Changes in the Image of 'Gypsies' in Slovakia and Hungary after the Post-Communist Transition

Mátyás Binder

In the present paper I attempt to outline the image that non-Gypsies carry about Gypsies in the economic, social, political and '*transitional*' context of two post-communist Eastern-European countries. My point of departure is that while under state socialism the Gypsies mainly represented a deprived *social stratum*, in the new system they came to be defined as an *ethnic group* or a *people*. We shall see that these assumptions are so simplistic that they can hardly be considered valid at all.

My aim is not a systematic comparison of the '*Gypsy policy*' of the two countries in the state socialist and the post-communist era but to examine the new and old elements of the image or rather images of Gypsies as they were embedded in the context of the post-communist transition. Because the issue at hand is complex by nature, my approach is a combination of the relevant results and methods of history, sociology, social psychology and cultural anthropology.

'Homogenous and double' Images of the Gypsies

There are two crucial dichotomies that have existed for centuries and need to be pointed out when speaking about the image of Gypsies as seen by the non-Gypsies. One is how the category of '*Gypsies*' seen as a homogenous group from the outside[1], is actually highly heterogeneous; and the other is whether Gypsies are to be defined on the basis of ethnicity, race, social standing or a way of life. The images of Gypsies as they appear in the various relevant dimensions (state politics, academic research, everyday interaction, media/the public) differ widely partly because this group of people is exposed ather helplessly to the definitions provided from the outside1, since the

> *Images about Gypsies are both changing and perennial, and range between the two ideal typical poles of an ethnic/racial and a social definition.*

image that non-Gypsies hold about Gypsies is always modified according to the shifts of focus and self-interest of '*the whites*'.[2]

The name '*Gypsy*' constructed by non-Gypsies[3] refers to groups of varying language, culture and identity only some of whom call themselves Gypsy, while the others denote their own communal identity by ethnonyms of their own such as '*Roma*', '*Zhitan*', '*Manus*', '*Sinto*', '*Kalo*', '*Boyash*'.[4] In 2003 the distribution of Gypsies according to mother tongue in Hungary (based on a representative sociological survey) was the following: 86.9% Hungarian; 4.6% Boyash (Romanian); 7.7% Gypsy (Olah Gypsy, i.e. Romani).[5] In Slovakia, in terms of mother tongue there are Slovak Roma (szlovacsike romu); Hungarian Roma (ungrike roma) and so-called Olah Roma (vlasike roma).[6]

This multiplicity is the result of adapting to varying circumstances which is hardly surprising in the case of a '*Diaspora type*' people.[7] The concept of Diaspora includes notions of a common place of origin and a (former) shared social consciousness. This role is played, in the case of the Gypsies, by India.

There are two things I would like to note in the context of India. Although the majority of researchers accept that Gypsies originate from India, some Gypsy communities have traditions of ethnic history which do not contain references to India as the ancient homeland.[8] It is a different question that for the Roma on the way to becoming a nation India as the land of origin plays

an important legitimising role[9] and thus the concept is becoming ever more widely known among the Roma.[10]

Speaking of the Indian origin, the idea also emerges to define Gypsies as a social stratum (rather than an ethnic group). According to a British researcher the theory of the purely Indian origin of contemporary Gypsies is untenable. He believes that the majority of the ancestors of England's Gypsies were *Gadjo*,[11] who had drifted to the peripheries of society at the time of the disintegration of feudalism and, in order to survive, adopted a migrant way of life.[12] Similar processes probably took place in Eastern Europe too, but available data do not allow for more than setting up hypotheses.[13] At any rate, perceiving the Gypsies as a multi-ethnic social group characterised by a particular way of life is something that also has its traces in 17th century Hungary. A Jesuit scholar wrote the following in a book published in 1691: '*(…) the lowly and migrant people of the Gypsies (…) are nothing other than a gang of thieves and a hoard cheats and work-avoiders who had gathered together from not very distant, indeed neighbouring nations*.'[14]

18th and 19th century sources from a Hungarian market town prove that, through a process of differentiation in wealth, some land-owning Gypsies managed to become *Gadjo* (or *neo-colonus* in Latin), while impoverished *Gadjoes* 'became' Gypsies.[15]

In practice, images of Gypsies as an ethnically defined category and as a social status existed in parallel with each other. In some 18th century Hungarian sources[16] the concept of the Gypsy appears in an ethnic dimension. In Latin texts the terms *natio*

and *gens* are used while in Hungarian they are referred to as a *nemzet* or *nemzetség*, meaning nation, people. In this case, being a Gypsy is an ethnic identity, belonging to a nation.

In another group of sources the concept of the '*Gypsy*' appears in a social dimension. In Latin sources we read of *conditio* (social status) and *professio* (occupation, source of livelihood). In this case, being a Gypsy is a particular social condition.[17] Which of the two definitions comes into play depends on the historical situation and also the kind of discourse in which '*the Gypsy*' happens to appear. For instance, the common vernacular reference to Gypsies in 15th-17th c. Hungary is primarily to do with lifestyle, while literary references imply an ethnic definition.[18]

Such duality in the image of the Gypsies naturally also surfaces in modern academic research. Sociologists and cultural anthropologists argue whether in the context of Gypsies we should speak of a culture of poverty[19] or an ethnic culture and whether their predicament is aptly described by the concept of the underclass adapted in a structuralist version to the Eastern European situation.[20] Even the basic question of '*who is a Gypsy*' is debatable.[21] Is it someone who was classified with the rank of the Gypsies by non-Gypsies on the basis of some sort of an image held by the latter[22] or is it someone who has a Gypsy/Roma identity? We may well feel that only the latter definition is adequate, but this is no use if in fact   external classification, categorisation also remains effective.[23] This is well illustrated by a statement by Ian Hancock, a figure who played an important part in the international Roma movement and the cultural-symbolical effort of Gypsy nation-building: '…*the common factor now being an awareness not of what we are, but of what all of us are not: Romanies are not gadže or non-Romani people.*'[24]

In my approach, which is based on the theory of constructivist ethnicity[25], Gypsy/Roma communities are seen as social groups with an independent ethnic identity and culture the boundaries and cultural elements of which may change in response to shifts in economic, social or political conditions. Accordingly, these communities

(and even the single individuals) may be on different levels[26] of acculturation.[27]

Stereotypes and Racism

Members of the heterogeneous category of Gypsies are permanently influenced by the unified (and usually negative) image of Gypsies carried by non-Gypsies. Particularly powerful in this process are stereotypes which create and preserve such images of the Gypsies. In the following section I attempt briefly to summarise the historical and theoretical frames of these stereotypes.

After the end of the 16th century a growing number of scholarly historical works appeared in Europe which contained those stereotypes, prejudices and platitudes about Gypsies which are still predominant today.[28] '*Adapting each other's negative opinions and descriptions, 16th to 18th century authors kept trying to prove from time to time that hostility, persecution of the Gypsies and even the intention to exterminate them were legitimate.*'[29] This highlights two things with regard to prejudices and stereotypes about the Gypsies: the responsibility of scholarship[30] and the function of stereotypes.

Heinrich Grellmann's work '*Die Zigeuner*' from 1783 summarised the academic knowledge of the age, but it also determined the way in which they thought about Gypsies in the 19th century and can thus be made responsible for the spreading of negative stereotypes.[31] Early ethnographers who studied the '*national character*'

of Gypsies rationalised the image according to which the Gypsy is a contemptible people or race with an inherent criminal proclivity.[32] Such a role played by academics is barely a surprise since they operate embedded in the social milieu of information manufacturers.[33]

Modern social science also lacks a '*unified and objective*' notion of the Gypsy. Different theoretical schools offer us, for example, evolutionist, diffusionist and culturologist images of Gypsies[34] or from a methodological point of view we can speak of essentialist or structuralist or, from a political perspective, about a '*deviancy-oriented*', a descriptive and an emancipatory approach.[35] The image created about '*the other*' always plays an important role in social groups forming their self-image. These images of the other are based on prejudices and stereotypes which are a '*natural*' part of the everyday life of the group and the individual.[36]

Stereotyping has both individual and social functions. Individual functions are mostly to do with evaluating – our own value becomes highlighted when contrasted with others. As early as 1922 Walter Lippman emphasised the role of self-justification: '*Stereotypes are bastions that protect the position we occupy in society.*'[37] The social function of stereotypes is mostly to legitimise the status, value and actions of the in-group by devaluing and condemning other groups. Perhaps the best known process of this kind is the appointment of '*scape-goats*'.[38]

According to researchers who examine ideological functions, stereotypes serve '*to explain the poverty or disempowerment of certain groups or the success of others in such a way as to make these differences appear legitimate, indeed, natural*'.[39] The emergence of negative stereotypes about the in-group[40] and the social consensus regarding stereotypes is explained by the theory of system justification.[41]

Besides ethnically or socially based stereotypes, Gypsy people often have to face an '*aggravating factor*' – racist prejudice. The ideas of racism and white supremacy are inseparable from a justification of white dominance over people with any other skin colour and the notion of science held by modern discourse.[42]

On the level of definition, racism means '*to regard with suspicion, indeed disdain, persons whose physical characteristics and culture are different from our own*'.[43] Its '*true face*' is that it arbitrarily projects a highly potent moral and psychological background behind a visual reality observable by anyone and then drives people to believe that this psychological construct is a biologically based reality.[44] Since the majority of the Roma have darker skin than their non-Gypsy compatriots, we cannot wonder if some consider those Gypsy children lucky who have light coloured skin (and a non-Gypsy sounding name)…

The Image of the Gypsy under State Socialism

In a 1973 article entitled '*An ethnic group, a race or a stratum?*' contributions to the concept of '*the Gypsies*' Hungarian sociologist Zsolt Csalog wrote that *officially* the Gypsies are a social category; viewed from the perspective of the Gypsies it is an existing, accepted category where the social category dominates, while in the opinion of the non-Gypsy general public this is primarily and increasingly a racial category.[45] After a brief historical introduction we are going to talk about the '*official*' Gypsy image of state socialism (i.e. that which manifests itself in state politics) and its '*everyday*' counterpart.

