

ROMANI MOBILE SUBJECTIVITIES AND THE STATE: INTERSECTIONALITY,
GENRES, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

July 2018

By

Bettina J. Brown

Dissertation Committee:

Michael J. Shapiro

Kathy E. Ferguson

Nevzat Soguk

Wimal Dissanayake

Robert Perkinson

Keywords: Romani, intersectionality, genres, human rights, European Union

Acknowledgments

Diverse, pluralizing Romani articulations guide and inform *Romani Mobile Subjectivities and the State: Intersectionality, Genres, and Human Rights*. This dissertation presents a mosaic of Romani people, place, time, and movement. I want to note my heartfelt appreciation to all at the Documentation and Cultural Center of German Sinti and Roma, in Heidelberg, and to the many who assisted at numerous source sites in Germany and the United Kingdom, during this doctoral work.

Thank you, to my advisor, Michael J. Shapiro, scholarship giant, for your kindness and inspiration, support and gentle patience. You gave me the opportunity to make this dissertation possible. I am eternally grateful. Thank you, Kathy E. Ferguson, for your scholarship among earthlings, helping to inform this dissertation and its title, and all your support. I am eternally grateful. Thank you, Nevzat Soguk, for your scholarship on communities displaced by hegemony, graciously serving on my committee, and your insightful support. Thank you, Wimal Dissanayake, for your scholarship on how worlds world, introducing me to Cultural Studies, and your helpful feedback. Thank you, Robert Perkinson, for your scholarship on civil rights, the incarceration industry, and your thoughtful encouragement. Vielen Dank, mentors and friends, faculty, staff, and fellow students (too many to mention) in Political Science, American Studies, Cultural Studies, and Women's Studies, for the generous assistance, and student collegiality. Thank you for the profound privilege to be informed by critically-oriented interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship in the Department of Political Science; animated by a like-minded spirit of affirmative community praxis in a Hawaiian place of learning.

Abstract

This dissertation examines the discursive entanglements of intersectionality, genres, and human rights, articulated with respect to migratory flows of Romani peoples and livelihoods. As such, it evinces site-specific Romani contestations in Europe, to the Schengen Agreement, to nation-state constructions of subject coherence and membership, as well as to the logic of euro area neoliberalism. The contextual terrain within which Romani communities encounter discrimination by some EU leaders and citizens, exacts a spatiotemporal mapping of human rights violations, exceeding institutional, regulatory state-centric formations. Typically, current work regarding Romani human rights, focuses on static, representational indices such as gender *or* race, within the Romani diaspora, *Porajmos* - the Romani Holocaust, and cultural survival. Instead, this critical inquiry invokes two alternating registers of analysis within the context of situated Romani aesthetico-political interventions - as encounters with majoritarian and state-policy events. The first register of analytical intervention, presents Romani film, art, music, photography, fiction, poetry, ethnography, and ancestral narrative - genres contravening normative, neocolonial, and juridico-political precepts of subject fixity. The second register juxtaposes Romani articulations as historiography, archive, and field notes in Germany, to investigate how Romani intersectionality engages the UN, EU, and NGO human rights discourse and policy implementation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Acknowledgments.....i

Abstract.....ii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....1

Prologue.....1

Introduction.....4

Framing Inquiry.....4

‘Subjects of eligibility’?.....9

Dissertation work.....21

CHAPTER 2: ROMANI MOBILE SUBJECTIVITIES.....23

Prologue.....23

Introduction.....25

Competing Cosmologies.....28

***Roma Rising*.....35**

‘Home’38

***Gadjo Dilo*.....48**

Nowhere to Go.....59

***Rom Som*.....64**

Concluding Thoughts.....68

CHAPTER 3: THE IDENTITY PROBLEMATIC.....	71
Prologue.....	71
Introduction.....	73
<i>Korkoro</i>.....	74
Taloche and ‘Chouroro’.....	77
In Transit.....	80
The Camp Dispositif.....	86
Boot Camp.....	90
Romani Rule.....	94
Roasted Chicken.....	100
Administration and Justice.....	113
Community and Sense.....	120
Concluding Thoughts.....	134
CHAPTER 4: HUMAN RIGHTS & ROMANI WOMEN.....	141
Prologue.....	141
Introduction.....	142
<i>Papusza</i>.....	143
Nomad and ‘Method’.....	159
Forced Sterilization.....	161
Subject Membership.....	170
EU Human Rights and the Neocolonial.....	172
‘Difference’ and the Former Eastern Bloc.....	196
Concluding Thoughts.....	201

CHAPTER 5: ROMANI COMMUNITY PRACTICES AND THE STATE.....	204
Prologue.....	204
Introduction.....	204
Discursive Interventions.....	206
Constitutional and Ideological Considerations.....	207
The Global Economic Crisis.....	215
Berlin Field Notes.....	219
Concluding Thoughts.....	222
References.....	227

Chapter 1: Introduction - It is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths. For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. Audre Lorde (1979)

If only Roma could live in this country as people.

--Agnesa Horátová (2005)

The reach of imperialism into 'our heads' challenges those who belong to colonized communities to understand how this occurred, partly because we perceive a need to decolonize our minds, to recover ourselves, to claim a space in which to develop a sense of authentic humanity.

--Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012)

Prologue

Where are you from?

Berlin, Neukölln Train Station:

Me: Where are you from?

Her: I have to buy my train ticket.

M: Okay

M: Your baby was crying, so I tried to calm him. Where are you from?

H: Romania

M: Have you been in Germany long?

H: Sometimes

M: What do you mean?

H: It is my place.

M: I don't understand.

H: My mother lives here. Are you from here? You look like a "Turkish."

M: I am from Hawai'i, but I was born here.

H: You are not German.

M: Yes, I am, and my grandmother came here from Portugal. Are you Romani?

H: No. I speak Romanian.

M: Is Romania your home?

H: No. My house is in Kreuzberg. There is my sister...

(Berlin field notes May 23, 2011).

I felt a sudden clasped compression on my chest pinning me against my upright seatback, my ears pinging in high pitch during an aborted landing at Tegel International Airport. Muscle memory is a fickle sensation; its loyalty unstable. It's intuitive, silent below the surface, yet reasserts itself in reflex after a boat ride on choppy seas, or a sinking feeling in your knees. I carried this sense in my long walks throughout the city. The surfaces are uneven and disjointed in Berlin on the cobblestone streets of market squares, and the smooth indifferent avenues of the city center. After purchasing more comfortable walking shoes, I realized street surfaces are an intimate relation to location, often ignored by privileged eye-level architecture. The terrain in its texture occupies our movement, not only by our navigated traversal but also by its selective spatiotemporal intrusion.

This territorial alliance (in an unconventional use of the term) coexists by impinging forces on the 'Traveller', yet as a dynamic neither corroborates the other in space nor time. The street surface affects mobile subjects by occupying their trajectory in the present. Territorial effect as 'affection' however, mobilizes subjects beyond the stasis of effect (uate), as the phenomenological interiority to exteriority modes of 'being-in-the-world', following Martin Heidegger's analytic, by its 'being as becoming'. In my shaky

posture in relation to the ground below my feet, I exit the airport terminal. The memory of the Lufthansa ‘encounter’ and ‘event’ with earth and sky had done its work of appropriating spatio-temporal time. I take a deep breath, and the initial mapping of my surrounding is met by a cursory side-glance from a white-shirted uniform official. She turns around, her hands clasped behind her back. The back of her shirt displays the letters *Ordnungspolizei*. I burst into laughter, back on solid ‘foundation’. The German foundation sweepers are back at work: everything is ‘in its place’, wobbly passengers-check; earth and sky-check; present and past-check. ‘Ordnungspolizei’ is Jacques Rancière’s police enforcing continuity; keep moving along folks. “Rather than relying on a mystical faith in the powers of interpellation.” His police “guarantees the continuation of the organic correspondences that constitute our regimes of perception and the partitions of the sensible that make circulations possible” (Panagia 2009, 123). Territorialization and its prefixes, Deleuzian informed ‘becoming’; ‘foundation’ and ‘fundament’; *Ordnung* (order) as a cultural psyche long before Carl Schmitt’s ordering of experience, all converge in varied indistinct zones of infinite subject location. Rule number one in real estate: location, location, location (Agamben 1998, 19). How does ‘location’ interarticulate movement? Rosi Braidotti’s (1994) insights are relevant and useful. In *Nomadic Subjects* she states:

...When Europe and other parts of the world are confronted by refugees from the East and South and movements of populations away from war-torn homelands, issues such as exile and the right to belong, the right to enter, the right to asylum, are too serious merely to be metaphorized into a new ideal.

In this respect, it is important to restore the notion of ‘the politics of location’ to the radical political function for which it was intended. It refers to a practice of dialogue among many different female genealogies. A location, in [Adrienne] Rich’s sense of the term, is both a geopolitical notion and also a notion that can

only be mediated in language and consequently by the object of imaginary relations. (21-22)

Introduction

This dissertation investigates Romani mobile and aesthetic contestations to dominant discursive, institutional codes and practices that neglect such movements. Romani people, place, time, and movement, unsettle homogenizing citizen-centric and static identity ascriptions. Thus, I seek to present conceptual linkages that further mobilize subjectivities. One of the conceptual nodal points I'm attempting to develop is my framing of inquiry as 'subjects of eligibility'. Braidotti's conceptualization of the 'nomad' speaks to this generative process. In juxtaposition to 'exile' (as a political refugee) and 'migrant' (seeking economic refuge and relief) is 'nomad'. "The nomad does not stand for homelessness or compulsive displacement; it is rather a figuration for the kind of subject who has relinquished all idea, desire, or nostalgia for fixity." In Deleuzian terms, "the life of the nomad is the intermezzo [...] he is a vector of deterritorialization" (Braidotti 1994, 22).

Framing Inquiry

My framing and reframing of inquiry in this dissertation mobilize "polyglot" interarticulation. Braidotti conceptualizes polyglot as nomadic, which "'practices' an aesthetic style based on compassion for the incongruities, the repetitions..." (15). Within the context of nomads as aesthetic practices, as articulations of "partitioning the sensible," I also present a brief overview of Jacques Rancière's (2004) "regimes of art" (85). In this way, I investigate evocations of encounter and event, site-specific and situated to Romani mobile subjectivities in relation to Romani communities, and state-policy event. In framing the inquiry of my investigation, my approach to the politics of

aesthetics is what I consider to be the post of post-Kantian thinking (as post-hermeneutic). Michael J. Shapiro (2006) describes the post-Kantian approach to “knowledge judgments,” as one in which the subject “has an active understanding that legislates and reflects” and is “responsible for constituting the condition in which things appear as things.” He cites Gilles Deleuze, who states, “I do not perceive objects...It’s my perception which presupposes the object-form” (8). Kant’s inability to “instantiate subjective necessity in his analytic of the sublime,” (Shapiro 2009, 110) extracts unwittingly a politics of mobility, which mobilized subjectivity “resist a central place from which a calculus of synthesis can occur” (99). This interrelation of mobile and spatial practices de-privileges dominant centralized loci, foci of bio- and geopolitical oriented articulations of “space and personhood” (Shapiro 1999, 89).

Rancière’s (2004) *aesthetic regime of art*, and his approach of *indisciplinary* thought as “not only a matter of going besides the disciplines but of breaking them,” informs my critical inquiry. Indisciplinary thought also asks the question: “who is qualified to speak about what?” (Rancière 2008). Rancière’s Indisciplinary thought mobilizes my conceptualization of subjects of eligibility (chapter 3). This inquiry with respect to Romani ‘mobile subjectivities’, is informed in large measure by Kathy E. Ferguson’s (1993) conceptualization of *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*:

Mobile subjectivities are temporal, moving across and along axes of power (which are themselves in motion) without fully residing in them. They are relational, produced through shifting enduring encounters and connections yet, never fully captured by them. They are ambiguous: messy and multiple, unstable but preserving. They are ironic, attentive to the manyness of things. They respect the local, tend toward the specific, but without eliminating the cosmopolitan. They are politically difficult in their refusal to stick consistently to one stable identity claim;

yet they are politically advantageous because they are less pressed to police their own boundaries, more able to negotiate respectfully with contentious others. (154)

Ferguson's analytic also speaks to mobility by which 'movement' is not delimited by "corporeal travel." Movement is also about "emotional and relational mobility" (Palladino 2016, 66). "The mobility of Gypsy Travellers involves the transmission of objects, expressions of support, the creation of landscape of memories, as well as physical and emotional returns to particular places" (Shubin and Swanson quoted in Palladino 2016, 66).

My inquiry regarding mobile subjectivities, refrains from 'final' analysis conclusive statements as a 'method' of disciplinary reifications of objectified, static Romani subjects. As framing departure points of critical analysis, method, is not necessitated by a chronological sequence. However, varying preceding trajectories of epistemological locations, inform site-situated subject enunciations. I think of it as a 'mosaic' or a 'kaleidoscope aesthetic' of inquiry. The varying forms and hues are slipping over and into each other to create new asymmetrical shapes and patterns, continually dependent on movement. My framing of inquiry averts texts such as *Gypsies and Orientalism in German Literature and Anthropology of the Long Nineteenth Century*; which seems to fetishize 'otherness' in its representational critique, to glorify the scope of German literature (Saul 2007). This form of analytical orientation utilizes distinctions between textual embodiments of Romani 'authenticity'. Authenticity, as a subject description, is meaning-making as a genuine way-of-being-in-the-world, but it also essentializes subject ascription. Michel Foucault (1970), I think, would take great delight in teasing this authenticity text apart, or as a practice, perhaps closer to 'knowledge' cutting:

“How can man think what he does not think, inhabit as though by a mute occupation something that eludes him, animate with a kind of frozen movement that figure of himself that takes the form of stubborn exteriority” (323).

Stubborn exteriority. It is persistent, as I attempt to explicate with some necessary coherent form my approach to something. The metanarrativizing *about, of, for* Romani micro-world (ings) of experience, articulate ‘dirty’ words when engaging in human subject-oriented work. I look at grammar and signifiers within the context of Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s work. Her insights interarticulate with conventions of writing, speaking, addressing anyone, anything, and are always already declarative as variations of ‘interpellation’ - as subject-making practices by daily interactions and script. Therein, are the nearly inescapable conceits of ‘method’. For example, how does my walking the urban configurations of Romani communities, and communication within bustling marketplace activity in Neukölln or Kreuzberg, as ‘participatory-observation’ method, inform my dissertation work? (chapter 5). I say ‘work’ in place of ‘research’, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) notes, within the context of colonial practices and history, it “is probably one of the dirtiest words...” In reflecting on ‘research’, she states, “just knowing that someone measured our ‘faculties’ by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds and compared the amount of millet seed to the capacity of mental thought offends our sense of who and what we are” (1).

Research ‘about’ Romani peoples has a long and dark history. I reflect on seeing large black and white photographic installations in the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma (chapter 2), depicting Nazi measurements of Romani foreheads, as an ‘intelligence’ criteria, part of death camp assessment ‘procedure’ and

taxonomies of ‘quantified’, ‘qualified’ life. How does walking across the suspended bridge towards a lighted candle, in multi-media installations of the Romani Holocaust - *Porajmos*, affect/effect “a particular [Foucauldian] *dispositif* of subjectivation and litigation through which politics comes into existence”? (Rancière 2010, 39). I think about Ian Hancock’s (2002) (director of Romani Studies at the University of Texas at Austin) statement, “there is anger at the *gadzo* [non-Romani] academics who have obtained their education as a matter of course and who are making their professional reputations by studying us and our language. There is anger at the things the *gadzo* experts have written about in their books and articles for all of us to see...” (98).

In response to Hancock’s complaint, am I eligible to write this dissertation? I am a woman, and I don’t know if I am ‘Romani’, though there are strong indications of this possibility. Even so, am I Romani ‘enough’, having no contact or engagement with Romani cultural identity practices? In other words, I don’t want to be a ‘pretend Romani’. Through widely available ancestry kits, my ‘emergent’ ancestral heritage includes the ascription, ‘Sephardic Jew’. Much of my family’s history in World War II Germany, is unknown or lost. With respect to subject purview, ‘standpoint’ and ‘method’, Sandra Harding (1987) relates, “there isn’t such a thing as a problem without a person (or groups of them) who have this problem.” In other words, “a problem is always a problem for someone or other” (Harding in Sprague 2016, 7). Especially problematic are ‘researcher’ practices of “abstract individuation,”: that is “to conceive social phenomena such as race, class, gender, sexual preference or limitation in ability in isolation from one another” (19). This abstraction (set of) practice(s) “creates

systemic biases in knowledge,” and an “objectification of the people they are used to describe” (25). Within the context of postcolonial scholarship (chapters 2 and 4), “the choices of critical scholars can also reflect their privilege” (7).

‘Subjects of eligibility’?

How does one become ‘eligible’ to write by any assemblages of prepositions or pronouns except ‘our own’? Ian Hancock is Romani. Does it make him eligible to speak for, from, or about all Romani? This is the post to the post in its kaleidoscope dynamic. Counter-‘story’-tellers, as singularity (ies), as historically ‘situated knowledge(s)’, as embodiment(s), as mobility(ies), might yawn at the singular instantiations of post- or neo-, in this instance, colonialism. They might add the follow-up question: where the heck have you been? North-South; East-West; First-World – Third-World; Developed – Developing; Emergent – Emerging; Alterity – Subaltern; Oriental – Occidental? It’s not simply a question of varying degrees of binary strength these ascriptions construct (as a way to order things so we can speak about them). In some ways, it also elides the increasing, accelerating complexity of fractionated subjectivities and assemblages between global capital exchange mechanisms and intersecting alliances of post- and transnational identities.

