns of Discrimination, Grievances and Political Activity among Europe's Roma: A Cross-Sectional Analysis," *Journal of Ethno-Politics and Minority Issues in Europe* (2001/2), http://www.ecmi.de/jemie/download/Focus11-2001Fox.pdf.
[101] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 232.
[102] James F. Brown, *Grooves of Change: Eastern Europe at the Turn of the Millennium* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), 211; emphasis in the original.
[103] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 25.
[104] Sally Kendall, "Sites of Resistance: Places on the Margin – the Traveller 'Homeplace,'" in *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, ed. Thomas Acton (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997), 73-74.
[105] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 66.
[106] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*; Office of Public Sector Information, *Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994*, http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1994/ukpga_19940033_en_9#pt5-pb7-l1g79 (accessed November 25, 2008).
[107] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 66.

[108] Donald Kenrick, "Foreign Gypsies and British Immigration Law after 1945," in *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, ed. Thomas Acton, 100-10 (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997).
[109] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 21.
[110] ní Shuinéar, "Gaujos Hate Gypsies" (see chap. 2, n. 151), 52.
[111] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 22.
[112] In this context, family visits and events are further complicated, in which case Gypsies and Travellers cannot travel with their own caravan and are forced to visit in overcrowded spaces; see Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*, 43-44.
[113] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 22.
[114] Ibid., 23; emphases in the original.
[115] Kenrick, "Foreign Gypsies."
[116] Kendall, "Sites of Resistance."
[117] Ibid., 78.
[118] Fox, "Patterns of Discrimination."
[119] Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[120] Kohn, *Race Gallery*, 179.
[121] Chris Powell, "Time for Another Immoral panic? The Case of the Czechoslovak Gypsies," *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 2 (1994): 113.
[122] Kendall, "Sites of Resistance."
[123] For more information, see Gillborn's discussion of citizenship and ethnicity in David Gillborn, "Ethnicity and Educational Performance in the United Kingdom: Racism, Ethnicity, and Variability in Achievement," *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28 (3) (1997): 376.
[124] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*.
[125] Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[126] Ibid. Clark offers the example of Slovak Gypsies sometimes identifying themselves as Hungarian because of the locally perceived good standing of the Hungarian minority.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Kohn, *Race Gallery*.
[129] Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[130] See, for instance, European Roma Rights Centre, European Roma Rights Centre, "Recognising and Combating Racial Discrimination: A Short Guide," Pamphlets, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=372 (accessed March 26, 2009); European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights, Summer 1997: Romani Holocaust," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1997), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=8 (accessed March 26, 2009); Project on Ethnic Relations, "Romani Politics Present and Future," PER and the Roma, (2006), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/PER_Romani_Politics.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[131] "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[132] Barany, "Orphans of Transition."
[133] Recensământ (see chap. 1, n. 28).
[134] Liegeois and Gheorghe, "Roma/Gypsies" (see chap. 1, n. 76). Barany objects to this figure of 2,150,000, however, which he considers overstated and assesses the Gypsy minority to be around 1,000,000. See Barany, "Orphans of Transition."
[135] Barany, "Orphans of Transition."
[136] Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism?"
[137] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*; McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism."
[138] Pete Lawrence, "New Age Travellers," BBC Four Time Shift, August 2005, http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/documentaries/timeshift/travellers.shtml (accessed November 5, 2008).
[139] Kenrick, "Foreign Gypsies."
[140] Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism?" 144.
[141] Ibid., 148-149. See also, Council of Europe, Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention of the Protection of National Minorities, 2002, *Opinion on the United Kingdom*, Strasbourg.

[142] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*.
[143] "Romii din România."
[144] Ibid.; "Boyash," Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boyash (accessed November 26, 2007); Marduk, comment on "Tiganii Din Romania – Citeva Chestiuni, privind integrarea lor in societate" ("Gypsies in Romania – Some Issues concerning their integration in society"), Hanu Ancutei Forum, comment posted on October 3, 2007, http://www.hanuancutei.com/forum/content-page/2875/Tiganii-Din-Romania-Citeva-Chestiuni/page/1050/ (accessed November 26, 2007). The translations from Romanian are the author's.
[145] "Romii din România."
[146] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[147] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*, 203-207.
[148] Ibid., 210.
[149] Ibid., 211; emphasis in the original.
[150] Ibid., 217-218.
[151] Isabel Fonseca, *Bury Me Standing: The Gypsies and Their Journey* (New York, NY: Vintage Departures, 1996).
[152] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 13.
[153] Lemon writes about the Russian Gypsies that are the focus of her analysis; see Lemon, *Between Two Fires*, 3.
[154] Williams, *Gypsy World*, 75.
[155] Ibid., 46.
[156] Ibid., 85.
[157] Levinson and Sparkes, "Gypsy Children, Space" (see chap. 1, n. 29), 752.
[158] Mary E. Andereck, *Ethnic Awareness and the School: An Ethnographic Study* (London: Sage Publications).
[159] Levinson and Sparkes, "Gypsy Children, Space," 753.
[160] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*.
[161] The World Gypsy Community.
[162] The Tzigane / Gypsy International Committee.
[163] The Roma International Committee.
[164] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*, 72-74.
[165] Ibid., 74-75.
[166] Vermeersch, "Ethnic Mobilisation" (see chap. 1, n. 7).
[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[170] Vermeersch, "Ethnic Mobilisation," 86.
[171] Ibid.
[172] "Europe's Spectral Nation."
[173] Ibid.; also see "Romii din România."
[174] Elizabeth M. Zechenter, "In the Name of Culture: Cultural Relativism and the Abuse of the Individual," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53 (1997): 319-47.
[175] In Romanian, Partida Romilor Social Democrată din România.
[176] The Romanian Parliament is composed of two chambers, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Other NGOs more active on Roma issues are the Project on Ethnic Relations, the European Roma Rights Centre, the International Roma Union, the European Roma Information Office, the European Roma Rights Centre, and the European Committee on Romani Emancipation. A local NGO still operating in Romania is, for example, Romani CRISS, which fights against Gypsy discrimination in public life (including education, employment, housing, and health), works for protection of Gypsy human rights, and offers legal support (see Romani CRISS, http://www.romanicriss.org/, accessed November 21, 2007).
[177] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 245.
[178] Vermeersch, "Ethnic Mobilisation."

[179] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*.
[180] Lemon, "Telling Gypsy Exile" (see chap. 1, n. 3), 38-39.
[181] "Europe's Spectral Nation"; also see Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[182] Achim, *Roma in Romanian History*, 216; also see Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[183] Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas."
[184] Martin Kovats, "Opportunities and Challenges: EU Enlargements and the Roma / Gypsy Diaspora," Open Society Institute's EU Monitoring and Advocacy Program, 2001, http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2001/nov/romadiaspora (accessed November 14, 2007). Also see Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[185] Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity."
[186] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[187] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*; "Europe's Spectral Nation"; Gross "Prolegomena to the Study."
[188] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[189] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 1. Also see Sam Beck, "The Origins of Gypsy Slavery in Romania," *Dialectical Anthropology* 14 (1) (1989): 53-61.
[190] Libor Stepanek, "Minorities in Europe – the Divergence of Law and Policy," Eumap.org (2002), http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2002/jan02/minorities (accessed November 19, 2007).
[191] Himadeep Muppidi, *The Politics of the Global* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 20.
[192] Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study."
[193] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia" (see chap. 1, n. 2).
[194] Richardson, "Discourse as Control" (see chap. 2, n. 20), 78.
[195] Colin Clark, "'New Age' Travellers: Identity, Sedentarism and Social Security," in *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, ed. Thomas Acton (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997), 126.
[196] Clark, "Counting Backwards."
[197] Dina Iordanova, *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture and the Media* (London: British Film Institute, 2001), 1.
[198] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness," 197.
[199] Cohn, *Gypsies*; Csepeli and Simon, "Construction of Roma Identity"; Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia"; Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism."
[200] Cohn, *Gypsies*.
[201] Ian Hancock, "Non-Gypsy Attitudes towards Rom: The Gypsy Stereotype," *Roma* 9 (1) (1985): 50-65; Ian Hancock, *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution* (Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc., 1987).
[202] Clark, "Identity, Sedentarism and Social Security," 136.
[203] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*, 23-26.
[204] Clark, "Identity, Sedentarism and Social Security," 136.
[205] Kenrick and Bakewell, *On the Verge*, 22.
[206] Barany, "Orphans of Transition."
[207] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness," 198.
[208] Ibid., 198-199.
[209] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," 1; Cohn, *Gypsies*; Lemon, *Between Two Fires*.
[210] See, for instance, most famously Victor Hugo's novel *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Georges Bizet's opera *Carmen*, the 2000 American film *Chocolat*, or Serbian director Emir Kusturica's 1988 *Time of the Gypsies* and 1998 *Black Cat, White Cat*, Tony Gatlif's 1992 *Latcho Drom*, or the 1998 French-Canadian musical *Notre-Dame de Paris*.
[211] As in the contemporary reproductions of Victor Hugo's novel *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame* – as is, for instance, the 1998 French-Canadian musical *Notre-Dame de Paris*.
[212] Kendall, "Sites of Resistance," 74.
[213] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*, 38-39. Such descriptors apply to traditional communities.

[214] Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy," 2, 4.
[215] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*.
[216] Tony Gatlif, *Latcho Drom*, 103 min., Michèle Ray-Gavras, 1993. Translated in French as Bonne Route, and in English as Safe Journey. *Latcho Drom* received special distinction at the International Film Festival in Cannes in 1993 and at the National Society of Film Critics in 1995. Also see Tony Gatlif, *Latcho Drom (1993)*, http://movies2.nytimes.com/gst/movies/movie .html?v_id=148396 (2005) (accessed on 28 January 2007).
[217] Gatlif, *Latcho Drom*. Also see an analysis of *Latcho Drom* in Adina Schneeweis, "Difference in Cross-Cultural Perspective: Framing Roma and Non-Roma in Film" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Francisco, CA, August 2-5, 2006).
[218] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*, 71.
[219] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 7.
[220] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness."
[221] Kohn, *Race Gallery*.
[222] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness."
[223] Ibid.
[224] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 9; also see Lemon, *Between Two Fires*.
[225] Crowe, "Muslim Roma" (see chap. 1, n. 3), 116.
[226] Lemon, "Telling Gypsy Exile," 43.
[227] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*.
[228] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness," 187.
[229] One of the Gypsy groups currently living in Britain.
[230] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 8.
[231] Leudar and Nekvapil, "Romanies in the Czech media," 488-490.
[232] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*, 202.
[233] Richardson, "Discourse as Control," 78.
[234] Ibid.
[235] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*.
[236] Ibid., 69.
[237] For more specific details, see Lemon's Russian examples in *Between Two Fires*, or Csepeli and Simon's analysis of Eastern and Central Europe prejudice and media imagery, in "Construction of Roma Identity."
[238] Richardson, "Discourse as Control."
[239] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*, 78; emphasis in the original.
[240] McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism," 9.
[241] Ibid., 8.
[242] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness," 197.
[243] Cohn's ethnography identifies some examples such as the fact that non-Gypsies are home-visited only for business, sexual relationships are limited to intra-group members, and fortune-telling is practiced only for non-Gypsies, and never for a Gypsy (see Cohn, *Gypsies*).
[244] Kendall, "Sites of Resistance," 75.
[245] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, 5; emphasis added.
[246] Ibid., 17.
[247] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*, 6.
[248] Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*.
[249] See Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (see chap. 1, n. 125); Hall, "Spectacle of the 'Other'" (see chap. 2, n. 126); Bhabha, *Location of Culture* (see chap. 1, n. 10); Inayatullah and Blaney, *International Relations* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[250] See Stewart, *Time of the Gypsies*, for a fuller analysis of these inversions. One example is the Gypsy reinterpretation of dominant social hierarchies into egalitarian relationships and mutual respect within the Gypsy communities – as a result of living in a stance of siege and oppression by the Gadzo, but also as reaction to the Gadzo living themselves with hierarchy.
[251] Lemon, *Between Two Fires*; Williams, *Gypsy World*.

[252] Williams, *Gypsy World*, 47.
[253] Ibid., 52.
[254] Ibid., 75.
[255] Kenrick and Puxon, *Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*; McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism"; Richardson, "Discourse as Control."

CHAPTER FOUR

[1] Marc Howard Ross and Elizabeth L. Homer, "Galton's Problem in Cross-National Research," *World Politics* 29 (1) (1976): 1-28.
[2] Lemon, for instance, notes in her analysis the overlap of the discourse of blackness with that of "Gypsiness," without, however, explicating the potential diffusion of the discourse of difference across cultural and national spaces. For more details, see Lemon, *Between Two Fires* (see chap. 1, n. 3).
[3] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (see chap. 1, n. 10), 70.
[4] Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse* (see chap. 2, n. 4); Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse* (see chap. 2, n. 4).
[5] Bove, "Discourse" (see chap. 1, n. 53).
[6] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge* (see chap. 2, n. 19).
[7] Shapiro, *Language and Political Understanding* (see chap. 2, n. 21), 155.
[8] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans'" (see chap. 1, n. 59).
[9] Neta C. Crawford, "Understanding Discourse: A Method of Ethical Argument Analysis," *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004), 22.
[10] Yoshiko M. Herrera and Bear F. Braumoeller, "Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis," *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004): 19.
[11] Cynthia Hardy, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips, "Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?" *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004): 19-22.
[12] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge*; also see Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (see chap. 1, n. 24), 55-61.
[13] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Burton, *Media and Society* (see chap. 1, n. 31); Croteau and Hoynes, *Media/Society* (see chap. 1, n. 64); Fowler, *Language in the News* (see chap. 1, n. 33).
[16] Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse*; Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse*; van Dijk, "News as Discourse" (see chap. 1, n. 4).
[17] Richardson, "Discourse as Control" (see chap. 2, n. 20), 82.
[18] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans,'" 113.
[19] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia" (see chap. 1, n. 2), 704.
[20] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 73-78.
[21] See Burton, *Media and Society*; Croteau and Hoynes, *Media/Society*.
[22] "Ţiganii din Grajduri-Iaşi Au Bătut un Echipaj de Deszăpezire" ("The Gypsies of Grajduri-Iaşi Beat Up a Snowplowing Crew"), *Adevărul*, 7 January 2002, http://www.adevarul.ro/index.php?section=articole&screen=index&id=3616&search=tigani (accessed March 2, 2007).
[23] See, for instance, "14 Ţigani din Orbic-Buhuşi Au Devastate o Pădure" ("14 Gypsies of Orbic-Buhuşi Pillaged a Forest"), *Adevărul*, 8 January 2002, http://www.adevarul.ro/index.php?section=articole&screen=index&id=3672&search=tigani (accessed March 2, 2007).
[24] "Gypsy Fellow Travellers," *The Times*, 11 September 2005, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/rod_liddle/article565143.ece (accessed March 2, 2007); emphasis added.
[25] Ibid.