The Gypsy population living in the area of contemporary Hungary and Slovakia were largely in the same position until the end of WW I. According to a Gypsy census held in historical Hungary[46] in 1893, there were roughly 280 thousand Gypsies living in the area of the country, accounting for 1.8% of the population. Although the census was ordered by the Minister of Home Affairs in the context of the question of settling migrant Gypsies, only 8938 such migrants were found, along with 20,406 '*semi-migrant*' and 243,432 settled Gypsies.[47]

The above mentioned survey also revealed that 82% of active age Gypsies worked, most of them as agricultural labourers but a significant number were occupied in the two most common 'Gypsy trades': there were 17 thousand Gypsy musicians and 13 thousand Gypsy blacksmiths in the country.[48]

According to calculations based on this census, in 1893, there were 65 thousand persons thought of as Gypsies living in the area of today's Hungary and 40-42 thousand in the territory of contemporary Slovakia.[49] (According to other sources there were only 36 thousand living in the Slovakian parts, and only 600 of them pursued a migrant form of life.)[50] Beyond general economic and social difficulties,[51] the life of Hungarian Gypsy musicians was also affected particularly unfavourably by the changes that affected the national borders after the Trianon Treaty, owing to their special position.[52] In the new Czechoslovakian state there was no demand for their music, therefore many of them moved to Hungary, causing an over-supply of such music.

In Czechoslovakia in the Czech parts (Bohemia, Moravia and Silezia) they first applied a '*Western exclusive*' policy regarding the Gypsies, while in less well developed Slovak areas they enjoyed the more '*accepting*' attitude characteristic of the Eastern European region.[53] One consequence was that in the Eastern part of the new state, as we saw above, there were mainly settled Gypsies living while in the Western, Czech parts the remaining Gypsies were few in number and pursued a migrant form of life.

Although the majority of Czech Gypsies were actually killed during the Roma holocaust, the image of the Nomadic Gypsy[54] continued to exist. This is reflected in the serious of projected measures (including labour camps, '*reform*' camps and criminal centres) which were intended, often with a racist edge, after WW II, to counter the influx of '*nomadic*'[55] Gypsies who arrived in the Czech area from Slovakia in search of work. Eventually the only thing that went into practice was the census surveying the Gypsy population which then fundamentally questioned the justification of planned anti-Roma measures. It became clear that the majority of the 16 thousand Gypsy immigrants from Slovakia worked, while the rate of what was called '*incorrigible asocial elements*' did not reach 1%.[56] All of this happened before the communist takeover of 1948.

The *Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (CPSU) did not consider the Gypsies as an independent nation or ethnic group because they did not meet '*Stalin's criteria*'.[57] The general '*Roma image*' reflected the position of the CPSU which considered the Gypsies a backward segment of the society '*which, as a result of its historical past, lifestyle and habits, and backwardness in all areas is slower and more difficult to integrate into society*'.[58] It must be added instantly that this image is far from homogeneous in space or time – for example the 1974 constitution of Yugoslavia accorded the Gypsies the status of a national minority.[59]

In Czechoslovakia the Gypsies were deprived of their status as a national minority in 1948.[60] After a controversial period, in 1958 the Czechoslovakian Communist Party Central Committee passed a ruling '*on the work to be done among the Gypsy population*' which, through its tasks and objectives, ushered in the period of forced assimilation of Gypsies which was to last till 1970. According to the ruling '*we must reject the ambitions of certain cultural workers to construct an artificial Gypsy literary language and literature out of the earlier dialects and to create Gypsy schools and classes with Gypsy as the language of education*'. They saw these ambitions as further undesirable boosts to the efforts of the Roma to isolate themselves and as a means of delaying their re-education.[61]

Ethnographic research regarding the Gypsies began in Slovakia in the 1950's, however, the picture of the Gypsies which it created was unable to over-write that propagated by the state. In 1961 an ideological manual was published under the title *Cikánská otázka v ČSSR* (The Gypsy Question in the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic) which debated the existence of the Gypsy ethnic group, its language and culture.[62] The perception of the Gypsies as a backward group of society only changed to a moderate extent as a result of the events of 1968. At the time of the Prague spring an organisation called the Roma Association was created which was able to function for four years, under powerful state control. The publication of a periodical called Romano Lil[63] was also permitted until 1977. After this brief detour the pressure to assimilate remained powerful throughout the 1970's and 80's.

In Hungary the situation was not as clear-cut. Although the Gypsies were not granted the status of a national minority, in 1957, under supervision by the state, they were allowed to start creating their own organisations under the auspices of the *Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies*. Aims of the organisation included promoting the Gypsy literature and language in order to eradicate prejudice. Later, however, the government moved toward an assimilative policy and the Party Resolution of 1961 declared that '*The Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies(…) is not suited to play a significant role in the re-education of the Gypsy population. (…) Our policy regarding the Gypsy population has to be based on the principles that despite certain ethnographic characteristics it still does not represent a national minority*'.[64]

In Hungary, contrary to other Eastern-European countries, the authorities supported Gypsy research. In the sociological writing that was produced as a result, a growing number of scholars emphasised that '*the culture of the Gypsies is more than a culture of poverty – it is essentially an ethnic culture which expresses its identity and its separate social standing through cultural and symbolic means alike*'.[65]

Perhaps it was the results of these findings that were reflected in the resolution of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee on Gypsies in 1974, '*Some people question the stance of the Political Committee whereby the Gypsy population living in Hungary is a special segment of society and believe that it is a national minority and deserves the rights of such a minority*'.[66] Although the authors of the document support exploring, preserving and publicising the cultural values and original folk art produced by the Gypsies,[67] at the end of the document they clearly point out, '*… Gypsies do not need to be considered a national minority in future, either*'.[68]

Later, by the end of the 1980's when the failure of the assimilation policy became blatantly obvious, political leadership decided to replace state patronage over the Gypsies with the ambition to reach a consensus ('*the politics of dialogue*').[69] Thus the character of the Gypsies as an ethnic group became far more emphatic and, in parallel with this, the Gypsy intelligentsia began to demand the status of a national minority.[70]

In the article from 1973 already mentioned, the author claims that the general public perceive the Gypsies on a racial basis. They are defined not by ethnic criteria (traditional trades, costume, mother tongue),

nor as a social category (e.g. income level), but by standards which are, or are believed to be, racially rooted: '*smoky-face*'; '*they lie as if they were reading it from a book*'; '*dirty*'; '*they breed like rabbits*'; '*he's been with the company eight years and he has never stolen as much as a nail, even though he is a Gypsy*' etc.[71]

Being a member of a stereotyped minority, despite the egalitarian ideology of state socialism, was never easy. Breaking out of a low status was rendered more difficult by the fact that the majority society (at least a significant part of it) did not easily accept the minority group pursuing any other than its traditional trades. One example is the case of a Gypsy baker. After the Hungarians found out that there was a Gypsy working in the village bakery, many of them refused to buy bread from that shop any more. In fact they did all they could to remove the person from his job. '*Oh, he is a Gypsy, I won't eat out of his hands*', they said.[72]

According to a public opinion survey carried out in Hungary in 1979, the majority of respondents conceived the Gypsies primarily as a question of blood, of something one is born into, indeed, many defined Gyp-syness as a '*race*'.[73] It was no use that anti-Fascist and internationalist legitimising ideology (Marxism-Leninism) prohibited open anti-Gypsy sentiment or racism, nor was it any use that the leading powers tried to define Gypsies as a social layer – stubborn stereotypes prevailed and influenced everyday interactions.[74]

Czechoslovakian and Hungarian state socialist '*Gypsy policy*' were realistic in their notions about the obstacles in the way of social integration (unemployment, lack of education, prejudices, housing problems etc.) but their paternalistic attitude, the practice and philosophy of '*re-educating*' and the almost perfect reluctance to acknowledge Gypsies as an ethnic group[75] prevented them from achieving wide-ranging and lasting success in '*the time available*'.

Social-economic Transformation and the Gypsies

In Eastern Europe the political transition cannot be interpreted as merely a shift from

dictatorship to democracy or from a planned economy to a market economy. It may be more appropriate to view the transition as an inevitable need and an opportunity to become integrated in the new system of the world economy and power relations[76] or the transformation of an existing social and economic system in the course of adapting to a changing environment.[77]

The massive costs of the transformation in social and human terms alike soon questioned the optimistic prognosis that we would soon catch up with the West[78], since post-communist Eastern Europe was characterised by mass-scale unemployment, growing inflation, massive debts and a 2 to 5 fold increase in poverty.[79]

According to Claus Offe, the specific trait of this region is that the three transformations took place simultaneously. The parallel transformations of the economy, of '*state identity*' (legitimising ideology) and of the political system force Eastern-European states to face an unparalleled mass of difficulties.[80] In the following section I shall review the position and function of Gypsies and '*the images imagined*' about them through the filter of these three dimensions of change. At the time of the political transition '*the Gypsies lost their hard-earned capital, for the second time in this century*'.[81] This statement is equally true of the Roma population of Slovakia and Hungary.

We have mentioned earlier that after the end of the 19th century the industrial revolution and mass production which followed in its wake eradicated the livelihood of Gypsies pursuing small trades such as tub carving and many other branches. Changes in political system and state boundaries made the life of Hungarian Gypsy musicians increasingly difficult.

During the period of state socialism, in parallel with assimilation campaigns of varying intensity, a certain degree of economic and social integration also took place[82], which, however, was unable to prevent the general wave of poverty accompanying market transition hitting the Gypsy communities with dramatic force. According to a comparative survey, Gypsies are two-three times as likely to become impoverished in the period of post-communist capitalism

as the non-Roma. Gypsy poverty is composed of elements such as low education standards, occupational disadvantages and ethnic discrimination[83] – the rate of these factors is rather hard to define.

