



How European Cities Craft Immigrant Integration. Something to Learn

Edited by

Giovanna Zincone and Irene Ponzio

Italianeuropei

FOUNDATION FOR EUROPEAN
PROGRESSIVE STUDIES
FONDATION EUROPÉENNE
D'ÉTUDES PROGRESSISTES



policy makers is to intervene promptly. Second, conflicts on the housing market could have been avoided, if ownership of the non-profit association had been transferred to the municipal public housing company.

In Langwasser the structural conflict between the city's planning sovereignty and the residents' "property rights" concerning the control of the neighbourhood of their houses evolved into a migrant-majority conflict due to a lack of pre-emptive communication with the residents by the city. This way, irrational fears developed, which were reinforced and exploited by anti-immigrant agitation by neo-Nazi groups. Counter mobilization against the anti-immigrant forces and careful actions taken by the project weakened the campaign against the garden.

Three major policy recommendations emerge from the Langwasser conflict. First, presuming that intercultural gardens are a successful integration project in themselves proved to be a very superficial policy transfer by the municipality. Conditions for importing best practices have to be carefully studied and taken into account. Second, citizen participation in neighbourhood projects is crucial to their success, and migrant integration projects are no exception. Third, the media play a crucial role in the success (or otherwise) of integration projects. Municipalities should have a strategy for communicating integration policies.

NOTES

¹ Migration background is defined as a person either having migrated her/himself or being the direct descendant of at least one parent who has migrated. *Statistischer Monatsbericht für Dezember 2010*, in “Statistik Nürnberg Fürth”, M396, 27 January 2011, available on www.nuernberg.de/imperia/md/statistik/dokumente/veroeffentlichungen/berichte/monatsberichte/2010/statistik_aktuell_2010_12.pdf.

² Research for this article was carried out as part of the European Integration Fund project Concordia Discors: Understanding Conflict and Integration Outcomes of Inter-group Relations in Selected Neighbourhoods of Five European cities (see www.concordiadiscors.eu). The project was coordinated by the Forum Internazionale ed Europeo di Ricerche sull’Immigrazione (FIERI) of Turin.

³ *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Stadt Nürnberg 2010*, in “Statistik Nürnberg Fürth”, January 2011, available on www.nuernberg.de/imperia/md/statistik/dokumente/veroeffentlichungen/tabellenwerke/jahrbuch/jahrbuch_2010.pdf.

⁴ R. Smutny, *Die Werderau in Nürnberg. Territoriales Verhalten in einer im Wandel befindlichen Werkssiedlung*, Dissertation Friedrich-Alexander-Universität of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen-Nuremberg 2004.

⁵ M. Sherif, C. W. Sherif, *Social Psychology*, Harper & Row, New York 1969.

⁶ H. Esser, *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen. Band 2: Die Konstruktion der Gesellschaft*, Campus, Frankfurt and New York 2000.

⁷ M. Sherif, C. W. Sherif, *op. cit.*

⁸ H. Esser, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

Giovanni Picker

Policy Logic and the Spatial Segregation of Roma in Europe. The Cases of Florence and Cluj-Napoca

This chapter examines the relations between housing policies for Roma and the segregation of Roma in European cities. Based on ethnographic research carried out between 2008 and 2011, it looks comparatively at two local policies; the first is the planning and construction of a peripheral “nomad camp” in Florence (Italy), the second is the relocation of 56 families to a polluted area on the outskirts of Cluj-Napoca (Romania). After discussing strategies, objectives, motivations and underpinning principles of each policy, four recommendations to policymakers and practitioners are put forward.

Introduction

About 6 million Roma are estimated to live within the borders of the European Union, and about twice as many in Europe as a whole. They constitute the largest, the youngest and the most vulnerable European minority. In a 2012 study, the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency and the United Nations Development Programme reported that about 90% of Roma in Europe live in households with an income below the poverty line.¹ The study made clear that one of the key disadvantages affecting Roma is the precariousness of their housing conditions, and – strictly related to that – spatial segregation.

Giovanni Picker, Post-doc, Center for Advanced Studies, Faculty of Sociology, Higher School of Economics, Moscow.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines segregation as «the separation or isolation of a race, class, or ethnic group by enforced or voluntary residence in a restricted area, by barriers to social intercourse, by separate educational facilities, or by other discriminatory means».² Hence, segregation can be either enforced or voluntary. In the case of Roma, recent research by the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency³ shows that segregation is not voluntary but only enforced by: government policy, economic pressure, local government or private action. European governments' policies can play a key role not only in granting all citizens equal rights and access to housing, but also – particularly in times of economic downturn – in enacting spatial segregation. Similarly, local governments in Europe often opt for policies addressing Roma which, instead of encouraging social inclusion and *mixité sociale*, achieve quite the opposite.