[26] Adina Schneeweis, "Textual and Visual Representations of US Hegemony in a US Film Broadcast on Romanian Public Television," *Journal of Visual Literacy* 25 (1) (2005), 85.
[27] John Fiske, *Introduction to Communication Studies* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1990), 68-70.
[28] Ibid., 101-3.
[29] van Dijk, "News as Discourse," 111.
[30] Burton, *Media and Society*.
[31] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[32] Bird and Dardenne, "Myth, Chronicle, and Story" (see chap. 2, n. 56).
[33] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, 97.
[34] "Out of the Grill Pan," *The Times*, 4 July 2003, Times2, 13.
[35] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*.
[36] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans,'" 114.
[37] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*.
[38] Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972), 9.
[39] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space* (see chap. 1, n. 6); David Gillborn, "Educational Performance" (see chap. 3, n. 123).
[40] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space*.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] "Ţigani sau Rromi, Periferie sau Şcolarizare" ("Gypsies or Roma, Periphery or Education"), *Ziua*, 18 October 2001, Editorial, http://www.ziua.ro/display.php?data=2001-10-18&id=74175 (accessed November 28, 2007).
[44] See European Union Constitution, http://ec.europa.eu/ireland/general_information/constitution/index_en.htm (accessed March 29, 2007).
[45] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[46] Both newspapers are produced in England, even while distributed across the UK. Niner writes that, within the UK, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Wales have taken different legislative and administrative approaches to the Gypsy populations. See Niner, "Accommodating Nomadism?" (see chap. 1, n. 27).
[47] See Martin and Hansen, *Newspapers of Record*. However, the terminology of newspaper of record is less common in Romanian media.
[48] See, for instance, Mignolo, *Local Histories* (see chap. 1, n. 19).
[49] Shannon E. Martin and Kathleen A. Hansen, *Newspapers of Record in a Digital Age: From Hot Type to Hot Link* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 5-6.
[50] Martin and Hansen, *Newspapers of Record*; Winfield et al., "History as the Metaphor" (see chap. 1, n. 31).
[51] Shannon E. Martin and David A. Copeland, eds., *The Function of Newspapers on Society: A Global Perspective* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003).
[52] See Shapiro, *Language and Political Understanding*, 140.
[53] "Ranajit Guha on Elitist Historiography – An Analysis," Wond'ring Aloud... Blog, February 1, 2007, https://risenphoenix.wordpress.com/2007/02/01/ranajit-guha-on-elitist-historiography-an-analysis/ (accessed December 31, 2007).
[54] Winfield et al., "History as the Metaphor."
[55] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[56] *The Times* Circulation, http://www.timesmediaadvertising.com/key-facts/ circulation/the-times.aspx (accessed December 26, 2006).
[57] Dell'Orto, "'We Are All Americans.'"
[58] "History of *the Guardian*," *The Guardian*, http://www.guardian.co.uk/information/theguardian/story/0,,1038110,00.html (accessed January 24, 2008).
[59] *The Guardian* Circulation and Readership, http://adinfo-guardian.co.uk/the-guardian/guardian-circulation-and-readership.shtml (accessed December 26, 2006).

[60] BRAT: Biroul Român de Audit al Tirajelor (Romanian Audit Bureau of Circulations), http://www.brat.ro/ (accessed December 26, 2006).
[61] Mirel Bran, "Romania: Computer-Generated Freedom," February, 2000, http://www.unesco.org/courier/2000_02/uk/dossier/txt12.htm (accessed December 26, 2006).
[62] In the Lexis Nexis search system, the "wildcard" "!" signifies filling in any number of letters. For example, "gyps!" yields results that contain the words "gypsy," "gypsies," and "gypsyville." Adding the wildcard "*" one time after a word yields results that add one more letter to the introduced word. The search term "traveller*" identifies articles including both "traveller" and "travellers."
[63] Jo Ellen Stryker, Ricardo Wray, Robert C. Hornik, and Itzik Yanovitzky, "Validation of On-line Search Terms for Content Analysis: The Case of Cancer News Coverage," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, NY, May, 2005, 8.
[64] James Dalrymple, "Downfall of a Duchess," *The Times*, August 23, 1992, Features, Sunday edition.
[65] That is, "Romanian," as adjective, adverb, and noun (referring to a Romanian person).
[66] As argued earlier, Gypsy activism favors and promotes "Roma" as the politically correct term for Gypsy groups. When referring to Gypsy activism, therefore, this dissertation uses the joined terminology of "Gypsy / Roma."
[67] Fox, "Patterns of Discrimination" (see chap. 3, n. 100); Gross, "Prolegomena to the Study" (see chap. 1, n. 8).
[68] Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas."
[69] The Project on Ethnic Relations, http://www.per-usa.org/brochure.htm (accessed January 23, 2007).
[70] European Roma Information Office, http://www.erionet.org/ (accessed February 7, 2008).
[71] Ibid.
[72] European Roma Rights Centre, http://www.errc.org/ (accessed February 7, 2008).
[73] European Roma Rights Centre, "What is the European Roma Rights Centre?" http://www.errc.org/About_index.php (accessed February 7, 2008).
[74] European Roma and Travellers Forum, "Short Presentation of the European Roma and Travellers Forum," http://www.ertf.org/en/short.html (accessed February 7, 2008).
[75] European Committee on Romani Emancipation, "Legal Structure of the European Committee on Romani Emancipation," http://www.eu-romani.org/legal.html (accessed February 7, 2008).
[76] European Committee on Romani Emancipation, "About ECRE," http://www.eu-romani.org/ecre.htm (accessed February 7, 2008).
[77] The Project on Ethnic Relations, http://www.per-usa.org/brochure.htm (accessed January 23, 2007).

CHAPTER FIVE

[1] *Adevărul* under the name *Scînteia*, that is, *The Spark*.
[2] "Un miting al ţiganilor," *România Liberă*, 18 January 1990, 3; "Apel al tiganilor nomazi," *România Liberă*, 28 January 1990, 3.
[3] "Şi copiii de ţigani au nevoie de afecţiune," *România Liberă*, 28 January 1990, 3.
[4] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness" (see chap. 1, n. 3).
[5] "Feriţi-vă buzunarele!," *Adevărul*, 25 January 1990, 3.
[6] "De necrezut!," *Adevărul*, 25 January 1990, 3; "Găinarii din Chirnogi," *Adevărul*, 15 February 1990, 5.
[7] In the article, the outcome of the conflict was not explicated.
[8] "Diary," *The Guardian*, 27 February 1990.
[9] "Big-spending Tory councils threatened by poll tax penalty," *The Times*, 29 January 1990, 6.
[10] "Stays of execution," *The Sunday Times*, 14 January 1990, H5.
[11] "Confessions of a lobby correspondent," *The Sunday Times*, 14 January 1990, C5.
[12] "Şi copiii de ţigani au nevoie de afecţiune," *România Liberă*, 28 January 1990, 3.
[13] Erjavec, "Case of Slovenia" (see chap. 1, n. 2); Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (see chap. 2, n. 122); Spurr, *Rhetoric of Empire* (see chap. 2, n. 132).
[14] "Feriţi-vă buzunarele!," *Adevărul*, 25 January 1990, 3.
[15] "Aruncat în fîntînă," *Adevărul*, 17 February 1990, 5.

[16] "Bişniţa, paşapoartele şi ajutoarele internaţionale," *Adevărul*, 17 January 1990, 1; "N-aveţi un bilet în plus?" *Adevărul*, 22 February 1990, 5; "Democraţia şi ordinea," *România Liberă*, 26 January 1990, 3.
[17] "Un miting al ţiganilor," *România Liberă*, 18 January 1990, 3.
[18] "Sakharov's brain under the microscope," *The Times*, 8 February 1990, 8.
[19] "Fresh horrors haunt a troubled land," *The Sunday Times*, 25 February 1990, C5.
[20] "PC tells of 'orchestrated abuse,'" *The Guardian*, 15 February 1990, 4.
[21] According to the 2002 Census, the Hungarian minority is second largest (after the Romanian majority), followed by the Gypsies and the Ukrainians – then the Germans, the Russian-Lipovenian, the Turks, the Tartars, the Serbian, the Slovakians, the Bulgarians, the Croats, the Greeks, the Jews, the Czechs, the Poles, the Italians, the Chinese, the Armenians, and the Csangas. "Population by Ethnic Groups at Population and Housing Census, on March 18, 2002," National Institute of Statistics, http://www.insse.ro/cms/files%5Cstatistici%5CStatistici_teritoriale2007%5Ceng%5C4.htm (accessed October 6, 2008).
[22] "De prudentia – marginalii la legea electorală," *România Liberă*, 2 February 1990.
[23] "Ward yields secret of infant AIDS," *The Guardian*, 5 February 1990, 22.
[24] Ibid.
[25] "Apel al tiganilor nomazi," *România Liberă*, 28 January 1990, 3.
[26] "Despre răpirea copiilor," *Adevărul*, 18 February 1990, 1, 3.
[27] "Apel al tiganilor nomazi," *România Liberă*, 28 January 1990, 3.
[28] "Old canker eating at new freedom," *The Times*, 10 January 1990, 12.
[29] "Despre răpirea copiilor," *Adevărul*, 18 February 1990, 1, 3.
[30] "Stays of execution," *The Sunday Times*, 14 January 1990, H5.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Cohen, *Folk Devils* (see chap. 4, n. 38), 9.
[33] "Citizens of Rostock applaud neo-Nazis," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 9.
[34] "Ţiganii cerşetori," *Adevărul*, 21 September 1992, 1, 3.
[35] "A leader who disregards evil," *The Times*, 1 October 1992.
[36] "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[37] The implications of discursively collapsing Gypsies with other social deviants are discussed below.
[38] "Heads roll as the axeman commeth," *The Guardian*, 12 October 1992, 11.
[39] "Deeply divided the Tories stand," *The Guardian*, 10 October 1992, 23.
[40] "Patronul loveşte cu sabia," *România Liberă*, 17 September 1992, 2.
[41] "Poliţia îşi continuă raidurile prin pieţe," *Adevărul*, 30 October 1992, 1.
[42] "Paseri călătoare revin din Germania," *Adevărul*, 21 October 1992, 1.
[43] "Police battle racist mob in fifth night of Rostock riots," *The Times*, 27 August 1992.
[44] "Out of the woods, a gnome is where the heart is," *The Guardian*, 15 August 1992, 23.
[45] "Şocul postcomunismului," *România Liberă*, 18 September 1992, 7.
[46] "Travellers' rights," *The Times*, 3 August 1992, Features.
[47] "Have food, will travel," *The Times*, 2 August 1992; emphases added.
[48] Robert Gooding-Williams, "Black Neo-Conservatism: A Critical Introduction," *Praxis International* 2 (1987): 133-142.
[49] "Gypsies attack camping curb as charter for persecution," *The Times*, 19 August 1992, 2.
[50] "Travellers face festival curb," *The Guardian*, 11 August 1992, 3.
[51] Ibid; "Creating harmony at festivals," *The Guardian*, 17 August 1992, 22; "How defiant gyro hippies milk system for cash on the hoof," *The Times*, 2 August 1992, 2; "Tarzan called in to hack away the red-tape jungle," *The Times*, 10 October 1992, 6; "The miners are the latest beneficiaries of the British love of the underdog," *The Times*, 22 October 1992, 20; "A slap for Travellers," *The Times*, 23 October 1992, Features.
[52] "Rapping and raving in the rain," *The Times*, 24 August 1992, Features.
[53] "Romania hopes poll will kill communism," *The Times*, 25 September 1992, 10; "Hatred of gypsies lurks beneath Romania's surface calm," *The Times*, 30 September 1992, 10.
[54] "Lilley targets 'scroungers,'" *The Times*, 8 October 1992, 8.

[55] "Păduri jefuite chiar de pădurari," *Adevărul*, 22/23 August 1992, 1, 3.
[56] "Cetățenii saltă dughenele," *Adevărul*, 7 September 1992, 3.
[57] "Hampshire braced for invasion by travellers," *The Times*, 7 August 1992, 2; "Police negotiate with New Age travellers in Hampshire," *The Sunday Times*, 9 August 1992; "Police move in on travellers after £1m fire," *The Guardian*, 10 August 1992, 3; "Citizens of Rostock applaud neo-Nazis," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 9.
[58] "Deeply divided the Tories stand," *The Guardian*, 10 October 1992, 23.
[59] "Cheers as neo-Nazis set refugee hostel ablaze," *The Guardian*, 25 August 1992, 8; "Remorse and recriminations after riot," *The Guardian*, 26 August 1992, 16; "Citizens of Rostock applaud neo-Nazis," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 9; "Echoes of Nazism," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 11; "Racist local heroes," *The Guardian*, 28 August 1992, 23; "German youths show little remorse over racist attacks," *The Times*, 17 September 1992, Overseas news.
[60] "Neo-Nazis' siren of hatred summons support across German spectrum," *The Times*, 28 August 1992, 10; "Majoritatea germanilor aprobă sloganurile xenofobe," *Adevărul*, 12 September 1992, 8; "Xenofobia – 'o rușine pentru Germania," *Adevărul*, 5 October 1992, 1; "Sărbătorirea unificării Germaniei umbrită de incidente," *România Liberă*, 5 October 1992, 1.
[61] "Kohl dithers as fires of race hate flare," *The Times*, 30 August 1992, 1, 10.
[62] "Neo-Nazis' siren of hatred summons support across German spectrum," *The Times*, 28 August 1992, 10; emphasis added.
[63] "Citizens of Rostock applaud neo-Nazis," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 9; emphasis added.
[64] Ibid; emphasis added.
[65] "Berlin asylum-seekers will fight repatriation," *The Guardian*, 30 September 1992, 6; "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[66] "Major denounces Maastricht 'myths,'" *The Guardian*, 10 October 1992, 6; "Tarzan called in to hack away the red-tape jungle," *The Times*, 10 October 1992, 6.
[67] "Violent homecoming awaits Romanian Gypsies," *The Guardian*, 30 September 1992, 6.
[68] "Hatred of gypsies lurks beneath Romania's surface calm," *The Times*, 30 September 1992, Overseas news.
[69] "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[70] "Witchcraft's potent brew for new religion," *The Guardian*, 29 August 1992, 22.
[71] "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[72] "Having a whale of a time – but I feel stranded," *The Times*, 17 September 1992, Features.
[73] "A home to go to," *The Guardian*, 19 August 1992, 16; "The good, the bad and the abnormal," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 32; "Heads roll as the axeman cometh," *The Guardian*, 12 October 1992, 11.
[74] Ion Iliescu has been accused of Communist allegiance in his political views and is currently under investigation of potential abuses of power while being a President.
[75] "Violent homecoming awaits Romanian Gypsies," *The Guardian*, 30 September 1992, 6; "Berlin asylum-seekers will fight repatriation," *The Guardian*, 30 September 1992, 6; "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[76] "Noi violențe rasiste," *România Liberă*, 5 / 6 September 1992, 10.
[77] "Parlament European al romilor," *România Liberă*, 31 August 1992, 6.
[78] "New Age health centre provokes clash of cultures," *The Sunday Times,* 2 August 1992, Home news.
[79] "Operația 'repatrierea țiganilor,'" *Adevărul*, 31 October / 1 November 1992, 1; "Mâine începe repatrierea imigranților români ilegali din Germania," 31 October / 1 November 1992, 8.
[80] "Homeless, stateless – genuine enough?," *The Guardian*, 25 October 1997, 3.
[81] "Gypsies flood into Britain in asylum quest," *The Sunday Times*, 19 October 1997, 8; "EU treaty blamed for Gypsy influx," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 1; "Romany roles," *The Times*, 21 October 1997; "Parents protest at influx of Slovak pupils," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 10; "The asylum trap," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 21; "Britain will reject you, Gypsies told," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 4; "Czechs lectured by Cook on gypsy 'asylum,'" *The Times*, 28 October 1997, 16; "Gypsies told to stay indoors during march," *The Times*, 15 November 1997, 2.
[82] "Gypsy malady," *The Guardian*, 20 November 1997, 2-3.

