Basic Concepts of Romani Policies in Europe

On Antigypsyism and the Idea of Roma in European Political Language

Iulius Rostas & Tim B. Müller

VDSR|BW VERBAND DEUTSCHER SINTI & ROMA LANDESVERBAND BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG

THE GREENS/EFA in the European Parliament

VDSR BW

VERBAND DEUTSCHER
SINTI & ROMA
LANDESVERBAND
BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG

Basic Concepts of Romani Policies in Europe

On Antigypsyism and the Idea of Roma in European Political Language

Iulius Rostas & Tim B. Müller

VDSR|BW VERBAND DEUTSCHER SINTI & ROMA LANDESVERBAND BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG

THE GREENS/EFA in the European Parliament

This publication is part of a project sponsored by the Greens/EFA Group in the European Parliament.

European Parliament
Rue Wiertz, 60
1047 Brussels
Belgium

November 2021
ISBN 978-3-9824171-1-0

This book is published by:

VDSR-BW
Verband Deutscher Sinti und Roma
Landesverband Baden-Württemberg e. V.
B 7, 16
68159 Mannheim
Germany
+49 (0) 621 – 911 091 00
info@sinti-roma.com

Project coordination: Dr. Tim Müller
Design & Layout: Despina Arvanitelli, Dr. Tim Müller

The documentation is also accessible at this website:
www.sinti-roma.com

Contents

Preface 5

PART I:
ANTIGYPSYISM

1 Antigypsyism as Racism 9
2 On Terminology 15
3 On the Origins of Antigypsyism 19
4 On Manifestations of Antigypsyism 30
5 On Mechanisms That (Re-)Produce Antigypsyism 37
6 Conclusion 39

PART II:
ON THE CONCEPT OF "ROMA" IN EUROPEAN POLITICAL LANGUAGE

1 European Political Language and Romani History 47
2 Contested Concept: The Rise of "Roma" 50
3 Modernity and the "Nomads":
Founding Romani Europe in the 1960s and 1970s 59
4 Discovering Diversity: "Romanies" in the 1980s 66
5 Enlarging Europe, Easternising Romani Europe:
The Return of the "Gypsies" in the 1990s 72
6 The Gradual Establishment of a European Name,
From Local to Governmental Levels:
"Roma" Since the Mid-1990s 83
7 Paradoxical Paradigm Shift: Conclusion 94

Bibliography 97

Preface

Successful action requires clarity of thought. This also applies to the complex field of European Romani policies. This publication attempts to contribute to a clarification of two of the most frequently used terms in the European debate on Romani people: antigypsyism and Roma. These are two basic concepts of European political thought and policy with regard to Europe's Romani citizens. European politics and administration have used Roma as a name for all European Romani minorities for more than two decades. Antigypsyism is the fundamental condition and structure of discrimination faced by all people of Romani origin and did not only become the central strategic term with the European Union Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation adopted by the European Commission in October 2020.

Yet these basic concepts are often used in contradictory and incompatible ways. With this contribution we address all those involved in the field of European Romani policies, from Romani civil society and self-organisations to NGOs, academics and researchers to regional and national governments to European institutions and policymakers. In Part I we want to sharpen the concept of antigypsyism theoretically, clarify its content and effects and show why this concept is indispensable to understand the realities of Romani people in Europe and to design more successful policies. In Part II, we trace the historical development of the term Roma in

European political language in order to better understand the content associated with this basic concept of European politics. In doing so, we hope to contribute to a better informed and more precise discussion as well as to a more comprehensive perception of options for effective action. It is crucial for Romani people in their diversity to participate in these European processes at all steps and at all levels.

For making our research possible, we would like to thank the Greens/EFA Group in the European Parliament, in particular Romeo Franz MEP, who initiated this research, and Marius Tudor, Senior Adviser, Office of MEP Romeo Franz and LIBE Committee, Non-Discrimination and Romani Policies, Anti-Racism and Diversity Intergroup, who provided organisational support for this project. We would also like to thank Thorsten Afflerbach, Head of Division, Roma and Travellers Team, Directorate of Anti-Discrimination, Directorate General of Democracy of the Council of Europe, and José Andrés Gonzalez Pedraza, Archivist of the European Parliament, for their support, as well as our many interlocutors – both personal and in the context of academic and Romani civil society discourse – too numerous to mention here, without whose critical perspectives we could not have written this contribution.

Berlin and Mannheim, November 2021

Part I
Antigypsyism

1 Antigypsyism as Racism

Despite its increasing use by activists, academics, and politicians, there is not yet a consensus on how to define the concept of antigypsyism. The confusions around antigypsyism are related to when the term appeared, who coined the term, to whom exactly it refers and how to understand these categories, the way to define it, what mechanisms generate it and spread it historically, how it operates in practice, and even if it represents the right term to use in relation to those populations that is believed are suffering the consequences of antigypsyism. The aim of this contribution is to bring clarity onto some of these aspects.

There are different definitions of antigypsyism provided both by academics and institutions. In this section, due to the limited space, the focus is on those definitions provided by institutions which play an important role in shaping policies and public discourse on Roma.

The Council of Europe's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) adopted in 2011 a general policy recommendation on combating antigypsyism and has defined it as follows:

> *"anti-Gypsyism is a specific form of racism, an ideology founded on racial superiority, a form of dehumanisation and institutional racism nurtured by historical discrimination, which is expressed, among others, by violence, hate speech, exploitation, stigmatisation and the most blatant kind of discrimination."*

The Alliance against Antigypsyism, a coalition of 95 Roma and pro-Roma organizations led by the European Roma Grassroots Organization (ERGO) network, provided the following working definition of antigypsyism:

> *"Antigypsyism is a historically constructed, persistent complex of customary racism against social groups identified under the stigma 'gypsy' or other related terms, and incorporates:*
> - *a homogenizing and essentializing perception and description of these groups;*
> - *the attribution of specific characteristics to them;*
> - *discriminating social structures and violent practices that emerge against that background, which have a degrading and ostracizing effect and which reproduce structural disadvantages."*

In 2020, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance provided the following non-legally binding working definition of antigypsyism to guide its work:

> *"Antigypsyism/anti-Roma discrimination is a manifestation of individual expressions and acts as well as institutional policies and practices of marginalization, exclusion, physical violence, devaluation of Roma cultures and lifestyles, and hate speech directed at Roma as well as other individuals and groups perceived, stigmatized, or persecuted during the Nazi era, and still today, as 'Gypsies'. This leads to the treatment of Roma as an alleged alien group and associates them with a series of pejorative*

stereotypes and distorted images that represent a specific form of racism."

These definitions use a mixture of terms and concepts which might confuse the readership: racism, ideology, discrimination, hate speech, dehumanization, essentialization, etc. At a glance, it is obvious that antigypsyism cannot be all these terms. One might notice that a common element of these definitions is that antigypsyism represents a form of racism. In addition, all these definitions are not being based on some empirical research and no attempts to measure antigypsyism based on these definitions have been in place. Most of the literature on antigypsyism is based on a qualitative approach while the quantitative dimension of the phenomenon was ignored. The issue of measuring antigypsyism is of significant importance as antigypsyism is one of the priorities of the new European Union Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation adopted by the European Commission in October 2020.[1]

Based on the empirical research conducted in five EU member states, at EU level (Carrera, Rostas and Vosyliūtė, 2017) and seven countries in the Western Balkans (Rostas et al., 2021), the definition of antigypsyism used here was based on the evaluation of the three rounds of

[1] Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – A Union Of Equality: EU Roma Strategic Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation, COM(2020) 620 final, Brussels, 7.10.2020, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0620&from=EN

policy making towards Roma in Europe, including the 2011 EU Framework for Roma National Integration Strategies of the European Commission (Rostas, 2019). The definition evolved through the experience accumulated during the empirical research so that it includes a range of highly pejorative terms used to stigmatize these groups and a reference to the concept of social imaginary[2] to help the readership understand the dynamic of this social phenomenon.

Antigypsyism is a special form of racism directed against those stigmatized in the social imaginary as 'Gypsies', "tsigane", "țigan", "Zigeuner", "tatars", "zingari" or other related terms, that has at its core the assumptions that they are an inferior and deviant group, and which justifies their dominance and oppression. Other key assumptions of antigypsyism are orientalism, nomadism, rootlessness, and backwardness. (Rostas, 2019: 12-20)

What does it mean that antigypsyism is a form of racism? How to define racism in an inclusive way to reflect the diverse experience of those subjected to racism across the globe? Such a definition becomes a stringent requirement considering the presence of the Roma all over the world and their marginal social position. As Ramon Grosfoguel defined it, "racism is a global hierarchy of superiority and inferiority along the line of the human that have been politically, culturally and economically produced and reproduced for centuries by the

[2] The term is used in the Charles Taylor meaning of the concept: "the social imaginary is that common understanding that makes possible common practices and a widely shared sense of legitimacy." (Taylor, 2004: 23)

institutions of the 'capitalist/patriarchal western-centric/Christian-centric modern/colonial world system'" (Grosfoguel, 2016: 9). As he points out, there are diverse forms of racism, depending on different colonial histories, and the human hierarchy could be constructed through different social markers – colour, ethnicity, language, religion, or culture. Hence, in order to avoid defining antigypsyism tautologically, one must provide some insights into the way racism is produced and reproduced and how it operates.

Therefore, the assumptions provide insights into the racialization and mechanism of production through which antigypsyism operates. Inferiority is linked with the perception of Roma as less human, closer to the animal world. Since the first writing about Roma, one might notice frequent references to animality while describing the Roma. Inferiority is also connected with the believed inability of Roma to respect the minimal rules and values of the society in which they live. Deviance emphasizes the outsider status of Roma and is often equated with criminality and certain practices considered Roma specific. Criminality is often perceived by the majority society as a genetic characteristic of Roma or as part of their nature. Orientalism based on skin colour and other ethnic characteristics emphasizes the non-European roots of the Roma, paving the ground for their exclusion. Roma play the role of the "significant other": they are the reference point in building the identity of majority populations. Nomadism is seen as a feature of the way of life of Roma, depicting Roma as unstable and not trustworthy people, wandering around at their free will. Nomadism is presented as a choice of the Roma, as a

strategy to avoid accountability to the society for paying taxes and alleged committed crimes, or as a primitive and antisocial way of life in stark contrast with the settled majority population. Rootlessness is closely linked with nomadism and underlines the lack of a sense of identity, depicting Roma as people incapable of having relations with the land, with no collective memory and sense of belonging. Backwardness consists of presenting Roma as uncivilized, uneducated, and having a very different and primitive way of life from that the majority. The way to deal with it is through modernization of Roma, which consists of their assimilation by adopting the norms and values of the majority population.

The above definition makes the case that what counts is the hierarchisation of humans based on their perceived belonging to a group whose identity is constructed and imposed by outsiders. This hierarchization justifies the control over the inferior group, including over their identity (domination) and the intentional disadvantaging of this group of people by arbitrarily or cruel exercise of power (oppression).

Similarly to antisemitism, antigypsyism is a form of racism that predates the racism as a concept defined by academics. As Michael Banton, one of the leading scholars on racial and ethnic studies has shown, the word "race" entered the vernacular languages in the 15th, but especially in the 16th century, and it went through subsequent mutation in its meaning, especially in regard to its horizontal dimension of the nature of distinctiveness

among groups.[3] (Banton, 2018: 11-12) David Theo Goldberg argued that "race was integral to the emergence, development, and transformations of the modern state" and that the modern states ordered themselves racially and culturally homogenously. (Goldberg, 2002: 4) Thus, racial thinking and racist articulation became normalized and naturalized already in the 16th century in modern European societies. (Goldberg, 1993) Other scholars, make even clearer the connection between racism and European modernity. Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze places the origin of the modern concept of 'race' in the European Enlightenment during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Eze, 1997). However, racialization of Roma happens already in the beginning of the 15th century and could be identified in the early writings on Roma by the authorities.

2 On Terminology

There are several terms referring to the historical experiences of marginalization and oppression of Roma: Romaphobia, anti-Romaism or anti-Romism, anti-Roma racism, antigypsyism. Above, there is a detailed

[3] Banton presented a bi-dimensional model of the term race: "Its vertical dimension identified the historical origins of what made a set of persons distinctive, emphasizing heredity and genealogy. This meaning fitted with the anthropology of the Bible. It was exemplified in John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs,* of 1570, when he referred to 'the outward race and stocke of Abraham'. The word's horizontal dimension identified the nature of that distinctiveness." (Banton, 2018: 11)

explanation of the use of antigypsyism. The term was originally coined by Roma activists in the Soviet Union during the 1920s open policies towards national minorities. Martin Hollers credits Aleksandr Germano as the inventor of the term 'antitsyganizm', the equivalent version of antigypsyism in Russian. (Holler, 2015)

For comparative purposes and a deeper understanding of these scholarly and activists' debates, there is a need to explain the other terms. Romaphobia is a neutral term with medical origins using the ethnonym Roma and some scholars and activists regard it as positive, in line with Islamophobia or homophobia.

The objections to the term relate to its medical roots and the implied solutions. Phobia is usually defined as an intense, persistent, and irrational fear of an object, place, situation, feeling or animal. However, the historical experience of Roma could hardly be explained as originating in such a fear. How could someone explain Roma slavery, the Holocaust, the so-called "Gypsy hunts", the forced sterilization of Romani women and other extreme forms of violence inflicted on Roma through the fear of the majority or even the prejudices and stereotypes towards Roma?

Secondly, the implied solution by the term Romaphobia seem to be rather medical – therapy or psychiatric treatment. Or, in order to effectively deal with the injustices and oppression of Roma, there is a need for much more than therapy and psychiatric treatment – effective and inclusive policies to remedy past injustices, including affirmative action, eliminate impunity and bring to justice those responsible for crimes and

atrocities committed against Roma, and a larger process of reconciliation with majority society.

The terms anti-Romaism or anti-Romism miss exactly the stigmatization mechanisms of those labelled as "Gypsies" and other terms and the identity trauma inflicted by majority population and state institutions on these communities. Moreover, these terms leave out those that are not identifying themselves as Roma as those stigmatized were not stigmatized as "Roma" but as "Gypsies". One should not ignore that there are significant populations that do not identify as Roma – such as Romani minorities in Hungary, who do not speak Romani language and identify themselves in Hungarian through the endonym "Cygany", or in Spain, who do not speak Romanes and identify themselves through the endonym "Gitano", or in the United Kingdom, who prefer to identify themselves as "Gypsies". The terms anti-Romaism or anti-Romism also risk to essentialize the Roma, which is often overlooked in scholarly works. In fact, understanding the diversity and the internal stratification of Roma has been a constant challenge for scholars over centuries. The essentialization of Roma within the anti-Romaism/anti-Romism formulas stands in opposition to the construction/projection of the "Gypsy" in the social imaginary of the term antigypsyism.[4]

4 Charles Taylor describes the social imaginary as "the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations." (Taylor, 2004: 23)

The term anti-Roma racism is clearly neutral and facilitates communication with a broader audience give the current context with the prominence of race and antiracism and decolonial movements around the globe. Hence, broader audiences could better understand and relate to the historical injustices suffered by Roma. However, the use of anti-Roma racism formula leaves out the specificity of the experiences of oppression and injustices suffered by Roma; these experiences becoming subsumed to broader patterns of oppression of other groups. While building alliances for the struggle against racism is important, especially in the case of historically oppressed and disenfranchised groups as Roma, their particular experiences and sufferings are exactly the glue that could bond them together and help Roma activists and scholars promote a common ethnic consciousness in mobilizing their constituencies.

