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Abstract

This paper investigates the discriminatory situation of Romas in contemporary Europe with the use of Zygmunt Bauman’s analytical framework he developed on the situation of Jews and the Holocaust. Characteristics of the Modern Society have, according to Bauman, created opportunities for cornerstones of discrimination to occur and together with facilitators they can hold the discrimination alive and make it long lasting. In the case Bauman examined, it all ended in genocide. With the aim to investigate how Bauman’s analytical framework would explain why Roma discrimination could continue and by using a qualitative method of text substance analysis of foremost academic articles, the situation of the Romas are presented in a code according to the concepts in a scheme of Bauman’s analytical framework. There is no genocide going on today against Romas, but when looking through the glasses of Bauman and implementing his analytical framework on the Roma situation, only one stone is missing for it to happen. This paper concludes that there are no reasons to deny that a new Holocaust can happen in the modern society of Europe, but this time with another minority group as victims. Racism seems to be there, the only missing element is a stronger belief in racial hierarchy. This paper also offers an analytical scheme for future studies on other groups that have been suffering of long lasting discrimination, to further emphasize how Bauman’s framework would be able to become generalized on discrimination.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Topic and research problem

Ethnical minority groups, living inside country boarders and yet not integrated in the society, are threatened by the uprising of right-wing integration- and migration politics in Europe. Usually one thinks of immigrants as the group in danger why the debate has been directed towards them while ethnical minorities are hidden and “accepted” victims in the everyday society. Even though only 60 years have passed since an ethnic minority went through genocide after having being structurally discriminated, compliance from structural discrimination has far from vanished from the European continent. This research shall focus on one of these groups: the minority groups of Romas that have a long history as subjects of discrimination and racism.

Romas are claimed to have their origins from India (Murad 2009:88)(Nagy & Pap 2004:384), but throughout their mobility they have also picked up a lot of cultural and language differences on their way to Europe where they are claimed to have arrived during the 1300’s. Today, the Romas are estimated to be the largest minority group in Europe (EC 2011), but numbers are unclear since a lot of countries do not count their inhabitants by ethnicity and sometimes Romas try to hide their ethnicity (Barany 2002:289).

The Roma people became a widely discussed subject before the second round of states were becoming members of the European Union in 2004. The discrimination toward Romas in these Eastern European countries had to stop; otherwise the western countries would face a huge immigration storm of Romas during a short time span after the entry (Gay y Blasco 2008:299). A lot of reports on how the Eastern countries should develop programs to include Roma minority in politics (often financed by Western European countries or the European Union itself) were written and the demand was also acknowledged in the Western media.

The contemporary discrimination towards Romas is expressed in different forms and what aims to be concerned here are both the contemporary anti-Ziganism and the discrimination conducted in structural and direct forms. The question is why there is no resistance from the general society to diminish this type of suppression that is somewhat performed and accepted as a wide phenomenon throughout Europe. Even though the European countries have seen devastating consequences of structural
racism in history, it still continues towards the Romas. As the Swedish Equality Ombudsman – Diskriminerings Ombudsmannen (DO) – puts it: “The anti-Ziganism has never, in contrast with anti-Zionism, been questioned. It lives on.” (DO:13). The problem visible in contemporary research is that no one aims to explain why this individual and structural discrimination is allowed to continue. Even though reports by NGO’s, governments, the EU, media and academics have been written on the subject, they tend to neglect the fact that there has to be an explanation to why whole societies turn to become passive bystanders when that many people suffer from exclusion and discrimination. This seems to be an avoided topic, but this research will try to put some light on this question and try to reflect upon the reasons to why an obvious discrimination is continuing.

1.2 Purpose

The main purpose is to find out how the contemporary continuation of discrimination against Romas in Europe can be understood by using Zygmunt Bauman’s analytical framework from his book “Modernity and the Holocaust” (Bauman 1989, 2nd edition 2010). Thus the research will show how Bauman’s framework would describe why the discrimination has not ended even though the majority has observed its existence.

1.3 Research questions

The main research question is:

• How does Bauman’s analytical framework understand why there is a continuation of discrimination against the Roma people in contemporary Europe?

Furthermore the research aim to answer the following sub-questions:

• What do the concepts given in Bauman’s analytical framework separately understand about the Roma situation in Europe?

• What could possibly be changed within Bauman’s analytical framework to contribute to an even deeper understanding of the discrimination of Romas?

1.4 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework presented by Zygmunt Bauman in “Modernity and the Holocaust” (1989, 2nd edition 2010) is what shapes this research. In his book, Bauman is critical to the easy explanations of the Holocaust as something extraordinary that
happened once and that it could all be blamed on the specific events involved. Bauman instead claims that different phenomena in the society e.g. modernity, bureaucracy and the view of morality, gives a ground to what happened. He does not stop there, but claims that those phenomena in the structure are still working today. This research will present Bauman’s thoughts about the Holocaust and then present his analytical framework in a scheme.

Bauman’s analytical framework is divided into five levels where Level I contains the characteristics of a modern society. These contain particularities that make it possible for to the foundation of discrimination, in Level II, to appear. Those are called cornerstones and categorized in the concepts Scapegoat & Enemy within; Negative Rhetoric, Outdistancing; Manipulated Choices; Internal Hierarchy; and Social Engineering. For these seven cornerstones to become long lasting, they have facilitators; compliance from the perpetrator; compliance from the victims; and Belief in Racial Hierarchy. This third facilitating level leads to Level IV, which is a maintained discrimination of a whole group. Bauman’s analytical framework also have a Level V, Genocide, but this level need particular circumstances within Level II and Level III to be reached.

Through looking at findings from Roma situations in contemporary Europe, the analysis of the research will show how Bauman would have been explaining why non-Romas do not react and why the discrimination is accepted even though it gets more visible in the contemporary society and politics. Bauman’s analytical framework is expected to be an appropriate tool in this study since he has created it when analyzing a situation with a similar suppressed minority, namely the Jews that with a closer look have a lot in common with the Romas. His framework is also analyzing the society as whole and not only particular actors as many previous discrimination theorists often have concentrated on.

1.5 Existing research and significance

There is a somewhat broad supply of sources existing on the topic of Romas. Most of these are about the language Roma Chib, the judicial system Roma Kris and also about Roma Culture and fiction Romas in the non-Roma society. Though in general, already existing academic research on anti-Ziganism and discrimination against Romas is not as available. As stated, Roma discrimination is already explained in the existing writings in matter of how, where and by whom it is perpetrated and this
research will instead aim to answer the question of why discrimination continues, and this through using Bauman’s framework. There is a lack of research on this last notion on why discrimination against Romas and why this anti-Ziganism is allowed to be that universal. Furthermore, no research has looked upon the Romas’ situation with the glasses of Bauman’s analytical framework. To use his point of departure, the research can also see if Bauman’s analytical framework at all is possible to apply on another group than Jews. If so, that could further encourage future researches to apply the same framework to other minority groups and their universal discrimination. This level of the analytical framework might be able to draw conclusions of more than one country at the same time, while the existing research often concretely discuss one country in particular and try to manage a small-scale of discrimination, even though the same phenomenon exist around the national boarders as well.

A study conducted by Véronique Mottier, Professor in Sociology at the Swiss University of Lausanne, claims that the Swiss state is a perfect example of what Zygmunt Bauman calls a gardening state, which is in the box of Social Engineering at Level II of the analytical framework. Mottier (2008) goes through the history of Switzerland and claims that eugenics and the struggle against difference and the Swiss ‘dream of order’ have been motivating forced sterilization of claimed less successful human kind, among others of Romas. Other measures to get rid of the “negative eugenics” of Romas were educational programs, forced enrollment to psychiatric clinics and removal of children from their Roma parents. These examples prove, according to Mottier (2008), that Bauman’s concept of the gardening state has been valid in recent history not only for Jews but for other minorities in a ‘modern society’ (Mottier 2008:263-268). Mottier (2008) is the only source that is using Bauman in her research.

As shown, the writings on the topic rarely come from a scientific approach, thus the contribution to research on minority discrimination will first of all be to put the topic in scientific frames of research and the new knowledge brought to the discussion will try to suggest a possible understanding of why Roma discrimination is widely spread and accepted. Furthermore the implementation of Bauman’s frames on Roma discrimination is a totally new way to approach the topic. If the different aspects of Bauman’s framework can be found in the contemporary Roma treatment, then the significance could also contain a possible warning and a wake-up call. In case the
analyze will show applicability of Bauman’s analytical framework, then the hidden racism that becomes more open, could end up worse than we think if nothing is done to stop the ongoing discrimination of minority groups. Furthermore, if Bauman’s analytical framework can make a wake-up call, then it could possibly do this in other cases as well. Since the topic has not been discussed that much, maybe there is a hidden reason to not wanting to know what happens. If a warning would come, then people might get forced to act, or at least react.

1.6 Method

By using a qualitative research method and with help of existing readings, mostly academic articles as aforementioned, this research will look into the contemporary problems the Romas are meeting in the European society. What has been available and used as sources in this research can be categorized to different groups. First, academic articles from different field of studies, for example history, sociology, political science and European studies have been the major source of findings. Moreover, a Swedish newspaper has been used to fill in with more recent information from 2008 and forwards. Apart from this, a Swedish Government Official Report, a report on Romas from the European Commission, education material from ABF, a Human Right First report and a Roma webpage have been used as sources, all these found online. Printed material used is foremost Zygmunt Bauman’s book that the analytical framework is based upon and a report from the Swedish Equality Ombudsman, (DO) which contributed to the findings. Moreover a few other printed sources provided by the Linnaeus University, have been used for the choice of method and strategy.

The findings have undergone a text analysis, more specifically a substance analysis and the findings will thereafter be looked upon through the analytical framework of Bauman and the conclusions that later will be drawn depending on the potential of the framework to describe the on-going anti-Ziganism. The choice of method, to do a desk-study, is made upon thoughts around appropriate approaches and the basis of lack of resources to go out and make a field study. Explaining the former reason will show that to make a field study and follow a smaller group in everyday life would take the emphasis from getting a general picture of the Roma situation. The chosen method will in a better and more appropriate way help to concentrate on the analytical
framework’s analysis of the patterns in society structures rather than in a single case. The research will geographically be done from Linnaeus University, in Växjö, Sweden, and from platforms there provided. Interviews with Romas will not be held since they more qualify into a research where particularities are wanted.

1.7 Structure
Chapter 2; Methodological Framework will go more into detail of what sources have been used, how the research has been conducted and with which tools. This follows by Chapter 3; Analytical Framework that explains Bauman’s thoughts on the Holocaust; the analytical framework from these thoughts; and how and why the framework will be used. Chapter 4; Background thereafter gives a short explanation of the notion “Roma” and motivate why this term has been chosen to name the group in this research. Also some brief history will be presented on the Romas and their historical situation in Europe when it comes to suppression and discrimination. Material that presents the current situation of Romas will then be presented in Chapter 5; Findings. This chapter first gives an overview of Roma discrimination and then more in particular under sub-headings named after concepts from Bauman’s framework. The last section of this chapter contains the findings that could not be put under any of Bauman’s concepts. Chapter 6; Analysis is using Bauman’s frame to analyze the findings, first motivating why some of the findings are categorized as they are in Chapter 5, and then something more about what the frame actually tells about the Roma discrimination. Chapter 7; Conclusion rounds up the whole discussion and further deliberate on what the analysis has shown and not shown.

1.8 Limitations and Delimitations
Since the research tries to find a generalization of Bauman (1989, 2nd edition 2010)’s analytical framework in the contemporary society, the geographical area of study has been carefully thought through since the purpose is not to look only inside one single country and their treatment of the Roma people. This delimitation has been drawn to include the member states of the European Union but to exclude the rest of the European countries and this is motivated by three considerations. First, the Roma people have been an increasing topic since before the Eastern European countries entry in the EU in 2004. This has caused increased writings about Romas and therefore it has been easier to find sources from EU member states. Second, after this
entry in 2004, more Romas then ever possess the EU citizen right to cross national boarders within the EU. Even if far from every Roma has tried out this right, many have done so and met obstacles. Third, Bauman’s analytical framework is valid in modern societies and while some would argue that some of the European non-EU members are not in the category of modern civilized countries, only a few would argue that there is non-modern, non-civilized states within the EU. To delimit the findings to derive from EU member states, this research attempts to also delimit the critique that it has chosen countries that does not fit into Level I in the analytical framework where the modern society’s characteristics are established.

In time perspective of delimitations, the study has tried to be as contemporary and current as possible in the findings. Since a major turning point came for Romas in 1989 with the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, this year constitute the ending point of the Historical Background and the starting point of the Findings. Thus contemporary is in this research referring to the last 22 years between 1989 and 2011.

The time limitation of this study has been approximately 3 months and within such a short time span, obviously all the existing research cannot be read, presented or analyzed. Therefore a delimitation of sources has also been made and academic articles have been a prioritized content of the findings.

1.9 Ethical issues

The first and foremost ethical issue to consider in this type of research is the term of how to call the group that will be investigated. This research has chosen the notion “Roma”, while other terms as “gypsy” and “zingaro”, which has been used as “bad names”, will not be used by this research. Though it has been mentioned when necessary to present findings and analyze those. Since there are a lot of different groups that have been called Romas, a statement of who is included (or not) in this expression has to be made. There is another important consideration of ethical issues when reading and writing about the minority of Romas; some groups that ethnically are regarded as Romas because of the close relationship in language, history and culture, do not want to call themselves Romas. These ethical issues have been deliberated further in the Background Chapter.
2. Methodological framework

2.1 Methodology

This topic would be impossible to approach without qualitative data. No quantitative data would be suitable to understand how Roma discrimination can be allowed to continue in contemporary society. Quantitative studies do not have the characteristic or ability to discuss values that are not transferable to numbers or other statistical data if not supplemented by qualitative data in a mixed method research. Accordingly, the choice of methodology excludes a pure quantitative approach from the start.

According to John W. Creswell (2009), a qualitative research is the most appropriate research approach to do a study about a phenomenon that has not been deeply investigated before. This way the researcher can be prepared to find unexpected results in the topic (Creswell 2009:18). Furthermore he claims that the qualitative approach is more likely to let the researcher make deeper investigation (Creswell 2009:19) and more comfortable when writing on issues related to marginalized people; the qualitative approach is thus a way to try to understand social and human problems (Creswell 2009:4). Creswell (2009) continues to claim that the field of study also should be considered. Thus the study should use the research methodology that also the contemplated audience would appreciate. (Creswell 2009:19). This study intends first of all, to approach a topic – Roma discrimination – that has not been widely touched upon before and it is obviously about a marginalized group of people. Second, it intends to look into this subject prepared to find unexpected results when looking through the glasses of Bauman. Third, this study intends to bring an academic contribution from the field of peace and development and this scholar commonly use a qualitative approach. The wish is also that other scholars will acknowledge the study as well, but the conclusion is that advocating the issue of Roma discrimination fits in to Creswell (2009)’s description of when to use a qualitative research.

Furthermore, Creswell (2009) also states that a qualitative method approach gives space for the researcher to collect opinions and point of views and analysis text while
quantitative research instead analysis statistics (Creswell 2009:15,17) and do not interfere with opinions in the data collection. A qualitative method also allows the researcher to concentrate on a single phenomenon and make own interpretations and conclusions from the findings (Creswell 2009:17) why this way of working lies more in the interest of this research.