[83] Translated by *The Times* as *With Your Own Eyes* ("'Tourists' who take the bus to a new life," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 11) and by *The Guardian* as *Through Your Eyes* ("Canadian vision leads Czech Gypsies astray," *The Guardian*, 14 August 1997, 10).
[84] "Canadian vision leads Czech Gypsies astray," *The Guardian*, 14 August 1997, 10.
[85] "Authorities count cost of providing for the refugees," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 10.
[86] A series of articles on fortune telling featured in the early part of August, prompted by Princess Diana's visit to a popular Londoner medium of Romany origin. Political analysts used this topic to offer commentary and critique of political figures.
[87] "Gypsies flood into Britain in asylum quest," *The Sunday Times*, 19 October 1997, 8; emphasis added.
[88] "Parents protest at influx of Slovak pupils," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 10; emphasis added.
[89] "'Tourists' who take the bus to a new life," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 11.
[90] "Watching brief," *The Guardian*, 17 November 1997, 20.
[91] "Gypsy family clutches as paper hopes," *The Times*, 24 October 1997, 10.
[92] Ibid.
[93] "Slovak embassy appeals to gypsies," *The Guardian*, 22 October 1997, 6; emphases added.
[94] "NOT RACIST," *The Times*, 2 November 1997, 8.
[95] "Britain will reject you, Gypsies told," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 4; "Appeal time is cut for bogus refugees," *The Times*, 28 October 1997, 1.
[96] "With reference to refugees," *The Guardian*, 25 October 1997, 22.
[97] "Monarchy and melancholia," *The Guardian*, 21 November 1997, 18.
[98] "Gypsy malady," *The Guardian*, 20 November 1997, 2-3.
[99] "Appeal time is cut for bogus refugees," *The Times*, 28 October 1997, 1.
[100] "Attention all shipping," *The Times*, 14 November 1997, 23.
[101] "The asylum trap," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 21.
[102] "Losers and winners wait for their fate," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 4.
[103] "On the rocky roads of Romany," *The Guardian*, 20 November 1997, 7.
[104] "Tide of Gypsy asylum-seekers ebbs," *The Guardian*, 20 October 1997, 5; "Dover overwhelmed by asylum-seekers," *The Times*, 20 October 1997, 1; "Parents protest at influx of Slovak pupils," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 10.
[105] "Gypsies on the road," *The Guardian*, 22 October 1997, 16.
[106] "A clear case of discrimination," *The Guardian*, 21 October 1997, 12.
[107] "Homeless, stateless – genuine enough?," *The Guardian*, 25 October 1997, 3.
[108] Ibid.; emphases added.
[109] "Sweden regrets its eugenic past," *The Guardian*, 26 August 1997, 7; "Austria 'sterilises mentally handicapped women,'" 28 August 1997, 9.
[110] "Strangers in their own land," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 18.
[111] "Czechs grapple with Romanies' failed flight," *The Guardian*, 20 August 1997, 3.
[112] "Philip Howard column," *The Times*, 24 October 1997, Features.
[113] "Long journey in search for a better life," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 10.
[114] "Gypsy malady," *The Guardian*, 20 November 1997, 2-3.
[115] "EU treaty blamed for Gypsy influx," *The Times*, 21 October 1997, 1.
[116] "Britain's little refugee problem," *The Guardian*, 22 October 1997, 15.
[117] Ibid.
[118] "Losers and winners wait for their fate," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 4; emphasis added.
[119] The analysis included only *Adevărul* press articles for this time period.
[120] See, for instance, "Rromii vor un loc separat în care să se închine moaştelor Sfintei Paraschiva," *Adevărul*, 5 October 2001, 7; "Palate de milioane de dolari, goale pe dinăuntru," *Adevărul*, 17 October 2001, 1, 9.
[121] "Oamenii grotelor de la Ocan Sibiului," *Adevărul*, 20 / 21 October 2001, 1, 12.
[122] "Negri la faţă," *Adevărul*, 12 October 2001, 1.
[123] "Rromii vor reintra în posesia a 300 kilograme de aur," *Adevărul*, 7 November 2001, 1.
[124] "Palate de milioane de dolari, goale pe dinăuntru," *Adevărul*, 17 October 2001, 1, 9.

[125] "Un palat țigănesc construit ilegal e dat jos cu picamerele," *Adevărul*, 12 October 2001, 1, 6 ; emphasis added.
[126] See, for instance, "Primăria Sectorului 4 a dat foc unei colonii de țigani," *Adevărul*, 23 October 2001, 3.
[127] "Negri la față," *Adevărul*, 12 October 2001, 1.
[128] "Țiganii din Piatra Neamț vor locui într-un cartier dotat după 'standarde europene,'" *Adevărul*, 11 October 2001, 1, 14.
[129] Bancroft, *Modernity, Race, Space* (see chap. 1, n. 6).
[130] "Construirea cartierelor speciale pentru romi – 'unwise,'" *Adevărul*, 15 October 2001, 1; "Adrian Năstase glosează pe tema țigănimii," *Adevărul*, 15 October 2001, 15.
[131] Cioroianu, "Țigani sau Rromi" (see chap. 4, n. 43).
[132] "Cartiere pentru țigani la Deva şi Baia Mare," *Adevărul*, 13 / 14 October 2001, 1, 12.
[133] "Rasism instituționalizat la Piatra Neamț?," http://www.divers.ro/focus_ro?func=viewSubmission&sid=4074&wid=37452.
[134] "Cartierul 'Speranța', bătaia de joc a țiganilor," *Evenimentul*, 25 March 2005, http://www.evenimentul.ro/articol/cartierul-speranta-bataia-de.html.
[135] "Țigani de lux şi second hand," *Adevărul*, 15 October 2001, 1, 15.
[136] "Cărămizi contrafăcute la groapa de gunoi Giuleşti-Sârbi," *Adevărul*, 5 September 2001, 7. "Rromii vor un loc separat în care să se închine moaştelor Sfintei Paraschiva," *Adevărul*, 5 October 2001, 7; "Romii din Bărbuleşti cer post de poliție," *Adevărul*, 21 November 2001, 10.
[137] "Palate de milioane de dolari, goale pe dinăuntru," *Adevărul*, 17 October 2001, 1, 9.
[138] "Un palat țigănesc construit ilegal e dat jos cu picamerele," *Adevărul*, 12 October 2001, 1, 6; "Mascații i-au scos pe cei care se baricadaseră în palatul cu turnulețe," *Adevărul*, 17 October 2001, 15.
[139] "Țiganii i-au sfâşiat cu dinții urechea unui şofer," *Adevărul*, 23 October 2001, 16.
[140] "Țiganii au reocupat în forță palatul cu turnulețe, din Timişoara," *Adevărul*, 16 October 2001, 16.
[141] "Mascații i-au scos pe cei care se baricadaseră în palatul cu turnulețe," *Adevărul*, 17 October 2001, 15.
[142] "Țiganii din Piatra Neamț vor locui într-un cartier dotat după 'standarde europene,'" *Adevărul*, 11 October 2001, 1, 14.
[143] "Țigani de lux şi second hand," *Adevărul*, 15 October 2001, 1, 15. The translation of these adjectives is quite literal and loses the jargon-feel of the Romanian words, which are a mix of Romany-borrowed terms and Romanian colloquialisms.
[144] Ibid.
[145] "Viitoarea Constituție Europeană – în faza finală," *Adevărul*, 13 June 2003, 13; "Viitoarea Constituție Europeană va include o referire specială la Romania şi Bulgaria," *Adevărul*, 14 June 2003, 12.
[146] "Liderii Europei celor 25 se întrunesc în format complet la Consiliul European de la Salonic," *Adevărul*, 20 June 2003, 13.
[147] "Liderii UE au aprobat proiectul Constituției Europene," *România Liberă*, 21 June 2003, 6.
[148] "Silvio Berlusconi l-a făcut nazist pe un euro-deputat german care îl criticase," *Adevărul*, 3 July 2003, 13; "Gafa lui Berlusconi ridicată la rang de conflict diplomatic," *Adevărul*, 4 July 2003, 13; "'Umorul' lui Berlusconi – cam greu de digerat," *Adevărul*, 4 July 2003, 13; "Silvio Berlusconi – decis să nu-şi ceară scuze Parlamentului European," *Adevărul*, 7 July 2003, 13.
[149] "Peter Hain online," *The Times*, 9 June 2003, 30.
[150] "Deadline looms for constitution," *The Times*, 13 June 2003, 21.
[151] "Remember this when you vote: the EU isn't working," *The Times*, 8 June 2004, 18.
[152] "Blair plays it canny in high stakes game," *The Guardian*, 17 June 2004, 11.
[153] "Uneasy Blair takes his place among usual suspects," *The Guardian*, 30 October 2004, 4.
[154] "A defining moment: The EU constitution," *The Guardian*, 21 June 2004, 17.
[155] For example, "Europe's leaders clinch historic deal," *The Guardian*, 19 June 2004, 1.
[156] "O statistică a indiferenței," *România Liberă*, 5 June 2004, 7.
[157] "Farm fresh chance for reform in enlargement," *The Times*, 29 July 2003, 24.
[158] Denmark, the Netherlands, and Austria also supported the proposal, whereas the EU had rejected it in June 2004.
[159] Specifically, drug-use, prostitution, child abuse, lying, unethical voting behavior, or no voting at all.

[160] "Ghetourile, pete pe obrazul Iaşiului," *România Liberă*, 26 June 2004, 1; emphasis added.
[161] "Grace Dent's world of lather," *The Guardian*, 9 October 2004, 12; emphasis added.
[162] "Patru şatre din sectorul 6, evacuate de administrația locală," *România Liberă*, 4 July 2004, 24.
[163] "Năstase, Franța şi problema țiganilor români," *România Liberă*, 12 July 2003, 3.
[164] "Thank God for psychotic buzzards," *The Guardian*, 23 July 2003, 5.
[165] "Pukka character required, no sweat," *The Times*, 3 June 2004, 43.
[166] "Gypsies' instant settlement 'shatters' village," *The Times*, 26 October 2004, 5; emphases added.
[167] "Yeo vows laws to crack down on gypsies," *The Times*, 4 October 2004, 8.
[168] "Doi tineri din Sibiu riscă o condamnare penală pentru rasism," *România Liberă*, 26 July 2003, 2.
[169] "A rural squatter's charter," *The Times*, 1 October 2004, 17.
[170] "Travellers deserve rights," *The Guardian*, 11 June 2003, 21.
[171] Office of Public Sector Information, *Criminal Justice* (see chap. 3, n. 106).
[172] See, for instance, articles on homeownership ("Sloping off to Chessex," *The Times*, 3 June 2003, 2; "Nimby homeowners 'must accept new developments,'" *The Times*, 18 July 2003, 2; "Bad news for the big developers could become good news for those who like to fill in the gaps," *The Times*, 29 October 2004, 2), tourism ("Wind farm threatens Kennedys' playground," *The Times*, 5 July 2003, 15), pollution ("Europe fails to set up havens for ships in distress," *The Times*, 30 June 2003, 21), airport regulations for celebrity-status ("Protesters at war over airport plans," *The Guardian*, 2 June 2003, 7; "How airport protesters hit turbulence," *The Times*, 20 June 2003, 3), gambling ("The future for all our cities? Viva Las Vegas!," *The Guardian*, 29 October 2004, 6), EU politics ("Democracy is dying," *The Times*, 9 June 2004, 20), and refugee politics ("Councils reluctant to take rape and torture victims from west African trouble spots under Home Office 'gateway protection' scheme," *The Guardian*, 4 October 2004, 6).
[173] "People traffic," *The Times*, 20 June 2003, 23; emphases added.
[174] "A rural squatter's charter," *The Times*, 1 October 2004, 17.
[175] "Gypsy desire for settled life stirs conflict in village," *The Guardian*, 29 October 2004, 7.
[176] "Rromii din Bacău acuză presa că le-a înnegrit imaginea în cazul ciordelii fondurilor UE," *România Liberă*, 9 June 2003, 2.
[177] "Gypsy site eviction breached right to respect family life," *The Times*, 10 June 2004, 36; "Legislation update," *The Times*, 15 June 2004, 7; "Gypsies' right to homes," 14 October 2004, 74.
[178] "Farm fresh chance for reform in enlargement," *The Times*, 29 July 2003, 24.
[179] "Ethnic tensions rising in the East," *The Times*, 2 July 2003, 23.
[180] "Zeci de familii de romi – evacuate dintre tone de gunoaie," *Adevărul*, 4 July 2003, 3.
[181] "Forces of nature," *The Times*, 21 June 2003, 18.
[182] "Gypsy desire for settled life stirs conflict in village," *The Guardian*, 29 October 2004, 7; emphasis added.
[183] "Brutal death of a travelling child," *The Guardian*, 10 June 2003, 9; emphases added.
[184] "Românii au furat banii destinați şcolarizării țiganilor," *Adevărul*, 17 June 2003, 11.
[185] "Labour is the gypsies' new best friend," *The Times*, 3 October 2004, 30.
[186] "Modruzeni, ghetoul din 'provincia europeană,'" *România Liberă*, 18 June 2003, 3.
[187] "Gypsies' instant settlement 'shatters' village," *The Times*, 26 October 2004, 5; emphasis added.
[188] "Travellers deserve rights," *The Guardian*, 11 June 2003, 21.
[189] "Blood soup," *The Guardian*, 7 June 2003, 28; "Forces of nature," *The Times*, 21 June 2003, 18; "Copiii romilor refuză locurile speciale la liceu," *Adevărul*, 27 October 2004, 16.
[190] "Somewhere better," *The Guardian*, 5 July 2003, 89.
[191] "Premierul Năstase le propune romilor să-şi înființeze propriul parlament european," *Adevărul*, 2 July 2003, 10.
[192] "East Europeans learn benefits of open borders," *The Times*, 19 June 2003, 4.
[193] "Campanie de vaccinări pentru rromi," *România Liberă*, 19 June 2004, 1.
[194] "'Şăfule, ce caută românii în rasa noastră?,'" *Adevărul*, 25 June 2004, 15.
[195] "Rromii vasluieni vin la şcoală … să mănânce," *România Liberă*, 8 June 2004, 24.
[196] "Sute de case fără autorizație – construite de rromi în Covasna," *Adevărul*, 15 October 2004, 3; "Blocuri cu horn pentru rromi," *România Liberă*, 20 October 2004, 28.

[197] "Românii au furat banii destinați școlarizării țiganilor," *Adevărul*, 17 June 2003, 11.
[198] "Peace protest on the table for travellers," *The Times*, 10 October 2004, 2.
[199] "70 de copii – în tabără pentru toleranță și discriminare," *Adevărul*, 21 July 2003, 8; "Presa și minoritățile naționale," *România Liberă*, 14 June 2004, 5.
[200] "Gypsy site eviction breached right to respect family life," *The Times*, 10 June 2004, 36; "Legislation update," *The Times*, 15 June 2004, 7; "Gypsies' right to homes," 14 October 2004, 74.
[201] "Roma decade mooted as Gypsy leaders demand a better deal," *The Guardian*, 1 July 2003, 12.
[202] "Midsomer murders," *The Times*, 18 November 2006, 58.
[203] "'Children of men' – Sfârșitul nu mai e chiar așa de departe," *Adevărul*, 16 November 2006, 8.
[204] "Locuitorii din Ferentari vor fi branșați la curent," *Adevărul*, 16 November 2006.
[205] "Europeana comună Buzescu," *România Liberă*, 4 November 2006, 1, 5.
[206] "La Botoșani, Ziua Internațională a Drepturilor Romului," *Adevărul*, 18 December 2006, 4.
[207] "Violence and persecution follow Europe's downtrodden minority across the continent," *The Guardian*, 28 November 2006, 17.
[208] "Television: pick of the day," *The Guardian*, 11 November 2006, 69.
[209] "Speaking up," *The Times*, 17 December 2006, 20.
[210] "Travellers are here to stay," *The Times*, 17 December 2006, 20.
[211] "Brăilienii din cartierul Colonie, gata de revoltă," *România Liberă*, 24 November 2006, 25.
[212] "Politicienii britanici nu ne văd bine in UE," *Adevărul*, 22 December 2006, 4.
[213] "La Botoșani, Ziua Internațională a Drepturilor Romului," *Adevărul*, 18 December 2006, 4.
[214] "Europeana comună Buzescu," *România Liberă*, 4 November 2006, 1, 5.
[215] "Last night's TV," *The Guardian*, 15 December 2006, 27.
[216] Ibid.
[217] "The way home," *The Times*, 3 November 2006, 22.
[218] "Rromi evacuați din sectorul 1," *Adevărul*, 6 December 2006, 5.
[219] "130 de rromi își vor petrece iarna în containere," *Adevărul*, 8 December 2006, 4.
[220] "Blears warns over 'explosive' immigration," *The Times*, 10 December 2006, 10.
[221] "Uncertainty on migrant numbers is hampering rate policy," *The Times*, 1 November 2006, 44.
[222] "Xenofobii britanici vor să ne încaiere cu minoritățile," *România Liberă*, 6 December 2006, 24.
[223] "Children smuggled in for life of crime on the street," *The Times*, 9 December 2006, 9; emphasis added.
[224] "Romanians get key to Britain's door", *The Times*, 31 December 2006, 9; emphasis added.
[225] Ibid.
[226] See, for instance, "London employers forced to plug the skills gap with migrant workers," *The Times*, 12 December 2006, 25.
[227] "EU enlargement: Screeching brakes," *The Times*, 16 December 2006, 34.
[228] "Violence and persecution follow Europe's downtrodden minority across the continent," *The Guardian*, 28 November 2006, 17.
[229] "Advocates at work," *The Times*, 17 December 2006, 20.
[230] "Briton denies snatching baby from 15-year-old Romanian mother," *The Guardian*, 18 December 2006, 3.
[231] "Ce zestre vă aduce România în UE, din perspectiva europenilor," *Adevărul*, 21 December 2006, 9.
[232] "Help them first," *The Times*, 17 December 2006, 20.
[233] "Making scapegoats," *The Times*, 17 December 2006, 20.
[234] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity* (see chap. 1, n. 13); Charnon-Deutsch, "Imaginary Spanish Gypsy" (see chap. 1, n. 12).
[235] "România ar trebui să aloce fonduri UE pentru rromi," *Adevărul*, 6 October 2006.
[236] "Violence and persecution follow Europe's downtrodden minority across the continent," *The Guardian*, 28 November 2006, 17.
[237] Carole Nagengast and Terence Turner, "Introduction: Universal Human Rights Versus Cultural Relativity," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53 (1997): 269.
[238] Ibid.
[239] "Protocol între polițiști și rromi," *Adevărul*, 3 November 2006, A5.