Drawing on ethnographic research carried out in 2007-2008 in Florence (Italy) and in 2008 and 2011 in Cluj-Napoca (Romania), this chapter aims to shed light on the segregating outcomes of local housing policies addressing Roma, and puts forward a few policy recommendations for more inclusive and sustainable policy outcomes. In particular, the empirical analysis will focus on the issues analysed during my fieldwork, namely the “policy logic”, i.e. the strategies, objectives, motivations and underpinning principles of local housing policies for Roma.

The chapter is organized into three sections. The first section provides an overview of the UN, European and national policy frameworks concerning housing and the Roma. The second section focuses on the cases of Florence (Italy) and Cluj-Napoca (Romania), in which specific housing policies addressing Roma have had outstanding segregating effects. On the basis of the existing policy framework and of the two case-studies, in the third section four policy recommendations are put forward.

The UN and European policy frameworks

Housing is one of the social rights granted by the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the decades following the Declaration, international law has defined the right to housing in greater detail. One of the main steps in this definition process was “General Comment 4”, adopted by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1991. This outlined, through the seven criteria for adequate housing, that the right to housing includes more than mere access to a shelter: namely, security of tenure; adequate services, materials, infrastructure; affordability; habitability; accessibility; location, and cultural adequacy.

The first Roma-focused UN document was “General Recommendation No. 27: Discrimination against Roma”, adopted in 2000 by the Officer of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Articles 30 and 31 of the Recommendation, under the heading “Measures to improve living conditions”, respectively invite governments:

«To develop and implement policies and projects aimed at avoiding segregation of Roma communities in housing; to *involve Roma communities and associations* as partners together with other persons in housing project construction, rehabilitation and maintenance» (article 30; emphasis added).

«To act firmly against any discriminatory practices affecting Roma, *mainly by local authorities and private owners*, with regard to taking up residence and access to housing; to act firmly against *local measures denying residence to and unlawful expulsion of Roma*, and to *refrain from placing Roma in camps outside populated areas that are isolated and without access to health care and other facilities*» (article 31; emphasis added).

Article 30 introduced the important idea of involving Roma communities and associations in the implementation of housing

measures, and article 31 underlined, once again, the role of local authorities in carrying out discriminatory practices. Since the 1960s the European Union has produced various policy texts to improve the social conditions of Roma, including housing. On a more general level, one of the most crucial issues that the EU has been encouraging is the recognition of Roma as a national minority.⁴ Although diversified according to each national system, including Roma among the recognized national minorities would create the structural conditions for combatting discrimination; this would include: the promotion of Romani cultural traits including Romani language in private and public educational curricula and in the public sphere; a wide range of public cultural activities under the patronage of the state concerning Romani history and language; the promotion and protection of Romani NGOs.⁵

Minority status is probably the most notable difference between Romania and Italy, i.e. the two countries under scrutiny in this chapter. While in Romania Roma have been recognized as a national minority since the adoption of the 1991 Constitution, in Italy they lack this status.

Florence. Peripheral camps as policy tool

One of the major consequences of the lack of minority status is the extreme difficulty of producing a realistic estimation of the number of Roma in Italy. According to a very general estimate they account for 200,000 people, i.e. 0.3% of the national population. From 1945 to the end of the 2000s, the Italian government did not directly draft and/or implement systematized and coherent policies explicitly addressing Roma.⁶ The only measure which the Italian government carried out in that period was a 1965 agreement with the national non-Romani NGO, Opera Nomadi.⁷ The agreement established Opera Nomadi as the only national-level institution in charge of the education of Romani children.

Policies addressing Roma in Italy have principally been drafted at regional level. From the early 1980s to the early 1990s, 12 out of 21 regions passed as many regional laws addressing Roma and Sinti (hereafter R&S). All of these regional laws are similar to each other, and one of the priorities that they establish is to provide proper housing for R&S, often called nomads in the text of the laws. In 1988 the Region of Tuscany passed the first law addressing R&S (law 17/1988), entitled “Interventi per la tutela dell’etnia rom” (Interventions for the Protection of Roma Ethnicity). Article 1 stated the goal of the law: «The Region dictates the norms aiming at the preservation (*salvaguardia*) of the Roma cultural patrimony, at avoiding impediments to the right to nomadism (*nomadismo*) and at granting the right to halt within the regional territory; it also aims to avoid impediments to the fruition of social and health services».

