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About ETHOS

ETHOS - Towards a European Theory Of justice and fairness is a European Commission Horizon 2020 research project that seeks to provide building blocks for the development of an empirically informed European theory of justice and fairness. The project seeks to do so by:

a) refining and deepening knowledge on the European foundations of justice - both historically based and contemporarily envisaged;
b) enhancing awareness of mechanisms that impede the realisation of justice ideals as they are lived in contemporary Europe;
c) advancing the understanding of the process of drawing and re-drawing of the boundaries of justice (fault lines); and
d) providing guidance to politicians, policy makers, advocacies and other stakeholders on how to design and implement policies to reverse inequalities and prevent injustice.

ETHOS does not merely understand justice as an abstract moral ideal that is universal and worth striving for. Rather, justice is understood as a re-enacted and re-constructed lived experience. The experience is embedded in firm legal, political, moral, social, economic and cultural institutions that are geared to giving members of society what is their due.

In the ETHOS project, justice is studied as an interdependent relationship between the ideal of justice and its real manifestation – as set in the highly complex institutions of modern European societies. The relationship between the normative and practical, the formal and informal, is acknowledged and critically assessed through a multi-disciplinary approach.

To enhance the formulation of an empirically-based theory of justice and fairness, ETHOS will explore the normative (ideal) underpinnings of justice and their practical realisation in four heuristically defined domains of justice - social justice, economic justice, political justice, and civil and symbolic justice. These domains are revealed in several spheres:

a) philosophical and political tradition,
b) legal framework,
c) daily (bureaucratic) practice,
d) current public debates, and
e) the accounts of vulnerable populations in six European countries (the Netherlands, the UK, Hungary, Austria, Portugal and Turkey).

The question of drawing boundaries and redrawing the fault-lines of justice permeates the entire investigation.

Alongside Utrecht University in the Netherlands who coordinates the project, five further research institutions cooperate. They are based in Austria (European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy), Hungary (Central European University), Portugal (Centre for Social Studies), Turkey (Boğaziçi University), and the UK (University of Bristol). The research project lasts from January 2017 to December 2019.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper aims to inform an ETHOS report on the relationship between institutionalised political justice and experienced recognition among minorities in Europe. Focusing on the Roma in the UK, it explores the relation between institutional and individual processes of ethnic identification, discursive construction and political representation, as well as their interaction with Gypsy, Traveller and migrant identities and policies. The report foregrounds the fluidity and context-sensitivity of Roma identities and teases out the reasons why different actors endorse or reject them. It asks which citizens engage in Roma politics, what they seek to achieve, and how they relate to institutional discourses and representative bodies.

Our analysis draws on relevant academic literature, national and regional policies adopted since the year 2000, a selection of prominent institutional discourses and semi-structured interviews with 11 key informants. The interviews took place between December 2017 and February 2018. Five of them involved Roma migrants of Romanian nationality, including two married couples, and four were conducted with professionals who had served or represented the Roma. One was a Romanian consultant woman, another two were Roma men engaged in civil society organisations dedicated to Roma integration, and the last was a political representative who had participated in a specialised consultative committee. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes and two hours and took place in respondents’ homes or workplaces. With the exception of one encounter where detailed notes were taken, they were audio recorded, transcribed, and thematically coded for systematic analysis.

Findings suggest that some Roma-specific policies are perceived as opening opportunities for countering negative stereotyping and promoting political participation whereas others raise fears of misrepresentation and misrecognition. Individual Roma generally did not object to being grouped together with Gypsies and Travellers but awareness of the stigma attached to these labels made them ambivalent toward their use in state monitoring and public policies. In terms of portrayal, they did not only reject hostile stereotypes of criminality and fecklessness but also benevolent ones of poverty and educational underachievement as well as some construals of their cultural traditions. Conversely, the discourse of anti-Roma discrimination generated a degree of consensus among respondents. The question of political participation was deemed significant to the extent that it contributed to addressing barriers to social mobility, but service providers and Roma migrants alike signalled dangers of tokenistic or self-interested representation. They also problematised the legitimacy of leaders who claimed to represent the Roma community as a whole without engaging with all its constituents, emphasising the diversity of national origins. In contrast, the political representative perceived the internal coherence of Roma demands, conveyed by a limited number of leaders, as a pre-requisite for effective dialogue. For Roma activists, the most immediate threat to representation was a lack of public funding which undermined civil society organisations’ capacity to mobilise Roma communities and take part in consultative mechanisms.
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INTRODUCTION

The history of Roma representation is a very short one in the UK. Until the beginning of the twenty first century the term ‘Roma’ scarcely appeared in official discourses, and it has not yet been included in the national census (last held in 2011). Reflecting and reinforcing this state of affairs, the United Kingdom has yet to develop a National Roma Integration Strategy as recommended by European institutions. \(^1\) The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (formerly Department for Communities and Local Government, DCLG) currently reports to the European Commission on generic social inclusion measures rather than on targeted Roma policies. \(^2\) The argument is that ‘the Government has moved away from having national programmes and separate funding streams that target specific groups of people’ and that ‘achieving integration through mainstream programmes is the best approach’. \(^3\) This rationale nevertheless stands in some tension with the claim that ‘the United Kingdom has some of the most comprehensive sets of data on Roma, Gypsies and Traveller in the [sic] Europe and is one of the few Member States that can collect ethnic data.’ \(^4\)

In part because of this weak institutional recognition, the definition of the Roma population is highly fluid and contested. In public debates, Roma are usually associated with people from Eastern European countries who fled the turmoil that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union and came in greater numbers after the expansion of the European Union. Several attempts have been made at estimating population size, which a 2013 study put at approximately 200 000 individuals mostly residing in England. \(^5\) However, these studies mainly rely on the perception of local authorities, themselves based on external ascription of Roma identity by front-line personnel, local organisations and other influential actors. \(^6\) The picture is further blurred by the interaction of Roma identities with those of (Romani) Gypsies, (Irish) Travellers and other, often nomadic populations who had previously been incorporated in UK laws and policies governing land, health, education and race. \(^7\) Gypsies were first recorded in British history in 1502 and expelled in 1530. During the following 70 years they were targeted by four criminal statutes banishing them from the realm, confiscating their property, encouraging their
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\(^2\) This information was confirmed by the Department in November 2017 in response to a freedom of information request. See https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/the_uk_governments_annual_respon.


\(^4\) Ibid., para 20.


\(^6\) BROWN, Philip, Philip MARTIN and Lisa SCULLION, 2014. Migrant Roma in the United Kingdom and the need to estimate population size. People, Place and Policy 8 (1), 19-33.

settlement and mandating their execution. The criminalisation of Gypsy identification itself came to an end in 1783, but disparaging discourses endured and Christian evangelists took it upon themselves to improve their fate through conversion and settlement. The tide turned in the 1960s and 70s, when local authorities were invested with a duty to provide sites for nomadic populations and courts characterised Gypsies and Travellers as racial minorities for the purpose of race equality legislation. These legal classifications, buoyed by the political philosophy of multiculturalism, have had an important impact on conceptions of ethnic disadvantage, prompting initiatives centred on empowerment and inclusion. However, they also raise the question of the extent to which the representation of Roma identities and policies is currently driven by Roma, Gypsies and Travellers themselves or by pre-existing discourses and institutions. In other words, which actors engage in the politics of Roma identity, what do they seek to achieve, and how do they relate to official discourses and representative bodies?

This report explores such questions by contrasting institutional, civil society and individual Roma perspectives on the boundaries of the Roma population, its characteristics and interests, and its political representation. Unlike the other working papers elaborated within the comparative 5.2 ETHOS report on the relationship between institutionalised political representation and experiences of (mis)recognition, it focuses on the social category that is explicitly labelled as Roma in the UK context and thus largely leaves out other ethnic categories, such as Gypsy and Travellers, which are also labelled as Roma by European institutions. While this epistemological choice entails limited engagement with the more voluminous literature addressing the latter, it also has important ethical and empirical advantages. Ethically, it reduces (even if it does not entirely eliminate) the retrospective imposition of an ethnic identity on individuals who may not embrace it, either now or at the time when relevant studies were conducted. In this way, it better protects their fundamental right to self-identification enshrined in international law. Empirically, it allows us to critically observe how ethnic identities are constructed by individuals and institutions, which becomes impossible when these identities are ascribed by researchers themselves. Such actor-driven processes of identity construction are especially important to foreground when it comes to studying political representation.