Since in the five years following 1989 industrial production decreased by 40% in Hungary and 50% in Slovakia[84], Roma people, mostly employed in industry and showing low levels of education, were losing their jobs at an astonishing pace.[85] The rapid impoverishment and marginalisation of the Roma is heavily influenced, apart from the above mentioned factors (structural changes, low education levels, discrimination in the labour market) by a territorial disadvantage. In both Hungary and Slovakia, the Gypsy population are highly over-represented in peripheral areas with a high unemployment rate (mainly the north-eastern and south-western corners of Hungary and Eastern Slovakia).[86]

Poverty, growing way faster among Gypsies than the national average, is becoming increasingly ethnically specific[87] and in many people's eyes Eastern European poverty has a Gypsy face.[88] In the social psychological background of this fact we find partly that '*the material of stereotypes comes from not understanding or misunderstanding that which is different*'[89], and partly that stereotypes, while seemingly increasing the value of the in-group, may also be used to justify differences in access to resources.[90] One of the most frequently used tools in this kind of justification process is prejudice, which claims that the Roma do not want to work. In Slovakia it is a wide-spread view that unemployment among Roma is self chosen and '*that once Communism stopped forcing Roma to work they quit their jobs – that they refuse to work or live "honestly"*'.[91] In Hungary in a 1994 survey 89% of respondents agreed with the following statement: '*The problems of Gypsies would be solved if only they started to work at last*'.[92] In a survey made in 2000, 28% perceived the whole of Hungary's Gypsy population as poor, and rejected the role of external social causes, blaming the Gypsies themselves for their lot.[93] The connection between poverty and the Gypsies as a homogenous '*ethnic, popular*' category is well describedby the theory of '*illusory correlation*'.[94]

Naturally, a negative opinion amidst the general public may be further aggravated and legitimised by thoughtless (or, even worse, by well-thought-out) statements from various opinion formers and leading politicians. The Roma are often presented as undeserving beneficiaries of the social welfare system. According to a statement published in the Slovakian press, '*The Roma are thieves of the social welfare system. They do not want to work. There is no discrimination against them*'.[95] Released from the clutches of the state party, the press now disseminates an image of the Gypsies which is undifferentiated, essentialist and deviancy-oriented and thus plays an important role in the spreading of stereotypes.[96]

Since 1989, social questions have appeared more and more in an ethnic guise.[97] With their sense of safety diminishing, people feel an enhanced need to justify themselves, their in-group and the system, and thus the boundaries between '*Gypsies*' and '*non-Gypsies*' have become more clearly outlined. According to a figure from 2005, 63% of Slovakians (if they had a choice) would oppose Gypsies living in Slovakia, and only 12.2% of them would accept a Roma person for a next-door neighbour.[98] In Hungary the situation is rather similar, only 20.5% of people would willingly live next door to Roma.[99]

Facts related to a difficult social position (e.g. unemployment, many children[100]) and the associated notions (work avoidance, unreliability, lack of motivation, criminal proclivity etc.) are seen by the majority society as ethnic, racial[101], and/or cultural characteristics which characterise Gypsies as a constant over time. Because individuals are rather easily included in the category of Gypsy (skin colour, name, behaviour, lifestyle)[102], these prejudices and stereotypes represent a genuine obstacle in the way of social integration and appear as a considerable psychological burden[103] for Gypsy people.

The Nationalism of the Nation State: the New Legitimising Ideology and the Roma

Exclusion and rejection based on social and economic factors become fixed and reinforced through ethnic stereotypes. Besides the

social psychological processes that form a part of everyday life, it is important to see how the ethnic and national dimensions of group membership gain extra value in the process of the post-communist transition. In Eastern Europe '*the short 20th century*' practically ended the same way as it had begun: with new nation states emerging in the place of former multi-national states.[104]

In the uncertain and restless period which followed the collapse of the state socialist system and the centrally planned economy, the role of collective integration was played by the national idea.[105] Questions of national identity, flooding a former ideological vacuum, may tower over any other issues of identity (e. g. sexual, social, family or local identity). In the process of the post-communist transition and the years that have gone by since then, the national problematic has come into the focus, with its elements colouring every type of political discourse.[106]

Of the two '*ideal types*'[107] of nationhood, the *political nation* and the *cultural nation*, the latter has traditionally been of decisive importance in Eastern Europe.[108] The main difference between the two types lies in their capacity for assimilation. Because a cultural nation sees its national essence as consisting in its mother tongue, the national culture and the national character,

and by way of a membership ideology it resorts to the measure of descent, it only allows for a fragile integration.[109]

National consciousness, with its integrating and legitimising function, needs images of both an external and an internal enemy.[110] The social integration of minorities may be ruled out or slowed down by the presence of national xenophobia which concentrates on the image of the internal enemy, rejects the ideas of multiple identity and which aims to exclude foreigners from their '*own*' already existing state.[111] In such a context it becomes understandable if the previously described homogenous, socially based, deviancy-oriented and ethnically conceived image of the Gypsy receives a further function: the Gypsies appear as an '*internal group*' seen as a social opponent and consolidating national identity by being so.[112]

It is inevitable at this point to speak about the extreme right movements which are presently gaining ground throughout Europe and which may be characterised by similar ideological patterns despite their diverging historical roots. However, while in Western Europe people are mobilised and motivated by xenophobia directed against immigrants, in Eastern Europe the corresponding force appeared after the post-communist transition as a social, economic and identity crisis. The extremists

of the post-socialist states targeted national and ethnic minorities which they turned into scape-goats as well as certain political and social minorities.[113] Racist assaults on the Roma by extremist groups were particularly common in the first half of the 1990's when attacks by skinheads were frequent in both countries. Undocumented cases are probably numerous, judging from the fact that if we project the results of the national, representative Gypsy survey of 1993-94 onto the total Gypsy population which is estimated to be at 424,000, probably as much as 0.9% (3813 persons!) were at some stage exposed to assaults by skinheads.[114]

A further phenomenon which gives ground for concern is that certain extreme right wing parties have grown into serious parliamentary factors over the past twenty years. In Hungary the Party for *Hungarian Life and Justice* (*Magyar Igazság és Élet pártja, MIÉP*) was a member of the Hungarian Parliament from 1998 to 2002; in Slovakia the *Slovakian National Party* (*Slovenská Národná Strana, SNS*) has been active as a parliamentary party with only a short break since 1990, was a member of the governing coalition between 1994-1998 and has been on government again since 2006. Leaders of SNS are renowned for their anti-Hungarian, anti-Gypsy and anti-Semitic statements, but leading politicians of the *People's Party – Movement*

for a Democratic Slovakia (*Ĺudová Strana – Hnutie za Demokraticé Slovensko ĹS – HZDS*), which was in power between 1990-1998[115] also have a similar attitude. In Hungary the '*Movement for a Better Hungary*' (*Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom*) which has grown into a weighty factor in the past few   years, tries to forge political capital[116] through openly racist, anti-Gypsy propaganda, emphasising the issue of '*Gypsy crime*'.[117]

Democratic Transition, Minority Rights, EU Integration and the Roma

In the Slovakian and Hungarian nation states, both of which essentially conceive themselves as a cultural nation, it is a 'natural' process to perceive the heterogeneous category of Gypsies as a people or ethnic group with permanent qualities. In the coming section I present the influences that shape this '*ethnic image of the Gypsy*' in the context of the emergence of the network of democratic institutions, the minority legislation and the European integration process. Owing to the democratic institutional system of the country it has become possible to document the atrocities suffered by the Roma. It has also become vital to do so since after the abolition of the '*police state*', as a result of the economic and social crisis and scape-goat forming mechanisms Gypsy people are exposed to a growing number of verbal and physical assaults.

A scholarly survey of the subject distinguished eight types of the breech of Gypsy rights in Hungary in the ten years since the post-communist transition. Thus, besides violence among the general population, police violence is rather common as are discrimination in education, in the labour market, incidents of Roma being prevented from visiting certain public venues or discrimination in the justice system.[118]

The pluralist media, which enjoys a high degree of freedom, plays a crucial part in generating that predominantly negative image of the Gypsies which serves as the foundation for anti-Gypsy sentiment.[119] According to a piece of research carried out in 1995, the Hungarian press usually writes about the Gypsies as a collection of problems and does not give sufficient attention to how and why their deprived situation emerged.[120]

Both in Hungary and in Slovakia the legal regulations on minorities clearly define the Roma as an ethnic or national minority. In Hungary '*Act LXXVII of 1993 on National and Ethnic Minorities*' recognises the Gypsies as an ethnic minority[121] and allows them to set up minority self-governments.[122] Slovakia lacks a similar comprehensive law to regulate the position of minorities. The extensive rights of national minorities and ethnic groups are encoded in the Constitution of 1992. As regards various laws and international agreements it appears that since 1991 the Roma have been perceived in Slovakia as a national minority.[123] Being '*ethnically recognised*' entails that Gypsy politicians appeared in the public arena and the media. This is clearly a new element in the image of Gypsies since there was no precedent before of anything similar. However, Roma politicians are often perceived in the majority's discourse as either '*the exception that confirms the rule*' or as businessmen engaged in '*ethno-business*'.[124] This is beyond doubt also the result of the fact that in many cases important positions are occupied by persons who lack sufficient training and are easily manipulated, in harmony with the interests of the ruling parties.[125]

The recognition of the Gypsy language (Romani) also confirms the validity of the '*ethnic image*' of the Gypsies, despite the fact that the majority of Gypsy people do not speak Romani. In the European Union it belongs to a special group of non-official languages, that of languages not associated with a territory; while in Hungary and Slovakia it is a legally recognised non-official language.[126]

Since the post-communist transition, the foreign political ambitions of the former state socialist countries are largely determined by European integration. A special feature in this process is when Eastern European Gypsies going to the West in search for work and livelihood come to face the '*Western European image of the Gypsy*'[127] and the way in which the consequences of these encounters appear in Slovakia and Hungary.