2.2 Method

Within the approach of qualitative studies, there are also a lot of different strategies of inquiry. Creswell (2009) claims that the choice of strategy is vital since it influences all the procedures dramatically (Creswell 2009:173). This research is using the method of text analysis. According Asbjørn Johannessen & Per Arne Tufte (2003), the best way of analyzing written data is to first systematize and compromise it through categorizing and coding then to interpret the perspectives or meanings that are presented within the data, find patterns and present the views common or uncommon in the different sources. This method was developed within Grounded Theory but is today valid in most qualitative research no matter what strategy of inquiry used, according to Johannessen & Tufte (2003:106). The result of these two processes will be presented in the findings chapter. The categorizing of the findings will in the second level be: Cornerstones of Discrimination in a Modern Society and in third level: Facilitating Factors of Discrimination in Bauman’s analytical framework. Furthermore the data will be coded according to the different concepts within these two levels. The second level consists of coding into Scapegoat & Enemy Within; Negative Rhetoric; Outdistancing; Neglected Morality; Manipulated Choices; Internal Hierarchy and Social Engineering. Within the third level the coding will be into Compliance Perpetrator; Compliance Victim and Belief in racial hierarchy. Thus the coding will be in two main groups but with 7 and 3 sub-codes within these levels. By examining two levels in the analytical framework, the result therefore has the possibility to end up differently in the two different levels and this can further and deepen the understanding of what Bauman’s analytical framework can tell about the situation of Roma discrimination.

Foremost, the analysis in this research is of the kind that Joannessen & Tufte (2003) calls analysis of the substance and concentrates on the text’s substance and what the author is trying to show with his or her words (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:109). This
research also takes their tips into operation that an analysis of the substance performs best when done in four steps: *summarizing general impression of the substance, Coding, Categorizing and see patterns and Summary* (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:110f, 114f). Thus this is the used strategy of inquiry.

Qualitative research is according to Johannessen & Tufte (2003) often connected with closeness to the people the research is about. Though they further claim that this is a common misunderstanding and that a qualitative study can be without any contact at all between the two parties (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:76f). This research is a pure desk study. Amount of time and resources matter as always in choices of how research will be done, but there is another major reason. To make a field study and interview Romas would contribute to a picture of how they live their life and about their traditions and so on. However, they would not be able to answer the core questions of this research. They cannot tell about how Bauman would interpret their situation and neither about everything on how the society treats them. Often this discrimination is institutionalized and hidden and it might not even be visible for the victims that there is actually discrimination taking place. Therefore this research would not be possible if the findings were based upon contact with the victims. The choice of making a desk-study with text analysis became the natural one, thus sources will primary be of non-Roma kind.

The text analysis is able to portray the whole picture of Romas’ situation without looking into small details. Rather the text analysis is able to look for things that fit into the analytical framework of Bauman. With a scheme of the framework in mind while reading, the useful information have been easier to distinguish and taken notice of. Thus the information searched for in the sources have been categorized and defined in the analytical scheme.

**2.3 Sources**

Johannessen & Tufte (2003) emphasizes the question of sources and furthermore conclude that the strategic choice of sources is important in a qualitative research. Since the choice of method does not have the purpose to create generalizations, the need to find sources or informants on a random basis is not present. Instead, Johannessen & Tufte (2003) claims that the selection should be based upon
qualification. (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:83f). In the same way as Creswell (2009) means that the qualitative research should be open to unexpected findings (Creswell 2009:18), Johannessen & Tufte (2003) claims that the patterns of the wanted qualifications are patterns that often grow during the research is made. The selection of sources becomes clearer for the researcher meanwhile the selection process actually takes place (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:84). This research started out without a selection of material just as Johannessen & Tufte (2003) argue is possible. The plan was more or less to read all the research that discussed Roma discrimination since there seemed to be little research done in the subject. The downside with this way of finding your selection might be that the researcher can stand in front of a massive supply of data and without a plan. It can be overwhelming to start going through the jungle of data without knowing if it fits into the need of the research or not.

Academic Articles were searched for and found on Libhub.com, a website accessible for students at Linnaeus University that collects the content from eleven full text databases; ACM Digital Library, ACS, DOAJ, EMERALD, IEEE Xplore, JSTOR, Oxford journals, Project MUSE, Sage Journals Online, ScienceDirect, and Wiley Online Library. Since “Romas” seems to be both a family name, a computer program and a word used in medical contexts, the word “Gypsies” were instead used in the searching field at Libhub as a first exclusion of – for this study – uninteresting material. A second selection, concerned articles that touched upon the situation in member states of the European Union, articles about other countries were excluded during the research. Also books have been found in the University Library, but since little relevance for this research has been found, these have not been used as sources.

Sources always run the risk of being biased and filled with pre-understandings. Governmental sources such as “Swedish Government’s Official Reports” or reports from the European Commission should be seen as a bit less biased. The reports often use statistical data as sources and/or make their research themselves. Academic research should always strive for neutrality, however all people, including researchers, might have acknowledged or unknown biased backgrounds or pre-understandings. Thus awareness of biases should always be present and therefore this research has not treated any source as completely objective but has always presented their claims as nothing else than claims. Two newspapers have been used and most of
the articles referred to is from Dagens Nyheter (DN), the other one is Svenska Dagbladet (SvD). Both newspapers are Swedish and accessed through their online news sites in this research. Their news sites most often quotes Tidningarnas Telegrafbyrå (TT), which is the largest news bureau in the Nordic countries and is claimed to be a neutral opinion-free news reporting actor that deliver the latest news day and night. The academic articles used should also be thought about in matter of reliability and relevance, especially since they constitute the primary type of source used. A clear majority of them are written by non-Romas, as the findings later will show, Romas have often been talked about instead of being talked to and this might contribute to misunderstandings and misinterpretations in their findings. Furthermore those two articles written by Romas, David Murad (2009) and Valeriu Nicolae (2002), have often presented “eyewitness” stories from Romas they met and they can explain the situation more from inside. Another group of articles has been concentrating on Roma education as for example Gwynedd Lloyd & Gillean McCluckey (2008) and another group has been concentrating on investigating housing policies as Patrice Van Cleemput (2007 & 2010). The sources that actually had “overall” discrimination as a topic were hardly found and even less common in the group of academic articles. Thus most articles were having these sub-topics within the Roma situation such as education, housing or similar. The consequences of using these kinds of sources to create a larger picture are that the findings become a puzzle with many puzzle pieces. The connections between them are not as clear as it would be if 100 articles discussed the same topic as the research aimed to do and giving a puzzle with less but larger pieces. Therefore the findings consists of a lot of different sources on several different topics, but this might also have been the contributing factor to the success of finding material that could be handled by the analytical framework of Bauman. Thus a wide spread material has been giving widely spread findings in this research and even though they are vertically strong and cover most things, they are not horizontally thick or deep and therefore runs the risk of being alone by stating those conclusions. However, as earlier stated there has not been found sources on reasons to Roma discriminations, why this way of using the sources has been the ultimate way for this research to reach the purpose of the study.
3. Analytical framework

This study uses Zygmunt Bauman (1989)’s reflections of the Jews situation before and during the Holocaust to create an analytical framework. This chapter first presents Bauman’s thoughts and conclusions around the Holocaust. Second, it lifts these conclusions from the specific situation to constitute the analytical framework of Bauman which is demonstrated in a scheme on page 22. Third, this chapter will explain how the analytical framework will be applied on the situation of Romas and forth, explain why Bauman’s analytical framework is suitable for this research.

3.1 Bauman about the Holocaust

Bauman lines out his perspectives and conclusions in what can roughly be categorized into three different areas: how discrimination can be explained on society level; how discrimination can be explained from the compliance of the perpetrators; and how it can be explained from the compliance of the victims. This is also how this chapter will categorize Bauman’s arguments to present his core conclusions, thus create an overview of what he claims and how he thinks in matter of the Jews and the Holocaust.

3.1.1 The Holocaust: Civilization has not erased violence or immorality

Civilization and cruelty are according to Bauman not at all two anti-poles, thus the etiological myth must be untrue. He claims that examining the Holocaust as either a cruel isolated event that happened to the Jews or, as an extreme cruelty caused by racism, is wrong. Bauman argues that the possibilities for another Holocaust to happen are present since the foundations the Holocaust relied on still exist and constitute a great part of our every-day modern society. (Bauman 1989:21f, 31, 59ff, 126 141-144)

The Jews have often been seen as the enemy within according to Bauman and he claims this is depending on two reasons: first because Jews that could not be distinguished from non-Jews were seen as a threat and second since Jews were living in a non-national space between all the nation-states and therefore could be used as tools in actions that the elites did not want to perform themselves. The Jews of course got blamed for the performances later. Bauman also claims that the new ages with national-states emerging made the state to take over the majority’s assignment to
control and define the position of Jews in the society (Bauman 1989:75-79, 84f, 87-89). Furthermore, the vertical position held by Jews kept them outside the society and they risked to be blamed from all levels of society for different things and become the scapegoat for most problems. (Bauman 1989:64-91)

The Enlightenment created the picture of Science as great power and the scientists became “the priests and the prophets” and science does not take morality into consideration according to Bauman. Social engineering, he claims, became a scientific base of creating a better social order. When Germany’s politics contained a purpose that was the vision of a better society in the hands of the gardener, the Jews that were seen as the weed in the garden had to be eliminated, how did not matter. (Bauman 1989:106, 109 135f).

The Nazis got, according to Bauman, rhetorical inspiration from this gardening society and also from Medical science; metaphorical comparisons such as calling the Jews for weed and stating that the German people could only get healthy if the Jews were eliminated were not uncommon expressions in the Nazi propaganda. (Bauman 1989:109-112). When not possessing expertise one is supposed to follow the one that have expertise and the personal responsibility thus disappears since experts in the society often legitimize actions that otherwise would not be acceptable. “Jew experts” made according to Bauman the discriminatory process in the beginning of the Holocaust possible since they separated the Jews from the non-Jewish population by expertise. (Bauman 1989:41, 269) Bauman claims that this kind of physical and social distance between the German population and the Jews made the discrimination – and later the Holocaust – possible by removing Jews out from the German population’s moral sphere. Since the separation leads to a society where morality gets disconnected from the use of violence, the bigger mass got blindfolded and could not see what was happening in front of them (Bauman 1989:51-54).

Because of five characteristics – goal-targeting, demand for efficiency, rational choice, de-humanization of the object and the loss of moral restrictions – Bauman concludes that modern society is particularly well equipped to serve genocide and he further claims that without this bureaucracy, the Holocaust would have been impossible to realize. Two of these need a closer explanation. First, loss of moral restrictions appears according to Bauman because of a division of functions and assignments within the organization and when technical responsibility replaces morality. Second, the goal-targeting is referred to the phenomenon that the vision has
to be reached no matter what and two factors made these visions easy to accomplish; the expertise activity and targeting. (Bauman 1989:38, 41f, 144-152)

What according to Bauman distinguishes the Holocaust from earlier genocides is the modernity’s active role instead of passive. In this reasoning, the Holocaust became the product of rational thinking, scientific characterizing, planning, effectiveness and coordination, thus the modernity’s particularities. The use of modernity’s characteristics, usually referred to as positive, could still result in an extremely negative event. Bauman adds that, to develop a holocaust the bureaucracy needs an extraordinary vision of a better and more rational society and this vision should include a pre-understanding of hierarchy between races or classes. Thus an anti-Semitism man as Hitler together with a concentrated power does not have to end up with a regime as the Nazis’ or genocide as the Holocaust, but it could. (Bauman 1989:117-132).

3.1.2 Compliance from non-Jews

Apart from deliberating on what parts of the society made the Holocaust and Jewish discrimination possible, Bauman looks at how the people could comply with the things happening around them or in front of them. He explains the compliance among the perpetrators during the Holocaust with three words; discipline, loyalty and administrative routines. The first is remained by the pressure of obeying the authority; the second by social production of distance and a “total identification with the organization” thus a de-personalization of the perpetrator; and the third is developing and growing within bureaucracies according to Bauman. (Bauman 1989: 41, 44f, 46f, 219f, 222, 266)

Moral responsibility is argued by Bauman to be dependent on the closeness of others. He further argues that the events around the Holocaust could happen because the moral responsibilities against Jews got neutralized and neglected and the events that led to the Holocaust kept the Jews socially and physically isolated from the non-Jews. (Bauman 1989:251-253, 257).

Another way the morality got neglected was according to Bauman through authority and orders that leads to individual loss of ethical considerations and furthermore the perpetuator gets the feeling of performing someone else’s actions. Since no-one took the accountability of the Nazi actions during the Holocaust, this shows according to Bauman that the Nazi organization of authority had removed the responsibility from
the perpetrators, the moral agent was gone and the responsibility had became floating. (Bauman 1989:222-226, 257-258).

3.1.3 Compliance from Jews

It is not only the perpetrators that comply according to Bauman; compliance can also be traced to the victims. Bauman claims that when the choice stood between acting morally and acting rationally, the Jews made choice based on the latter. He explains that there have been Jewish leaders claiming that they had to “sacrifice some to save many”, thus they motivated their choices with rationality. By manipulating the choices given to Jewish elite, The Nazi regime fooled them to believe that they had a choice to decide over their own lives. But the obvious rational choices Jewish elite made, instead affected Jews irrational and ended devastating for them but always in favor of the German vision. (Bauman 1989:49,183-185,191,198,209). When the options given to Jews were “you or the other”, then most often the latter was chosen. When the question of self-preservation emerged, the price of it could also escalate to affect more people along the way. When the moral boundaries diminish, the victims in a selfish choice are already de-humanized by their own urge to survive. (Bauman 1989:201f,206f). Moreover this self-preservation could show in other rational thinking of the Jews that Bauman presents; The hierarchies within the Jewish society made Jews believe that if you reached the top within this hierarchy, you would have the possibility to live a better life. Bauman means that Jews trying to become a “better” Jew this way legitimized the Nazis plans and the possibility that “less better” Jews could live a worse life or get into other troubles. In the same way, non-Jews trying to save their friends, neighbors, traders etc by writing the authorities that this special Jew was a good Jew gave the same affect: acceptance and legitimizing. (Bauman 1989:185-187)

3.2 Bauman’s Analytical Framework

Now it is time to distinguish Bauman’s analytical framework from his thoughts outlined above. They are lifted up from analyzing the Jews to a more abstract level to be applicable on other groups. Thus Bauman’s analytical framework has arguments on how discrimination is up-held towards a group and Figure 1 illustrates this scheme on next page.
3.2.1 Civilization makes discrimination possible

As the overall statement, the analytical framework claims that the etiological myth is untrue. To blame discrimination as something that strives against the civilized and modern society is wrong, thus discrimination is a natural outcome of the modern society and its characteristics in Level I of the scheme.
The analytical framework describes how discrimination can be preserved for a very long time and it starts to line out the aspects from the society level. Level II presents these cornerstones of Discrimination in a Modern Society that is possible and triggered by the characteristics in Level I.