[240] "Adio, flori vândute pe trotuar!," *Adevărul*, 13 December 2006, 5; emphasis added.
[241] "Travellers' ludicrous and selfish lifestyle," *The Sunday Times*, 10 December 2006, 18; emphases added.
[242] "Ce zestre va aduce România în UE, din perspectiva europenilor," *Adevărul*, 21 December 2006, 9.
[243] Ibid.
[244] Norman Fairclough, "The Dialectics of Discourse," 2001, http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/2001a.doc (accessed December 12, 2008).
[245] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (see chap. 1, n. 24).
[246] "Poliția își continuă raidurile prin piețe," *Adevărul*, 30 October 1992, 1.
[247] Edward Said, *Edward Said – On Orientalism*, Media Education Foundation, 40 min, Edward Said, 1998, DVD.
[248] "Patronul loveşte cu sabia," *România Liberă*, 17 September 1992, 2.
[249] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[250] "Gypsy road to nowhere," *The Guardian*, 2 October 1992, 23.
[251] "Gypsy malady," *The Guardian*, 20 November 1997, 2-3.
[252] "Losers and winners wait for their fate," *The Times*, 22 October 1997, 4.
[253] "Țiganii din Piatra Neamț vor locui într-un cartier dotat după 'standarde europene,'" *Adevărul*, 11 October 2001, 1, 14.
[254] "Deadline looms for constitution," *The Times*, 13 June 2003, 21.
[255] "Gypsy desire for settled life stirs conflict in village," *The Guardian*, 29 October 2004, 7.
[256] See, for instance, McVeigh, "Theorising Sedentarism" (see chap. 1, n. 86).

CHAPTER SIX

[1] Spurr, *Rhetoric of Empire* (see chap. 2, n. 132).
[2] The Project on Ethnic Relations (see chap. 4, n. 77).
[3] European Roma Rights Centre (see chap. 4, n. 73).
[4] European Roma Information Office (see chap. 4, n. 70).
[5] European Roma and Travellers Forum (see chap. 4, n. 74).
[6] European Committee on Romani Emancipation (see chap. 4, n. 75).
[7] European Roma Information Office, Commission of the European Union, Focus Consultancy Ltd., and European Roma Rights Centre, "The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union," (2004), http://erionet.org/site/basic100049.html (accessed March 26, 2009); European Roma Information Office, European Roma Rights Centre, Interdisciplinary Research Cell in Human Rights, Migration Policy Group, and Open Society Institute, "Equality for Roma in Europe: A Roadmap for Action," (2006), http://erionet.org/site/basic100048.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[8] European Union, "The Charter of Fundamental Rights," http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/rights/charter/fsj_rights_charter_en.htm (accessed June 19, 2009). As regards the difference between the two documents, the EU explains, "The charter is a text from the European Union, which currently has 25 Member States. The 1950 European Convention on Human rights is a text from the Council of Europe, which is made up of over 40 European countries, including Russia. The scope of the two texts also differs. The Council of Europe Convention relates solely to civil and political rights. The charter contains extra elements, such as the right to good administration, workers social rights, personal data protection and bio-ethics. The charter also expands on the conventions provisions on the right of access to the law. The charter insists that this right must involve being heard by a judge, and not merely by a national administrative body."
[9] United Nations, "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights," http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/ (accessed June 12, 2009); Nagengast and Turner, "Introduction" (see chap. 5, n. 237).
[10] EU, "Charter of Fundamental Rights."
[11] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (see chap. 1, n. 24).
[12] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness" (see chap. 1, n. 3).

[13] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights Autumn 1998: Legal Defence," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1998), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1553 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[14] European Roma Information Office, "The European Parliament Adopted Resolution on the Situation of Roma Women in the European Union," Press Releases, (2006), http://erionet.org/site/basic406.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[15] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Countering Anti-Roma Violence in Eastern Europe: The Snagov Conference and Related Efforts," PER and the Roma, (1994), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/snagov.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[16] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 1/2002: Extreme Poverty," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2002), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=719 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[17] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Kosovo," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1999), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=800 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[18] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights Spring, 1998: Racially Motivated Violence against Roma," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1998), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1795 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[19] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights Summer 1998: Roma and the Right to Education," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1998), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=50 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[20] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2/2002: Fortress Europe," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2002), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=910 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[21] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 3-4/2005: Justice for Kosovo," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2005), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2511 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] ERRC, "Spring, 1998"; ERRC, "Autumn 1997"; European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 3/2000: Rights of the Child," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2000), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1008 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[26] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Images and Issues: Coverage of the Roma in the Mass Media in Romania," PER and the Roma, (1997), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/imgs_iss.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[27] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 1/2001: Access to Justice," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2001), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=658 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[28] Project on Ethnic Relations, "The Romanies in Central and Eastern Europe: Illusions and Reality," PER and the Roma, (1992), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rctr_eu.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[29] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Building Romanian Democracy: The Police and Ethnic Minorities," PER in Romania, (1999), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/Police.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[30] For instance, ERRC, "Kosovo."
[31] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights Spring 1997," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1997), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1758 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[32] European Roma Rights Centre, "Barriers to the Education of the Roma in Europe: A Position Paper by the European Roma Rights Centre," Position Papers, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=385 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[33] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Romanian-American Symposium on Inter-Ethnic Relations," PER in Romania, (1991), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rom_sym.htm (accessed March 26, 2009); PER, "Illusions and Reality."
[34] ERRC, "Racially Motivated Violence."
[35] PER, "Illusions and Reality."
[36] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Autumn 1996," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1996), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1479 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[37] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[38] Project on Ethnic Relations, "The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions," PER and the Roma, (1996), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rommedia.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

[39] ERRC, "Barriers to the Education."
[40] For instance, European Roma Rights Centre, "Executive Summary: European Roma Rights Center Country Report: State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania," Country Reports, (2001), http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009); European Roma Rights Centre, "ERRC Concerns: Romania," Fact Sheets, N.d., http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2253 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[41] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 1/2006: Exclusion from Employment," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2006), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2583 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[42] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2/2000: Housing," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2000), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=849 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[43] European Roma Information Office, "European Roma Information Office Newsletter September 2006," Newsletters, (2006), http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/Newsletter-September2006.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[44] ERRC, "Exclusion from Employment."
[45] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2-3/2001: Government Programmes on Roma," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2001), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1704 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[46] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 4/1999: Romani Media / Mainstream Media," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1999), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1134 (accessed March 26, 2009). This particular news is collected from Irish News.
[47] ERRC, "Right to Education."
[48] ERRC, "Barriers to the Education."
[49] ERRC, "Right to Education."
[50] For instance, European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 3-4/2004: Health Care," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2060 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[51] See, for instance, ERRC, "Rights of the Child"; ERRC, "Recognising and Combating" (see chap. 3, n. 130).
[52] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2/2004: Ethnic Statistics," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1995 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[53] Project on Ethnic Relations, "The Roma in the Twenty-First Century: A Policy Paper," PER and the Roma, (1997), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/21st_c.htm (accessed March 26, 2009). More evidence of sterilization of Roma women is documented in European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 1/2004: What is Roma Rights?" Roma Rights Quarterly, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1838 (accessed March 26, 2009); European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 4/2006: Romani Women's Rights Movement," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2006), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2747 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[54] ERRC, "Health Care."
[55] ERRC, "Exclusion from Employment."
[56] Ibid.
[57] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Roma and Elections in Romania," PER in Romania, Princeton, NJ: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2000.
[58] Project on Ethnic Relations, "The Media's Impact on the Participation of Romani Organizations in Parliamentary Elections," PER in Romania, Princeton, NJ: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2001.
[59] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights, Winter 1998: Police Violence against Roma," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1998), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=475 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[60] ERRC, "Romani Media"; emphasis added.
[61] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?"; emphasis added.
[62] Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and the Law: Demythologizing the *Gypsy Criminality* Stereotype," PER and the Roma, (2000), http://www.per-usa.org/reports/RomaandtheLaw00.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009); emphases added.
[63] ERRC, "Romani Media."
[64] ERRC, "Extreme Poverty."

[65] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[66] ERRC, "Autumn 1997."
[67] ERRC, "Right to Education."
[68] ERRC, "Romani Holocaust" (see chap. 3, n. 130).
[69] ERRC, "Autumn 1996."
[70] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Roma and Statistics," PER and the Roma, (2000), http://www.per-usa.org/reports/PERStrasbourg.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[71] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[72] See, for instance, European Roma and Travellers Forum, "European Roma Rights Charter – Legitimate Roma Right," Strasbourg: Directorate of Human Rights, European Roma and Travellers Forum, 2005.
[73] PER, "Illusions and Reality."
[74] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Making the EU's Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments Work for Romani Communities in the Enlarged European Union," PER and the Roma, (2005), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Andrzej%20Mirga%20_2.PDF (accessed March 26, 2009).
[75] European Roma Information Office, "European Roma Information Office Newsletter October-November 2006," Newsletters, (2006), http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/-%20Newsletter.october-november2006.pdf (accessed March 10, 2008).
[76] PER, "Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments."
[77] PER, "Media and the Roma."
[78] Ibid.
[79] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[80] ERRC, "Romani Women's Rights."
[81] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[82] ERRC, "Romani Holocaust."
[83] ERRC, "Barriers to the Education"; emphasis added.
[84] Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[85] European Roma Rights Centre, "Sudden Rage at Dawn. Violence Against Roma in Romania," Country Reports, (1996), http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009).
[86] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 1/2005: Positive Action to Ensure Equality," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2005), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2208 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[87] European Committee on Romani Emancipation, "The Impact of Special Schools on the Roma in Central Europe," Reports, (2003), http://www.eu-romani.org/ec302ss.htm (accessed March 26, 2009); emphases added.
[88] Ibid., emphasis added.
[89] ERRC, "Barriers to the Education."
[90] ERRC, "Justice for Kosovo."
[91] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 1/1999: Forced Migration," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1999), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=546 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[92] ERRC, "Government Programmes."
[93] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[94] ERRC, "Forced Migration."
[95] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[96] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2/2002: Fortress Europe," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2002), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=910 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[97] Richardson, "Discourse as Control" (see chap. 2, n. 20); Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*.
[98] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?"; European Roma Rights Centre, "Romani Women's Rights."
[99] ERRC, "Right to Education."
[100] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Roundtable Discussion of Government Policies on the Roma in Romania," PER and the Roma, (1999), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/Predeal2.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[101] PER, "Illusions and Reality."

[102] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Prevention of Violence and Discrimination Against the Roma in Central and Eastern Europe," PER and the Roma, (1997), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/prv_viol.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[103] PER, "Countering Anti-Roma Violence."
[104] ERRC, "Spring 1997"; emphasis added.
[105] ERTF, "European Roma Rights Charter."
[106] Project on Ethnic Relations, "State Policies Toward the Romani Communities in the Candidate Countries to the EU: Government and Romani Participation in Policy-Making," PER and the Roma, (1999). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/StatePolicies99.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[107] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Competing Romani Identities," Roma Rights Quarterly, (1999), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=969 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[108] ERRC, "Spring 1997."
[109] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Spring 2000 Bulletin," PER Bulletins, (2000), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/news.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[110] ERRC, "Housing."
[111] European Committee on Romani Emancipation, "ECRE Management Committee to Roy Perry, Vice Chairman Petitions Committee of European Parliament," Correspondence, (2003), http://www.eu-romani.org/comm15.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[112] ERRC, "Racially Motivated Violence."
[113] Ibid.
[114] ERRC, "Positive Action."
[115] ERRC, "Women's Rights."
[116] For instance, ERRC, "Autumn 1997"; ERRC, "Women's Rights"; ERRC, "Autumn 1996" documents a beating by the mayor, in the mayor's office, in Bulgaria.
[117] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 2-3/2006: ERRC 10th Anniversary," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2006), (http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2707 (accessed March 26, 2009); emphases added.
[118] ERRC, "Romani Media"; emphasis added.
[119] ERRC, "Sudden Rage at Dawn."
[120] Ibid.
[121] Ibid.; emphases added.
[122] ERRC, "Right to Education."
[123] ERRC, "Romani Women's Rights."
[124] ERRC, "Rights of the Child"; emphasis added.
[125] ERRC, "Sudden Rage at Dawn."
[126] Zechenter, "In the Name of Culture" (see chap. 3, n. 174).
[127] Sophie M. Clavier, "Human Rights and the Debate Between Universalism & Cultural Relativism," http://userwww.sfsu.edu/~sclavier/research/hrdebate.pdf (accessed May 7, 2009).
[128] ERRC, "Autumn 1997."
[129] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 2/2005: Rights and Traditions," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2005), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2284 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[130] ERIO, ERRC, IRCHR, MPG, and OSI, "Equality for Roma in Europe"; emphasis added; also see PER, "Romanian-American Symposium."
[131] For example, see ERRC, "Rights and Traditions."
[132] ERRC, "Rights and Traditions"; emphasis added.
[133] ERRC argues that Roma are denied justice in several significant ways. First, "authorities do not open criminal investigations when Roma fall victim of human rights abuse"; second, "police conduct inadequate and purely formal investigations lacking even rudimentary substance"; third, "prosecutors intervene to cancel investigations or bring non-indictment decisions"; fourth, "authorities retaliate against Roma who file complaints by pressing charges against them; fifth, "[i]mmunity from prosecution is nearly guaranteed when the suspected culprits are police officers." ERRC thus concludes that, "[i]mpunity – an unwritten

covenant that actions pertaining to Roma are not governed by the same rules as those for non-Roma – extends to nearly all spheres of social life in Romania." (ERRC, "Executive Summary")
[134] European Roma Rights Centre, "State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania," Country Reports, (2001), http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009).
[135] ERRC, "Racially Motivated Violence."
[136] ERRC, "Romani Women's Rights."
[137] ERRC, "Rights and Traditions."
[138] Ibid.
[139] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 4/2003: Political Rights," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2003), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1310 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[140] Ibid.
[141] ERRC, "Extreme Poverty."
[142] Ibid.
[143] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 3/2003: Personal Documents and Access to Fundamental Rights," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2003), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1062 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[144] PER, "Romani Politics" (see chap. 3, n. 130).
[145] PER, "Roma and Statistics."
[146] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?"
[147] In an example such as ECRE's investigation report that reads, "Many Roma *questioned stated* that the Special schools were adequate for their children. This sort of statement did not tie in with our knowledge of the real views of Roma." See ECRE, "Impact of Special Schools"; emphasis added.
[148] For instance, PER writes, "At [linguistic specialists'] suggestion, this report uses the term Rom to refer to a member of the group; Roma to refer to a plurality of members and to the group as a whole, and also as an adjective to modify group members ('Roma participants,' 'Roma children'); and Romani as an adjective to describe the group's language and culture. These terms are sometimes confused with Romania, the country, or Romanian, because of the similarities in spelling and the fact that Romania has a significant minority of ethnic Roma; in fact there is no connection" (PER, "Illusions and Reality").
[149] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?"
[150] ERRC, "Legal Defence."
[151] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?"; emphases added.
[152] PER, "Roma in the Twenty-First Century"; emphases added.
[153] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Leadership, Representation, and the Status of the Roma," PER and the Roma, (2002), http://www.per-usa.org/reports/PERKrakow.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[154] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Roma and the Question of Self-Determination: Fiction and Reality," PER and the Roma, (2003), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Jadwisin1_12_03.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[155] Ibid.
[156] PER, "Leadership, Representation."
[157] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 4/2001: Mobilisation / Participation," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2001), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1248 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[158] PER, "Romani Politics."
[159] ERIO, ERRC, IRCHR, MPG, and OSI, "Equality for Roma in Europe."
[160] PER, "Roma in the Twenty-First Century."
[161] Ibid.
[162] Ibid.; emphasis added.
[163] ERIO, ERRC, IRCHR, MPG, and OSI, "Equality for Roma in Europe."
[164] See, for instance, ERRC, "Autumn 1997."
[165] PER, "Roma in the Twenty-First Century"; emphasis added.
[166] ERRC, "Political Rights."
[167] European Roma Information Office, "Monitoring Reports on Bulgaria's and Romania's EU Accession," Press Releases, (2006), http://erionet.org/site/basic431.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[168] PER, "Romani Politics."