In view of this goal, the only housing tool that the law envisages is the camp, and two types of camps are mentioned: camps for R&S who intend to halt and stay more than thirty days (halting camps for “sedentary” people, *campo sosta per sedentarizzati*), and camps for R&S who only intend to halt for a period of less than thirty days (halt-transit camps, *campo sosta transito*).

From both the text of the law and the debates in the Regional Council that preceded the vote on the bill it is possible to infer that Tuscan policymakers defined Roma not as subjects whose political, social and economic rights should be protected, but only as entities belonging to one single “nomadic culture”, which was considered in need of protection. This culture-oriented approach presents two problematic aspects. Firstly, it is a blunt misrecognition, because the vast majority of Yugoslav Roma who arrived in Florence had never followed a nomadic lifestyle; secondly, the «right to halt within the regional territory» cannot be viewed as a “real right”, because it is not protected by either the Constitution, or by a state law. At the

end of this section the implications of both these problematic aspects for envisaging new reforms will be discussed.

One piece of evidence for this culture-oriented approach is a statement by the president of the Fourth Regional Commission, which proposed and discussed the bill before voting on it: «This law is a product of our culture, and it could not be otherwise. Thus, we stem from this in order to reflect something we discussed today, because the fact that it is a product of our culture does not mean that it should overwhelm other cultures, which are currently in our Region».⁸

Without a national framework protecting Roma cultural rights, the definition of Roma as a different “culture” – and, more generally, a culture-oriented approach – seems to have had a very specific impact on both socio-political dynamics involving R&S, and on the subsequent regional laws addressing R&S. As a result of the law, in spring 1988 the first camp, called Oلماتello, was built on the extreme outskirts of Florence, which is Tuscany’s regional capital and has a population of 370,000 inhabitants. The camp initially hosted Yugoslav Romani families in precarious socioeconomic conditions, and until 1991 their living conditions were relatively bearable. However, with the passing of time, and the outbreak of the Bosnian war (1992), several new Yugoslav Romani families joined the camp, and the city administration decided to intervene. In winter 1993 the Oلماتello camp was fenced in with a concrete wall; an infirmary and a prefabricated building for toilets were set up, and electricity was installed. A security lodge was also installed at the entrance of the camp.

Due to the increasingly precarious conditions of Oلماتello, in 1995 the Regional Council decided to draft another regional law for R&S amending the previous one. The 73/1995 law, which is entitled “Interventions for the Roma and Sinti peoples”, did not embrace the camp as the only housing solution for Roma. However, the aim of the law was very similar to that of the previous

one, namely, to «preserve the Roma cultural patrimony and the R&S identity, in order to *facilitate communication between cultures*, to grant the right to a nomadic life, to the religious practice, and to halt and stay within the regional territory. Moreover the right to enjoy the access to social, health and school services is granted» (article 1; emphasis added).

As can be noted, this law introduces a major new aim, namely «to facilitate communication between cultures». While this accent on communication appears to be a novelty, it does not seem to break with the first law's culture-oriented approach. On the contrary, considering the ever increasing instability of material and social conditions under which immigrant Roma were arriving and organizing their housing, an emphasis on culture in such a key policy document as the regional law, appears rather astonishing. I will come back to the emphasis put on "culture" in the last part of this section; let me now briefly account for the continuity in approach to housing for Roma, between the 1988 law and 2007 (namely the year in which I carried out ethnographic research among civil servants dealing with Roma in Florence).

In spring 2007, while interviewing a civil servant in charge of Olmatello, she told me: «Once I was struck by what a Roma living in the camp told me: "If I don't get a job I will go away", and he left for Germany. I would never be able to leave like that, from one day to the next. This is the point: maybe they have this travelling sense in their blood, which makes it easy for them to travel».

Opinions about Roma being intrinsically different from "us", and innately "nomads" were widespread among the civil servants with whom I met regularly. And indeed this notion of Roma as nomadic is blatantly false. It is estimated that less than 5% of Roma living in Italy leads what could be defined as a "nomadic" way of life. Certainly, it would be wrong to consider the majority of Roma coming from Kosovo in the 1980s or 1990s to be

nomads. However, as mentioned previously, nomadism was the main pillar on which the first regional law for Roma was based, and the culture-oriented approach adopted in the first law persisted in the second one (i.e. law 76/1995).