First of all, when a nation-state has the authority to define and control the position of minority groups the minority group themselves has not the possibility to influence on how they will be perceived in the society and they are therefore often misunderstood without being able to defend themselves. If a minority gets the blame for everything in the society, then it does not matter if they are proven innocent to one of the problems, they will always be the constant scapegoat for another problem. The majority has to be able to distinguish these scapegoats; otherwise the minority becomes the enemy within and this furthers their assumed blame. Another thing that deepens the enemy within is if the minority gets blamed for troubles in the society that the nation-state itself want to take distance from. If a society furthermore adopt rhetoric that nick-name the minority group to for example “weed” or un-wanted deceases, then it becomes nothing but natural for the science-based social engineering to outdistance this unwanted factors just as medical science and “gardening” shows that it is possible and wanted. When experts claim something about a minority group, true or not, people will listen to them since they are experts. If this judgment shows to be separating the minority further away from the majority, then a physical or social distance occurs. This distance removes the minority from the moral sphere thus discrimination against the group will not be viewed as immoral by the majority.

The framework also concludes that rationality is superior morality. A prolonged thought about this is that self-preservation is based on rational grounds, and therefore also self-preservation is superior to morality. If the discrimination should be able to become long-lasting compliance is needed, otherwise the discrimination would be stopped and cut off if actors would not comply with it. Thus compliance would become a facilitator and this can according to the analytical framework be split in to: from the perpetrator and from the victim. These are together with Belief in racial hierarchy illustrated as facilitating factors of discrimination in Level III of the scheme.
3.2.2 Compliance from the perpetrators

When the rational society’s technological and bureaucratic success creates separation and when the closeness disappears with the outdistancing, the responsibility also disappears with it, thus a moral neutralization takes place. Authorities’ orders also make moral responsibility floating and one can not establish if the authority or the one fulfilling the order is the responsible. Both will deny the responsibility and therefore the phenomenon of authority also makes compliance possible. The analytical framework shows that pressure of obeying authority creates discipline. Furthermore, identification with the organization together with the social production of distance creates loyalty and de-personalizes the perpetrator, thus morality is also de-personalized and in this situation neglected. These factors are vital when it comes to compliance of discrimination and the analytical framework summarizes these in two: outdistancing the victims and neglected morality create a base where the perpetrators will comply with the discrimination.

3.2.3 Compliance from the victims

This analytical framework also sees patterns of how the compliance of the victims contributes to uphold discrimination in a society. For example rationality can make groups act against their own will if the choices are manipulated. If the perpetrator has been creating the different choices given to the discriminated group, then they probably have been designed so that all choices fit the perpetrators. The chance that any of the choices would give a positive outcome for the victims is small. By making the victims to make active choices, the perpetrator also gives them the illusion that they can actually change their own destiny while they cannot and there is no reason for the victims to complain, thus the discrimination can continue.

If a person from the victimized group has to sacrifice someone else in the group to survive, he will do so in most cases. This self-preservation is connected to the third phenomenon of victim conformity that the analytical framework claims supporting the long lasting of discrimination. The victims can (against their rational will) legitimate the discrimination by trying to climb the internal hierarchy. Trying to become a better person than others in the group to avoid being treated as bad as they are indirectly telling the perpetrators and the bystander that even the members in the victimized group comply. The framework also claims that this legitimizing can spread
and people outside the group can try to save people within the group by claiming that they are not real “victims”, they are better and deserve to be treated accordingly.

3.2.4 Racial Hierarchy

A belief in racial hierarchy would according to the analytical framework also facilitates the discrimination to continue since the superiority of one race over the other would legitimate all negative actions towards the other. This belief also has to be present in the discourse and convince the majority. If a belief in racial hierarchy lays the ground for social engineering, then European history could repeat itself as the next paragraph suggests.

3.2.5. The most extreme case: Genocide

A new Holocaust or genocide towards a group can according to the analytical framework possibly happen since the particularities that created the last Holocaust are still present. It further claims that a bureaucracy does not have to change to be used for genocide; it can be used exactly as it is. However, it needs the bureaucratic goal targeting to aim on a specific type of goal, namely a radical social engineering vision about a better society, with the pre-understanding of hierarchy between races.

3.2.6. Summary

In sum, the basics of the Modern society can create negative outcomes that first of all disprove the etiological myth and second of all push for compliance of the perpetrating and also the victimized group. When shown that discrimination is applicable in a modern society and that compliance occurs in both groups, then according to this framework, it is no wonder that the discrimination can continue even though the modern society is well aware of what has been happening before. A new Holocaust is moreover possible according to the analytical framework, but not without a view on racial hierarchy and a radical social engineering with the aim of a better “weed-less” and “healthy” society.

3.3 Use of Analytical Framework

Bauman’s framework says that modernity’s particularities can lead to discrimination and will also keep this discrimination long lasting. Since Europe is classified as a modern society and Romas is a group that has been discriminated in that society for a
long time, it is interesting to see if the situation fits in also in the middle layers of the scheme that presents Bauman’s framework.

Bauman himself thinks that Jews are a unique group since the increased discrimination was modern and the suppression of them led to the genocide where modernity was active instead of passive for the first time. But, Bauman also states that a new increased discrimination or even a Holocaust can happen and he does not particular mention Jews in this context, and this opens up the possibility that the analytical framework would also fit other groups than Jews. Furthermore, Bauman has been analyzing the discrimination and the Holocaust from the Jews’ perspective and not to forget, it was not only Jews that became victims of the genocide. Among other groups, Romas also suffered in this part of the European history. This is reason enough to believe that the analytical framework is interesting to use on Romas as well, since it started out from analyzing the Jews that had very much in common with them, both during the event that Bauman analyzed – the Holocaust – and in other particularities in the groups history, livelihood and lifestyle.

The analytical framework is generalizing Bauman’s thoughts and reasoning, but when applying it on the Roma situation, the context of the victims and perpetrators has to be clarified; Romas constitute the framework’s group of victims and the European society constitutes the framework’s group of perpetrator.

It is still important to bear in mind that the analytical framework is taken from a genocide case and one cannot expect to find out that discriminations analyzed with the glasses of Bauman will seem to lead to genocide only because all the parameters correspond to the findings. The expectations should rather be that when the parameters correspond, it could teach us something and contribute to further understanding of why discrimination can continue even though it is widely known about.

The scheme categorizes the analytical framework into boxes and these boxes constitute the ground on how the findings will be coded. Once the findings are done, these boxes are also going to analyze the findings about Romas and categorize it to see if all the boxes will be filled and how. The analysis will aim to cover the whole picture of Roma discrimination and how Bauman would explain it. To accomplish this, the analysis will consider the three different categories found in Bauman’s conclusions and apply on the separate findings, but also to make an overall picture of the discrimination towards Romas and why it can continue in a modern and
enlightened society that is claimed to know better than excluding fellow human beings. If all the boxes could be filled with Roma information then Bauman’s analytical framework can help us to understand, not only the situation of the Jews, but also discrimination of Romas and furthermore, this could argue that the framework could be used on other groups as well.

Later – in the analysis chapter – the connection between Bauman’s thoughts and the contemporary discrimination of Romas will be done. The interesting part is to see how Bauman would explain the situation and what types of conclusions his analytical framework could draw from the information in the result chapter. The main argumentation of his framework will thus be lifted out from the context of the Holocaust to a level where implementation is possible to analyze the findings of the Roma situation.

3.4 Choice of Analytical framework

According to Bauman himself, previous research has proved unsuccessful to understand the discrimination of Jews that led to the Holocaust and its connection to the society; they have rather been researching as if the Holocaust had something to tell about sociology. One of the reasons Bauman have written his book is to burst this bubble. He claims that previously, only historians and theologians have been questioning the “obvious” reasons of the Holocaust and he wants to put the context in a pure sociological reasoning where the sociology looks into the Holocaust and not the other way around (Bauman 1989:22f). Thus asking Bauman, he would probably claim that his framework would be the first one with sociological point of departure that actually examined discrimination as an impact of normal particularities in the modern society. But there is no reason to believe that there is only one possible discrimination theory that could be used to analyze the Roma situation in Europe. Therefore it is vital to explain why the choice became Bauman’s analytical framework. Other discrimination theorists out there are for example Erving Goffman (1963), Sandra Fredman (2002), Hans-Ingvar Roth (2005) and Philip G. Zimbardo (2007).

Goffman (1963) tells us his findings about stigmatization and claims that it is a natural phase to categorize others into social identities and when this person possesses a Stigma, thus a difference from the “normal”, then the stigma will probably be the social identity connected with the person. Furthermore Goffman claims that the
stigma will also connect the person with characteristics, sometimes good, but more often bad ones, thus discrimination will sooner or later be directed towards this person and this person starts to identify himself with the stigma since this is the only way the surrounding sees him. Also whole groups can be put into these social identities, for example minority groups according to Goffman. (1963:2,6-9).

Fredman (2002) has experienced many sides of discrimination as a white South African Jewish woman and has later been writing on discrimination and discrimination law. She lines out for example that one of the greatest rivals to equality is liberty. Fredman uses a discrimination theory that claims discrimination is formed by historical and political contexts of a society. Discrimination is therefore seen as something embedded in these social spheres and hard to fight against. She uses a them-us perspective in her reasoning around discrimination and claims that discrimination can be prevented by legislation. (Fredman 2002:vii, 23, 27, 53f).

Roth (2005), Associate Professor in Ethics and Lecturer at the former College of Education of Stockholm has written about negative and positive distance and closeness. He argues that a structural discrimination within the society, for example in livelihood, employment or grade of citizenship, evolves from the actual differences between people’s culture and way to live. Cultural racism has according to Roth replaced the previous “traditional racism” (Roth 2005:27ff, 36f).

Zimbardo (2007) is well known for his Stanford Prison experiment where he afterwards concluded that the factors needed to make the students discriminate each other was among others de-humanization of the victims, de-individualization of the perpetrators, conformity to the group and obedience to authority. Zimbardo makes interesting conclusions about how normal people can carry out such evilness, though the experiment ended because a few bystanders said enough was enough. (Zimbardo 2007:168ff,278ff,298ff,307ff,354)

These theories represent different way of looking at discrimination. Goffman (1963) emphasis the visible stigma and the different identities while Roth (2005)’s group emphasis foremost cultural racism and invisible differences; Fredman (2002) represent theorists that tries to hinder the sources of discrimination and puts the society as the main actor; and Zimbardo (2007) represent the sociology scholar that see how people in person comply to the situation and accompanies the power of the evilness. All these areas of discrimination theories give us very interesting views and particularities worth to consider when examining discrimination of various kind.
However, Bauman’s analytical framework is covering the wider picture of discrimination in the society and is therefore more useful as a base when looking at Roma situation. For example the use of his framework will be able to see how compliance is working on a society level – not only on an individual level, and while other theorists make useful conclusions to distinguish why discrimination victimizes minorities, Bauman has the possibility to give us the greater understanding on how the bigger mass of people accepts what they know is wrong and why the Romas have not been given more attention when it is well known that anti-Ziganism is present in the society. Bauman’s framework also shows opportunity to understand the Romas’ own view of the situation and why they conform to the situation.

Furthermore, Bauman has been aiming on describing the Jews situation, before and during the Holocaust, and how this suppression could be widely accepted and long lasting. It seems possible for it to find similar understandings in the situation of the widely accepted and for a long time on-going discrimination towards another group, in this case Romas. There are as well particularities common between the minority groups of Jews and Romas. First, Romas have, just like Jews, been a minority with a stateless condition. Both groups have been known as travelers and often had to move to other countries because of suppression. Second, this suppression have been long lasted and it has been widely known from majority groups that these minorities exist, get suppressed but still it have continued. Last of all; let us not forget that both of the groups were victims of the Holocaust. The emphasis is always on the Jews because they suffered from the highest death number and were the Nazis’ obvious target group. But there were according to Rex W. Thomson & István Soós (2005) at least half a million Romas killed in the Holocaust as well. Thus a framework that already examines one of the groups can be particular interesting to try to implement on the other group’s situation to see if it catches sight of new phenomenon that has not yet been emphasized in the situation of, in this case, Romas. By using Bauman’s analytical framework this is possible.
4. Background

This chapter will try to give a short but informative background on who the Romas are, where they come from and how the rest of the society has been treating them in the history. This is accomplished by first presenting an ethical discussion on the notion and use of “Roma” and second giving a short summary on the Roma history and former suppression. To avoid stereotyping, this research will not go deep into Roma culture, Romani Chib (the language), Romani Kris (the internal law system) or professions held by Romas, if not necessary to analyze discrimination of Romas with Bauman’s analytical framework.

4.1. The notion “Roma”

The word “Roma” comes from their own language (Kende 2000:200) and means man (noun). The First World Roma Congress that was held in London 1971, established the word Roma as a replacement for “Gypsy” in international contexts. (ROMEA 2006). Previous research has more often used either the concepts “Roma” or “Gypsy”. Terms as “Gypsy” and the language variations of “Zingaro” are built upon the misunderstanding and myth of the Egyptian origin of Romas (Turner 2000:70). Further, these concepts have often outdistanced the group and therefore they have been avoided in this research. Even though other political correct notions such as “Roma and Sinti” and “Romani” have been found in the process of this research, here only the term “Roma” will be used throughout this paper to contribute to coherence and consistency in the line of thought. Other notions have also been used in other research to distinguish between the sub-groups within the group of Romas but since this research in similarity to the Swedish Equality Ombudsman – Diskrimineringsombudsmannen (DO) – wants to show the common discrimination pattern between all these sub-groups within the notion Roma, these will not be distinguished from each other. However, some groups that ethically is counted as Romas because of the close relationship in language, history and culture, does not want to call themselves Romas (Gay y Blasco 2008:297) since they want to distinguish the differences between their group and others, as in the German case of Sinti (Robins et al. 2010:643). Though, as DO claims, if kept in mind that these sub-groups does not always have the same background and recent history one can
examine the discrimination which the different groups meet, as one since they are, with few exceptions, treated the same way by the society (DO).

Peter Vermeersch (2003) argues that there is no universal language, culture or strong common ethnic identity at all among Romas. (Vermeersch 2003:880f). However most writers, such as Royce Turner (2000), connect the common Roma identity with nomadism, self-employment, language and cultural hygienic routines (Turner 2000:71). Furthermore, there seems to be a common Roma history that most research agrees on and this will follow in the rest of this chapter.

4.2 History

That Romas came to Europe from India was figured out in the 1800’s after tracing the particularities in the language to Hindi and other Indian language. The many hundred years old myth that Romas came from Egypt could then by revealed as untrue by scientists. Romas came to Europe around 1300 A.C and picked up particularities from culture and language from the areas they passed to reach Europe (Kenrick 1998:68). While migrating further towards Europe, the Romas committed to professions easy to hold while mobilizing towards another place frequently. Traveling is moreover something that Romas always have been connected to and as travelers other complications have been crossing their way. Between the 60’s and 80’s for example, England made up rules about where Romas were allowed to live and not and these types of rules and constrictions on Romas and traveling life have also been conducted in whole Europe. (Turner 2000:68).