[169] See PER, "Building Romanian Democracy," or Project on Ethnic Relations, "Spring/Summer 1997 Bulletin," PER Bulletins, (1997), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/spr97bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).
[170] European Roma and Travellers Forum, "European Roma and Travellers Forum Welcomed Adoption of 'Day of the Roma Ethnic Community by Romania', Strasbourg, 14 April 2006," Press Releases, (2006), http://www.ertf.org/pr/12006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).
[171] ERRC, "Romani Holocaust."
[172] PER, "Roma and Elections."
[173] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Winter/Spring 2006 Bulletin," PER Bulletins, (2006), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/2006_PER_Bulletin.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[174] PER, "Spring 2000 Bulletin."
[175] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Summer 2001 Bulletin," PER Bulletins, (2001), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Summer2001PER%20NEWSLETTER.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[176] See ERRC, "Justice for Kosovo"; ERRC, "Romani Women's Rights"; European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 3-4/2002: Segregation and Desegregation," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2002), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1593 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[177] ERRC, "Forced Migration."
[178] ERRC, "Romani Women's Rights."
[179] See, for instance, European Roma Information Office, "European Roma Information Office Newsletter December 2006," Newsletters, (2006), http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/Newsletter_DECEMBER_2006.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[180] ERRC, "ERRC 10th Anniversary."
[181] PER, "Fiction and Reality."
[182] ERRC, "Autumn 1996"; ERRC, "Romani Holocaust."
[183] European Roma Rights Centre, "Political Participation and Democracy in Europe: A Short Guide for Romani Activists," Pamphlets, (2004), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=364 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[184] ERIO, ERRC, IRCHR, MPG, and OSI, "Equality for Roma in Europe."
[185] ERRC, "Romani Media."
[186] Before EU becomes a prominent shaping force in Europe, PER comments on US' interest in a peaceful Europe and Americans' possibility to share their experience and resources with the post-Communist countries. See PER, "Romanian-American Symposium"; PER, "Illusions and Reality"; Project on Ethnic Relations, "Winter/Spring 1999 Bulletin," PER Bulletins, (1999), http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/wsp99bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009); Project on Ethnic Relations, "Political Will: Romania's Path to Ethnic Accommodation," PER in Romania, (2001), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Bucarest8101.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009);
[187] PER, "State Policies."
[188] PER, "Spring 2000 Bulletin."
[189] PER, "State Policies."
[190] ERIO, "European Parliament Adopted Resolution."
[191] See, for instance, several of PER's 2000 and 2001 materials.
[192] ERRC, "Racially Motivated Violence."
[193] ERRC, "Forced Migration."
[194] See, for one, ERRC, "Autumn 1996."
[195] PER, "Facts and Fictions."
[196] European Roma Rights Centre, "Roma Rights 4/2000: Racism: Denial and Acknowledgement," Roma Rights Quarterly, (2000), http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1187 (accessed March 26, 2009).
[197] PER, "Roma and Statistics."
[198] PER, "Fiction and Reality."
[199] PER, "Leadership, Representation"; Italic emphasis in the original; Underlining emphasis added.
[200] Ibid.; emphasis added.

[201] ERRC, "Women's Rights"; Capitalization emphasis in the original; Italic emphasis added. The statement is given by a Rom in response to a Romni arguing for Roma women's rights.
[202] PER, "Fiction and Reality."
[203] PER, "Media's Impact."
[204] PER, "Roma and Elections."
[205] Ibid.; emphasis added.
[206] Project on Ethnic Relations, "PER Field Trip for Journalists and the Seminar 'Roma In Romanian Media,'" PER and the Roma, Bucharest, Romania: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2002; emphases added.
[207] See Colin Sparks for a detailed review of development paradigms in Colin Sparks, *Globalization, Development and the Mass Media* (London, UK: Sage Publications, 2007).
[208] PER, "State Policies"; emphasis added.
[209] PER, "Countering Anti-Roma Violence."
[210] PER, "Roma in the Twenty-First Century."
[211] For example, ERRC, "Forced Migration"; ERRC, "Romani Media."
[212] ERRC, "Sudden Rage at Dawn."
[213] ERRC, "Political Rights"; emphasis added.

CHAPTER SEVEN

[1] ERRC, "Romani Holocaust" (see chap. 3, n. 130).
[2] Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge* (see chap. 2, n. 19).
[3] Said, "Discrepant Experiences" (see chap. 1, n. 11).
[4] Robbins et al., "A Symposium," 9 (see chap. 2, n. 73).
[5] Schneeweis and Southwell, "Constructing 'the Disadvantaged Roma'" (see chap. 3, n. 13).
[6] ERRC, "Political Participation" (see chap. 6, n. 183).
[7] See, for instance, ERTF, "Forum Welcomed Adoption" (see chap. 6, n. 170).
[8] Robbins et al., "A Symposium"; Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (see chap. 2, n. 64); Said, "Discrepant Experiences."
[9] ERRC, "Access to Justice" (see chap. 6, n. 27); also see ERRC, "Housing" (see chap. 6, n. 42).
[10] See, for instance, ERRC, "Access to Justice."
[11] Gramsci, *Selections* (see chap. 1, n. 48).
[12] Dara Z. Strolovitch, *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007).
[13] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex," *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 39 (1989): 139-67, quoted in Dara Z. Strolovitch, *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 6.
[14] Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas" (see chap. 1, n. 7).
[15] This dissertation referred to the Roma as an "ethnic group" throughout the chapters as a writing device. The purpose was to refer to the Roma as they are conceived in the European socio-political sphere – and not as a final categorization of the minorities as an ethnicity. Most often, it was used as a synonym meant to avoid repetition.
[16] Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 1994).
[17] Kende, "Hungary of Otherness" (see chap. 1, n. 3).
[18] Ibid.
[19] See Omi and Winant's explanation of the ethnicity paradigm (Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation*), or Catherine R. Squires, *Dispatches from the Color Line: The Press and Multiracial America* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2007).
[20] Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity* (see chap. 1, n. 13).
[21] Quoted in Belton, *Questioning Gypsy Identity*, 172.
[22] Similarly, scholars such as Mehdi Semati now argue that the Muslims, post 9/11, occupy that same space – in different cultural imaginations. See, for instance, Mehdi Semati, "Brown Men of the Middle East: The

Politics of Islamophobia," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May 21-25, 2009.
[23] "Citizens of Rostock applaud neo-Nazis," *The Times*, 26 August 1992, 9.
[24] ERRC, "What is Roma Rights?" (see chap. 6, n. 53).
[25] Ibid.
[26] Project on Ethnic Relations, "Political Uses of Anti-Semitism," PER in Romania, (2005), http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/AntiSemitismPER.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).
[27] ERRC, "Women's Rights" (see chap. 6, n. 53); emphasis added.
[28] Barrett, *The Politics of Truth* (see chap. 1, n. 50); Foucault, *History of Sexuality* (see chap. 1, n. 52).
[29] Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse* (see chap. 2, n. 4); Terdiman, *Discourse / Counter-Discourse* (see chap. 2, n. 4).
[30] Blasco, "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas."
[31] Barrett, *The Politics of Truth*, 126; emphasis in the original.
[32] Fonseca, *Bury Me Standing* (see chap. 3, n. 151).
[33] ERRC, "Forced Migration" (see chap. 6, n. 91).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Newspapers

Adevărul
The Guardian
România Liberă
The Times

Non-Governmental Organizations Documents

The European Committee on Romani Emancipation Documents
Correspondence

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Petitions Committee of the European Parliament." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/compet.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm05.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to The European Ombudsman." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm06.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to The European Ombudsman." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm09.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm11.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Roy Perry, Vice Chairman Petitions Committee of European Parliament." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm13.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Roy Perry, Vice Chairman Petitions Committee of European Parliament." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm15.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Fabrizio Barbaso, acting Director General for Enlargement European Commission." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm18.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Petitions Committee." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm19.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Chairman of Petitions Committee." Correspondence. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm21.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Chairman of Petitions Committee." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm22.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Chair Petitions Committee." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm25.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "Petition Committee Notice to Members (annex to letter above)." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm24.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to readers of this list." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm26.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Chair Petitions Committee." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/comm27.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Ombudsman." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/nupepet.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "ECRE Management Committee to Ombudsman." Correspondence. (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/nupecom.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Reports

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "The Impact of Special Schools on the Roma in Central Europe." Reports. (2003). http://www.eu-romani.org/ec302ss.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "Some Reasons Why the European Parliamentary Petitions Committee Should Be Scrapped." (2004). http://www.eu-romani.org/bsr0014.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "The Cigány Economy Simulation System." Reports. (2003). http://www.seel-telesis.com/cess/ (accessed March 26, 2009).

The European Roma and Travellers Forum Documents

Charter

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "European Roma Rights Charter – Legitimate Roma Right." Strasbourg: Directorate of Human Rights, European Roma and Travellers Forum, 2005.

Country Reports

European Roma Information Office, Commission of the European Union, Focus Consultancy Ltd., and European Roma Rights Centre. "The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union." (2004). http://erionet.org/site/basic100049.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office, European Roma Rights Centre, Interdisciplinary Research Cell in Human Rights, Migration Policy Group, and Open Society Institute. "Equality for Roma in Europe: A Roadmap for Action." (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic100048.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

Press Releases

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "First European Roma and Travellers Forum Plenary Assembly to Be Held at Council of Europe from 13 to 15 December." Press Releases. (2005). http://www.ertf.org/pr/12005.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "European Roma and Travellers Forum Welcomed Adoption of 'Day of the Roma Ethnic Community by Romania', Strasbourg, 14 April 2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://www.ertf.org/pr/12006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "Anti-Gypsyism, a European Cultural Heritage, Strasbourg, 2 August 2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://www.ertf.org/pr/22006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "Don't Create a Palestinian Refugee Problem in Europe, Pristina, 9 September 2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://www.ertf.org/pr/32006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "European Parliament Must Pay More than a Lip Service to Roma Rights, Strasbourg, 3 October 2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://www.ertf.org/pr/42006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "European Roma Parliament Adopts Resolution on Roma in Europe, Strasbourg, 9 November 2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://www.ertf.org/pr/52006.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

The European Roma Information Office Documents

Newsletters

European Roma Information Office. "European Roma Information Office Newsletter September 2006." Newsletters. (2006). http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/Newsletter-September2006.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office. "European Roma Information Office Newsletter October-November 2006." Newsletters. (2006). http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/-%20Newsletter.october-november2006.pdf (accessed March 10, 2008).

European Roma Information Office. "European Roma Information Office Newsletter December 2006." Newsletters. (2006). http://www.erionet.org/site/upload/pubblications/newsletters/Newsletter_DECEMBER_2006.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Press Releases

European Roma Information Office. "Monitoring Reports on Bulgaria's and Romania's EU Accession." Press Releases. (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic431.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office. "The European Parliament Adopted Resolution on the Situation of Roma Women in the European Union." Press Releases. (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic406.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office. "European Commission Approved the Monitoring Report on the State of Preparedness of EU Membership of Bulgaria and Romania." Press Releases. (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic411.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office. "Schulz Criticises New Commissioner's Role as 'Skimpy.'" Press Releases. (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic100062.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Information Office. "Closing Event of the EU Community Action Programme to Combat Discrimination, 27-28.11.2006." Press Releases. (2006). http://erionet.org/site/basic100015.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre Documents

Country Reports

European Roma Rights Centre. "Sudden Rage at Dawn. Violence Against Roma in Romania." Country Reports. (1996). http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Executive Summary: European Roma Rights Center Country Report: State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania." Country Reports. (2001). http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania." Country Reports. (2001). http://www.errc.org/Countryrep_index.php (accessed March 26, 2009).

Fact Sheet Romania

European Roma Rights Centre. "ERRC Concerns: Romania." Fact Sheets. N.d. http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2253 (accessed March 26, 2009).

Pamphlets

European Roma Rights Centre. "Political Participation and Democracy in Europe: A Short Guide for Romani Activists." Pamphlets. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=364 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Recognising and Combating Racial Discrimination: A Short Guide." Pamphlets. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=372 (accessed March 26, 2009).

Position Papers

European Roma Rights Centre. "Protecting Romani Refugees around Europe: A Position Paper by the European Roma Rights Centre." Position Papers. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=382 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Barriers to the Education of the Roma in Europe: A Position Paper by the European Roma Rights Centre." Position Papers. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=385 (accessed March 26, 2009).

Roma Rights Quarterly

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Autumn 1996." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1996). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1479 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights Spring 1997." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1997). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1758 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights, Summer 1997: Romani Holocaust." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1997). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=8 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights Quarterly Autumn 1997." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1997). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1510 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights, Winter 1998: Police Violence against Roma." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1998). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=475 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights Spring, 1998: Racially Motivated Violence against Roma." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1998). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1795 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights Summer 1998: Roma and the Right to Education." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1998). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=50 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights Autumn 1998: Legal Defence." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1998). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1553 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/1999: Forced Migration." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1999). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=546 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Kosovo." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1999). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=800 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Competing Romani Identities." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1999). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=969 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 4/1999: Romani Media / Mainstream Media." Roma Rights Quarterly. (1999). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1134 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/2000: Women's Rights." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2000). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=605 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 2/2000: Housing." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2000). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=849 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 3/2000: Rights of the Child." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2000). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1008 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 4/2000: Racism: Denial and Acknowledgement." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2000). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1187 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/2001: Access to Justice." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2001). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=658 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 2-3/2001: Government Programmes on Roma." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2001). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1704 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 4/2001: Mobilisation / Participation." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2001). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1248 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/2002: Extreme Poverty." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2002). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=719 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 2/2002: Fortress Europe." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2002). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=910 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 3-4/2002: Segregation and Desegregation." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2002). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1593 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1-2, 2003: Anti-Discrimination Law." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2003). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1395 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 3/2003: Personal Documents and Access to Fundamental Rights." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2003). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1062 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 4/2003: Political Rights." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2003). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1310 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/2004: What is Roma Rights?" Roma Rights Quarterly. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1838 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 2/2004: Ethnic Statistics." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1995 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 3-4/2004: Health Care." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2004). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2060 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 1/2005: Positive Action to Ensure Equality." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2005). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2208 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 2/2005: Rights and Traditions." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2005). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2284 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights 3-4/2005: Justice for Kosovo." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2005). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2511 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 1/2006: Exclusion from Employment." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2006). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2583 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 2-3/2006: ERRC 10th Anniversary." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2006). (http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2707 (accessed March 26, 2009).