Over time, Roma in Florence started organizing themselves into associations, the first of which was founded in 1992 and called CIDAMEN. In the late 1990s a group of Roma became involved in consultation with an important local housing think tank, Fondazione Michelucci, and as a result of these consultations, a new regional law was proposed. From these evolutions, in 2000 a third regional law (2/2000) was passed amending the previous one. Although this law perpetuates the idiom of “culture” and “right to nomadism”, it introduces two new developments with regard to housing: the rehabilitation of old public and/or private buildings for social uses (article 4), and the use of social housing, as provided for in the immigration law. Within the framework of these two legislative innovations, NGO Arci and regional authorities carried out the so-called “Progetto Toscana” (Tuscany Project), which resulted in 110 Romani persons within the regional territory gaining socioeconomic independence. This socio-legal framework also made it possible for municipal authorities to shut down the Olmatello camp in summer 2012, allowing the 140 people who were still living there to move to different public and private housing solutions.

As discussed in this section, the culture-oriented approach was the principle trend from the late 1980s to the mid/late-2000s in representations of Roma by Tuscan policymakers. It was this approach which influenced policy decisions and measures concerning housing, ultimately making it possible for a peripheral “Roma camp” to stay in place for twenty-four years. This approach indicates a major paradox that can be found in all twelve regional laws addressing Roma in Italy: the protection of culture, “Roma culture”, without state guarantees. Indeed, the right to nomadism and to halting within the regional territory that all

laws recognize is nothing more than an informal right, because it is protected neither by the Constitution nor by state laws. The alleged “cultural right” to nomadism referred to in all regional laws for Roma proves that simply officially recognizing Roma as a national minority would grant them real cultural rights, meaning entitlements which would be properly protected by a court, including the right to decide what constitutes “Roma culture” and what – like nomadism – ceased long ago to form part of the Roma’s experiences.

Although the Olmatello camp was shut down, spatial segregation in Florence persists. Poderaccio is an informal, non-fenced peripheral settlement in which Yugoslav Romani families found shelter in the late 1990s. In 2004 it was renamed “Poderaccio village” after the local council replaced shacks with small wooden houses, and today it hosts about five hundred Romani persons.

Cluj-Napoca. Modular housing near a rubbish dump as policy tool

According to the 2011 census, there are 619,000 Roma in Romania, i.e. about 3.2% of the national population. Other estimates, such as the one made by the UNDP, report a figure of 1,500,000 people, since it is believed that many Roma fear stigma and prejudice in disclosing their ethnic belonging. One of the fundamental consequences that the recognition of Roma as national minority has on policymaking is the fact that no policy – besides those covered by minority status, such as teaching Romani language in schools and providing consultation to political and administrative authorities – can be explicitly addressing Roma unless it comes under ethnic discrimination.

I will now present the findings of my ethnographic research, conducted intermittently from spring 2008 to summer 2011 in Cluj-Napoca (310,000 inhabitants, of which less than 1% is

Roma), the capital of Transylvania, on the city administration's attitudes vis-à-vis local Roma. Here I will focus on the only municipal measure which has directly targeted local Roma over the last decade. In mid-December 2010, the city administration relocated 270 Romani people, i.e. 56 families, living in Coastei Street, in the centre, to a polluted industrial area called Pata Rât, near the municipal rubbish dump on the extreme outskirts of the city. 22 families had been squatting, while 18 were residing there legally; 16 families who were also occupying the site illegally were given cardboard and pieces of wood to build their own makeshift shelters by the dump. Prior to making an empirical analysis, it seems necessary to point out that Cluj-Napoca is one of Romania's most crucial hubs for foreign investment, and one of the country's most dynamic cities, with about 100,000 students attending the prestigious local university. An increasing phenomenon in all fast-growing post-socialist cities is that western companies and corporations need large portions of land to set up their headquarters and offices. This makes the value of land in the region very high, especially in the city centre, and Cluj is no exception.⁹