Our analysis draws on relevant academic literature, national and regional policy documents, a selection of prominent institutional discourses and semi-structured interviews with 11 key informants. The interviews took place between December 2017 and February 2018. Five interviews were conducted with Roma migrants of

---

9 CRESSY, David, 2016. Evangelical ethnographers and English Gypsies from the 1790s. Romani Studies 26 (1), 63-77.
13 UN COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, General Comment No. 20 — Non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural rights E/C.12/GC/20, 2 July 2009, para 16: ‘In determining whether a person is distinguished by one or more of the prohibited grounds, identification shall, if no justification exists to the contrary, be based upon self-identification by the individual concerned.’ See also RINGELHEIM, Julie, 2011. Ethnic categories and European human rights law. Ethnic and Racial Studies 34 (10), 1686-1688.
Romanian nationality, including two interviews with married couples. They were all identified through snowball sampling, using the intermediation of a consultant who acted as their source of information on all things legal, and who was kind enough to vouch for the interviewer and ETHOS project. With one exception where the interview was conducted in a quiet café, every conversation took place in the home of participants, at times in the presence of children. The length of each conversation ranged between half an hour and 50 minutes. Four additional interviews were conducted with professionals who were in some way involved in either serving or representing the Roma community. One of them was a consultant, a Romanian woman who did not label herself an activist, but who had worked over the course of a long career with numerous Roma migrants and support networks which spun the local authority and third sector. Another two were Roma men who were active in civil society organisations dedicated to improving Roma integration, and who were more broadly engaged in the political representation of the Roma. The last participant was a political representative who had been a member of a consultative committee engaging with the Roma. Both activists and the political representative were interviewered at their workplace. With the exception of one encounter where detailed notes were taken, every interview was audio recorded, transcribed, and thematically coded. Due to the sensitive nature of the topics addressed and particularly the stigma attached to the Roma identity, all participants requested the interview to remain anonymous. To protect their privacy, the names of specific institutions and organisations were removed from direct quotes. Interview transcripts were uploaded to a secure server and all analysis was conducted directly by ETHOS project members.

In order to situate Roma politics in their recent institutional context, Section 2 documents the increasing salience of Roma identity in official discourses since the turn of the millenium, highlighting its contextual variations and overlaps with Gypsy and Traveller categories. It also identifies some of the rationales behind different definitions of the Roma community. Section 3 contrasts four institutional discourses on Roma characteristics, problems and interests, namely the discourses of immorality, disadvantage, discrimination and cultural diversity. It shows how some discourses are strongly contested by individuals identifying as Roma and by professionals defending their interests, whereas others are ambivalently or wholeheartedly endorsed. Section 4 focuses on the fraught relationship between individual Roma, the civil society organisations purporting to represent them and elected politicians, highlighting the contested meanings of effective or legitimate representation. The conclusion synthesises our findings with a view to informing deliberative democratic theories and concepts in the light of the Roma experience.

‘GYPSY, (ROMA?) AND TRAVELLER’: THE EMERGENCE OF A COMPOSITE ETHNICITY IN UK POLICY

The first years of the millennium marked a turning point in Roma policymaking at the European level. Since the 2003 Budapest conference ‘Roma in an Expanding Europe: Challenges for the Future,’ Europe-wide projects have included the Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-2015), and the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies (2011-2020). There has also been a resurgence of interest among intergovernmental organisations such as the World Bank and UNDP, which have implemented developmental projects seeking to shape Roma
subjects according to neoliberal criteria of desirability. In this context, which also included the progressive lifting of EU movement regulations, the focus of UK integrationist measures on Gypsies and Travellers slowly expanded to incorporate the Roma in a catch-all ‘Gypsy, Roma and Traveller’ framework.

Because of its far-reaching influence on the construction of social realities and problems, including in the field of ethnic relations, the census constitutes a necessary starting point for the analysis of Roma representation. The UK census includes a range of ethnic categories, based on prevalent patterns of self-identification, and these have been the subject of some controversy. For instance, the legacy of English imperialism was apparent in 2001 when it was possible for respondents in Northern Ireland and Scotland to tick a box for Irish and Scottish, but respondents in England and Wales did not have a box for ‘English’ or ‘Welsh’. This was remedied in the 2011 census where, for the first time, respondents were also given the option of identifying as ‘Gypsy or Irish Traveller’ (in Northern Ireland, ‘Irish Traveller’ only). Census categories are often used for monitoring purposes by a range of public authorities but it can take several years for the ‘trickle down’ process to take place. Thus the National Health Service still recommends the use of the 2001 census categories and it was only in March 2018 that ‘Gypsy or Irish Traveller’ was added to the list of the Home Office’s ‘self-defined ethnicity’ codes used by police officers acting under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. The Department of Education was one of the first authorities to include ‘Roma’ as an ethnic option in 2003.

Beyond quantitative ethnic monitoring, a number of policy documents illustrate how the composite GRT category became institutionalised in various contexts. In 2004-2005, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) undertook a large-scale inquiry into the planning of Gypsy sites by local authorities in England and Wales. Its aim was to assess whether they complied with their legal duty to promote racial equality and good race relations in

---


respect of Gypsies and Irish Travellers. This was done by sending a questionnaire to 410 local authorities as well as issuing an open call for evidence to their officers, councillors, Gypsies, Irish Travellers and local support groups, other members of the public, police officers, racial equality councils and statutory bodies such as social and health professionals. At the time of this survey the census for England and Wales did not explicitly mention Gypsies and Travellers, which posed an obstacle to the collection of reliable and comparable data on their situation. To circumvent this, the questionnaire sent for the survey recommended that ‘for the sake of consistency […], all organisations use the same two-category headings for these groups that schools now use – Roma/Gypsy and Traveller of Irish Heritage’. Apart from this indirect mention, the term ‘Roma’ did not appear in the report except as an occasional adjective in the expression ‘Romany Gypsies’. One of its main findings was that while nearly all local councils had adopted a Race Equality Scheme and hosted long-term or transitory Gypsy and Irish Traveller populations, less than 30% of the Schemes explicitly referred to them.21

In March 2010, the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued guidelines to support local authorities, police and other agencies when tackling ‘anti-social behaviour’ associated with Gypsies and Travellers, set out the powers at their disposal and how they could be used. The guidance included advice on dealing with fly tipping, noise nuisance and straying livestock. It put particular emphasis on the administration of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, civil injunctions obliging adults over the age of 18 to refrain from engaging in a particular action.22 The word ‘Roma’ did not appear in this report.

In November 2010, in response to the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, the DCLG set up a Ministerial Working Group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers. The working group brought together ministers from seven governmental departments. In 2012 it published a list of 28 commitments on education, health, accommodation, responding to hate crime, employment and financial services. One of these commitments was for the Home Office and the Department for Work and Pensions to include Gypsies and Travellers as a monitoring category in prison and welfare policies, respectively. In its introduction, the report acknowledged that the working group’s focus was on ‘ethnic Gypsies and Travellers (including those who are living in conventional housing and, where appropriate, travelling show people).’ However, it also stated that ‘some issues affecting Roma in this country overlap with those impacting Gypsies and Travellers; Department for Education policy and evidence explicitly includes Roma, for example, and that is reflected in this report.’23

In line with the Department of Education’s greater focus on the Roma, the Office of Standards in Education (OFSTED) put them at the centre of a December 2014 report summarising how three local authorities and 11 schools had promoted pupils’ engagement and attainment. The report addressed exclusively the situation of Roma pupils whose family had migrated from Eastern Europe, but it also stated that ‘in national statistics, ‘Gypsy/Roma’ is regarded as one single ethnic group’ and that “‘Roma’ is a generic term that describes Romani Groups, whereas “Traveller of Irish Heritage” is a separate ethnic group’. This lumping together of the long-

settled Gypsies and recently arrived Roma meant that the latter were seamlessly incorporated into a local history of educational underachievement, as this opening paragraph illustrates:

Historically, Gypsy/Roma pupils have had the poorest outcomes of any ethnic group in England in terms of attainment, attendance and exclusions. The number of Gypsy/Roma pupils in schools has been increasing over time and rose by 13.7% last year, from 16,735 in January 2013 to 19,030 in January 2014.