The framing of inquiry is (a) stage-setting, a theatrico-, and cinematico- of politics, the exchangeable apparatuses of scene-settings, mis-en-scène, and preparations as mis-en-place. It a ‘curb appeal’. It reminds me of the line delivered by Jerry (Tom Cruise) in the film *Jerry Maguire* (Cameron Crowe 1996). Jerry is in the process of breaking up with his girlfriend Avery (Kelly Preston) as she angrily complains that it’s all about him, “soothe me, save me, love me,” and Jerry later comments, “Ok just jump right into

my nightmare, the water is warm” (Crowe 1996). Without trivializing epistemological categories that help engender and mobilize counter-hegemonic discourse or critique, they do make surfaces smooth for critical intervention. Dive right in. As mobile subject trajectories from this to that, first to third, north to south, women to men, and so on; it flattens ‘location’ (verb and noun) of counter-sites articulated as juxtaposed spatiotemporal incongruencies within ‘one place’.

As urban heterotopias, sited im-positioning does not restrict Foucauldian archaeology to deviant, marginal or compulsory points of entry (jail, insane asylum, brothel, prison, etc.). I see it as a contested space within itself. It is the spatialities of space, the temporalities of time, mobilities of movement. It brings to mind, the Neukölln train station conversation with a young mother. Her subject trajectories are situated and specific to space, time, and movement. She is from Romania and her mother “lives” in Germany. Perhaps this family connection makes Germany “her place”. She indicates her residence in Germany by stating, “my house is in Kreuzberg.” It appears she does not consider Romania “her place” since her “house” is in Kreuzberg. She does not indicate if she shares this house with her mother and sister. I ask, “have you been in Germany long?” She replies “sometimes” (Berlin field notes May 23, 2011, 1). Perhaps she is replying in reference to her short-term residence in Kreuzberg or her proximity to family living in Germany. She does not claim Romani ethnicity, stating she speaks Romanian. Perhaps she is not Romani or does not (want to due to discrimination) self-identify as Romani. Romani self-identification is based on linguistic affiliation and cultural practices specific to people, place, time, and movement.

It brings to mind, the Kreuzberg Romani community of markets of varying dialects

splitting into differing registers, and political economies of spatiotemporal exchange and circulation. It brings to mind, Romani communities self-fashioning and making abandoned urban and rural spaces idiosyncratically their own - distinct and interstitial between surrounding spatial enclosures (chapter 3). Romani spatial self-fashioning as Foucauldian 'heterotopia' is the becoming of a syncretic spatial 'writing' (Foucault 1970, xix). It brings to mind, site-seeing Berlin's government center from a tour boat on the Spree, as I observe sunbathers lounging on peripheries between looming buildings of steel and glass, and the river's edge. The juxtaposition of suited government employees hustling past imported sand as the beach, and requisite umbrellas, lends a comical resistant effect. However disorienting such apprehensions of hybrid, spatiotemporal mobilizations might be, they operate within a specified register of juridico-political constituted order and regulatory matrices of intelligibility. The urban beach scene, articulates novel, self-fashioning residence of space and pace. And then is replicated as simulacra of simulacra, repeated at various intersections of dense circulations of transit and exchange (shopping emporiums, visitor attractions, museums, universities, etc.) In this way, its ironic contestation to dominant modes of ordering urban space become regularized. It becomes 'settled' space, "sedentary space," which "is striated by walls, enclosures, and roads between enclosures" (Lefebvre quoted in Palladino 2016, 69).

Where once it is novel, ironic spatio-temporal intervention, as a moment of Deleuzian informed figural deformation of boundaries (O'Sullivan 2006, 59), then by replication, becomes a "sovereign exception," (in chapter 2) as analogues of self-authorization and legitimation by localizing 'exceptional' space (Agamben 1995, 19).

‘Exceptional space’ (chapters 2 and 3) as “dominated” place delimited by hegemonies of spatial order(ing), such as the ‘Ordnungspolizei’ at Tegel Airport. Exceptional space “is for the state a political instrument of primary importance,” and as Henri Lefebvre notes, “an administratively controlled and even policed space” (Lefebvre quoted in Palladino 2016, 65). The policing of delimited space as ‘sovereign’, is site-specific to Romani mobile subjectivities, as in Irish Travellers (chapter 3) trajectories of displacement, dislocation, forced settlement, and as in the Great Halt in 1950s post-war Poland (chapter 4). Self-authorization, irrespective of purview or threshold is a high-risk agency. There is a self-reflexivity involved in momentarily choosing a situationalist form of essentializing subjectivity or identifying categories for the sake of argument or tactical subversion of some entity as Other. As Laura Corradi (2018) states in *Gypsy Feminism: Intersectional Politics, Alliances, Gender, and Queer Activism*, “definitions and categories are never neutral or innocent, and the word ‘Gypsy’ is no exception” (xv).

Romani ‘Gypsies’ were mistaken as a people coming from Egypt (chapter 2). The term ‘Gypsy’ devolved into discriminatory identity ascriptions associated with terms such as being ‘gypped’ (being cheated out of something). However, “the exonym ‘Gypsy’ “as a signifier” with “*a contended area of meaning*” is being re-appropriated by Romani activists and communities. Romani activist and author, Laura Corradi (2018) elaborates that “the term has been reclaimed among researchers and activists in different ethnic and non-ethnic groups, combining the understanding and valorization of internal differences with the awareness of living under the same type of oppression.” Corradi states, “Roma, Sinti, Manouche, Kalé, Yanish, Gitans, Camminati, Gens du

Voyage, and Travellers have all been called Gypsies; all have dealt with anti-Gypsism and persecution throughout history” (xv). For example, Romani activist, Jessica Reidy blogs on *Gypsy Represent: Thinking Critically about Romani Representation in Pop Culture* (Reidy 2014a). And *The Gypsy Lore Society* is an “an international association of persons interested in Gypsy and Traveller Studies” that “sponsors programs and conferences and publishes twice-yearly *Romani Studies* (continuing *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*)”(Gypsy Lore Society 2018). Ian Hancock, Director of Romani Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, considers the term ‘Gypsies’ discriminatory, “since “it does not account for variance and disparities among different stigmatized people” (Corradi 2018, xv).

“At the institutional level,” the European Commission does not use the term in any official capacity or document. “As Katrin Simhandl discovered, it was during the process of the European enlargement that a divide occurred; the political discourse around Western Gypsies and Travellers became marginalized, while discussions about the situation of Roma in Eastern countries gained attention.” Thus, “Travellers were separated from Eastern Roma in institutional discourse and practice.” As discursive practices, “Simhandl points out how boundaries drawn around human beings turn them into *political subjects*.” Whereas “Gypsies and Travellers” were categorized “as ‘non-ethnic’ groups, [...] the Roma underwent categorization as ‘minority’ to be respected and protected” (Corradi 2018, xvi). In this way, ‘Gypsies’ and ‘Travellers’ in the United Kingdom are categorized as ‘non-ethnic’ Whites, erroneously considered to choose to travel as a nonconforming lifestyle (chapter 4). And Eastern Romani groups are racialized as “the largest ethnic minority in Eastern Europe” (Silverman 1995). The

“small” or “insignificant” as “*minor*” in the designation of ‘minority’ “diminishes those who are the object of the defining practice.” “Calling each group of people of color ‘a minority’ does not account for the fact that Whites in the world are *the minority* compared to people of color, who should start considering themselves, as African American scholar Angela Davis suggested, an *emerging majority*” (Corradi 2018, xvi).

In ‘The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma’ (2010), reaffirming Romani human rights, the Council of Europe (CoE) uses the term ‘Roma’ irrespective of EU (European Union) regions or member-state subject ascriptions. Two EU provision developments, regarding the omission of ‘intersectionality’ (as vectors of power not limited to gender, race, class, and nation) in UN (United Nations) and EU Treaty Romani rights protections, are in the categories (Provision 13) “hate speech” (Provisions 22, 23) and “Women’s rights and gender equality” (Council of Europe 2010, 1, 2). “Hate speech” against Romani is condemned “particularly in public and political discourse.” However, hate speech is disaggregated from gender, “unequivocally racism,” with no mention of hate speech against Romani women (1). The CoE provision regarding Women’s rights and gender equality, “put in place effective measures to respect, protect and promote gender equality of Roma girls and women within their communities and in society as a whole.” The CoE provision also aims “to abolish where still in use harmful practices against Roma women’s reproductive rights, primarily forced sterilization” (2). This rights protection is under current EU and UN Treaty principles, based on the vector of power, as ‘nationality’, and left to the jurisdiction of individual EU member states (interpretation and implementation). EU and UN jurisdictional determinations are based on Treaty principles of ‘non-intervention’ and State ‘territorial integrity’. I investigate

this in further detail in chapter 4. EU human rights language uses the term ‘Roma’. In this dissertation, I refer to Roma as ‘Romani’; a self-identification accepted by varying diverse Romani communities, according to wider recent discourse and literature generated by Romani scholars and activists (chapter 4).

The term ‘Gypsy’ is used specifically within the context of cited sources and text. The terms *Romanipen*, *Romaniya*, and *Rombase*, all referring to Romani unwritten law, are different terms signifying the Romani code of unwritten law, and used alternately within the context of cited resources. This approach includes my use of the term *gadjo*, referring to non-Romani, with varying forms of spelling, such as *gorger*, *gorgia*, specific to dialects in *Rromanes* - the Romani self-identified and accepted term as a common basis for Romani language (Hancock 2010, xxi-xxii). In my dissertation work, I become even more “aware of the ambiguous circumstances in which words are contended objects in terms of meaning – and how politically they work as powerful signifiers” (Corradi 2018, xvii).

Yaron Matras’s scholarship regarding the Romani language, as a linguist at the University of Manchester, “speaks about a *double signifier*.” Signifiers engage the “capacity to define,” and ‘name’. To define, name, and categorize peoples “has always been a prerogative of those in power.” Thus, “redefining” or renaming, including re-appropriation of definitions and names by those subordinated, “has become a subversive activity worthy of reflection.” Matras articulates his insights about a ‘double signifier’ as a subversive act. He does so in reference to Dipesh Chakrabarty’s theory. Chakrabarty articulates that “History 1 is the history of imperial Europe, modern capital, and those who have power, and History 2 is made up of those many histories of

the subaltern, the colonized, and the poor.” And “wheras History 1 and History 2 are antagonistic,” the “*counter-hegemonic* interpretation” that “Matras equates” with “Gypsy 1” speaks to “the social phenomenon of itinerant communities” without defining “their origin.” He articulates “Gypsy 2 with naming practices that demonstrate Indian origins of Romanes [language], representing the Gypsies’ ancestors as Kshatriyas (warrior caste) instead of Sudra (lower caste)” (Corradi 2018, xvii).

Chakrabarty “re-signification” and “counter-definitions” engage “a *semiotic inversion of the despotic signifiers*,” and re-appropriate ‘names’ such as ‘Gypsy’. This re-signification and re-definition mobilizes a linguistic agency or a “semiotic counter-power” to the discursive practices and taxonomies of naming ‘names’ and categorizing. (Corradi 2018, xviii). When I think of post- or neo- epistemological orders, and paradigms of global polarity such as North-South, I see a hypertext of digitized, crisscrossing connectivity of capital and resource accumulation. The diagrammatic of some written word orders, in written form, as idiosyncratic spatiality, supports this inter-sectional connectivity. As idiosyncratic, syncretic spatializing, heterotopias, Foucault (1970) notes, “are disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this and that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy ‘syntax’ in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to hold together” (xix). And in this way, “an enunciation takes place whenever a group of signs is emitted. Each of these articulations has its own spatio-temporal individuality” (Foucault 1972, 101).

By shattering or tangling common names as reconfigurations, subjectivities mobilize

away from centralizing signifiers as linguistic and territorializing devices, as with Ferdinand de Saussure's [1916] "theory of the sign" (Chandler 2017). He provides new nodal points of conceptualization and departure, from which subjects of eligibility fracture 'authenticity' narratives entrenched in essentializing codes and practices. By mobilizing into further conceptual strands of singularity (ies), subjects of eligibility persistently subvert Foucault's articulation of 'stubborn exteriority'. As a tool of critical inquiry, it assists in bringing to the surface conceits of subject uniformity, or by colliding and passing through the porous narrative surfaces of fetishizing Othering. I say Othering more so now than Other for two reasons: first, the use of Other grammatically instantiates and reifies stable *functions* of identity ascriptions and the static 'noun'. Second, 'authenticity' subject constructions as a priori narratives, are not immune to grammatical intervention, destabilizing fixed signification and meaning. Further development and creation of new conceptual linkages, because of and despite their abstractions, offers new possibilities of movement "back and forth through" what Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1994) term the "plane of immanence" of concepts, the "planomenom" (35).

In framing my inquiry, these conceptual linkages, as discussed in the following chapters, mobilize subjectivities in large measure as Rancière's (2004) *ethical regime of art*, and another, *the representative regime of art*. In the former regime, "'art' is not identified as such, but is subsumed under the question of images." The specificity of images as a type of entity is the object of two questions: "the question of their origin (and consequently their truth content) and the question of their end or purpose, the uses they are put to and the effects they result in" (20). Also, "in this regime, it is a matter of

knowing in what way ‘images’ mode of being affects the *ethos*, the mode of being of individuals and communities” (21). I’m thinking here of Schmitt’s rendering of *Ortung* (making, designating the place, locating space); *Ordnung* (taxonomies of ‘order’); and *Ausnahme* as an ‘exception’, not confined to Giorgio Agamben’s (1998) conceptualization of ‘camp’ (19). Instead, ‘Ausnahme’ is a further development of Foucault’s ‘exception’ of ‘heterotopia’ as a possibility for an affirmative instantiation of difference. As Deleuze (1983) states, “a thought that would affirm life instead of knowledge that is opposed to life. Life would be the active force of thought, but thought would be the affirmative power of life. Both would go in the same direction, carrying along, smashing restrictions, matching each other step by step, in bursts of unparalleled creativity” (101).

As genres of creative enunciations, Romani ancestral stories, folktales, and fairy tales, are in part articulated as ethical instantiations that engage the way images ‘affect’ persons and communities - as *the ethical regime of art*. For example, one such site of articulation is the children’s animated film and fairy tale, *The Gypsy Woman and the Devil* (Horváth 2014). I present this story in summary:

Once upon a time, a beautiful widow leaves home and ventures into the world in desperation to find food for her thirteen hungry children, and along the way encounters the devil. The devil transforms himself into a handsome young prince, lures her into his castle and offers his help. He keeps her imprisoned inside the castle wall. One day, while he is sleeping, she gathers the food from the dinner table, digs a hole through the wall and escapes. Upon waking, the devil transforms himself from a prince into a crow, flies after her in pursuit, and with a curse, transforms her into a cherry tree. The children hearing noises outside, find a large cherry tree. They look in astonishment and wonder at the tree and find a crow perched among the branches. Using a sling, they kill the bird, cook it and eat it. They also gather the cherries and eat them. The next day, the tree grows more cherries. The children set out in search of their mother, and hear the story, ‘The Gypsy Woman and the Devil’, not knowing it is about their mother’s journey in

search of food. Since then, Romani children have been roaming the earth, in cities and villages around the world, looking for their mother, and fulfilling their thirst and hunger with cherries from the cherry tree. (Horváth 2014)

As Hungarian Romani ancestral knowledge, this story speaks to the perils of Romani community contact with the non-Romani world, but seems to do so in a life-affirming and resourceful way. This Romani fairy tale articulates physical and cultural survival as an ethos of situated ‘truth-telling’. *The Gypsy Woman and the Devil* is part of an animation series directed by Mária Horváth (Kecskemétfilm Studio) that articulates “Roma folk traditions and Roma cultural values.” “From a post-colonialist perspective,” the purpose of the producer and director “was to collect authentic folk tales, and involve Roma artists in the working process.” This fairy tale “allows the Roma artists to represent their folk heritage, and to illustrate their tradition with their contemporary art through their knowledge, tales, drawings, paintings, and music” (Orosz 2017).

The representative regime of art “breaks away from the ethical regime of images. It identifies the substance of art or rather of the arts – in the couple *poesis/mimesis*. The mimetic principle is not at its core a normative principle stating that art must make copies resembling their models. It is, first of all, a pragmatic principle that isolates, within the general domain of the arts (ways of doing and making), certain particular forms of art that produce specific entities called imitations.” As such, “these imitations are extricated, at one and the same time, from the ordinary control of artistic practices by their use and from the legislative reign of truth over discourses and images” (Rancière 2004, 21). And “it develops into forms of normativity that define the conditions according to which imitations can be recognized as exclusively belonging to an art and assessed, within this framework, as good or bad, adequate or inadequate:

partitions between the representable and the unrepresentable; the distinction between genres according to what is represented...” (21-22).