On building alliances and attracting support for the Roma cause, one has to say that blaming the non-Roma collectively is not a productive avenue. In their desire to strongly reject racism and other oppressive practices, some Roma activists use the term „gadje racism". However, the term is both scholarly untenable and socially divisive, limiting the capacity to attract broader support from the society in their struggle for justice and equality. Due to persistent negative attitudes towards Roma in societies, the size of Roma population and the structural racism and discrimination, Roma's access to power and resources is limited. Thus, Roma constitute a "politically insular minority" with limited possibilities to be part of power-sharing arrangements, being dependent on

attracting support from outside the community and in need of special protection (Rostas, 2019).

Scholarly, the term "gadje racism" does not differentiate between racists discourses and practices of those who do not belong to the Roma minority (Gadjeology) and the non-belonging to the community as identification (Gadje). This distinction is similar to the one between "white people" and "Whiteness". As David Gillborn puts it: "'Whiteness' refers to a system of beliefs, practices and assumptions that constantly centre the interests of White people, especially White elites. People who identify themselves and/or are identified by others as 'White' may act in the interests of Whiteness, but it is not automatic or inevitable. White-identified people can challenge Whiteness, just as people of colour can sometimes become vocal advocates for Whiteness" (Gillborn, 2020: 115).

3 On the Origins of Antigypsyism

Antigypsyism is already present in Europe in the very first documents about Roma. Archival documents show that the power holders and the majorities perceived them as different and inferior, even less human. Already in 1385 Roma are mentioned as slaves within the Principalities of Walachia and Moldova. There were three categories of slaves: those belonging to the state, those belonging to the Orthodox Church and monasteries, and those belonging to private landowners – Boyars. Slavery was state of total dependency of the will of the owner. The slave (rob) was a property which could be sold or offered as a

present. The duration – almost 500 years of slavery – is what differentiates slavery in Romania in comparison to other geographical areas were slavery existed as an institution. (Achim 2000)

Medieval chronicles in Western Europe racialized Roma and questioned their Christianity. The 1422 anonymous *Chronicles of Bologna,* the writing of earlier scholars and travellers' notes in the 15th century, such as Lionardo di Niccolo Frescobaldi and Arnold von Harff, already described Roma as darker-skinned, ugly, sinful and heathens.[5] Thus, antigypsyism precedes the commonly agreed appearance of race and racism as concepts related to the European modernity and predates the colonial project and the slavery in America.[6]

What exactly determined hatred against Roma? How can one explain the high level of rejection Roma encounter in Europe nowadays? A comparative approach might be useful here in explaining the hatred towards Roma. One of the groups that historically has faced hatred, exclusion and genocide was the Jews. Methodologically, a comparative approach with the concept of antisemitism is also inspiring. The writing of the Critical Theorists from the Frankfurt School on antisemitism is a good starting point. Theodor Adorno in a draft addressed to Horkheimer, anticipating the *Dialectic of*

[5] For the description of Roma in the anonymous *Chronicles of Bologna*, see Eliav-Feldon, 2009. For the writing of Frescobaldi and Harff, see Taylor, 2014, p. 26.

[6] Gilad Margalit also claims that antigypsyism existed in Central and Eastern Europe before the concept of racism came into being: "Traditional antigypsyism existed in Central Europe centuries before racism as a concept came to being". (Margalit, 1996: 2)

the Enlightenment, identifies the origins of the antisemitism in the repression generated by work in a settled society:

> *"The survival of nomadism among the Jews might provide not only an explanation for the nature of the Jew himself, but even more an explanation for anti-Semitism. The abandonment of nomadism was apparently one of the most difficult sacrifices demanded in human history. The Western concept of work, and all of the instinctual repression it involves, may coincide exactly with the development of settled habitation. The image of the Jews is one of a condition of humanity in which work is unknown, and all of the later attacks on the parasitic, miserly character of the Jews are mere rationalizations. The Jews are the ones who have not allowed themselves to be 'civilized' and subjected to the priority of work. This has not been forgiven them, and that is why they are a bone of contention in class society."* (Wiggershaus, 1994: 276)

The same argument could be extrapolated to the situation of Roma. Moreover, nomadism persisted long among Roma, even in Western Europe. What is surprising is that Roma are portrayed in the public imaginary as work-shy while for centuries they have been slaves, working hard for producing wealth for their masters and building churches and monasteries for the Orthodox Church. As craftsmen Roma were extremely skilled and they served the imperial armies and the revolutionaries

in providing invaluable support as blacksmiths, horse traders and other professions.

The concept of work in Western Europe is connected with the settled habitation (Adorno apud Jakobs, 2005: 162). Having a nomadic lifestyle explained by their search for markets and partly by the hostility encountered from majority populations, authorities and the church, Roma have been perceived and depicted as lacking the practice of sedentary life. Thus, the attacks on their lifestyle as parasitic and the hatred is a rationalization of the instinctual repression of the majority population determined by the social anxiety of work in the highly hierarchically stratified society.

What exactly explains the existence of an image of Roma as work-shy, parasites and engaged in begging, theft and other activities that are reprimanded by society, in parallel with the idyllic image of Roma travelling around in caravans, with fire, music and happiness? Adorno's explanation is linked with the repressions produced by work: The world of settled habitation is a world of work which produces repression (Adorno apud Jakobs, 2005: 162):

> *"But the more the world of settled habitation – a world of work – produced repression, the more the earlier condition must have seemed to be a form of happiness which could not be permitted, the very idea of which must be banned. This ban is the origin of anti-Semitism, the expulsions of the Jews, and the attempt to complete or imitate the expulsion from Paradise."*

The nomadism and the Romani lifestyle might not only invite others to join them or to rebel against the ruling classes, but the happiness they expose in their existence is a rejection of repressions and social alienation determined by the work and the working relations in the society. Their rejection of this order is at the very origin of hatred against Roma.

The hatred of Roma is produced by the psychological mechanism that fuels hatred against Jews identified by Adorno and Horkheimer:

> *"No matter what the makeup of the Jews may be in reality, their image, that of the defeated, has characteristics which must make totalitarian rule their mortal enemy: happiness without power, reward without work, a homeland without frontiers, religion without myth. These features are outlawed by the ruling powers because they are secretly coveted by the ruled. The former can survive only as long as the latter turn what they yearn for into an object of hate. They do so through pathic projection, since even hatred leads to union with the object in destruction."* (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002: 164-165)[7]

[7] The translation of the 2002 Stanford edition of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* seems to be not the best. The same passage can be found in the translation of Jakobs, which is more comprehensible: "their image, as that of the defeated people, has the features to which totalitarian domination must be completely hostile: happiness without power, wages without work, a home without frontiers, religion without myth. These characteristics are hated by the rulers because the ruled secretly long to possess them.

Romani Studies scholars have also explored the origins of antigypsyism. Some of these scholars locate the origins of antigypsyism in the historical transformation of the state and its administration and the birth of the modern nation-state. Aidan McGarry places the emergence of antigypsyism at the nexus of identity, belonging and territoriality in the context of the nation-state building processes. For creating a sense of unity, Roma were exoticized and essentialized as to become the significant other for the majority societies.

Roma were excluded from the nation through the process of conceptualizing authority and borders and defining the sovereignty and territory of the nation-state. McGarry points out the role of the state and nation in producing and reproducing prejudices towards Roma, although specific mechanism on the production of antigypsyism are not described:

> *"I have placed the blame for Romaphobia squarely at the feet of nation-states, which have consistently excluded Roma communities from equal citizenship and actively constructed Roma as a deviant 'other' that threatens the fabric of the nation. The negative ascription of Roma identity as criminals, parasitic, thieves, untrustworthy and dirty has stubbornly persisted due to deliberate identity work on the part of the state."* (McGarry, 2017: 245)

The rulers are only safe as long as the people they rule turn their long-for goals into hated forms of evil." (Jakobs, 2005: 164)

In his analysis of the late eighteenth-century transformation of the so-called 'police and Cameralistic sciences', Huub van Baar identifies the origin of antigypsyism in the way imperial authorities regulated Europe's borders and in the strengthening of imperial state administrations for increasing control over populations. (van Baar, 2011)

The biopolitical regulations and the body of knowledge on populations produced by the newly-emerging scientific disciplines of the time influenced the perception of Roma as well. The scholarly works of Heinrich Grellmann and Johann Ruediger influenced the perception of Roma by authorities and their approach to the issues faced by Roma. A similar analysis of the works of Grellmann and Ruediger leads the Dutch scholars Will Willems, Leo Lucassen and Annemarie Cottaar to locate the origins of antigypsyism in the social transformations since the eighteenth-century when Romani identity stigmatization legitimized the anti Roma measures ranging from assimilation policies under Habsburg absolutist rule to the Nazi extermination policies. (Lucassen and others, 1998)

Ian Hancock sees the origin of antigypsyism in several areas of public life: "the historical basis of anti-Romani prejudice in a number of areas, in particular racism, religious intolerance, outsider status and the fact that Romanies maintain an exclusivist or separatist culture." (Hancock, 1997: 23-24) Hancock did not include the political process and the transformation of the state among the root causes of antigypsyism. He indicated as the historical roots of antigypsyism the following factors: (a) the association of Roma with Islam and the Asian

invaders at the time of their appearance in Europe, (b) the medieval Christian doctrine of interpreting darkness as sin, (c) the Romani cultural rule of non-interactions with non-Roma being conducive to a lack of trust, (d) the survival strategy of Roma in a hostile environment, where they chose to perform roles and exploit non-Roma images and representations of 'Gypsies' as exotic and mysterious, (e) the manipulation of images and stereotypes by non-Roma in order to define the boundaries of their own identity, (f) the weakness of Roma as regards military or economic force or political support from their own (non-existent) nation-state, which makes them a perfect target for scapegoating, (g) the portrayal of 'gypsies' as the epitome of freedom in the literary texts and the media, where the fascination with these idyllic images is combined with resentment and repulsion, and (h) the lack of closer contacts between non-Roman investigators and Roma, which has led to accounts being published that are full of stereotypes.

Donald Kenrick locates the origins of antigypsyism in the early writings on Roma during 1400 and 1450, when approximately 62 historical chronicles and town council records about Roma could be identified. As mechanisms for producing and reproducing antigypsyism he points out the role of imitation and exaggerations: "It is from these early chroniclers, copied and exaggerated over the centuries, that the literary image of the Gypsy was to emerge." (Kenrick, 2004: 80)

Thomas Acton identified multiple factors that influenced the origin and the development of antigypsyism: (1) the early image of Roma among Byzantine occultists or fortune-tellers of the eighth century AC; (2) the

misrepresentation of the Roma in front of the incoming Muslim occupiers; (3) the general anti-nomadism of the sedentary people and their distrust of military aggressions and invasions of pastoral nomads; and (4) the role of relations of production. (Acton, 2012)

Markus End proposes a shift in perspectives from the object of discrimination to the majority society. He sees the origins of antigypsyism in "the historical social processes of norm- and moral-production which European majority societies have undergone", in which several transformations of social life have overlapped: the transformation of the economy from an agricultural to a capitalist one, the competition for territory, the appearance of the nation-states and their claim to a monopoly on violence, the strengthening of patriarchy in gender relations coupled with the strengthening of sexual moral codes, and cultural changes accompanying the establishment of a scientific approach to the world. (End, 2012: 9-10)

There are two important points of criticism of Markus End's work on antigypsyism. First, the explanation of the origins of antigypsyism through the historical transformation are very large concepts – modernization, industrialization, Protestant ethics – leading to a schematization of European history. While they are useful in understanding certain dimensions of antigypsyism, there is a need for localized research which allows for contextualization and understanding the differences among regions, local histories, and Roma groups with concrete examples and analysis. The second point of criticism concerns the description of antigypsyism as an attribute of the majority that has no connection to the

Roma. While it is convincing to conceptualize antigypsyism as a "projection" or as an "invention", it is key to emphasize that it has terrible consequences for the Roma. Moreover, Roma have internalized in their surviving strategies components and processes of antigypsyism, which subsequently became part of their identity. For example, consider those Roma that identify themselves through a pejorative exonym and resist adapting this process of self-identification to the new realities in Europe. For that reason, we employ the concept of social imaginary proposed by Charles Taylor in order to link the projection with the everyday realities of those stigmatized as "gypsies".

In explaining the roots of antigypsyism we depart from the early interpretation of the Critical Theorists of antisemitism as a primary product of economic forces – a Marxist interpretation.[8] In the case of antigypsyism, there are several factors, the economy being just one of them and not necessarily the first one. Political, social, economic, cultural, ideological, and religious factors are

[8] Jakobs points out the changes in Horkheimer's thinking on Jews and antisemitism from the primordiality of economics to a more complex approach: "Horkheimer's thinking shifted considerably. In the period just before the War began, Horkheimer still placed particular stress on the primacy of economics in explaining the phenomenon of anti-Semitism. In pieces written during the War by Horkheimer and by Adorno dealing with anti-Semitism, economics is merely one part of a multi- faceted explication. The shift in Horkheimer's perspective, I have argued, was part and parcel of a larger shift that deeply affected Critical Theory as a whole, and is best explained by the influence of Adorno, and by reflection on the destruction of the Jews in progress." (Jakobs, 2005: 165)

at the base of antigypsyism, and they have played different roles in different social contexts. There is a need for in-depth research of practices, institutions and structures which racialize Roma, which produce and reproduce antigypsyism, across time and geographies. Identifying the mechanisms through which antigypsyism is continuously produced and reinforced should consider local histories and the diversity of Roma, allowing for contextualization and critical reflection.

Clearly, the framing of Roma as spies for their opponents contributed significantly to their portrayal as political enemies. Powerholders augmented the portrayal of Roma as exotic and different with dangerous and traitors. Religious institutions depicted Roma as heathens, non-believers and strange Christians and, as was the case in Eastern Europe, treated Roma as objects without soul. Nomadism was socially inacceptable and dangerous of the status quo and landowners and state authorities perceived it as antisocial behaviour, inspiring rebellion and unrest. Economic exploitation of Roma for the benefit of the Church, rulers and landowners was highly profitable. The economic inequalities between Roma and non-Roma have a great deal to do with an exploitative system that denied intergenerational transmission of wealth. Exploitation of the poor nowadays is still profitable.