In Great Britain both the scholarly and the administrative discourse carry what we termed a '*double Gypsy image*' at the beginning of this paper. Certain scholars, as well as the '*Caravan Site Act*' of 1968 define Gypsies as a life style group (a Gypsy is a person pursuing a nomadic way of life regardless of ethnicity of origin)[128] On the other hand, the Race Relations Act[129] of 1976 conceives the Gypsies as an ethnic and not a social group. In order to resolve this duality, several sources recommend the use of the term: Gypsy/Traveller. Be that as it may, for the members of the majority society Gypsies often appear as an undesirable social group.[130]

In Germany, when Germans say someone leads a '*Zigeunerleben*' (Gypsy life) they are referring to someone with a nomadic, disorderly life-style, despite the fact that the great majority of this ethnic group are not nomadic at all and are extremely meticulous about cleanliness.[131]

The '*migrant*' character of the Gypsy minority appeared as a proof of their '*Europeanness*' in a speech made in 1991 by the Secretary General of the European Council: '*You constitute a truly European people because according to their traditions and definitions the Gypsies are a migrant people who travel from country to country knowing no boundaries within Europe*'.[132] This obviously benevolent remark does little more than employ an ossified stereotype to separate Gypsies from the '*other*' peoples of Europe, taking no heed of the reality of multiple identities and a settled way of life.[133]

Ever since the second half of the 1990's onwards Gypsies from East-European countries have been arriving continually in EU states as well as Canada and the United States. In the majority of cases they apply for asylum as refugees and refer to the negative discrimination they suffered in their country of origin.[134] In the Western countries this process provoked '*hysterical*' articles, as well as rapid discriminative steps to curb the process.[135] For instance, Great Britain prescribed visas for all Slovakian citizens for a while.[136]

Around the end of the 1990's the number of Gypsies applying for a refugee status increased[137] which directed attention to the

position of the Gypsy minorities living in the countries which were then applying for membership. Thus the EU made it a condition that the states improve the situation of their Gypsy population. Such a manifestation of '*double standards*'[138] was mostly to do with the heightened fear of immigration which existed after the enlargement of the EU.[139] This element, inevitably further increased tension between the Roma and the majority, triggering a renewed and intensified process of scapegoat formation.[140]

In Hungary, Roma migration received hardly any publicity until the incident of the emigration of '*the Roma of Zámoly*' (July 2000).[141] The incident had a noisy publicity and as a consequence the topics of Roma migration and the situation of the Roma were much discussed in Parliament and became factors in the clashes of party politics. A number of condemning and even stigmatising speeches were made, even by the responsible cabinet minister, accusing the Roma of Zámoly that they damage the country's reputation.[142] In Slovakia the situation was even more acute because of a high number of Gypsy emigrants when compared to other countries and the obligation to hold visas which emerged as a consequence. It was generally believed that a nomadic way of life is a historically and genetically given characteristic of Gypsies, therefore the migration of the Roma to the West cannot be explained by political circumstances. Ethnic

stereotypes came in perfectly handy for the political management and interpretation of the '*refugee crisis*'. In November 2000, the cabinet minister in charge of minorities and rural development spoke of the migration of the Roma as '*a phenomenon that has existed for centuries*'. Leading politicians declared that the wave of Roma refugees was something that threatened Slovakia's EU membership. Daily papers discussed the issue under headlines such as '*asylum adventure*', '*Roma conspiracy*', '*ethno-business*' or '*ethno-tourism*'.[143]

Naturally, Roma migration has nothing to do with 'the nomadic temperament referred to by racists' but it may be misleading if it is traced back purely to a desperate economic situation or discrimination.[144] Sociological and cultural anthropological research, which perceives Roma emigration as a social and economic instead of an ethnic phenomenon, offers a more nuanced image of the motivations of migration.[145]

Summary

Images about Gypsies are both changing and perennial, and range between the two ideal typical poles of an ethnic/racial and a social definition. The construction of images about the Gypsies are supported by a number of predominantly negative stereotypes which may survive unchanged through centuries, regardless of '*who the Gypsies happen to be*'. The Gypsy policy of state socialism tried to assimilate/ integrate Gypsy people as a backward layer of society but the tenuous results which were achieved over a few decades were swept away at once by the crisis of the post-communist transition, the simultaneity of the '*triple transition*'. Amongst changed economic, political and ideological circumstances, ethnic identities and boundaries have gained a heightened significance and the self-justifying function of stereotypes (of self, in-group or the system) have grown more important. Accordingly, the anti-Gypsy ethnic stereotypes that existed even earlier in the everyday consciousness of the general public (and certain areas of the state organisation) have come to the surface and become parts of the public discourse and political struggles. This time it is the '*social*' element that has become merged with the '*minority*' aspect, and the poverty of those falling behind the majority society has come to be seen as an ethnic issue.[146]

I tend to agree with those researchers who claim that solving '*the Gypsy issue*' purely on the grounds of civil law is not satisfactory. Since, apart from a few exceptions, anti-Roma discrimination is not a legal phenomenon, a strategy aiming at altering the legal context cannot attain lasting results.[147] The politics of '*recognition*' or '*dialogue*' is insufficient in itself; they need to be embedded in an economic and social policy which applies a complex approach to the situation of masses of people living in increasingly disadvantaged regions, struggling with mass-scale unemployment, increasing discrimination and segregation in terms of residence, education and the labour market; and takes effective steps against the stereotyping mechanisms which sustain and confirm a negative image of Gypsies.

Notes:

[1] Cf. Lucassen, Leo: The Power of Definition, Stigmatization, Minoritisation and Ethnicity. In: *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, 27 (1991) 2. 80-91.

[2] See Prónai, Csaba: *Cigánykutatás és kulturális antropológia*. Budapest-Kaposvár, ELTE BTK – Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1995. 9. and Szuhay, Péter: Akiket cigányoknak neveznek – akik magukat romának, muzsikusnak vagy beásnak mondják. In: *Magyar Tudomány*, 42 (1997) 6. 656-678.

[3] The Hungarian term '*cigány*', German '*Zigeuner*' or French '*tsigane*' probably come from the Greek atsinganos which the Byzantines used in order to refer to Gypsies. The origin of this Greek word is still debated – perhaps it originally denoted a heretic sect coming from Asia Minor. In contrast, the English term '*Gypsy*' and Spanish '*gitano*' probably refer to the supposed Egyptian origin of the Gypsies (cf. the Hungarian phrase '*the Pharaoh's people*' used in the 15th-17th centuries.) Cf. Fraser, Angus: A *cigányok*. Budapest, Osiris Kiadó, 2002. 51-52; Liégeois, Jean-Pierre: *Romák, cigányok, utazók*. Budapest, Pont, 2002. 17-18.; BALÁZSI, József Attila: A cigány szó és származékai pejoratív kifejezésekben. In: *Magyar nyelv*, 97. (2001) 3. 313-324.

[4] Cf. Prónai, Csaba: A cigány kultúrák antropológiája. „Transznacionalitás", „multietnicitás", „transzkulturalitás". In: *A tükör két oldala. Bevezetés a kulturális antropológiába*. Ed. by Boglár, Lajos – Papp, Richárd. Budapest, Nyitott Könyvm_hely, 2007. 206-207.

[5] Kemény, István – Janky, Béla – Lengyel, Gabriella: *A magyarországi cigányság 1971–2003* Budapest, Gondolat – MTA ENKI, 2004, 39.

[6] Jurová, Anna: Cigányok-romák Szlovákiában 1945 után. In: *Regio*, 7. (1996) 2. 35-56.

[7] According to Leo Lucassen the concept of Diaspora also includes that the members of the scattered people should feel that they belong to group and have a bond even to those who do not live in the same country. Because this was not characteristic of the Roma until very recently, Lucassen claims that the Gypsies cannot be considered as a Diaspora group. See Lucassen, Leo: A cigányok története nem csak üldöztetések és áldozattá vált emberek története. In: *Amaro Drom*, 12. (2002) 4.

[8] This assumption is confirmed by the external origin of the terms denoting the Gypsies, or the myth of their Egyptian origin ('*the Pharaoh's people*'). The assumption of Indian origins can be traced back to the work of a Hungarian vicar, István Vály, who studied at the university of Leiden in the second half of the 18th century and there met three students from Ceylon (Sri Lanka). Since he discovered a similarity between the languages of these students and the Gypsies of his home country, he questioned these young men about their mother tongue and compiled a glossary of over 1000 words. FRASER, Ibid. 2002. 178. Vály's results were published in 1776 by Lutheran pastor Sámuel Augustini ab Hortis. Augustini ab Hortis, Sámuel: *A magyarországi cigányok mai állapotáról, különös szokásairól és életmódjáról, valamint egyéb tulajdonságairól és körülményeiről. [1775–1776.]* Budapest

– Gödöllő, Györffy István Néprajzi Egyesület – Magyar Néprajzi Társaság – SZIE GTK, 2009. 257-261. On relations between the individual Gypsy communities and the Indian ancestral homeland, see: BINDER, Mátyás: "Three-fold Identity?" The ethnical and national identity of the Hungarian Boyash Gypsies. In: *European Union, Nations and National Minorities. International Scientific Conference*. Ed. by Bodó, Barna. Kolozsvár, Scientia, 2008. (forthcoming); Binder, Mátyás: Egy beás cigány közösség etnikai és nemzeti identitásáról. In: *Kultúra és Közösség*, 12. (2008) 2. 5-16; Okely, Judith: *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983.