Rancière’s (2004) third regime articulates the *aesthetic regime of art*. “The aesthetic regime of the arts stands in stark contrast with the representative regime. I call this regime *aesthetic* because the identification of art no longer occurs via a division within doing and making, but is based on distinguishing a sensible mode of being specific to artistic products” (22). The aesthetic regime of art is based on a mode of sensory apprehension that draws on “Schiller’s *aesthetic state*” (23). “The aesthetic state is a pure instance of suspension, a moment when form is experienced for itself. Moreover, it is the moment of the formation and education of a specific type of humanity” (24). I draw on three of Rancière’s supporting examples in the following dissertation chapters: “Kantian ‘genius’ that is unaware of the law it produces”; “Mallarmè’s idea of a poem by the spectator-poet”; “Bresson’s idea of film as the film-maker’s thought withdrawn from the body of the ‘models’ who, by unthinkingly repeating the words and gestures he lays down on them, manifest their proper truth without either the film-maker or the models knowing it; etc.” (23). Thus, “the word aesthetics does not refer to a theory of sensibility, taste, and pleasure for art amateurs. It strictly refers to the specific mode of being of whatever falls within the domain of art, to the mode of being of the objects of art” (22). I think this is one of the most emancipatory conceptual linkages of reclaiming the ‘political’ away from normative disciplinary and social order. “The aesthetic regime of the arts [...] identifies art in the singular and frees it from any specific rule, from any hierarchy of the arts, subject matter, and genres,” and “establishes the autonomy of and the identity of its forms with the forms that life uses to shape itself” (23). It speaks to in

part what William Connolly (2011) describes in “Vicissitudes of Experience” as “uncertain exchanges between stabilized formations and mobile forces that subsist with and below them,” and “as between one open system and other human and nonhuman systems that intersect with it” (43).

Dissertation work

In the following dissertation chapters, I present a mosaic of Romani self-articulations and identity practices. Romani sites of enunciation as genres, mobilize aesthetico-political interventions to hegemonies of domination and regulatory ideals. Each chapter engages varying contextual registers as Romani historiography and archive, and site-specific Romani encounter with State-policy event. Romani film, art, music, poetry, photography, ethnography, ancestral narratives, and my field notes as ‘data’. My methodology is informed by neo-Kantian thinkers, which significance I interarticulate throughout the chapters, gradually culminating within the ‘terrain’ of international human rights. Rancière’s ‘politics of aesthetics’ conceptualizes a ‘partitioning of the sensible’ and ‘community of ‘sense’. Romani artistic enunciations articulate an aesthetic way-of-being-in the world informing my inquiry approach, and critical framework of analytical thinking.

Each chapter employs varying analytical practices, detailed in their respective introductions. I employ critical and feminist theory throughout this dissertation work, and contextually-specific, key theoretical concepts, and quotes are rearticulated or bear repeating in site-specific instantiations. My chapter writing is site-oriented, as ‘points of departure’ for critically-oriented interventions to normative ‘ways of doing’ social science work. My aim is that chapters are intertextually ‘in conversation’ with each

other. This dissertation is not a unified body of work: chapter 2 utilizes my work in the International Cultural Studies Graduate Certificate Program at the East-West Center; chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 utilizes my seminar coursework with Michael J. Shapiro; seminar coursework with Kathy E. Ferguson, and work in the Advanced Women's Studies Graduate Certificate Program. Chapter 5 utilizes in its entirety, with some modifications, my work published by the *Journal of Community Positive Practices* No. 2/2012 (Brown, 2012a). This chapter is articulated through my field notes in Germany, site-specific to institutionally-based resources, and Romani activist organizations. Realizing fairly soon during my interdisciplinary course of study, that I need not look far for significant, internationally-recognized scholarship pertaining to political theory, I have drawn in large measure from the work of my mentors; Michael J. Shapiro, and Kathy E. Ferguson. I begin chapter 2 with an ethnographic account of essentializing Romani identity and juxtapose historiography, and photography installations, as Romani archive and counter-event.

Chapter 2: Romani Mobile Subjectivities

Anda 'vresqe jakha sa dikhel anda pesqe khanc.

You see the splinter in another's eye but fail to see the beam in your own.

--Gyula Paczolay (2002)

I've seen what resentment does, how folks become the beasts they detest.

--Anonymous

Prologue

A gipsy's freedom is total, unhindered by the myriad restraints with which a Gorgio willingly yokes himself. His only contract is with nature. Nothing else binds him if he remains true to his particular creed. He acknowledges no rules or proclamations, save those made by the seasons. Not even the most totalitarian state can bring him down or change his ways, although attempts have been made down the ages. The only real solution has been to kill him, for nothing will make him conform. The true Romany is as ungovernable as any fey creature in the woods and fields. Indeed, he reveals himself to common gaze about as often as a dog fox, with whom he shares several characteristics. Not that the gipsy is afraid: merely contemptuous (Cockcroft 1979, 9).

This quote from *A Romany Summer* reflects Barry Cockcroft's (1979) accounts of his "first sighting" (12) of the Romany (man) of the Yorkshire region of Britain and his subsequent record of "whatever portions of their life they would willingly reveal" (11). He differentiates "traveling folk" who "are largely descended from Irish stock," from the "pure blood Romany" who have an "urge to wander" and "find common currency in the horse, but little else," adding "that no one knows where they come from," though "probably from the East they say" (10). Interestingly, Cockcroft's purity claims ascribes mutually exclusive categories of the Traveller's modern caravans, the 'pure blood' Romani's stock in the horse, and his referential construction of 'East'. "His way of life," he adds in self-reference, is differentiated from the Romani by "grinding through the low gears of a car" (12). "And suddenly, there was Cocker," of the pureblooded transportation category, whose "face was as brown as a chestnut," wearing an "odd

assortment of clothes” (12-13).

Cockcroft’s confusing attributions and accounts of Romani purity (also released as a documentary and “transmitted twice on the full ITV network”) invokes a taxonomy of essentialisms between human, animal, and machine: resisting conformity, the Romani “can’t be made to heel, nor gazed upon like a dog fox” by way of their vehicular elusive contract with the freedom of nature. The only effective solution to their nonconformist “way of life” and participation in the gloriousness of it all, their freedom “is to kill them” (Cockcroft 1979, 9). Cockcroft constructs his essentializing narrative to advocate for Romani human rights. However one chooses to describe Cockcroft’s dated and xenophobic composition, his essentializing tropes present articulations of ambivalence between fear and desire of Other, as “the disturbing distance in-between that constitutes the figure of colonial otherness...” (Bhabha 1994, 64). Cockcroft’s “representation of difference” might “be hastily read as the reflection of *pre-given* ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition” (3). However, he employs an ordering of otherness, as in the “traveling folk” who are “descended from Irish stock,” and “pure blood Romany,” who “no one knows where they came from,” though “probably from the East they say” (Cockcroft 1979, 10). His “representation of the subject in the differentiating order of otherness,” (Bhabha 1994, 64) locates “the very place of identification, caught in the tension of demand and desire,” as “a space of splitting” (63). Cockcroft’s racialization of Romani identities evokes the Occidental/Oriental binary, but also what Homi Bhabha (1994) characterizes as “the liminal problem of colonial identity and its vicissitudes”(64). The Irish Travellers are “different from those that are different,” such as the Romany from the ‘East’, and makes them like “one of us” (Cockcroft 1979, 64).

Cockcroft interacts with Cocker, an Irish Traveller, in the absence of the Romany, accessible “to common gaze about as often as a dog fox” (9).

Bhabha (1994) differentiates the liminal of colonial identity and “ambivalent use of different,” as “the Unconscious speaks of the form of otherness,” (64) from “the minority perspective.” The “minority perspective,” as a “social articulation of difference” is “a complex, on-going negotiation,” and “seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation” (3). Bhabha’s explication of psychological and historical articulations of identity, present points of departure from which I investigate ‘hybridities’ as Romani aesthetic subject diversifications. As a divergent approach to investigating cultural hybridity authorized primarily by psychic or historical moments, I focus on Romani mobile and *aesthetic* contestations to dominant discursive, institutional codes and practices of subjectivity that neglect such movements. Romani subject diversification and (re)positioning is mobile not only as a migratory physical movement but also the movement of continual subject ‘becomings’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 298). Put another way, I investigate Romani ‘identity’ practices that in part diversify *as* trajectories of changing aesthetico-political interventions and material ‘conditions of possibility’ (following the Kantian analytic). My concern with Romani cultural identity practices and trajectories is with *how* the hybridity of Romani subjectivities resist statist capture of subject eligibility and membership.

Introduction

In this chapter, I employ aesthetico-cultural interventions as a spatiotemporal and

site-specific informed methodology, which analytical practices invoke the politics of aesthetics, critical theory, feminist theory, and postcolonial theory. My inquiry ‘method’ juxtaposes photography, fiction, poetry, music, feature film, documentary film, ethnography, interviews, situated subject narratives, and historical documentation. Genres and source sites present Romani contestations to the global ethico-political orders of subject intelligibility as national and transnational static identity formations. These sites evince cultural practices as marginalized embodiments of fractured selves by a situated aesthetic ethic. Romani identity practices enact a performative encounter with difference that exceeds the conflicting Other (ing). In this way, I invoke instances of the genres as varying sites that reveal movement as an aesthetico-ethical dynamic of places, temporalities, material conditions, and agency, affirming and contesting spatiotemporal narratives of ‘fixed identities’. Counter to normative geo- and biopolitical narratives of identity cohesion and territorial unity, the cinematic ‘storytelling’ of the *The Crazy Stranger – Gadjó Dilo* (Gatlif 1997); the fictive treatment of nomadic encounter in the novel *Zoli* (McCann 2006); the work of ethnographer Isabel Fonesca (1995) in *Bury Me Standing: The Gypsies and Their Journey*; and my site-specific fieldwork, present points of entry into competing cosmologies of Romani knowledge and cultural practices. However, I first foreground the Romani subject trajectories, to situate singularities of historically informed subject knowledge. Such knowledge is informed in part by site-specific material conditions, corporeal, and articulated embodiments specific to the survival of a Romani individual, family, clan, or as a diaspora. Ethnolinguistic diversifications also inform competing cosmologies as Romani cultural hybridity, and by mobile *encounter* and *event*, to which

I subsequently turn. However, before doing so: what are encounter and event?

I employ ‘encounter’ throughout this writing as a *nexus* – “a particular fact of togetherness among actual entities,” informed by both Louis Althusser, and Gilles Deleuze (Candea, Matei 2016, 40). Althusser’s “idea of the encounter alludes to a chance conjuncture of atoms, the event whose consequence may be provisional configuring of facts or forms.” And that, “history emerges here as the continuous transformation of provisional forms by new, indecipherable and unanticipated events.” Althusser’s philosophy of a “materialism of the encounter” is distinct in its “nonteleological principles and its consequent ignoring of origins or ends” (Southern Nights 2012). Deleuze (2001) animates ‘encounter’, to contingencies exceeding recognition that “forces us to think.” He states, “encounter [...] forces thought to raise up and educate the absolute necessity of an act of thought or a passion to think” (139). Deleuze (1990) articulates ‘event’ as a philosophy of ‘becoming(s)’:

...the quasi-cause of what is produced within us, the Operator; of producing surfaces and linings in which the event is reflected, finds itself again as incorporeal and manifests in us neutral splendor which it possesses in itself in its impersonal and pre-individual nature, beyond the general and the particular, the collective and the private. (148)

For example, he inter-articulates his conceptualization of Event with a double structure, “a present moment of actualization” [...] embodies in a state of affairs,” yet with “no other present than that of the mobile instant which represents it, always divided into past-future” as “counter-actualization” (151). As in the personal “impersonality of dying” (153) - Deleuze asks:

Which war, for example, is not a private affair? Conversely, which wound is not inflicted by war and derived from society as a whole? Which private event does not

have all its coordinates that is, all its impersonal social singularities? There is, nevertheless, a good deal of ignominy in saying that war concerns everybody, for this is not true. It does not concern those who use it or those who serve it – creatures of *ressentiment*. Only by spreading *ressentiment* the tyrant forms allies, namely slaves and servants. The revolutionary alone is free from the *ressentiment*, by means of which one always participates in, and profits by, an oppressive order. (152)

How do conjunctural encounter and Event inform Romani situated-knowledge cartographies as non-static ‘becomings’?

Competing Cosmologies

Romani culture is rooted in oral ancestral narratives and language, and tied to individual family ‘stories’. Romani ancestral stories mobilize competing cosmologies of historically situated aesthetic and cultural practices. Specific to some Romani clan articulations of family, the retelling of stories requires elder permission. This ‘Romanipen Code’ articulates cultural knowledge as varying orthodox practices. (Weyrauch 2001, 2). For example, the collective of *kumpaniya* (families) is sparse as a literary chronicle, yet engages singular historiographies of linguistic and cultural practices. (Lee in Weyrauch 2001, 190). Romanipen code, as a culturally embedded and sacred ancestral practice, developed historically as the safeguarding of Romani cultural knowledge and survival. Romanipen elucidates genealogical trajectories and articulations of Romani (self) identification. Through ethnolinguistic inquiry, historians trace “that ancestors of the Romani people lived in the northern part of India,” and by some accounts in “central India, possibly in the modern Indian state of Rajasthan,” eventually migrating “to northwest India, in the Punjab region around 250 B.C.” (Romani People 2018). The ancestors of the Romanies “belonged to a Dom caste and their language came from Sanskrit and is related to modern Hindustani” (Romani Society and Culture 2018). Their migration across the Iranian Plateau to Southern

Europe by way of Northern Africa dates their arrival as early as the eleventh century. Accounts by historian Nicolae Iorga associate “the Roma people’s arrival with the 1241 Mongol invasion of Europe, and considered their slavery as a ‘vestige’ of that era” (Romani People 2018).

Ian Hancock (2010) (Director of the Program of Romani Studies at the University of Texas at Austin) places the arrival of the Romanies in Europe “at the end of the thirteenth century, at a time when the Ottoman Turks were taking over the Christian Byzantine Empire in order to spread the Muslim religion and extend their political influence.” Hancock adds, “at first; some Europeans thought the Romanies were Turks too and, in some places, that is still a name applied to us; another name reflecting this mistaken idea was *Saracen*, which is what the French and German people called us.” However, “there were two names which stuck” as mistaken forms of identity, “‘Tsigani’ and ‘Egyptian’.” “Tsigani” Hancock asserts, “has produced such forms as *Cingano*, *Cikan*, *Ziehgeuner* and *Cingene* and is from Byzantine Greek [...] a name given to Romanies during the Byzantine period and which means something like the ‘don’t touch’ or ‘hands off’ people.” The other names based on the mistaken identity of ‘Egyptian’ include “*Gypsy*, *Sipsiwn*, *Mojito*, *Gjupci*, *Gitano*, *Yiftos*, *Gitan* and so on.” This European ascription of Egyptian was produced in medieval Europe “as a cover-term for a number of different foreign populations at that time,” and also for the Romani’s temporary residence on the Adriatic Coast, otherwise referred to as “‘Little Egypt’” (Hancock 2010, 1).

Some historical evidence indicates that Romanies, according to Hancock (2010), “at that early period had been forcibly removed from the Balkans to Egypt by the Ottomans

but managed to make their way back to Europe, and then said they had come there from another country.” He notes, “nevertheless the name ‘Egyptians’ was probably first used to refer to Domaris then later Romanies, which was already being used in the Byzantine Empire before their move on into Europe, and so may have been brought in from there” (2). Other accounts place the Romanies emigration “in the context of raids by Mahmud of Ghazni.” As these soldiers were defeated, they moved west with their families into the Byzantine Empire.” Circa 1360, “the Romani established an independent fiefdom in Corfu and became,” what is still described as “a settled community and an important part of the economy.” By the fourteenth century, they arrived in the Balkans, in Germany by 1424, and in Scotland and Sweden by the sixteenth century. This Romani route was the second flow of migration, meeting the migrant group from the Iberian Peninsula in France” (Romani People 2018).

Romani clan subjectivities diversify by linguistic identity articulations, historical migration, and are self-designated along cultural, dialectical, and territorial subject trajectories. Romani living in Europe range from estimates as 4 to 14 million. For a number of reasons, some of them culturally significant, site-specifically, Romani refrain from identifying their ethnic identity in country censuses. Since “all Romanis use the word Romani as an adjective, it is used to designate the ethnic group by many organizations, including the United Nations and the Council of Europe.” The term ‘Roma’, with ties to Eastern and Central Europe, is “increasingly used as a generic term for the Romani as a whole.” Hancock (2010) explains further, “that while its use in this way is sanctioned by different Romani organizations (such as, e.g., the Nordic Roma Council, Sa-Roma, Inc., and the Roma National Congress), not all groups accept it by

any means.” This select acceptance of the term ‘Roma’ is due to the meaning ascribed originally to the word *Rom* as a “married Romani male,” however “after their arrival in Europe, it diverged in two directions. This interpretation was kept for some but restricted specifically to themselves, and for others, it meant only ‘husband’. On the other hand, *all* groups use the adjective Romani to describe themselves.” Hancock adds, “a Sinto or Romanichal will readily admit to being a Romani person, to speaking the Romani language, and maintaining Romani culture” (xix).

Some other dialectical and territorial examples are Romani of Central Italy; the Iberian Kale of Portugal and Spain; the Finnish Kale who also migrated to Sweden; the Welsh Kalé; German-speaking Sinti; French-speaking Manush; the Romanisael of Sweden and Norway; and the Romanichal of Great Britain (Romani People 2018). There are also further internal differentiations based on territorial and occupational ascriptions, as Hungary’s Lovari; and Arginari silversmiths. Romani socio-cultural identity articulations, as the “Rom-Vlach Gypsies” of Europe, the United States and Canada, differentiate by way of group-centered boundaries of identity formations (Lee in Weyrauch 2001, 188). “The primary identity of any member of the Rom-Vlach group is the family. The individual Rom-Vlach Gypsy then belongs to an extended *familiya* (family), which along with other numerous families forms a *vista* (clan), and a large number of *vitsi* (plural of *vista*) form a *natsiya* or nation” (197). However, individual Romani self-identification rarely use personal names such as Patrin or Papush from their language, and more often adopt names of a linguistic ‘host’ culture; perhaps this is due, in part to efforts of integration, or fear of discrimination and persecution (Romani People 2018).