Romas was an excluded group in Europe already from the beginning and could be distinguished by their visible features and therefore easily discriminated and called thieves (Uerlings & Patrut 2009:9ff). In the past they have been suffering from slavery in Romania for around 500 years and been victims in the Nazi Holocaust during the 1940’s (ibid.)(Ahmed et al. 2007:235) where more than half a million Romas were killed (Freud 2006:252f)(Thomson & Soós 2005:256). According to multiple sources, Romas have been subject to assimilation during history (Thomson & Soós 2005:256), for example in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in late 18th century (Hadziavdic 2006:57), in Germany in the beginning of the 19th century (Uerlings & Patrut 2009:10), in Sweden (and Norway) during the 1970’s (SOU 2010;55:317,523) and in Eastern Europe during communism (Ahmed et al. 2007:235) (Barany 2000:421f,426,428,432) (Vermeersch 2003:392). These assimilation policies have
been tried out without succeeding erasing the entire Roma culture and identity because of strong resistance from Roma people, even though some particularities actually did disappeared in assimilation (Ahmed et al. 2007:235f).

Other examples of Roma suppression in European history are when 100,000 Romas were left stateless without possibility to claim social securities in Czech Republic in the 90’s; Austria and Germany have refused Romas asylum; Ethnic cleansing has been taking place in Croatia and Bosnia during the Balkan war; In Spain and in Czech Republic walls have been built to separate Romas from non-Romas (Brearley 2001:595); Parts of Roma culture have been banned in Europe as the language in Spain and Hungary and the clothing in Portugal (Kenrick 1998:55f); In Sweden, abductions of children, denial of voting right and of child allowance have been a few of the authorities’ human right violations towards Romas during the history (SOU 2010:55); and in the Hungarian village Zámoly, the leaders have declared Romas personae non grata (Kende 2000:189). Furthermore, Romas have usually been talked about instead of talked to when it comes a solutions of the discrimination, but also when it has been about identifying the group and presenting their way of life and particularities, furthermore Roma politics have almost never been conducted or advised by Romas themselves (Kende 2000:195) (Wilson 2007:63).

Except from assimilation policies and child abductions, the Swedish government has put other restrictions against Romas to control and change this part of the population. Forced sterilizations have been one of the methods Sweden has been conducting towards Romas between 1935 and 1975. There were Swedish laws from the years 1935 and 1941 about sterilization that affected Romas and these laws were not removed from the Swedish law system before 1975. Children have also been taken away from Roma parents to put them in homes where they can assimilate while the parents have been sterilized. Furthermore Sweden had a restriction that did not allow Romas to travel or move into Sweden during the years 1914-1954 (Vermeersch 2003:208,474,532,541,543,574). Another example of forced sterilizations of Romas is from Germany where it in 1933 became legal to force-sterilize Romas and some other minority groups (Hadziavdic 2006:58).

Thus Romas have a long history of discrimination since they immigrated to Europe in the 1300’s. They were discriminated and victims of assimilation processes throughout the era of communism in Eastern Europe, but the situation has in most ways worsened since 1989 and the fall of communism (Brearley 2001:588) (Ahmed
et al. 2007:235). How the situation now has turned and what type of situation Romas stand in front of today, will be presented in next chapter.
5. Findings

First, this chapter will describe how the current situation looks like in Europe for those groups included in the notion Roma. This first part will with data and reflections try to give the reader an impression of the vulnerable situation Romas are in today and the impacts of discrimination when it comes to social aspects as employment, education and health. Figure 2 is a table over Roma population in member states of the European Union and contributes to an overview of how many people that might be included in the undermined life situation of discrimination described beneath and later in the findings. This first part is to establish how Level IV in the analytical scheme looks like for the Romas.

Second, this chapter will turn to the different examples on cornerstones in Level II and facilitators in Level III from Bauman’s framework and these will be presented separately, to be easy distinguished later when discussed in the analysis chapter, under the headings 5.2-5.3.

Last, those findings that did not find a clear spot within Bauman’s framework are presented in heading 5.4.

5.1 Level IV: Contemporary situation of Roma discrimination

Today Romas constitute the largest ethnic minority in Europe and the European Commission (EC) made in year 2011 the estimation that there are about 11 million Romas in whole Europe and further that around 6 of them live within the European Union (EU). They estimate that there are Romas in all member states but Malta. Since many countries do not count inhabitants in ethnic categories, numbers are indefinite, but the EC has done estimations of Roma population in member states of the EU, which is presented in Figure 2. Lowest % Romas of total population is estimated in Luxemburg (0,06), Lithuania (0,08), Denmark (0,10), Estonia (0,10) and Poland (0,10). Malta is claimed to have none Roma inhabitants while the highest % is estimated in Bulgaria (10,33), Slovakia (9,17), Romania (8,32) and Hungary (7,05). (EC 2011).
### Figure 2. Table over estimated Roma population within the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population (July 2009)</th>
<th>Roma Population Average Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated Romas % of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8,205,533</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10,414,336</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7,262,675</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>792,604</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>10,220,911</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5,484,723</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1,307,605</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5,244,749</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>64,057,790</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>82,400,996</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10,722,816</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>9,930,915</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4,156,119</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>59,619,290</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2,245,423</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>3,565,205</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>486,006</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>403,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Netherlands</td>
<td>16,645,313</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>38,500,696</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10,676,910</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>22,246,862</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>8.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>5,455,407</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2,007,711</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46,157,822</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9,276,509</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>60,943,912</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in EU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,172,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.73%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-EU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,084,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.63%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,256,900</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The EC claims that many of the Romas in Europe suffer from prejudice, intolerance, discrimination and social exclusion. (EC 2011:2). Even though the situation has been progressed and some achievements have been done within the EU member states, the every-day exclusion continues since the socio-economic conditions are still problematic and urgent to solve. (EC 2011:3) Further there are many sources claiming that Romas are the worst disadvantaged ethnic minority group, in for example Bulgaria (Gatenio Gabel 2009), Hungary (Thomson & Soós 2005), Italy (Woodcock
2010), Romania (Nicolae 2002), Sweden (Roth 2005) and United Kingdom (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008). Often, but not always, Romas are recognized as an ethnic national minority and thus protected from discrimination against minority by law. According to Zoltan Barany, this matter of policy towards Romas developed differently in the eastern European countries after the fall of communism. This contributed to a difference for Romas depending on where they lived if they would be protected against discrimination by law or not. (Barany 2000:422). Though Margaret Greenfields and the Swedish DO, witness about that even if there are preventive laws, anti-Ziganism can continue to be functional and spread, as in the Swedish (DO:1,10) and British societies (Greenfields 2008:303f).

Discrimination towards Romas is conducted in different forms and impacts different parts of life. Examples of individual and direct discrimination are through denial or eviction from accommodation; harassments from neighbors (DO:17); denied entry in stores, restaurants and hotels (DO:20); non-equivalent service in stores and at camping sites (DO:21) (Freud 2006:133f); and last but not least in contact with the authorities and health care where Romas tend to be categorized (DO:26ff). Also racist violence has been reported during recent years according to Thomson & Soós (2005:256). Dr. Sherrill Stroschein (2002) claims that for example in Romania, Slovakia and Czech Republic, the racial attacks towards Romas increase (Stroschein 2002:4). November 4th in 2007, there were according to Shannon Woodcock (2010) many hundreds Italians in Rome demonstrating and giving the Romanian immigrants (read Romas) only 10 days to leave the country. (Woodcock 2010:476).

Structural discrimination also takes place against Romas in Europe, through poverty and unemployment (Melero et al. 2011:226)(DO:22,25), racial agitation or stereotyping through media and fiction (DO11f); and from lack of educational tradition and understanding staff in school (DO:40). To give a few examples, 60-80% of the Roma population in Hungary was unemployed in year 2005 (Thomson & Soós 2005:257), corresponding 44% in Bulgaria while ethnic Bulgarians had 21% unemployment (Gatenio Gabel 2009:66). In Romania a few years earlier 42% of the Romas were unemployed (Crowe 1999:58) and SOU (2010:55) states that unemployment is valid for around 80 % of the Swedish Romas (SOU 2010;55:35).

When it comes to education, DO presents that the problem is that the educational system is built upon the basis and ideas of the majority, thus not acknowledging the needs of Romas (DO:24). Furthermore in example Romania, Romas is not
acknowledged as a “national minority” and therefore Romani language is not taught in school. (Martin & Straubhaar 2002:73). Romas in Romania are low educated or meet obstacles such as non-conformity between education and lifestyle, high absence and discrimination in school. A lot of sources claim that this can also be seen, among other countries, in Bulgaria, Hungary (Ahmed et al. 2007:231), United Kingdom (James 2007:369)(Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:335ff), Belgium (Bafekr 1999:299f), Sweden (DO), Slovakia (Stroschein 2002:1f) and Czech Republic (Vermeersch 2003:891). Patrice Van Cleemput has made a research that investigates the differences between health of Romas and health of non-Romas in United Kingdom. The findings show that the health of Romas is worse than for the non-Romas. The research concludes that lack of choice and lack of control over own life as impacts of discrimination are responsible for these health problems. (Van Cleemput 2007:103f).

A further problem has been that Romas often lack the knowledge of where to turn in cases of discrimination according to DO (DO:1). They further claims that there is a lack of trust for authorities. For example only 8% of the Bulgarian Romas knew their own rights during the post-communist according to a research that the department for International Development funded and was conducted by Grødeland et al. where minorities in Eastern Europe were asked if they knew their rights in the society. (Grødeland et al. 2000:53).

The discrimination and stereotyping is so widespread in the society that also media and public persons continue to reinforce them. Even the Home Secretary of United Kingdom has according to Lloyd & McCluckey (2008) called Romas for thieves in public (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:331) and Donald Kenrick (1998) claims that the governments in Eastern Europe have no interest or possibility to change popular attitudes. (Kenrick 1998:55). Moreover, there are parties and politics growing stronger in European countries that openly are against Romas and Roma rights. For example the right-wing Greater Romania Party in Romania attacks rights of minority groups (Martin & Straubhaar 2002), Lega Nord in Italy has campaigned against Romanian Romas (ABF Gestrin) and the Hungarian party Jobbik has won election by expressing anti-Ziganism in their nationalistic politics (DN 2011e).

Since 1971, six World Roma Congresses have been held containing delegates from up to 40 countries according to ROMEA (2006), a Roma information service online. They also state that these meetings have led to the establishment of an annual International Roma Day, a Roma-flag, a national song and cooperation with the UN to
acknowledge the Romas internationally. The UN recognized Romas as a specific ethnic group in 1977 and that means that they now can be protected internationally from discrimination according to ROMEA (2006). However, DO claims that anti-Ziganism is not questioned enough (DO:13) and others claim that the progress does not reach the individuals; that the hatred is viewed as acceptable (Van Cleemput 2010)(Turner 2000:68) and that it is so widespread that it has been called the last respectable racism (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:331).

5.2 Level II: Cornerstones of Discrimination of Romas

5.2.1 Scapegoats & Enemy within

The constant scapegoat

According to David M. Crowe (1999), the Roma people in Romania feel that they are blamed for everything that goes wrong or constitutes a problem (Crowe 1999:62). Kenrick (1998) claims that this statement covers whole Eastern Europe and that it is not just a feeling; Romas have been scapegoats for everything in the post-communist society (Kenrick 1998:55ff). The same view is possessed by Margaret Brearley (2001), who claims that the post-communist societies’ negative characteristics always are blamed on the Roma people, in particular she mentions Bulgaria, Slovakia and Romania and (Brearley 2001:588). Furthermore she claims that when Romas and Roma communities in Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and Romania become victims for violence, the local investigators often blame the Romas themselves. Thus they become the scapegoats even for their own “victimness”. (Brearley 2001:592f). Also the politicians blame the Romas. For example, according to an article in the Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter (DN 2010e), the President of the Swedish Delegation of Roma questions, Maria Leissner, has accused Denmark’s politicians to claim that Romas are criminal only because they are Romas. (DN 2010e). DN (2011e) reports that Jobbik, a Hungarian antiziganistic party, pictures Romas as voluntary dependent on social welfare and lacking interest to work or educate themselves. Jobbik also accuses Romas for being thieves claims DN (2011e). Dr. Shirley Gatenio Gable (2009) states that in Bulgaria, the majority also blames Romas for criminality; the high crime rates in the country are their fault. Since Bulgarians have been working
hard at many jobs parallel to be able to live well while rebuilding the country, they see the unemployed Romas with hatred and assume that they are lazy and dishonest. The picture that Romas do not want to contribute to the Bulgarian society is one of the popular things to blame them for according to Gatenio Gabel (2009:68). Van Cleemput (2007) means that instead of seeing the real reason to poor health among Romas in United Kingdom (housing enforcement, lack of control over own life and the overall stress of being discriminated), their poor health is blamed on themselves, their habits and their nomadic lifestyle. Rather, Van Cleemput (2007) claims, it is the restrictions on the nomadic life style that the society puts up to make that life harder, that should be the scapegoat in this situation. (Van Cleemput 2007:109), but once again the Romas are seen as the problem.

The Enemy Within

First, Habiba Hadziavdic (2006) states that even though Romas have been living in Germany for 600 years, they are still considered to be “the elements of conspiracy”. They have become the “known others” with in Germany and are called traitors and invaders. (Hadziavdic 2006:58). Second, according to Nando Sigona, the Roma people in Italy are viewed as enemies rather than strangers because of the outsider-status they have and he claims that this is the “inner enemy”. When being just a stereotype and a negative one, Romas can easily get manipulated in the Italian society and that is what distinguishes the enemy from the stranger according to Sigona (2005:747). Third, another Swedish newspaper, Svenska Dagbladet (2011) claims that on a regional level, countries in the EU, for example France and the Netherlands, want an exemption rule to be created towards the new visa rules in EU. The new Visa rules allow citizens from some countries east of the EU to enter the member states without a Visa. The suggested exemption would mean that if a member state can proof that a lot of illegal immigrants from one specific country are present, certain visa rules could be adapted towards that country. This has been on the agenda because a lot of Romas and Albanians from Serbia and people from Macedonia have come to EU countries to apply for asylum according to SvD (2011) Last, the EU entry of the post-socialist countries in eastern Europe were predicted to be followed by an enormous increase of Roma migrants from these countries to the western sphere of EU according to Dr. Paloma Gay y Blasco (2008). The western countries had to take actions and apart from starting new programs to reduce the discrimination of Romas...
in the eastern countries, they also took measures such as changing migration policies. (Gay y Blasco 2008:299) Romas would not only be the enemy with-in regarding the nation-states but this fright has according to Gay y Blasco (2008) spread to a regional level.

**5.2.2 Negative Rhetoric**

Gay y Blasco (2008) also discusses the rhetoric about Romas and concludes that they are always portrayed as outsiders and instead of being treated as subjects with rights they are treated as objects that have to be watched upon, even if they are national citizens. (Gay y Blasco 2008:300). The Negative Rhetoric about Romas today would according to Turner (2000) never be printed, said or predicted about any other group, for example black people. That would never have been accepted. (Turner 2000:73)

What follows is a sampling of examples on how the Romas in words are being observed, portrayed and treated in politics, media and in public.

Words and names that have been used about Romas have been connected to diseases, crime and animals such as parasites, delinquents and predatory according to Gay y Blasco (2008:299). Media has also according to Brearley (2001) used this vocabulary and creates the overall negative picture of Romas in Europe. Romanian media always mentions the ethnicity when it is a Roma thief or lawbreaker. Furthermore in Bulgaria the media divides all statistics into “Roma” and “non-Roma” crimes (Brearley 2001:596) and the same is done in Romanian media according to Valeriu Nicolae (2002:389). According to Nicolae (2002) there is also a tendency to mention the high Roma delinquency but without reporting unemployment and poverty that according to the Bulgarian professor Marin Bachvarov (1997), are the underlying reasons of the delinquency. (Bachvarov 1997:220).