[9] See Hancock, Ian: The East European Roots of Romani Nationalism. *Nationalities Papers*, 19. (1991) 3; Fosztó, László: Van-e cigány nemzettudat? In: *Társadalmi önismeret és nemzeti önazonosság Közép-Európában*. Ed. by Fedinec, Csilla. Budapest, Teleki László Alapítvány, 2002; Fosztó, László: Diaspora and Nationalism: an Anthropological Approach to the International Romani Movement. In: *Regio. A rewiev of Studies on Minorities, Politics, and Society* (2003) 102-120; Lucassen, Leo: A cigányok története nem csak üldöztetések és áldozattá vált emberek története. In: *Amaro Drom*, 12. (2002) 4; Binder, Mátyás: Roma Nation-Building – A Historical and a Cultural Anthropological Cross-section. In: *Self-organising Utopias*. Ed. by Bozsó, Péter. Budapest, Eszmélet Press Foundation, 2008. 129-156.

[10] For instance the circular symbol or assumed Indian origin which is seen in the middle of the Roma flag. The various elements of this flag have attracted various explanations. According to one common explanation, '*besides the traditional blue and green colours in the middle we find the red wheel (the 16 spoke chakra). Blue is the colour of the sky and of heaven. Green is that of the earth which is organic and growing. Blue refers to eternal values, green to those in this world. The central wheel is the symbol of movement and change. The national flag of India also has a chakra in the middle*'. (www.romaart.hu)

[11] In Romani the word *Gadjo* (gazho, gadjo, giorgo) means a non-Gypsy person.

[12] Okely, Ibid. 1983. 8-15.

[13] Cf. Nagy, Pál: Civitas Zingarorum. In: *Amaro Drom*, 10. (2000) 8.

[14] Nagy, Pál: *„Fáraó népe" A magyarországi cigányok korai története (14–17. század)*.Pécs, PTE BTK, 2004. 135-136.

[15] Nagy, Ibid. 2000.

[16] The area of present-day Slovakia was part of '*historical Hungary*' until 1918.

[17] Nagy, Pál: Cigány csoportok és az együttélési modellek változásai a Kárpát-medencében a 15–20. században. In: *Történelemtanárok (17.) Országos Konferenciája 2007. október 13–14.* (www.tte.hu/_public/ttorszkonf/nagypal2007_jegyzetekkel.pdf) 6-7.

[18] Nagy, 2004. 134.

[19] The concept of the '*culture of poverty*' comes from anthropologist Oscar Lewis. See Lewis, Oscar: A szegénység kultúrája. In: *Kultúra és Közösség*. 15. (1988) 4. 94-105.

[20] See Stewart, Michael Sinclair: Depriváció, romák és „underclass". In: *Beszélő*, 6. (2001) 7–8. 82-94; Ladányi, János – Szelényi, Iván: Van-e értelme az underclass kategória használatának? In: *Beszélő*, 6. (2001) 11. 94-99; Ladányi, János–Szelényi, Iván: A kirekesztettség változó formái. Közép- és délkelet-európai romák történeti és összehasonlító szociológiai vizsgálata. Budapest, Napvilág, 2004; Szuhay, Péter: A magyarországi cigányság kultúrája: etnikus kultúra vagy a szegénység kultúrája. Budapest, Panoráma, 1999; Horváth, Kata: Éhség-szövegek. A szociológia, a média és egy cigány közösség éhség-interpretációi. In: *Cigány világok Európában*. Ed. by Prónai, Csaba. Budapest, Nyitott Könyvm_hely, 2006. 103-123; Džambazovic, Roman and Jurásková, Martina: A romák társadalmi kirekesztettsége és szegénysége Szlovákiában. In: *WEB társadalomtudományi folyóirat* (2003) 11. 41-46; Binder, Mátyás – Pálos, Dóra: A kisebbség kisebbsége és a szegénység kultúrája? Szélsőséges egyenlősdi egy erdélyi magyar cigány közösségben. In: *Néprajzi Látóhatár*, 18. (2009) 3-4.

[21] Ladányi, János – Szelényi, Iván: Ki a cigány? In: *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok*. Ed. by Horváth, Ágota – Landau, Edit – Szalai, Júlia. Budapest, Új Mandátum, 2000. 179-191; Ladányi, János – Szelényi, Iván: Az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról. In: Horváth – Landau – Szalai, Ibid. 2000. 203-209; Havas, Gábor – Kemény, István – Kertesi, Gábor: A relatív cigány a klasszifikációs küzdőtéren. In: Horváth – Landau – Szalai, Ibid. 2000. 193-201.

[22] Roma people experience a sharp divide between the feeling that the identity they are ascribed by non-Gypsies is unbearable and the sense of identity with their own group. Csepeli, György – Örkény, Antal – Székelyi, Mária: Hogyan lesz egy ember cigány? In: *Kritika*, 28. (1999) 3.

[23] On ethnic classification see, e.g. Eriksen, Thomas Hylland: Etnikai osztályzás: mi és ők. In: *Szöveggyűjtemény a nemzeti kisebbségekről*. Ed. by Kántor, Zoltán – Majtényi, Balázs. Budapest, Rejtjel, 2005. 148-157, on the way in which categorisation determines identity see: Jenkins,

Richar: Az etnicitás újragondolása: identitás, kategorizálás és hatalom. In: Kántor – Majtényi, Ibid. 2005.127-147, on the way in which these processes influence Gypsies see: Lucassen, Leo: The Power of Definition, Stigmatization, Minoritisation and Ethnicity. *The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, 27. (1991) 2. 80-91; Pálos, Dóra: „Cseperedünk". Egy beás cigány közösség önstereotipizálási folyamatairól. In: *Mindennapi előítéleteink. Társadalmi távolságok és etnikai sztereotípiák*. Ed. by Bakó Boglárka – Papp Richárd – Szarka László. Budapest, Balassi – MTA ENKI, 2006. 91-119.

[24] Hancock, Ian: *We are the Romani people. Ame sam e Rromane džene*. University of Hertfordshire Press, 2002. 20.

[25] In a constructivist approach, ethnic identity is '*a requisite of social organisation and not a vague expression of culture*'. Barth, Fredrik: Régi és új problémák az etnicitás elemzésében. In: Regio, 7. (1996) 1. 3-25. As regards ethnic groups, it is not worth talking about them as if they were internally homogenous real entities with sharp outlines or permanent collectives. See: Brubaker, Rogers: Ártalmas állítások. Mítoszok és tévképzetek a nacionalizmuskutatásban. *Beszélő*, 1. (1996) 7. 26-41; Keményfi, Róbert: Az etnicitás fogalma és helye az etnikai térszerkezeti kutatásokban. In: *Kisebbségkutatás*, 11. (2002) 2. 376-383, The emphasis is on the situational and contextual character of ethnicity. Sokolovskii, Sergey – Tishkov, Valery: Ethnicity. In: *Encyclopedia Of Social And Cultural Anthropology*. Ed. by Barnard, Alan – Spencer, Jonathan. London, Routledge, 290-295.

[26] There are four aspects from which it is advisable to approach acculturation: integration, assimilation, marginalisation and separation. Powerful identification with both groups (the ingroup and the majority) may be a presaging sign of integration, while if there is no identification with either group, we are talking of marginalisation. Exclusive identification with the majority culture entails assimilation, while if a person identifies only with the ethnic group, we are seeing a case of separation. John W. Berry's theory is quoted by: Pálos, Dóra: *Cigány énkép és identitás egy önbeszámolókon alapuló vizsgálat tükrében*. Szakdolgozat. (manuscript) Budapest, ELTE PPK, 2009. Even a single person may be observed as employing different strategies of acculturation in different fields of life.

[27] '*Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups...*' Berry, John W. – Poortinga, H. Ype – Segall, Marshall H. – Dasen, Pierre R.: *Cross-Cultural Psychology. Research and Applications*. Cambridge, University Press, 2002. 349.

[28] *A cigányok. Három korai tanulmány*. Ed. by Magyar, László András. Budapest, Orpheusz, 1998. 13.

[29] Deáky, Zita – Nagy, Pál: Augistini ab Hortis Sámuel és a cigányok történeti-néprajzi kutatásának kezdetei. In: Augistini Ab Hortis, Sámuel, Ibid. 2009. 5-28.

[30] Editors of the volume '*Racism in Science*' believe that the power of the different scholarly disciplines to shape society and politics can be most clearly seen these days in overestimation of ethnic differences and the covert legitimisation of the category of race. Kende, Anna – Vajda, Róza: Bevezető. Tetten ért tudomány. In: *Rasszizmus a tudományban*. Ed. by Kende, Anna – Vajda, Róza. Budapest, Napvilág, 2008. 7-30.

[31] Prónai, Csaba: Kulturális antropológia és cigánykutatás. In: *Kultúra és Közösség*, 12. (2008) 2. 43-48.

[32] Willems, Wim – Lucassen, Leo: The Church of Knowledge. Representation of Gypsies in Dutch Encyclopedias and Their Sources (1724-1984). In: *100 Years of Gypsy Studies. Papers from the 10th Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore Society*. Ed. by Salo, Matt T. Cheverly-Maryland, The Gypsy Lore Society, 1990. 31-50.

[33] Goldberg, David Theo: A faji tudás. In: Kende – Vajda, Ibid. 2008. 100-131.

[34] Prónai, Ibid. 1995. 10.

[35] Dupcsik, Csaba: A magyarországi cigányvizsgálatok cigányképe', in Kántor – Majtényi, Ibid. 2005. 479-499. Further distortions may come from the '*methodological Eurocentrism*' which considers the Euro-centric (white, middle-class etc.) values which reign in the different disciplines as bearing universal value. Goldberg, Ibid. 2008. 100-101.

[36] Bindorffer, Györgyi: Sztereotipizáció az interetnikus kapcsolatokban. In: Bakó – Papp – Szarka, Ibid. 2006. 9-35.

