

Article history: Received 30 June 2015; accepted 30 October 2015

‘Roma’ migration in the EU: the case of Spain between ‘new’ and ‘old’ minorities

Tina Magazzini*
Stefano Piemontese ♦

Abstract

The 2004 and 2007 EU Eastern enlargements facilitated the mobility of citizens from CEE countries, including European citizens of Roma ethnicity, which in turn contributed to the Europeanization of the ‘Roma issue’. This article examines the politics of Roma ethnicity by giving a concise, yet we hope comprehensive, overview of how recent Roma migrations from EU Member States (particularly from Romania) to Spain can be understood and analysed in relation to both pre-existing policies for the Spanish Gitano communities and to wider European dynamics and structures.

Keywords: Roma migration; diversity management; Gitanos; integration; ethnopolitics; Spain

Introduction

In recent years, no other ethnic minority in Europe has received the same kind of attention from the academia than the Roma¹. Following the migration flows in the 1990s from ex-Yugoslavia, but even more in the aftermath of the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargement to Central and Eastern European states, Romani studies have shifted from a prevalently anthropological matter to a more interdisciplinary approach. This approach has seen the merging of fields such as migration research and European policy-making.

* Tina Magazzini, Human Rights Institute, University of Deusto, Bilbao, Spain and School of Global Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom. E-mail: tina.magazzini@deusto.es

♦ Stefano Piemontese, Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Hungary and Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain. E-mail: piemonteses@ceu.edu

¹ The usage of the term Roma has been the subject of intense debates both among scholars and policy makers (Matras 2013; Surdu 2015). ‘Roma’ is tautologically used by European policies to refer to a range of different groups commonly known as Gypsies, Travellers, Manouches, Ashkali, Sinti and Boyash that are identified as ‘Roma’. Although we do not use it in brackets, in this article the term ‘Roma’ should be always understood as a politically constructed expression. For the purpose of simplification this article uses the term ‘Roma migrants’ to refer to Romanian or Bulgarian individuals identified or who self-identify as *Tigani* or *Tsigani* living in Spain. The term Gitano(s) is used, instead, to refer to the Spanish Roma or *Caló* population. We use the formulation ‘Gitano/Roma’ when referring to the Spanish policies for Gitanos, because these policy schemes have been adopting the EU discourse on ‘Roma’ as such, identifying Gitanos as ‘Roma’, and targeting also non-Spanish Roma coming from other European countries.



Within this strand of research, the main goal of this paper is to understand how academic research and policies for ‘new’ Roma minorities draw upon, challenge, or complement traditional approaches to ‘old’ Roma minorities. We ask ourselves what the criteria for the comparisons we have to make between ‘old’ and ‘new’ Roma are, and whether we should deal with Roma migration on its own, or understand it in terms of wider structures.

We begin by giving a bird’s eye view of the increasingly complex landscape of Romani westward migration in Europe in terms of political rights, legal statuses, recognition, cultural identity and access to social security. We then move on to make explicit the kind of theoretical and practical consequences that the policies for ‘old Roma’ present with respect to the new Roma migrants by analyzing the Spanish case. We consider Spain to be a particularly compelling case-study because it has a long history of Gitano/Roma-targeted policies and it is also one of the main receiving countries for Romanian migrants of Roma ethnicity. Finally, we draw some tentative conclusions on the need to problematize specific ‘diversity management’ measures in ways that take into account the possible draw-backs, unwanted side-effects or even counter-productive consequences of ethnically targeted integration policies.

The debate on European ‘Roma’: one minority or many?

Despite their long historical presence in Europe, the Roma population started to be perceived as a European ‘issue’ in occasion of the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargements. The European Union enlargements made migration easier to both the Roma and the rest of EU citizens from Eastern towards Western Europe² and triggered a new debate giving Roma minorities an unprecedented visibility³. Even though migration was the trigger of the increased attention that European political bodies started paying to Roma (Bíró, Gheorghe, and Kovats 2013; O’Nions 2011), this led to an increased focus on the situation and status of Eastern Roma migrants, but also of Western European Roma citizens. The EU Roma Policy Framework published by the European Commission in 2011 requested all Member States to develop National Roma Integration Strategies “to ensure that Roma are not discriminated against but treated like any other EU citizen with equal access to all fundamental rights as enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights” (European Commission 2011). The strategies, however, rarely make a distinction between nationals and non-nationals, through what has been called “a lumping of the lumped” (Picker 2014), and in their current form, they tend to address more the former than the latter. Roma transnational mobility thus reawakens and shifts the policy and philosophical

² Nationals from Eastern EU countries (EU8+2) residing in Western EU (EU15) raised from 1.6 million in 2003 to 4.8 million in 2009, the half of which being Romanians and Bulgarians (OECD 2012: 65).