Rex W. Thomson & István Soós (2005) have been writing about Romas’ physical culture in Hungary and conclude that Romas often have been secret about their way of living (Thomson & Soós 2005:255). Turner (2000) agrees and further states that this has increased the media’s opportunity to portray stereotypes of Romas. These stereotypes have often looked the same and therefore reinforced themselves every time they are used. Turner furthermore implies that names like scrounger that only should be judging individuals often come to judge the whole group of Romas in the UK. (Turner 2000:72). Also, generalizations are usual. For example DN claims that two murders where Romas were involved as perpetrators have been maintaining the
bad picture of Romas. Instead of seeing this as individual people involved in the killings, the whole Roman ethnicity has been suffering from this. (DN 2011e). The Hungarian webpage Kuruc.info describes themselves as “a patriotic Hungarian conservative, right-wing, nationalist, fact-finding news site that is independent of political parties” (Kuruc.info 2008) and is especially good at this according to DN (2011e) since they spread generalizations about Romas. Even when a closer look of crimes shows that it was not Roma people, the rumor has already spread over the Internet and it is too late to change people’s opinions, according to DN (2011e). They also have a whole page of “humor” about Romas that DN (2011e) rather claims is racial agitation than humoristic. (DN 2011e)

It is not unusual to find articles in Romanian media that take a negative stance against Roma people according to Nicolae (2002:389). Furthermore, Greenfields (2008) claims there is a link between how and when the words “Gypsy”, “mess”, “dirt” and “cost” is present in British media and that it is not in advantage for Romas. (Greenfields 2008:303f). Turner (2000) further claims that newspapers use a special wording when describing situations with Romas: the wording of a war. Words like “battle”, “invasions”, “invaders”, “furious”, “fears” and “taking OUR cash” are used to Romas’ disadvantage. (Turner 2000:73).

It is not only Romas that are called negative things, it has also become the other way around; negative things, behavior or characteristics have been nick-named after Romas. For example Nikos Marantzidis & George Mavrommatis (1999) explain that “Gypsy-bargaining” in Greece means to buy election-votes from the voters. This expression is widely used also in politics which makes it political applied and signal to the public that it is all right to use this expression. (Marantzidis & Mavrommatis 1999:447). In Italy, “nomadism” has also been described as something very bad, and then the connection with Romas will automatically put another negative characteristic on them according to Sigona (2005). Gay y Blasco (2008) witnesses about two other concepts that are well known within Europe and foremost the eastern countries: “the Gypsy issue” and “Gypsy invasion”. The former has been used in general when debating on how to take care of problems that Romas have been the scapegoat for, and the later has been the naming of the feared mass-immigration to western EU countries when the union expanded toward east. (Gay y Blasco 2008:299). Furthermore DN (2011e) states that another concept is well established in Hungary, namely “Gypsy crime” (DN 2011e).
According to Brearley (2001) and Patricia Ahmed (et al. 2007), rhetoric of hate has been used widely towards Romas also in politics. For example, a Slovakian prime minister has called Romas “antisocial, mentally backwards, inassimilable and socially unacceptable” and “mentally retarded people”. In Italy, Romas have been called “a gathering of thieves and prostitutes, muggers and rapists”. In among other countries, Poland, Romania, Russia and Germany have had right-wing parties with slogans such as “Death to Gypsies” and “Gas the Gypsies” (Brearley 2001:595f) (Ahmed et al. 2007:235).

Vermeersch (2003) argues that Romas never had the chance to establish their own identity since the society has done it for them, and furthermore that politics has been framing the Roma identity for own purposes (Vermeersch 2003:879). This has created a lot of stereotyping of the Roma people. For example, according to Caterina Pasqualino (2008), the romanticism that picture Romas as romantic, passionate and sometimes seductive people have been seen in the cinemas since the 1950’s. Other authors agree that this has led to a common stereotype of Romas in real life (Pasqualino 2008:339)(Cowan & Lomax 2003:305)(Kende 2000:187)(Murad 2009:87)(Uerlings & Patrut 2009). Other examples of stereotypes of Romas are according to Amit Yahav-Brown (2006) that they are often in possession of only one function without any other individualized characteristics as other ethnicities would be figured in media (Yahav-Brown 2006:1124) and according to Peter Kabachnik (2010) the Roma as “placeless” and lack interest of place and community where they live. This “statelessness” has made Romas vulnerable; if they are claimed not to care about places the authorities could move them easily without objections. Being “placeless” is also connected to nomadism and all Romas are not nomads but many live a sedentary life. Kabachnik (2010) further argues that Romas as “placeless” is a myth since place is as important for Romas as for anyone else. (Kabachnik 2010:205).

5.2.3 Outdistancing

Outdistancing is more or less when a distance occurs and/or increase between two groups; it is a type of separation and summarizes the concepts of psychological, social and physical separation. The group that gets outdistanced from the majority gets pushed further away in these three spheres from the society.

Murad (2009), a Roma himself, claims that the majority does not know anything about Romas other than what popular knowledge tells about them since they most
often live apart from the majority and never socially mix with the majority. (Murad 2009:88). Attila Sándor Nagy & Miklós Pap (2004) claims to be able to prove that this separation has been long-lasting through their dermatoglyphic comparison between Hungarian children and Roma children to see if there are differences expressed in their fingerprints and palm patterns (Nagy & Pap 2004:383). According to Nagy & Pap (2004), these types of biological and genetically comparisons between Hungarians and Romas are not uncommon and they have proved differences between the two groups. (Nagy & Pap 2004:384,397). This can, according to them and their research, also be a proof of how two groups have been living next to each other but even though completely socially isolated from each other. (Nagy & Pap 2004:398).

Many claims that social exclusion is a fact for Romas in Europe in matter of for example housing, employment, health and equality and many claims that Romas are the most vulnerable group of the exclusion and segregation (Melero et al. 2011:226)(Greenfields 2008:206)(Marantzidis & Mavrommatis 1999:446) (Van Cleemput 2010:317) (Van Cleemput 2007:112) (SOU 2010;55:35) (Thomson & Soós 2005:256) (Powell 2008:88) (Sigona 2005:753). To give one of many examples on how this distancing gives expression, Kenrick (1998) claims that completely healthy Roma children are sent to special schools for mentally handicapped in Czech Republic (Kenrick 1998:59). This is also happening in Hungary where in 2001, 36% of the children in special schools for “retarded or difficult children” were healthy Roma children according to Brearley (2001:590f). This phenomenon is also known and exercised in Romania according to Nicolae (2002:390).

Not only by social structured outdistancing, but also cases from companies in contemporary times gets reported. Trevor Phillips, Chair of the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) in United Kingdom has according to Lloyd & McCluckey (2008) witnessed about signs that say “No Travelers” on stores and pubs. (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:331).

The social outdistancing can also lead to other social distancing, for example Lloyd & McCluckey (2008) have declared about separation that evolves because of Romas lack of participation in school and education. (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:339). Moreover Van Cleemput (2007) claims that when getting harassed by neighbors in housing, Romas more often chose to move without reporting the harassments and sometimes they move to Roma campsites instead of to another modern housing. The common threat of being discriminated has created barriers that resist social mixing
according to Van Cleemput (2007:112). Further, when it comes to campsites,
complains from the majority have resulted in changed plans of authorized campsites
according to Van Cleemput (2007). The result is often that the authorities move the
sites further away from the majority housing and this contributes to a physical
separation between the Romas and the rest of the society. (Van Cleemput 2007:108).
Furthermore reports have been made on societies building up walls around Roma
camps to keep the two parties apart. One example is from Czech Republic where the
social and physical distancing went so far that a wall (the Usti-wall) was built to
separate Romas from the majority. Though the wall was according to Clark &
Dearling (1999) demolished in 1999 and the Czech government was embarrassed by
the whole situation. (Clark & Dearling 1999:14). Another example is from Italy
where specific “nomad campgrounds” were built outside Florence in 1987 far away
from the center according to Wilson (2007), and the authorities have been moving
Romans there where they live in self-built huts and vans. Romas had the choice before
of where to live, but that choice disappeared with the construction of the “nomad
campgrounds”. The authorities’ signal was more or less that the Romas should be
kept apart from the Italians. (Wilson 2007:55f)

DN (2011e) has been interviewing Ágnes Osztolykán, a Roma women and member
of the Hungarian parliament. She tells DN (2011e) that the Romans she has been
talking to does not notice the discrimination. DN (2011e) also claims that Osztolykán
at the same time states that Romas are segregated in special areas and some of these
people live in sheds out of wood plank, bricks and cartonnage. Implicit it states that
the social separation never lets Romas get in contact with non-Romas so they can feel
the discrimination personally. Osztolykán herself can, according to DN (2011e),
sometimes hear from her parliament colleagues from the Jobbik Party, that she is
actually “only a Roma”. (DN 2011e).

According to Mike Sell (2007), the Roma people can be put into a category of
people described as the unmarked population that constitutes emptiness – a vacuum –
2010:55) witnesses about how Romas are seen as “the other” in Sweden (SOU
2010;55:35) and according to Ágnes Kende (2000) there is a similar presence of
“otherness” for Romas in Hungary (Kende 2000:187).

Stroschein (2002) warns about the negative aspects of NGO’s earmarking of money
for “Roma-purposes”. This separates them physiologically and socially even further
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from the majority population and might contribute to paternalism within NGO’s towards Romas, especially since they tend to lack Roma employers or board members according to Stroschein (2002:17).

5.2.4 Neglected Morality

Kende (2000) who describes the Roma situation in the Hungarian society tells that the discrimination can continue towards Romas without more than just a few people caring about it. (Kende 2000). Overall, it is claimed to be differences between the western and the Eastern Europe. Kenrick (1998) states that these differences are not in the discrimination in itself, but in western Europe there are laws that are supposed to protect Romas and protests and compensation are more likely to happen there than in the eastern countries. (Kenrick 1998:60).

Czech Republic has according to Vermeersch (2003) tried to put over the so-called “Roma problem” to the agenda of EU, since they claim that the Romas are citizens of Europe and not by Czech why it is not their concern to take care of them. The Czech ministry has both with words and with symbolic and financial support tried to make the issue to a regional one within Europe. (Vermeersch 2003:892-895). He also claims that Slovakia has done the same. By trying to make the “Roma problem” an international regional problem, the problem is not any longer Slovakia’s to consider and moreover they aim to loose the notion of being an antiziganistic state this way according to Vermeersch (2003:895ff). Furthermore Czech Republic should according to some in the ministry always and more often reject criticism for common anti-Ziganism. (Vermeersch 2003:892-897). Also neglecting the Roma situation by leaving the responsibility over to NGO’s is a common feature of European governments claims Stroschein (2002:17).

States have sometimes legitimized violence by painting a picture of the victim as the perpetrator and that the state is acting in self-defense against this “enemy-within”. One example is once again from Italy: according to Woodcock (2010), racist violence against Romas is encouraged by the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and his government and it has increased rapidly since the election he won in 2008. The violence is claimed to be justified since Romas are stealing babies and raping women thus they attack the “real” citizens of the Italian nation. (Woodcock 2010:469).

According to DN (2010b), the French President Sarkozy’s reason to mass
deportations of Romas in 2010 lies in their asserted blame to be behind the increasing criminality in France and DN (2010b) further claims that even if these deportations would be legal, they would still be immoral. First of all because of the conducted way of evacuations from the Roma camps and second, because if this would happen to, for example Latin Americans in the US, ministers from France and other countries in Europe would react and send protests to the US government (DN 2010b). The deportations from member states of the EU are also claimed to contradict the established moral values that European countries have been building up in the modern societies according to DN (2010d).

5.2.5 Internal Hierarchy

Barany (2002) explains how internal hierarchy has made more successful groups (or rather groups closer to the majority) of Romas to take distance from the less lucky ones. The internal differences claim to be vertical rather than horizontal and this is established out of economical opportunities and residency status according to Barany (2002). What he claims is also that since migration has been widely done among Romas, this has also created an outdistancing and hierarchy layers within the group. Furthermore Barany (2002) has heard from a Roma activist that the problem with leadership within the Roma community is that if someone gets ahead in the group, the internal reaction is “to hinder, instead of help” that person. (Barany 2002:290f)

One can, according to Marantzidis & Mavrommatis (1999), find a pyramidal structure within the population in Sofade, Greece. The social excluded Romas are in the bottom, topped by the Romas that are of higher importance than the others in terms of economy and education. Above this, the rest of the society is based on the top layers. According to Marantzidis & Mavrommatis (1999), this is reinforcing and confirming social structures that are negative for the Roma people as a group and there is constantly internal competition between Romas to reach the higher Roma-layer in the hierarchy pyramid. This higher level constitutes those who hold the clientage relation with the non-Romas in Sofade (Marantzidis & Mavrommatis 1999:453).

5.2.6 Manipulated choices

Western European countries’ law making that hinder the easy life for Nomads is making it difficult for Romas to choose to continue their lives as travelers according
to Brearley (2001). Therefore they have often been staying on the same place and Romas often ends up in the poorest housing with limited health care and education reachable. (Brearley 2001:590). For example in Brittan, Romas have according to Margaret Greenfields & David Martin Smith (2010), been increasingly moving to conventional housing after authorities have changed legislations to a harder one for nomads. They also claim that the authorities use a “choice/constraint model” as a consequence from the Housing Act 2004. This means that the Romas can make an individual choice of themselves, but with constraints from structural forces that hinder the total positive outcome if “wrong choice” is made. In these British cases that Greenfields & Smith (2010) talk about, these restrictions have made Romas choose to live in publicly funded housing. Some restrictions that have made Romas move to housing are; lack of sites to live on; obstacles for private site permissions; and that nomadism was made unlawful in 1994. Even though authorities would say that the Romas made the choice themselves, Romas say according to Greenfields & Smith (2010) that they could not travel any longer and that they have a hard time adjusting to the housing routines. (Greenfields & Smith 2010:397f). Dave Cowan & Delia Lomax (2003) are on to the same topic and claim that active choices have been given to Romas in Brittan, but that they have been designed so that the right choices are made; the choices get manipulated so the Romas act as the authorities want to and this has been calculated in detail by the later according to Cowan & Lomax (2003:290).

### 5.2.7 Social Engineering

Cowan & Lomax (2003) state that British authorities concluded in a proposal that those Romas who “make the right choice” described in previous paragraph and later have a hard time to adopt to housing, should get cultural counseling on education, health and housing. This kind of settlement training was according to Cowan & Lomax (2003) blamed from academics to be a sort of ethnic cleansing. This proposal was though also based on what Greenfields & Smith (2010) call choice/constraint. (Cowan & Lomax 2003:291f).