[37] Cited by Jost, John T. – Banaji, Mahzarin R.: A sztereotipizálás szerepe a rendszer igazolásában, a hamis tudat képz_dése. In: Jost: *Önalávetés. A társadalmi rendszerigazolás pszichológiája*. Budapest, Osiris Kiadó, 2003. 29-61.

[38] Hamilton, David L.: A sztereotípiák megértése: elméletek és problémák történelmi perspektívában. In: *Sztereotípiakutatás. Hagyományok és irányok*. Ed. by Hunyady, György – Nguyen, Luu Lan Anh. Budapest, ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2001. 13-21., Bindorffer, Ibid. 2006., Jost – Banaji, Ibid. 2003. 37.

[39] Banaji, Ibid. 2003. 44.

[40] It is a well-known fact that a negative identity is the characteristic psychological trait of all discriminated minorities which may in certain cases go as far as self-loathing. Cf. Csepeli – Örkény – Székelyi, Ibid. 1999.

[41] The essence of the justification of the system is that people show a willingness to attribute to themselves or others traits, both negative and positive, which are in harmony with their social standing, rather than question the rules and legitimacy of the system which had led to the emergence of the existing social system. Jost – Banaji, Ibid. 2003. 45-46.

[42] West, C.: A modern rasszizmus genealógiája. In: Kende – Vajda, Ibid. 2008.

[43] Jelloun, Tahar Ben: *A rasszizmus, ahogy a lányomnak elmagyaráztam*. Budapest, Ulpiusház, 2003.

[44] Csepeli, György: Beteljesült rajtunk az utópia bosszúja. In: *Mozgó Világ*, 24. (1998) 1. 31-42.

[45] Csalog, Zsolt: Etnikum? Faj? Réteg? Adalékok a „cigányság" fogalmához. In: *Világosság*, 14. (1973) 1. 38-44.

[46] At the time the Kingdom of Hungary comprised, among other parts, the whole of contemporary Slovakia and the Western parts of Romania (Transylvania). (Data from 1891; territory: 325 411 square km; population: 17 448 274).

[47] The survey produced a very heterogeneous image of Gypsies in terms of both religion and language. Those who lived a settled way of life usually followed the religion of the local majority population while among nomadic Gypsies the majority were Greek Orthodox, which usually indicates a Transylvanian or Romanian origin. As far as mother tongue is concerned, 30% of Gypsies spoke Romani, 38% Hungarian, 24.4% Romanian and 7.5% some other language. See: Hermann, Antal: *A Magyarországon 1893. január 31-én végrehajtott czigányösszeírás eredményei. Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*. Budapest, Athenaeum R. Társulat, 1895.

[48] Kemény, István: Előszó. In: *A romák/cigányok és a láthatatlan gazdaság*. Ed. by Kemény, István. Budapest, Osiris Kiadó – MTA KI, 2000. 9-37, The greatest number of Gypsy blacksmiths probably lived in the counties which today belong to Slovakia. Mann, Arne B.: A szlovákiai romológiai kutatások áttekintése. In: *Lokális cigány közösségek Gömörben. Identitásváltozatok marginalitásban*. Ed. by Prónai, Csaba. Budapest, MTA ENKI, 2005. 7-20.

[49] Kemény, István: Az 1893. évi cigány összeírás. In: *A magyarországi romák*. Ed. by Kemény, István. Budapest, Útmutató, 2000. 11-12.

[50] Guy, Will: Ways of Looking at Roma: The Case of Czechoslovakia. In: *Gypsies. An interdisciplinary reader*. Ed. by Tong, Diane. New York, Garland, 1998. 13-68.

51 Industrialisation marginalised the trades of Gypsy blacksmiths and nail-smiths; the commencement of mass-production reduced demand for the products which were their chief source of livelihood (such as tubs, wooden dishes, baskets, brooms, rush carpets, bags or cauldrons) and the traditional Gypsy services (cauldron mending, pot-mending, reed-work) also declined. See Kemény, Ibid. 2000a.

52 On the connections between Hungarian national identity and the '*Hungarian music*' performed by Gypsy musicians ('*verbunkos*') as well as Hungarian '*nóta*' songs, their development and social scientific background see: Sárosi, Bálint: *Cigányzene…* Budapest, Gondolat, 1971., Kállai, Ernő: A cigányzenészek helye és szerepe a magyar társadalomban és a magyar kultúrában. In: *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből*. Ed. by Kovács Nóra – Osvát Anna – Szarka László. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 2002. 327-345.

53 Guy, Ibid. 1998. 19.

54 The 1952 edition of the Dictionary of the Czech Language defines '*gypsy*' as follows: '*gypsy* [with a small „g"] – *member of a wandering nation, a symbol of mendacity, theft, wandering,* […] *jokers, liars, impostors and cheaters*.' Cited by Kalvoda, Joseph: The Gypsies of Czechoslovakia. In: *Nationalities Papers*, 19. (1991) 3. 269-296. It was in an effort to control '*wandering Gypsies*' that special '*black*' ID cards were introduced in Hungary in the 1950's. (By this time nomadic Gypsies had practically disappeared from Hungary.) The measure was described as an act of racism even by the resolution which cancelled it in 1961. Purcsi Barna Gyula: Fekete személyi igazolvány és munkatábor. Kísérlet a cigánykérdés „megoldására" az ötvenes évek Magyarországán? In: *Beszélő*, 6. (2001) 6.

55 The majority of Gypsies arriving in the Czech parts lived a settled life and looked for work who returned for short periods of time to their home in Slovakia whenever they could. See Guy, Will: Czech lands and Slovakia: another false dawn? In: *Between past and future. The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ed. by Guy, Will. University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001. 285–323.; Jurová, Anna: A szlovákiai romák Csehszlovákiában az 1945 és 1947 közötti időszakban'. In: *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 10. (2008) 1. 95-124.

56 Jurová, Ibid. 2008. 96-105.

57 According to Stalin's definition, '*A nation is a historically emerged, lasting community of people which developed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and culture and the resulting psychological constitution*'.

Sztálin, V. I.: Marxizmus és nemzeti kérdés. In: *A nemzeti kérdésről. A nemzeti kérdés lenini elméletének alakulása 1896–1914*. Ed. by Zalai, Edvin. Budapest, Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 265-285.

58 Sághy, Erna: Cigánypolitika Magyarországon 1945–1961. In: *Regio*, 10. (1999) 1. 16-35.

59 Barany, Zoltan: *A kelet-európai cigányság. Rendszerváltás, marginalitás és nemzetiségi politika*. Budapest, Athenaeum 2000, 2003. 121., 126-127.

60 Barany, Ibid. 2003. 122.

61 Jurová, Ibid. 1996.

62 Mann, Ibid. 2005. 11.

63 Klímová, Ilona: Romani political representation in Central Europe. An historical survey. In: *Romani Studies*, 12. (2002) 2. 103-147.

64 *A magyarországi cigánykérdés dokumentumokban 1422–1985*. Ed. by Mezey, Barna. Budapest, Kossuth, 1986.

65 Szuhay, Péter: Az egzotikus vadembertől a hatalom önnön legitimálásáig. A magyarországi cigányokról készített fotók típusai. In: *Beszélő*. 7. (2002) 7–8. 97-106.

66 Mezey, Ibid. 1986. 257.

67 According to British social anthropologist Michael Stewart, who has been doing research in Hungary since the mid-1980's, in the eyes of state socialism the model of complete assimilation is described by the following formula: (Gypsy) + (socialist labourer + flat) = (Hungarian worker) + (Gypsy folklore). Stewart, Michael Sinclair: *Daltestvérek. Az oláhcigány identitás és közösség továbbélése a szocialista Magyarországon*. Budapest, MTA Szociológiai Intézet, 1994. 71.

68 Mezey, Ibid. 1986. 264.

69 Cf. Kovats, Martin: A Jó, a Rossz és a Csúf. A romapolitika három arca Magyarországon. In: *Eszmélet*, 8. évf. (1996) 32. sz. 133-136.

70 Binder, Mátyás: „Felébredt ez a nép…". A magyarországi romák/cigányok etnikainemzeti önszerveződési folyamatairól. In: *A múlt feltárása – előítéletek nélkül*. Ed. by Gergely, Jenő. Budapest, ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, 2006. 61-81.

71 Csalog, Ibid. 1973. 43.

72 Csalog, Zsolt: *Kilenc cigány*. Budapest, Kozmosz, 1976.

73 Dupcsik, Ibid. 2005. 481.

74 Naturally, stereotypes were at work not only in everyday interaction but also in the various segments of the state organisation. In Hungary, e.g., in the 1980's a separate branch of the police were employed in handling '*Gypsy crime*'. TAUBER, István: Mit érdemel az a bűnös... In: *Amaro Drom*, 5. (1995) 5.sz. 8-10, Sociological research in the 1970's highlighted that the '*selection mechanisms*' of the education system

often used the code of a '*biologically based pathology*' to classify the sociological deprivation of Gypsy or low-class children and thus these children were placed in the category of '*mildly mentally retarded*', implying all the customary consequences of such categorisation (special schools, deprivation of the opportunity of further studies). Berkovits, Balázs – Oblath, Márton: Ki nevel a végén? Rendszerváltás és az „értelmi fogyatékosság" diskurzusai. In: *anBlokk*, 1. (2008) 1–2. 29-41.

75 Jurová, Ibid. 1996, Nagy, Ibid. 2007; Ethnic/national identity is something I consider highly important because, regardless of the state's attitude, the general public mostly categorised the Gypsies as a national or racial category and certainly not as Hungarians or Slovaks. The absence of denial of an ethnic (and valuable) culture is thus a further element in the image of Gypsies held by non-Gypsies which does not help assimilation, only tries to force it. After the post-communist transition the policy of ethnic recognition became characteristic which, marginalising the social and economic causes of the '*problem*', again proved unable to offer constructive solutions. (For more on this subject see the section Democratic transition, minority rights, EU integration and the Roma.