European Roma Rights Centre. "Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 4/2006: Romani Women's Rights Movement." Roma Rights Quarterly. (2006). http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=2747 (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations Documents
Central European Series

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Political Leaders on Interethnic Relations and Regional Security in Central Europe: A Roundtable." Central European Series. (1998). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/PoliticalLeaders98.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

PER and the Roma

Project on Ethnic Relations. "The Romanies in Central and Eastern Europe: Illusions and Reality." PER and the Roma. (1992). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rctr_eu.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Countering Anti-Roma Violence in Eastern Europe: The Snagov Conference and Related Efforts." PER and the Roma. (1994). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/snagov.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions." PER and the Roma. (1996). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rommedia.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "The Roma in the Twenty-First Century: A Policy Paper." PER and the Roma. (1997). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/21st_c.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Prevention of Violence and Discrimination Against the Roma in Central and Eastern Europe." PER and the Roma. (1997). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/prv_viol.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Images and Issues: Coverage of the Roma in the Mass Media in Romania." PER and the Roma. (1997). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/imgs_iss.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "OSCE Roundtable on Roma and Sinti National Policies." PER and the Roma. (1998). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/osce_rnd.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roundtable Discussion of Government Policies on the Roma in Romania." PER and the Roma. (1999). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/Predeal2.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "State Policies Toward the Romani Communities in the Candidate Countries to the EU: Government and Romani Participation in Policy-Making." PER and the Roma. (1999). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/StatePolicies99.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and the Law: Demythologizing the *Gypsy Criminality* Stereotype." PER and the Roma. (2000). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/RomaandtheLaw00.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and Statistics." PER and the Roma. (2000). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/PERStrasbourg.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Romani Representation and Leadership at National and International Levels." PER and the Roma. Krakow, Poland: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2001.

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Leadership, Representation, and the Status of the Roma." PER and the Roma. (2002). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/PERKrakow.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "PER Field Trip for Journalists and the Seminar 'Roma In Romanian Media.'" PER and the Roma. Bucharest, Romania: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2002.

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and the Question of Self-Determination: Fiction and Reality." PER and the Roma. (2003). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Jadwisin1_12_03.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and EU Accession: Elected and Appointed Romani Representatives in an Enlarged Europe." PER and the Roma. (2004). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Per%20Brussels%20Report.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Making the EU's Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments Work for Romani Communities in the Enlarged European Union." PER and the Roma. (2005). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Andrzej%20Mirga%20_2.PDF (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Romani Politics Present and Future." PER and the Roma. (2006). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/PER_Romani_Politics.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

PER Bulletins

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Winter 1996 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (1996). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/win96bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Spring/Summer 1997 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (1997). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/spr97bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Winter/Spring 1998 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (1998). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/wsp98bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Winter/Spring 1999 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (1999). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/wsp99bul.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Spring 2000 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (2000). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/news.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Summer 2001 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (2001). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Summer2001PER%20NEWSLETTER.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Fall 2004 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (2004). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/PER%20FALL%2004%20BULLETIN.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Winter/Spring 2006 Bulletin." PER Bulletins. (2006). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/2006_PER_Bulletin.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

PER in Romania

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Romanian-American Symposium on Inter-Ethnic Relations." PER in Romania. (1991). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/rom_sym.htm (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Schools, Language, and Interethnic Relations in Romania: The Debate Continues." PER in Romania. (1998). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/SchoolsLanguage98.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Building Romanian Democracy: The Police and Ethnic Minorities." PER in Romania. (1999). http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/Police.html (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "The Year 2000 Elections in Romania: Interethnic Relations and European Integration." PER in Romania. (2000). http://www.per-usa.org/reports/Year2000.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Roma and Elections in Romania." PER in Romania. Princeton, NJ: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2000.

Project on Ethnic Relations. "The Media's Impact on the Participation of Romani Organizations in Parliamentary Elections." PER in Romania. Princeton, NJ: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2001.

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Political Will: Romania's Path to Ethnic Accommodation." PER in Romania. (2001). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/Bucarest8101.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Project on Ethnic Relations. "Political Uses of Anti-Semitism." PER in Romania. (2005). http://www.per-usa.org/Reports/AntiSemitismPER.pdf (accessed March 26, 2009).

Secondary Sources

Books

Achim, Viorel. *The Roma in Romanian History*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004.

Andereck, Mary E. *Ethnic Awareness and the School: An Ethnographic Study*. London: Sage Publications.

Bancroft, Angus. *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

Barker, Chris. *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities*. Buckingham, PA: Open University Press, 1999.

Barrett, Michèle. *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beier, A. L. *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England 1560-1640*. New York, NY: Methuen, 1985.

Belton, Brian A. *Questioning Gypsy Identity: Ethnic Narratives in Britain and America*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2005.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Brearley, Margaret. *The Roma/Gypsies of Europe: A Persecuted People*. Institute for Jewish Policy Research, London, Research Report 3, December 1996.

Brown, James F. *Grooves of Change: Eastern Europe at the Turn of the Millennium*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.

Burton, Graeme. *Media and Society: Critical Perspectives*. New York, NY: Open University Press, 2005.

Carey, James W. *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Cohen, Stanley. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972.

Cohn, Werner. *The Gypsies*. Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1973.

Croteau, David R., and William Hoynes. *Media/Society: Industries, Images, and Audiences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2003.

Culler, Jonathan D. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975.

de Vaux de Foletier, François. *Le Monde des Tsiganes*. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1983.

Dell'Orto, Giovanna. *Giving Meanings to the World: The First U.S. Foreign Correspondents, 1838-1859*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Derrida, Jacques. *On Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn. *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Fairclough, Norman. *Media Discourse*. London: Blackwell, 1995.

---. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.

Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York, NY: Grove Press, 1963.

---. *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press, 1967.

Fiske, John. *Introduction to Communication Studies*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1990.

Fonseca, Isabel. *Bury Me Standing: The Gypsies and Their Journey*. New York, NY: Vintage Departures, 1996.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock, 1972.

---. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, vol. 1. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1990.

Fowler, Roger. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Goldman, Michael. *Imperial nature: The World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York, NY: International Publishers, 1971.

---. *Prison Notebooks*. Edited with Introduction by Joseph A. Buttigieg. Translated by Joseph A. Buttigieg and Antonio Callari. vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Gregory, Derek. *The Colonial Present*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Grellmann, Heinrich Moritz Gottlieb. *Die Zigeuner: Ein historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge* (Göttingen: Johann Christian Dieterich, 1787). Quoted in Radu P. Ioviță and Theodore G. Schurr, "Reconstructing the Origins and Migrations of Diasporic Populations: The Case of the European Gypsies" (*American Anthropologist* 106, 2004), 267.

Grossberg, Lawrence. *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.

Gudykunst, William B., and Young Yun Kim. *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication*. 4th ed. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 2003.

Guha, Ranajit. *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hall, Stuart. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London: Verso, 1988.

Hancock, Ian. *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc., 1987.

Hart, Gillian Patricia. *Disabling Globalization: Places of Power in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Hornby, Helen Bassett, ed. *Lights of Guidance*. New Delhi: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1994.

Inayatullah, Naeem, and David L. Blaney. *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.

Iordanova, Dina. *Cinema of Flames: Balkan Film, Culture and the Media*. London: British Film Institute, 2001.

Kennington, Don. *Gypsies and Travelling People: A Select Guide to Documentary and Organisational Sources of Information*. 3rd ed. Stamford, Lincs: Capital Planning Information, 1986.

Kenrick, Donald. *Gypsies: From the Ganges to the Thames*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2004.

Kenrick, Donald, and Sian Bakewell. *On the Verge: The Gypsies of England*. 2nd ed. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1995.

Kenrick, Donald, and Grattan Puxon. *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*. London: Sussex University Press, 1972.

Kohn, Marek. *The Race Gallery: The Return of Racial Science*. London: Vintage, 1996.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. New York, NY: Norton, 1978.

Lemon, Alaina. *Between Two Fires: Gypsy Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Postsocialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*, vol. 2. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Lowery, Shearon A., and Melvin L. DeFleur. *Milestones in Mass Communication Research: Media Effects*. 3rd ed. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1995.

Lucassen, Leo, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar, eds. *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Lyotard, Jean François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Macdonell, Diane. *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction*. Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Martin, Shannon E., and David A. Copeland, eds. *The Function of Newspapers on Society: A Global Perspective*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

Martin, Shannon E., and Kathleen A. Hansen. *Newspapers of Record in a Digital Age: From Hot Type to Hot Link*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

McRobbie, Angela. *The Uses of Cultural Studies: A Textbook*. London: Sage, 2005.

Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study of Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Mignolo, Walter D. *Local Histories / Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

---. *The Darker Side of Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Mowitt, John. *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992.

Muppidi, Himadeep. *The Politics of the Global*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 1994.

Poliakov, Léon. *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe*. Translated by Edmund Howard. New York, NY: Meridian, New American Library, 1975.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York, NY: Knopf, Inc., 1993.

---. *Freud and the Non-European*. New York, NY: Verso, 2003.

---. *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books, 2003.

Saukko, Paula. *Doing Research in Cultural Studies: An Introduction to Classical and New Methodological Approaches*. London: Sage, 2003.

Schneider, David Joe. *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2004.

Shapiro, Michael J. *Language and Political Understanding: The Politics of Discursive Practices*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.

Smitherman-Donaldson, Geneva, and Teun A. van Dijk, eds. *Discourse and Discrimination*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1988.

Sparks, Colin. *Globalization, Development and the Mass Media*. London, UK: Sage Publications, 2007.

Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Ethics*. 2 vols. New York, NY: Appleton, 1892.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Spurr, David. *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999.

Squires, Catherine R. *Dispatches from the Color Line: The Press and Multiracial America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Stewart, Michael. *The Time of the Gypsies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997.

Strolovitch, Dara Z. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Terdiman, Richard. *Discourse / Counter-Discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Thompson, John B. *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Threadgold, Terry, E. A. Grosz, Gunther Kress, and M. A. K. Halliday, eds. *Semiotics, Ideology, Language*. Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, 1986.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.

van Dijk, Teun A. *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Williams, Patrick. *Gypsy World: The Silence of the Living and the Voices of the Dead*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

---. *The Sociology of Culture*. New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1995.

Wilson, David. *Inventing Black-on-Black Violence: Discourse, Space, and Representation*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005.

Articles and Chapters

Anderson, Perry. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci." *New Left Review* 100 (1977): 5-78.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. "General Introduction." In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 1-4. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Bahá'í International Community, Office of Public Information. (Chapter *Right to Development*). Wilmette, IL: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1989.

Barany, Zoltan. "Orphans of Transition: Gypsies in Eastern Europe." *Journal of Democracy* 9 (3) (1998): 142-156, http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v009/9.3barany.html#REF1 (accessed November 21, 2007).

Beck, Sam. "The Origins of Gypsy Slavery in Romania." *Dialectical Anthropology* 14 (1) (1989): 53-61.

Bennett, Tony. "Media, 'Reality', Signification." In *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 287-308. London: Methuen, 1982.

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *October* 28: *Discipleship: A special issue on psychoanalysis* (1984): 125-33.

---. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1): *"Race," Writing, and Difference* (1985): 144-65.

Bird, S. Elizabeth, and Robert W. Dardenne. "Myth, Chronicle, and Story: Exploring the Narrative Qualities of News." In *Media, Myths, and Narratives: Television and the Press*, edited by James W. Carey, 67-86. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.

Blasco, Paloma Gay Y. "Gypsy/Roma Diasporas. A Comparative Perspective." *Social Anthropology* 10 (2) (2002): 173-88.

Bove, Paul A. "Discourse." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, edited by Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 50-65. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Braham, Peter. "How the Media Report Race." In *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 268-86. London: Methuen, 1982.

Brearley, Margaret. "The Persecution of Gypsies in Europe." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (4) (2001): 588-99.

Burawoy, Michael. "For a Sociological Marxism: The Complementary Convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi." *Politics & Society* 31 (2) (2003): 193-261.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "A Small History of Subaltern Studies." In *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 467-85. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Charnon-Deutsch, Lou. "Travels of the Imaginary Spanish Gypsy." In *Constructing Identity in Contemporary Spain*, edited by Jo Labanyi, 22-40. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Clark, Colin. "'New Age' Travellers: Identity, Sedentarism and Social Security." In *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 125-41. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997.

---. "Counting Backwards: The Roma 'Numbers Game' in Central and Eastern Europe." *Radical Statistics* 69 (1998): 35-46, *The Patrin Web Journal: Romani Culture and History*, http://www.geocities.com/~Patrin/countingback.htm (accessed November 21, 2007).

Cooper, Frederick. "Conflict and Connection: Rethinking Colonial African History." In *The Decolonization Reader*, edited by James D. Le Sueur, 23-44. New York, NY: Routledge, 2003.

Council of Europe. Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention of the Protection of National Minorities. 2002. *Opinion on the United Kingdom*. Strasbourg.

Cramer, Janet M. "Woman as Citizen: Race, Class, and the Discourse of Women's Citizenship, 1894-1909." *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs* (1998).

Crawford, Neta C. "Understanding Discourse: A Method of Ethical Argument Analysis." *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004): 22-5.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 39 (1989): 139-67. Quoted in Dara Z. Strolovitch, *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

Crowe, David M. "Muslim Roma in the Balkans." *Nationalities Papers* 28 (1) (2000): 93-128.

Csepeli, György, and Dávid Simon. "Construction of Roma Identity in Eastern and Central Europe: Perception and Self-Identification." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (1) (2004): 129-50.

Curran, James. "Communications, Power and Social Order." In *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 202-35. London: Methuen, 1982.

Derrida, Jacques. "Letter to a Japanese Friend." In *Derrida and Différance*, edited by David Wood and Robert Bernasconi, 1-5. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988, http://www.hydra.umn.edu/derrida/letter.html (accessed February 22, 2007).

Domke, David. "The Press and 'Delusive Theories of Equality and Fraternity' in the Age of Emancipation." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 228-50.

Erjavec, Karmen. "Media Representation of the Discrimination Against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia." *Discourse & Society* 12 (6) (2001): 699-727.

"Europe's Spectral Nation." *The Economist*, May 10, 2001, http://www.uwec.edu/geography/Ivogeler/w111/articles/roma.htm (accessed November 21, 2007).

Fairclough, Norman. "The Dialectics of Discourse." 2001, http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/norman/2001a.doc (accessed December 12, 2008).

Fee, Margery. "Who Can Write as Other?" In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 242-8. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

Fine, Michelle. "Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Kent Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 70-82. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

Foucault, Michel. "Nietzche, Genealogy, and History." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 76-100. New York, NY: Pantheon, 1984.

Fox, Jonathan. "Patterns of Discrimination, Grievances and Political Activity among Europe's Roma: A Cross-Sectional Analysis." *Journal of Ethno-Politics and Minority Issues in Europe* (2001/2), http://www.ecmi.de/jemie/download/Focus11-2001Fox.pdf (accessed January 23, 2007).

Gana, Nouri. "Of Contrapuntology: Said's Freud." *Theory & Event* 7 (2) (2004), http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.2gana.html (accessed on 2 October 2007).

Gheorghe, Nicolae. "Originea Sclaviei Romilor în Principatele Române" ("The Origins of Roma Slavery in Romanian Principalities"). *Roma* 7 (1983). Quoted in "Romii din România" ("The Roma in Romania"). Centrul de Documentare şi Informare despre Minorităţile din Europa de Sud-Est (CEDIMR-SE), http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/Romii_din_Romania.pdf (accessed November 26, 2007).

Gillborn, David. "Ethnicity and Educational Performance in the United Kingdom: Racism, Ethnicity, and Variability in Achievement." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28 (3) (1997): 375-93.

Golding, Peter, and Graham Murdock. "Culture, Communications and Political Economy." In *Mass Media and Society*, edited by James Curran and Michael Gurevitch, 70-92. 3rd ed. London: Arnold, 2000.

Gooding-Williams, Robert. "Black Neo-Conservatism: A Critical Introduction." *Praxis International* 2 (1987): 133-142.