In its 2015 Planning policy for traveller sites, the Government introduced a restrictive definition of ‘Gypsies and Travellers’ as ‘persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily’ (emphasis added). The policy added that consideration should be given to whether an individual had previously led a nomadic habit of life, the reasons for ceasing this habit and their intention to take it up again, how soon and in what circumstances. This definition entailed that local authorities did not have to take into account the needs of sedentary Gypsies in their planning for traveller sites and it was widely criticised by civil society organisations and international bodies.

In 2016, the House of Commons Select Committee on Women and Equalities launched an inquiry into the inequalities faces by Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities. The inquiry was interrupted by the 2017 General Election but resumed in subsequent parliaments and was still on-going at the time of writing. Its terms of reference cited various sociological studies, some of them encompassing Gypsies, Roma and Travellers and others focusing on one or two of these categories. The terms of reference also drew parallels between the long-standing disadvantages faced by Gypsies and Travellers and the newer ones affecting the Roma in terms of educational achievement, health and vulnerability to discrimination.

The evidence submitted by various stakeholders likewise covered all these categories in varying combinations. Submissions detailed how inequalities have become more entrenched. Calls centred on the need for the government to implement and increase Gypsy and Traveller and Roma specific policies.

At regional level, both the Welsh and Scottish governments have published various policies focused mainly on long-settled Gypsy and Traveller communities. A lengthy justification of this focus can be found in the framework for Gypsy and Traveller integration published by the Welsh government in September 2011:

This Framework for Action has been developed specifically for the indigenous Gypsy and Traveller population in Wales and does not address emerging issues as a result of migrant Roma from Bulgaria and Romania settled in Wales. The indigenous Gypsy and Traveller population

---


and European Roma are two very distinct groups, with different languages, cultures and traditions and they should not be confused.

At the same time, the Framework noted that individuals’ reticence to identify as Gypsy or Travellers in the school context had led educational authorities to introduce other ethnic categories, including ‘British Gypsy/Gypsy Roma’, ‘Gypsy/Gypsy Roma from other countries’ and ‘Other Gypsy/Gypsy Roma’. It did not comment on the tension between these forms of identification and the report’s recommendation not to confuse ‘indigenous’ Gypsy/Travellers and ‘European’ Roma.28

In recent years, there seems to have been a broader shift toward the inclusion of the Roma category in Welsh and Scottish policy. For instance, the targeted health policy drawn up by the Welsh government in 2015 mentioned ‘Roma/Sinti’ among the specific groups falling under the ‘Gypsies and Travellers’ label. It also privileged the expression ‘Romani Gypsies’ as a functional equivalent to English, Welsh and Scottish Gypsies, suggesting a cultural affinity with recent Roma immigrants.29 A toolkit to promote equality and tackle racism in Welsh schools, elaborated in collaboration with the Show Racism the Red Card campaign, was directed at ‘Gypsy, Roma and Traveller’ children in Welsh schools.30 In 2015-2016, the government carried out a consultation exercise on the need for a dedicated strategy for the inclusion of migrant Roma in Wales.31 Its summary of responses concluded that there was ‘a clear desire for Welsh Government leadership in supporting the social inclusion of Roma. The preferred approach appears to be the development of specific proposals to support this community within the wider Travelling to a Better Future - Gypsy and Traveller Framework for Action. Similarly, the Scottish draft educational strategy for ‘children and young people from travelling cultures’, first published in 2017 and currently under consultation, used the term ‘Traveller’ to refer to ‘those with a mobile lifestyle and/or culture, including, but not exclusively, European Roma, Scottish Gypsy/Travellers and Showpeople or Showmen’. Furthermore, it stressed that ‘Scottish Gypsy/Travellers share many cultural features with European Roma communities, such as a belief in the importance of extended family bonds and family descent, a preference for self-employment, and a strong commitment to a nomadic lifestyle’.32

An elected representative who has been involved in the consultation of GRT communities throughout the United Kingdom confirms the sensitive nature of these ethnic adscriptions:

The Gypsy/Roma/Traveller, or the Gypsy/Traveller/Roma – we had to be very careful to get the order right! Although I found it rather facile, making these rather silly changes, one has to be respectful to the people who are engaged at the front line. And we obviously wanted to be


32 SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT, 2017. Improving educational outcomes for children and young people from travelling cultures, 5, 7.
cautious as representatives, we didn’t want to unintentionally offend anyone in that way. (UK5.2iv07)

He also recalls that the terms ‘Traveller’ and ‘Gypsy’ were used much more frequently than Roma by local authorities:

Roma was not used by any of them. I don’t recollect Roma being used, other than it being a very specific Roma issue which arose in a number of urban settings, mostly in the North, at a particular time.

In civil society debates, however, specific ethnic identities tended to be associated with different issues and areas:

The Roma, where we engaged with them, were fighting issues of prejudice, access to housing and services, which I know is the same with other groups, of course, and the way in which they were being talked about in society and therefore their access to public services. In the case of the Irish travellers, they were concerned about the provision of pitches provided by local authorities, their treatment in respect of lawful and unlawful encampments, and the failure of local authorities to provide any adequate alternatives, where they found themselves in those positions. And that wasn’t the case with the Roma. There were other groups who were concerned about the regulation of the scrap metal trade, and that wasn’t one which the Roma were tied up in. So there were a number of differentials, really, within them, and I would say that perhaps the Gypsies and Travellers were more rural-based, and Roma’s issues were more urban-based, generally, from what we were engaging with.

As with racism and related problems in access to services, nomadism was perceived as an issue that transcended specific ethnic categories:

In local authorities, they didn’t feel there was a need to make a distinction because access should be equally available. They weren’t making distinctions between - they were people with a nomadic lifestyle, as you say. They were a culture, so they were making provision on the basis for that, without any kind of judgement about whether they’d be Irish Travellers, Travellers, Gypsies, Roma.

Respondents who identified as Roma generally did not object to being counted together with Gypsies in censuses and often used both terms, Roma and Gypsies, interchangeably in English: ‘I really have no issue with this, or if anyone tells me I’m a Gypsy. That’s who I am. I can’t remove myself if that’s who I am.’ (UK5.2iv02) Some also thought that the English population as a whole saw the terms as synonymous. While they felt that ‘Gypsy’ had more negative connotations than ‘Roma’, this did not prevent them from using the former but spurred them to contest the meanings it evoked:

You say Gypsies, that sounds a certain way. Then everyone goes: that Gypsies steal, that Gypsies do this or the other, it’s only bad things you hear about the Gypsies. But if you sit and think, the Romanians and the English do what the Gypsies do. No? All steal, all murder, all burgle and break into cars. Everyone. (UK5.2iv02)
One of the advantages mentioned was that bringing Roma and Gypsies together in ethnic categories also made them unite in their struggles, in part by highlighting cultural commonalities. For several respondents, this commonality transcended the barrier of language and encompassed Irish Travellers, who were sometimes portrayed as a part of ‘Gyspydom’ and sharing a common descent: ‘If you think about that past era, because at the end of the day all Gypsies come from India. Gypsies and Irish should be one and all.’ (UK5.2iv03) For some, even the language differences were less clear cut than usually assumed:

Respondent 1: From what I hear about the Irish, they’re the same thing as Gypsies. I don’t think they should be separate just because they speak a different language from us, that’s nothing. I don’t think they should be separate.

Respondent 2: Look there’s lots of Irish who speak Gypsy.

Interviewer: You mean Romanes?

Respondent 2: Romani.