76 Laki, László: Honnan hová jutottunk? Kísérlet a rendszerváltás szociológiai értelmezésére. In: *Tekintet* (2009) 1. 3-26.

77 Lomax, Bill: A tranzitológia válsága. A kelet-európai változások és a tranzitológiai elmélet. In: *Rendszerváltás és társadalomkritika*. Ed. by Krausz Tamás, Budapest, Napvilág, 1998. 307-315.

78 See the chapter by Eszter Bartha in the present volume.

79 Krausz Tamás: Kelet-Európa konzervatív forradalmai. Fordulat Kelet-Európában: mítosz és valóság', in Krausz, Tamás: *Megélt rendszerváltás. Publicisztikai írások. 1989–1994*. Budapest, Cégér Kiadó, 1994. 29-52; Ladányi, János – Szelényi, Iván: Szegénység a posztkommunista átmeneti id_szakban. In: *Az elemző: Közép és kelet-európai politikai és gazdasági szemle*, 1. (2005) 2. 123-140.

80 Offe, Claus: Demokratikusan tervezett kapitalizmus? A demokráciaelmélet szembesítése a kelet-közép-európai hármas átmenettel. In: *Szociológiai Szemle*, (1992) 1. 5-21.

81 Csalog, Zsolt: A cigányság a magyar munkaerőpiacon'. In: *Szociológiai Szemle*, (1993) 1. 29-33.

82 Under the influence of forced industrialisation, by 1970 85.2% of active age Gypsy males found employment. Kemény, Ibid. 2000a. 20. In Czechoslovakia the corresponding ratio was

66% in 1970 and 75% in 1981. See: Zoon, Ina: A társadalom peremén. A romák és a közszolgáltatások Szlovákiában. In: *Regio*, 13 (2002) 2. 129-165.

[83] Ladányi – Szelényi, Ibid. 2004. 151.

[84] Hofbauer, Hannes – Komlosy, Andrea: Tőkefelhalmozás és a gazdasági fejlődés dilemmái Kelet-Európában. In: *Rendszerváltás és társadalomkritika*. Ed by Krausz, Tamás. Budapest, Napvilág, 1998. 87-114.

[85] At the end of 1993 in Hungary the rate of persons in employment in the age group of 15-59 year-old men was 64% and in the total Gypsy population it was 29%. See: KEMÉNY, Ibid. 2000a. 25. In Slovakia, the employment rates of Gypsies decreased radically in parallel with growing unemployment and the rate of the jobless is four times higher among the Gypsies than the rest of the population. ZOON, Ibid. 2002. 130.

[86] Kertesi, Gábor: A cigány foglalkoztatás leépülése és szerkezeti átalakulása 1984 és 1994 között. Munkatörténeti elemzés'. In: *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 47. (2000) 5. 406-443; Jurová, Anna: Romóvia v procesoch transformácie, problémy, ohrozenia. In: *Národ a národnosti na Slovensku v transformujúcej sa spoločnosi – vztahy a konflikty*. Ed. by Šutaj, Štefan. Prešov, Universum, 2005. 257-271; Džambazovic – Jurásková, Ibid. 2003. The situation was further exacerbated by the fact that because Gypsies were given no land, or hardly any, during the great land allocation era before the socialist period, after the political transition most of them, although they were mostly rural dwellers, were not granted any landed property, contrary to the majority population.

[87] Ladányi – Szelényi, Ibid. 2005.

[88] Cf. Kligman, Gail: A „másság" társadalmi felépítése: a „roma" azonosítása a posztszocialista közösségekben. In: *Szociológiai Szemle*, (2001) 4. 66-84.

[89] Csepeli, György: Cigányok és gádzsók. Romakép a magyar társadalomban. http://www.csepeli.hu/pub/2008/csepeli_ciganyok_gadzsok.pdf (28.09.2009)

[90] Eriksen, Thomas H.: *Etnicitás és nacionalizmus. Antropológiai perspektívák*. Budapest – Pécs, Gondolat – PTE, 2008; Jost – Banaji, Ibid. 2003.

[91] Guy, Ibid. 2001. 296.

[92] Csepeli, Ibid. 2008. 10.

[93] Székelyi, Mária – Örkény, Antal – Csepeli, György: Romakép a mai magyar társadalomban. In: *Szociológiai Szemle*, (2001) 3. 30.

[94] Illusory correlation emerges when the association of the '*minority*' with '*undesirable behaviour*' drives the observer, a member of the majority, to the conclusion that the two phenomena occur more frequently in conjunction than is actually the case in reality. Csepeli, Ibid. 2008. 4.

[95] Zoon, Ibid. 2002. 162. On the social and economic exclusion and ethnic discrimination affecting the Roma see e.g.: Csepeli, Ibid. 2008; Székelyi – Örkény – Csepeli, Ibid. 2001; Zoon, Ibid. 2002; Džambazovic – Jurásková, Ibid. 2003.

[96] Cf. Vicsek, Lilla: Cigánykép a magyar sajtóban (1995. március-június). In: *Szociológiai Szemle*, (1997) 3.

[97] Hofbauer – Komlosy, Ibid. 1998. 113.

[98] Benkovič, Boris: Rómovia optikou verejnej mienky. In: Šutaj, Ibid. 283-291. The rate of Slovaks rejecting the Roma as next-door neighbours was constantly over 80% between 1991 and 2000. Deegan-Krause, Kevin: Uniting the Enemy: Politics and the Convergence of Nationalisms in Slovakia. In: *East European Politics and Societies*, 18. (2004) 4. 651-696.

[99] Székelyi – Örkény – Csepeli, Ibid. 2001. 22.

[100] Inappropriate formulations about the '*fertility*' of the Roma population in scientific publications with an intention of objectivity can enhance prejudice and engender fears of a rapidly growing Gypsy population in members of the majority society. Neményi, Mária: Kis roma demográfia. In: *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok*. Ed. by Horváth, Ágota – Landau, Edit – Szalai, Júlia. Budapest, Új Mandátum, 2000. 277-282. In all demographic calculations the Roma are a '*qualified*' population, meaning that it is the environment who determines whether a person is a Gypsy or not. By virtue of this, sinister demographic forecasts can only give us an idea of the possible future number of persons '*pursuing a Gypsy way of life*' if the current tendencies of segregation and exclusion prevail. In an essay written in 2000 Hablicsek prognosticated that by 2050 the Gypsy population would be around 900,000 in contrast to current estimates which speak of between 500 and 600 thousand. Hablicsek, László: Kísérlet a roma népesség előreszámítására 2050-ig. In: Horváth – Landau – Szalai, Ibid. 2000. 243-275. Populist parties also do their best to play the ethnicdemographic card – according to an earlier utterance by the current Slovakian governing party, SMER, '*in only two generations the Roma will be in a majority in Slovakia.*' See: Vadász, Rezső: Roma-kérdés és EU-tagság: a szlovák „dupla vagy semmi." *Kisebbségkutatás*, 10. (2001) 4. 82-84. Quite to the contrary, the past few decades have ushered in a time of '*demographic revolution*' among the Roma, the number of births per capita is declining, particularly in areas where social conditions are better. See: Jurová, Ibid. 1996. 37-38. The common stereotype of the '*Gypsies who breed fast*' distorts genuine social processes. The growing ratio of the Roma population is caused partly by the decreasing fertility rate of the non-Gypsy population and partly by the fact that the fertility rate of the Gypsies is higher than that of the majority society even though in itself it is also a *decreasing* fertility rate. See Hablicsek, Ibid. 2000.

[101] The racial approach is not used very frequently in the public discourse, but it is used in a confused sense when they speak of inherited, general ethnic cultural characteristics. I am thinking of statements such as '*all right, it is not in his blood but in his culture*'.

[102] According to Csepeli et al. in contemporary Hungarian society practically anyone may be declared a Gypsy in spite of their will, as the key of the qualification is in the hands of people who certainly do not qualify themselves as Gypsies. Csepeli – Örkény – Székelyi, Ibid. 1999.

[103] Not to mention physical violence fuelled by racist feeling.

[104] Anderson, Benedict: *Elképzelt közösségek. Gondolatok a nacionalizmus eredetéről és elterjedéséről*. Budapest, L'Harmattan, 2006; Brubaker, Rogers: *Nacionalizmus új keretek között*. Budapest, L'Harmattan, 2006.

[105] Hroch, Miroslav: A nemzeti mozgalomtól a nemzet teljes kifejlődéséig: a nemzetépítés folyamata Európában. In: *Nacionalizmuselméletek (szöveggyűjtemény)*. Ed. by Kántor, Zoltán. Budapest, Rejtjel, 2004. 230-247. Eric Hobsbawm also believes that the increase in ethnically based political activity in the former socialist countries is due to social disorientation. Hobsbawm, Eric: Etnikai identitás és nacionalizmus. In: *Világosság*, 34. (1993) 4. 19-28.

[106] Hofer, Tamás: Harc a rendszerváltásért szimbolikus mezőben: 1989. március 15-e Budapesten. In: *A rendszerváltás forgatókönyve. Kerekasztal-tárgyalások 1989-ben. Alkotmányos forradalom. Tanulmányok. VII. kötet*. Ed. by Bozóky András. Budapest, Új Mandátum, 2000. 627-650; Lázár, Guy: kisebbségek szerepe a nemzeti identitás kialakulásában. In: *Regio*, 6. (1995) 1–2. 28-63; Szabó, Ildikó: Rendszerváltás és nemzeti tematika. In: *Politikatudományi Szemle*, 14. (2005) 2. 89-110.

[107] Cf. Niederhauser, Emil: Egy történész reflexiói a nemzetre vonatkozó elméleti kérdésekről. In: *Regio*, 13. (2002) 4. 131-137.

[108] Kovač, Dušan: *Szlovákia története*. Pozsony, Kalligram, 2001; Niederhauser, Emil: *A nemzeti megújulási mozgalmak Kelet-Európában*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977.