Gross, Peter. "A Prolegomena to the Study of the Romani Media in Eastern Europe." *European Journal of Communication* 21 (4) (2006): 477-97.

Grossberg, Lawrence. "The Ideology of Communication: Post-Structuralism and the Limits of Communication." *Man and World* 15 (1982): 83-101.

Guha, Ranajit. "The Prose of Counter-Insurgency." In *Selected Subaltern Studies*, edited by Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 45-86. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Beyond the Nation-State? On Some Consequences of Economic Globalization." In *Democracy in the European Union: Integration through Deliberation?*, edited by Erik Oddvar Ericksen and John Erik Fossum, 29-41. London: Routledge, 2000.

Hall, Stuart. "Culture, the Media and Ideological Effect." In *Mass communication and society*, edited by James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott, 315-48. London: Edward Arnold in association with The Open University Press, 1977.

---. "The Social Production of News." In *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and the Law and Order*, edited by Stuart Hall, Charles Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. London: Macmillan. Quoted in Karmen Erjavec, "Media Representation of the Discrimination Against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia," *Discourse & Society* 12 (6) (2001): 702.

---. "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Oppressed in Media Studies." In *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran, and Janet Woollacott, 56-90. London: Methuen, 1982.

---. "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 411-40. London: Routledge, 1996.

---. "New Ethnicities." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 441-49. London: Routledge, 1996.

---. "The Spectacle of the 'Other.'" In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, edited by Stuart Hall, 223-90. London: Sage Publications in association with The Open University, 1997.

Hancock, Ian. "Non-Gypsy Attitudes towards Rom: The Gypsy Stereotype." *Roma* 9 (1) (1985): 50-65.

---. "Genocide of the Roma in the Holocaust." *The Patrin Web Journal: Romani Culture and History*, http://www.geocities.com/~Patrin/genocide.htm, 1997 (accessed November 21, 2007).

---. "The Struggle for the Control of Identity." *Transitions*, http://www.tol.cz/look/Transitions/article.tpl?IdLanguage=1&IdPublication=7&

NrIssue=4&NrSection=1&NrArticle=4233&search=search&SearchKeywords=hancock&SearchMode=on&SearchLevel=0 (1997) (accessed November 5, 2007).

Hardy, Cynthia, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips. "Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?" *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004): 19-22.

Hegde, Radha S. "A View from Elsewhere: Locating Difference and the Politics of Representation from a Transnational Feminist Perspective." *Communication Theory* 8 (1998): 271-97.

Herrera, Yoshiko M., and Bear F. Braumoeller. "Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis." *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1) (2004): 15-9.

Howard, Marc Morjé. "Can Populism Be Suppressed in a Democracy? Austria, Germany and the European Union." *East European Politics and Societies* 14 (2) (2000): 18-32.

Ioviță, Radu P., and Theodore G. Schurr. "Reconstructing the Origins and Migrations of Diasporic Populations: The Case of the European Gypsies." *American Anthropologist* 106 (2) (2004): 267-81.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn. "Humanistic Scholarship as Qualitative Science: Contributions to Mass Communication Research." In *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*, edited by Klaus Bruhn Jensen and Nicholas W. Jankowski, 17-43. London: Routledge, 1999.

Juluri, Vamsee. "Globalizing Audience Studies: The Audience and Its Landscape and Living Room Wars." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 85-90.

Kendall, Sally. "Sites of Resistance: Places on the Margin – the Traveller 'Homeplace.'" In *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 70-89. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997.

Kende, Ágnes. "The Hungary of Otherness: The Roma (Gypsies) of Hungary." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 8 (2) (2000): 187-201.

Kenrick, Donald. "Foreign Gypsies and British Immigration Law after 1945." In *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 100-10. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997.

Koulish, Robert E. "Attitudes towards Roma Minority Rights in Hungary: A Case of Ethnic Doxa, and the Contested Legitimization of Roma Inferiority." *Nationalities Papers* 31 (3) (2003): 327-45.

Kress, Gunther. "Ideological Structures in Discourse." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Vol. 4. Discourse Analysis in Society*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 27-42. London: Academic Press, 1985.

Kyuchukov, Hristo. "Transformative Education for Roma (Gypsy) Children: An Insider's View." *Intercultural education* 11 (3) (2000): 273-80.

Lemon, Alaina. "Telling Gypsy Exile: Pushkin, India, and Romani Diaspora." In *Realms of Exile: Nomadism, Diasporas, and Eastern European Voices*, edited by Domnica Radulescu, 29-48. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002.

Leudar, Ivan, and Jiří Nekvapil. "Presentations of Romanies in the Czech Media: On Category Work in Television Debates." *Discourse & Society* 11 (4) (2000): 487-513.

Levinson, Martin P., and Andrew C. Sparkes. "Gypsy Children, Space, and the School Environment." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 18 (6) (2005): 751-72.

Liegeois, Jean-Pierre, and Nicolae Gheorghe. "Roma/Gypsies: A European Minority." Minority Rights Group International Report, London, 95/4, 1995.

McVeigh, Robbie. "Theorising Sedentarism: The Roots of Anti-Nomadism." In *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 7-25. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997.

Moore-Gilbert, Bart. "Spivak and Bhabha." In *A companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 451-66. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Nagengast, Carole, and Terence Turner. "Introduction: Universal Human Rights Versus Cultural Relativity." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53 (1997): 269-72.

ní Shuinéar, Sinéad. "Why Do Gaujos Hate Gypsies So Much, Anyway?" In *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. A companion volume to *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, edited by Thomas Acton, 26-53. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 1997.

Niner, Pat. "Accommodating Nomadism? An Examination of Accommodation Options for Gypsies and Travellers in England." *Housing Studies* 19 (2) (2004): 141-59.

Papadimitriou, Dimitris. "The EU's Strategy in the Post-Communist Balkans." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 1 (3) (2001): 69-94.

Parameswaran, Radhika. "Local Culture in Global Media: Excavating Colonial and Material Discourses in *National Geographic*." *Communication Theory* 12 (3) (2002): 287-315.

Powell, Chris. "Time for Another Immoral panic? The Case of the Czechoslovak Gypsies." *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 2 (1994): 105-21.

Quayson, Ato. "Postcolonialism and Postmodernism." In *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 87-111. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Richardson, Joanna. "Talking about Gypsies: The Notion of Discourse as Control." *Housing Studies* 21 (1) (2006): 77-96.

Robbins, Bruce, Mary Louise Pratt, Jonathan Arac, R. Radhakrishnan, and Edward Said. "Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism*: A Symposium." *Social Text* 40 (1994): 1-24.

Ross, Marc Howard, and Elizabeth L. Homer. "Galton's Problem in Cross-National Research." *World Politics* 29 (1) (1976): 1-28.

Said, Edward. "Discrepant Experiences." In *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, edited by Gregory Castle, 26-37. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Schlager, Erika. "The Plight of the Roma in Eastern Europe: Free at Last?" *East European Studies Newsletter* 226 (2001), http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?topic_id=1422&fuseaction=topics.publications&doc_id=8548&group_id=7427 (accessed November 14, 2007).

Schneeweis, Adina. "Textual and Visual Representations of US Hegemony in a US Film Broadcast on Romanian Public Television." *Journal of Visual Literacy* 25 (1) (2005): 77-96.

Scholle, David J. "Critical Studies: From the Theory of Ideology to Power / Knowledge." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 5 (1988): 16-41.

Schwarz, Henry. "Mission Impossible: Introducing Postcolonial Studies in the US Academy." In *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 1-20. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Sharpe, Jenny. "Postcolonial Studies in the House of US Multiculturalism." In *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray, 112-25. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Shome, Raka. “Caught in the Term ‘Post-Colonial’: Why the ‘Post-Colonial’ Still Matters.” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 203-12.

Shome, Raka, and Radha S. Hegde. “Postcolonial Approaches to Communication: Charting the Terrain, Engaging the Intersections.” *Communication Theory* 12 (3) (2002): 249-70.

Tajfel, Henri. “Cognitive Aspects of Prejudice.” *Journal of Social Issues* 25 (1969): 79-97.

Urbinati, Nadia. “From the Periphery of Modernity: Antonio Gramsci’s Theory of Subordination and Hegemony.” *Political Theory* 26 (1998): 370-91.

van Dijk, Teun A. “The Interdisciplinary Study of News as Discourse.” In *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*, edited by Klaus Bruhn Jensen, and Nicholas W. Jankowski, 108-20. London, Routledge, 1999.

Vermeersch, Peter. “Ethnic Mobilisation and the Political Conditionality of European Union Accession: The Case of the Roma in Slovakia.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28 (1) (2002): 83-101.

Wacquant, Loïc J. D., and William Julius Wilson. “The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501 (1989): 8-25.

Wartella, Ellen. “The History Reconsidered.” In *American Communication Research: The Remembered History*, edited by Everette E. Dennis, and Ellen Wartella, 169-80. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.

Wiley, Stephen B. Crofts. “Rethinking Nationality in the Context of Globalization.” *Communication Theory* 14 (1) (2004): 78-96.

Willems, Wim. “Ethnicity as a Death Trap: The History of Gypsy Studies.” In *Gypsies and Other Itinerant Groups: A Socio-Historical Approach*, edited by Leo Lucassen, Wim Willems, and Annemarie Cottaar, 17-24. New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1998.

Winfield, Betty Houchin, Barbara Friedman, and Vivara Trisnadi. “History as the Metaphor through Which the Current World is Viewed: British and American Newspapers’ Uses of History Following the 11 September 2001 Terrorist Attacks.” *Journalism Studies* 3 (2) (2002): 289-300.

Young, Robert J. C. “Colonialism and the Desiring Machine.” In *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, edited by Gregory Castle, 73-98. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Zechenter, Elizabeth M. "In the Name of Culture: Cultural Relativism and the Abuse of the Individual." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53 (1997): 319-47.

Online Articles and Documents

BBC Radio 1Xtra: Gypsies and Travellers: What You're Saying. http://www.bbc.co.uk/1xtra/tx/documentaries/gypsies_travellers.shtml (accessed October 24, 2006).

"Boyash." Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boyash (accessed November 26, 2007).

Bran, Mirel. "Romania: Computer-Generated Freedom," February, 2000. http://www.unesco.org/courier/2000_02/uk/dossier/txt12.htm (accessed December 26, 2006).

BRAT: Biroul Român de Audit al Tirajelor (Romanian Audit Bureau of Circulations). http://www.brat.ro/ (accessed December 26, 2006).

Clavier, Sophie M. "Human Rights and the Debate Between Universalism & Cultural Relativism." http://userwww.sfsu.edu/~sclavier/research/hrdebate.pdf (accessed May 7, 2009).

Commission for Racial Equality. "Gypsies and Irish Travellers: The Facts." http://www.cre.gov.uk/gdpract/g_and_t_facts.html (accessed February 4, 2007).

de Vaux de Foletier, François. "Their World Their Homeland – Gipsies." *UNESCO Courier*, October, 1984, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1310/is_200202/ai_3455603 (accessed December 17, 2007).

European Committee on Romani Emancipation. "About ECRE." http://www.eu-romani.org/ecre.htm (accessed February 7, 2008).

---. "Legal Structure of the European Committee on Romani Emancipation." http://www.eu-romani.org/legal.html (accessed February 7, 2008).

European Roma and Travellers Forum. "Short Presentation of the European Roma and Travellers Forum." http://www.ertf.org/en/short.html (accessed February 7, 2008).

European Roma Information Office. http://www.erionet.org/ (accessed February 7, 2008).

European Roma Rights Centre. http://www.errc.org/ (accessed February 7, 2008).

---. "What is the European Roma Rights Centre?" http://www.errc.org/About_index.php (accessed February 7, 2008).

European Union. "Why the European Union?" http://europa.eu/abc/12lessons/lesson_1/index_en.htm (accessed February 5, 2007).

European Union. "The Charter of Fundamental Rights." http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/rights/charter/fsj_rights_charter_en.htm (accessed June 19, 2009).

European Union Constitution. http://ec.europa.eu/ireland/general_information/constitution/index_en.htm (accessed March 29, 2007).

Gatlif, Tony. *Latcho Drom (1993)*, http://movies2.nytimes.com/gst/movies/movie.html?v_id=148396 (2005) (accessed on 28 January 2007).

"History of *the Guardian*." *The Guardian*. http://www.guardian.co.uk/information/theguardian/story/0,,1038110,00.html (accessed January 24, 2008).

Guardian Circulation and Readership, *The*. http://adinfo-guardian.co.uk/the-guardian/guardian-circulation-and-readership.shtml (accessed December 26, 2006).

Gypsy Lore Society, The. http://www.gypsyloresociety.org/ (accessed December 10, 2007).

Hanu Ancutei Forum. http://www.hanuancutei.com (accessed November 26, 2007).

Kovats, Martin. "Opportunities and Challenges: EU Enlargements and the Roma / Gypsy Diaspora." Open Society Institute's EU Monitoring and Advocacy Program, 2001, http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2001/nov/romadiaspora (accessed November 14, 2007).

Lawrence, Pete. "New Age Travellers." BBC Four Time Shift, August 2005. http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/documentaries/timeshift/travellers.shtml (accessed November 5, 2008).

"Multi-Ethnic States and the Protection of Minority Rights." United Nations, 2001. http://www.un.org/WCAR/e-kit/minority.htm (accessed December 10, 2007).

Office of Public Sector Information. *Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994*. http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1994/ukpga_19940033_en_9#pt5-pb7-l1g79 (accessed November 25, 2008).

"Population by Ethnic Groups at Population and Housing Census, on March 18, 2002." National Institute of Statistics. http://www.insse.ro/cms/files%5Cstatistici%5CStatistici_teritoriale2007%5Ceng%5C4.htm (accessed October 6, 2008).

Project on Ethnic Relations, The. http://www.per-usa.org/brochure.htm (accessed January 23, 2007).

Project on Ethnic Relations, The. "The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions," 1996. http://www.per-usa.org/rommedia.htm (accessed December 27, 2006).

Recensământ 2002 (Census 2002). http://www.recensamant.ro/ (accessed December 26, 2006).

Romani CRISS. http://www.romanicriss.org/ (accessed November 21, 2007).

"Romii din România" ("The Roma in Romania"). Centrul de Documentare şi Informare despre Minorităţile din Europa de Sud-Est (CEDIMR-SE), http://www.edrc.ro/docs/docs/Romii_din_Romania.pdf (accessed November 26, 2007).

Stepanek, Libor. "Minorities in Europe – the Divergence of Law and Policy." Eumap.org (2002), http://www.eumap.org/journal/features/2002/jan02/minorities (accessed November 19, 2007).

The Times Circulation. http://www.timesmediaadvertising.com/key-facts/ circulation/the-times.aspx (accessed December 26, 2006).

United Nations. "Multi-Ethnic States and the Protection of Minority Rights." United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. Durban, South Africa: 31 August – 7 September 2001. http://www.un.org/WCAR/e-kit/minority.htm (accessed December 5, 2005).

---. "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights." http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/ (accessed June 12, 2009).

"Ranajit Guha on Elitist Historiography – An Analysis." Wond'ring Aloud... Blog, February 1, 2007, https://risenphoenix.wordpress.com/2007/02/01/ranajit-guha-on-elitist-historiography-an-analysis/ (accessed December 31, 2007).

World Factbook, The. "United Kingdom." https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/print/uk.html (accessed February 4, 2007).

Unpublished Works

Andrițoiu, Anca. E-mail message to the author, November 28, 2007.

Dell'Orto, Giovanna. "'We Are All Americans': The Discourse about America in the Western European Press at the Dawn of the 20th and the 21st Centuries." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2004.

Mirga, Andrzej. "Making the EU's Anti-Discrimination Policy Instruments Work for Romani Communities in the Enlarged European Union." Based on a paper presented at the European Parliament's Public Seminar "Promoting EU Fundamental Rights Policy: From words to deeds or how to make rights a reality?" organized by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, April 2005.

Schneeweis, Adina. "Difference in Cross-Cultural Perspective: Framing Roma and Non-Roma in Film." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, San Francisco, CA, August 2-5, 2006.