Respondent 1: Yes Romanes, I spoke to them.

Interviewer: Really?

Respondent 1: Yes really. From Bulgaria, from Ireland. I find them at work. (UK5.2iv05)

Similar reservations were expressed regarding to the possibility of separating the Roma from Romanians. It is important in this sense to reflect upon the fact that six interviewees were happy to call themselves, and to be recognised, as ‘Romanianised Gypsies’, that is, Gypsies that have aligned themselves with/become like Romanians. The (Roma) activist, by contrast, found such hybridisations of Roma ethnicity within the White imaginary of Romanianness saddening. Like an erosion of identity which spoke both to the naturalisation of negative connotations in the figure of the Gypsy (why else would the good Gypsy have to be recognised as Romanian first), and to a loss of drive to reclaim the label and infuse it with new meanings:

Romanianised means to lose your identity. To embrace the culture of Romanians, to stop speaking the language, to stop wearing the clothes, and to forego the bulibastra, the kin, where every elderly woman is your nan and every woman is your aunt. So it means to lose the identity a bit. You recognise you are a Roma but claim to be different. It’s a superficial superiority. (UK5.2iv08)

Activists also displayed some scepticism toward the use of the term ‘Gypsy’, stressing how it had been externally imposed various centuries ago on the mistaken belief that the Roma people proceeded from Egypt. When asked about the possibility of changing its negative overtones, the result of a long history of social and political persecution, one of them reflects:

I don’t know. I think it can happen. People usually tend to forget bad things that happen during their history. So if we take it that way and if the community, for example, are bringing up positiveness around the term itself then during the years, the term itself, when you say Gypsy in 50 years’ time, might mean something that you can be proud of. If we can bring behind the term Gypsy the music and, well, I don’t know, the good things about the Roma community, it
might change the view of people. But at the same time, the non-Roma community might always remember Gypsies. You're always beggars. You're always slaves. So I don't know, to be honest. It depends on how it starts because we have seen, during the history, 70, 80, 100 years of peace time. Things tend to be forgotten, and people start to feel better, and enjoy, and forget bad things behind different wars. But when war starts again, all of these bad things are remembered, and they are used against the people. It happened during the history, many times. And it might happen again in the future. (UK5.2iv07)

According to a Romanian service provider for recent Roma immigrants, however, all the components of the GRT category were inherently discriminatory and should thus be removed from state policy except in very limited circumstances, which may include specific educational programmes:

The moment you put Gypsy and Irish Travellers in a box as a different kind of White, it's a bit like saying: keep away. At least that's what it was like in Romania, and that's why I say it's discriminatory. Now it also depends on why you need it. Regarding education, maybe. Because if they are uneducated and have no kind of culture, maybe they should be taken a bit, goodness I don't want to discriminate, but they should be helped a little more. (UK5.2iv06)

Most other participants, including those who openly identified as Roma and/or advocated greater opportunities to do so, also acknowledged that the Roma often went to great lengths to hide their identity in order to avoid being discriminated against. Because of this, many were sceptical about the appropriateness of state identification as such, and all insisted that it should in any case be voluntary rather than mandatory. According to a Roma activist, censuses should also give respondents the opportunity to identify in other ways than through a list of pre-established categories. In general, therefore, the composite GRT category seemed to dovetail with individual Roma’s identification preferences, but there was no consensus as to the role these frequently stigmatising labels should play in different areas of state monitoring and service provision.

**INSTITUTIONAL PORTRAYALS OF ROMA IDENTITIES**

At the beginning of the 2000s, as Gypsies and Travellers emerged as an increasingly criminalised pariah group, a negative narrative developed in tabloid press, at times fed by political scapegoating. Themes of welfare dependency, anti-social behaviour and law breaking gained prominence. Support by the CRE and activists pulled Gypsies and Travellers towards the top of the policy agenda. State and regional governmental agencies and service providers looked into integration through policies designed to break their perceived culture of deprivation. Education and health climbed high in the integration priorities. Much of the focus was on children in the context of growing statistical evidence gathered from studies carried out by local authorities, NGOs and academia showing low educational attainment and health disparities. Public outbreaks of hostility between Gypsies and Travellers and settled communities, violent attacks (such as the one which led to the death of the
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Traveller child Johnny Delaney) and local rejection of site developments prompted the government to direct services and social policy towards Gypsy and Traveller integration.\textsuperscript{35}

The irruption of the ‘Roma’ in the public imagination was embedded in this discursive context. In October 1997, a number of Roma families arrived from Slovakia and the Czech Republic in Dover, and attempted to claim political asylum. They met vitriolic and hostile reactions from most sections of the British press, and public tensions were raised to fever pitch levels, attracting the attention of members of far-right organisations.\textsuperscript{36} From 2004 onwards, the extension of free EU movement to so-called A8 nationals (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia) and, later, A2 (Bulgaria and Romania) accession countries increasingly brought Roma from Central and Eastern Europe into the Gypsy Traveller frame. Politicians and associated media latched onto predicted ‘floods’ of Roma arrivals in a climate of anti-Gypsyism, immigration and xenophobia. The \textit{Daily Express} devoted issues to the predicted ‘invasion’ of ‘1.6 million Gypsies,’ repeating vagabondry imaginaries. Coverage included an opinion poll entitled ‘Should we let the Gypsies invade Britain?’ and a map of the accession countries with the title ‘THE GREAT INVASION 2004: Where the Gypsies are coming from.’ In the following years, child exploitation, trafficking, begging, theft and benefit scrounging emerged as dominant themes in media discourses and on-line platforms. These narratives converged with civilisational concerns of new arrivals unused to the ‘British way of life.’\textsuperscript{37}

A study on over 4000 news items published in ten of the most widely read UK newspapers between December 2012 and December 2013 found that the words ‘Gypsy’ and ‘Roma’ were most frequently used in relation to crime and rough sleeping, although more so in the case of ‘Gypsy’ than ‘Roma’.\textsuperscript{38} Another study examined the media coverage of Roma relations in Sheffield during late 2013/early 2014 and found they were associated with an array of dog-whistle words such as ‘(im)migrants’, ‘benefits’, ‘rioting’, ‘work’, ‘behaviour’, ‘tensions’, ‘influx’, ‘ruin’, ‘intimidating’, ‘sex’ and ‘fear’. Deep-rooted myths of baby-selling and underage prostitution were recycled for commercial purposes.\textsuperscript{39}

The study illustrated the mutual influence of media and political discourses, for instance through a widely quoted declaration by Sheffield MP David Blunkett stating that ‘the cultural gulf between the Roma and the settled community is 50 per cent greater than that between white Britons and Pakistani immigrants who came to Britain a generation ago’ and that ‘Roma youngsters have come from a background even more different culturally, because they were living in the edge of woods, not going to school, not used to the norms of everyday


\textsuperscript{39} RICHARDSON, Jo, 2014. Roma in the news: An examination of media and political discourse and what needs to change. \textit{People, Place and Policy} 8 (1), 54-55.
life’. Similar instances of institutional stigmatisation abound. In a parliamentary debate on ‘enforced criminal activity (children)’ held on 6 February 2008, MP Anthony Steen denounced how ‘Roma organised criminal networks’ were ‘trafficking Roma children into Britain and other EU countries, notably Italy and Spain, and using them to milk the benefits system and for criminal activities such as shoplifting, pickpocketing and ATM theft.’ He then went on to report hearsay according to which ‘Roma families move between local authority areas and claim again and again’, admitting he didn’t ‘know whether that is true’. In the same speech he spoke of the ‘infiltration of increasing numbers of Roma Gypsies who settle not just in Slough, where they rent terraced houses, but all over London. They move 23 to 26 people and often more into one house, and sleep in a similar way as back home. Entire families of six or eight people live and sleep cheek by jowl in one room.’ He described the situation as ‘out of control’, with the authorities being ‘overwhelmed’ and the police lacking the resources to disrupt the ‘vast criminal networks’. All this, in turn, was due to the free movement rights created by the EU’s eastward expansion: ‘As the going gets easier for the criminal gangs, the trickle of Gypsies will increase to a flood. Free right of access across EU frontiers makes it possible for the first time for the Roma communities to come from across Europe. That form of trafficking is entirely new.’