Cultural exclusion as an expression of their framing as non-belonging to the nation has historical continuity. Literature and arts served as mechanism for manipulating negative images and narratives about Roma. Moreover, with the development of sciences and scientific methods, the justification of the domination and

oppression of Roma received a significant boost. Eugenic and racial sciences constructed their exclusion and marginalization scientifically as they were not fit for the community or society, being portrayed as an inferior race. During communism, because of their resistance to assimilationist policies, forced sedentarization and proletarization, from brothers and sisters, Roma became an ideological enemy as they did not respect the socialist ethic and refused to integrate into the socialist economy. Hence, all these factors have contributed to the perception of Roma as inferior and deviant, producing and reproducing antigypsyism.

Antigypsyism is not a static product. While certain images and prejudices towards Roma are a historical constant, antigypsyism evolved in time, and new dimensions could be added with the economic, social, scientific, and cultural development. For example, after the development of the internet and new communication technologies, certain manifestations of antigypsyism received new spaces for expression. Hate speech against Roma is the norm on social media all over Europe and the authorities' ignorance of the issue transforms them into enablers of antigypsyism. Antigypsyism could also vary across geographies. Certain terms to stigmatise Roma in public sphere acquire specific meaning in given national and cultural context.

4 On Manifestations of Antigypsyism

There are numerous misunderstandings around the concept of antigypsyism. Very often, antigypsyism is

understood as the result of ignorance and lack of information, as consisting of stereotypes and prejudices. This view is very minimalistic and is oversimplifying this phenomenon. Antigypsyism cannot be reduced to stereotypes and prejudices, and not even to individual discrimination. Stereotypes and prejudices cannot explain the violence inflicted on Roma by state and non-state actors. Another widespread misperception about antigypsyism, connected with the ignorance, stereotypes, and prejudices, is that education is the key to combat antigypsyism. Again, this approach is oversimplistic.

Antigypsyism is a complex phenomenon that needs to be approached through its mechanisms that produces inequalities in all areas of public life. Reducing combating antigypsyism to educating the public is not going to have a significant impact. There are multiple practices, rules, norms, laws, and institutions that contribute to producing and re-producing inequalities between Roma and the rest of the society. They are going well beyond educating the public. There is a need for in-depth research to identify the subtle ways in which these inequalities are generated across countries and in specific areas.

For example, the police is a highly problematic institution when it comes to its relations with Roma. Often Roma perceive the police as mistreating Roma when under arrest and that the police targets more often Roma in its actions, including in imposing disproportionate and more frequently fines on Roma individuals than the rest of the society. The police is also perceived by many Roma as using disproportionate force and firearms when

policing Roma communities. Raids, as a collective form of punishment, is too often used by the police in their activity to maintain public order. There is also a historical mistrust of Roma in the police due to such oppressive practices.

Hence, in order to address antigypsyism, there is a need for an institutional audit of the police to investigate what exactly facilitates the infliction of violence against Roma. Only based on such complex research, one could propose police reforms that will result in combating antigypsyism in policing. Similar research on other state institutions will equip policymakers with the necessary knowledge for effectively combating antigypsyism in other areas. Thus, in order to combat antigypsyism, besides educating the public, there is a need of research that will inform adjustments of policies as well as a need of institutional norms and regulations, financial and human resources for training, hiring specialized staff and members of the community, a wide range of policy tools and, above all, political commitment across the political spectrum for combating antigypsyism.

A simple enumeration of the manifestations of antigypsyism is necessary. Based on existing research one could list, without being exhaustive, the following manifestations as being the most common:

- Prejudices and stereotypes
- Labelling, hate speech, and hate crime
- Discrimination – individual, institutional and structural
- School segregation of Romani children

- Residential segregation
- Forced evictions
- Police and other law enforcement officials' violence targeting Roma
- Forced sedentarization
- Proletarization
- Forced sterilization of Romani women
- Policies of assimilation (banning the use of language or wearing traditional clothes, placing Roma children in foster families, changing of names, etc.)
- Mob violence and skinheads' attacks
- Deportations, including ethnic cleansing
- Killings
- Extermination attempts
- Roma and Sinti Holocaust, its denial, distortion, and misrepresentation
- Passive role of state authorities in protecting the rights of the Roma
- Lack of information about Roma in mainstream curricula
- Lack of cultural institutions and of support for Romani language
- Cultural appropriation
- Denying equal protection of the law to Roma
- Ignoring history of oppression
- Selective implementation of law and policies

A simple enumeration of these manifestation does not provide an accurate picture of the oppression of Roma. An in-depth analysis of the interplay of different factors and manifestations would be more appropriate.

Contextualization of these manifestations would bring even more accuracy in analyzing the oppression of Roma.

Antigypsyism is about power relations. As a form of racism, it involves human hierarchies and the belief that some groups are superior to other groups, in this case, Roma. A key characteristic of the research conducted on antigypsyism is the belief of the majority population in their inherent superiority over Roma. This superiority is reflected into what Ismael Cortes called "symbolic and epistemic violence against Roma" (Cortes, 2020).

Power relations are directly linked with privileges. In the case of antigypsyism, the majority population is not even aware of the privileges they have nor of the lack of such privileges by Roma. Any claim for combating antigypsyism will call also into question the existing privileges of the majority population. While in the beginning there would be some supporters of eliminating antigypsyism, few of them will still stand by this claim once existing privileges will be questioned.

Antigypsyism is about the rule of law. Here, we refer to two dimensions of equality: first, to the equality before the law, in the sense that every person should have the same rights, irrespective of its race, skin color, ethnicity, religion, etc.; second, to the idea of equal protection of the law, meaning that the law should be applied equally to all persons. Antigypsyism manifests itself in the administration of justice through disproportionate prosecution and higher sentencing for the same acts, limited access to legal aid, ineffective investigations of racist motives for the crimes committed against Roma, and limited access to justice.

One of the characteristics of antigypsyism is its systemic character. Antigypsyism is not an accident or the result of some involuntarily actions. Antigypsyism is a system of oppression of Roma which is the result of multiple forms of individual and institutional discrimination, violence and affirmed domination and superiority over Roma by the majority society. The Covid-19 pandemic revealed that the various forms of discrimination, violence, and inequalities have a cumulative dimension.

The impunity enjoyed by the perpetrators is another characteristic of antigypsyism. Those that inflict violence on Roma, those that discriminate against, bully, or harass Roma, or those that promote racial hatred in their speech and actions against Roma, are too often unsanctioned by the state authorities. Thus, they feel encouraged to continue engaging in such behavior as they know that nobody will keep them accountable before law for their actions. The message sent to Roma is that if they complain against the treatment they are subjected to, there is none to defend them, and they simply should submit and accept their inferior social status. Any claim for equality would endanger the status quo and will be penalized by the system.

Ignoring Roma's history of oppression is an expression of antigypsyism as well as a mechanism for reproducing historical inequalities. The expectation of political elites and others that Roma would mobilize and make their voice heard throughout democratic processes is unrealistic as it ignores the history of domination and oppression of Roma and the mistrust of Roma in state institutions and non-Roma alike. For example, expecting Roma to cast their votes like anyone

else, ignores the very reality of many Roma communities that are isolated, lack access to public transport, and whose members have to make an extra effort to reaching the polling stations. In addition, as revealed by some scholars, Roma are often targeted by hate speech during the electoral campaigns, as anti-Roma discourse might help nationalist, populists and/or extremist political forces mobilize their constituencies.[9]

A sensitive topic related to antigypsyism is the racialization of poverty. Roma are often blamed for living in extreme poverty as this was their choice or it is part of their culture. The historical depiction of Roma as lazy or work-shy, as living in the present without planning for future and without memory feeds into the narrative of extreme poverty. Moreover, the neoliberal discourse promoting hard work, free market and meritocracy as alternatives to poverty further exacerbates the plight of the Roma. There are too few who consider that the historical factors play into the current situation of Roma. The fact that Roma were slaves or in different forms of dependency from their masters, that they were excluded from cities and banned to access markets for their merchandise, that they were excluded from the land redistribution – the most important historical commodity – led to a wealth gap between Roma and non-Roma that was transmitted intergenerationally. Without taking into consideration these historical facts of Roma

[9] For a selection of different cases of antigypsyism in political campaigns, se the Central Council of German Sinti and Roma's publication *Antigypsyism in Public Discourses and Election Campaigns*, Heidelberg, 2017.

oppression, the explanation of the wealth gap and life conditions between Roma and non-Roma nowadays is only partial and risks missing the complex interplay between multiple factors which lead to poverty.

5 On Mechanisms That (Re-)Produce Antigypsyism

The visual regime of those stigmatized as "gypsies" includes references to skin colour (blacks, dark-skinned, brown-skinned, coloured), physical characteristics such as hairstyle (dark hair, deep dark hair, dark-blonde hair) or clothing (colourful skirts), social and geographical characteristics (poor, immigrants from a country belonging to a minority, Southerner, South-East European, Indians or inhabitant of a specific neighbourhood in a given country, extended family, use of a specific accent while speaking), behaviour (fortune-telling, pickpocketing, begging, travelling perpetrators, nomads, persons that change residence frequently, mobile ethnic minority). Markus End analysed the visual regimes of antigypsyism within the police forces in Germany and how police has historically contributed to the racialization of those perceived as "gypsy" and their description as a threat to society. (Markus, 2019)

The construction and manipulation of these images have contributed to the spread of antigypsyism by powerholders. As Kenrick explained, through exaggerations and imitations of certain images were transmitted from generation to generation, explaining the fact that the

images of Roma created during the early years of their arrival into Europe have survived until today.

Antigypsyism distorts the market and the public sphere and reinforces itself. For example, antigypsyism limits the ability of Roma to compete on the labour market. Due to prejudices towards Roma and the belief in the inferiority of Roma, the owner/manager of the company will not hire a Roma even though this individual might be qualified and possess the necessary skills to implement the task required by that position. Thus, the owner/manager will get a less qualified worker instead of what is best for its company and interests. At best, if the owner/manager hires a Roma, the retribution paid for its work is as a rule less due to the assumed inferiority of Roma.

Antigypsyism affects the work relations but also the circulation of capital. When Roma engage in trade or commerce, Roma are perceived as speculators, try to take advantage of the scarcity of goods on the market to enrich themselves. The Roma turns into an oppressor of the majority through its greed to accumulate resources. Or the market is governed by the balance between the demand and offer. The imbalance of this relation is the quintessence of capitalist market in developed economies. While this rule is accepted and formalized through law and institutions such as stock exchanges, when Roma are taking advantage of this rule, they are regarded as speculators and outlaws. Hence, antigypsyism distorts the work relations and the functioning of the capitalist market.

Another example of how antigypsyism distorts the market and the public sphere is from education. School

segregation of Roma pupils is a widespread phenomenon in Europe. Due to their physical and cultural or ethnic characteristics, Roma children are separated from their peers in schools, buildings, classes, and other facilities. Their socialization is limited and, thus, their right to education is restricted both in terms of access to education but also the quality of education they receive. One of the main sources for the prejudicial perception of Roma is the lack of direct contact. Also, school segregation prevents even further the normal relationships between individuals in society. Moreover, in spite of economic losses for the societies by segregating Roma children and failing to produce a future highly skilled work force able to compete on the labour market, policy makers and the majority society (mostly non-Roma parents) prefer to support a segregated educational system which produces deep social inequalities. Hence, Roma are subjected to social inequalities inherently embedded in the capitalist system but also the social inequalities produced by antigypsyism.

6 Conclusion

Antigypsyism is a social phenomenon. Those that are stigmatized as "gypsy" are confronted with it every day in their life. Some societies are defining their identity in opposition to "gypsies" affirming not only their differentiation from "gypsy" but also their superiority. The superiority is often expressed in the belonging to the nation and/or to a given territory, but also to a culture that is considered superior to the more primitive "oral"

culture of the "gypsies". Thus, the "gypsy" becomes the etalon to measure social and public virtues. The superiority of the majority and the assumed inferiority of Roma is the essence of antigypsyism.

Antigypsyism is an economic phenomenon. The exploitation of Roma was described in the first writings on Roma in Europe. As mentioned above, Roma were enslaved in the Romanian Principalities of Walachia and Moldova for almost 500 years. They worked and produced wealth for their owners – the Orthodox Church and monasteries, the local landlords (boyars), and for the state and society. When they were liberated from slavery, instead of being compensated for their exploitation and suffering, those who have been compensated were their masters.[10] Their exclusion from the land redistribution – the most important currency with an intergenerational social inequality effect – further exacerbated antigypsyism.

The exclusion of Roma from the benefits of agricultural reforms created a wealth gap between Roma and non-Roma which was transmitted over generations. Thus, all the Communist-era policies, combined with the ideological economic determinism, contributed to the further stigmatization of Roma: Communist policies of forced sedentarization, limiting their movement to sell their products (proletarization), the forced placement of Roma in factories for jobs they had no qualifications or training for, and the forced assimilation consisting in the

[10] For a comprehensive analysis of the liberation from slavery see Chiriac, 2019. Chiriac cites sources estimating the number of Romani slaves at 250,000 at the time of liberation.

denial of their ethnic recognition, banning ethnic organizations, the use of language and their culture in public sphere etc. These policies fed the widely held stereotypes and prejudices that Roma are work-shy, social parasites and a burden for the society.

One of the arguments of those that keep postponing the adoption of comprehensive policies towards Roma, including affirmative action, is that the required investments are too high, and the economy cannot support such investments. In reverse, development agencies and some civil society actors presented economic arguments for Roma inclusion, ignoring the fact that antigypsyism as racism is not necessarily rational.

Antigypsyism is a cultural phenomenon. Cultural supremacy of the majority population is often invoked by those groups that have no shame in affirming their superiority over Roma. Very often Romani culture is seen as primitive and underdeveloped and studies studied as "exotic", "oriental", "primitive", and "naïve art".[11] Depicted mostly as an oral culture, dominated by low quality music and dancing, enjoyed mostly by those uneducated segments of the population, Romani culture is trivialized by both academics and mainstream cultural institutions. The contribution of Romani culture to national and European cultures is ignored, and often certain Romani cultural products are appropriated, as it is the case of

[11] Daniel Baker, a Romani artist and scholar, suggests that "historic marginalisation and continuing discrimination have determined the contingent nature of the Roma aesthetic resulting in keen facilities for adaptation and obscured visibility." (Baker, 2017)

flamenco in Spain. The lack of cultural institutions such as museums, theatres, philharmonics, art schools and galleries, is interpreted too often as an expression of Roma cultural inferiority, without considering the role of the nation-state in excluding Roma from cultural support and the Romani cultural products and artists having no place in mainstream cultural institutions as a consequence of antigypsyism. The exclusion of Roma from academia and knowledge production further exacerbates the impact of missing support for identity representation institutions and limits the capacity of Romani scholars and activists to fight antigypsyism. (Mirga-Kruszelnicka, 2018)

Antigypsyism is a political phenomenon. The stigmatization of Roma by the authorities could be noticed at the end of the 15th century, when Roma have been framed as spies for Ottomans or Arabs by the Diets in Frankfurt in 1497 and Freiburg in 1498, and respectively by the Pragmatica of the Spanish Kings 1499 in their Reconquista. (Kenrick, 2004)

Antigypsyism historically served political purposes and it requires political will to eradicate it. As the state is the main source responsible for producing and re-producing antigypsyism, it becomes a political matter how to reset the institutions and to enact policies to promote equality and diversity in society. Some steps have been taken in this regard, as antigypsyism is increasingly recognized by international organizations, civil society actors and even governments as being the source of Roma exclusion and oppression. In this sense, in November 2014, the European Commission in a report to the EU Parliament and the EU Council on the application of the

Anti-Discrimination Directive recognized that due to antigypsyism Roma required special protection:

> *"The Commission recognises that legislation alone is not enough to resolve the deep-rooted social exclusion of the Roma and the prejudice they still face. Legislation needs to be combined with policy and financial measures. [...] Achieving full equality in practice may in certain circumstances warrant Roma-specific positive action."*[12]

Moreover, the new 2020 European Union Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation set antigypsyism as a priority and it is expected that member states will adopt measures to combat antigypsyism as part of their national strategies for Roma. It remains to be seen how the states will ensure special protection of Roma.