³ Such debates see the ‘normal’ predicaments associated with migrant integration mixed with the preoccupation of Western European countries towards a minority that is perceived as presenting special challenges in terms of cultural integration (Stewart 2012).

debates on the relation between European, national and local contexts. Furthermore, the coexistence of 'national' and 'immigrant' Roma on a same territory, as well as under the same policy framework raises potential issues in terms of the stereotyped and racialized perceptions that might be 'transferred' from one group to the other. The departing point of this article is therefore that the integration frameworks adopted by old EU Member States in response to Roma westward migration can represent a good litmus test to evaluate Europe's ability and willingness to translate the principles of solidarity and cultural diversity into policies and practices.

Otherring, old and new

As O'Nions stated in 2011, when a European strategy for Roma integration had just been approved by the European Parliament, "the issue of Roma inequality has been on the EU agenda for some considerable time yet this may be the first time that the scale of inequality has been apparent to politicians in the west. Free movement and residence rights have facilitated Roma migration to Western Europe and this has meant that it is no longer possible to view the issue as the responsibility of CEE state" (O'Nions 2011). Indeed, while the marginalization and discrimination experienced by Roma minorities in Europe is not new, the political relevance of this issue has bolstered in the last decade, both at the European and national levels. This, in turn, has meant that there has been the need for policy-makers and administrators to define 'who the Roma are', and frame their presence and status in legal and policy terms.

Historically (and contemporary history is no exception), Roma have been depicted as an 'issue' because of their distinctiveness from majority populations. The 2006 Final Report on the Human Rights Situation of the Roma, Sinti and Travelers in Europe for the Attention of the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly (Gil-Robles 2006) stressed that European societies have traditionally perceived Roma as "Others, as foreigners in their home countries", and treated them as such. As a number of scholars have noted (see for example Bíró et al. 2013; Blasco 2002), the construction of otherness as the main feature of Roma-Gadje (non-Roma) relations in Europe is a product of processes that have been cultivated on both sides, and has been a part of dealing with Romani groups for centuries (Agarin et al. 2014; Carrasco and Bereményi 2011). Intense debates on policy definitions of Roma, particularly on the vagueness of the present-day category 'Roma' in the EU discourse, have so far led to no shared consensus on whether integration should concern cultural recognition, socio-economic redistribution, ethnicity or lifestyle. Indeed, one of the main difficulties is that 'integrated Roma' are often regarded as not (or no longer) 'true Roma' or 'genuine Roma', and thus fall out of the scope of policies.⁴

⁴ The status of 'other' has become so deeply-rooted and integral to the image and understanding of 'who the Roma are' (and who they are not) that it becomes difficult to retain such identification while acting as part of the majority society (Messing 2014). Many policies are aimed to 'Roma'

Some authors have interpreted the politics of exclusion and expulsion of Eastern European Roma migrants from Western European countries as a symptomatic paradox of European identity: it “reflects a construct of European identity which views the Roma as outsiders who have no legitimate claim to the bundle of rights given to the true European citizens” (O’Nions 2011). This is striking, especially because it has been in these same recent times that European institutions have declared the Roma a ‘true European minority’ and that Roma culture and traditions have been recognized and embraced officially as a contribution to European identity (Council of Europe 1993; Liégeois 2007; Soros and Thorbjørn 2015).

The proposed measures to address the ‘Roma issue’ have varied widely and have often been contradictory: while recent EU directives have put a strong emphasis on the non-ethnicization of integration measures (starting from the Copenhagen criteria, and followed by the Racial Equality Directive 2000/43, the Employment Equality Directive 2000/78, and so forth), on the other hand most international initiatives assume that social inclusion can be pursued alongside promoting the cultural identity of the Roma minority.⁵ These approaches both stem from what Vermeersch (2013) identified, together with migration, as being one of the main causes for a European policy on Roma starting from the Nineties: an increased attention to human rights in general, and to minority rights in particular. The focus of the policies depends on which rights (group rights or individual rights) are seen as the most important, and both have pros and cons.

While an individual-focused color-blind anti-discrimination approach might overlook patterns connected to structural racism, group cultural recognition policies might foster what van Baar dubbed as a ‘reasonable anti-Gypsism’ (van Baar 2014), as the fostering of cultural identity tends to ethnicize the issue. Also, such ethnic or cultural policies might involuntarily contribute to the essentialization of the Roma as a single group in the minds of the majority populations.

Despite the fact that Roma minorities have always been seen as ‘foreigners’ to European mainstream societies, they differ widely in terms of historical and national backgrounds, language, religion, education, status, income levels, and so on.

Making a distinction between historical and immigrant Roma, and de-essentializing the ‘Roma category’ opens up a series of questions: is the social and economic disadvantage in which many Roma find themselves similar amongst ‘old’ and ‘new’ Roma communities in Western Europe, or not? Do

only insofar as they represent an impoverished and marginalized group. Roma ‘middle class’ are, in this sense, despite the EU ‘ethnic’ definition, not ‘Roma’ for the purpose of targeted measures.
⁵ This is the case of the 2005-2015 Decade of Roma Inclusion, of the 2011 European Commission call for National Roma Integration Strategies, and also of paramount policy documents such as the 2012 UNPD “Opportunities for Roma Inclusion”.

they face the same challenges, and should different or similar integration policies be adopted for these groups?