The association of the Roma with crime and child exploitation re-emerged more subtly in a 5 December 2013 debate on modern slavery, during which MP Michael Connarty claimed a parallel between the historical events that inspired Oliver Twist and the contemporary situation of the Roma in the UK:

Oliver Twist is not fiction. The court reports of that time show that Italian men would go to the south of Italy and promise families to take the young boys to the north of Italy and train them to be, perhaps, a watchmaker, but instead they brought them to London and taught them to be pickpockets. There was never a Fagin—that was a piece of anti-Semitism in the writing of the novel—but it was a true story. It was repeated here with the Roma children pickpocketing on south-east trains four or five years ago. They were rounded up—more than 150 young people from Roma families.

The Roma have sometimes been singled out in political discourses on immigration control, such as the statement issued by then Home Secretary Theresa May on 16 June 2011, after the EU Justice and Home Affairs Council in Luxembourg. The statement illustrates the intersection of citizenship, particularly in its dimension of symbolic in/exclusion, and the governance of mobility:

The Commission presented the main findings from the first six months of monitoring the impact of granting visa liberalisation to the Western Balkans. Even though the large majority of travellers are bona fide, there had been a high number of unfounded asylum applications in certain Member States relating to minority populations (especially Roma). The Commission underlined that the Western Balkan countries were starting to address these problems. A number of follow-up measures would now be necessary, including targeted information campaigns, increased use of border controls and entry bans, and targeted assistance to minority populations.

40 Ibid.
As much as discourses of criminal and social deviancy have attached to Gypsy, Traveller, and Roma groups,\textsuperscript{41} the use of a rights lens of persecution, suffering, and discrimination has grown. The latter tied into Holocaust histories of Porrajmos (the ‘great devouring’ or ‘Gypsy Holocaust’) that reduced populations of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe dramatically during the Second World War. In other Central European countries, the end of Communism also worsened the situation for some Roma, with many denied citizenship and state discrimination in education, housing, and employment. The Home Office’s 2016 action plan against hate crime made special mention of Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities as vulnerable groups.\textsuperscript{42} Similarly, in its report \textit{Is England Fairer? The state of equality and human rights 2016}, the Equality and Human Rights Commission included ‘Gypsies, Travellers and Roma’ alongside ‘homeless people’, ‘people with learning disabilities’ and ‘migrants, refugees and asylum seekers’ among ‘England’s most disadvantaged groups’. This was backed by evidence, drawn from general and educational censuses as well as smaller-scale studies, showing higher-than-average rates of educational underachievement and school exclusion, unemployment, economic inactivity, infant mortality, chronic health problems, incarceration and victimisation.

In the cultural field, the development of Romani Studies as a specific academic subdiscipline across the 1990s and 2000s owed much to the growth of educational policies directed specifically at those identified or identifying as GRT.\textsuperscript{43} Bourne discusses how philosophies on diversity have intersected with the integration agenda, which calls for all minorities to ‘adhere to the central values and practices of British society’. GRT groups are envisioned as ‘non-conforming and non-contributing outsiders’ to the interests of ‘normative’ society.\textsuperscript{44} On the other hand, multicultural initiatives such as the GRT History Month are designed to celebrate minority traditions.\textsuperscript{45} But in a context defined by negative stereotypes and stigmatisation, these projects have contradictory outcomes. At the time of the first GRT Month, headlines told of ‘police fury as bosses tell them to ‘celebrate’ gipsies’\textsuperscript{46} and ‘social workers running after [Roma] with fruit and flowers’.\textsuperscript{47} Only a few years after its inauguration, the GRT History Month had fallen into abandon. The withdrawal of Department of Education funding was criticised by Baroness Whitaker in a parliamentary debate coinciding with International Roma Day on 2 April 2014. All speakers returned to the theme of Roma persecution and discrimination, but the Baroness also narrated more positive aspects of their history, highlighting how ‘the Roma were distinctive in not going to war against their neighbours as well as travelling, and thus they did not found a state. They travelled via Persia, the Middle East—hence the British term ‘Gypsies’—and Turkey, adding words from those languages to their
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ative Indian language as they went.’ On a more contemporary but also more value-laden register, she added that ‘surely it is good to have among us groups which value family solidarity, which care for their children throughout the extended family, which respect old people and which have the culture of enterprise and skill, albeit one that needs easier entry into modern circumstances.’

During our interviews, every respondent was acutely aware of the generally negative overtones in representations of the Roma in the public imaginary. ‘Not everyone is...’ was how many of them started their answers: a burglar, a thief, or a beggar who sells the Big Issue on street corners. Migrants stressed at various points their wish to be recognised for being ‘people like all people’, ‘normal people’: who work, who take their children to school, who keep their homes clean. There was hardly a participant who did not reflect upon, and actively seek to distance themselves from, the poor representation the Roma enjoyed in the UK and in Romania. Yet it was the beggar in particular who elicited the most vivid response. ‘At least that if you steal something, you do something, you make an effort, you risk something!', one male interviewee began musing. ‘But they do nothing at all whatsoever’ he continued, with reference to the beggars: ‘They sit at the street corner and they speak English too: ‘Please, change’. And you see them sitting on a duvet, goodness there were some women, they were so beautiful, I couldn’t believe it.’ (UK5.2iv04) To sit at street corners with one’s hand out was to abandon oneself to wilful idleness. It was as if to give up on one’s potential for labour, at home or outside of it, and to hand oneself over to pity. What appeared to irritate interviewees in the Roma’s associations with begging was the act of self-abandonment: ‘They do nothing’. And since it was the women beggars, with their plaited hair and long flowery skirts, who were the most visible image of the Roma in the public imaginary, their figure too was a source of irritation for those who sought to affirm their own normality as people who strive for self-sufficiency, people who live ‘normal lives just like everyone else’.

The rejection of salient Roma stereotypes was not confined to openly derogatory ones but also encompassed more benevolent representations of their economic or educational disadvantage: ‘There are Gypsies who have money, there are Gypsies who are doctors, there are Gypsies like me, I did hotel management and now I am chef’, insisted one Roma respondent (UK5.2iv03). ‘There are Roma who are educated, who have a university degree, there are Roma who are musicians [lautari], there is many, many, many…’, added another (UK5.2iv01). In some cases, the denial of disadvantage went hand in hand with the denial of immorality, echoing free market ideologies that equate good behaviour and the pursuit of self-interest: ‘You asked me about Romanians, why they are poorer or something like that earlier, or the Gypsies. Gypsies know how to earn money, how to work. The Gypsy pulls for his home. You understand me? For his children. For the Gypsy man his family is important, that his wife and children want for nothing.’ (UK5.2iv02).

Conversely, the problem of anti-Roma prejudice and discrimination, which shifted attention to the attitudes and behaviour of wider society, was openly acknowledged by most respondents. Many were also able to report in detail specific cases of discrimination, especially in the workplace:

Because here where I worked a few months ago, I was of Roma ethnicity, there was also a girl who worked in the kitchen with me, and another who cleaned the hotel. The manager came to us and said why don’t you clean? So at some point we heard her insult us: that the Gypsies don’t clean, and then I was revolted and I went over her. And I grabbed her by the collar and said why do you call me a Gypsy, you have a problem, come say it to my face. I have my colleague, A knows the problem, and over time, that’s how I learnt that my contract was false, that the tax they retained was illegal, and that other colleagues were equal. It was just us who
were Roma…. the manager was English. But she couldn’t stand Blacks, Gypsies. Whenever she saw us she was like: oh the Gypsies the Gypsies the Gypsies.

Interviewer: But how did she know you were Gypsies and not just Romanians?