[12] European Commission (2014) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Joint Report on the application of Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin ('Racial Equality Directive') and of Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation ('Employment Equality Directive').

Part II
On the Concept of "Roma" in European Political Language

1 European Political Language and Romani History

If Europe is also a language, as Luuk van Middelaar and others have argued, what would the place of "Roma" in this language be? How have the people designated by this name entered European political discourse, what names were given to them in European political language, and how was the concept of "Roma" shaped over the decades of European post-war integration?

This is a partly unknown history with present-age ramifications. It is of relevance not only for those in the narrower field of European Romani strategies. It is also a symptomatic story of powerful institutions creating the human object of their political intervention. However, is it rather a story of civil society cooperation, participation and self-determination of a minority, a story of bureaucratic rule and expert committees defining a field of action, or a story of governments and nations controlling their spaces of power? (Middelaar, 2013)

The following pages will confine itself to the aspect of the names given to a specific group of European citizens, the European Romani minority.[13] For glances at a fuller picture, some preliminary historical remarks seem appropriate. Many Romani communities have been for centuries deeply embedded in the history and culture of their nation-states, in spite of recurring events of

[13] In this part of the present study which is devoted to the European political concept of "Roma", Romani people and related terms are used to designate the minority.

persecution, culminating in the National Socialist genocide of the European Sinti and Roma.

German Sinti, e.g., were soldiers and officers in the multiple German armies or police officers of German princedoms in the early modern age, they became citizens and powerfully claimed their civil rights in the early 19th century, they participated in the rise of mass-communication society since the turn of the century, they fought for their German Empire and their emperor in the First World War and some even still for Germany at the outset of the Second World War, until the day when they were deported into death (Matras, Winterberg and Zimmermann, 2003; Mengersen, 2015; Opfermann, 2007; Strauß and Müller, 2021). Sinti were feeling German, they were Germans, and often shared, in addition to their Sinti and national German identities, the local and regional German identities of their places of origin, such as East Prussian, Bavarian, or Swabian (Florian, 2012; Lagrenne, 2015; Schmidt, 2020; Strauß, 2002; Tuckermann, 2018).

As this brief example shows, there can be no history of Romani people in Europe (nor of the names they chose for themselves or that were imposed on them from the outside) that is not at the same time a history of Romani people in and as part of their nations, states, or regions. There is simply no supra-national history of Sinti and Roma in Europe. Romani people belong to multiple cultural spaces and have different histories. They have neither decontextualized nor de-territorialized histories.[14] And their national histories are not only histories

[14] In addition to the examples given in the preceding paragraph and many other contributions, see, e.g., Richardson, 2021, who

of persecution or exclusion, but also of resistance, emancipation, and participation (Mirga-Kruszelnicka and Dunajeva, 2020; Verhás, Kóczé and Szász, 2018).

However, they are also shapers of a supra-national entity such as "Europe", and are simultaneously being shaped by supra-national forces. Furthermore, above the national level, there have been certain common features shared by many Romani people, such as the importance of the language Romanes or Romani with its many varieties (Strauß, 2021), a common struggle for human, political and social rights, or the fight against antigypsyism, the specific form of racism from which all Romani people suffer.

Antigypsyism is pervasive in all Europe, it is a form of racism that was created earlier than modern biologistic racism and incorporated cultural, religious and political prejudice long before being systematized and radicalized by "racial science" and other forms of racist knowledge. Therefore, to understand the present-day European contexts of Romani people, it is most important to arrive at a proper understanding of antigypsyism, both at theoretical and empirical levels. This is what the first part of this study has done.

The following part of this study will keep its focus on the names political Europe has given to its Romani citizens since they were "discovered" by European institutions in the 1960s. It is not yet a political history. Rather, these pages include some preliminary

gives a new, contextualized picture of Roma in the medieval Islamic world as one of the major groups responsible for facilitating Afro-Eurasian cultural exchange.

observations of the trajectory of political "naming", tentative steps toward a more comprehensive history of the Romani "passage to Europe" and Europe's discourses and practices vis-à-vis "Roma".

Still, as conceptual history and the history of political languages have taught us, words are also deeds, and there can be a whole history or political agenda in a name. Key concepts offer important insight into the political, social, intellectual or moral fabric of an age. Concepts are multitemporal. They convey images of the past, aspirations of the present, projections of the future. (Koselleck, 1989; Koselleck, 2000; Kurunmäki, Nevers and te Velde, 2018; Müller and Nevers, 2019; Rodgers, 1998; Rosanvallon 2006) They change continually, and often, they only take shape in constellations of conflict, as antagonistic acts. At the same time, terminological change is not to be conflated with conceptual change. Concepts can remain stable while terminology is transforming, whereas terminological continuity might disguise conceptual change. What kind of history is contained in the European political concept of "Roma"?

2 Contested Concept: The Rise of "Roma"

It is important to keep in mind that this investigation is not about the historical development of endonyms like Roma and Sinti and their use inside the groups. Neither is this contribution about the debate among Romani activists about the public name(s) for their communities. International research has enlightened us much in these regards. Early examples of endonyms are from the

Middle Ages and early modern period, self-identified Romani self-awareness has been publicly expressed, even in print, by intellectuals and activists at least since the early 20th century. (Kenrick, 2004; Marushiakova and Popov, 2021; Opfermann, 2007)

This linguistic and historical research on names could not fail to note that in the second half of the 20th century, fundamental change happened also in the realm of European political language. A critical perspective comes from Elena Marushiakov and Vesselin Popov. With regard to the designation of the Romani minorities in large parts of Central Eastern, South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, they state in a 2018 contribution: "In the last quarter of a century, [...] a new common designation has been established in the region's public discourse, namely their self-appellation 'Roma', which is considered to be politically correct. The processes of labelling and imposition of the new name on these communities did not stop in this region, and the label 'Roma' is increasingly spreading in the remaining parts of Europe and even beyond." The authors recognize that a political dynamic has been initiated which threatens to ignore the self-determination of the diverse Romani communities in Europe: "this labelling does not take into account the self-identifications and the respective self-appellations of the individual communities in question" (Marushiakova and Popov, 2018: 386).

For an impression of how complex matters are, and how much complexity has been reduced by later accounts, a closer look at the 1971 World Romani Congress in London is a case in point:

> *"One can read that at this congress the International Romani Union (IRU) was established, which accepted national attributes such as usage of the common name 'Roma' for all 'Gypsies' around the world, the Roma flag and the Roma anthem. Even though the congress reports, which were published immediately after the Congress [...], do not confirm completely these sacred mantras [...], they are uncritically reiterated not only in journalistic articles and different kinds of policy and 'expert' reports, but also in numerous academic studies [...] neither in the text of Donald Kenrick (which in fact is a complete protocol of the congress activities and adopted decisions) nor in the text of Grattan Puxon [...], there is no single mention of discussion about a common name for the communities, let alone taking a decision on this issue."* (Ibid.: 392)

Only prior to the Second World Romani Congress in 1978 did the proponents of "Roma" as the generic endonym for all Romani people in Europe establish the new terminological reality (ibid.: 393). German Sinti, e.g., were involved in this process since 1981 but although the German civil rights movement achieved political and legal recognition for the term "Sinti and Roma", nowhere outside Austria and Germany was the self-designation Sinti ever used by leading activists or European political entities (ibid.: 395). Sinti, one of several Romani communities not calling themselves Roma, did hardly get a hearing in this process.

Marushiakova and Popov, however, do not stop at the struggle over endonyms but also consider the

change of political language. After 1989, in Central and South Eastern European countries, where the term "Gypsies" in the national languages was still dominating official language, "the adoption of the designation 'Roma' was [...] perceived as an unavoidable part of the process of democratization and Euro-integration. [...] An extremely important factor for the official acceptance of the name 'Roma' and its usage in the public space (the acts of state and local authorities, the media, etc.) was the rapid development of the non-governmental sector, where the usage of the 'politically correct' term 'Roma' was considered mandatory" (ibid.: 396).

As important as the two renowned scholars' analysis is, this emphasis on "political correctness" permeating Marushiakova and Popov's account, blurs distinctions and does not really help much to understand terminological, or even conceptual change. The linguistic reconstruction and the political critique remain unconnected. What does "politically correct" mean, where did it come from, how did it work? The contexts and conditions of change are ignored. A closer reading than their brief review (ibid.: 396-97) of key European documents will reveal that the term "Roma's" path to European political language was much more twisted. And the authors' deplorable attempt at rehabilitating the term "Gypsy" is intellectually unconvincing and lacks historical sensitivity (ibid.: 404-405).

Still, Marushiakova and Popov's appreciation of Romani diversity is important: "the real socially responsible engagement is to show the picture of history and current situation as diverse as it is in reality" (ibid.: 412). Likewise, their critique of the official (with the notable

exception of the OSCE) diversity-averse and paradoxical European definitions of who "Roma" are – both ethnically defined people of "Indian origin" and communities characterised by "the nomadic way of life", not ethnicity – is valid (ibid.: 398-9).

Also, their findings that "today we see a mechanical replacement of the previously used designations with the term 'Roma' and the issue of appropriateness or inappropriateness of the politically correct terminology is not on the agenda" (ibid.: 397), remain true – at least until the 7 April 2021 European conference on Romani self-designations sponsored by the group of the Greens/EFA in the European Parliament (VDSR-BW, 2021). The issue of naming seems to reflect a broader European problem: The lack of cultural sensitivity, the ignorance of Romani heterogeneity, and the neglect of Romani voices in the process has led cost-intensive European Roma strategies basically to nowhere (Rostas, 2019).

Even further in their criticism of current political naming practices go Mihai Surdu and Martin Kovats. Their well-known article "Roma Identity as an Expert-Political Construction" argues that "Roma is an identity constructed at the intersection of political and expert knowledge by various actors, such as policymakers, Romani activists, international organizations and scholars. This political-expert identity is applied to groups that are not bounded by a common language, religion, cultural practice, geographic location, occupation, physical appearance or lifestyle". The European concept of Roma, according to the two authors, is mutually reinforced and perpetuated by several overlapping "identification practices" shaping "Roma as an epistemic object and policy

target", namely European Roma strategies, police profiling, Romani activism, administrative surveys, and quantitative social research (Surdu and Kovats, 2015: 5). "Presented as a pan-European minority, Roma can symbolise the need for European governance", they even argue (ibid.: 9).

In their view, this process resulted in a "self-sustaining cycle [...] where Roma knowledge identifies Roma problems requiring a policy response, which produces more Roma knowledge, more needs and more policy responses". Thus, these identification practices of Roma, which Surdu and Kovats describe as a "racialising public discourse by presenting Roma as both problematic and essentially different", are supposed to have reinforced – rather than improved – "the exclusion of those categorised as Roma" and they have definitely not stopped "hostility towards Roma", which "has increased in many states" (ibid.: 5). They connect what they view as denial of diversity to the fact that current Roma-related policies "draw on more than two centuries of scholarship devoted to Gypsies, and now Roma", and speak of "diverse groups ostracised over time as Gypsies and currently conceptualised as Roma" (ibid.: 6). Surdu and Kovats even state: "This newly conceptualised Roma people has many resemblances with that which has been defined as Gypsies during the last two centuries. Today's 'Roma' is the contemporary inheritor of the Gypsy legacy, an identity historically fabricated by scholars, experts and bureaucrats." (ibid.: 7; Surdu, 2016).

While their important critique of the "expert-political construction" of the European political concept of Roma has validity, the authors' radical social

constructivism is carried too far, when they question the existence of an "actual Roma people" beyond the political identity formation processes from above at all (Surdu and Kovats, 2015: 6-7). This attempt seems detached from the lives and self-conceptions of many Romani people (Rostas, 2019: 1-47). When Surdu and Roma, e.g., make the historically important point that Roma slavery in what is today Romania was a social and not an ethnic category (Surdu and Kovats, 2015: 10-11), self-identifications and self-understandings of the affected people are not investigated. Still, this widely discussed contribution raised two crucial issues: what is the role of experts, politics, and NGOs in creating the European concept of "Roma" – or rather: what kind of concept do they construct and what are the ramifications? And do European Roma strategies, because of a problematic concept of Roma disregarding both Romani diversity and the complexity of social identities, in fact stabilise rather than abolish social exclusion?

In a similar manner but with greater emphasis on what the authors describe as "neoliberal" economic consensus, an important book by Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan has several years ago already showed the paradoxical and adverse effects of the formation of the European policy field of Roma, which is driven by at their core "neoliberally" oriented NGOs. While the "neoliberal" label is far from uncontested, their indication of a market-economic rationale guiding actors and strategies in the field is highly important (Sigona and Trehan, 2009). Nidhi Trehan calls this process the "NGOization of human rights" which conceals "exclusionary practices at the societal level" and even facilitates the "structural

oppression of Europe's Romani citizens", for it subordinates Romani voices from below. What is sorely missing, according to the author, is Romani voices beyond the small circles of "NGOised" Romani activists well-versed in European political concepts (Trehan 2009: 61, 63). Again, this is a grievance which gatherings such as the above-mentioned Greens/EFA-sponsored 7 April 2021 European conference of mid-sized and grassroots organisations and many individual diverse Romani voices from below help to remedy.

Katrin Simhandl's contribution to this volume further dissects the "construction of the political categories 'Gypsies' and 'Roma' before and after EU enlargement" and formulates as one result of her research: "Regardless of what terminology is used, it is beyond doubt that the category per se exists and can be clearly distinguished from others" (Simhandl, 2009: 74). Her observations, although focused on more recent discourse, touches on historical aspects and includes a diachronic approach to the different names given to an assumed ethnic entity by European institutions, from a (non-sedentary) "lifestyle"-centred terminology in the first decades to an Eastern Europe-centred categorising of Europe's largest minority in the mid-1990s. According to the author, attempts to end the "absent presence" of Romani people as subjects and not only objects of discourse have become visible only in the post-2000s (ibid.: 76, 79, 84-85).