Assimilation is a way for the society to make a group that differs from the majority to become more similar to the mainstream. A succeeded assimilation would therefore result that there is no difference between the two. Romas have, as stated in the background chapter, often been objects to assimilation policies. But there are also examples of assimilation of Romas more recently. For example the UK has been
conducting assimilation policies according to Greenfields (2008). She claims that the aforementioned policies set up by the authorities concerning camping and hindering nomadic lifestyle is a way to assimilate the Romas by force into a “British” way of living. (Greenfields 2008:302). In year 2000, a resolution document was adopted by the Czech government that, according to Vermeersch (2003), implied three things about Roma assimilation: first that it was not a bad thing thus there is no reason for the government to reject the strategy; second, that the Czech population expects Romas to assimilate; and third, that assimilation of Romas can lead to a “meaningful” citizenship. (Vermeersch 2003:893f).

In Czechoslovakia, Roma women over 35 years old were from year 1966 offered sterilization according to Barany (2000) and as a payment; the women were offered 25,000 Czechoslovakian crowns. In 1986, the age-limit was lowered to 18 years but Barany (2000) does not say what year the program ended. (Barany 2000:424).

The French president Nicolas Sarkozy announced in the end of July, 2010, that 300 illegal Roma camps in France were going to be torned down, but he did not stop there; the hundreds and hundreds of Romas living there would be sent to Romania and Bulgaria according to DN (2010a). The goal was to deport 950 Romas before the end of the summer. The Commissioner for Human Rights in the EU, Thomas Hammarberg claims according to DN (2010a) that the deportations were illegal since many of the Romas were EU-citizens and had not been in France for the three months as their EU-citizenship gives them the right to. (DN 2010a). DN (2011b) wrote one year later that Human Right Watch reported continued deportations of Romas and destruction of their areas by French authorities. According to the same source, the complaints from other authorities in Europe have stopped and the European Commission has gotten silent. (DN 2011b). The Romanian president Traian Basescu asked France already in 2009 not to deport the Romas from France according to DN (2010g).

But it is not only France that has deported Romas lately. According to DN (2010c), around 40 Romas were sent from Finland to Romania as an impact of their burnt down camp in Helsinki. TT reported according to DN (2010c) that the social authorities concluded that the best thing for the Romas was to return to Romania and according to DN (2011c), the Finish police are still, in year 2011, evacuating Romas from camps in Helsinki (DN 2011c). Denmark was deporting at least 23 Romanian Romas who had settled down in Copenhagen in 2010, according to DN (2010f). DN
(2011d) further reports that the Danish Integration Administration in 2011 admitted that some of the deportations conducted in 2010 were illegal and contradicted both Danish and European Union law (DN 2011d). Another example is from Italy and presented by DN (2008a). The Italian government started a national head count of the Roma population and an archiving of fingerprints from Romas. The result of this would be to distinguish which Romas who were allowed to be in Italy and which ones to deport. The first message that came in early July was that everyone, even children would be fingerprinted (DN 2008a) but 20 days later, DN (2008b) reported that Prime Minister Berlusconi announced that Roma children between 6 and 14 years were not affected by the archiving. Moreover they changed so that only those without a valid identification would be head counted according to DN (2008b). Furthermore DN (2010d) and DN (2010e) state that also Sweden has deported Romas without caring about the 3-month rule. DN (2010e) claims that the reason often has been begging and that the police claim that they have the right to deport foreigners if they cannot support themselves. DN (2010d) brings up examples when Romas have been deported from Sweden back to Kosovo even though they risk structural discrimination and poverty as inhuman living conditions there. (DN 2010d) (DN 2010e).

5.3 Level III: Facilitators of Roma discrimination

5.3.1 Compliance from non-Romas

As declared in 3.3 Use of Analytical framework, this research categorizes the European society with its different actors and instances as the perpetrators in Bauman’s analytical framework. This paragraph will bring up examples of how these actors have complied with the discrimination towards Romas.

Nicolae (2002) gives an example when the perpetrator blames the authority: a Roma girl, only 10 years old, had been witnessing her father get beaten by the police and asked them why. The answer from the police was that the law tells them to. (Nicolae 2002:391). Physical abuse, torture and killings of Romas have further been reported from prisons and even in police custody according to Brearley (2001:593f)

Crowe (1999) deliberates on the Romas in Romania and claims that the police do not act or try to stop crimes when the victims are Romas. Physical violence has in some cases resulted in death but even so, the police and authorities often have failed
to handle these cases. (Crowe 1999:60) He further claims that the government is a trigger of antiziganistic violence and that this was visible for example in 1990 when the government let miners attack Romas on the street to end a long-gone demonstration. At the same event, media also went out publicly telling the people to protect the television studios from Romas according to Crowe (1999:61). Philip Martin & Thomas Straubhaar claim that overall, the government in for example Romania does not prioritize to end the discriminatory situation Romas suffer from. (Martin & Straubhaar 2002:73). According to Human Right First (2011), the central and eastern European police have also on local authorities orders forced Romas to leave their homes and sometimes they have been deported from the country (Human Right First 2011).

Authorities in Western European countries are, by Brearley (2001), claimed to restrict Roma life with policies that are actually customized for that purpose. This applies to both national legislation and local bylaws according to Brearley (2001:590). In England, Cowan & Lomax (2003), have done a research on how policing of campings are done and in their findings they present that one area never tolerated Roma camping before an election, a second area had changed its policies totally after complains from the public and a third had gone so far that a “hotline” could be used to call in and report Romas present on the campsites in the neighborhood. (Cowan & Lomax 2003:303). In the whole United Kingdom, campsite policing has gone as far that a “Land Sheriff” company, as Van Cleemput (2007) presents, has been advertising themselves to be experts in Roma evictions and that they can make it faster and smoother than the police since the authorities’ internal rules does not concern them as Land Sheriffs (Van Cleemput 2007:110). In Italy, Sigona (2005) states that the majority of the population asks the police to protect them from the Romas. This also implies that the “gypsy problem” is about safety and order, but also that the public sees a problem with Romas in the society and this legitimates the contemporary Italian politics, according to Sigona (2005:745,751f).

Furthermore the public supports the politicians standing for antiziganistic politics by voting for them as well. The aforementioned head count of Romas in Italy, is claimed by DN (2008a) and DN (2008b), to have 80 % compliance from the Italian population (DN 2008a) (DN 2008b). The Hungarian antiziganistic party Jobbik had 17% of the votes in the parliament election 2010 but the participatory was low according to DN (2011e) and the support from the Hungarians is according to a public opinion poll as
high as 25%. The party has strong connections with Magyar Garda, which is one of a number of uniformed but unarmed Gardas that shows up, marching in Roma-densely areas and where Romas have been in conflict with non-Romas, according to DN (2011e). For example, according to the Swedish newspaper, TT-Reuters reported about evacuations from a Roma area close to Budapest as late as in April 2011. The Roma population was fleeing from one of the Roma-hostile Gardas and the Red Cross has been helping with the evacuations according to DN (2011a). DN (2011e) claims that the public supports these different Gardas as well, since the police do not have an every-day presence in these areas (DN 2011e). Moreover, Sigona (2005) concludes that the Italian politicians are not interested in decreasing the open discrimination of Romas at all. They do not even want to acknowledge Romas as full inhabitants in Italy why the Roma minority is left outside the benefits of the society. If they would be included in the politics, Sigona (2005) claims that there could be a big intrigue between the now separated Romas and the majority. Now, instead a conflict is lying resting and waiting to explode (Sigona 2005:753).

Another way people comply to the discrimination is by objecting to having Romas as neighbors and this is shown by hostility and harassments against them, according to Van Cleemput (2007:108). Lloyd & McCluckey (2008) state that children in school also discriminate, by racist name-calling, harassment and bullying Roma children. At the same time they report that teachers have been “silencing the issue” by neglecting pupils’ differences and they also claim that this could neglect integration and constitute an “anonymous assimilation” instead. (Lloyd & McCluckey 2008:339f).

Overall, harassments and racism are widely spread in for example Germany, Spain and Italy against Romas and hate crimes are perpetrated by members of the majority population towards minority Romas, according to Brearley (2001:590), without anyone reacting against it. Sigona (2005) gives an example from 1999 when Italian locals attacked Romas to retaliate that one single Roma had been involved in a car accident. The newspapers reported that no one reacted with shame, worry or sympathy when Romas had to escape. Instead the journalist witnessed people clapping hands and shouting encouraging when the Roma campground was set on fire. (Sigona 2005:742). A last example brings us to Spain where authorities and media, according to Pasqualino (2008), have used the terms “our Gypsies” to describe those Romas who share the same religion and been living long enough in the community (Pasqualino 2008:338).
As mentioned before, Romas were according to ROMEA acknowledged by the UN in 1977 as an ethnic group (ROMEA 2006). Even though UN has done this, all countries have not followed according to Barany (2000:422). Martin & Straubhaar (2002) claim, as earlier stated, that for example Romania has not acknowledged Romas as a national minority (Martin & Straubhaar 2002:73).

5.3.2 Compliance from Romas

Just as the perpetrators comply the situation of discrimination, the victims can do that as well according to the analytical framework of Bauman. In this paragraph, eight findings of compliance of the victims will be presented. The victims are defined as all Romas, no matter what social, economical or historical position they have. They are grouped up since it should be in the interest that their common notion as Romas does not constitute a reason to suppression and discrimination.

First of all, many claim that a lot of Romas hide their Roma identity. Since they know that others have been discriminated, suppressed and victims of violence only because of their Roma identity, other Romas have chosen to neglect their own belonging to that group according to Van Cleemput (2010:318,322), Vermeersch (2003:897f), Barany (2002:289), SOU (2010;55:36) and Nicolae (2002:385). For example Romas in London often claim that they are Greek to avoid discrimination according to Turner (2000:71). Furthermore Van Cleemput (2010) claims that Goffman’s theory of Stigma fits in here: the Romas can start to see themselves as thieves and bad people just as they are told they are by the society. This can then lead to neglecting of identity and a psychological justification of the treatment (Van Cleemput 2010:322).

Second, according to Van Cleemput (2010), Romas have – just as other ethnic groups under threat – named the “others”, non-members in the ethnic groups and in that way distanced themselves from the majority. Thus Van Cleemput (2010) claims that it is not only the majority that have been nicknaming Romas with the impact of outdistancing, this phenomenon has been working both ways. Furthermore she claims that their naming is a proof of an unwillingness to assimilate, which for the majority could justify further outdistancing and thoughts that the Romas do not want to be a part of the society anyway. (Van Cleemput 2010:318). Additionally, Ryan Powell testifies about Romas that have been talking about non-Romas as “normal people” thus indirect called themselves and other Romas for abnormal (Powell 2008:105).
Third, another pattern that Barany (2000) brings up is that when Romas have been educated during the communism they have tended to get involved in political activities promoting Roma culture, livelihood and equality if studying humanities or social sciences, and if studied natural science, then an assimilation to the majority to leave the Roma identity behind has been more likely. This later choice has probably been depending on better work opportunities according to Barany (2000:403f).

Forth, Roma people are also according to Brearley (2001), afraid of reporting to the police since it is widely known in Eastern European Roma society, as mentioned before, that they often get the blame for the crime they in fact are victims of (Brearley 2001:593f).

Fifth, Barany (2002) claims that Romas often have unusually low participation in the politics, especially in Eastern Europe if comparing with those other minorities within those countries. He further means that it is hard to convince Romas even to vote since they have no trust in the electoral system (Barany 2002:306). Furthermore if more Romas would get into politics, nothing guarantees them to have fully Roma support. In Greece for example, attempts to increase Roma influence in politics have been made by having Roma representatives in the elections according to Marantzidis & Mavrommatis (1999), but they also claim that the goal to increase influence is hindered by votes being sold to other representatives and thus Roma-votes expected to go to Roma representatives, have been gone to others in the elections (Marantzidis & Mavrommatis 1999:450).

Sixth, in Slovakia, a lot of Romas were according to Vermeersch (2003) in favor of a government resolution 1996 that classified Romas as “Citizens in need of special care” since they saw the opportunity to fund education and other social areas where the Roma wealth usually were poor. Those Romas against the resolution claimed that it was paternalistic and connecting Romas with “negative social behavior” and “socially retarding environments” (Vermeersch 2003:895ff).

Seventh, Nicolae (2002) explains that Romas sometime also refuse help. When NGO’s working for Roma rights is finding staff, they neglect suitable, educated or experienced NGO workers. They rather tend to employ their friends or neighbour and this makes according to Nicolae (2002) no sense, but he states at the same time that there is a tradition of thinking that only Romas can help Romas (Nicolae 2002:393).

And eight, in Romania there have been disagreements between different Roma groups about which NGO that should get the funding. This is, according to Stroschein
an unintended consequence of NGO funding and has led to withdrawal of Western Roma founding in Romania. Another example Stroschein mentions about such internal fights occurring, were when Romas signed a contract between groups in Hungary and in Romania got questioned in public and therefore their status as representatives weakened (Stroschein 2002:17).

5.3.3 Belief in Racial hierarchy

Nicolae (2002), who himself is a Roma, claims that non-Roma Romanians view the Romas as “a subspecies genetically oriented toward theft and violence.” (Nicolae 2002:386). Other sources that belong to the non-Roma category agree that this view is normal. According to Yahav-Brown (2006), non-realistic stereotypes that Romas have been given has the prevailing explanation from racism – even if it is not the only explanation – and that Romas is not seen as a fully member of humanity and should therefore neither be a fully member of the society in whole (Yahav-Brown 2006:1125).

According to Ahmed et al. (2007) one can compare the situation of Romas in contemporary Europe with the previous situation for Black Americans in the United States. They are distinguished as a group through visible futures and that is how the perpetrators know whom to discriminate. They also compare Roma classification with the racial classification of Latin Americans in United States and claim that Roma ethnicity is "racialized" since they can be visibly seen among the majority and the later will exclude Romas by connecting negative social characteristic to the race and ethnicity. Further they claim that these negative characteristics are evolving from biological and physical measures (Ahmed et al. 2007:236,244ff).

Brearley (2001) claims that skinheads are responsible for most hate crimes against Romas in Czech republic, Hungary, Bulgaria and Slovakia. She continues to argue that these eastern countries have their antipathy towards Romas only because of racism and their fear of otherness. Furthermore she mentions hatred of Romas, what she calls “Romophobia” and argues that this has been emerging since 1989 (Brearley 2001:593f). According to Thomson & Soós (2005), there has also been violence directed towards Romas based on racial grounds. Also prejudice and discrimination have been racially motivated in Hungary according to Thomson & Soós (2005:257). An example from a Western European country is stated by Hadziavdic (2006); she concludes that the antiziganistic view of Romas (and Sinti) in Germany – that all of
them are nomads – belongs to a belief in racial characteristics. Meanwhile, other characteristics that the German majority subscribes the Romas are negative and also based on the ethnicity and racially difference from the majority according to Hadziavdic (2006:52f).

5.4 Outside the scheme: Other findings

5.4.1. Power relations
Powell (2008) might not be the only source that brings hierarchy up, or the majorities’ superiority over Romas, but he is the only source that names this phenomenon to “power-relationships”. According to him, the group of Roma is dis-identified by the more powerful majority that can name, identify or construct the “otherness” of Romas. He also claims that race and ethnicity is not central but rather that the Romas are powerless compared to the others in the society thus get used and neglected from its powerlessness (Powell 2008:87f).