The official reason for evicting the legally residing families too was that they were living in unhealthy conditions and that their neighbours had made repeated complaints (see municipal directive 127/2010). On 10 May 2011, following protests by the relocated Romani families and various activist groups, the mayor of Cluj, Sorin Apostu, declared: «The evacuation from Coastei Street has been carried out, due to the fact that the tenants' way of life had sparked many controversies regarding the inhabitants of the area, including the children among them, as well as regarding the very meaning that our city has in Romania and abroad».¹⁰

Interested in understanding the underpinning worldviews, official and unofficial motivations, as well as the material outcomes of the relocation policy, in 2011 I carried out semi-structured in-

terviews with the civil servants who were in charge of the relocation measure. The civil servant who coordinated the entire relocation depicted the situation in a way that was shared by all the interviewees:

«The problem of Roma citizens in Coastei Street is an old one. First there were four flats, which were owned by the municipality and rented out to some families – these included Romanian and Romani families. We relocated 40 families, of whom 18 were in *relucatiune tacita* [meaning they had already regularly paid to the municipality part of the rent in advance for a certain period of time] while 22 were abusively occupying the municipal property. (...) But you should consider that those flats were unhygienic and inadequate for a decent life in Cluj-Napoca municipality, with regard to general public health laws. It was a potential risk for public health. Moreover, with the passing of time, their number swelled and they started developing major prejudices vis-à-vis other Clujeans. (...) What happened? We granted them some land, we built modular housing units, and when this housing was completed, we asked the Roma living in Coastei to apply for this new housing».

All in all, 270 people were relocated, but the 40 families selected, who received modular housing units, amounted to 201 people. The remaining 69 individuals (16 families) did not receive modular units. They were given pieces of wood and metal in order to build their own housing facilities close to the modular houses.

Later during the interview, I told her that I had seen the unhealthy conditions at the rubbish dump, and asked her if she thought that the relocated Romani families had benefitted from the relocation, and she replied: «You should also look at who the people targeted by this policy are. I wonder, what is their *mentality*? That's because a public policy can be very good, but if it's not applicable, meaning that the people for whom it is designed to be implemented see reality in a completely different way... then everything becomes complicated».

An accent on Roma's alleged "mentality" emerged not only in the interviews I conducted in 2011, but also in those with civil servants in 2008. More generally, the opinions about Roma shared by local civil servants attribute the ultimate cause of the Roma's social marginality to the Roma's alleged mentality.¹¹ Mentality here means the radically backward, uncivilized and unchangeable state in which Roma supposedly live. As the director of the technical office told me while we were talking about the relocation: «Every year we go to Cantonului Street [another Roma settlement close to the dump] to clean up. In Coastei Street we cleaned up only after the relocation, because we knew people would have moved. *We try to civilize them, but we can't manage it*». According to a study carried out in November 2012 among the relocated families, «the average living space among the relocated families is 4.01 square meters, and each available bathroom is shared by at least 17 people; there is no plumbing in any of the modular homes and no hot water; the average income has fallen by 30%, and 28% of all working adults who were working before the relocation are now out of work»; finally, the damage which the relocation caused to these persons' health proved to be outstanding.¹²

In this section I showed that what seemed to be a necessary and sustainable solution for the local authorities, due partially to unlawfulness and partially to the questionable hygienic conditions in which some of those 56 Romani families were living, ended up having serious segregating outcomes. In particular, I indicated that the policymakers who took the decision to relocate those families expressed specific representations of the policy recipients as being "different" (as the first interview excerpt confirms) and "uncivilized" (as the second excerpt confirms). This means that the policy logic was influenced by those representations and, given the outcomes of exclusion, those representations have very likely played a major role in policymaking.

Conclusions. Recommendations on housing policymaking for Roma

Both housing policies for Roma which I have examined in this chapter, i.e. the construction and persistence of Olmatello camp in Florence and the relocation in Cluj-Napoca of 56 Romani families to modular houses near a rubbish dump, enacted spatial segregation. In doing so, they failed the criteria for adequate housing set by the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1991. Given the fact that 90% of Romani families in Europe live below the poverty line, on the basis of both the UN and European frameworks, and the two case studies, it seems advisable to look for innovative and more sustainable housing policies addressing Roma. To this end, I would like to put forward four recommendations for policymakers and practitioners.

First recommendation: if ethnic/cultural difference plays a role in housing policies for Roma, let Roma decide what role

Both case studies presented here and many others across Europe show that when it comes to policies for Romani families, cultural specificity plays a role in the policymaking process; and that cultural specificity has been arbitrarily imposed on the Roma, without any consultation with them on their own identity, habits, lifestyle and desired alternative housing conditions. In all member states there are active Romani NGOs, associations, and even national and local agencies, such as the Romanian National Agency for Roma (ANR). It is advisable that policymakers working on Roma-related policies create the conditions, through egalitarian dialogues with Romani collectives, in order to let them play a leading role in decision-making processes.