Without denying the merits of discourse analysis as advanced by Simhandl and others, the following sections of this study take one step back and engage in a historical reconstruction of the transformation of terminology. If sources allow, also the history of the concepts is

tentatively investigated. This step is necessary to arrive at greater precision in the debate on the concept of "Roma" and its creation in European political language. Surdu and Kovats complain rightfully that historical approaches are often neglected: "Historical context is important" but "historians analysing the social formation of the Roma group under elite pressures and dominant discourses often do not address recent history", while "political scientists who are critical of recent developments in Roma identity politics and inclusion policies avoid examining contemporary events against historical contexts", whereas "quantitative researchers – that is policy-oriented researchers – most often use both a-theoretical and a-historical perspectives when explaining the Roma they are discussing" (Surdu and Kovats, 2015: 6).

However, a closer look at history, even in the preliminary form entertained here, might modify, question or change the stories and interpretations offered by the important contributions discussed before. History tends to increase complexity. For instance, expert-political construction and a self-sustaining circle of policy-field creation is only one element of a more comprehensive history. Not only "Roma" but also "Europe" is more diverse than depicted by scholars, critics and activists. Europe is obviously not a monolith. There are different levels of agency, divergent perspectives and interests, competing and coordinating institutions or actors, multi-layered concepts and discourses. The terminological trajectory will be followed diachronically. Evidence for this tentative, inconclusive discussion is taken from the archives of the Council of Europe as the initially most

important European institution regarding European Roma policies and terminologies, supplemented – in particular with a view to the pivotal mid-1990s – by findings from the records of European Parliament whose impact has increased enormously in the last decades.[15]

3 Modernity and the "Nomads": Founding Romani Europe in the 1960s and 1970s

Neither "Europe" nor specific European institutions are monolithic containers. Different ranges of activity correlate to different perspectives. The institutional logic is reflected in documents, different types of sources with different purposes exist.[16] The Council of Europe's (CoE)

[15] The authors are grateful for the support they received from responsible officers and archivists, in particular Thorsten Afflerbach, Head of Division, Roma and Travellers Team, Directorate of Anti-Discrimination, Directorate General of Democracy of the Council of Europe, and José Andrés Gonzalez Pedraza, Archivist of the European Parliament.

[16] To take just one body of the Council of Europe (CoE) as an example, the "Adopted Texts" of the CoE's Congress of Local and Regional Authorities include "Recommendations" addressed to the Committee of Ministers for implementation by governments. They are also sometimes addressed to other European or international organizations, as well as to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. "Resolutions" refer to local and/or regional authorities, as well as to their associations or to the Congress itself. Then there are "Reports", i.e., explanatory memoranda, and "Opinions", which generally refer to questions submitted by the Committee of Ministers or by the Parliamentary Assembly to the Congress seeking the Congress's advice on

most important institutions in the field of Romani policies are the Parliamentary Assembly, consisting of members of the national parliaments of member states, the Committee of Ministers, and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of (the Council of) Europe (until 1994: the Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe; the Congress, or CLRAE).

The two foundational documents, the earliest articulations of a European "Roma policy" *avant la lettre*, are almost six years apart but the latter is based on the former. The chronology clearly indicates that awareness among members of the Parliamentary Assembly was much earlier developed, before the Committee of Ministers devoted itself – and thereby committing their governments – to this cause. Given their foundational character, not only terminology but policies outlined in these documents are discussed here, to give an impression of the state of the argument *in statu nascendi*.

The first recorded document is the Recommendation 563 of the Parliamentary Assembly: "Situation of Gypsies and other travellers in Europe", adopted on 30 September 1969. It connected the situation of Roma and Sinti to the theme of social and economic structural change in modern societies.[17]

matters which affect the competencies and interests of local and regional communities; quoted from https://www.coe.int/en/web/congress/adopted-texts.

[17] See http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=14599&lang=en#.

> *"The situation of the Gypsy population of Europe is severely affected by the rapid changes in modern society, which are depriving the Gypsies and other travellers of many opportunities to carry on with their traditional trades and professions, and worsening their handicaps with regard to literacy and educational and professional training."*

Speaking of "handicaps" related to economic traditions, as the framework is socioeconomic and not cultural or ethnic. The recommendation also recognizes antigypsyism (without the name) as a key problem:

> *"in many cases efforts to improve the situation have failed owing to discrimination against Gypsies, on the ground that they belong to a particular ethnic group, which is incompatible with the ideals underlying the European Convention on Human Rights and the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights."*

Therefore, the recommendation considers it imperative to fight discrimination: "take all steps necessary to stop discrimination, be it in legislation or in administrative practice, against Gypsies and other travellers", which amounts to much consideration given to "caravan sites" etc., including appropriate schooling for children in the vicinity of such places. However, "nomadic" traditions are also clearly treated as causes of disadvantages and failed integration:

> *"lack of education, resulting mainly from the Gypsies' and other travellers' nomadic way of life, has far-reaching repercussions, over and above the purely material or financial factors, on their life and social climate, which threaten to prejudice in the long term their integration in modern European society and their acceptance as citizens with equal rights."*

Still, the principle of speaking with people, not about them, the principle of participation is already established: "programmes designed to improve the situation of the Gypsies should be prepared in co-operation and consultation with their representatives." And even consulting bodies with equal representation are recommended:

> *"support the creation of national bodies consisting of representatives from governments, Gypsy and travellers' communities as well as voluntary organisations working in the interests of Gypsies and other travellers, and to consult these bodies in the preparation of measures designed to improve the position of the Gypsies and other travellers."*

All measure should be taken to guarantee equal rights and provide equal access to "social security provisions and medical care" for "Gypsies and other travellers". These are the terms used throughout the document: "Gypsies" and "travellers", in the French version of the document "Tziganes et autres nomades". The nomadic lifestyle or its long-term aftereffects are the

characteristic traits of the group whose legal and social situation the parliamentarians wished to improve in co-operation with the group concerned.

This Recommendation 563 was embraced almost six years later by the Committee of Ministers in its own Resolution (75) 13, "Containing Recommendations on the Social Situation of Nomads in Europe", adopted on 22 May 1975.[18] The terminology, however, differs somewhat from the parliamentary parlance and indicates a French influence. The resolution acknowledges that the "situation of nomads in Europe has been seriously affected by industrial and urban development and the extension of town and country planning" and it regrets that "prejudice or discriminatory practices on the part of the settled population against such persons have not entirely disappeared in member states." The ministers observe that the "low level of school attendance of the children of nomads endangers seriously their chances of social and occupational advancement" and therefore argue: "there should be special measures designed to assist the fuller integration of nomads into society."

"Nomads", the key term also in the English version, was the traditional French administrative term (Foisneau and Merlin, 2018) but the terms "nomads" and "gypsies" are used interchangeably in the document. A rudimentary definition of the group is given and starts the long European tradition of what could be called the "footnoted" or "bracketed" definition of Romani people: "the expression 'nomads' means persons who for historical reasons are accustomed to following an itinerant

[18] See https://rm.coe.int/09000016804c2aae.

way of life, as well as persons of nomadic origin who experience difficulties in integrating into society for sociological, economic or similar reasons." It is obvious that this is mainly a "sociographic" understanding of the group, with only vague reference to "nomadic origin" as a potentially ethnic description. A fully developed ethnic definition of "gypsies" is not (yet) part of political language; the specific mention of "gypsies" intends to give a prominent example of "nomadic" groups.

Ambitious appropriate measures by European members states are strongly recommended. The principles on which these measures are based are part of the genealogy of minority rights in Europe. The overall perspective on "nomads" and "gypsies" is not centralistic, anti-pluralist, or homogenizing: the groups are not described as a threat, but rather as something to be protected and preserved ("cultural heritage and identity of nomads should be safeguarded"), even if their way of life has somewhat outdated features. The rights-based approach ("enjoying the rights and protection"), however, keeps the paternalistic sound in check. States are asked to use national legislation "to stop any form of discrimination against nomads". An informational campaign is advised to counter antigypsyism: "The prejudices which form the basis of discriminatory attitudes and behaviour against nomads should be countered by inter alia giving the settled population better information about the origins, ways of life, living conditions and aspirations of nomads."

Most important is the principle of participation and power-sharing which was introduced in both early documents. This is a lasting, still to be fully implemented

legacy of these foundational acts of Romani Europe: Noncompliance to this principle has been considered to be one of the main deficiencies of the Roma policies of later decades (Rostas, 2019). This is also acknowledged by the 2020 European Union strategy, renamed "EU Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation", and the corresponding earlier resolution and report of the European Parliament.[19] In contrast, the CoE's 1975 resolution, based on the 1969 recommendation, already demanded that the "participation of nomads in the preparation and the implementation of measures concerning them should be encouraged and practised under conditions laid down by national legislation."

Among the fields which are given special attention is education: "the schooling of the children of nomads should be promoted by the most suitable methods, working towards integrating them into the normal educational system." In addition to schooling, vocational, for the job-training is explicitly dealt with as part of education: "nomads and their children should be enabled to benefit effectively from the various existing provisions for vocational guidance, training and retraining. [...] the

[19] 7 October 2020 EU strategic framework, https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/union_of_equality_eu_roma_strategic_framework_for_equality_inclusion_and_participation_en.pdf; 17 September 2020 European Parliament Resolution "Implementation of National Roma Integration Strategies: combating negative attitudes towards people with Romani background in Europe", https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0229_EN.html; 6 May 2020 "Franz Report", https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/LIBE-PR-650654_EN.pdf.

greatest possible account should be taken of the natural abilities."

Health and social welfare, support from social workers and access to social security – persons "should be assisted to make use of the available services" – are also part of the foundational programme. All of this breathes the post-war spirit of modernisation. Emancipation, equality and participation can be brought about by careful political governance. However, this is not modernisation theory in its more authoritarian and homogenizing varieties but an appreciation of "multiple" modernity, of a pluralistic modernity with different ways of life. Nonetheless it is a self-confident vision of state-led change for the better. Scenarios of failure do not exist. As it corresponds to the age of modernisation theories, ethnicity plays a subordinate role, if it is not cancelled at all. Ethnicity was seen as a relic of the past. This was an age of the social and of planning for a better society. (Brick, 2006; Doering-Manteuffel and Raphael, 2010; Ekbladh, 2010; Gilman, 2003; Rodgers, 2011; Streeck, 2011)

4 Discovering Diversity: "Romanies" in the 1980s

After this ambitious foundation of a European Romani policy, it took almost another decade before the next relevant document, the 22 February 1983 Recommendation (83) 1 of the CoE's Committee of Ministers, was adopted. The terminology and the concept of the minority are still and consistently "nomads" – the recommendation

"applies to persons who, for traditional reasons, are accustomed to follow an itinerant way of life ('nomads')."[20]

Change, however, was taking place. Behind the scenery of state-level interaction, on 27-29 October 1981, the plenary of the CoE's Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe devoted for the first time its attention to "populations of nomadic origin" (French: "d'origine nomade").[21] Points of reference for the debate were the two foundational documents discussed above, as well as a report by Ane Lieuwen, mayor of Wierden in the Netherlands, and a hearing by the Cultural Committee of the Conference on 21 November 1979.

Patterns of argumentation are reminiscent of earlier documents and highlight a social or socio-economic group left behind by the forces of modernisation.[22] The depiction, however, borders the ambiguous. We get a glimpse of the later problematising of Roma, as the local authorities discuss people also as causing problems in society, even if phrased in understanding words:

> *"people of nomadic origin who have been more or less forced to settle down have a tendency to cause*

[20] See https://rm.coe.int/09000016804fc21e.

[21] See https://rm.coe.int/1680719df0.

[22] E.g., "it is becoming ever more difficult to maintain a nomadic way of life in a modern European society where most of the rights and obligations of the citizens are linked to their residing in a fixed place and where intensive land use, especially in urban but also in rural areas, leaves little room for open spaces such as were used traditionally by travelling people, while at the same time industrialisation takes away the value of their traditional skills, by which they can no longer earn their living" (point 8).

> *problems due to the loss of their cultural and social identity, which is often linked to the nomadic way of life, and are unable to adopt from one day to the next the social and cultural patterns of the settled inhabitants of the community."* (Point 9)

Social traits evolve here into issues of "identity" – a new concept not alluded to before, which brings in more of an ethnic perspective and which rises from here to ever greater prominence.

Obviously, socio-economic modernization theories underlie such understandings of the social. Simultaneously, there is a strong commitment to minority rights and an admission that these are not generally popular and work is to be done to promote universal minority rights recognition. This is not modernization by force but a more open, co-operative vision of modernity. A minority rights convention complementing the human rights convention is explicitly asked for (point 13, v). "Nomadic peoples have kept to their way of life despite all attempts to persuade or force them to become integrated or even to eliminate them altogether. Far from solving the problems involved these integration efforts have often created new ones," explained rapporteur Ane Lieuwen who argued against any coercive methods to adapt "nomads" to economic modernity (CoE, 1982: 18).

However, this very perspective points to a key fact: all considerations and recommendations relate to traveling people and are intended to improve their situation in modern society. Sociological or "sociographic" categories are crucial to define this group; social and economic support and the struggle against discrimination are the

main concerns, while culture and ethnicity are still rarely touched upon. "Gypsies" means in fact "travelling Gypsies" (the document is about "travelling people" or "nomads", and "Gypsies" are one group among them), there is no concept of resident "Gypsies", at least there is no need seen to deal with and support "Gypsies" with a sedentary life-style, they are not mentioned and not conceptualised.

The creation – with "nomad" participation – of an information centre, information material, encounters and meetings to counter prejudice, and a European "mediator" with the CoE, "an independent person entrusted in particular with the task of reviewing the progress made in the implementation of Resolution (75) 13 and maintaining continuous contact with representatives of the nomads and the bodies in each country dealing with matters relating to nomads", are recommended.

The CLRAE also urged governments to establish "a solidarity fund, within the framework of the Council of Europe, to cover the cost of general assistance for nomads, including measure to be taken in the field of the promotion of their cultural identity", which is "considered as a common European heritage" (point 13, iv). The "nomads" are definitely not seen as the "other" in a cultural sense, they are rather considered to be a group outside socio-economic modernisation.

Therefore, the following differentiation might come as a surprise and even could have brought about a paradigm shift in European political language. In the argumentative context of a plea for a minority rights convention and for the safeguarding of minority rights,

a high degree of political and cultural sensitivity and reflection is displayed: The Conference

> *"calls upon the governments of member states [...] to recognise Romanies and other specific nomadic groups such as Samis as ethnic minorities and, consequently, to grant them the same status and advantages as other minorities may enjoy; in particular concerning respect and support for their own culture and language."* (Point 14, ii)

It is likely that the term "Romanies" reveals a recognition of the demands of the international Romani civil rights movement, activists and intellectuals. The entire document refrains from using the politically still widespread term "Gypsies". Romanies and Sami (also an endonym) are presented as culturally specific groups of nomads. Ethnicity enters the debate and becomes the defining criterion. Roma as a name or specific group are not mentioned.[23] Local authorities and the experts they commissioned seem to have been the driving force in the process of recognition not only of Romani rights and culture but also of Romani diversity.