Respondent: Because skin colour too matters a lot. [...] Let’s give an example. I went for an interview at a hotel a few months ago, the owner looked at me like that, saw me a little shabby, and when she said what are you, well I am a Gypsy, I’m not afraid to say that, but why do you ask, she said I just asked. What profession do you have? I am chief cook, I can prove it, I work in London, this and that, yeah come another time and I’ll call you. And it’s not the first time, there are lots like that, at school, and so on. (UK5.2iv03)

The rental housing market was another sphere where Roma ethnicity could trigger discrimination:

Two months ago I went to get a home, and the owner of the agency where I went, the first thing he asked was: are you of Roma ethnicity? And I say why do you ask this? Because we have had Gypsies before and they left the house a mess. And I said we’re not all the same. I can prove where I work, what kind of person I am, don’t paint us all… And he said he’d call us. But… (UK5.2iv03)

Another interviewee recounts being impeded from accessing health services because of his background:

You go somewhere, to a GP, they ask: why did you come here and don’t go to your country?

Interviewer: Really, here? You were told that?

Respondent: Yes, it happened here, I fell ill and I went to the doctor, I went with my boy. I thought it was impossible, how can you wait so long. And they told me go in your country.

Interviewer: Was that at the GP, or at the hospital?

Respondent: At the hospital. They told my boy, and I can’t believe it because an emergency is an emergency. If my mom is dying how long does she have to wait for, 3 or 4 hours was enough, in my country I would have been seen by then, so if you don’t like it go to your country they said. (UK5.2iv04)

It is interesting to remark here upon the privilege some participants associated with being read as white, and to grasp the burden of being interpellated as a subject of colour, in racialised readings which conflated body, mind and character. The Roma migrants who reported experiencing racial discrimination reflected specifically upon how the treatment they received stemmed from the inescapable visibility of their bodies. One of the participants who recounted, with a certain note of relief, that she and her husband had never felt racially discriminated against in England, added that this happened despite the fact that they were darker. In spite of this, England, with its diverse ethnicities, provided a space where darkness appeared to mean less. ‘They asked me I was a Turk’, one of the female participants was amused to recall. (UK5.2iv02) Or, another male added, ‘they asked me if I was Indian.’ (UK5.2iv03) To evade racial interpellation was thus to efface the visibility of one’s blackness; it was to escape its conflations with alterity, and to show, as participants noted over again, that Gypsies were just like everyone else. Encounters with Romanians, at home and abroad, made it much harder to evade having one’s darkness read as a determinant of one’s alterity. Accent, language and dress, participants and the service
provider added equally, were all giveaways that could be picked up on and deployed in narratives of incompatibility. This echoes Grill’s findings on Slovakian Roma people’s inclination to identify as Slovakian in their interactions with UK institutions, and the key role played by non-Roma co-nationals in their racialization.48

Unlike the strong reactions, negative or positive, elicited by discourses of Roma immorality, disadvantage and discrimination, uncertainty and ambivalence generally surrounded issues relating to cultural heritage. Rather than being wholeheartedly defended, traditional practices such as Roma justice councils, arranged marriages and plaited hair were frequently rejected or characterised as symptoms of backwardness. Others, such as crafts, bear taming and the Romanes language, were described as declining in a rather neutral, matter-of-fact way. The respondents who identified as ‘Romanianised Gypsies’ described the label as referring to ‘a Gypsy who is a bit more civilised, a Gypsy with a bit more common sense. That’s my idea’. (UK5.2iv04) ‘If he’s not Romanianised’, he continued, ‘he’s one of those scum Gypsies who...’, ‘lacks the seven years from home’ his wife completed his sentence. (UK5.2iv04) Another woman interviewed together with her husband remarked: ‘Romanianised comes from the style of the human. His way of speaking, his dress, you know? The one who doesn’t work a craft, who goes to work and that’s it. He doesn’t do flowers or cast iron’. (UK5.2iv04) Asked then how the term emerged, the man answered: ‘Romanianised is a Gypsy who reads, who went to school, so that’s where it comes from’. (UK5.2iv04)

To most of our respondents, therefore, ethnicity did not seem to matter that much. It was certainly not something to hide, they stressed. But as a couple of men (who called themselves bear tamers) put it: ‘We speak Romanian at home, we just speak Romans with each other when we have some secret we want to keep from the children.’ (UK5.2iv04) The children, for their part, were encouraged to know their background but fashion their own identity in adulthood. And there was a sense of relief, visible especially when we talked about the space of the school, that they were treated no differently from other children. That acquiring a formal education, one of the key components in their parents’ marginalisation, would ensure their social mobility, and with it mute their interpellation under the imaginary of the petty criminal Gypsy.

Roma activists were nearly alone in deploiring this cultural loss and advocating the revival of Roma traditions, for instance by assembling collections of orally transmitted tales or teaching Roma history and culture in schools. According to an interviewee, this could go some way in countering the negative portrayals transmitted to children by their families:

Something good has happened in this country when they’ve developed Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month. So in every June, June was dedicated as Gypsy Roma and Traveller History Month. And with this occasion, school got some funds from the government to develop activities. So to make Roma Gypsy Travellers and non-Roma Gypsy Traveller children to understand better the history, the culture and to become friends, and to encourage Roma children to acknowledge their identity, and to encourage non-Roma children to accept their Roma colleagues. But unfortunately, the funds for that have been blocked. And it’s not happening anymore. [...] This was a bad thing, to be honest. Things like this should continue to happen. As there is Black History Month, there should be this as well, because this community is not just Roma but Gypsies and Travellers. They have suffered discrimination for many, many,

many years and during the history. [...] Many children come at school with stereotypes that they learn at home from their parents. I've heard many stories of non-Roma parents saying to their children, 'If you're not going to be a good child today, the Gypsy will come and steal you' and things like this. And schools should address that. Schools should have funds to do things for GRT History Month so they can break these stereotypes. (UK5.2iv09)

An activist involved in the adaptation of folk tales acknowledged that this process of cultural revival, if it was to be reconciled with the fight against prejudices, could only take place in dialogue with the culture and values of the broader society:

So I picked and adapted the stories, some of them can't be written the way they are written because of child protection issues!

Interviewer: What do you mean they have to be adapted?

Respondent: They need to be adapted to have them accepted by a wider audience. Because some of them sound like animal abuse, for instance. We are not allowed to publish anything like that. To give you an example, I will write a story about the bear tamers, a Gypsy clan. So to tame a bear the young cub used to be placed on hot embers while the Gypsy beat the drum. It came to associate the heat under its paws with the sound of the drum and so every time the Gypsy played the drum it would start dancing. I would have liked to put that in, at least at the end, but I can't because of animal protection, this looks like animal cruelty, and kids aren't used to it. (UK5.2iv08)

While the moral core taught by the tales was largely universal, teaching lessons such as the importance of hard work or respect for one’s family, the characters themselves had to be redrawn to fit the conventions of modern British didacticism. Such elisions of Roma-ness were performed and blended quietly into the editorial process. For the activist this was a knowing compromise, worthy nonetheless for its impact upon the refashioning of a label which had for too long been associated with immorality:

That's the feedback I received from other teachers at least, my colleagues. They told me I do what I want, but they advised I keep it out. I am talking here of dozens of teachers who told me the book can no longer be used as a didactic material if it has that kind of stuff in. And to me it's a lot more important that others embrace our culture than that I write it just for our own people.

It is important to remark here that, judging by the class-based attributes ordinary migrants used to flesh out the figure of the Romanianised Gypsy, activists would have likely come across as the most romanianised of them all. Not in any pejorative way, for none of the migrants used the label mockingly; just as men who had managed, by virtue of their education, professional authority and sum of capitals, to never be called Gypsies without their wishing to. To be able to transcend being interpellated through one’s embodied darkness and to fashion one’s own ethnic reading, to reclaim a label that was broadly used as a term of abuse, and to contest its hegemonic racist interpretation was a privilege reserved for the relatively powerful and educated, who could mute their Gypsyness by affirming themselves as middle class. This did not remain unnoticed by the activists:

It’s true, when you are Roma you are guilty before anyone knows you. Hiding behind nationality it’s easy to escape. If you asked me 20 years ago if I was Roma, I wouldn’t have admitted. But
being in the system I realise that not recognising the ethnicity we leave it to be associated with evil: beggars, thieves and so on. (UK5.2iv08)

Regardless of their specific objectives, from countering stereotypes to redefining the nature and sources of disadvantage to transmitting and adapting traditional practices, Roma self-portrayals thus take place within an evolving and unequal dialogue with the ones emanating from institutional authorities.