As seen in the case of Florence, it was not until the late 1990s that local authorities became influenced by Romani NGOs, and it was precisely such influence that allowed more effective and appropriate housing solutions. While prior to consulting the Roma, re-

gional authorities imposed peripheral camps in the name of an alleged – and largely invented – “nomadism”, consulting with Roma brought about a radical, positive shift in housing solutions (although it did not diametrically shift perceptions of nomadism). However, Florence is an isolated case in Italy; only three Regions have amended their laws for Roma thus shifting partially from camp policy to more differentiated housing solutions. Therefore, at national level, it is highly advisable to follow the EU recommendation to officially recognize Roma as a national minority. Only this measure would institutionalize the role of Romani NGOs as consultants to policymakers, both at regional and at national level, thus paving the way for making joint decisions the rule. In Romania, in practical terms this means ceasing to take decisions without engaging in egalitarian consultations with local/national Romani NGOs, first and foremost the National Agency for Roma’s representatives.

Both official recognition as a national minority (e.g. in Italy) and the practical enforcement of existing minority status in decision-making processes (e.g. in Romania) would have positive consequences in terms of citizenship rights. As shown in the two case studies, approaching Romani people as being nothing but bearers of a different “culture” (Italy) or as “uncivilized” (Romania) is likely to translate into policies with exclusionary outcomes. In contrast, viewing Roma as citizens of the state with their own cultural rights, which they themselves identify and define, would create the concrete conditions for Roma to be addressed by policies which, by recognizing citizenship rights and not by leaning on arbitrary and unofficial cultural definitions, could produce effective and sustainable inclusionary outcomes.

Second recommendation: learning from past experiences; things can be done differently Each type of policy measure concerning Romani families’ housing has precedents. As shown in the case of Tuscany and Florence, camps for Roma in Italy have seri-

ously jeopardized their chances of gaining an equal status in urban and regional society. Planning to push Roma into fenced or non-fenced peripheral areas, as for instance the Rome municipality is currently doing by implementing the so-called “Piano nomadi” (Nomads Plan), directly leads to spatial segregation. Only by revising its own policy did the Tuscany Region change its strategy from a camp policy to differentiated housing solutions for Roma. Over the past five years relocation policies targeting Romani families have been steadily implemented in Romanian cities both large and small.¹³ Today, this seems a failure, if seen in terms of the standards of equality and non-discrimination that the European Union is inviting member states to meet on a permanent basis.¹⁴

Third recommendation: planning integrated social policies

Meeting the United Nations’ seven fundamental criteria for adequate housing means considering the whole social context in which policy recipients (Roma families) live, namely employment, education, and health. Indeed, spatial segregation, as seen in the Romanian case study, has serious consequences in terms of job loss and deterioration of living standards. This practically means considering the needs and situations of each family case by case, such as the location of their place of work, their schools and their general practitioner; the conditions and costs of public transport, and the adequacy of the area. Indeed, without shops, welfare services, workplaces, leisure and meeting places, etc. at a reasonable distance – as in both case studies presented here – family life can easily become unsustainable.

The Italian policy discussed in this chapter did indeed integrate work and housing. However, according to the culture-based approach that was adopted, the only jobs that the policy envisaged, such as craftsmanship and manual work, were informed by the policymakers’ own flawed, erroneous image of “nomadic people”. Moreover, none of the nomad camps planned by the Italian Regions was at a reasonable distance from supermarkets or

markets. In the Romanian case, the relocation policy was extremely compartmental, attributing no relevance whatsoever to reasonable distance from supermarkets, schools and workplaces, and not even to the health of policy recipients, given that the new housing is located close to a landfill and a rubbish dump.

Fourth recommendation: using all available EU funds for housing policies for Roma

In both Florence and Cluj-Napoca none of the local policymakers I spoke to was aware of the large amount of EU initiatives for the social inclusion of Roma. As a result, the financial resources that they thought were available did not include several European Union funds for social inclusion and development. Over the past year all member states have adopted a National Strategy for Roma Social Inclusion. In its invitation to draft the Strategy, the European Commission has stressed that «up to €26.5 billion of EU funding is allocated to support Member States' efforts in the field of social inclusion, including to support efforts to help the Roma»¹⁵ and that this money will come from several EU sectors, including the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development; the European Regional Development Fund; the EU technical assistance to member states, and the European Progress Microfinance Facility.