The historical persecution of the Romani is significant to their contemporary experiences of discrimination, and has a long historical legacy. The Romani slave trade in “Bulgaria and Serbia”, precede official historical records of Romani persecution in ‘The Great Roundup’ (1749) of Spanish Romani and Gitanos (Romani People 2018). This brings to mind the contemporary persecution by the Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel’s approved expulsion of an approximated 12,000 German-speaking Romani in 2010 that fled Kosovo during the Serbian conflict (Human Rights Watch n.d.). It also implicates the ethnocentric and xenophobic tactics by former French President Nicolas Sarkozy’s directed deportation of Romani living in 200 camps on the outskirts of Paris and Lyon, on the basis of ‘criminality’ and ‘delinquency’ (Saltmarsh 2010). Another example of ongoing violence against the Romani in France is cited by an August 2012 EU news report stating, “French authorities on Thursday dismantled two makeshift camps housing 200 people near Lille and 240 Roma Gypsies from Lyon to Romania in the biggest repatriation of its kind since Francois Hollande succeeded Nicolas Sarkozy as President in May 2012” (The Local France 2012). Further violence and persecution escalates in September, as “a group of vigilantes have evicted a group of Roma (Gypsies) from a Marseille housing estate and burnt down their camp” (BBC 2012b). All such ordered decrees are in direct violation of ‘EU citizen rights’, which necessitate an individual case-by-case investigation of violation under member-state law. Furthermore, in other parts of Europe, a documentary filmed as late as 2003, evidences in horrific detail, the forced sterilization of Romani women in Slovakia as a routine practice in a hospital near Bratislava. Romani are also subject to forced labor, ethnic ‘cleansing’, and Romani children abducted or forced into schools for the

‘developmentally delayed’. Amnesty International confirms reports on a policy proposal by Slovakia’s Prime Minister, Robert Fico (no longer in office since July of 2010) “that Roma children will be taken from their home settlements and placed in state-run schools,” as a forced-boarding school strategy (Parry n. d.).

One of the greatest horrors of Romani persecution occurred during the *Porajmos*, the Nazi genocide of Romani people living in Germany during World War II (Romani People 2018). In 1937, the Romani were stripped of their citizenship, deprived of their civil rights with the National Citizenship Law, imprisoned in concentration camps and later extermination camps such as the Belzec death camp. Heinrich Himmler in the same year issued “The Struggle against the Gypsy Plague” decree, which required documentation on Romanies to be sent from regional police headquarters to the Reich Central Office. This Nazi decree was based on the reiteration “that Romanies of mixed blood were the most likely to engage in criminal activity” (Hancock 2010, 37). The deportation of Romani to Auschwitz-Birkenau was ordered by Himmler on December 16, 1942 and was the “final stage of the final solution of the Gypsy Question” (44). And “the decree served as the basis for complete extermination” (45). This policy of Romani extermination was extended to Nazi-occupied territory and applicable to allies, such as Romania and Hungary. Hancock suggests an estimated million and a half Romani were murdered, while other estimates (due to inaccurate pre-war census numbers) propose between 220,000 and 500,000 Romani killed. (Romani People 2018). “Although it wasn’t the first governmental order to exterminate Romanies, (German Emperor Karl VI had previously issued such an order in 1721) it was by far the most devastating, ultimately destroying over half of the Romani population in Nazi-occupied Europe.” “In

Romani, the Holocaust is referred to as the *Baro Porrajmos*, or ‘great devouring’ of human life” (Hancock 2010, 34).

“In 1956,” the German Federal Court stated that “their (Roma and Sinti) deportation to the concentration camps had not been persecution out of racial reasons, but a pre-emptive criminal measure.” Since “1980 German Roma survivors have been eligible for roughly 3,000 now (euros) per person,” roughly 4000 U.S. dollars. Also, “until 1985 all marriages, births, and deaths of traveling people had to be reported to the criminal police.” The Central Council of German Sinti and Roma, issued a complaint addressed to the U.N. Working Group on Minorities, about a Bavarian police database of Romani personal records. It was not until October of 2001 that the Bavarian Constitutional Court ordered the deletion of such personal records, which included data on Romani clan leaders. The same year, in Brandenburg, Germany, a Romani campsite was bombed and set ablaze with Molotov cocktails (Minority Rights International n. d.).

Currently, Romani, and Jews remain the primary targets of neo-Nazis and other radical right-wing groups. In the Czech Republic, members of the far-right, anti-Romani ‘Worker’s Party’, Ivo Muller and Vaclav Cojocar, hurled a Molotov cocktail into the Romani home of three-year-old Natalka Kudrikova . “The attack took place on “the 120th anniversary of Adolf Hitler’s birth.” Natalka survived (CNN 2010). In November of 2001, The International Organization for Migration, designated to compensate Romani Holocaust survivors, issued a brief indicating, Nazis murdered 1.5 million Romani (Hancock 2010, 48). Furthermore, the Nazi genocide of Romani and Sinti is not officially recognized in Germany until 1982. It isn’t until October 24, 2012, that a “memorial to Roma Holocaust victims opens in Berlin.” German Chancellor Angela

Merkel, German President Joachim Gauck, and Romani Rose, Head of the German Central Council of Sinti and Roma are in attendance. Romani Rose, declares, “opening the memorial sends an important message to society that anti-Roma sentiment is as unacceptable as anti-Semitism” (BBC 2012a). “Despite the official recognition of the Roma Genocide by the German Authorities, this chapter in European history still remains largely unrecognized.” The Romani Holocaust “was denied recognition based on the argument that the murders of Roma under the Nazi regime were not done on racial grounds, but rather for the Romani status as ‘antisocial’ or criminal groups.” However, “April 15, 2015 marked a historical moment. The European Parliament voted with an overwhelming majority to finally adopt a resolution” that “recognized 2 August as the European Roma Holocaust Memorial Day” (International Roma Youth Network 2015).

Roma Rising

The recent ‘memorializing’ of Romani Holocaust victims by the German federal (parliamentary republic) government speaks to Homi Bhabha’s (1994) explication of “ambivalence”, “hybridity”, and “mimicry” in the encounter with difference within and between the colonizer and the colonized (75). Merkel’s approved collective expulsion/deportation of 12,000 Romani from Germany, juxtaposed by way of her commemoration and recognition of Romani Holocaust victims, presents a critical disjuncture between statist/static and mobile identity formations. A momentary spatiotemporal agency enacts a symbiotic inter-articulation of fixed identity, as a state-centric encounter between Angela Merkel, Germany’s state leader, and Romani Rose, leader of Germany’s Documentation and Cultural Center of Sinti and Roma. The co-

presence(ing) of Merkel and Rose standing nearby and gazing into the memorial's reflective water feature, speaks to a ritual production and reproduction of what Bhabha might describe as a self-defining dependency on the conflicting, yet indispensable Other. The 'memorializing' of Romani Holocaust victims by the participants of this state encounter and event, makes Romani identity 'markers' "recognizable," as a criteria for 'legitimacy', and gestures to the Sinti and Roma Documentation and Cultural Centre's exhibition of a photography text, *Roma Rising* (Butler 1997, 5).

Roma Rising: romské obrozeni, is a photography text by Chad Evans Wyatt (2005). It is a collection of 170 formal black and white portraits of Czech Roma. The portraits are full-page length size. The book size and dimension is that of a periodical. Opposite the portrait photograph of individual Romani subjects is a brief biographical summary. It includes the date and place of birth, education, occupation, life successes, and questions such as "do you live as you wish?"; "what are your plans?"; "your life motto, credo, wish is...?" The book's publication seeks to provide a counter-text to romanticized, mythologized photographic depictions of the Romani exotic Other. Photographer Wyatt explains, "consider the 'gypsy' photograph as text." He asks, "what are its usual elements?" Wyatt continues, "the first ingredient is an exoticism, an otherwise 'otherness' separating a group from its majority context [...]. Often as not, this is presented in garish color, furthering the isolation of those captured on film. In its current form, this style of photograph, in the word of Miroslav Vojtěchovsky, produces a kind of 'theater' of grotesque characters unresolvably different, without redemption, often emphasizing aspects of poverty, unbridled ecstasy, rootlessness, and irresponsibility." Furthermore, "the 'gypsy' photograph admits of only one truth,

unresolvable problems. But if this received wisdom were only partly true, is it speaking falsely even of this partial truth? What if there were substantial parts of the Roma community thought not to exist, who lead lives of accomplishment, on terms society can understand?" Wyatt continues to describe occupational identities of accomplishment: "attorney, doctor, teacher," and those "who have crafted businesses, who have published works in all the arts of writing." And Roma "who are musicians, yes, but also pedagogues" (Wyatt 2005, 12).

I encountered the Roma photography portraits depicted in this book in a life-size format in installation during my fieldwork at the Roma and Sinti Documentation Center in Heidelberg, Germany on June 14, 2011. This photography collection was a temporary exhibition alongside the Centre's permanent exhibition of Romani Holocaust victims. The Romani portrait installation was part of a larger traveling exhibition throughout Europe called, 'We Are Who We Are'. The exhibition was sponsored by the non-profit organization, The Good Neighbor Endowment Fund, which "provides cultural and educational activities" (Wyatt 2005, 9). My attendance at the exhibition was by happenstance accompanied by an Anthropology student who graduated with an M.A. from U.H. Mānoa five years ago, and her insights partially informed me. The exhibition presentation was an austere, stark, and harshly lighted confrontational experience. Perhaps, this was the intent of the exhibition organizers. Wyatt's narrative of countering 'truth' or partial 'truths' of prior photographic depictions of Romani, in some ways substituted one practice of essentializing Romani subjectivities with another. Instead of depicting the Romani as the romanticized and exotic Other, Wyatt photographs Romani as 'successful' subjects, constituted in part by statist formations of

productive citizen membership, and as Wyatt states, obliged “on terms that “society can understand” (12). Within the framing of a photographic counter-text, devoid of color, it seemed tactically well placed and configured to achieve whatever desired effect of Romani accomplishments and ‘success’. However, it appeared to be operating on the flip side as a majoritarian and statist constructed identity criteria of ‘legitimacy’ and ‘recognizability’, to constitute a refashioning of Romani subjectivities. As such, these photographic depictions of Romani also seems to effect a re-territorializing, in place of a de-territorializing of mobile subject sites, as encounter and event. The traveling exhibition of Wyatt’s black and white photographs is in a room adjacent to the permanent ‘exhibition’ of black and white photographs of Romani Holocaust survivors and victims. Upon exiting this ‘documentation centre’ in Germany, I became chillingly aware of the juxtaposition of both photographic counter-texts to the horrors of German-state directed violence, surveillance, and control. However, both instances of photographic documentation appeared to evidence an appeal to state-sanctioned identity constructions of ‘Romani legitimacy’, either by ‘memorializing’ or by integrating ‘successful-identity’ membership.

‘Home’

Romani historically situated knowledge and embodiments are inscribed by cartographies of identity surveillance. The strange essentialist ascriptions of Romani ‘purity’ by Cockcroft explicate a trajectory of colonial ambivalence that might well serve the rallying of counter-essentialist identity narratives. The binary identity markers as animate/inanimate; human/non-human; fear/desire; occidental/oriental; self/other; subject/object; man/woman; black/white; homosexual/heterosexual;

organic/mechanism; nature/machine; science/technology; analog/digital, etc., seem to lure the metaphysical politics of transcendence and ‘oppositionality’ along simultaneous trajectories of control. Specific critical inquiry regarding cultural identity formations highlights the process of ambivalence between Romani subject diversifications, self-articulations, and hybridity. Emergent critiques as reorientations of ‘material realities’ seem to scope and poke within and between these fissures of fractioned subjectivities. No longer considered the dialectical “insidious foundationalism,” (Coole and Frost 2010, 6) of the twentieth century, the dynamic agency of matter, or what I invoke as micro-materialisms, effect, impinge by way of/as immanent and ‘molecular becomings’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 34). For example, articulations of techno-temporal and digitized spatialities as cultural practices may engender conjuncture (al) networks of movement, speed, and inter-articulating embodiments. ‘Face-time’ as features of ‘smart-phone’ applications, and live video streaming on social media platforms forges new cultural modalities of information gathering and situated knowledge. The virtual and the ‘real’, as interacting matrixes, forge new fissures and offshoots of fractal subject diversifications and micro-materialisms, which exact a site-specific ontological agency. In this way, matter is continually provoking and prodding re-assemblages of hybrid self-articulations.

Between and alongside these fissures of sited mobility and nodal subject formations, lie the continual contestations, and “the dissonance between place and desire” (Mufti and Shohat 1997, 1). Articulations of fractured selves and self-diversification impinge and is impinged by its shifting form in a continual vacillation within assemblages and embodiments of absenced presence, and invisible visibility. It is less Bhabha’s (1994)

third-space hybridity “the split space of enunciation” as “the cutting edge of translation and negotiation” and is more akin to Meiling Jin “– the evil eye – becoming the ‘subject’ of a violent discourse of *ressentiment*” (56, 75). It is what Jin “calls the secret of ‘Invisible-ness’,” which “is articulated in those iterative instances that simultaneously mark the possibility and impossibility of identity, presence through absence” which “creates a crisis in the representation of personhood, and at the critical moment initiates the possibility of political subversion.” (79, 75). As such, “invisibility erases the self-presence of that ‘I’ in terms of which traditional concepts of political agency and mastery function.” The eye “outstares linear continuous history and haunts the teleological agency” (79). The eye reassembles, becomes disembodied, re-embodied as a historical and micro-material agency, reorienting linearity, as in the conjunctural spatiotemporal conditions of possibility, as in memories, as in the memories of Zoli Novotna, to which I now pivot. In the novel *Zoli*, roughly based on the life of the Polish Romani poet Papusza, Zoli remembers. In Czechoslovakia, 1930’s:

I was six years old. My hair was cut short. I’d hacked it off with a knife. I tell you this directly, there is no other way to say it-mother was gone, my father, my brothers, my sisters and cousins too. They had been driven out on the ice by the Hlinka guards. Fires were lit in a ring around the shore, and guns were pointed so they could not escape. The caravans were forced to the middle of the lake as the day grew warmer. The ice cracked, the wheels sank, and the rest followed, harps, wheels and horses. I did not see any of it happen daughter, but I could hear it in my mind and, although there was great music to come along later, sweet sounding moments when our people were raised up and strong and valued, that will always be a time of looking backwards, listening and waiting for my dead family to catch up. (McCann 2006, 15)

Zoli’s recollection of bearing witness to the murder of her family by the Hlinka fascists and her register of sense perception and experience articulate a present tense that exceeds grammar and resides between “partitions of the sensible” that are “always of

the moment” (Rancière 2004, 88). “It is the demonstration (*manifestation*) of a gap in the sensible itself” (Rancière 2010, 39). Zoli recounts the agency of the ice cracking, the sweet sounding moments when her people were raised up, listening for her deceased family to catch up (McCann 2006, 15). It invokes what Davide Panagia (2009) describes as “the emergence of a heterology extraneous to a common world of perceiving and, through that emergence, a disruption of the mechanisms that enable the fluidity of operation.” She tells directly: her hair is cut short, the caravans are forced to the middle of the lake, and the day grew warmer. She did not see this happen, and with great music to come later. Zoli “makes visible what had been excluded from the perceptual field, and it makes audible what used to be inaudible.” As such, her ‘re-partitioning of the sensible’ “is an aesthetico-political moment that results in the reconfiguration of the regimes of perceptions that seize our attention, so that we can no longer assume the legislative authority (or logical priority) of any one form of perception” (Panagia 2009, 42). With this in mind, I introduce the Polish Romani poet, ‘Papusza’ on whose life the novel *Zoli* is based.

Papusza (‘doll’) was a Polish Romani poet who managed successfully to sneak in reading time and trade chickens for books. The novel *Zoli* indicates that she was taught by her surviving grandmother to read and write, though other accounts vary. “Polish poet Jerry Ficowski heard Papusza sing and immediately recognized her talent.” He then “began collecting and transcribing the stories that she had painstakingly copied out in Romani, written phonetically in the Polish alphabet.” He persuaded her to publish her work, with the rationale that by raising public awareness of the plight of her people, she could help them. Papusza survived the fascist and then communist regimes in post-WW

II Europe. “The new socialist government in postwar Poland aspired to build a nationally and ethnically homogenous state.” The “Office of Gypsy Affairs,” (though Romani are only a very small minority in Poland) that is the police, “enforced the settlement of the Gypsies,” with a program known as The Great Halt. It was initiated in 1952 and remained in effect until 1989” (Fonesca 1995, 7).

In postwar Poland, The Great Halt “belonged to the feverish fashion for ‘productivization’,” with similar legislation enacted in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania. Government officials manipulated Papisza and her writing for propaganda purposes. Using her public profile, they constituted her and her work as a successful ‘model’ of Gypsy assimilation. However, communist propaganda interests in her work waned, and Papisza felt used and embittered, and she asked the publishers to stop printing her work, but they refused. She then went home and “burned all her work—some three hundred poems.” She was put on trial in the Polish Romani community and called before “the *Baro Shero*, Big Head, or elder.” “After much deliberation, she was proclaimed *mahrime* (or *magherdi* among Polish Roma) as ‘unclean’; the punishment was irreversible exclusion from the group.” After that, she lived alone and in relative obscurity. However, in the 1960’s, she wrote many more poems which remain available to this day. She died in 1987. Shortly before she was put on trial and excluded from her Romani community, she wrote to Ficowski, whose initial encouragement to publish her verse, positioned him to influence the publishers. “If you print these songs I shall be skinned alive, she wrote, my people will be naked against the elements. But who knows, maybe I will grow another skin, maybe one more beautiful” (Fonesca 1995, 7-9).