A comparative look at some of the earliest European Parliament (EP) documents in this regard underlines the pioneering work of the CoE to which reference is made

[23] This pivotal conference and the contributions to it have entered textbooks on the evolution of international and European Roma rights and policies (Danbakli and Morris, 2001: 193-196). The minutes of the 29 October 1981 meeting haven been published in the Official Report (CoE, 1983: 133-139).

in EP documents. The EP's "Report drawn up on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on the situation of gypsies in Europe" (1544-83 EN), which had been in the making since 1981 and was presented on 19 March 1984, was ground-breaking in its call to end discrimination but did not consider issues of naming or self-designations. The image of "large groups of gypsies without a homeland", "roaming for years in Western Europe", and the need to take care of "the gypsy problem" prevail (p. 11).[24] The French version reads "Tziganes", the German "Zigeuner", the Italian "Zingari". Other brief early documents such as the Parliamentary Questions of 9 March 1977 (1350-77) and of 19 September 1980 (1185-80) used "gitans", "Tsiganes", "gitanos", "gypsies", "Gypsies" and "Zigeuner".[25]

However, there is an avant-garde German-language note (49/82) by the Dutch deputy Bouke Beumer of 10 November 1982, addressed to Simone Veil and the members of the Legal Affairs Committee, which without further explanation uses exclusively the term "Roma" throughout the text. Its subject is the "diskriminierende Behandlung der Roma". The unique terminological

[24] For the dominant image of non-sedentary groups in the EP, see also Parliamentary Question 1185-80, 19 September 1980: "Zigeuner und andere nicht seßhafte Bevölkerungsgruppen" or "gitans et autres nomads". Also, Parliamentary Question 2561-85, 21 January 1986.

[25] See also Motion resolution 879-86, 3 October 1986; Motion resolution 583-87, 14 June 1987; Motion resolution 1352-87, 25 November 1987; Parliamentary Question 1026-78, 31 January 1979; Parliamentary Question 767-88, 18 October 1988; Parliamentary Question 407-89, 23 November 1989.

sensitivity left no traces in the further discussion of that time.

5 Enlarging Europe, Easternising Romani Europe: The Return of the "Gypsies" in the 1990s

After the early 1980, there is a decade of silence in the CoE records. The end of the Cold War and the transformation of former socialist countries seems not to have coincided with Romani strategies high on the political agenda. Only in 1993 are key documents of the CoE again devoted to the Sinti and Roma minority. After the promising early years with their pluralist perspective, why did history take a different turn? The investigation of terminology will not find an answer but can contribute some interesting observations.

The Recommendation 1203 (1993), titled "Gypsies in Europe", adopted on 2 February 1993 by the Parliamentary Assembly and in full support of minority rights, repeats the term "Gypsies" time and again. It is simultaneously a celebration of cultural diversity and a terminological step backwards:[26] "Gypsies [...] are a true European minority, but one that does not fit into the definitions of national or linguistic minorities." Thus, language is not considered a uniting element and defining criterion. Rather a more folkloristic depiction is given: "As

[26] See http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=15237&lang=en; the French version speaks now of "tziganes" rather than "nomads".

a non-territorial minority, Gypsies greatly contribute to the cultural diversity of Europe. In different parts of Europe they contribute in different ways, be it by language and music or by their trades and crafts."

The assumption seems to be prevalent that "Gypsies" have lost their language and may recuperate it if it is promoted: "Guarantees for equal rights, equal chances, equal treatment, and measures to improve their situation will make a revival of Gypsy language and culture possible, thus enriching the European cultural diversity." The recommendations to governments are in line with this:

> *"a European programme for the study of Romanes and a translation bureau specialising in the language should be established;*
> *the provisions for non-territorial languages as set out in the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages should be applied to Gypsy minorities."*

Why such change in terminology? The accession of new member states from Eastern Europe seems to be an important part of an explanation: "With central and east European countries now member states, the number of Gypsies living in the area of the Council of Europe has increased drastically." Also, the explicit exhortation that the "implementation" of the earlier recommendations and resolutions mentioned above, "particularly in the new member states, is extremely important for the position of Gypsies", points into this direction. Further research is necessary but these hints indicate a geographical trajectory of the "new" terminology: for the

return of the "Gypsies" after 1990, and in the years to come as a countermovement the embracement of the name "Roma", (Central and South) Eastern European backgrounds must have played a role. Still, the fight against intolerance, prejudice and discrimination and the protection of minority rights are the key concerns of the documents. The terminological issue is but a sideshow.

In the same year, just a few weeks later (28th session, 16-18 March 1993), the Conference of Local and Regional Authorities updated its stand as "Resolution 249 (1993) on gypsies in Europe: The role and responsibility of local and regional authorities" (the French version reads "tsiganes").[27] In paradoxical contrast to the terminologically enlightened, inclusive stance just a few years earlier, we observe the reintroduction of more discriminatory naming practices. However, apart from the title, the document itself uses also a more inclusive term, "Rom/Gypsies", and while it is not the first document to attempt a definition, it is the first one to give terminological explanation in a footnote which acknowledges now also sedentary lifestyles. "Gypsies" is presented as self-identification of Romani people:

> *"In this report, the word Gypsy is used to designate the diversified group of those who generally identify themselves as Gypsies and Travellers, for example Rom, Travellers, Yenish, Kale, Sinti, Voyageurs, etc. The Gypsies and Travellers community present in*

[27] See https://rm.coe.int/1680719ba0.

the different European States is made up of nomadic as well as sedentary families."

The background of the resolution is an intensification of the fight against discrimination, the Central and Eastern European perspectives and experiences come to the fore when reference is made to a 1991 hearing and a 1992 conference in Slovakia, "showing that the position of Rom/Gypsies in Europe has deteriorated in recent years, causing increased mobility among those who had become settled."

The local and regional authorities require that their own earlier resolutions and the recent 1993 resolution of the Parliamentary Assembly are finally heeded, for they "have as yet been followed up with little concrete action". The media are singled out for detrimental effects: "the media all too often projects a negative image of Gypsies, encouraging policies of rejection, expulsion and violence." The local institutions' conference recognizes their own special responsibility "towards Rom/Gypsies, particularly with regard to accommodating Gypsies in the municipality, their education, training, health, development and the promotion of their culture", and therefore urges local and regional authorities

"I. to take necessary measures as part of an overall strategy to facilitate the integration of Rom/Gypsies into the local community [...]
II. to encourage Rom/Gypsies themselves to collaborate and participate in projects to foster such integration;

III. to counter the prejudices suffered by Rom/Gypsies in order to facilitate and promote communication between Gypsy and non-Gypsy communities through comprehensive information;
IV. to help develop networks of municipalities with a view to achieving these aims."

This includes small-scale projects, analysing data, and the preparation of a report after three years of network operation. The CLRAE also encourages governments to ratify the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Throughout the second half of the Resolution, the term "Gypsy" is almost exclusively used without the "Rom" supplement, while Romani communities themselves are invited to "set up a European association to represent Gypsy communities which will serve as a political interface for governments and European bodies."

The – 1994 renamed – Congress keeps working on these issues, while the Parliamentary Assembly (in 2002) and the Committee of Ministers (in 2000) wait into the next millennium before returning to the subject. The CoE's European Commission against Racism and Intolerance Policy Recommendations (ECRI, set up in 1993 and operational since 1994) started to work in this field only in 1998. The 31 May 1995 Congress Recommendation 11 (1995) titled "Towards a Tolerant Europe: the contribution of Rroma (Gypsies)"[28] introduces but a slight modification ("Rr-") of terminology, praises the recent "Verspaget report on 'The Gypsies in Europe'", which inter

[28] See https://rm.coe.int/1680719252.

alia made reference to Donald Kenrick's and Grattan Puxon's work,[29] and applauds that "the Budapest Conference the OSCE (Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe) set up a contact point for Rroma issues, within the ODIHR (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights) in Warsaw."

The Eastern European genealogy of the reintroduction of the "Gypsy" is made plausible again by references to specific events and examples in new member states. However, no explicit explanation is given on why the Recommendation itself uses now "Rroma (Gypsies)" but the twin term is used throughout: States are invited to recognize "Rroma (Gypsies)" as a minority with the same status and advantages as other minorities" and to sign and ratify the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities which was opened for signature just a few months earlier, on 1 February 1995. The newformed ECRI is asked "to pay particular attention to the discrimination, racism and intolerance affecting Rroma (Gypsies)" and to "suggest legislative measures to guarantee that the media do not deliberately or unintentionally convey a negative image of Rroma (Gypsies)." Several important measures such as "training programmes for Rroma (Gypsy) mediators" are detailed and demanded in the document.[30]

---

[29] For the report, see https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=6762.

[30] The Committee of Ministers supported the Recommendation: https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016804e61bd&format=native), of 1-2 July 1996, Item 6.2; see also the Congress Resolution 16 (1995), "Towards a Tolerant Europe: the contribution of Rroma

An interesting side development concerns the change of German terminology in European political language. The official German translation of the 1995 CoE document substitutes "Roma und Sinti" for "Rroma (Gypsies)".[31] But when the term Roma was finally introduced as political umbrella term by the Congress – though not yet by all institutions of the CoE – in 1997, even the German translation, despite German Central Council of Sinti and Roma involvement in the debates and CoE commitment to the recognition of self-designations, used exclusively the term "Roma".[32]

To add some observations on European Parliament parlance in those years, it is remarkable that even the Spanish Romani MEP Juan de Dios Ramírez Heredia's important 25 February 1994 report 124-94 on the "situation of gypsies in the community" and the parliamentary debate on the report retained "gypsies", "Tziganes", and "gitanos" as political terms. In the German version of the report, "Sinti and Roma" as a new terminology is used in the title and in the text of the report itself but "Zigeuner" is still the dominant term in the parliamentary debate,

(Gypsies)", with similar naming and spelling, https://rm.coe.int/-towards-a-tolerant-europe-the-contribution-of-roma-gypsies-rapporteur/1680719fb1.

[31] See https://rm.coe.int/den-beitrag-der-roma-und-sinti-zum-aufbau-eines-toleranten-europas-ber/168071959b; on German Central Council involvement in the discussion process, see the 11 February 1997 explanatory memorandum. https://rm.coe.int/towards-a-tolerant-europe-the-contribution-of-roma-explanatory-memoran/16808bf58a.

[32] See https://rm.coe.int/entschliessung-44-des-kongresses-der-gemeinden-und-regionen-europas-be/168071a204.

including the officially translated version of Ramírez Heredia's speech.

Rather than parliamentary reports and questions, where naming practices are inconsistent, using mostly "gypsies" and sometimes "Gypsies" and "Roma" in the very same documents, it was first an expert "note" written by the Italian diplomat, EP political officer and Ramírez Heredia's close collaborator Enzo Mariotti which seems to have brought about the change of the tide. Mariotti's 12 May 1992 "The Gypsies in Eastern Europe" introduced, despite its title, a single common name for Romani people across Europe. The text begins with a reflection on diversity and terminology which is remarkable for both its sensitivity and its confusion:

> *"In the countries of Eastern Europe, there lives a single people known by many names: Tziganes, Calderas, Sinti, etc.*
> *In the English-speaking world they are known as 'Gypsies' (a name which probably comes from the word 'Egyptians').*
> *These names, together with other regional names found in particular areas of Europe (Gitanos, Manush, Tatars, Heiden, etc.), can be classified as exonyms.*
> *The endonym of this people was established recently during a congress held in London in 1971. The participants at the congress, representing a large majority of the Gypsy people, decided to find a common name for their people which, with their quite different traditions and customs, is scattered throughout all the countries of Europe.*

The London conference not only recognized the need to find a common name but also reached unanimous agreement on the choice to be made.
The name chosen was 'ROM', a word which in Sanskrit, their original language, means 'Man'.
This awareness on the part of the 'ROM' people of the need to mark themselves off clearly from other cultures was of historic importance.
[...]
The fact of living in a society which is increasingly organized across wide land masses has forced the ROM to find a cultural profile for themselves which will allow them to come together in all their diversity as a clearly defined entity to support their campaigns to uphold their rights.
This awareness of their own cultural separateness has important consequences which vary as between the 'ROM' living in Western Europe and those living in the East.
[...]
'Communist' countries in line with their ideology have tried to resolve the ROM problem as a 'social' problem rather than a 'cultural' problem.
[...]
The result of this was the dissolution of their social environment and the breaking up of the groups in which the ROM traditionally lived.
This was a serious threat to Eastern European ROM, and to defend their culture against this social levelling practised by the Communist regimes, they tried to give themselves a cultural and social identity which would be as clearly defined as possible.

> *Eastern Europe this witnessed an 'ethnogenesis' arising out of the need for the ROM to fend off absorption by the majority culture. Their wish was to stop being a community of outsiders in order to achieve the status of an ethnic minority with official recognition"* (p. 1-2).

It is noteworthy that this important EP document offered a peculiar mixture of admirable cultural and political awareness of diversity on the one hand and an almost arbitrary combination of different realities on the other hand. The style is rather traditionally ethnological with a geopolitical bent, the sound borders the paternalistic. Of course, this "note" was composed by a person familiar with Romani issues, feeling with Romani people, fascinated by them and fighting for their rights. The author picked up on ideas popularised by the Romani civil rights movement.

The text includes an unsparing critique of the political conditions in former socialist states. The "reemergence" of a "climate of hostility" and antigypsyist violence in "Eastern Europe and the Balkans" are analysed and condemned. There is dense political and social information and much reference to research. The reasons why "ROM" are "migrating from Eastern to Western Europe" are seen in the "crisis in Eastern Europe" and, although increased by antigypsyist violence, also interpreted as part of a secular event, the large-scale post-Cold War "mass emigration" from former Soviet and socialist states to the West.

But the hasty identification of Eastern and Western European Romani aspirations and imaginations, despite

the emphatic acknowledgement of diversity, has certainly contributed to a lasting confusion in European political language – and it went towards making invisible the peculiarities of Western and Northern European Romani groups. What they consider their endonyms are treated as exonyms and thereby devaluated.

The pan-European unity of Romani groups that is invoked here was more a wishful agenda – certainly to be welcomed by the parliamentarians and instrumental in creating support for Romani organisations – than an appropriate description of Romani realities in post-Cold War Europe. The aim is for the "ROM" to "organize [themselves] politically" also in the West and to intensify the already established political organisation in the East. Correspondences to contemporaneous political strategies of self-organisations and NGOs are evident.

However, despite all its weaknesses, this report definitely made the point that there is a common Romani cultural identity which needs to be taken into consideration and respected by European policymakers. In this regard, it was a conceptual step forward, leaving behind the preoccupation with non-sedentary lifestyles found in earlier EP and other European institutions' documents. Notwithstanding the many confusions of its own, this "note" put a stop to the confusion of "sociographic" and cultural understandings of Romani people in Europe and was a plea for the fostering both of a common cultural identity and common political activities.