Moreover, two further (non-financial) resources are recommended: the European Economic and Social Committee, which would provide a platform of possible intermediate agencies for implementing the Strategy; and the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion, a relatively new innovation-based approach for social inclusion policies. Using all available financial and non-financial resources would enlarge the spectrum of housing possibilities and enrich the overall process of sustainable, mature and efficient policymaking for Roma in an age of economic downturn and social insecurity, in which 90% of them currently live in radically deprived socioeconomic conditions.

NOTES

¹ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and United Nations Development Programme, *The Situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States. Survey Results at a Glance*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg 2012.

² www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/segregation.

³ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, *Housing Conditions of Roma and Travellers in the European Union. Comparative Report*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg 2009.

⁴ See, *inter alia*, Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe Resolution 125 (1981) with which member states are invited «to recognise Romanies and other nomad groups such as the Samis as ethnic minorities and, consequently, to grant them the same status and advantages as other minorities may enjoy; in particular concerning the respect and support of their own culture and language» (article 14, II), available on www.wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=331990&SecMode=1&DocId=673530&Usage=2; and the Resolution of the European Parliament of 9 February 1994: «whereas the linguistic diversity of the European Union is a key element in the Union's cultural wealth», after stating the necessity to protect and promote minority languages, «(...) in relation to non-territorial autochthonous languages (e.g. the Roma and Sinti languages and Yiddish) calls on all relevant bodies to apply *mutatis mutandis* the recommendations set out in this resolution», available on www.ciemen.org/mercator/UE23-GB.HTM.

⁵ See Council of Europe, *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, available at conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/157.htm; for the case of Italy, see also P. Bonetti, *I nodi giuridici della condizione di Rom e Sinti in Italia*, in P. Bonetti, A. Simoni, T. Vitale (eds.), *La condizione giuridica di Rom e Sinti in Italia*, Giuffrè, Milan 2012, pp. 15-126.

⁶ In 2008 the government declared a “state of emergency” in relation to nomad camps, in which notoriously only Roma live. This included also a census which was carried out by collecting biometric

data. For an in-depth analysis of this policy, see G. Picker, *Nomads' Land? Political Cultures and Nationalist Stances vis-à-vis Roma in Italy*, in M. Stewart, M. Rövid (eds.), *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Romany Studies*, Central European University Press, Budapest 2010, pp. 11-227.

⁷ Non-Romani NGO means that the NGO was not founded nor is it managed by Romani people.

⁸ Consiglio Regionale della Toscana, *Consultazione della IV commissione sulla proposta di legge n. 175: Interventi per la tutela dell'etnia rom* (typescript), 1987, p. 28.

⁹ N. Petrovici, *Excluderea muncitorilor din centrul Clujului. Genetificare într-un oraş central-european*, in "Sociologie Românească", 3/2007, pp. 42-70.

¹⁰ *În numele tatălui Basescu, al fiului Boc si al sfântului Apostu Sorin*, in "Ziarul de Cluj", 17 May 2011, available on www.zcj.ro/pagini/detalii-stire/browse/4/inapoi/pe-urmele-lor/articol/pd-se-intoarce-pe-partea-cealalt259.html.

¹¹ I discuss this issue at length in G. Picker, "Țiganu-i tot Țigan". *Verbal Iconicity and Urban Marginality in a Post-Socialist European Town*, in "Civilisations. Revue internationale d'anthropologie et de sciences humaines", (forthcoming).

¹² European Roma Rights Centre, *Taken from the City. Romanian Roma Evicted to a Rubbish Dump*, European Roma Rights Centre, Budapest 2012, pp. 6 *et passim*.

¹³ C. Berescu, *The Rise of the New European Roma Ghettos: A Brief Account of Some Empirical Studies*, in "Urban Research and Practice", 3/2011, pp. 344-52.

¹⁴ Publications about best practices of policies for Roma in Europe are burgeoning. For the case of Italy, see T. Vitale, *Politiche possibili. Abitare la città con i rom e i sinti*, Carocci, Rome 2009.

¹⁵ European Commission, *An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020*, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions, COM(2011) 173 final, Brussels 5 April 2011, p. 9.