Following is one of Papisza’s remaining poems:

I love the fires as my own.
Winds fierce and small rocked the gypsy girl and her far out into the world.
The rains washed away my tears.
The sun-the golden Gypsy father warmed my body and wonderfully singed my
heart
.....the Gypsy horse neighs, wakes strangers
But gladdens a Gypsy heart
Oh how fine to live, in the night go the river,
Catch cool fish like cold water
In your hand...In heaven the hen and chickens
And the Gypsy wagon
They foretell the whole Gypsy future,
And the silver moon,
The father of the forefathers of India,
Gives us light,
Watches the children in the tent.
Lights the Gypsy woman
That she may swaddle the baby well...no one understands me,
That of which I speak
Has all passed away
Everything, Everything has gone with it.
And those years of youth. (Thibodeau 2003).

Papusza's life and poetry chronicle diversifying subjectivities between inclusion and exclusion within the Romani and non-Romani culture and structures of domination, coursing along the trajectory of fixed identity coordinates, such as gender or race or ethnicity or class or nation. The politics of aesthetics, as an alternate reading of hybridity, evokes a dynamic of the subject becoming that supersede Bhabha's and

Fanon's re-conceptualization of the negotiation of desire. The intervention of the aesthetico-political moment 'always already' resides in the moment and the structures of domination. Developed by Paul Ricoeur (1990), "the self is 'always already' "dialogically related to other selves," as an "intersubjective sphere of consciousness." And "for Ricoeur, the self in its temporal attestation to itself is always already in response to" [...] otherness (Klemm 2002, 105). Thus, the subjective negotiation is not born out of recognition or acknowledgment of totalizing/generalizing discourse, mythologies, and underlying categorical assumptions as for gender or sexuality or race or class or nation. Instead, the momentary freeze-frame of the sensible and its re-partitioning counter-intuitively mobilizes political agency within the suspension of this gap, between sense, the consciousness of self, and action. Romani cultural identity practices as marginalized embodiments of fractured selves, as a "situated ethic," aesthetically enact a performative encounter with difference (Ong 2009: 159). This 'situated ethic' exceeds Bhabha's (1994) explication of ambivalence and antagonism to avoid "the increasingly facile adoption of a homogenized Other" (75). Romani mobile subjectivities are self-fashioning as a situated aesthetic-ethic and re-articulate, as a re-distribution of the sensible. This Romani self-fashioning is the 'sensible' as "a system of coordinates defining modes of being, doing, making, and communicating that establishes the borders between the visible and invisible, the audible and the inaudible, the sayable and the unsayable" (Rancière 2004, 89).

Hybridization as mobile diversifying subjectivities resides within and along these gaps between the sensible - and material, corporeal agency, in the absence of legislation. Thus, subject hybridity substantiates structures of domination which agency

works alongside hegemony while subverting it. However, inhabiting spatiotemporal agency, subject hybridity always already mobilizes aesthetico-informed subversions to epistemological methodologies of legitimization and abstractions of sovereignty. As such, hybrid agency is molecular, fluid, and collides, envelops, permeates through the porous coding and materiality of universalized abstractions of ‘autonomy’ and ‘uniformity’. Hybridity as always already intersubjective, as a spatiotemporal agency of subversion, does not seek an oppositional or emancipating counter-narrative based on hegemonies and modalities, arresting subjective suspension and diversification. Hybridity’s molecular dynamic and becomings, its *proximity*, *indiscernibility*, persistently diffuse centripetal organization of hegemonic hierarchies, by dispersed (in) voluntary association (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 279). Hybridity as an aesthico-material dynamic, however, articulated and embodied as de-territorializing subject trajectories and cartographies, de-privilege bio-politically and geo-politically oriented articulations of Other. Romani hybrid intra- intersubjectivities associate as communal, clan or kinship affiliations, and material conditions on the ground, which diaspora contest multicultural assimilations and historical acculturations. “For example, in censuses, the hetero-identified Roma do not often self-identify as Roma and they choose to identify with other ethnic groups, while in other social situations the same people self-identify as Roma” (Bunescu 2016, 1). Thus, “at the local level in a multi-ethnic locality in Transylvania, one could observe that within the same hetero-identified Roma group there is a tendency for differentiated and fragmented self-identifications, while at the state level, for instance in Romania, and at the international level there is a an opposite tendency that blurs differentiations and emphasizes a more homogenous

collective identity of the Roma” (2). This Romani hybridity introduces further critical provocations with respect to the Romani diaspora, inter- intra- transcultural, national migration and exile.

Critical re-articulations of migration, of exile and diaspora “have played an important role in a cultural critique that not only charted the history of communities displaced [...] but also employed that history as a condition and a trope for cultural criticism itself.” Thus, “the repeated mutual impacting of divergent trajectories, claims, and memories which constitute the cultural landscape of late capitalism, the loss of home and the struggle to reclaim it are experienced fraught with tension” (Mufti and Shohat 1997, 2). One locus in the ‘loss of home’, is experienced by Elvis Berishaj’s from Dingelbe, deported from Lower Saxony in Germany to Kosovo. Elvis Berishaj is contending with various competing state-membership eligibility requirements. He articulates his subjectivities as a Serb-speaking Kosovar Roma, who grew up in Germany, speaking German and Romani. He considers Dingelbe his home. He has childhood memories of Kosovo, yet now feels foreign around ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, and does not speak the language. According to German government regulations, Elvis has to obtain a Kosovo passport to apply for legal residency in Germany. Kosovo is not yet recognized as an EU member-state by all EU states. Kosovo immigration officials speak Albanian, and due to his extended and continued absence, lack of identity documentation, as well as destroyed birth records during the 1999 war, are now reluctant to provide him the necessary paperwork for a passport application. He has been denied political ‘refugee status’ in Germany, and the Ministry of the Interior deems his repatriation (deportation) commonly referred to as

'Abschiebung' (expulsion), to Kosovo as “safe for return”. His deportation reflects a current ongoing ‘repatriation’ policy of “50,000 Roma, most of them Serbian speaking,” to Kosovo since 1999, with as many as 12,000 people facing deportation from Germany alone (Human Rights Watch n.d.).

In 1997 the Albanian Liberation Army burned hundreds of Romani, Serb, and Ashkali homes in Kosovo. Since then, many Romani refugees have settled in Rosenwinkel, in the provincial town of Göttingen in Lower Saxony, Germany. The Romani community in Rosenwinkel is comprised largely of refugees from Kosovo. Some Romani children have never been to Kosovo, and speak mostly German and schooled English. Other Kosovar Romani have been granted *Duldung* (tolerance) status by the German Ministry of the Interior, and have since visited Kosovo since it gained independence from Serbia. Though Kosovo is deemed “safe for return,” more explicitly deportation of the Romani by the German government, and ethnic hatred against the Romani by the Kosovar Albanians, remains. Large sectors of Romani communities in Kosovo sided with the Serbs during the war, at a time when Kosovo was yet a province of Serbia (Human Rights Watch n. d.). Elvis’s expulsion from Germany, which he considers his home, reveals the critical juncture between Romani mobile identity practices and state-policy events or practices. Thus, within in the context of a culture of surveillance and control, “belonging cannot be housed simply within the material space of walls and roof, of fenced topographies and well-drawn maps” (Mufti and Shohat 1997, 1).

As Avtar Brah (1996) notes, how does one examine or problematize distinctions between “‘indigene’ subjectivities and nativist discourse,” in the “immanent diaspora

space inhabited by diasporic subjects, but also by those who are constructed and represented as indigenous” (16). Within this analysis, the term diaspora, cultural landscape, and home conspicuously interconnect ideational, semiotic and semantic peripheries. In this way, the diaspora is often contextually located in reference to borders, as to landscape, as to culture, as to ‘home’. However, varied sites that exceed considerations of loci as static and nomadic enunciation, reveal diasporic movement as an ethical dynamic of people, place, time, event, and encounter, affirming and contesting spatiotemporal narratives of ‘fixed’ identities and geopolitical enclosure. According to Gilles Deleuze (1986), “movement is a translation of space. Now each time there is a translation of parts in space, there is a qualitative change in a whole” (8). Exemplary of such considerations is the genre of film, as a cultural locus or site of enunciation, enacting an aesthetico-material agency. Film mobilizes its own diasporic movement and cinematic cartography concerning subject (re)positioning in relation to space, place, and time. These cartographic linkages and dialogic inter-articulations between a film’s cinematic subjects, and with the film’s viewer, engages a modal exchange and circulation of the haptic embodiment. The viewer’s embodiment in relation to the screen’s filmic space is oriented by the ‘movement image’. In the following, the cinematic storytelling of *The Crazy Stranger* or *Gadjo Dilo* (Gatlif 1997) by Romani director Tony Gatlif, presents another such point of entry into competing cosmologies of identity-knowledge boundaries.

Gadjo Dilo

In *The Crazy Stranger* (1997), Stéphane, the main protagonist (Romain Duris), a young man visiting from France, wanders along an icy road in search for Nora Luca, a

Romani singer. He carries with him a cassette tape of her music belonging to his deceased father, whom he describes as restless, dying with the nomads somewhere in Syria. His sentimental quest develops in the yearning for his father, and childhood memories of his father's frequent absence. In his search for Nora, Stéphane encounters Isidor (Izidor Serban) whom he mistakenly understands as comprehending his travel quest. Isidor brings him to the Romani village of Crețulești, Romania, and Stéphane settles in, hoping to find Nora. Despite initial Romani distrust of his intentions, he gains the affections of Isidor and his clan community. New to the village, to the micro-worlds of Romani ethnocultural allegiances, Stéphane and Isidor's linguistic barriers, and mutual recognition of mobile subjectivity forges a shared haptic alliance and kinship.

The film's primary (re)orientation depicts the village's main road as a central thematic presence and agency, as it cuts to long shots of its trajectory. At the beginning of the film, as the credits roll, we hear the road as the crunching of snow and ice, as viewers potentially doubt their association of sound with image. This viewer doubt is perhaps a "cinematographic *Cogito*: 'insistent' or 'obsessive' framing, which makes the camera await the entry of a character into the frame," and makes "the camera felt" (Deleuze 1986, 74). As the screen image appears, the camera angle is pointed toward Stéphane's back, hovering slightly above his plodding, isolated figure, against the backdrop of a barren winter landscape. He complains that he does not like to walk, and announces his further refusal to do so. Then the Romani music begins and Stéphane dances in a circular motion, as viewers share his visual perspective of swirling ground and sky. The rhythm of the music speeds up to dizzying effect, as we visually swirl faster and faster around with him. This shared haptic and visual space between the

film's protagonist and film viewer enacts a digital agency of mutual subject identification. The increasing musical tempo also establishes an audible relationship between the viewer and the cinematic framing and rhythm of storyline sequences. As the Romani musical rhythms and performance frequencies increase, the plot quickens.

Stéphane first sights Sabina (Rona Hartner) as he continues his journey on the same road. After getting a ride in a flatbed truck for part of the way, he proceeds on foot, eventually encountering a horse-drawn wagon carrying Sabina and other Romani women from the village. Both Stéphane and the wagon encounter difficulty in their travel. His shoes are falling apart, and as he stops to examine them, the horses slowly pass him as they attempt to pull the wagon and cross the road's icy surface. He greets the women and asks in French if they are musicians. They don't understand him, except for Sabina who responds with a Romani song. Having left her husband in Belgium to return to her village, she has learned to speak French. Stéphane does not comprehend her song, speaking neither Romani nor Romanian. As such, this frames the initial plot sequences as Stéphane attempts to further linguistically negotiate his search for Nora Luca. His 'outside' status evident, Sabina's status links her to her French language comprehension. Romani men in her village shun her and label her a whore, due to her uncertain marital status and loss of virginity. As an outsider in her community, she develops a friendship with Stéphane after her initial contempt for him as a Frenchman, perhaps a residual affect/effect of her experiences with her husband in Belgium. As Stéphane continues his journey, a truck carrying uniformed officers and a young, facially battered Romani male prisoner passes in transit.

Eventually cold and exhausted, Stéphane arrives in the village, boarded up for the

evening curfew. He befriends Isidor, an older man mourning the loss of his arrested son Adriani (the prisoner he encounters earlier on the road), and reluctantly shares Isidor's insistent offer of his vodka bottle. Neither men gain entrance into the village café after persistent attempts and seek solace in each other's company. Both men communicate with each other in their language. Stéphane asks in French if Isidor has heard of the musician Nora Luca. Isidor responds in Romani, gesticulating and shouting that his people get no justice. Despite their mutual misunderstanding, a form of communication takes place, as the camera zooms in on their faces close-up. Affinity and affection pass through their faces, idiosyncratically, momentarily, reflecting intensity of individual passions, though semantically misaligned, they bond through grievance and loss. As Deleuze's (1986) insights edify, "In so far as it thinks about something, the face has value above all through its surrounding outline, in reflecting unity which raises all parts to itself. Sometimes on the contrary; it experiences or feels something, and has value through the intensive series that its parts successively traverse as far as paroxysm, each part taking on a kind of momentary independence" (89).

Gatlif's cinematic framing informs by aesthetic interventions rather than just psychic narratives of subject mobility. He aesthetically (re)configures Romani cultural 'gendered performativity', in Judith Butler's analytic, as Romani embodied cultural practices interarticulated by music and dance scenes in varying street and café venues. In place, the film's rendering of subject articulations is always already in process, in circulations of exchange between the gaps of insider, outsider subjectivities. Fixed identity markers of gender, race, class, and nation seem to become performance platforms for Gatlif's cinematic technique, as he riffs off them with de-territorializing

glee. Insider/outsider binary identity constructions become increasingly irrelevant as they shift in encounters, events, and material conditions on the ground. Evinced in part by the following analysis of film sequences, affective exchange between Stéphane, Isidor, Sabina, Adriani, Romani, and non-Romani village residents, intra- and inter-personally rupture static personhood. All negotiate varying subjectivities between themselves and within themselves, effected by ambiguities and uncertainties in space, place, time, and movement.

As Stéphane awakens in Isidor's cottage the day following their bonding experience, he greets the curious Romani village residents in French. They respond to him with accusations of being a bum, pointing to his worn-out shoes, as they come to terms with his stranger presence in their village. "He is a thief," they say, who wants to steal their chickens, and he must be crazy they say. Gatlif crafts each film sequence in a way that engenders another role reversal and swap in identity ascriptions or constitutive associations. Chased out of the village by the Romani residents, Stéphane encounters more linguistic difficulties with Romanian non-Romani in the café in his attempts to order a drink. Meanwhile, Isidor returns in the wake of Stéphane's departure and scolds the Romani villagers for letting Stéphane leave. "Why hold back someone who is crazy," a Romani woman replies. "He is a murderer." "He will kidnap the women and children." "He is a bandit." "He has cursed your house." One of the Romani men enters Isidor's cottage to investigate, "No," he mutters, "there is nothing here to steal except the fire in the fireplace." But it too has gone out. Isidor maintains his defense of Stéphane's presence in his house and village, claiming this brings him good luck, and that he will teach him, Romani. As the Romani elder, Isidor loses his authority in this

exchange, as the Romani residents become increasingly angry and hostile to Stéphane's presence. Isidor gets little respect outside his community as well when he greets non-Romani residents on the way to the village café with Stéphane. In the café filled with non-Romani and soldiers, he boasts that Stéphane is from Paris, and introduces him as his son, pointing out his physical attributes in his affirmation of difference, "He is all pink." And he has a straight back. Isidor continues his boasting with the attributes of Paris and all that it has to offer, "A place where all the French people and Gypsies live in perfect harmony!" "You should go there too you and your family," a non-Romani responds. "We'll go," replies Isidor in a low dejected tone. Gatlif layers various territorializing identity narratives within this sequence, letting them collide and fall each into the other with predictable results. This sequence, however, is not how the film's cinematographic imagination or consciousness does its work: Gatlif allows the film to do its thinking, not with a chronological, mimetic play of the past or what is to come, but rather within and between the fissures of singular instantiations of in-process present time. It is precisely between the junctures of Isidor's haptic recognition of/as territorialized static identity markers, and his calling on regulatory ascriptions, that deprivilege his identity recognition. As such, by his recognized affirmation of identity coordinates, he mobilizes and embodies their varying intersecting collisions. This simultaneous scaffolding of subject registers like gender, race, ethnicity, and nationhood, slip in and out along mobile dispersals and trajectories of becoming, continually in flux. "The multiplication of the individual's positionality in the universe is, necessarily, a lessening or even loss of individuality. We are not as distinct subjectivities but rather as that which gives *appearances* to different modes or functions

of being” (Bersani and Dutoit 2004, 5).