To address these issues in more practical terms, it is useful to take a look at the Spanish case, which is usually upheld as a positive example of successful Roma policies. Recent surveys however, raise the issue of the difficulty of incorporating the 'new' Roma in the 'old' framework (see Bereményi and Mirga 2012).

Love at first sight? 'Eastern European Roma' in the Spanish policies for Gitanos

Spain became one of the countries of destination of Roma from South-Eastern Europe in the early Nineties. Whilst during the first period of time they arrived in Spain as refugees, they soon became part of the broader phenomenon of Romanian and Bulgarian intra-European mobility, migrating in search of better work opportunities (Macías León 2005: 90). It was in the last decade, however, that their presence began to increase quite significantly due to the 2001 suppression of the Schengen visa requirement for Romanian and Bulgarian citizens (MSSSI 2012a: 12). Especially after the 2007 EU enlargement and the mass evictions from Italy and France, Roma immigrants became very visible in the Spanish political and media agenda (Beluschi Fabeni et al. 2013; López Catalán and Aharchi 2012; Piemontese, Castellsagué Bonada, and Bereményi 2014). Nonetheless, unlike other countries, their presence was never framed as a 'national problem'. To date, Romanian and Bulgarian Roma citizens living in Spain are estimated to be somewhere between 50,000 (MSSSI 2012a: 12) and 170,000 (López Catalán 2012; Slávkova 2010).⁶

On the other hand, the Gitano (Spanish Roma) population is the largest national minority in Spain. Since the mid-Eighties it has been the target of specific policies aimed to compensate their historical socio-economic marginalization.⁷ Given these conditions, during the last decade, Roma migrants have tended to fall either into existing general immigration policies or in specific policies for Gitanos (FRA 2009c: 65–67). Their incorporation in the previous work with Gitanos took place in three phases and was promoted by three different actors: the private non-profit-making sector, the regional administrations, and the national governments.

Despite (or because of) harsh situations of poverty, institutional violence, racism, and conflicts with the majority population, Gitano and pro-Gitano

⁶ The lack of official records on the ethnic background and the phenomenon of 'identity negotiation' are some of the methodological and theoretical difficulties that hinder the processing of statistics on Roma in general, and Roma migrants in particular. The number of Roma migrants has been usually calculated considering their estimated proportion in the society of origin, and applying it to the stock of the migrants with the same nationality.

⁷ Spanish Gitanos are somewhere between 500,000 and 1,000,000. The estimates reported in the *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana* (MSSSI 2012) is of 725,000-750,000, the same evaluation that the Council of Europe makes in its official website. This accounts for approximately 1,5%-2% of the whole population residing in Spain.

organizations did not defend the rights of immigrant Roma up until 2005-2007 (see Piemontese and Beluschi Fabeni 2014). Only when the international context turned Roma migration into a political issue and the European Commission started to financially support projects aimed at ‘the Roma’ did these organizations start to address the needs of the ‘new’ Roma. While the local Gitano population looked at the newcomers as potential competitors for scarce resources, Gitano or pro-Gitano organizations realized that by adopting the EU discourse and terminology on ‘Roma’ they would have gained easy access to the funds for the social intervention with these new beneficiaries.

Around the same time, regional governments started taking measures to deal with the expected increase in the number of Roma immigrants. In the words of the Fundamental Rights Agency, Spain became an example for broadening its national Roma-specific policy in order to positively include Roma from other Member States (FRA 2009a). Indeed, several regional policies on Gitanos did include non-Spanish Roma as a target population of their actions. It is noteworthy that a number of regional differences and of political contexts resulted in a variety of methods of incorporating Roma from other Member States in the already existing regional policies for Gitanos: a part from the *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana* (the National Roma Integration Strategy in Spain), there are currently five Spanish regions that have adopted ‘Gitano Plans’: Basque Country, Navarra, Catalonia, Extremadura and Andalusia.

The Basque Plan (*Plan Vasco Para la Promoción Integral y la Participación Social del Pueblo Gitano*, 2004-2007 and 2008-2011) takes generically into account “the increase in the immigration of Roma people” and supports the realization of a diagnostic study on Portuguese and Romanian Roma but it only targets the descendants of the Gitano families immigrated to the Bask Country from other parts of Spain during the first half of the XX century. On the other hand, the more recent Navarrese Plan (*Primer Plan Integral de Atención a la Población Gitana de Navarra*, 2011-2014) explicitly addresses the situation of the “increasing number of immigrant Roma living in a condition of serious social exclusion” and incorporates ‘Eastern European Roma’ as equal beneficiaries of the whole Plan. However, one of the most relevant regional attempts to incorporate Roma from other Member States in a broader policy measure for Gitanos is the case of Catalonia. Here, the official recognition of both Gitano identity and culture as integrating part of the Catalan society⁸ culminated in the approval of the *Pla Integral del Poble Gitano a Catalunya* (2005-2008 and 2009-2013). The Plan recognizes ‘the Roma’ as a trans-European people. In particular, the first edition considers the presence of ‘Eastern European Roma’ in Catalonia as an opportunity for Gitanos to recover the lost *Romani* language through the recruitment of Eastern European Roma as *Romani* teachers and lecturers.