Schneeweis, Adina, and Brian Southwell. "Constructing 'the Disadvantaged Roma' Audience: Public Health Communication and Politics in Contemporary Romania." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May 21-25, 2009.

Semati, Mehdi. "Brown Men of the Middle East: The Politics of Islamophobia." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL, May 21-25, 2009.

Stryker, Jo Ellen, Ricardo Wray, Robert C. Hornik, and Itzik Yanovitzky. "Validation of On-line Search Terms for Content Analysis: The Case of Cancer News Coverage." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New York, NY, May, 2005.

Szalai, Júlia. "Az elismerés politikája és a 'cigánykérdés'," manuscript, 2000: 12. Quoted in Ágnes Kende, "The Hungary of Otherness: The Roma (Gypsies) of Hungary." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 8 (2) (2000): 196.

Audio-Visual Materials

Gatlif, Tony. *Latcho Drom*. 103 min. Michèle Ray-Gavras, 1993. Videocassette.

Said, Edward. *Edward Said – On Orientalism*. Media Education Foundation. 40 min. Edward Said, 1998. DVD.

Appendix A

Newspapers Examined for Coverage of Gypsies / Roma

between 1990 and 2006

TABLE A.1 Newspaper selected for analysis during specific time periods

Selected sites of coverage	*The Times*	*The Guardian*	*Adevărul*	*România Liberă*
Jan-Feb 1990	X	X	X	X
Aug-Oct 1992	X	X	X	X
Aug-Nov 1997	X	X		
Oct-Nov 2001			X	X
June-July 2003; June 2004; October 2004	X	X	X	X
Nov-Dec 2006	X	X	X	X

Table Key: X = Paper to be examined in the specific time period
(Blank) = Paper not to be examined in the specific time period

Appendix B

NGO Documents Examined for Representation

of Gypsies / Roma between 1990 and 2006

TABLE B.1 NGO Documents analyzed for discourses

NGO	*Documents*
The Project on Ethnic Relations (PER)	***Bulletins*** - Winter 1996 Bulletin (1996) - Spring/Summer 1997 Bulletin (1997) - Winter/Spring 1998 Bulletin (1998) - Winter/Spring 1999 Bulletin (1999) - Spring 2000 Bulletin (2000) - Summer 2001 Bulletin (2001) - Fall 2004 Bulletin (2004) - Winter/Spring 2006 Bulletin (2006) ***Central Europe*** - Political Leaders on Interethnic Relations and Regional Security in Central Europe: A Roundtable (1998) ***Roma*** - The *Romanies* in Central and Eastern Europe: Illusions and Reality (1992) - Countering Anti-Roma Violence in Eastern Europe: The Snagov Conference and Related Efforts (1994) - The Media and the Roma in Contemporary Europe: Facts and Fictions (1996) - The Roma in the Twenty-First Century: A Policy Paper (1997) - Prevention of Violence and Discrimination Against the Roma in Central and Eastern Europe (1997) - Images and Issues: Coverage of the Roma in the Mass Media in Romania (1997) - Roundtable on Roma and Sinti National Policies (1998) - Roundtable Discussion of Government Policies on the Roma in Romania (1999) - State Policies Toward the Romani Communities in the Candidate Countries to the EU: Government and Romani Participation in Policy-Making (1999) - Roma and the Law: Demythologizing the *Gypsy Criminality*

Stereotype (2000)
- Roma and Statistics (2000)
- Romani Representation and Leadership at National and International Levels (2001)
- Leadership, Representation, and the Status of the Roma (2002)
- PER Field Trip for Journalists and the Seminar "Roma In Romanian Media" (2002)
- Roma and the Question of Self-Determination: Fiction and Reality (2003)
- Roma and EU Accession: Elected and Appointed Romani Representatives in an Enlarged Europe (2004)
- Making the EU's anti-discrimination policy instruments work for Romani communities in the enlarged European Union (2005)
- Romani Politics Present and Future (2006)

Romania
- Romanian-American Symposium on Inter-Ethnic Relations (1991)
- Schools, Language, and Interethnic Relations in Romania: The Debate Continues (1998)
- Building Romanian Democracy: The Police and Ethnic Minorities (1999)
- The Year 2000 Elections in Romania: Interethnic Relations and European Integration (2000)
- Roma and Elections in Romania (2000)
- The Media's Impact on the Participation of Romani Organizations in Parliamentary Elections (2001)
- Political Will: Romania's Path to Ethnic Accommodation (2001)
- Political Uses of Anti-Semitism (2005)

The European Roma Information Office (ERIO)

Country Reports
- The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union (2004)

Equality for Roma in Europe: A Roadmap for Action January 2006 (2006)

Newsletters
- European Roma Information Office Newsletter September 2006 (2006)
- European Roma Information Office Newsletter October-November 2006 (2006)
- European Roma Information Office Newsletter December 2006 (2006)

Press Releases
- Monitoring Reports on Bulgaria's and Romania's EU Accession

(2006)
- The European Parliament Adopted Resolution on the Situation of Roma Women in the European Union (2006)
- European Commission Approved the Monitoring Report on the State of Preparedness of EU Membership of Bulgaria and Romania (2006)
- Schulz Criticises New Commissioner's Role as "Skimpy" (2006)
- Closing Event of the EU Community Action Programme to Combat Discrimination, 27-28.11.2006 (2006)

The European Roma and Travellers Forum (ERTF)

Charter
- European Roma Rights Charter – legitimate Roma right (2005)

Press Releases
- First European Roma and Travellers Forum Plenary Assembly to be held at Council of Europe from 13 to 15 December (2005)
- European Roma and Travellers Forum welcomed adoption of "Day of the Roma Ethnic Community by Romania", Strasbourg, 14 April 2006 (2006)
- Anti-Gypsyism, a European cultural heritage, Strasbourg, 2 August 2006 (2006)
- Don't create a Palestinian refugee problem in Europe, Pristina, 9 September 2006 (2006)
- European Parliament must pay more than a lip service to Roma rights, Strasbourg, 3 October 2006 (2006)
- European Roma Parliament adopts resolution on Roma in Europe, Strasbourg, 9 November 2006 (2006)

The European Roma Rights Center (ERRC)

Country Reports
- Sudden Rage at Dawn. Violence Against Roma in Romania (1996)
- Executive Summary: European Roma Rights Center Country Report: State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania (2001)
- State of Impunity: Human Rights Abuse of Roma in Romania (2001)

Fact Sheet Romania
- ERRC Concerns: Romania

Pamphlets
- Political Participation and Democracy in Europe: A Short Guide for Romani Activists (2004)
- Recognising and Combating Racial Discrimination: A Short Guide (2004)

Position Papers

- Protecting Romani Refugees around Europe: A Position Paper by the European Roma Rights Center (2004)
- Barriers to the Education of the Roma in Europe: A Position Paper by the European Roma Rights Center (2004)

Roma Rights Quarterly

- Roma Rights: Autumn 1996 (1996)
- Roma Rights Spring 1997 (1997)
- Roma Rights, Summer 1997: Romani Holocaust (1997)
- Roma Rights Quarterly Autumn 1997 (1997)
- Roma Rights, Winter 1998: Police Violence against Roma (1998)
- Roma Rights Spring, 1998: Racially Motivated Violence against Roma (1998)
- Roma Rights Summer 1998: Roma and the Right to Education (1998)
- Roma Rights Autumn 1998: Legal Defence (1998)
- Roma Rights 1/1999: Forced Migration (1999)
- Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Kosovo (1999)
- Roma Rights: Newsletter of the European Roma Rights Center: Competing Romani Identities (1999)
- Roma Rights 4/1999: Romani Media / Mainstream Media (1999)
- Roma Rights 1/2000: Women's Rights (2000)
- Roma Rights 2/2000: Housing (2000)
- Roma Rights 3/2000: Rights of the Child (2000)
- Roma Rights 4/2000: Racism: Denial and Acknowledgement (2000)
- Roma Rights 1/2001: Access to Justice (2001)
- Roma Rights 2-3/2001: Government Programmes on Roma (2001)
- Roma Rights 4/2001: Mobilisation / Participation (2001)
- Roma Rights 1/2002: Extreme Poverty (2002)
- Roma Rights 2/2002: Fortress Europe (2002)
- Roma Rights 3-4/2002: Segregation and Desegregation (2002)
- Roma Rights 1-2, 2003: Anti-Discrimination Law (2003)
- Roma Rights 3/2003: Personal Documents and Access to Fundamental Rights (2003)
- Roma Rights 4/2003: Political Rights (2003)
- Roma Rights 1/2004: What is Roma Rights? (2004)
- Roma Rights 2/2004: Ethnic Statistics (2004)
- Roma Rights 3-4/2004: Health Care (2004)
- Roma Rights 1/2005: Positive action to ensure equality (2005)
- Roma Rights 2/2005: Rights and traditions (2005)

- Roma Rights 3-4/2005: Justice for Kosovo (2005)
- Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 1/2006: Exclusion from Employment (2006)
- Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 2-3/2006: ERRC 10th Anniversary (2006)
- Roma Rights: Quarterly Journal of the European Roma Rights Centre: 4/2006: Romani Women's Rights Movement (2006)

The European Committee on Romani Emancipation (ECRE)

Correspondence

- ECRE Management Committee to Petitions Committee of the European Parliament (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to The European Ombudsman (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to The European Ombudsman (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Roy Perry, Vice Chairman Petitions Committee of European Parliament (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Roy Perry, Vice Chairman Petitions Committee of European Parliament (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Fabrizio Barbaso, acting Director General for Enlargement European Commission (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Petitions Committee (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Chairman of Petitions Committee (2003)
- ECRE Management Committee to Chairman of Petitions Committee (2004)
- ECRE Management Committee to Chair Petitions Committee (2004)
- Petition Committee Notice to Members (annex to letter above) (2004)
- ECRE Management Committee to readers of this list (2004)
- ECRE Management Committee to Chair Petitions Committee (2004)
- ECRE Management Committee to Ombudsman (2004)
- ECRE Management Committee to Ombudsman (2004)

Reports

- The Impact of Special Schools on the Roma in Central Europe (2003)
- Some Reasons Why the European Parliamentary Petitions Committee Should Be Scrapped (2004)

Appendix C

Discourses of Gypsies / Roma Observed in Press Coverage

between 1990 and 2006

The Gypsy of 1990: The unlawful brunet

1. The Gypsy as the other
2. The Gypsy as victim of discrimination
3. The civilized Gypsy

The Gypsy of 1992: The social burden

1. The Gypsy as the other
2. The Gypsy as an unwanted problem
3. The Gypsy as victim of discrimination
4. The Gypsies as an abandoned people
5. The civilized Gypsy

The Gypsy of 1997: Someone else's problem

1. The Gypsy as an unwanted problem
2. The Gypsy as someone else's problem
3. The Gypsy as a European problem

The Gypsy of 2001: Moving in

1. The Gypsy as the other
2. The Gypsy to be changed
3. The Gypsy as politically tolerated

The Gypsy of 2003-2004: "The big economic headache" and the Nimbies

1. The Gypsy as the other
2. The Gypsy as an unwanted problem
3. The Gypsy as someone else's problem
4. The Gypsy as victim of discrimination
5. The Gypsy as political project of social integration

The Gypsy of 2006: Abandoning the "anachronistic, indefensible and ludicrous existence"

1. The Gypsy as the other
2. The Gypsy as an unwanted problem
3. The Gypsy as victim of discrimination
4. The Gypsy as political project of *cultural integration*
5. The Gypsy as political *integration-through-change* project

Appendix D

Schematization of Themes and Topics Constructing Discourses

of Gypsies / Roma Observed in NGO Documents

The Roma as victim of discrimination

This discourse identifies discrimination, racism, anti-Gypsism, and prejudice against the Gypsies / Roma.

- Area of discrimination: Employment, housing, health services, education, social assistance
- Manifestations of discrimination: Official violence (authorities, police brutality or injustice), poverty, media discrimination, use of stereotypes, ethnic conflict
- Historic discrimination: References to slavery, the Holocaust, communism, sterilizations, eugenics
- Identifying Gypsies / Roma as victims, victimized by the system

State blame

This discourse identifies discrimination as the fault of the state / authorities / officials.

- State failures to assist Roma communities (in the fields of employment, housing, health services, education, social assistance, identification documents)
- Unwillingness to help
- Police brutality (excessive use of force)
- Racial profiling, expectation of Roma criminality
- Negative framing of the state as unwanting the Roma communities (as refugees or local communities): Attempts at deportation, expulsion, segregation, ghettoization, relocation, eviction (planned, threatened)
- State framed to scapegoat Roma communities

Roma rights

This discourse advocates for Roma rights, using human rights and minority rights arguments. It also documents litigation successes for Roma rights and frames litigation failures as the fault of the state / a corrupt and discriminatory system.

- Documentations of human rights violations, litigation successes, court cases, litigations failures
- Roma issues are a human rights concern (may be discussed as universal, relativist, cultural, or special right)
- Roma are a minority whose rights must / should be protected
- Gender equality as human right
- Ethnic conflict and racial attacks identified as human rights violations
- Roma as political and / or legal topic
- Emergence / discussion / topic of political correctness of the term “Roma”
- Identifying / discussing / emphasizing the Roma rights / Romani / NGO movement working to protect Roma rights

Ethno-genesis
This discourse discusses the construct of one (or several) Roma / Gypsy identity(ies). It engages questions of representation, authenticity, voice (who speaks for the Roma), political status and legitimacy, history and tradition, nation-building vs. the statelessness of the Roma

- Discussions about Roma as a unique, special ethnic group
- Discussions about Roma as a European people with one identity
- Terminology issues
- Discussing the process of identity-making within Roma communities and leaders
- Definitions of race, ethnicity, Roma-ness, Gypsy-ness
- Descriptions of the Roma / Gypsy communities as self-confident, growing, modernizing, learning, adapting to democratic systems
- Discussions of the concept of Roma nation (necessity, difficulties, pros and cons)
- Political presence (need for, fragmentation among Roma communities, traditional vs. new Roma leaders / intellectuals, need to nurture civic / political engagement)
- Contribution of Roma rights / Romani movement to identity-building

Social integration
This discourse offers solutions to political, economic, and social problems that Roma face. It praises successes towards integration of the Roma into mainstream societies.

- Evidences / praise of political participation and collaborations
- Evidences / praise of progresses in education of / for the Roma (literacy, skills training, higher education)
- Successes in legislation and policy-making
- Attention to violence and human rights violations (training of Roma, lawyers, and judges)
- Working towards a more balanced media portrayal (training of Roma and non-Roma journalists, collaborations)
- Willingness of Roma to collaborate
- Progress in general noted and praised
- NGO involvement in solving problems and project coordination
- Projects towards integration
- Discussion of / debate between integration / assimilation
- Democracy as necessary context for collaboration and improvement (European and US institutions manifesting interest and support (including financial) towards democratic, inter-ethnic accord; also modernization approach to integration)

Resistance by safeguarding tradition
This discourse advocates for protection of tradition in the face of democracy, modernization, European institutions working towards (in this view) assimilation, and most broadly discrimination.

- Tradition to take central role in identity building

- State criticized to attempt assimilation (seen as destruction of Romani culture, values, and traditions)
- Traditional political roles and leaders preferred to modern (educated, Westernized) ones
- Women's rights framed as an offense to tradition and preservation of culture
- Education seen to equal assimilation
- West knows best / supremacy view on international aid and organizations seen as ignorant of culture and traditions, with potential harmful effects on Romani life
- Discrimination seen here as threat to Romani culture (as first discourse argues, but here part of argument "world out to get us" – discrimination in conjunction to other themes delineated here, not just noting discrimination)

The Roma as the Gypsy other

This discourse identifies the Roma as backward, less civilized, not interested in collaborations, growing, adapting, and / or modernizing.

- Roma framed as standing out because of their difference (different lifestyle)
- Roma community framed to be backward
- Roma leaders / activists framed to be hesitant, uncomfortable, less civilized (fragmentation of opinion, not unified, arguing, loud, surprised at technology)
- Roma communities framed as inferior to Hungarian minority that is better organized and therefore better integrated and less of a social problem
- Change depends on Roma's willingness to change (which they do not show)