**speaking with many voices: the organisation and institutionalisation of Roma political claims**

The 2000s have seen the growth of GRT representative groups, underpinned by a commitment to social justice and community empowerment. As we have seen, GRT groups have often demanded greater focus on making the Roma visible as a significant minority, in part through bureaucratic legibility. For instance, a briefing paper submitted by Friends Families and Travellers to the All Party Parliamentary Group on Gypsies and Travellers in 2010 noted:

> Sometimes the invisibility of Gypsies and Travellers within discourses concerning issues such as community empowerment, participation in health and social care service planning and delivery, access to justice and democratic engagement is attributed to the lack of robust data. There is, currently, no ethnic monitoring of Gypsies and Travellers within the National Health Service, nor is there ethnic monitoring of Gypsies and Travellers in relation to local democratic participation nor, for example, appointments to public offices. This means that much of the evidence concerning persistent and systematic exclusion of travelling communities is partial or anecdotal.

Compared to Gypsies and Travellers, Roma migrants have displayed lower levels of formal organization, which has been attributed to their precarious work conditions, dense informal family and kin networks, reluctance to draw attention to their ethnicity, limited knowledge of the English language and isolation from local institutions. The most influential Roma organization currently active in the UK is the Roma Support Group (RSG), established in 1998 to support Roma migrants and refugees in London. Initially focused on assisting asylum seekers in detention centers, opposing deportations and raising awareness about the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe, its remit subsequently extended to facilitating access to public services, finding employment and promoting social inclusion. Many activities have also focused on the dissemination of Roma culture. For example, a music and dance ensemble was formed in 1999, preparing Roma youth to perform in music events across the UK. RSG has also collaborated in the celebration of GRT History Month and organized various festivals, concerts, exhibitions, forum theaters and conferences, in addition to disseminating educational resources. On the political front, a DoE grant in 2011-13 allowed the organization to raise awareness of Roma culture among some 1800 public sector professionals. More generally, it has lobbied the DCLG to develop a UK National Roma Integration Strategy and carried out consultancy work with local authorities on safeguarding the needs of Roma children and young people. RSG’s governance structure reflects a willingness to empower individual Roma by reserving a

majority of seats in its management committee for them, employing them as staff (particularly in teaching positions) and inviting them to volunteer. Furthermore, it seeks to understand their concerns and aspirations through project evaluations, focus groups and individual meetings. 50

From 2010, the ideal of the Big Society promoted by the Coalition Government under Conservative prime minister David Cameron began to play out in the increased involvement of GRT organisations in social policy. Roma representatives have thus been invited to offer mediation, training and advocacy services, and GRT Liaison Officers work between police forces, state councils, and local communities. 51 Similarly, civil society projects such as #OperationReportHate have aimed to raise awareness within GRT communities about self-reporting mechanisms in hate crime cases. In our interviews, the service provider and activist both reflected on the need to address the barriers particular to the Roma by offering a range of services tailored to them. It was argued they needed someone to break through the trust barrier, someone who could undo the long history of rejection which laid at the foundation of mistrust, and whom they could recognise as their own kind.

A charity for the Roma would be ideal, because they would probably understand their needs better... They are reluctant to ask for help in general, they don’t know where to ask for it, and due to the lack of education and of the fact that they don’t understand it they are vulnerable. (UK5.2iv06)

This tailored support, the activist added in a separate conversation, is not only necessary for migrants themselves but also for existing British institutions. Schools wouldn’t know what to do without a Roma liaison, he believed, when for example they are called on to respond to students who had reached the age of nine without ever receiving formal education. The social services would intervene, he added, without fully knowing what it is they are intervening upon:

We certainly need special organisations. You need to know what you are dealing with. It’s very important to know what they are dealing with. The Roma and Brits too. We need to know each other and work together. (UK5.2iv08)

One of the ways in which UK authorities have attempted to harness the expertise of Roma representatives has been the establishment of ad hoc or long-term consultative mechanisms, such as the aforementioned House of Commons inquiry on GRT inequalities. There is also a long-standing All-Party Parliamentary Group on Gypsies, Travellers and Roma involving 7 MPs from Labour, Conservatives, Liberal Democrats and the Scottish National Party. These receive regular briefings on issues affecting GRT communities (such as the regulation of unauthorized encampments, race disparity audits and Brexit) from the civil society organization Friends Families
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and Travellers, itself funded by the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust.\(^{52}\) Lower down the administrative hierarchy, civil servants from the DCLF meet on a quarterly basis with the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (NFGLG), an umbrella organization for GRT groups. In its 2016-2017 report, the Federation credited these meetings with helping to trigger the review of a law on scrap dealers and the restoration of public funding for traveller pitches.\(^{53}\)

Activists perceived some merit in official consultative fora, which could diminish the tension between the diversity of Roma identities and the strength of their voice:

The very good thing that they are doing is that they’re bringing us all together. They are bringing all Gypsy, well not all, but some Gypsy Roma Travellers, all kinds of nations together, where we have a chance to say what we would like to change, what we would like to happen, where we have a chance to bring messages from the community in front of them. [...] Not only the Department of Education, but also Department of Health, Housing, or whatever. (UK5.2iv09)

However, they were acutely aware of the difficulties of representing, in the narrow corridors of power where politics is enacted, a population whose political subjectivity is constituted by its own voicelessness. In particular, they reported a level of tokenism in the relationship between ‘Parliament’ and the ‘seven or eight Roma organisations who go there every year’. This is how one described it:

We only have something to say when we are called upon in meetings. They listen to us to tick a box. But I have seen no change. I have been to meetings for the past 4-5 years. I am talking about Parliament meetings; people ask but I see no change. We are just being talked to and the questions are the same: where do you come from, how long are you here for. I even told someone, jokingly of course, that the Gypsies are coming here to stay! He laughed. (UK5.2iv08)

Such criticism coincides with the opinion expressed in 2017 by the Council of Europe Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, according to which the DCLG Liaison group ‘lacks participation of Roma representatives’ and ‘Gypsy, Traveller and Roma presence in public service is very limited’.\(^{54}\) In their 2016 submission to the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, civil society groups denounced the significant planning policy changes that had been made shortly after a Liaison Group meeting without having been discussed with the Group.\(^{55}\) Civil society groups and the Advisory Committee also


deplored the disappearance of the Ministerial Working Group on tackling inequalities experiences by Gypsies and Travellers after the publication in 2012 of 28 ‘commitments’ whose implementation the Group was meant to monitor.\textsuperscript{56} The devolution of regulatory powers to local authorities brought about by the Coalition government’s ‘localism’ agenda may further limit the effectiveness of state-level consultative processes.\textsuperscript{57}

Beyond tokenistic or superficial consultation, activists identified a danger that squeezing the Roma voice into the figure of a few representatives could lead to the implementation of self-interested or poorly designed projects and policies. One thus recalled the case of an immigrant who claimed to be a Roma Serb and lent his support to local authorities’ plan to demolish Irish caravans. The whole exercise was described as a travesty where the voice of a Roma person was deployed to bolster a contentious political project. In another example of perverse representation, a Romanian woman had approached the same individual with a project designed to address Roma destitution in Romania by providing farm subsidies and thus quelling the ‘push’ factor of poverty. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it transpired that one condition for receiving the subsidy was that Roma recipients prevent family members from going abroad to beg. The project, furthermore, had no reservations about assisting with deportations if called upon by European police organs. According to the Roma activist, misrepresentation could also take the form of civil society leaders disproportionately proceeding from a specific state:

One organisation, until recently, a year ago, they had and they worked with Polish Gypsies, but they said they worked with all the Roma. They help some 20 Polish families, the same ones every time, but it is one thing to help a few Polish people and it is another thing to claim to work with the whole Roma of London. They had a Romanian there too, who came from a village and said he was a politician. So I went there, he told me the same thing: I’m a politician. [...] It turns out he was just councillor in a village of 5000 people. So he was small, he signed whatever they wanted him to sign, and they did whatever they wanted with European money. They put him forward as the representative of thousands. So there is an interest in having someone who can be controlled. (UK5.2iv08)

This sensitivity to national distinctions among the Roma population was not matched by a similar awareness of gender, sexuality, class or other differences. It also stood in tension with the expectations of unified representation expressed by the elected politician interviewed:

I think one way of actually encouraging the variety of groups that exist to find common cause would be to say, ‘Look. We want to speak to a limited number of organisations and representatives’ and say, ‘it is absolutely essential that you, between yourselves, sort out who is the voice and how that voice is going to be heard.’ And if we get any complaints from any other group saying that they haven’t come along, then that will undermine the voice that comes into the room. So I mean, I think that, to a certain extent, you need to pull on all the groups themselves to try and achieve harmony and common cause really. Having said that, if you have one that is just purely taken over with an obsession with pursuing a particular ax to grind which


others don’t share, you’re going to have a discordant voice whatever you do. But I think legislators and politicians find it really difficult to say, ‘Well, what do you want?’ and get 1,000 voices which aren’t necessarily coherent because in those circumstances, the legislators will be saying, ‘Well, we’ve got lots of other priorities to deal with.’ (UKS.2iv07)

When it came to having Roma representatives in Parliament, respondents appeared uniformly reluctant. Roma migrants were deeply distrustful of politicians who claimed to represent the community while doing little more than pursuing a narrow personal interest. To illustrate this, many of them recalled the figure of King Cioaba, an almost caricatural character in the Romanian public imaginary, who claimed for years to speak in the voice of the Roma but whom they saw as a self-titled and self-appointed leader with little to offer ordinary people. ‘We don’t need kings’, one male informant noted:

If I have a work problem they don’t come up to me to say: wait a minute, I’ll give you work. They do it for themselves, and I stay here waiting, crying for work, or waiting for someone to call me to give me work....We don’t even trust the country leader, but the little guys. If they gave us work we wouldn’t be abroad. We’d have stayed there and eat our bread. Now we’ve come to eat our bread with the English. (UKS.2iv04)

Like King Cioaba, whose highly mediatised flamboyance made him the most recognisable of Roma spokespeople, the Roma Party in Romania who had a Roma MP in parliament, as well as other well-known MPs of Roma ethnicity, were regarded with unshakeable mistrust. To the question whether greater political representation would help the Roma, a woman responds: ‘It would help, but it would have to be someone who cares about the poor too, not just for themselves.’ (UKS.2iv05) An activist, who harboured an aspiration to work in the local council and even in the British parliament within a few years, believed that this level of distrust was understandable and warranted. Cioaba was a caricature who made his name through gold restitutions. Nicu Paun, the Roma representative in the Romanian Parliament, is allegedly a multi-millionaire who owns a vast security firm and shares in various shopping malls. As for Madalin Voicu, a seasoned Social Democrat MP and vocal proclaimer of his Roma ethnicity, his privileged upbringing by a father who was allegedly in Ceausescu’s close entourage and a mother who descended from a famous noble family hardly made him a relatable Roma voice. No wonder then, the activist summarised, that such figures provided little faith or inspiration in the political system: ‘What kind of Gypsy is that who takes violin lessons at Stradivarius? People don’t trust him because he was never a Gypsy’. (UKS.2iv08)

The political configurations of the United Kingdom elicited more muted reactions, but this was likely to do with the scarcity of encounters with anything that commanded the authority of a political institution. Neither the migrants nor the service provider had heard of the parliamentary inquiry on for GRT inequalities. Rather than formal representation in Parliament, the activists and service provider stressed the need to sustain hands-on support, be it provided by public services or via third sector organisations and prevent existing networks from crumbling under financial precariousness. It is with a note of bitterness that the activist remarked how the limited availability of government funding could create competition between the charities addressing the social mobility of Roma, undermining the essential activity they provide.

They need money for at least 5 years, and the possibility to be flexible to work in various boroughs. Because experience we have aplenty. We need money and the state. There are about 10 organisations. The money they get is in very small proportion from the EU or Government. It’s mostly private, people you know etc. You can’t keep staff next to you. You realise that you
spend time, you invest in someone, they get good, and then you can’t afford to keep them anymore because you don’t have funds, and they need to find another job. (UK5.2iv08)

The difficulty of building and maintaining the skills and trust to engage with the Roma in times of austerity, budget cuts and mass redundancies has also been flagged by local authorities. In fact, for all the limited availability of funds the activist noted over the course of the conversation, it made no difference whether the Roma were reached out to independently or in projects more broadly targeted at GRT. Hence, whenever we spoke of why representation mattered, the conversation returned to existential themes of funding and cooperation between service providers, which had less to do with the constitution of the Roma as a distinct cultural group with an institutional presence than with placing their life chances on the radar of political action. This was a theme migrants echoed in full: a need for jobs, homes and education. Such centrality of socioeconomic claims in the relationship between Roma and public authorities illustrates how political (mis)representation may not only be intertwined with symbolic (mis)recognition but also material (mal)distribution, particularly in the case of an ethnic minority whose poverty had been elevated to a near-defining feature.

CONCLUSION

In the United Kingdom, Roma identity mainly became politicised as a result of migration from Central and Eastern Europe following the end of communism and the EU’s eastward expansion. However, its precise definition and relationship to Gypsies and Travellers remains highly contested and context-sensitive, not the least because the EU has been promoting a broader understanding of ‘Roma’ than UK authorities. Whereas planning policies may exclude them implicitly by defining their target population through a nomadic lifestyle which few European migrants share, migration debates explicitly set Roma apart from ‘indigenous’ Gypsies and Travellers. Education and anti-discrimination laws and policies tend to deploy the three labels interchangeably, which has the ambivalent effect of incorporating the Roma into a local history of stigma and disadvantage. This variety of definitions is matched by a corresponding diversity of discourses and mechanisms for political participation. When cast as nomadic, the Roma are frequently stigmatised as sources of nuisance and potential criminals; when portrayed as migrants or asylum-seekers, they raise debates on employment, welfare and overall deservingness; when identified as ethno-racial minorities, they evoke ideas of discrimination and poverty. Long-term and ad hoc consultative mechanisms seeking to promote dialogue between Roma leaders and political representatives, as well as among leaders themselves, have been created at state and regional level to address specific problems. These have provided opportunities for Roma communities to forge alliances and redefine themselves in the process.

Exploratory interviews revealed several tensions between this framework of institutional identification, portrayal and representation, and individual Roma’s subjective experience of recognition and respect. Respondents generally did not object to being grouped together with Gypsies and Travellers but were keenly aware of the stigma attached to these labels and expressed ambivalence toward their use in state monitoring and public policies. In terms of portrayal, they did not only reject hostile stereotypes of criminality and fecklessness but also benevolent ones of poverty and educational underachievement as well as some construals

of their cultural traditions. These well-intentioned characterisations seemed less problematic for Roma activists whose professional status invested them with a greater ability to cross boundaries of class and cultural ascription. The discourse of anti-Roma discrimination generated more consensus, although some Roma also played it down by highlighting the lesser salience of racial boundaries in the UK compared to Romania.

The question of formal political representation was deemed significant to the extent that it contributed to addressing concrete barriers to social mobility and especially the fencing of Roma along intersecting axes of race and class. However, service providers and Roma migrants alike signalled the danger of political representation being reduced to mere tokenism or disguising the pursuit of individual self-interest. They also problematised the legitimacy of leaders who claimed to represent the Roma community as a whole without engaging equally with all its components, with a specific emphasis on diversity of national origins. This contrasted with the perspective of the political representative who saw the internal coherence of Roma demands, conveyed by a limited number of leaders, as a pre-requisite for effective dialogue. For Roma activists, the most immediate threat to representation was the lack of public funding for civil society organisations, which undermined their own capacity to mobilise citizens and take advantage of opportunities to make their voices heard.
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