⁸ Parlament de Catalunya. 2001. “Resolució 1046/VI Del Parlament de Catalunya, sobre el reconeixement de la identitat del Poble Gitano i del valor de la seva cultura.” Butlletí Oficial Del Parlament de Catalunya, 240.

Building on a specific diagnostic study of this population,⁹ the second edition explicitly targets them as transversal beneficiaries of the whole plan, as well as through nine specific measures.

The Catalan Plan anticipated many of the features of the 2011 National Roma Integration Strategy in Spain and among these the incorporation of 'new' Roma in the policy framework for 'old' Roma. The strategy asserts that Gitanos share common features with other Roma groups in Europe and therefore requires the Spanish authorities to pay special attention to "Roma population originating from other countries", to include them in the measures and actions aimed at Gitanos and, where circumstances allow it, to develop specific measures and actions aimed at promoting their social inclusion (MSSSI 2012a).

The progressive incorporation of Roma immigrants in the Spanish policies for Gitanos has been influenced by financial, ideological, and political elements. In other words, while the progressive categorization of 'the Roma' as a transnational population fostered the 'trickle down' adoption of the EU official discourse on Roma people as both "victims of racism, discrimination and social exclusion" (Fundamental Rights Agency and UNPD 2012) and "truly European minority",¹⁰ the distribution of EU funding for Roma inclusion together with the need to give a policy response to the freedom of movement of impoverished Romanian and Bulgarian Roma citizens resulted in a puzzle of measures of both inclusion and securitization of the 'new' Roma.

Practical problems of targeting 'Roma' from other Member States

Unlike other European countries, Spain has not yet experienced the complete out-sourcing of the governance of Roma migration to third sector organizations.¹¹ There has been some politicization of the issue of Roma migration, but to a lesser degree than in countries such as Italy and France, and the presence of highly visible shantytowns inhabited by Roma immigrants is also comparatively limited (Beluschi Fabeni et al. 2013; Vlase and Preotesa 2012: 76). These elements have prevented (at least until now) the development of specific instruments. Consequently, in spite of the strategy's suggestion to develop specific measures, municipal social services are carrying out most of

⁹ Vinclé. 2006. "Gitanos Procedents de l'Europa de l'Est a Catalunya". Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya. Departament de Benestar i Família.

¹⁰ See the Parliamentary Assembly of the 1993 CoE "Recommendation 1203 on Gypsies in Europe": "(1) One of the aims of the Council of Europe is to promote the emergence of a genuine European cultural identity. Europe harbours many different cultures, all of them, including the many minority cultures, enriching and contributing to the cultural diversity of Europe. (2) A special place among the minorities is reserved for Gypsies. Living scattered all over Europe, not having a country to call their own, they are a true European minority, but one that does not fit into the definitions of national or linguistic minorities. (3) As a non-territorial minority, Gypsies greatly contribute to the cultural diversity of Europe. In different parts of Europe they contribute in different ways, be it by language and music or by their trades and crafts.[...]"

¹¹ However, ongoing research highlights that an important process of externalization of social services dealing with migrants Roma is currently taking place in Catalonia (see Vrăbiescu 2015).

the social intervention with Roma migrants, addressing their needs in the same way they do with other European citizens sharing the same socio-economic conditions, and away from the spotlight of the 'Roma issue'.¹²

In certain cases NGOs started implementing specific programs addressed exclusively at Roma migrants, but it is difficult to assess whether the causes have to do with a decreased outreach capacity of social services (due to budget cuts and administrative restrictions to EU2 citizens) or to increased EU funding for Roma-related projects. Still, some elements that in our view may have an impact on future trends can be highlighted.

Despite the expectations that may arise from the discourse on the so-called 'Spanish model' for the inclusion of Gitanos/Roma – which is generally, albeit somewhat superficially, regarded as a 'good practice' (Bereményi, Piemontese, and Mirga 2012) – the policy documents that clearly address these groups at the regional and local levels are very limited.¹³ However, when specific measures do exist, Roma targeted policies need Gitano and pro-Gitano organizations to be implemented. In fact, since the ethnic belonging of the beneficiaries of Gitano/Roma-specific policies cannot be certified by any public authority,¹⁴ Gitano and pro-Gitano third sector organizations are made responsible in the last resort of verifying 'who is Gitano': "In this way, the state can both ensure its fundamentally redistributive orientation and take compensatory measures of ethnic recognition, but also avoid the troublesome, essentialist, and ever-dangerous task of establishing objective criteria for ethnic identification" (Beluschi Fabeni, López López, and Piemontese 2014: 94).