As Stéphane settles into Isidor’s house for a lengthier stay (Isidor thwarts his search for Nora Luca), his guest resident ascription in the Romani community, eventually becomes one of accepted Romani community member. The Romani residents grow to like Stéphane, as does Sabina, warming up to his continuing presence. Her previous negative associations and interactions, evidenced by her spitting, biting, lifting her skirt and mooning him (a Romani insult) shouting sexual, racial slurs and cursing, move along gendered trajectories and embodiments of performativity. Following Butler’s (2006) conceptualization of compulsory identity categories, Romani ‘traditional woman’, Romani ‘modern woman’, are identity constructions as varying registers and sites of inclusion and exclusion, to which Sabina appears to heed little or no attention (xxviii). Living in a patriarchal community, where virginity testing and certification by some clans is a normative Orthodox practice regarding a Romani woman’s desirability and eligibility for marriage, Sabina seems unconcerned with meeting the requirements. Though she participates in her clan’s gendered division of labor, her defiance seems to develop not as resistance against forces of subordination within her community, but rather the film depicts her negative association to the Frenchman as a specific affect in response to the husband she left in Belgium. Though the film constructs her personhood by ironic juxtapositions between conflicting and cooperating cultural and gendered practices, Gatlif sidesteps depictions of anthropological subject fixity with Sabina’s self-fashioning linguistic and embodied Romani self-articulations. As she engages in an intimate relationship with Stéphane, she does so independently of her clan’s cultural norms and practices. When she reflects on her stay in Belgium with her husband,

surrounded by children in her community, she comments that in Belgium, “women have one child, two at the most.” She seemingly articulates her observations that the caretaker/motherhood role subordinates women within her clan’s patriarchal regulatory practices. Gatlif continues to interrogate the film viewer’s cultural identity constructions, with his aesthetic reframing of a shot sequence of Sabina caring for a young Romani child in her tent. The image suggests it is her child, yet Gatlif neither affirms nor negates this suggestion in later sequences, probing perhaps cultural constructions of ‘mothering’ along subject trajectories. This aesthetico-political framing gestures how the film enacts agency and ‘thinks’, “by the ontological drawing back,” and “the potentializing” of ambiguities, pluralizing ways of being in the world (Bersani and Dutoit 2004, 114).

Sabina’s relationship with Stéphane develops further into performative articulations as encounter and event by her community’s song and dance. He records the music, as they tour cafes, suspending his search for Nora Luca. In one of the café dance scenes, Stéphane unwittingly finds Nora. Drunk with vodka, he hears a song he recognizes to be on the Nora Luca cassette. Sitting next to him is Sabina, also drunk with her head cast down towards the table. She is singing as Nora to herself, initially without heeding any reciprocating response from Stéphane. Her performative self-diversification appears as a spontaneous subject articulation, in this instance seemingly independent of those around her. The film’s agency affects, effects, effectuates a passage of now. As Stéphane turns to Sabina, his face contorted with multiplicities of joy, the movement displaces and suspends from the interiority of the cinematic frame, the filmic *Innenwelt*, between physicality and image. The still-frame zooms out at the viewer. The movement

passages within the cinematic modality of absorption escape in a de-territorializing “line of flight,” facial (izing) the screen’s digital exteriority, *Aussenwelt*. The screen’s digital exteriority, its ‘face’ as a material and sovereign plane of organization, “takes hold of it again [movement], blocks the line of flight, and reimposes its organization upon it.” “It is precisely the continually refought battle between a faciality trait that tries to escape the sovereign organization of the face,” (much like a facial tic), “and the face itself, which clamps back down on the trait [...]” Yet “if the face is a politics, dismantling the face is also a politics of real becomings, an entire becoming clandestine,” and as such, “it is not a question of ‘returning’ to the presignifying and presubjective semiotics” of cultural subjectivities (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 188).

As Stéphane and Sabina tour café venues and return to the village, Adriani (Isidor’s son) is released from jail. His father, Sabina, and the Romani community joyously celebrate his homecoming. He continues his celebration in the village café, offers to buy beer for the non-Romani residents, and announces, “a drink for those who sent me to jail.” The town secretary enters the café, and Adriani exclaims, “Gadjo I’ll buy you a drink too!” He sits down next to another non-Romani man, Dimitri, who turns to ask Adriani, “what are you after?” Adriani repeats, “I want to buy a drink for those who sent me to jail.” “I’ll buy you lunch too...” The two men continue to stare at one another. Adriani adds “you, your mother, and your father.” Dimitri replies, “Me, my mother and my father spit on your Gypsy Mafioso face!” Adriani throws his drink at Dimitri’s face, falling over, motionless. Enraged, the non-Romani villagers chase after Adriani, as the town secretary announces that Dimitri is dead. Adriani flees to the Romani community with the non-Romani residents in quick pursuit. Romani music

plays, which translation states, “God what did I do to you to be so black,” further ambiguates static cultural identity: race, ethnicity, ethics, encounter, and event.

Meanwhile, the Romani clan community is collecting firewood in the surrounding area, see the enraged oncoming mob and escape in panic. Adriani hides in the loft of a Romani cottage. The non-Romani villagers break the cottage windows (with Adriani trapped inside) and set it and the surrounding Romani homes on fire. Everything the Romani own burns down to rubble and ashes. Stéphane and Sabina return from the woods, unaware of the unfolding catastrophic events. In horror and shock they encounter the scene, and Sabina grief-stricken runs to inform her father who is in the middle of a Romani music performance at a non-Romani social event. The film concludes with a reorientation to the village road. Stéphane appears by himself, no longer walking but driving down the road. He pulls his car over on the side of the road, gets out and starts to dig by what appears to be an unmarked gravestone. He buries all the cassettes of the café music recordings and performs a funeral. He dances by the burial mound, splashes some of the contents of a vodka bottle over it and places it on the burial mound. As he dances with his eyes closed, he snaps his fingers, and the music plays as recollections of his recordings. Suddenly, Sabina appears. Lying down for a nap in the car’s backseat, she awakens, and her head pops into view. She observes Stéphane’s funeral dance and slowly smiles to herself. The cinematic semiotics of this film and the techniques Tony Gatlif employs present a spatiotemporality by way of a concentric, circular diagrammatic, much like a fluid ripple effect. The cartography and ethnography of cinematic articulation reflect less in this film as a re-partitioning of *graphic* dimensions or planes, or as more characteristically envisioned grids of

intersecting coordinates. Ethno-graphy or “ethnoscape” (Appadurai 2001, 222) by Gatlif’s cinematic deployment becomes more diagrammatic - ethno-grammatic, cartogrammatic. The village café, as the first and last site in the film’s depictions of regulatory surveillance (initially with Stéphane and Isidor shut out due to the village curfew, and finally Adriani’s encounter with ethnic and racial ‘policing’/vigilantism), comes full circle, yet without a ‘return’ to itself, rippling outwards in centrifugal affect-effect. The village café site seems to appear as the smallest, tightest concentric circle emanating eventually to the larger exteriority of the diagrammatic of the village road, the film’s first and last site of encounter, and event. However, there is no recovery of (subject) ‘origin’, as the multiplicities of embodied, and cartogrammatic de-territorializations of identity-knowledge boundaries transformatively ripple outwards.

Cinema’s digital politic refocuses the mind’s eye through imagery’s recovery of matter by the (re)partitioning of the sensible. It re-frames the normative political dialectic and internal ‘speech’ integration between cognitive and sensory-motor functions. By challenging the linear linkage of human experience, uncovering the progression of human interrelatedness as potentially singular events, autonomous of universal order, it resists the binding experiential classification and survey of chaos, in interval moments within the human condition. Cinematic technique transforms the seemingly apolitical into the political and its reversal, thereby sustaining its capacity as a medium for critical political thought. One of Gatlif’s perhaps unintended effects of thematizing the complexities of aesthetico-political subjects, and his schematic disruption of fixed identity narratives, is that by his disavowal of essentializing identity ascriptions he in part re-instantiates their subject fixity but alongside unsettles it. I

return here to Bhabha's third space hybrid entity that is neither 'this' nor 'that' in the colonial encounter. This 'hybridity' introduces the non-fiction genre and work of ethnographer Isabel Fonesca (1995) in *Bury Me Standing: Gypsies and Their Journey*, to which I now turn.

Nowhere to Go

[Europeans] from philanthropic societies for the abolition of the slavery in America, even while in the bosom of their continent, in Europe, there are 400,000 Gypsies who are slaves and 200,000 others who are buried in the gloom of ignorance and of barbarism! (Mihail Kogălniceanu in Fonesca 1995: 186)

As cited previously, in September of 2012, vigilantes burned a Romani camp in Marseille, France. There are many more such currently documented events across EU member states. In 1991, the year of Fonesca's ethnographic documentation, Romania was not an EU member state; it joined the European Union in 2007. I present this ethnographic interview, since it is one of the most comprehensive ethnographic accounts currently available *from* Romani people, unlike brief journalism reports as accounts *about* the Romani.

Constanta, Romania: "In 1991, nearly a year after the events in which twenty-seven houses were razed and five more destroyed, continuing controversy over the fate of the dispossessed Roma of Kogălniceanu, [a small town] named after Mihail] had brought back the tension with a vengeance." And "this town 'was far from glamorous, but it was cosmopolitan in its way: Romanians, Turks, Tartars, nomadic and settled Gypsies, Germans, Macedonians, Moldavians, and Bulgarian-speaking Muslims—called the Gagá ouz-all lived there." And "even the settled Roma community was broken into two distinct groups, one known as the Turks, which meant that they were Muslims [...] and

the others identifying themselves, mainly by contrast, as Christians” (Fonesca 1995, 187).

Fonesca: Yes, I said and then interrupting myself, but what happened on the night of October 9?

Romani: There was a fight in the bar. They gathered in the bar. They gathered in the German church. The Germans in the bar told the priest. The church called everyone together. Drinks were offered. The priest is a drunk.

F: How many people came?

R: Thirty-five. Three hundred. They came with benzene. And tractors and cars. And steel poles.

F: Did you know any of them? Were they young people?

R: I knew every one of them. We knew them from school; we asked them why are you doing this. We weren't doing anything. None of us were here; we were in the woods. We were afraid of the woods. There were no people here, only animals. They stole our horses and pigs and chickens. All this happened in one night. When we returned the next morning everything was burned. We stayed away for three days, and when we came back, the houses were still smoking. There were dead animals in our wells. And furniture.

F: We [Fonesca and several aid workers] learned that four (or fourteen) policemen eventually did come—after the mob had gone—bearing a message for the Gypsies.

Police: You must leave the village because they will come back and kill you.

Roma: But we stay here because we have no place to go.

R: We must stay here because we were born here.

F: And how are the relations with other residents of Kogălniceanu now?

R: Some of them have come to say they are sorry.

R: They are afraid we will burn their houses.

R: They brought us some blankets.

R: They spit on us if we go to town.

R: We are not allowed in the pub. (Fonesca 1995, 189-190)

Isabel Fonesca and the group of aid workers go to the pub, 'The Discobar', enter and interview the pub staff: a waiter, and a bartender, and a man named Mihai. Fonesca notes, "They were not pleased to see us" (191).

Bartender: Why do you want to talk about it after all this time!

Ted Zang (aid worker): Because nothing has happened. There has been no case before the courts, not even a serious investigation. And still, these people have no homes.

Ina (aid worker): Where were you on the evening of October 9?

Waiter: I was on my way to visit the Gypsies.

Mihai: I am Macedonian. What happened here was a war between the Gypsies and everyone else. All the other nationalities were together: Macedonians, Romanians, the Germans, and the rest.

Ted: How did it start?

Mihai: A Turk and a Macedonian were having a fight. The Gypsies intervened on the side of the Turk. A Romanian was caught driving alone through the Gypsy quarter in his truck. He was beaten.

Corin (aid worker): This was the drop that filled the glass.

Fonesca: Did someone call the police?

Mihai: If we had asked the police, they would have done nothing. What can four policemen do? There were between three and four hundred of us. On the way to the Gypsy quarter, people joined the crowd. We brought petrol, to finish the job once and for all. There was no killing.

Fonesca: And what did the policemen do?

Mihai: They watched. And now there are six policemen there.

Fonesca: And the firemen, what about them?

Mihai: We were there at 12:30 p.m. and the firemen turned up around three. We surrounded the Gypsy houses and set fire to everything. It was planned for two days later, but we thought they might stop us.

Fonesca: But nobody was arrested afterwards? Did you really think you might be stopped?

Mihai: This was not a crime. It was an uprising.

Fonesca: And how do you feel about it now?

Mihai: It was a very good idea. We should have done it a long time before. We have no problems with them. They don't feel so big and strong now. It was the only way. Everyone used to be afraid of them. Now everyone behaves. They have no more courage. I've seen the people from those houses since, of course. But I don't speak to them. They're more respectful now. They even greet you in the street from time to time.

Corin: If the Gypsies are so well behaved now, why do you keep them out of the bar?

Mihai: They are not civilized. I wouldn't serve a Gypsy.

Ina: What does democracy mean to you?

Mihai: To be able to do what I want and nobody should interfere.

Bartender: The lone Romanian who had been beaten in his truck had been transporting weapons—wooden dowels from the local mill—to a hiding place closer to the Gypsy quarter.

Fonesca: How did the Gypsies know?

Bartender: Well they know things don't they? They have no place in this village. If they rebuild their houses, we will burn them again. The people here don't trust them. We don't want Gypsies in Kogălniceanu. (Fonesca 1995, 191-93)

Isabel Fonesca returns to Kogălniceanu a year later, in 1992, and notes, "Gheorghe, a group of Sinti-German Gypsies based in Heidelberg, had pledged 120,000 Deutschemarks (and had given 40,000) for the reconstruction of the houses, on the condition that the Romanian government match the donation." She continues, "the government had done so, and a criminal investigation had begun." However, "on closer inspection, things didn't look so good: the houses were bare with dirt floors," and "made from coarse cinder blocks." Also, "there was no plumbing, and no running water anywhere, just a long ditch filled with swamp water, dug about twelve feet in *front* of the houses and promising some kind of epidemic..." And "the houses at the end of the

row were only half built...” (Fonesca 1995, 194). Moreover, “apparently local government had control over the dispersal of the funds, even though the project had been approved by Bucharest.” Referencing a source, Fonesca reports, “according to Nicolae, who had been negotiating on all sides, the authorities had made it clear that they would continue construction only if the Gypsies abandoned their case in the courts.” “By 1994—more than four years after the attack—all activity in the road and the courts had ceased” (196).

Fonesca’s interview with the pub staff reflects hate speech. The European Roma Rights Centre states: “In the case of Roma, hate speech covers the whole range of abuse and follows a pattern distinct from ordinary abusive speech against any given group. Whether it is a minor insult or an outright incitement to killing, the purpose of the perpetrator is the same: To *exclude* and *eliminate* Roma from society” (emphasis is mine). Hate speech against Romani is not about an equally unacceptable practice of forced assimilation. It is “aimed at excluding them,” and “anti-gypsyism is not a form of discrimination based on differences of culture, and behavior, but an attitude of utter contempt.” The misappropriation of funding for the rebuilding of Romani homes, Fonesca documents several years later, underscores the continued presence and escalation of Romani discrimination and persecution among EU member-state officials and leaders. “On May 19, 2007, president of an EU member-state, “the president of Romania, Mr. Traian Basescu, addressing Ms. Andreea Pana, a journalist, stated, “you pussy, don’t you have anything to do today?” He is later recorded as privately stating, “how aggressive that stinky gypsy was” (European Roma Rights Center 2017). Anti-Romani hate speech and discriminatory statements by EU member-state authorities

embolden or condones public expression of hate and mob violence as evidenced by Fonesca's interviews and current news reports. Romani activists and international human rights agencies express the urgent call for action through the European Court of Human Rights and the European Social Charter and public repudiation against hate speech and Romani persecution. Romani activists and advocacy groups also work locally, specific to community and clan affiliations. One such site is Romnokehr in Mannheim, Germany, introduced in the documentary film, *Rom Som* (2009). I visited the site, and the film showing at the Sinti and Roma Documentation Center in Heidelberg, Germany in June 2011.

Rom Som

The documentary film *Rom Som* (Alisch et al. 2009) presents an assemblage of Romani cultural articulations and situated knowledge as genres within genres. *Rom Som* introduces the viewer to three Sinti Roma artists. Anita Awosusi, a Sinti poet, and activist, speaks to the horror of the Romani and Sinti Holocaust with contemporary poetry readings in forums such as *Romnokher*, which translated means culture as *Romno*, and house as *kher*. It is a 'culture house' and as a spatial site, renders a place situated for Romani cultural identity practices, or as Daniel Strauss states, "to make culture come alive." (Alisch et al.2009). In this way, *Romnokher* enables spatio-temporal mobilizations of Sinti cultural and historical identity enunciations. Contextually specific, as habitus, as the relation of Sinti 'body' to space, Awosusi's subject performativity becomes inscribed as positioning and re-positioning of self to Other or Othering. By way of her poetry reading, which re-articulates singularities of Sinti historical knowledge and WWII experiences of horror and trauma, Awosusi

animates and inhabits intra- and intertextual situated identity narratives. She does so by way of a dialogical intervention between space as place with/in the poetic articulation of Sinti trauma narratives – and space as place of Romnokher’s situated ‘storytelling’ of mobilized Sinti encounter and event. Each informs the other. Awosusi reads the poem with a Romani introduction, then continues in German:

Weine Jakob

*Verabschiede dich weinend
Von deinem liebstem, deinen kleinen Sohn
Hai*

*Der Deutsche kommt mit schweren Bombern
Hier ist der Russe mit bruellendem Panzern
Hai*

Cry Jacob
Bid farewell crying
From your most beloved, from your little son
Hai

The German comes with heavy bombers
Here is the Russian with hollering tanks
Hai. (Awosusi in Alisch et al. 2009)

The film juxtaposes Awosusi’s poetry reading with her own embodied identity constituted by her (re)positioning in relation to space, place, time, and movement. “I am at home in the world, but here in Germany is my *Heimat* [homeland]” (Alisch et al.). The film’s digital modality also interfaces dialogically with the aesthetic-ethic of Romani poetic identity articulations of self to ‘othering’; Awosusi’s haptic identity enunciations; and the viewer’s embodied relation as a sensory response of (re) positioning to filmic space. Film as a popular cultural site of political expression exceeds the content-driven semantic operation by its aesthetic rendering of subject-

object (re)configuration within the cinematographic imagination.