5.4.2. Choosing to be outside society creates unpopularity
Refusal to conform to the mainstream creates according to Turner (2000) unpopularity. Since the Romas challenge the liberal democracy, they do refuse to conform to it according to Turner and he claims “Gypsies, by contrast [to other discriminated minorities], remain outside society, in part by choice, in part through exclusion” (Turner 2000:76). Thus he argues that Romas actually want to stand outside the society and that the society has answered as they would have been doing with all groups that refuse to conform; by making the Romas “unpopular” (Turner 2000).

5.4.3. Pogroms and spontaneous violence on racial grounds
According to Nicolae (2002), a lot of angry mobs have been attacking Romas on racial grounds. Houses have been burned and destroyed and racial violence has not been unusual (Nicolae 2002:387). Human Rights First, a non-profit NGO based in the United States, has made an investigation of these attacks in Europe. The “Hate Crime Survey” came in 2008 and was called Violence Against Roma. This report calls at least 8 incidents in Italy in 2008 for pogroms against Romas. Apart from other things conducted, Molotov cocktails were thrown into Roma camps according to Human
Rights First. The NGO does not report other pogroms within the European Union against Romas, but other acts of violence because of racial hate. For example arsons and attacks towards Roma camps in Italy, skinheads that repeatedly has beaten up Romas, old as young, in Bulgaria; sometimes people has been killed; in the United Kingdom the attacks are conducted towards the camp sites; in Slovakia whole families have been violently attacked with baseball bats and families’ homes have been burnt in Slovenia (Human Rights First 2008:6f,9ff,14f).
6. Analysis; Bauman’s analytical framework on the Roma situation in contemporary Europe

First of all, this research assumes that the member states of the European Union can be classified as “modern states”, thus these countries are assumed to fit into Level I in Bauman’s analytical framework that claims a modern society contains Science & Experts, Authority, Rationality and Bureaucracy. Second, the findings of the “contemporary situation” in Chapter 5, paragraph 1, show that discrimination is widely perpetrated and also accepted against Romas in these modern societies within these countries. The discrimination is conducted both structurally and directly. Furthermore it can from the similar findings in the historical background of Romas in Chapter 4, paragraph 2, conclude that it has been long lasting and no evidence has shown that this situation is diminishing. Therefore the analytical framework from Bauman could be used as a tool of examining and explaining this phenomenon. The findings are already somewhat categorized in Chapter 5 by the concepts of the scheme from Bauman’s analytical framework presented in Chapter 3, but they need now to be explained and analyzed by the analytical framework to be able to answer the research questions. This will be done in this chapter, as well as a summary of which concepts that are found and how they are expressed in the situation for Romas. There will also be a part that analyzes what Bauman might have forgotten and what his analytical framework might say about these additional concepts that are not seen in the analytical scheme. The whole situation with all parts together will thus be analyzed and answer how Bauman’s analytical framework explains the continuation of discrimination against Romas in contemporary Europe.

6.1 Level II: Cornerstones of Discrimination

6.1.1 Scapegoat & the Enemy Within: Usual for the Romas

Romas are often scapegoats for everything and nothing and the arguments in the findings claim that Romas are blamed for a lot of things that are bad for the countries where they live in. According to the findings, these accusations come from all parts of the society: from the authorities and the police; from the political parties and politicians and from the majority of the people. This would according to Bauman
contribute to a feeling of enemy within status when the Romas are living in the same society but still get the blame for the national backdrops. Other sources explicitly say that Romas possess an “enemy within” status. The findings present that Romas in Germany are considered to be “the elements of conspiracy”; in Italy Romas are “enemies” and when Romas become citizens of the European Union, and the same thing is happening there, member states try to hinder Romas from having the same rights as others, then Bauman would claim that they have got into possession of the same claims here and that they are the enemy within who does not really belong there.

6.1.2 Negative Rhetoric: Stereotyping and naming from different levels of the society

There is no doubt that there is material to fill the analytical framework’s box of negative rhetoric: the findings show a lot of examples of when Romas have been treated badly with the power of speech. Bauman would claim that these features all together create false pictures of the entire group of Romas. Though there are different types of negative rhetoric presented and Bauman’s framework would want to distinguish some of them to show what they are leading to or deriving from. First of all that Romas are being treated as objects and they are often stereotyped as possessor of a certain characteristics and these stereotypes are still reinvented in modern fiction. Bauman would claim that Romas never had the chance to set their own conditions because the majority has been stereotyped – as thieves, nomads, placeless and seducers. This objectization is according to Bauman removing Romas out from the non-Romas’ moral sphere. Romas become the “other” and the different from “us” and a psychological separation occurs and there is no reason for the non-Romas to object on Roma discrimination since they are not subjects within the moral sphere. Second, Romas are named after bad things such as diseases, animals and crime, while bad behavior also is named after Romas. Also when Romas are not called bad names, it has been shown in the findings that they can be connected with bad names and be talked around in wordings of war. By connecting Romas with disease and parasites they are, according to Bauman, interpreted to be something that the modern society wants to get rid of, and something that can be cured. This could, according to Bauman, result in policies of assimilation and other social engineering; another cornerstone of discrimination that will be deliberated on later in this chapter. By connecting Romas with war, thoughts go to the nation-state that traditionally is the
actor of war, and once again, the created enemy within status is reinforced. Third, as one source claims in the finding, other groups would never have been talked about in the wordings and ways that Romas is talked about, further the reason to believe that the Romas have left the moral sphere according to Bauman. If talking about others in the same way would be morally wrong, then morality has to be neglected in the case of talking about Romas in the same way. Forth, another situation where Bauman would claim that morality is neglected is when media reports on Roma delinquency but never reporting on the underlying poverty. The actions are instead connected to the stereotyping and other accusations towards the Romas. Fifth, generalizations, thus when what a few have done is blamed on all members of the group, also helps to re-invent and keep up the stereotyping and the picture of the Romas as the obvious scapegoat. Furthermore this rhetoric has been intervening in different layers of the society: media, politics, public and in vocabulary, which again, deepen a physiological separation. Separation leads to outdistancing which is one of Bauman’s most well interconnected concepts within the framework.

6.1.3 Outdistancing: Romas as a counterpart to non-Romas

The findings have shown different examples of outdistancing and these would according to Bauman be possible to distinguish as physical, psychological and social separation leading to outdistancing, but at the same time they are reinforcing and creating each other. An example of separation is Osztolykán, the Roma woman in the Hungarian parliament. She is physical present and contains the same social feature (a position in the parliament) as her colleagues in the antiziganistic party Jobbik. Since they cannot outdistance her physically or socially, they instead outdistance her psychologically as a less important person. There are a lot of other situations in the findings that exemplify separation leading to outdistancing, thus this box of the analytical framework’s scheme is also filled. The findings shows that Romas are often separated from the rest on all of the societies basis: they lack education and employment; if there are any, there is just a few and not very successful representatives in politics; they lack representatives in authorities such as governments, parliaments and municipalities; they do not live in the same places as non-Romas, if they do they do not mix up. Plain psychological separation is in motion because of the thought of “the other”.

Social-, physical- and psychological outdistancing often go hand in hand in Romas situation and impact the existence of the other. According to Bauman, outdistancing also creates neglected morality in different ways. The psychological outdistancing creates an image of the Romas as a lower type of person that does not constitute a person enough to be a part of the moral sphere. Social outdistancing on the other hand will make people not know much about Romas, contributing to that stereotypes will be believed in and in that way contributing to neglected morality against Romas. The third type of outdistancing, the physical seems to be less common in the case of Romas but still exist. In Hungary, the case when comparing children’s fingerprints and claiming to find differences, is an example of something that contributes to the belief of a physical distance between Romas and non-Romas. However, the result of the scientific research exemplified from Nagy & Pap (2004) also showed that the two groups actually have been physically isolated from each other, but what all this research could do according to the framework, is also to create a psychological distance between the two groups. Since science is claimed to be an important authority in the modern society, Bauman would say that this further the separation and outdistancing by treating the group as a counterpart to the mainstream within science.

6.1.4 Neglected Morality: Implicit rather than Explicit

Bauman would claim that the outdistancing deliberated on above, leads to neglected morality but this research have not found overwhelmingly many examples to put under the headline “Neglected Morality” in the findings. However, a lot of other examples in the findings are obviously lacking morality since they have been perpetrated. For example the hate crimes committed by skinheads in Czech Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria and Slovakia have been categorized to “Belief in Racial Hierarchy” since the racial hate stood behind these crimes, but a lack of morality had to have been present according to Bauman, since the skinheads would not act violent towards persons who stood within their moral sphere, unless it was about self-preservation since self-preservation according to Bauman is a rational act superior to morality. There is no such information within these examples that the perpetrator would act out of self-preservation, why the analytical framework therefore would claim that the actions were conducted without moral obligations towards the victims. Another situation where a whole state could be said neglecting morality towards
Romas is when the state will not recognize Romas as a national minority. Bauman could claim here, that the law would be the moral sphere, and not realizing the group of Romas as one agent would be to neglect that Romas is discriminated because of their origin and furthermore neglect them as a group from the moral sphere of the nation. However, the research has classified some examples as neglected morality. One of them is the case when the Czech Republic and Slovakia have tried to put the “Roma problem” on the European Union agenda and remove it from the national agenda. These political actions – to put the problem to someone else – is to neglect the own moral responsibility to take real actions in the matter. Romas are claimed to be European citizens and therefore not the states’ problems. Another example is Berlusconi and his government when the legitimization of violence against Romas with their criminality against Italians. Again, Bauman would point at the enemy within concept and say that without the nation-state and the nationhood that comes with it, the enemy-within concept might not work. Here, it does since the Romas are the others within the nation and are put as an opposition against “Italians”. Furthermore Bauman’s analytical framework points out that the “criminals” are already outside the moral sphere since they did wrong first. The rhetoric used by Berlusconi, that establishes a “them-us” relation and moreover a conflict where “them” threaten “us”, creates a sense of self-preservation and as stated earlier, Bauman’s framework defines the rationality of self-preservation as superior to morality. Thus Berlusconi has by negative rhetoric created an outdistancing and also a manipulated choice where the Italians are believed to have no other options than compliance.

6.1.5 Internal Hierarchy: Little evidence in the case of Romas

This research cannot claim to have filled the box of Internal Hierarchy in scheme of Bauman’s analytical framework. There have been just two clear examples. Bauman would see the first one of an expression of legitimizing that to be a traveling Roma would be a bad thing. There are those within the groups of Romas that climbs on the social ladder and gets wealthier and more accepted in the society and called “our Romas” in one place in Spain according to one source, thus they do not hold an outdistanced status within the society in whole. These Romas tend to outdistance themselves from the Roma community the closer they come to the mainstream. This example shows when a Roma high in the Internal Hierarchy reject its Roma heritage,
though when discussing this cornerstone of discrimination, Bauman’s analytical framework is more into the type of hierarchy that a Roma would be a better Roma than the other but still call themselves a Roma. Evidence of such interpretations has not been found at all in the frames of this research, except for one case that is presented from Greece where the hierarchy in a village is explained in a pyramid. Though this seems more proper as a proof of social separation where Romas fill the two bottom layers in the whole society, instead of being some kind of internal hierarchy in the terms of what Bauman would distinguish the concept of a “good Roma” is better than explicitly understood usually “bad Romas”.

6.1.6 Manipulated choice: The insecurity of a nomadic life

This research has found the examples of manipulated choices from the United Kingdom. Here Bauman would claim that there are manipulated choices from the government that force Romas to move into housing and later after doing so, the Romas regretting it. Bauman would term this as a “rational choice leading to irrational actions” and claim that the perpetrator (authorities) probably done this by purpose to pretend that the Romas had a choice but be sure that they would do whatever the authorities aim was, in this case to move into modern housing. The perpetrator creates the manipulated choices to create compliance from the victims. Bauman would claim that if the Romas were given no choice, but were forced to move into housing, then a resistance would probably be built up, but Bauman would say that since they are given the free choice they have no reason to resist that strongly but make the choice that fits them the best – which of course is what the British government and local authorities want them to do. Only three sources talk about this but it seems to be a clear example from United Kingdom and the findings witness about one source claiming that many countries are whole European Union is trying to make it harder to be living a nomadic life.

6.1.7 Social Engineering: Illegal deportations

Social engineering is a concept that sometimes is hard to discover and probably also a bit sensitive to accuse a state for. Those types of social engineering that are presented in the findings can be summarized as follows; assimilations is conducted through a manipulation of choices, and for example, are handled by a resolution within the Czech Republic, which states that assimilation should not be rejected as an option;
sterilizations laws in a European Union country was changed (thus not removed) as late as 1986 according to the findings, but no source can tell us if and when this law was banned; and deportations of Romas are increasing in the Western European Union countries. These social engineering policies would according to Bauman not be possible without science and experts or authorities. They portray Romas to be diseases or parasites as shown in the discussion about negative rhetoric, scapegoats and enemy-within status. A disease can with medical science improvements today often be cured and should so also be according to the modern society. Once the parasite is localized – the Romas – then it should be removed somehow and if the features (the “Roma criminality”) cannot be diminished or removed, then the whole object (the Roma) that hold that feature, has to be removed. Deportations would make this and create a more healthy society without “obstacles”. Apparently – would Bauman say – the negative rhetoric and the picture of Romas as parasites have succeeded well since the police in EU member states do not follow their own laws, but deport Romas before their 3 months right to stay in another EU country have expired.

6.1.8 Summary

There is no doubt that Romas in Europe are the scapegoats for everything in some societies and for at least something in every society within the European Union. There have been cases where they have become the enemy-within and Romas are huge victims of negative rhetoric in all parts of the society. They are being socially outdistanced in all countries, often also psychologically and in some even physically outdistanced through “proof” of differences between them and other ethnicities. Bauman would point at a lot of things where morality was neglected and social engineering through deportations is increasing within the European Union. So far, the boxes in the scheme of Bauman’s analytical framework have been filled well and therefore it can teach us how the cornerstones of discrimination constitute a ground to how the discrimination evolves. Though when it comes to the Internal Hierarchy, examples are vague and have also been localized. One of the examples is from a small place in Spain, and the other from an even smaller place in Greece. Nothing in the findings point at that this is a widely spread phenomenon for Romas. Thus this box has to be regarded as very unsteady when it comes to Roma’s situation. Moreover manipulated choices have been exemplified only from one EU member state, namely
the United Kingdom. Though one source also claims that the whole Europe is using same kind of systemized choices, thus even if not very strong, this box is at least somewhat generalized to all the Western European countries and therefore has to be regarded as somewhat applicable to the Roma situation.

6.2 Level III: Facilitators of Discrimination

The victims in this case are obviously Romas, and as aforementioned, all Romas are included according to Bauman’s analytical framework. The perpetrator in Bauman’s analytical framework is everyone who discriminates, complies with, or is a passive bystander in the case of discrimination, which in the Roma case is basically everyone who is not a Roma. Of course the exceptions could be claimed to be NGO’s working for Romas and activists. But Bauman would here also say that for example an NGO only working for Romas right away distanced the Romas from the other groups of the society. However, this paragraph is to show what Bauman says about the actual findings on the facilitator boxes in the analytical scheme.