The difficulties related to the implementation of ethnic policies in the Spanish color-blind State have been mainly resolved by outsourcing their implementation to third sector organizations or by relying on a geographical focus aimed at intervening in areas identified as pockets of poverty and marginalization, where it is commonly known that impoverished Gitanos live.

This constellation becomes challenging when it comes to Roma immigrants: they cannot rely on a network of ethnic-driven associations and are not geographically concentrated in well-defined segregated neighborhoods, as impoverished Gitanos are. In other words, beyond a scarce mobilization

¹² We are aware that a similar statement could be made also with respect to Gitanos, because the improvement of their living conditions stemmed from the democratization of mainstream welfare system rather than from Gitano-specific policies (Gamella 2011). However, we cannot underestimate the impact (whether factual or symbolical) of a well-established and widespread system of call for grants for the implementation of Gitano-specific programs.

¹³ According to a recent survey run in Andalucía, the Autonomous Community with the highest Gitano population, only 16% of the policy documents that regulate the housing conditions of the Gitano population targets exclusively this population, 26% if we also consider those documents that mention the Gitano population in addition to other beneficiaries (Beluschi Fabeni, López López, and Piemontese 2014: 84).

¹⁴ This is because Spain, as most Western European countries with the exception of the U.K., does not allow data collection based on ethnicity. See Simon's (2007: 36) report on the 'Ethnic' statistics and the data protection in the countries of the Council of Europe.

potential, they have neither the resources nor the numbers to assert themselves as legitimate recipients of Gitano/Roma-specific policies.¹⁵ Therefore, immigrant Roma families are generally not recipients of targeted policies, although many of them would qualify both as members of the Roma pan-European minority, and as members of a socio-economically disadvantaged population. They may be perceived as *gitanos rumanos* by neighbors, but their ascribed ethnic identity blurs in the super-diverse landscape of the Spanish suburbs. Eventually, when in need, they might attempt to access universal welfare services as other low-income individuals do.

An exception to this general rule takes place in instances in which Roma immigrants happen to be hyper-visible, such in shantytowns, or in cases of conflicts with other neighbors. Building on current ethnographic research, as well as on the existing literature on Roma securitization (van Baar 2011, 2015; Clough Marinaro and Sigona 2011; McGarry 2014; Sarcinelli 2015; Sigona 2008; Vermeersch 2012; Vrăbiescu 2015), our hypothesis is that Roma immigrants become target of specific measures of both inclusion and surveillance only when other social actors problematize their presence. For instance, looking at the incorporation of 'Eastern European Roma' in the Catalan Plan of the Gitano People in Catalonia, Bereményi and Mirga (2012: 133) demonstrates that "[...] if the integration of immigrant Roma families is not perceived by neighbors or public administrations as a threat to public order, they are served and attended in terms of 'non-Spanish-nationality' EU citizens."

'New' Roma or 'other' Roma?

In 2009 the Fundamental Rights Agency, looking at the Comprehensive Plan for the Roma Population in Catalonia, argued that "where broad social integration measures for national Roma are implemented, Roma from other Member States are likely to benefit" (FRA 2009b: 9).

A number of studies, workshops and reflections around these broad themes have been carried out in Spain the last few years, and we try to summarize here the issues that we consider to be at the core of these debates.

Firstly, there seems to be a general consensus that the policies and programs developed for Spanish *Gitanos* are *not* applicable to Roma migrants, and that different measures need to be adopted: Roma immigrants are perceived to be 'at a previous stage' if compared to local Gitano communities in what concerns both their socio-economic situation and their level of group organization.¹⁶

¹⁵ Exploratory interviews realized in the framework of the EU/LLP REdHNET project (*Romani People, educational and housing policies: key links to share*) with the recipient organizations of the 2012 and 2013 grants for the implementations of initiatives in the framework of the Comprehensive Plan for the Andalusian Gitano Community (PICGA) show that the financed projects targeted Roma migrants only "as individuals" and "by chance".

¹⁶ During the workshop for scholars, policy makers and the third sector "Bridging the Gap between Policy Making and Social Research. Strengths and challenges of the policies for Gitanos/Roma in Spain" (Barcelona, October 2014), one of the participants stated that Roma immigrants "have very basic needs that turns their *a priori* incorporation in the policies for

Secondly, they are often blamed for reinforcing the overlap of the cultural and ethnic identity of ‘the Roma’ with situations of social-economic marginalization. What emerges is an unfortunate picture of a disadvantaged and complex population with which general policies do not work.

Already one decade ago Bustamante (2005) anticipated these discourses, denouncing that neither the social services nor the Gitano associations would have been able to give adequate answers to the situation of Roma migrants. Nowadays, the discourse and practice of most practitioners indeed suggest that the situation of Roma immigrants should be addressed by more specific measures, separated from those addressed to Spanish Gitanos.