[109] Csepeli, György: *Nemzet által homályosan*. Budapest, Századvég, 1992.

[110] Deegan-Krause, Ibid. 2004; Lázár, Ibid. 1995.

[111] Hobsbawm, Ibid. 1993. 22.

[112] Lázár, Ibid. 1995. 58.

[113] Bayer, József: A jobboldali radikalizmus előretöréséről. In: *Jobboldali radikalizmusok tegnap és ma. Tanulmányok.* Ed. by FEITL, István. Budapest, Napvilág, 1998. 147-156.

[114] Kertesi, Gábor: Megalázottak és megszomorítottak. Cigány emberek beszámolói az őket ért sérelmekről és megaláztatásokról az 1993/94. évi, országosan reprezentatív cigányvizsgálat megkérdezettjei közül. In: *Esély: társadalom- és szociálpolitikai folyóirat*, 7. (1996) 3. 48-61.

[115] Hamberger, Judit: A szlovák parlamenti szélsőjobb: a Szlovák Nemzeti Párt. In: *Szlovákokról és csehekről – magyar szemmel*. Ed. by Hamberger Judit. Pozsony, Kalligram, 2000. 318-329; Hamberger, Judit: Nem alternatíva, hanem szükségszerűség – a szlovákok kacskaringós útja az Európai Unióba. In: *A huszonötök Európái*. Ed by Kiss, J. László. Budapest, Osiris, 2005. 826-854; Zoon, Ibid. 2002. 161-162.

[116] In affiliation with the *Jobbik* party an organisation called the *Hungarian Guard* is regularly organising intimidating demonstrations and encouraged the so far un-explored anti-Gypsy assaults of the recent past, all of which are the consequences of a highly negative image of the Gypsies, of the economic recession, the efficiently organised propaganda of the extreme right, of social dissatisfaction and the feebleness of the political will.

[117] While it was clearly the result of crude prejudice to assume a connection between criminality and ethic identity, surveys carried out in Hungary at various times (1930's, 1982) have shown that the extent of criminality is no higher whatsoever among the Gypsies than among non-Gypsy social groups of a similar status. See e.g.: POMOGYI, László: A század elejétől 1945-ig. In: *A magyarországi romák*. Ed. by Kemény, István. Budapest, Útmutató. 12-16; Tauber, Ibid. 1995. Owing to massive impoverishment after the transition, there has probably been an increase in the number of Gypsy and non-Gypsy criminals in grave conditions. As the Roma are over-represented among the poor, playing up the '*illusory correlation*' between criminality and the Roma (see footnote No. 94) is an excellent weapon in the hands of the extreme right. In fact the separate registration of Gypsy criminals was abolished in Hungary in 1989 and it is still not permitted to record the ethnic identity of criminals. The situation is similar in Slovakia, except for the period between 1994 and 1998 when extreme right wing party SNS, then in government, attained that the ethnic identity of criminals be

treated as publicly accessible information. Hamberger, Ibid. 2000. 326.

[118] Prónai, Csaba: Áttekintés a magyarországi romákat ért jogsérelem és a roma jogvédelem irodalmáról (1990–2000). In: *Kisebbségkutatás*, 12. (2003) 2. 374-383.

[119] In Hungary, on the one hand, media surfaces showing extreme right views are in great supply, on the other hand there are three different undesirable attitudes emerging with regard to the extreme right: over-dramatisation, belittlement and support. Barta, Judit: A szélsőjobboldali tematika kezelése a magyar médiában. In: *Médiakutató*, (2008) 4. In Slovakia, as we have seen, extreme right, populist parties are constantly present in Parliament, including politicians who do not belong to any of the extremist parties but often make anti-Roma statements in order to reap political success. Cf. Halász, Iván: A romák jogi helyzete Szlovákiában és Csehországban. In: *Merre visz az út? A romák politikai és emberi jogai a változó világban*. Ed. by Majtényi, Balász. Budapest, Lucidus, 2003. 207-239; Zoon, Ibid. 2002. 161-165; Guy, Ibid. 2001. 299-300.

[120] Vicsek, Ibid. 1997. In the media, which are a powerful means of socialising and orienting people, and particularly on television, Gypsies are usually seen in roles which are in harmony with the expectations of justifying the system and do not question the validity of stereotypes.

[121] The act does not name ethnic minorities by name, but in effect it refers to groups which do not have a mother country, which only allows us to include the Roma and the Rusin minority. See: Majtényi, Balázs – Majtényi, György: Állami romapolitikák. In: *Pro Minoritate*, (2005) 3. 69-109.

[122] The emergence of Gypsy minority self-governments was part of the process whereby governments place the emphasis not on improving the life conditions of the Roma but on negotiating with '*representatives of the independent Roma ethnicity*'. According to Martin Kovats this is the great paradox of Roma policy in Hungary, since the institutional-organisational approach, and thus the '*official*' discrimination of the Roma came in the foreground precisely at a time when their social and economic position worsened dramatically. See Kovats, Ibid. 1996; Kovats, Martin: The political significance of the first National Gypsy Self-government in Hungary. In: *Contemporary Politics*, 6. (2000) 3. 247-262. In her analysis of the subject Julia Szalai points out the foreign political motives behind the minority act (meeting the expectations of the '*western norms*', position of the Hungarians living in minority outside Hungary's borders) and also highlights that in fact the minority

self-government does not have any more power than any Hungarian citizen who addresses the authorities. Szalai, Júlia: Az elismerés politikája és a „cigánykérdés". A többség-kisebbség viszony néhány jelenkori problémájáról. In: Horváth – Landau – Szalai, Ibid. 2000. 531-571.

[123] Halász, Ibid. 2003. 225.

[124] Székelyi – Örkény – Csepeli, Ibid. 2001.

[125] In Hungary the majority of leading Roma politicians has drifted into the sphere of influence of one of the larger parties and they lack autonomous image of their own. See: Kovats, Ibid. 1996. In Slovakia, in the period between 1994–98 the government headed by HZDS supported the Roma in setting up political parties and used them as a device in halting the political organisation of the Hungarian minority. Vermeersch, Peter: Brüsszel és a kisebbségi politika alakulása Szlovákiában: a romák helyzete. In: *Pro Minoritate*, (2003) 2. 21-40.

[126] Lanstyák, István: Az Európai Unió nyelvpolitikája és a Szlovákiában beszélt nyelvek. In: *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, (2004) 6. 43-66.

[127] Western European thinking frequently identifies Gypsy culture with being a nomad, despite the fact that most European Gypsies have lived a settled way of life for a long time. See: Acton, Thomas: Egység a különbségben. In: *Cigány Néprajzi Tanulmányok* 2. Ed. by Bódi, Zsuzsanna. Budapest, Mikszáth, 1994. 89-98.

[128] Fraser, Ibid. 2002. 11.

[129] On cases of the application of this act with a relevance to Gypsies see: Kovács, A. Gy.: A romák helyzete és a faji kapcsolatokról szóló törvény gyakorlata Nagy-Britanniában. In: Majtényi, Ibid. 2003. 133-186.

[130] Tóth, Kinga Dóra: *Sikeres cigányok identitása Angliában és Magyarországon*. Budapest, L´Harmattan, 2008.

[131] Tebutt, Susan: Sinti and Roma: From Scapegoats and Stereotypes to Self-Assertion. In: *Sinti and Roma. Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature*. Ed. by Tebutt, Susan. New York-Oxford, Berghan Books, 1998. 9-23.

[132] Cited by Majtényi, Ibid. 2003. 30.

[133] According to experts, no more than 10% of European Gypsies can be termed migrants. Jaróka, Lívia: 'Cigányok „Fókuszban", avagy média és antropológia „akcióban". In: *Cigány világok Európában*. Ed. by Prónai, Csaba. Budapest, Nyitott Könyvm_hely, 2006. 124-131.

[134] Kováts, András: A Magyarországon élő romák migrációja. In: *Roma migráció*. Ed by Kováts András. Budapest, MTA KI, 2002. 13-33.

[135] See e. g.: Jaróka, Ibid. 2006; Kovács, Ibid. 2003. 165; Tebutt, Ibid. 1998. 12.

[136] Vašecka, Imrich – Vašecka, Michal: Recent Romani Migration from Slovakia to EU Member States: Romani Reaction to Discrimination or Romani Ethno-tourism? In: *Nationalities Papers*, 31. (2003) 1. 27-45.

[137] This increase varied from country to country. Between 1994 and 1999 the number of applications for asylum submitted per year grew almost double in the case of Poles while among Slovaks it grew seven times higher. The number of Hungarian asylum-seekers did not increase in the period. See: Kováts, Ibid. 2002. 19.

[138] The '*shared*' minority policy of the European Union contains expectations which mainly challenge the countries currently intending the accede rather than the existing member states. See: Majtényi, Ibid. 2003. 48.

[139] Vermeersch, Ibid. 2003. 25.

[140] Kováts, Ibid. 2002. 14.

[141] Hell, István: A zámolyi romák – az út Strasbourgig. In: Kováts, Ibid. 2002. 91-105.

[142] Bognár, Katalin – Kováts, András: A roma migráció a magyar sajtóban. In: Kováts, Ibid. 2002. 106-121.

[143] Vašečka – Vašečka, Ibid. 2003., Vermeersch, Ibid. 2003.

[144] Stewart, Michael Sinclair: Előszó. In: Kováts, Ibid. 2002. 7-12.

[145] There is no space here to present in detail the research findings, however, it seems certain that the highest number of Roma emigrants come not from urban areas rather than the poorest rural communities, in both Slovakia and Hungary. See: Kováts, Ibid. 2002; Vašečka – Vašečka, Ibid. 2003.

[146] Szalai, Ibid. 2000. 539.

[147] Ladányi – Szelényi, 2000c.; Stewart, 2001.