The process of the creation of a common European "ROM" identity that has been set in motion is testified to by this important EP "note". Also, numbers of "Rom population" of 1986 for all European countries are given.

Their number is estimated here at just under 6 million; for West Germany, e.g., the number 84,000 is given. To be sure, the implementation of the common name "Roma" was a gradual process also in the EP.[33] Terminological change seems to have been more or less completed in 1997.[34]

6 The Gradual Establishment of a European Name, From Local to Governmental Levels: "Roma" Since the Mid-1990s

This is also a decisive year inside the CoE. The pivotal document here was the 7 March 1997 Congress Resolution 44 (1997), "Towards a tolerant Europe: the contribution of Roma."[35] For the first time, "Roma" is used exclusively

[33] See, e.g., Ramírez Heredia's Motion Resolution 1503-93, 3 November 1992, criticising German policies towards Romanian Roma ("gypsies", "Zigeuner", and "Tziganes" is used). The record thereafter is mixed for some years: "Roma" is used in Claudia Roth's 1993 Motion Resolution 1115-93, concerning refugees from the former Yugoslavia, in a 9 December 1996 Question (3452-96) or in a 15 December 1993 letter by Egon Klepsch, President of the EP, to Willy Claes. But many documents keep for several years to come terminologies like "gypsies" and "Tziganes" (see, e.g., Parliamentary Question 586-96, 11 March 1996, or the European Commission's 14 January 1997 answer to Question 3452-96, given by Commissioner Hans van den Broek.

[34] See, e.g., Parliamentary Question 2927-97, 17 September 1997, when also the Commission's 27 October 1997 answer, again by Hans van den Broek, exclusively used "Roma" (in French, "Roms").

[35] See https://rm.coe.int/1680719702. The work of Slovakian rapporteur Alexander Slafkovský was crucial in this regard, as

and throughout as the only term designating the minority (the French version reads "Roms"). This is the moment when decisive terminological change happened at the level of local and regional authorities. Two paragraphs mention the decision that has remained effective until this day:

> *"14. Resolves to use the spelling "Roma", with a single 'r', in future so as to comply with usual practice within the Council of Europe and the OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe);*
> *15. Decides, in order to provide for better reading and understanding, to comprise under the expression 'Roma' the whole variety of groups such as Roma, Gypsies, Sinti, Manush, Gitanos..."*

At the same time, the resolution embraces in point 18 the recommendation of the "Ploiesti Round Table" in Romania of November 1996 quoted in the appendix:

> *"1. The CLRAE is encouraged to continue to address the situation and problems of the Roma, acknowledging their ethnic/national identity, among other things by encouraging the use of the self-designation 'Roma' in texts referring to Romani communities, and to stress the need for protection against ethnically-motivated discrimination, exclusion, and violence. In this connection, it is asked to initiate a series of events dedicated to the theme*

footnotes and the 11 February 1997 explanatory memorandum show.

'The image of the Roma: the reality of ethnic identity vs the myth of "social behaviour"', intended to help disentangle the set of replicated images of Romani identity and so to help clarify the real dimensions of the problems Romani communities face."

"Roma" is now finally introduced as umbrella term at this level of European institutional activities, it is connected to "ethnic identity", and the string impression is given that Roma is the self-designation of "Romani communities".

Still, as already indicated, it took several years for the parliamentary representatives and in particular for the European governments to adopt unequivocally the new terminology. Even the first policy recommendation by the ECRI regarding Roma of 6 March 1998 still deploys the terms "Roma/Gypsies" interchangeably, while it recommends member states "to ensure that the name used officially for the various Roma/Gypsy communities should be the name by which the community in question wishes to be known" – a standard which was hardly met by this recommendation itself, despite all its important elements.[36]

Also, the 3 February 2000 Recommendation (2000) 4 of the Committee of Ministers "On the Education of Roma/Gypsy Children in Europa" maintains the older double term. No terminological discussion or footnote is added. The 27 November 2001 Recommendation (2001) 17 of the Committee of Ministers on improving the economic and employment situation of "Roma/Gypsies and

[36] See https://rm.coe.int/09000016808b5a3a.

Travellers in Europa" not only keeps the "Roma/Gypsies" identification and continues to ignore the discussion of the Congress and the earlier recommendations, but is the first to include again "Travellers" ("the present recommendation covers Roma/Gypsies and Travellers, to be referred to as Roma/Gypsies in the text") as a generic term. Both groups' challenges are to be countered by identical measures. This is not only terminologically, but also conceptually a step backwards, as the recommendation homogenises different groups as victims of discrimination.[37]

Terminological change was faster adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly. Its 25 April 2002 Recommendation 1557 (2002) on the "Legal Situation of the Roma in Europe", as well as the accompanying documents, use exclusively "Roma". Anti-discrimination and what is today called empowerment – such as encouraging Roma to set up their own organizations and improving the situation of "Romany women" (Romany with -y becomes occasionally the attribute) – are the key concerns. The accompanying reports include an addendum on the legal situation in all member states and state basic principles for Romani equality: (1) "Integration without assimilation. The Roma must be treated as an ethnic group and a socially disadvantaged community"; (2) "The disadvantaged social situation of the Roma" must always be taken into consideration; (3) "Fight against ethnic discrimination. Marginalisation and social segregation"; (4) "The Roma must be treated as full citizens of the country they

[37] See https://rm.coe.int/09000016805e2e91 and https://rm.coe.int/09000016805e2958.

live in. A shared but asymmetrical responsibility"; (5) "Participation of the Roma in public life and in the decision-making process". The "Kosovo conflict" is acknowledged as one of the reasons of increasing Roma migration into Western Europe.[38] Similarly, the parliamentarians promoted in 2003 the rights of refugee Roma from Kosovo and other former Yugoslav territories.[39] The new parlance of Roma is well-established by this time.

The reply from the Committee of Ministers continues to use both the terms "Roma" and "Gypsy" and emphasises the importance of the work of the governments vis-à-vis the parliamentarians. The text includes a footnote revealing lingering terminological uncertainty at the level of national governments: "'Roma' refers, in accordance with the Council of Europe and other

[38] See http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=16999 and Doc. 9397, https://pace.coe.int/en/files/9676, report of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, rapporteur: Csaba Tabajdi from Hungary; Doc. 9417, https://pace.coe.int/en/files/9699, opinion of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Demography, rapporteur: Boriss Cilevics from Latvia; and Doc. 9424, https://pace.coe.int/en/files/9707, opinion of the Social, Health and Family Affairs Committee, rapporteur: Marlene Rupprecht from Germany.

[39] Recommendation 1633 (2003), 25 November 2003, on Forced returns of Roma from the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, to Serbia and Montenegro from Council of Europe member states, https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=17165&lang=en.

international organisations' texts, also to Sinti, Travellers, Gypsies and other Roma related groups."[40]

In the early 2000s, the gap between government and other perspectives widens. The governments, while supportive of measures improving the social situation and fighting discrimination, are still stuck in traditionally discriminatory language. A 2004 recommendation of the Committee of Ministers uses "Roma/Gypsies and Travellers". This reveals the ongoing replacement of the term "Gypsy" by "Roma" without changing the contents of the concept. The perspective is still focused on non-sedentary, nomadic groups, irrespective of their ethnicity:

> *"The present text covers those Travellers, Roma, Sinti, Yenish and other related groups in member states who have traditionally a nomadic or semi-nomadic life-style and who are citizens of those states or legally residing in these countries. For the sake of convenience the term 'Travellers' will be used in this Recommendation."*

The "nomadic" lifestyle is treated as an element of "specific cultural identities". A view of non-sedentary lifestyle – a rather small and negligible social event, but the main topic of the entire recommendation – still dominates the political perception of "Roma". Measured by their language and image of "Roma", governments maintain more of traditional antigypsyist views than do parliamentarians or representatives of local authorities

[40] See https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=10183&lang=EN, 11 June 2003, doc. 9828.

at that time. But also governmental language is now reaching a pivot point.

The governmental preoccupation with a non-sedentary lifestyle characterizes also a 2005 recommendation. The terminology is still "Roma/Gypsies and Travellers". Only the appendix changes completely to "Roma", emphasising diversity: "The term 'Roma' used in the present text refers to Roma/Gypsies and Traveller communities and must be interpreted as covering the wide diversity of groups concerned." The preoccupation is also visible in sentences such as "Member states should affirm the right of people to pursue sedentary or nomadic lifestyles, according to their own free choice."

However, the resolution also includes important, still neglected points regarding housing policies, such as the obligations "to combat the creation of ghettos and segregation of Roma from the majority society", to "provide Roma communities and organisations with the means to participate in the process of conceiving, designing, implementing and monitoring policies and programmes aimed at improving their housing situation", and to "promote empowerment and capacity-building on a wider basis among Roma communities by fostering partnerships at local, regional and national levels, as appropriate, in their policies aimed at addressing the housing problems facing Roma". Legal frameworks to guarantee these rights and procedures still need to be developed by member states, as the recommendation urges and elaborates, also proper funding is needed for adequate housing policies: "Member states should acknowledge that successful social cohesion policies

require proper funding and assistance, continuous commitment and a long-term approach."[41]

Finally, by the mid-2000s the terminological paradigm shift was completed in all CoE institutions. Parliamentary Assembly and local authorities initiated the change that was finally also fully adopted by European governments. The 12 July 2006 Recommendation 10 (2006) of the Committee of Ministers on better access to health care for Roma and Travellers in Europe adopts as the new umbrella term "Roma and Travellers", not without an explanatory definition: "The term 'Roma and Travellers' used in the present text refers to Roma, Sinti, Kalé, Travellers, and related groups in Europe, and aims to cover the wide diversity of groups concerned. In the context of the United Kingdom 'Roma and Travellers' also refers to self-proclaimed 'Gypsies'." "Romani" is used as an adjective.[42]

The new name and the definition, albeit in several slightly modified versions, had now become codified. "Roma/Travellers" is taken for granted: "The definition of 'Roma and Travellers' is taken from the glossary on Roma-related terminology used at the Council of

[41] See Recommendation 14 (2004) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the movement and encampment of Travellers in Europe, 1 December 2004 (https://rm.coe.int/09000016805db80c); Recommendation 4 (2005) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on improving the housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in Europe, 23 February 2005 (https://rm.coe.int/09000016805dad2c).
[42] See https://rm.coe.int/09000016805aff57.

Europe."[43] Similarly, also the ECRI changed its terminology.[44] Only one final element of terminological change happens thereafter, when "Travellers" are more and more dropped from the titles of the official documents and no longer part of the umbrella term.[45] Several documents using the by now well-established term "Roma", especially adopted by the CLARE and the Parliamentary Assembly, even start in the mid-2000s to refrain from

[43] See the 20 February 2008 Recommendation 5 (2008) of the of the Committee of Ministers on policies for Roma and/or Travellers in Europe, https://rm.coe.int/09000016805d3e1c.

[44] See, e.g., the 24 June 2011 (amended 1 December 2020) General Policy Recommendation No. 13 on Combating Antigypsyism and Discrimination against Roma, https://rm.coe.int/09000016808b5aee: "in the present recommendation, the term 'Roma' includes not only Roma but also Sinti, Kali, Ashkali, 'Egyptians', Manouche and kindred population groups in Europe, together with Travellers, so as to embrace the great diversity of the groups concerned" (p. 4).

[45] See, e.g., "The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma", adopted at the Council of Europe High Level Meeting on Roma on 20 October 2010, https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805ce1de, or the Declaration of the Committee of Ministers on the Rise of Anti-Gypsyism and Racist Violence against Roma in Europe of 1 February 2012, https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805cb2c8.

giving a definition at all.[46] But this is not practised in all cases.[47]

---

[46] See, e.g., Summit of Mayors on Roma, 22 September 2011 Final Declaration, http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/virtuallibrary/librarydb/web/files/pdfs/179/VL-094.pdf; the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities' 26 March 2014 Resolution 366 (2014), Empowering Roma youth through participation, https://rm.coe.int/168071ab71; the corresponding Recommendation 354 (2014), 26 March 2013, https://rm.coe.int/0900001680718a98 (in contrast, see the Committee of Ministers' 10 October 2014 reply, https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805c4cd2); Resolution 1927 (2013) of the Parliamentary Assembly on Ending discrimination against Roma children, 23 April 2013, http://semantic-pace.net/tools/pdf.aspx?doc=aHR0cDovL2Fzc2VtYmx5LmNvZS5pbnQvbncveG1sL1hSZWY-vWDJILURXLWV4dHIuYXNwP2ZpbGVpZD0xOTY4OSZsYW5nPUV0&xsl=aHR0cDovL3NlbWFudGljcGFjZS5uZ-XQvWHNsdC9QZGYvWFJlZi1XRC1BVC1YTUwyUERGLnhzbA==&xsltparams=ZmlsZWlkPTE5Njg5; Resolution 2153 (2017) on Promoting the inclusion of Roma and Travellers, 27 January 2017, http://semantic-pace.net/tools/pdf.aspx?doc=aHR0cDovL2Fzc2VtYmx5LmNvZS5pbnQvbncveG1sL1hSZWY-vWDJILURXLWV4dHIuYXNwP2ZpbGVpZD0yMzQ5MCZsYW5nPUV0&xsl=aHR0cDovL3NlbWFudGljcGFjZS5uZ-XQvWHNsdC9QZGYvWFJlZi1XRC1BVC1YTUwyUERGLnhzbA==&xsltparams=ZmlsZWlkPTIzNDkw;

[47] See the important 19 October 2011 CLRAE Resolution 333 (2011), The situation of Roma in Europe: a challenge for local and regional authorities, https://rm.coe.int/1680719e6e; or its 20 October 2016 Recommendation 388 (2016), The situation of Roma and Travellers in the context of rising extremism, xenophobia and the refugee crisis in Europe, https://rm.coe.int/168071a5ab.

Among the most recent developments are even more detailed definitions such as the one given by the 17 October 2017 Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers on improving access to justice for Roma and Travellers in Europe:

> *"The terms 'Roma and Travellers' are being used at the Council of Europe to encompass the wide diversity of the groups covered by the work of the Council of Europe in this field: on the one hand a) Roma, Sinti/Manush, Calé, Kaale, Romanichals, Boyash/Rudari; b) Balkan Egyptians (Egyptians and Ashkali); c) Eastern groups (Dom, Lom and Abdal); and, on the other hand, groups such as Travellers, Yenish, and the populations designated under the administrative term 'Gens du voyage', as well as persons who identify themselves as Gypsies."*[48]

This has become standard European parlance, as a comparative look at the 12 March 2021 European Union

[48] See https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=090000168075f2aa; the wording is maintained by the Council of Europe Strategic Action Plan for Roma and Traveller Inclusion (2020-2025) https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=0900001680998933 of 22 January 2020 but the signatories here want it to be understood as an explanation and not as a definition. See also https://rm.coe.int/coe-strategic-action-plan-for-roma-and-traveller-inclusion-en/16809fe0d0; or the Recommendation CM/Rec(2020)2 of the Committee of Ministers on the inclusion of the history of Roma and/or Travellers in school curricula and teaching materials, https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016809ee48c.