The considerations put forward by these practitioners aim at emphasizing the distance between Spanish Gitanos and impoverished Roma newcomers. However, in the making of this ethnic boundary, the description of immigrant Roma resort to the same misconceptions about Gitanos themselves: that of a group made of “deficient”, “saturated”, and “gregarious” subjects always “in need of protection” (Beluschi Fabeni et al. 2014). This has much to do with the fear of a more powerful overlap between Roma identity and socio-economic marginalization: having worked for decades toward empowering and promoting the image of Spanish Gitanos in their own country, Gitano organizations now fear that the hostility towards Eastern European Roma will fall upon them. As other authors have shown, both in Spain (Bereményi and Carrasco 2014; Laparra and Macías León 2009) and elsewhere (Roman 2014) similarities between ‘old’ and ‘new’ Roma tend to create major differentiation markers rather than foster empathy or inter-ethnic solidarity. It seems fair to expect that the presence of Roma immigrants is dreaded by ‘old’ Roma because it might harm the reputation of the whole ethnic community by reinforcing the stereotyped descriptions of Gitanos as people *que estafa u obra con engaño*¹⁷.

Conclusions

In order to analyze Spain as a paradigmatic case of changes and challenges in its management of inclusion policies as a consequence of westward Roma migration, we started off by giving an account of the European and supranational context on the Roma minorities, and then focused on how this European dimension influences and is intertwined with pre-existing policy frames and practices in the Spanish case.

In doing so, we tried to give an account of how such ‘inclusion’ or ‘integration’ policies have created a number of by-issues ranging from the need

Gitanos into a non-sense”. The proceedings of the workshop is available at: <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/romastudies/Barcelona-Report-16102014.pdf>.

¹⁷ The literal translation is “that swindle or behave deceitfully”, and is (still) one of the definitions of “Gitano” given by the Dictionary of the Spanish Royal Academy. See the Real Academia Española, definition number 4, available at: <http://buscon.rae.es/drae/srv/search?id=VfuMZQr7JDXX2Bi35now>. See also the article “Les Gitans d’Espagne: une catégorie sui generis?” by Nathalie Manrique (2015: 70).

to fit the Roma into general matters of cultural diversity management, to the question of how Roma's social identification relates to marginalization, social exclusion and inequality, and to structural, accepted and normalized anti-gypsism narratives and practices in Western liberal European countries.

Some underlying questions that remain open for further research are: How do public action towards immigrant Roma people relate to the *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana*? In order to establish a connection, should we take into consideration the source of funding, the adjustments to objectives of the *Estrategia*, or simply the fact that these initiatives are explicitly targeted to Roma migrants?

From this general overview, a few conclusions can be drawn. First, the ways in which specific policies for Roma immigrants are drafted and implemented, as well as the media and political narratives that surround them, tend to reinforce the overlap between ethnic belonging and socio-economic exclusion. This overlap, which is nourished by the same overarching architecture of the EU Policies on Roma, conflates in one artificial construct: the abstract 'Roma' umbrella term. While some anti-discrimination or cultural claims could unite 'old' and 'new' Roma, when it comes to regional and local policy making, class difference and socio-economic competition prevail at the expenses of the intra-ethnic solidarity.

Also, and possibly more importantly, the 'explicit but non-exclusive' approach is a nice formula, but it seems difficult to adapt to the situation of Roma immigrants in Spain: explicit measures developed in shantytowns inhabited by immigrant Roma are very likely to be exclusive, while non-exclusive measures take mainly the shape of access to general welfare services in poor districts. One may conclude that this principle is more likely to work in well-defined areas, such as segregated districts inhabited (also) by impoverished 'old' Roma. As long as the policies for Gitanos/Roma do not turn into Gitano/Roma-specific measures framed in broader mainstream policies, they will hardly address structural inequalities, but rather reproduce segregation.

Acknowledgements:

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 316796.

Tribute must also be paid to "Evaluating the Six Years of the Comprehensive Plan for the Roma Population in Catalonia", a project funded by the Open Society Foundations' Roma Initiatives (EU Framework Advocacy Grant); to the EU/LLP REDHNET project "Romani People, and Educational and Housing Policies: Key Links to Share" and to the event "Bridging the Gap between Policy Making and Social Research. Strengths and challenges of the policies for Gitanos/Roma in Spain. A workshop for scholars, policy makers,

and the third sector”, organized in October 2014 by the Taller ACSA and the EMIGRA research groups of the Autonomous University of Barcelona.