Lita Cabelutt is another artist introduced by the film *Rom Som*. She creates portrait paintings of human faces. She describes herself as Spanish, born in Barcelona of German Roma Sinti ancestry. She is Spanish speaking and states, “more than being Sinteza, I am simply a human being. It’s a big honor to be Sinti. To be a person, a human being is the most important.” She adds, “I work with emotion; memory is something unconscious. If I have seen you for five minutes or an hour, and you touched me somehow, then I don’t work from memory but from emotion, and all the connections of this impression creates a picture.” She continues, “It is the sensibilities and impression in this moment that I submit to.” “If I hear Camarón,” (Romani flamenco musician) then “I hear his song almost simultaneously with my brushstrokes. He sings I dance, and Antonio Gades could be dancing directly alongside. It is a dance with various disciplines, but it is a dance in that submitting in life, whatever might occur” (Alisch et al. 2009).

Cabelutt inter-articulates subjectivities between music and brushstrokes on canvas as affect/effect. Her creative inter-articulation enacts an assemblage, or in Rancière’s (2010) Foucauldian grammar, “a particular *dispositif* of subjectivation and litigation through which politics comes into existence” (39). Effect as ‘affection’ mobilizes subjects beyond the stasis of effect - as the phenomenological interiority/exteriority of ‘being-in-the-world’ - by its ‘being as becoming’. As stated previously but bears repeating, the aesthetic-ethic of ‘taking on the political’ is indebted to what Michael J. Shapiro (2006) describes as the post-Kantian approach to “knowledge judgements,” as one in which the subject “has an active understanding that legislates and reflects,” and

is “responsible for constituting the condition in which things can appear as things.” Shapiro cites Gilles Deleuze, who states, “I do not perceive objects [...] it’s my perception which presupposes the object-form” (8). “Kant’s inability to establish the subjective necessity he sought, when he evoked the encounter with the sublime,” (Shapiro 2009, 110) extracts unwittingly a politics of mobility, whose mobilized subjectivity “resist a central place from which a calculus of synthesis can occur” (99). This interrelation of mobile and spatial practices, de-privilege dominant loci, foci, of bio-and geopolitical oriented articulations of “space and personhood” (Shapiro 1999, 89).

In Rom Som, Romeo Franz articulates his identities as: “I am a violinist. I play the music of the German Sinti.” It is a Sinti music tradition informed by the musical, cultural practices of previous Sinti generations, or as Franz states “from my grandfathers” (Alisch et al. 2009). Franz’s musical influences are also self-articulated as site-specific Romani interpretations of jazz and flamenco. Franz indicates the influence of Schuckenack Reinhardt, a Sinti Romani who “became a prominent Jazz violinist in the style of Django Reinhardt.” Django, otherwise known as Jean-Baptiste Reinhardt, was “one of the greatest-ever composers of jazz music and is considered to be the founder of Romani jazz interpretation. Some prominent musicians, B.B. King and Duke Ellington among them, have credited Django for their inspiration” (Hancock 2010, 135). The instrumental, vocal and choreographic features and characteristics of flamenco is a “composite musical form” influenced by Romani “*canto jondo* or ‘deep song’ which has been compared with the *loki djili* or ‘slow song’ in Hungary, as well as with Sindhi musical forms in India” (126). Such singularities of historico-culturally

situated knowledge and self-diversifications, as cartographies of hybridity and genre of mobilized Romani subjectivities, resist and rupture static identity indices.

Romani identity knowledge boundaries and cultural practices mobilize across and between subject trajectories of self to Other (ing), as a continual repositioning and reconfiguring of self-identification. In other words, the indeterminate and continual re-assertions of Romani subjectivities are “always of the moment,” between what Rancière (2010) describes as “partitions of the sensible” (39). Rancière’s ‘third aesthetic regime of art “is also known as the “distribution of the sensible” (85). It “does not simply mean that an aesthetic attunement to the world shows us that there are different perspectives or points of view that must be recognized” (Panagia 2009, 6). Instead, his “phrase suggests that our modes of perceiving the world, of sensing the presence of others, are parsed; that as subjects of perception, human beings are partial creatures variously divided” (3). In this way, “a partition of the sensible thus refers to perceptual forms of knowledge that parse what is and is not sensible, what counts as making (i.e., fabricating) sense and what is available to be sensed” (6). As Rancière concludes, “politics [...] is an activity of reconfiguration of that which is given to the sensible” (Rancière quoted in Panagia 2009, 6).

Concluding Thoughts

Davide Panagia (2009) states in the *Political Life of Sensation*, “dynamics of the sensible suggest that our capacity to comprehend things is grounded in a particular organoleptic configuration that constitutes the self-evident dispositions of a sensing body; we always already know what it means to sense, what seeing, touching, and hearing are.” He adds, “such assurances and the practices of sense-making that enable

them are, by definition political. They relate our bodies to the world. But also determine the conditions through which and by which we might sense the world and those who occupy it ...” (7). As such, Romani and Sinti counter-hegemonic narratives are self-articulated as diverse genres such as the novel *Zoli* (2006); the film *The Crazy Stranger* (1997); and Isabel Fonesca’s (1995) ethnography *Bury Me Standing: The Gypsies and their Journey*. As popular cultural modalities of film, novel, poetry, art, and music, as situated aesthetic practices, they express and reorient who defines the political and how. This continual Romani and Sinti subject re-positioning resists the hermeneutic and representational practices through which global power relations are constructed. “Only in the context of a living world does the human as an agentic creature emerge, one whose dependency on others and on living processes give rise to the very capacity for action” (Butler 2015, 44).

My conceptualizations of hybridity are inspired by various sources. Rooted in post-colonial theory and cultural studies, the applicability of hybridity as a construct has extensive implications for critical analysis and emergent theorizations on cultural becomings: new materialisms; new media; digital studies; cybertheory; feminist theory; as well as by discourse analysis. By reinvigorating hybrid, diversifying analytical practices with a dynamic of ‘mobility’, alternate readings and ways of being-in-the-world may be engendered. Inspired in part by Kathy E. Ferguson’s (1993) work on ‘mobile subjectivities’, as a conceptual and linguistic resistance to the static framing of identity, my development of hybridity is also informed by post-Kantian thinkers. Michael J. Shapiro’s work with genres and aesthetico-political interventions, extends the scope of this dissertation, to investigating hybridity as immanent site-situated

assemblages. In doing so, I seek to investigate artistic narratives/practices contesting fixed, discriminatory, and mythologizing Romani identity ascriptions. Also, Gilles Deleuze and his conceptualizing of molecular ‘becomings’, helps to frame critical inquiry regarding hegemonies of static identity enclosures. As Awosusi translates, *Rom Som* means “Menschlichkeit” (Alisch et al. 2009). Menschlichkeit is the affect, the effect of being human. It is becoming.

Chapter 3: The Identity Problematic

I want to show my own world to the people. It is important to understand that we are all human beings and art allows us to live and exist. Art connects us.

--Ceija Stojka (1986)

And what of the mythical King of the Gypsies? The real truth is that there never has been a Romany king. Only the odd self-proclaimed fool, who ends up getting himself and his whole bloodline beaten to a pulp.

--Mikey Walsh (2009)

Prologue

Romani situated subjects exceed considerations of ‘loci’ as static and nomadic ‘enunciation’, and reveal movement as an ethical dynamic of ‘places’. Romani subject trajectories affirm and contest normative spatiotemporal narratives of ‘fixed identities’ (Shapiro 1999, 121). The conceits of habitual socio-political conventions and practices of erasure of mobile subjectivities necessitate further critical provocation of nomadism as counter-hegemonic, as postnational, or as Jacques Rancière (1999) describes, beyond that of “the consensual state” (123). The admission of Romania and Bulgaria as European Union member states in 2007 amongst previous others, casts ‘open borders’ as a collective effort and interest of cross-boundary EU ‘subject’ mobilization. As such, the EU posits itself as a regulatory and structural ‘body’ inhabiting an ‘identity problematic’. This EU identity problematic directly calls into question various competing cosmologies of legitimating/de-legitimizing constructions of ‘subjects of eligibility’, as my generative conceptual extension of subject intelligibility.

Paradoxically, the socio- and ethico-political orders of subject intelligibility, as static subject formations by transnational, state- and androcentric discursive practices, pronounce the tenuous ‘status’ of embodied ‘subject sovereignty’. In *Reading “Adam*

Smith”: *Desire, History, and Value*, Michael J. Shapiro (2002) states, “...the European Union and increasingly, the state-as-coherent-actor or unitary entity has been destabilized as various ‘subnational,’ or tribal and ethnic groups have asserted desires to reoccupy old sovereignties that preexist the current geopolitical map (31). I deploy my conceptual framing, subjects of eligibility, not by ‘disciplinary’ uniform codes of identity (de)legitimation and authorization (as in the EU citizen-subject). Instead, I’m inspired by the potential linkage between Rancière’s neologism, ‘indisciplinary’ as “the question of the distribution of territories, which is always a way of deciding who is qualified to speak about what.” It is also a question as “those regarded as qualified to think from those regarded as unqualified; those who do the science and those who are regarded as its *objects*” – with an alternate way of being-in-the-world, ‘a community of sense’ (Rancière 2008). I deploy Rancière’s (2009) ‘community of sense’ as an alternative conceptual framing of subjects of eligibility; a deterritorializing dynamic between mobile subjectivities, subject fixity, and state-centric membership. As Rancière states, this phrase does not “mean a collectivity shaped by some feeling,” but rather “a community of sense is a certain cutting out of space and time that binds together practices, forms of visibility, and patterns of intelligibility.” And he adds, “I call this cutting out and this linkage a partition of the sensible” (31). This re-partitioning of the sensible de-territorializes conceptual personae (the fortune-telling Gypsy woman; the *Zieh-Gauner*, translated as horse-pulling – German ‘name’ referencing Romani) and mobilizes differentiations of subjectivity through continual re-pluralizing and deterritorializing. I deploy subjects of eligibility within my work in an ironic use of ‘identity’ ascription and uniformity, by gesturing towards the conceits of citizen-centric,

androcentric (hetero)normativity, and subject fixity. Romani aesthetic knowledge production is not a “science of the sensible” or “depoliticized discourse,” but “imbricated in the constitution of specific orders of visibility and sense through which the political into assigned roles and defined parts manifest itself” (Rancière 2006, 1).

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to situate Romani sites of enunciation, as genres, as site-specific narratives that re-habituate and problematize identity ‘knowledge boundaries’ from within and from without dominant biopolitical, juridical, and statist regimes of control. I employ an aesthetico-political informed methodology, which analytical practices invoke the politics of aesthetics, critical theory, and feminist theory. As such, Romani knowledge-making, identity re-articulations, include subject trajectories and sacred-knowledge ‘stories’ as a mobile ethos, and as situated sites of continuing relatedness between them. In this way, subjects of eligibility are the ‘becoming’ embodiment of encounter and event, both from within and between Romani communities, and the non-Romani community, which “asserts itself in struggles for legitimate co-presence in worlds that contain more than one world” (Shapiro 2009, 110). This ‘identity’ problematic evinces Romani aesthetico-political subject formations and shared contingencies, which speak to “a specific historical organization of social roles and communality” (Rancière 2009, 1). My inquiry method works from the margins of historical persecution of Romani peoples to the center of Romani cultural practices and Romaniya/Romanipen law. I juxtapose feature film, documentary film, film series, the autoethnography *Gypsy Boy*, ancestral narratives in *Roast Chicken and other Gypsy Stories*, personal narrative, poetry, news articles, historical accounts, and

employ discourse analysis, evincing Romani situated identity-knowledges in relation to state-policy event. I now begin with the feature film *Korkoro* (in varying translations, ‘alone’ or ‘freedom’).

Korkoro

The barbed wire quivers, plucked like guitar strings, rhythmically to the music. It’s movement that foregrounds the static winter scene of a lifeless detention camp somewhere in Vichy France, in 1943. The crunching over the gravel road, as caravan wheels grind ahead, resonate as auditory, transitory filmic shifts between movements of season and place in *Korkoro*’s (Gatlif 2009) sequence cuts. Taloché (James Thiérrère), a member of the Romani clan, sniffs the air and apprehends Claude’s presence. Both respond with mutual fright; the scared boy, Claude, is feared to be a ghost. The clan questions Claude’s identity renamed as ‘Chouroro’, or *Korkoro*, Romani for ‘alone’ or ‘pauper’. His presence compromises their stealthy movement through the woods in their attempts to evade detection by German soldiers.

Based on ‘real-life’ events of Nazi occupied France, Gatlif depicts the film’s plot of the “rarely documented Porajmos (the Romani Holocaust)” as historically informed trajectories of Romani mobility. Nazi systematic killing and annihilation of an estimated 500,000 to 1.5 million Romani during WW II, exacts by initially documented accounts, the genocide of one-quarter of the Romani people (Hancock 2014). French policy implementation of Nazi Nuremberg Laws constituting Romanies and Jews as “enemies of the race-based state,” restricts movement specific to the nomadism of Romani clan practices (*Korkoro* n.d.). Gatlif’s aesthetic treatment of Romani subjectivities and their mobility, as a spatio-temporal complex of encounter to event, articulates their survival

tactics as script to schema. Romani tactics and their attempts to evade capture by German soldiers inscribe an attendant ‘filmic agency’ in *Korkoro*’s mise-en-scène. This agency enacts an inter- and extra-cinematic grammar of historically situated contingencies. Gatlif’s cinematic technique straddles gaps between documented accounts and fictive encounters. However, his cinematic storytelling does not reify disjunctive historical imaginaries, as ‘between’ ‘fact’ and ‘fiction’. In ‘place’, he reconfigures partitions of subject dis-placements and trajectories as site-specific - to genres - to aesthetic and Romani narratives - to documentation as historiographies of experience and performance. Gatlif riffles between cinematographic formations, from within, from without the film, and from the middle of ‘nowhere’.

Specific Romani clan practices, recalcitrant to identity markers such as ‘accurate’ census figures, scientific documentation, or literary chronicle, articulate a cultural self-fashioning that may evade state-regulatory and self-disclosure measures. Tony Gatlif, himself of Romani ethnicity, initiates the *Korkoro* production in 1970 as a documentary film effort. He approaches a French Romani writer Matéo Maximoff in his efforts to interview the Romani in Montreuil. Neither Gatlif nor Maximoff succeeds in their interview efforts, as the Romani refuse their requests. Despite the lack of historical documentation of French Romani persecution, Gatlif persists in his research, encountering Jacques Chirac’s recognition efforts of the *Justes* (French Resistance - Organisation Juive de Combat, OJC). Gatlif subsequently learns of Yvette Lundy’s resistance activities, on which the Mademoiselle Lundi character is based (played by Marie-Josée Croze). A schoolteacher and city hall clerk, she is deported to Ravensbrück, a concentration camp for women north of Berlin, for forging passport

identifications of Romani living in caravan settlements in the Montreuil area. “The Vichy French gendarmerie uses the documentation made in the passports of its citizens to monitor their movements for which a threshold was set, along with imprisonment for violations. Lundi uses her powers as a clerk, and forges their passports, removing documentation about their movements” (Korkoro n.d.). She survives and is enlisted by Gatlif to assist him in the retelling of her story. In the limited archive on the Porajmos, Gatlif invokes an anecdote, by historian Jacques Sigot, of the Romani clan detention (at the Montreuil-Bellay camp), and later extermination (at Auschwitz), on which the film’s narrative is based. The protagonist, Théodore Rosier (Marc Lavoine), the mayor and veterinarian, is based on the accounts of a French notary in Sigot’s anecdote. He sells his ancestral home for one franc to bypass the nomad detention policy and assists the Romani family in their survival. Communists in Poland implement similar forced settlement policies, known as the Great Halt from 1952 to 1989, as well as in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania (Bronislaw Wajs n.d.). Ralph Sandland (Professor of Law and Difference at the University of Nottingham) elaborates further in the context of more recent policy developments:

Placing legal limitations on freedom of movement and freedom to settle have historically turned sour, and perhaps the 1968 Caravan Sites Act in the UK is a good precedent to consider. While it established the first legal precedent for acceptance of nomadism as legitimate cultural practice, it also limited this practice to authorized sites. This limitation effectively allowed the law to be used to evict Roma caravans from ‘unauthorized’ sites, control and limit their movement, while at the same time weakening the members of the caravans by cutting off their source of livelihood, limiting their routes, and forcing them into (in) visible authorized sites. The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act, which reversed the 1968 Act by removing the UK government’s duty to provide caravan sites, increasing the state’s power to evict ‘illegal settlers’, criminalizing the nomadic way of life, served as a reminder of the kind of violence that a legal double standard through limitations can inflict. (Sandland in Pusca 2010, 11)

Romani caravans are on the move again, in *Korkoro*'s initial film sequences. They move, they appear, they appear out of nowhere. Gatlif immediately introduces the viewer to the paradox of Romani survival: nomadic subjectivities and subject fixity, temporary settlements of movement, movement of temporary settlements, from the stationary camp barracks of liminal life to the mobile trajectories of Romani communal life and caravan wheels. Gatlif's filmic assemblages territorialize capture, de-territorialize "lines of flight," (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 216) and rupture the 'nowhere', the "zones of indistinction" of Romani life (Agamben 1998, 19). His cinematic writing textually reconfigures Romani fragmented subjects: embodiments of the camp prisoner, seasonal labor migrants; political refugees: 'identified' or 'unidentified'; documented or undocumented, constituting the ontological registers of effectuating affect as passage, as 'in-betweenness'. He contests the binary knowledge structures of subject/object; interior/exterior; molar/molecular segmentations of being-in-the-world. In this way, he directly provokes subject intelligibility, and articulations, or what I term, 'subjects of eligibility'.