6.2.1 Compliance from non-Romas: authority, outdistancing and neglected morality makes it possible

According to Bauman’s analytical framework, there are vital factors such as Outdistancing and Neglected Morality that create a base of compliance from the perpetrator and both types of compliance are exemplified in the findings. But also Authority is important and this will be the first deliberated aspect here. Authority is not only vital since the authorities spread a false picture of Romas being bad: In the case with the 10-year old girl watching her dad get beaten and the police officer say “that’s the law”, Bauman would see a clear example of when morality becomes floating because of authorities orders. The same authority that makes the law, tells the society that Romas are bad, as a consequence the police interpret it as that the law allow police to hit Romas and thus refer to the law when doing so. But the authorities would probably according to Bauman say that they never ordered this policeman to hit that Roma. Thus both deny the responsibility of the action. The police have been thought by the modern society that authorities should be followed and pressure of obeying creates this floating responsibility. As already mentioned in this chapter under foregoing paragraph, separation and outdistancing also create neglected morality. Outdistancing is already shown to be a widely present phenomenon for
Romas in the European Union, thus according to Bauman there is also a large moral neutrality where Romas stand outside the moral sphere of the perpetrators. Responsibility for caring about Romas not being suppressed disappears with this outdistancing and people can be passive bystanders as when no-one cares in most of countries, or even cheering the violence as in the case from Italy presented in the findings, where no-one watching Romas run from their homes to save their lives. Bauman’s concept of compliance from the perpetrator is seen according to the findings in the case of Romas through different ways, summarized as: police do not stop, prevent or solve crimes against Romas; governments have not either and sometimes they have even triggered the violence; police have fulfilled the authorities orders to “remove” and deport Romas; politicians in United Kingdom change their politics towards Romas depending on if it is election period or not; special “hotlines” have been established in United Kingdom that the public uses to report Romas; a company has established in the same country to help the public to evict Romas; the public in most countries prefer not to have Romas as neighbors and when they do they treat them bad; when teachers neglect the Roma children’s identity, it could this way be forgotten by the system and neglected from external actors when trying to identify the individual needs of the pupil; once again the example from Spain about “our Gypsy” has to be mentioned, it reminds of the well-known xenophobic expression “he is a nice immigrant” which by framing this specific immigrant as nice, implicit frames all other immigrants as un-nice; and maybe most interesting is the big support that antiziganistic parties have in modern, civilized countries, numbers given in the findings are 80% support in Italy and 25% in Hungary. The Gardas in Hungary and the fingerprint-system of Romas in Italy have been particularly pointed out as supported politics in these countries.

All this supports Bauman’s analytical framework that authority, outdistancing and neglected morality leads to compliance. Bauman would though claim that the outdistancing has to be supported by negative rhetoric and this research have more than well proved that such rhetoric is concerning Romas in the contemporary European society.
6.2.2 Compliance from Romas: Rational Choice, Lack of reporting, and Hidden Identity becomes legitimization of the discrimination

The findings exemplify Bauman’s concept of compliance from the victims in different situations. For example it is stated that Romas often hide their Roma identity and Bauman would claim that this legitimate the discrimination in the way that Romas know that they are subjects of discrimination if they would reveal their Roma background. By neglecting it and for example saying that they are Greek instead, would send a signal to other Romas that they also should hide their identity. When Romas also name the non-Romas to certain names, they distance themselves and comply with the psychological outdistancing that they are “others”. The example of calling the non-Romas as “normal” and thus implying that the Romas are something else but normal, is also complying by the victims and risk to both outdistance them and further legitimate the outdistancing. Romas have also a tendency according to the findings to neglect their background if they educate themselves in the natural science scholar. The source that mentions this example, Barany (2000), claims that it is probably because of better work opportunities in this field of study. Bauman would strictly say that it is a way to hide your identity and therefore contribute to the compliance of Romas discrimination. If hiding the identity and therefore get a better work, it is to comply that another Roma could be rejected the same opportunity of not hiding his or her Roma status. As stated before, the findings lack information to fill out the box of internal hierarchy. The internal hierarchy is according to Bauman’s framework a function to compliance from the victim by legitimizing to be a “better Roma”. Thus this phenomenon is missing in the picture that the findings show of Romas situation in contemporary Europe. However this function is in the case of Romas instead filled by the “Hidden Identity”. It has the same function and is connected to the same concepts as internal hierarchy, but in this case the Roma is “too good to even be in the group” and is therefore increasing its status in the whole society’s hierarchy instead by claiming to be non-Roma. Further, as earlier stated in the analysis, there has not been any self-preservation in the acts of the perpetrators, and none of the findings witness about self-preservation in a question of life and death for the victims either. But to see other become victims of violence and therefore hide one’s own identity is of course a matter of self-preservation. And this is as here deliberated widely known in the European society that Romas do hide their identity.
The legitimization of discrimination from victims could also be seen when Romas choose not to report crimes to the police. Even though the findings show that the police do not do very much to help Romas and one can understand that the Romas’ trust for the authorities is not very high, this is also an example of what Bauman calls compliance from the victim. If not reporting, then the violence and crimes could be seen as legitimate. Although the findings also show that some cases, Romas do not know their own rights. Even when Romas have been involved in politics, they have not been fully supported by their own group according to the findings. Depending on the reason for this, it could be a rational choice from an individual that results into an irrational action that ends up negative for the whole group. Also when it comes to the Roma driven NGOs that according to the findings employ Romas instead of experts and have arguments about where the money should go so that the financial partners withdraw, would according to Bauman’s analytical framework be compliance from the victims. Though the framework does not mention these situations in particular, but these findings could widen this box in the analytical scheme to include these types of compliance. These NGOs can make a rational choice that it is better to have a Roma as employee since it gives a friend or a family member employment and “only Romas can help Romas”, but it could end up in an irrational situation where the Romas as a group cannot be helped. This way, this kind of victim’s compliance is explicitly mentioned in Bauman’s framework.

As shown here, also the functions of the box of compliance from the victims have been filled up but as said, Bauman’s concept of the Internal Hierarchy might not be valid in the case of Roma discrimination. Instead, having the same function as “Hidden Identity” could fill up the box of compliance from the victims.

6.2.3 Belief in Racial Hierarchy: Not proved in the case of Roma discrimination

The many biological and genetically comparisons between Hungarians and Romas witness of some sort of belief in racial differences, but the one exemplified in the findings has not been stated a hierarchy them between. The findings also show that many claims that Roma discrimination more or less comes from that Romas are racially different or straight out that the criminality committed by Romas is in their genes. Romas’ situation has also been compared with Black Americans in the history of the United States. Implicitly this states that the situation of Romas has been
decided on racial terms. Germany, Hungary, Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Slovakia are mentioned when it comes to racism and to view Romas as something less worth. The findings show that academics have concluded that violence is committed on a racist ground towards Romas, but the question is if this is enough to claim that the box is filled. This interpretation of the findings is that it is not enough. To prove a common belief in racial hierarchy would need a stronger explicit statement from the actual perpetrators that they did. A political party that went publicly and said that Romas are a “lower race” and then got a lot support in the election; a president stating that Romas are less human than others; or similar, would fill this box up condignly.

6.2.4 Summary

Level III of Bauman’s analytical framework that describes facilitators of discrimination has not been completed by the findings of this research; some of the boxes have been filled, some not. Compliance from perpetrator has been filled and mostly by examples that is already explicitly given in the analytical framework in Chapter 3. Thus examples are found in the Roma situation when authorities have mattered for the perpetrators and when outdistancing has created opportunity for immoral actions to take place. Compliance from Victim is a box that is filled by different types of compliance, though by other examples than those mentioned in Chapter 3. This does not mean that the box in Level III has to change name, since it is still compliance of victims, though a more proper scheme in the case of Roma discrimination in contemporary Europe would exchange the box in Level II of Internal Hierarchy to one that is called “Hidden Identity” since that could be seen as a cornerstone of the Roma discrimination in the modern Europe. Furthermore a Belief in Racial Hierarchy is not found by this research. Though the analytical framework would not have expected that either. Since the social engineering is present, according to the findings, the belief in racial hierarchy would according to Bauman have resulted in genocide and furthermore possibly a new Holocaust. This third facilitator is according to the analytical framework not as necessary for discrimination to continue as the two others, but if it does exist, then the discriminated group risks not to get rid of the discrimination before genocide takes place.
6.3 Further concepts outside Bauman’s analytical framework

There were four concepts or findings that could not at first sight be placed within the scheme of Bauman’s analytical framework. First of all, power relations have never fully been evaluated in the framework. The power relations might be considered by Bauman to already be a part of the discrimination. But the findings show another way to look at the power relations within the discrimination. The power of the majority to name the Romas and ascribe them an identity they would not choose themselves, is something that in the analytical framework would be put under negative rhetoric. Though this finding indicates that it is such a strong part of the Roma discrimination that it might be worth an own box in Level II – cornerstones of discrimination – in the scheme.

Another thing worthy of some attention is the notion that “choosing to be outside society creates unpopularity”. That Romas often choose themselves to be outside the society and do not want to conform to the “normality” could, argued in the findings, work as a straight signal to the society that it is not a wanted society for Romas to live in, why they would become “unpopular”. Even though this is a concept not explicitly mentioned in Bauman’s analytical framework, it could still argue that it is covered by the Level III facilitator Compliance from victim since the victim actually then would explicitly choose to be outside and thus not enjoy the same rights as others. However, since the findings often witness about Romas trying to enjoy the same rights as others – for example the right to decide over own life – but being refused to, this notion is not strong enough since evidence shows that they do not want to be outside society but more often are forced to because of social and psychological separation and thus outdistancing.

Little in Bauman’s analytical framework is arguing that racism has anything to do with long-lasting discrimination. Rather opposite Bauman has claimed that it is the particularities in the modern society that create and allow cornerstones that together with the facilitator make discrimination long-lasting and that little has to do with actual racism. A lot of the findings in the case of Romas say differently though; according to them there have been a lot of violence and even pogroms towards Romas that have not created reactions from the majority. These actions are claimed to be based on racial hatred and therefore they should be examined by the scheme as well. If having a look on the scheme it does not suit into Level I since it is not a
characteristic of a modern society, Level II is cornerstones of discrimination and racist actions are not really matching up with those either. Once having a look at the facilitators in Level III, Bauman clearly states that pogroms against Jews were rather hindering the anti-Semitism then furthering it, and even if the violence against Romas has not been hindering discrimination, this research has not been presenting findings that prove that it further discrimination either. Since it is not suitable to put it under Level V as genocide either, maybe these violent actions are actually a part of the discrimination itself, or as a middle step between discrimination and genocide? But since racist violence neither further discrimination or is proved by the findings to derive naturally from the cornerstones of discrimination, the racist violence is interpreted as something else that does not fit into the line of thoughts of Bauman’s analytical framework’s scheme.
7. Conclusion

7.1 Comments on the Analysis
Zygmunt Bauman’s analytical framework shows us that there are many different factors that can explain why the discrimination against Romas in contemporary Europe is continuing and also why it has not evolved in genocide – yet. Important to notice, is that it also warns us that the long lasting discrimination can continue even further and with a small change, genocide could be reality. Bauman’s analytical framework implemented on discrimination of Romas, provides us with the understanding on how the modern society provides us with the cornerstones of discrimination and how facilitators in shape of compliance from both Romas and non-Romas helps it to continue.

7.2 A modified scheme
Zygmunt Bauman described what he concluded were important triggers and facilitators to long-lasting discriminations of Jews and what led to the Holocaust. His analytical framework was thus deriving from the situation of Jews and in this research clarified in a scheme where 7 cornerstones and 3 facilitators of discrimination are distinguishable and further he argues that what makes this possible are the 4 characteristics of the modern society, the nation-state. Through this analytical framework, the situations of Romas have been analyzed and understood in this research. Bauman’s framework help to build up a picture to find the vital underlying concepts that actually make the discrimination possible to become long lasting. Most of the different concepts of Bauman have been distinguished in one way or the other, they have been expresses either as Bauman explicitly have stated that they look like, or there has been “new” things filling out the boxes in the scheme of the framework. Therefore the framework has worked as a point of departure when examining the Roma discrimination in contemporary society and this research has analyzed why, according to Bauman’s framework, the situation can continue. However, since Bauman’s analytical framework lack a few points when it comes to this topic, a slightly modified scheme is appropriate to suggest understanding the situation even better.
Figure 3 on page 73 shows the suggestion of a modified scheme to make it more realistic in the case of Roma discrimination. Five of the seven cornerstones of discrimination in Bauman’s analytical framework are easy found in the Roma situation: Scapegoat and Enemy within; Negative Rhetoric; Outdistancing; Neglected Morality and Social Engineering why these are still present in the scheme. However, it was harder to distinguish cases of Manipulated Choices even though it is found and claimed to exist in the Western European countries within the European Union, but it was found and should therefore not be completely out-ruled since it affects compliance of the perpetrators. Thus this cornerstone has been left but somewhat distinguished to be “unsure” by making this box’s boarders unclear. The last cornerstone in Bauman’s analytical framework – Internal Hierarchy – is only exemplified by what seems to be exceptions in the European society. Therefore this cornerstone should be removed from the modified scheme and be replaced by the larger concept acknowledged in the Roma situation: Hidden Identity. Hidden Identity is foremost built on the characteristic Rationality from the modern society and is a way of Compliance from the victim, why the label cornerstone in Level II is most suitable to put this discovered concept in. There is one further change in Level II and that is an addition of Power Relations. Power relations are foremost affected by authority and close connected to negative rhetoric and can establish compliance from both perpetrator and victim.

The facilitator compliance from perpetrator and compliance from victim both exist widely in Roma discrimination according to the findings, though the third facilitator, a belief in racial hierarchy does not. However, it would not be fair to Bauman to rule this concept out since he explicitly explains that this is the one facilitator that would lead to genocide - Level V. Why this facilitator is kept is also to warn that if it does get filled in the Roma situation and sets up the goals for the social engineering taking place in Europe, then a genocide of Romas could be a fact in the future according to Bauman’s analytical framework and thus the edited version to fit Romas’ discrimination.

Furthermore if the pressure increases and genocide would take place, then the internal hierarchy would probably increase among Romas. Maybe Bauman miscalculated when he did not connect the internal hierarchy as an impact rather than a reason to the discrimination and the Holocaust. It might go both ways, but without the classical hen-egg problem; the discrimination came first and first when it got over
the top towards real danger, the internal hierarchy brakes out and re-enforces the facilitators of discrimination.

**Figure 3. Modified scheme of Bauman’s analytical Framework**
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**FIGURE 3.** The Scheme over Bauman’s Analytical Framework modified according to the discrimination against Romas in contemporary Europe.
7.2 Further research

Further research could be done on the subject since the time limit of this research was strict and could not within the time frame go through all the academic material there is about Romas. There might also be other channels of distribution of materials that has not been reached because of the geographical limitation to Linnaeus University, campus Växjö. Moreover it would be interesting to see how the original scheme of Bauman’s analytical framework and further the modified scheme would analyze other groups that are, or have been, suffering from discrimination – or genocide. A third, a forth and a fifth use of the analytical framework as this research has been conducted, might have the possibility to establish a general ground that is common to all situations of widely accepted discrimination.

Bauman has not provided measures of how to stop discrimination and it has neither been the purpose of this research to present an anti-discrimination policy. However, with the knowledge of why the discrimination can continue, further research should be possible on what policy measures that could end discrimination against Romas in contemporary Europe, and most important, to prevent it from becoming the Holocaust of the 21st century.
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