References

- Agarin, T. et al. 2014. *When Stereotype Meets Prejudice: Antiziganism in European Societies*. edited by Timofey Agarin. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag.
- Beluschi Fabeni, Giuseppe et al. 2013. *Report on the Pilot Survey: Spain. The Immigration of Romanian Roma to Western Europe: Causes, Effects, and Future Engagement Strategies (MigRom)*. Granada: University of Granada.
- Beluschi Fabeni, Giuseppe, Juan de Dios López López, and Stefano Piemontese. 2014. “Between Assimilation and Heritagization. The Linguistic Construction of Gitanos in Spanish Housing Policies.” Pp. 81–116 in *WOR(L)DS WHICH EXCLUDE. The housing situation of Roma, Gypsies and Travellers in the language of the acts and the administrative documents in Europe*, edited by Leonardo Piasere, Nicola Solimano, and Sabrina Tosi Cambini. Fiesole (FI): Fondazione Giovanni Michelucci.
- Bereményi, Bálint-Ábel, and Silvia Carrasco. 2014. “Gitans Espagnols et Immigrés Roms En Espagne. Discours Émancipatoire et Nouvelles Catégories de Stratification Dans La Société et L'école.” *Migrations Société* 26(152):131–45.
- Bereményi, Bálint-Ábel, and Anna Mirga. 2012. *Lost in Action? Evaluating the 6 Years of the Comprehensive Plan for the Gitano Population in Catalonia*. Barcelona: FAGiC and EMIGRA/CER-M. Retrieved (<http://grupsderecerca.uab.cat/emigra/en/content/reports-and-non-periodical-publications>).
- Bereményi, Bálint-Ábel, Stefano Piemontese, and Anna Mirga. 2012. “Did the National Roma Strategies Learn from the Shortcomings of the ‘Spanish Model’?” in *Paper presented at the 2012 Gypsy Lore Society Annual Meeting, Istanbul (Turkey), September 20–22, 2012*. Istanbul.
- Bíró, András, Nicolae Gheorghe, and Martin Kovats. 2013. *From Victimhood to Citizenship. The Path of Roma Integration*. edited by Will Guy. Budapest: Pakiv European Roma Fund.
- Blasco, Paloma Gay Y. 2002. “Gypsy/Roma Diasporas. A Comparative Perspective.” *Social Anthropology* 10(02):173–88.
- Carrasco, Silvia, and Bálint-Ábel Bereményi. 2011. “Roma Culture and Language.” *Roma and Traveller Inclusion in Europe. Green Questions and Answers*.
- Clough Marinaro, Isabella, and Nando Sigona. 2011. “Introduction Anti-Gypsyism and the Politics of Exclusion: Roma and Sinti in Contemporary Italy.” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 16(5):583–89.
- Council of Europe. 1993. *Gypsies in Europe (Recommendation 1203, Parliamentary Assembly, 1993)*.
- European Commission. 2011. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020. COM(2011) 173/4*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fundamental Rights Agency. 2009a. “Selected Positive Initiatives. The Situation of Roma EU Citizens Moving to and Settling in Other EU Member States.”
- Fundamental Rights Agency. 2009b. “The Situation of Roma EU Citizens Moving to and Settling in Other EU Member States.”

- Fundamental Rights Agency, and UNPD. 2012. "The Situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States. Survey Results at a Glance."
- Gamella, Juan Francisco. 2011. *Historias de Éxito. Modelos Para Reducir El Abandono Escolar de La Adolescencia Gitana*. Estudios C. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación. Secretaría del Estado de Educación y Formación Profesional. Instituto de Formación del Profesorado, Investigación e Inovación Educativa (IFIIE).
- Laparra, Miguel, and Almudena Macías León. 2009. "Spanish Gitanos, Romani Migrants and European Roma Identity: (Re)unification or Self-Affirmation?" Pp. 226–46 in *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe. Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order*, edited by Nando Sigona and Nidhi Trehan. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre. 2007. *Roma in Europe*. Council of Europe.
- López Bustamante, Joaquín. 2005. "Las Pateras Del Asfalto. Algunas Consideraciones Sobre La Inmigración de Los Gitanos Rumanos." *I Tchatchipen*.
- López Catalán, Óscar. 2012. "The Genesis of a 'Romanian Roma Issue' in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona: Urban Public Spaces, Neighbourhood Conflicts and Local Politics." *URBS. Revista de Estudios Urbanos Y Ciencias Sociales.*, 95–117.
- López Catalán, Óscar, and Noura Aharchi. 2012. "Discursos Sobre La Inmigración Rrom (gitana) Rumana En Barcelona. Estudio de La Representación Del 'Conflicto Vecinal' Y Los Trabajos Marginales a Partir de El País, La Vanguardia Y El Periódico de Catalunya." *Discurso & Sociedad*, 543–90.
- Macías León, Almudena. 2005. "La Población Romani En El Flujo Migratorio Del Este Hacia Europa Occidental: El Caso de Rumanía." *Revista de Estudios Sociales Y de Sociología Aplicada*, 79–98.
- Manrique, Nathalie. 2015. "Les Gitans d'Espagne: Une Catégorie Sui Generis?" *Confluences Méditerranée* Printemps(93).
- Matras, Yaron. 2013. "Scholarship and the Politics of Romani Identity: Strategic and Conceptual Issues." *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 10(1):211–47.
- McGarry, a. 2014. "Roma as a Political Identity: Exploring Representations of Roma in Europe." *Ethnicities*.
- Messing, Vera. 2014. "Methodological Puzzles of Surveying Roma/Gypsy Populations." *Ethnicities* 14(6):811–29.
- Ministerio de Sanidad Servicios Sociales e Igualdad. 2012. "National Roma Integration Strategy in Spain 2012–2020." *Informes, Estudios E Investigación* 2012.
- Ministerio de Sanidad Servicios Sociales e Igualdad de España. 2012. *Estrategia Nacional Para La Inclusión Social de La Población Gitana En España 2012-2020*.
- O'Nions, Helen. 2011. "Roma Expulsions and Discrimination: The Elephant in Brussels." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 13(4):361–88.
- OECD. 2012. "Mobility and Migration in Europe." Pp. 61–86 in *OECD Economic Surveys: European Union 2012*. OECD Publishing. Retrieved November 29, 2014 (http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/economics/oecd-economic-surveys-european-union-2012_eco_surveys-eur-2012-en#page65).
- Picker, Giovanni. 2014. "Policy Logic and the Spatial Segregation of Roma in Urban Europe: The Cases of Florence and Cluj-Napoca." in *Research puzzles and competing approaches to studying Roma migration. Workshop within the framework of the Annual Conference of the INTEGRIM Network. December 12, 2014*.
- Piemontese, Stefano, and Giuseppe Beluschi Fabeni. 2014. "Entre Organización Social Y Políticas Públicas. Pautas Residenciales de Familias Rumanas Romanías En