Council Recommendation on Roma equality, inclusion and participation proves:

> *"Acknowledging the diversity that exists among Roma, the term 'Roma' is used as an umbrella term to refer to a number of different groups of Romani origin such as Roma, Sinti, Kale, Gypsies, Romanichels and Boyash/Rudari. It also encompasses groups such as Ashkali, Egyptians, Eastern groups (including Dom, Lom, Rom, and Abdal), as well as traveller populations, including ethnic Travellers, Yenish or those designated under the administrative term 'Gens du voyage', and people who identify themselves as Gypsies, Tsiganes or Tziganes, without denying the specific characteristics of those groups."*[49]

7 Paradoxical Paradigm Shift: Conclusion

According to these recent definitions and explanations, the concept of "Roma" in European political language is still anything but clear. European institutions advocate and acknowledge diversity but at the same time are committed to the institutional and administrative logic of bringing very different groups into a single name and thereby creating the human object of political intervention. It remains questionable what the common denominator is, if not the traditional governmental

[49] See https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32021H0319(01)&from=EN.

preoccupation with non-sedentary lifestyles or the assumed long-term effects of a history of "nomadic" culture. Even if ethnicity and cultural identity have been increasingly referred to since the 1990s, the paradoxical construction of the concept has never been solved. Conceptually, "Roma" in European political language borders the aporetic. There remains a major task to be done. Romani participation, at European, national, regional, and grass-roots levels, is the only way to do this.

However, this is not to be misinterpreted as a critique of political measures proposed and demanded by European institutions. In the real world, and not some imagined ideal place, European institutions have been time and again standard-bearers of best possible practice. They have been, and remain to be, the most enlightened institutions on the continent and are, contrary to at least some national governments, deeply committed to Romani rights and welfare as well as to Romani participation in all political developments.

But this contribution is a mere reconstruction of the use of words, not a history of European Romani strategies and policies. One finding, though, is definite: Despite earlier tendencies indicating that different terminological trajectories could have been possible, with "Roma" a distinct umbrella term has been gradually established in European political language since the mid-1990s. Even the national governments which seem to have been responsible for the reintroduction of the term "Gypsies" in the early 1990s had finally adopted "Roma" by the mid-2000s. Ever since, good political intentions, the realities on the ground, ethnic diversity, and the heterogeneity of history and culture have created an instable force field.

Further conceptual and terminological transformation is likely to be ahead when Romani voices are increasingly involved in the designing and implementation of European Romani policies.

Bibliography

Achim, Viorel (2000). *The Roma in Romanian History*, Budapest.

Acton, Thomas (2012). "Social and Economic Bases of Antigypsyism". In *New Faces of Antigypsyism in Modern Europe*, ed. Hristo Kyuchukov, Prague: 31-37.

Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott, Stanford.

Baar, Huub van (2011). *The European Roma: Minority Representation, Memory and the Limits of Transnational Governmentality*, Amsterdam.

Baker, Daniel (2017). "Shifting visibilities: the social implications of a Roma aesthetic", *Identities*, 24:6, 741-750.

Banton, Michael (2018). *What We Now Know About Race and Ethnicity*, New York.

Brick, Howard (2006). *Transcending Capitalism: Visions of a New Society in Modern American Thought*, Ithaca.

Carrera, Sergio, Iulius Rostas and Lina Vosyliūtė (2017). *Combating Institutional Anti-Gypsyism: Responses and promising practices in the EU and selected Member States*, Brussels.

Chiriac, Bogdan (2019). "Mihail Kogălniceanu's Historical Inquiry into the Question of Roma Slavery in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Romanian Principalities", *Critical Romani Studies*, 2:2, 24-40.

CoE (1982). Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, Thirty-Fourth Ordinary Session (First Part), 26-30 April 1982: Documents: Working Papers, vol. II, Strasbourg.

CoE (1983). Council of Europe, Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, Sixteenth Ordinary Session, 27-19 October 1981: Official Report of Debates, Strasbourg.

Cortes, Ismael Gomez (2020). "Antigypsyism as Symbolic and Epistemic Violence in Informative Journalism in Spain 2010–2018", *Critical Romani Studies*, 3:1, 4-25.

Danbakli, Marielle and Rachel Morris, eds. (2001). *Roma, Gypsies: Texts issued by International Institutions*. Hatfield, 2001.

Doering-Manteuffel, Anselm and Lutz Raphael (2010). *Nach dem Boom: Perspektiven auf die Zeitgeschichte seit 1970*, Göttingen.

Ekbladh, David (2010). *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*, Princeton.

Eliav-Feldon, Miriam (2009). "Vagrants or Vermin? Attitudes towards Gypsies in Early Modern Europe". In *The Origins of Racism in the West*, ed. Miriam Eliav-Feldon, Benjamin Isaac and Joseph Ziegler, New York: 276-291.

End, Markus (2012). "History of Antigypsyism: The Social Causes". In *New Faces of Antigypsyism in Modern Europe*, ed. Hristo Kyuchukov, Prague: 7-15.

End, Markus (2019). "The 'gypsy Threat': Modes of Racialization and Visual Representation Underlying German Police Practices". In *The Securitization of the Roma in Europe*, ed. Huub van Baar, Ana Ivasiuc and Regina Kreide, London: 261-283.

Eze, Emmanuel Chukwudi (1997). *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*. Oxford.

Florian, Reinhard (2012). *Ich wollte nach Hause, nach Ostpreußen! Das Überleben eines deutschen Sinto*, ed. Jana Mechelhoff-Herezi and Uwe Neumärker, Berlin.

Foisneau, Lise and Valentin Merlin (2018). "French Nomads' Resistance 1939-1946". In *Roma Resistance during the Holocaust and in its Aftermath: Collection of Working Papers*, ed. Evelin Verhás, Angéla Kóczé and Anna Lujza Szász, Budapest: 57-101.

Gillborn, David (2020). "The White Bones of Policy: Structure, Agency and a Vulture's-Eye View with Critical Race Theory". In *Knowledge, Policy and Practice in Education and the Struggle for Social Justice Essays Inspired by the Work of Geoff Whitty*, ed. Andrew Brown and Emma Wisby, London: 115-133.

Gilman, Nils (2003). *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*, Baltimore.

Grosfoguel, Ramon (2016). "What is Racism?", *Journal of World-System Research*, 22:1, 9-15.

Hancock, Ian (1997). "The Roots of Antigypsyism: To the Holocaust and After". In *Confronting the Holocaust: A Mandate for the*

21st Century, ed. G. Jan Colijn and Marcia Sachs Littell, Lanham: 19-49.

Holler, Martin (2015). "Historical Predecessors of the Term 'Anti-Gypsyism'". In *Antiziganism: What's in a Word?*, ed. Jan Selling, Markus End, Hristo Kyuchukov, Pia Laskar and Bill Templer, Newcastle upon Tyne: 82-92.

Jacobs, Jack (2015). *The Frankfurt School, Jewish Lives, and Antisemitism*, New York.

Kenrick, Donald (2004). "The Origins of Anti-Gypsyism: The Outsiders' View of Romanies in Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century". In *The Role of the Romanies: Images and Counter-Images of 'Gypsies'/Romanies in European Cultures*, ed. Nicholas Saul and Susan Tebbutt, Liverpool: 79-84.

Koselleck, Reinhart (1989). "Begriffsgeschichte und Sozialgeschichte". In *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, Frankfurt: 107-129.

Koselleck, Reinhart (2000). *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik*, Frankfurt.

Kurunmäki, Jussi, Jeppe Nevers and Henk te Velde, eds. (2018), *Democracy in Modern Europe: A Conceptual History*, New York.

Lagrenne, Hildegard et al. (2015). *"Da wollten wir frei sein!" Eine Sinti-Familie erzählt*, ed. Michail Krausnick, Neckargemünd.

Lucassen, Leo, Will Willems and Annemarie Cottaar, eds. (1998). *Gypsies and other Itinerant Groups*, Houndmills.

Margalit, Gilad (1996). *Antigypsyism in the Political Culture of the Federal Republic of Germany: A Parallel with Antisemitism?*, Jerusalem.

Marushiakova, Elena and Vesselin Popov (2018). "Roma Labelling: Policy and Academia", *Slovenský Národopis*, 66:4, 385-418.

Marushiakova, Elena and Vesselin Popov, eds. (2021). *Roma Voices in History: A Sourcebook: Roma Civic Emancipation in Central, South-Eastern and Eastern Europe from the 19th Century until World War II*, Paderborn.

Matras, Yaron, Hans Winterberg and Michael Zimmermann, eds. (2003). *Sinti, Roma, Gypsies: Sprache – Geschichte – Gegenwart*, Berlin.

McGarry, Aidan (2017). *Romaphobia: The Last Acceptable Form of Racism* , London.

Mengersen, Oliver von, ed. (2015), *Sinti und Roma: Eine deutsche Minderheit zwischen Diskriminierung und Emanzipation* , Bonn.

Middelaar, Luuk van (2013). *The Passage to Europe: How a Continent Became a Union* , New Haven.

Mirga-Kruszelnicka, Anna (2018). "Challenging Anti-gypsyism in Academia", *Critical Romani Studies* , 1:1, 8-28.

Mirga-Kruszelnicka, Anna and Jekatyerina Dunajeva, eds. (2020). *Re-Thinking Roma Resistance throughout History: Recounting Stories of Strength and Bravery* , Berlin.

Müller, Tim B. and Jeppe Nevers, eds. (2019). "Narratives of Democracy". Special issue, *Journal of Modern European History* , 17:2, 123-233

Opfermann, Ulrich F. (2007). *"Seye kein Zigeuner, sondern kayserlicher Cornet": Sinti im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert: Eine Untersuchung anhand archivalischer Quellen* , Berlin.

Richardson, Kristina (2021). *Roma in the Medieval Islamic World: Literacy, Culture, and Migration* , London.

Rodgers, Daniel T. (1998). *Contested Truths: Keywords of American Politics since Independence* , Cambridge.

Rodgers, Daniel T. (2011). *Age of Fracture* , Cambridge, MA.

Rosanvallon, Pierre (2006). "Inaugural Lecture, Collège de France". In: *Democracy Past and Future* , ed. Sam Moyn, New York: 31-58

Rostas, Iulius (2019). *A Task for Sisyphus: Why Europe's Roma Policies Fail*, Budapest.

Schmidt, Zilli (2019). *Gott hat mit mir etwas vorgehabt! Erinnerungen einer deutschen Sinteza*, ed. Jana Mechelhoff-Herezi and Uwe Neumärker, Berlin.

Sigona, Nando and Nidhi Trehan, eds. (2009). *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order*, London.

Simhandl, Katrin (2009). "Beyond Boundaries? Comparing the Construction of the Political Categories 'Gypsies' and 'Roma' Before and After EU Enlargement". In *Romani Politics in*

Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order, ed. Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan, London: 72-93.

Strauß, Daniel and Tim B. Müller (2021). "Sinti im Südwesten. Eine deutsche Geschichte". In *Ausgrenzung und Verfolgung: Ravensburger Sinti im Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Sabine Mücke and Peter Fritsch, Ravensburg: 35–42.

Strauß, Daniel, ed. (2002), *"... weggekommen": Berichte und Zeugnisse von Sinti, die die NS-Verfolgung überlebt haben*, Berlin.

Strauß, Daniel, ed. (2021). *Ungleiche Teilhabe: Zur Lage der Sinti und Roma in Deutschland*, Mannheim.

Streeck, Wolfgang (2011): "The Crises of Democratic Capitalism", *New Left Review*, 71, 5-29

Surdu, Mihai (2016). *Those Who Count: Expert Practices of Roma Classification*, Budapest.

Surdu, Mihai and Martin Kovats (2015). "Roma Identity as an Expert-Political Construction", *Social Inclusion*, 3:5, 5-18.

Taylor, Becky (2014). *Another Darkness, Another Dawn: A History of Gypsies, Roma and Travellers*, London.

Taylor, Charles (2004), *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham, NC.

Trehan, Nidhi (2009). "The Romani Subaltern within Neoliberal European Civil Society: NGOization of Human Rights and Silent Voices". In *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order*, ed. Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan, London: 51-71.

Tuckermann, Anja (2018). *"Denk nicht, wir bleiben hier!" Die Lebensgeschichte des Sinto Hugo Höllenreiner*, Munich.

VDSR-BW (2021). Verband Deutscher Sinti und Roma, Landesverband Baden-Württemberg, The Right to Our Own Name: Making Visible the Self-Designations of Romani-Speaking Europeans, Mannheim.

Verhás, Evelin, Angéla Kóczé and Anna Lujza Szász, eds. (2018). *Roma Resistance during the Holocaust and in its Aftermath: Collection of Working Papers*, Budapest.

Wiggershaus, Rolf (1994). *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance*, Cambridge, MA.

On the authors

Dr. Iulius Rostas is Visiting Professor at the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (Bucharest, Romania). Between 2016 and 2019 he served as Chair of Romani Studies and Assistant Professor at Central European University and he was Visiting Lecturer at Corvinus University of Budapest (2012-2016). Dr. Rostas is the editor of *Ten Years After: A History of Roma School Desegregation in Central and Eastern Europe* (2012) and in 2011 he published *Social Inclusion or Exclusion: The Rights of Persons Living with HIV in Moldova*. He is the founding Editor-in-Chief of the *Critical Romani Studies* journal (www.crs.ceu.edu). His latest book, *A Task for Sisyphus: Why Europe's Roma Policies Fail*, was published by CEU Press in 2019 and translated into Romanian in 2020.

Dr. Tim B. Müller is a historian and director of research and administrative director of the German Sinti and Roma Association of the State of Baden-Württemberg. He taught at Humboldt University in Berlin 2005-2010 and was a research fellow of the Hamburg Institute for Social Research 2010-2018. Among his books and edited volumes are *Krieger und Gelehrte: Herbert Marcuse und die Denksysteme im Kalten Krieg* (2010, awarded with the Wiener Library Ernst Fraenkel Prize), *Nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg: Lebensversuche moderner Demokratien* (2014) and (with Adam Tooze) *Normalität und Fragilität: Demokratie nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (2015).

This publication contributes to a clarification of two of the most important basic concepts in the debate on Europe's Romani citizens: antigypsyism and Roma.

Antigypsyism is the key term of the new European Union Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation. A precise concept of antigypsyism is indispensable to understand the realities of Romani people in Europe and to design more successful policies. By tracing the historical development of the term Roma in European political language, the authors also expose some of the contradictions of previous policies.

This book lays the groundwork for a more differentiated discussion of options for effective action. It addresses all those involved in the field of European Romani policies, from Romani civil society and self-organisations to NGOs, academics and researchers to regional and national governments to European institutions and policymakers.

ISBN 978-3-9824171-1-0