- Granada." *Sociologia, Revista da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto. Número temático – Ciganos na Península Ibérica e Brasil: estudos e políticas sociais* 153–73.
- Piemontese, Stefano, Alba Castellsagué Bonada, and Bálint-Ábel Bereményi. 2014. "Ethnicization of Nomadism as a Control to Mobility Regimes. The Description of Gitanos/Roma in the Spanish Press." in *Paper presented at the 2014 Gypsy Lore Society Annual Meeting, Bratislava (Slovakia), September 11-13, 2014*. Bratislava.
- Roman, Raluca B. 2014. "Trans-National Migration and the Issue of 'Ethnic' Solidarity: Finnish Roma Elite and Eastern European Roma Migrants in Finland." *Ethnicities* 14(6):793–810. Retrieved (<http://etn.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1468796814542179>).
- Sarcinelli, Alice Sophie. 2015. "La Question Rom En Italie, Entre Logiques Sécuritaires et Logiques Humanitaires." *Confluences Méditerranée* Printemps(93).
- Sigona, Nando. 2008. "The 'Latest' Public Enemy: Romanian Roma in Italy. The Cases Studies of Milan, Bologna, Rome and Neaples."
- Simon, By Patrick. 2007. "Ethnic" *Statistics and Data Protection in the Council of Europe Countries. Study Report*. ECRI - Eur. Council of Europe.
- Slávkova, Magdalena. 2010. "Romani Migrations from Bulgaria to Spain: Challenges and Perspectives." *Romani Mobilities in Europe: Multidisciplinary Perspectives. International Conference. Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford. 14-15 January 2010. Conference Proceedings*, 210–14.
- Soros, George, and Jaglang Thorbjørn. 2015. "Why We Are Setting up a Roma European Institute."
- Stewart, Michael, ed. 2012. *The Gypsy "Menace". Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Surdu, Mihai. 2015. *Expert Trademarks: Scientific and Policy Practices of Roma Classification*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Van Baar, Huub. 2011. "Europe's Romaphobia: Problematization, Securitization, Nomadization." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*.
- Van Baar, Huub. 2015. "The Perpetual Mobile Machine of Forced Mobility: Europe's Roma and the Institutionalization of Rootlessness." in *The Irregularization of Migration in Contemporary Europe: Deportation, Detention, Drowning*.
- Vermeersch, Peter. 2012. "Reframing the Roma: EU Initiatives and the Politics of Reinterpretation." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.
- Vermeersch, Peter. 2013. "The European Union and the Roma: An Analysis of Recent Institutional and Policy Developments." *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* (9):341–58.
- Vlase, Ionela, and Ana Maria Preotesa. 2012. "Roma Migrants from Bulgaria and Romania. Migration Patterns and Integration in Italy and Spain." Pp. 65–87 in *Roma from Romania, Bulgaria, Italy and Spain between Social inclusion and Migration. Comparative Study*, edited by D. Tarnovschi. Bucharest: Soros Foundation Romania.
- Vrăbiescu, Ioana. 2015. "Roma Migrant Children in Spain: Between the Politics of Benevolence and the Normalization of Violence." in *Mobility in crisis. Is Europe becoming more mobile during the economic crisis or is European mobility in crisis?* IMISCOE Conference, European University Institute. Florence, January 29-30, Florence.