Taloche and 'Chouroro'

As I state in my introduction, I conceptualize subject eligibility, not by 'disciplinary' uniform codes or laws, (de)legitimizing (as in the citizen-subject) but instead, I draw in part on Jacques Rancière's "in-disciplinary thought" (Rancière 2006). Tony Gatlif aesthetically deploys the playful protagonist and actor, Taloche (Thiérée), in an ironic and indisciplinary reclaiming of the 'political' away from regulatory and legal codes of subject intelligibility. Gatlif confronts and interrogates the film viewer's apprehension of normative identity ascriptions: Thiérée was the only actor allowed to improvise. His

characterization of Taloché is built on spontaneity, and in many instances, Gatlif did not know how he would act in a scene, such as in the tap scene in which he plunges into a stairwell. In another scene, in which he dances with war music in the background, Thierrée pretends to make love to the earth like an animal. Gatlif who wants the character to have the ability to sense forthcoming danger as animals do, finds Thierrée is suitable for the role because he is very much an animal. The dance scene where Taloché is shown falling from a tree is done without stunt doubles (Korkoro n.d.).

In the film's opening sequence, Taloché sniffs the air and tracks Claude hiding in the grass. In a later sequence, as the Romani clan members obtain their newly stamped passports from Mademoiselle Lundi, Taloché playfully heists the stamp and proceeds to mark his naked bottom. Gatlif riffs here also, between subject trajectories of regulatory identifying. Taloché participates in Mademoiselle Lundi's classroom instruction along with the other children, yielding neither to the disciplinary passage of schooling nor institutional practices of control. Among the other Romani clan members (Gatlif employs Romani actors), Taloché relates closest to the earth - to fundament - to water- to sky- to heterogeneous elements and multiplicities. Taloché transforms, as, in Deleuzian idioms: rhizomatic; "becomings-molecular"; "becomings-child"; "becomings-"animal"; "body without organs". Taloché is transforming, embodying, the virtual, potentialities, undifferentiated as 'organism' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 247-248, 150). It is the 'in-volution' of human to non-human subject trajectories. becomings-Taloché 'involves', "its variations and dimensions are immanent to it," as "each multiplicity is already composed of heterogeneous terms in symbiosis." It is a "multiplicity continually transforming itself into a string of other multiplicities,

according to its thresholds and doors” (249). Mademoiselle Lundi questions Taloché about his injured hand, as she secures his release from initial camp imprisonment. He exclaims, “I wanted to fly like a wild goose over the wire.”

Chouroro (also known as Claude) the orphaned French boy and Gadjo (non-Romani outsider) also embodies the tensions that mobilize the differentiating of subjectivity. His fluctuating interiorities and exteriorities of identity, marginalized by his orphaned being, re-habituate how Claude embodies belonging and problematizes his identity. He too appears out of the middle of nowhere, from zones of indistinction, from a patch of grass somewhere alongside the road. Taloché sniffs Claude’s presence and adopts him as his Romani brother. Oblivious to the Nazi orders of mobile and static subjects, Claude’s survival tactics engender subject eligibility that is the becoming embodiment of encounter to event, which (re)assert legitimacy claims between the world(ings) or, following Heidegger’s analytic, ‘world-making’. Claude’s renaming as Romani ‘Chouroro’ as ‘the free one’ is only free to mediate in-flux conditions on the ground, and contingencies of liminal forms of existence. After the initial arrest and detention of his newly adopted Romani family, he is sheltered, nourished, and loved by Mademoiselle Lundi and Théodore. Upon their arrest, and the loss of his provisional parents, he rejoins his Romani family at their caravan settlement. Released from imprisonment in the detention camp by Théodore’s efforts to furnish proof of their residential settlement, with the procurement of the house and title deed, the Romani clan resides only temporarily in the confines of walls and spaces, rooms haunted by ghosts. “They’re only mice,” exclaims Chouroro as ‘Claude’, in his efforts to calm his Romani family members, “every house has them.” Chouroro’s avatar Claude articulates

identities that are constituted by knowledge ‘stories’ and as situated sites relating between them. Gatlif also employs situated-stories, extra-cinematically, in dialogical exchange and interface, between the film’s digital modality and the protagonist Mademoiselle Lundi - informed by the historical retelling of Yvette Lundy’s biographical narrative. In the film’s final sequence, Claude as a Gadjo-outsider voluntarily accompanies his adopted Romani family to their caravan settlement and final journey to the Auschwitz death camp. His identity practices determine the ‘state’ of his subjecthood, and seal his fate of death camp ‘eligibility’.

In Transit

Singularities of subject (re)positioning, as in the poetry of the Polish Romani woman, Papusza, and the film *Papusza*, speaks as historiography and archive, both from within and from outside her Romani clan. Her auto-ethnography and life writing as verse present Romani loci of mobile enunciation in relation to the state: intersectionality, genre, and human rights. Papusza’s verse and historical account of hiding in the forest resonate with Jessica Reidy’s writing on the website Rombase, “Unite and Celebrate: A Band of Roma. A Roma Day lyric essay in Quail Magazine”. She relates a conversation with her grandmother regarding her historically situated subject trajectory. Reidy asks, “Papusza suffered for the song of her people, but what if we all sang at once?” (Reidy 2014b).

Tears of Blood: How We Suffered Under the German Soldiers in Volhynia From 1943 to 1944

In the woods. No water, no fire – great hunger.

Where could the children sleep? No tent.

We could not light the fire at night.
By day, the smoke would alert the Germans.
How to live with children in the cold of winter?
All are barefoot...
When they wanted to murder us, first they forced us to hard labor.
A German came to see us.
I have bad news for you.
They want to kill you tonight.
Don't tell anybody.
I too am a dark Gypsy,
Of your blood – a true one.
God help you
In the black forest...
Having said these words,
He embraced us all...

For two three days no food.
All go to sleep hungry.
Unable to sleep
they stare at the stars...
God, how beautiful it is to live!
The Germans will not let us...

Ah you, my little star!
At dawn you are large!
Blind the Germans!
Confuse them,
lead them astray,
so the Jewish and Gypsy child can live!
When big winter comes,

what will the Gypsy woman with a small child do?

Where will she find clothing?

Everything is turning to rags.

One wants to die.

No one knows, only the sky,

only the river hears our lament.

Whose eyes saw us as enemies?

Whose mouth cursed us?

Do not hear them God.

Hear us!

A cold night came,

the old Gypsy women sang

a Gypsy fairy tale:

Golden winter will come,

Snow, like little stars,

will cover the earth, the hands.

The black eyes will freeze,

the hearts will die.

So much snow fell,

it covered the road.

One could only see the Milky Way

In the sky.

On such night of frost

A little daughter dies,

And in four days

Mothers bury in the snow

four little sons.

Sun, without you,

see how a little Gypsy
is dying from cold
in the big forest.

Once, at home, the moon stood in the window,
Didn't let me sleep. Someone looked
inside.

I asked – who is there?

-Open the door, my dark Gypsy.

I saw a beautiful young Jewish girl,
shivering from cold,
asking for food.

You poor thing, my little one.

I gave her bread, whatever I had, a shirt.

We both forgot that not far away
were the police

But they didn't come that night.

All the birds
are praying for our children,
so the evil people, vipers, will not kill them.
Ah, fate! (Papusza 2015).

Romani liminal zones of existence, in the “creation of a space in which bare life and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of indistinction,” site-specific to death camp ‘stories’, deterritorialize the human and non-human *Gegenstand* (Agamben in Downey 2013, 125). In German, *Gegenstand* is ‘object’ and as such, distinct from ‘subject’ by which human life is apprehended. Stories as immanent, as infinite, as movements,

situate the eliding of concepts, of empirical ‘subject data’ used for the purpose of something, or a means to an end. Storytelling in written or oral form, as arrangements of intensities, haecceities, disrupts the sovereign apparatus of bio- and geopolitical practices of identity cohesion, of territorial unity. In place, stories affirm sovereignty as movements, affirm difference as differentiation, mobilizing itself in a transitory lodging, dislodging from and within a securing of “conceptual linkages” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 37). They neither negate nor privilege authorial presence by absence, and absence by transcendental or metaphysical presence. Here, sovereignty splits from the “French *écriture*,” from self-referential writing, from the theory of the sign (Michel Foucault 1977, 119).

For example, the painterly work of Ceija Stojka, as liminal articulations of ‘in-betweenness’, invokes an alternate ‘script’. Her storytelling is mobilized not with the personal narratives of death camp horrors, but by the aesthetically informed ethical ‘writing’ of her ‘painting’. “Her work may be described as a hybrid of folk art and German expressionism.” The stark brush strokes of Stojka’s work, “Mama in Auschwitz,” create a central figure, and is part of “a series of ink drawings” including ““Even Death is Afraid of Auschwitz”” (L.H. 2016). Mama is indistinct from human and non-human form, enveloped by a death camp winter landscape. Contours of subject-object fuse as intensities, vibrations, despite the dimensionality of perspective - barbed wire foreground to forested background. The finer brushstrokes of trees animate their living form as attendant to the winter motif. Mama peers ahead, static, lifeless, as non-human form, a dark paint mass of little to no contour strokes, organization, or limbs. It is a ‘body without organs’, “at the limit of the lived body,” there is no

organism, “no organization of organs.” ‘Mama’ as “sensation is not qualitative or quantified.” Mama “has only an intensive reality, which no longer determines within itself representative elements” (Deleuze 2003, 39). Stojka’s painterly text bypasses clichés of representation, of morphological and organic differentiation. Mama’s subject is interdisciplinary. Stojka’s aesthetic articulations as Romani-woman-survivor, effectuate counter-memory that supersedes personal narratives. Her brushstroke stories mobilize “an ongoing practice and slights our customary attention to the finished product” (Foucault 1977, 116).

Ceija Stojka’s mother, Sidi, is described as “a strong, cheerful and tradition-conscious woman in her children’s memories,” and “even though she was illiterate, she radiated a feeling of safety and security because of her vision and intelligence” (Heinschink and Teichmann 2003). The Stojka name is a well-known artist family from the Lovara clan in Austria, emigrating from Slovenia and Hungary in the second half of the 19th century. The Lovara clan are horse traders by profession, and are part of the Vlach-Roma community, whose “linguistic influence can be traced to the bondage and slavery of the Roma in the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia that lasted for centuries.” Romani people, migrated “from Asia Minor [...] attracted by the wealth of the Romanian principalities of that time” (Teichmann 2001). From the start of the 20th century, Romani were forced to settle or leave Austria. “In order to inhibit traveling their draught and pack animals were taken away.” The Stojka family, relied on their artistic talents to earn a living, including Harry Stojka, a renowned jazz artist. Though the family elude authorities for a significant period, yet, “in 1939, we were somewhere in Styria; and my family heard that we were not allowed to travel about anymore,” and

then “the Gestapo came to fetch our father from the camping place.” Ceija, as a child, is deported to Auschwitz in 1941, and then “to Ravensbrück and Bergen-Belsen.” Ceija states, “the Nazis had murdered my father and my brother. They had taken everything I loved and treasured from me. I didn’t have a past anymore, no present, and even less so a future.” In 1945, Ceija returns to school, and her family’s “artistic – talents lay dormant.” The Stojka family earn a successful living “trading carpets and cloth” and at “horse markets” (Heinschink and Teichmann 2003). It is not until the 1980’s, that Ceija writes her autobiographies: *We Live in Seclusion: The Memories of a Romni* (1988); *Travellers on This World* (1992); *Träume ich, dass ich lebe?* (Revolvy n.d.). In orthodox *Lovara* that observes Romanipen codes, women’s writing is prohibited, certainly for a non-Romani public. Though she is initially discouraged by the family she keeps her writing in the kitchen (Ceija Stojka 1988) “where no one else would linger. And whenever I had a new page ready, I added it to the pile. In the end, nobody could stop me” (Heinschink and Teichmann 2003). Stojka’s undaunted determination to write and publish her work resists patriarchal Romanipen codes. Her painterly and written work inspired Romani women to record their lived experiences.

The Camp Dispositif

My grandmother survived WWII Germany as a Romani woman. Now she likes to say, “I am a weed. No one wanted me, they tried to destroy me, but I grew. I am a weed, and I’m proud. And I’ve always liked weeds best, anyway. Wild, strong, and very pretty.”

She hasn’t been near a Romani community in 50 years, not since she fled Germany alone. Her decision to pass down what remains of her family’s culture, the culture they hid and the language they lost to survive, was not an easy one. When I was a child, she warned me that even knowing my roots was dangerous. She told me, “I was lucky to come to America where no one knew me, and I could keep hiding.”

She said, “It was hard enough being German, I couldn’t be Gypsy too.” (Reidy 2014b)

The sovereign’s “right of death and power over life,” if his “very existence was in jeopardy,” has yielded to modern state-sanctioned “biopower” and in Foucault’s (2010) initial conceptualization, (*The Will to Knowledge*) the technologies of disciplines of power and control (258). The sovereign’s “right to *take* life” is now “simply the reverse of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, and develop its life” (259). As such, “entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital.” The defense of “the juridical existence of the sovereign” is no longer the “ancient right to kill.” Instead, states maintain the “biological existence of a population,” and “power is situated and exercised” in the name of ‘protecting’ life, “the species, the race” (Foucault 2010, 260). The state’s ‘righteous’ power “to kill those who represented a kind of biological danger to others” is central to “the state’s surveillance mechanisms of control” (261). As such, ‘Germaness’ is certified with the *Ahnenpass* (genealogy, ancestor passport) whereby identity markers (race, ethnicity), of Aryan lineage in the *Ariernachweis* legitimate ‘state-subjects’ of eligibility and qualify for ‘life’. In my family, my paternal grandmother (Portuguese ancestry), forges her *Ahnenpass* to avoid capture by Nazi officials. Her husband, my grandfather, secures a falsified *Ahnenpass* through contacts as a theatrical director. This ancestral passport requirement develops from the anti-Semitic Nüremberg Laws in 1935, and as part of the sovereign apparatus of bio- and geopolitical methodologies of control, as part of the horrors of Nazi eugenics and topographical orders of German *Reinheit* - racial ‘purity’ laws. The ‘camp’, itself, functions as an apparatus, a *dispositif* of German ‘purification’. Projected in Nazi

propaganda films as a retreat to the great outdoors, at camp in the Bavarian Alps, in the leisure of the German countryside, the racially 'pure' German family is depicted hiking, boating, picnicking, and in general communing with nature. This romanticized portrayal of 'purifying', and reinvigorating vitality of mind and body, modeled 'legitimate' qualified 'life' by appealing to the sentimentality of shared 'Germaness', and love of *Heimat* (homeland).

The *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (Nationalist Socialist German Worker's Party) propaganda and portrayal of the camp classified and qualified German leisurely 'life'. The Nazi killing of Jews and Gypsies in death (extermination) camps and concentration (labor) camps classified "life unworthy of life" (Glass 1997, 5). Those 'unworthy of life' could only attempt to redeem any virtue of their life through work, by forced labor – *Arbeit macht frei* (labor makes free). Jews and Gypsies were life disqualified, 'unworthy' as *unmenschlich*, the non-inhuman, The Other. 'Unworthy life' included homosexuals, communists, persons with physical deformities, or persons with disability. The sovereign apparatus of death camps, and labor camps – *Arbeitslager* - introduces the 'camp dispositif' as a "decisive event of modernity," as "the politicization of bare life" (Agamben 1998, 4). It is, however, "not so much the inclusion of *zoē*" (natural life) "in the *polis*-which is in itself ancient-nor simply the fact that life as such becomes a principal object of the projections and calculations of State power" (9). Instead, it is at this juncture, that the camp dispositif evinces "concrete ways in which power penetrates subjects' very bodies and forms of life" (5). As such, "the realm of bare life-which is originally situated at the margins of political order-gradually begins to coincide with the political realm, and exclusion and inclusion,

outside and inside, *bios* and *zoē*, right and fact, enter into a zone of irreducible indistinction” (9).

The Holocaust camp apparatus as “sovereign violence opens a zone of indistinction between law and nature, outside and inside, violence and law. And yet the sovereign is who maintains the possibility of deciding on the two to the very degree that he renders them indistinguishable from each other” (64). These zones of indistinction emerge within limited sight distance (invoking a roadway analogy), and yet in approaching varied intersections, marked as gender, race, class, and nation, “one ‘exists’ not only by virtue of being recognized, but in a prior sense by being *recognizable*.” Subjectivities ‘in transit’, mobile between intersections, become vulnerable. They move in a zone of indistinct transition. Their ‘recognizable’ existence becomes dependent “on the address of The Other” (Butler 1997, 5).

This address of The Other is not limited to the recognizable of conventional hyphenated-identity in transit, as French-Romani-woman, as the British-Romany Mikey Walsh. It is Walter Benjamin’s *blosses Leben*, (Agamben 1998, 65). It is “bare life,” as “a zone of indistinction and continuous transition between man and beast, nature and culture, continually operative in the civil state in the form of sovereign decision” (109). ‘Unconventional’ identity markers are recognizably dependent on ‘The Other’. Carl Schmitt calls it *Ausnahme*, an exception, “the state of exception”; the sovereign decision “proves itself not to lead the law to create law” (19). And “together with the process by which the exception everywhere becomes the rule,” the camp dispositif becomes regularized (9). In this way, mobile subjectivities are hailed over on roadway ‘zones of indistinction’. Police hail you - your vulnerabilities recognizable like unfurled flags in

this transit zone. You are marked *immediately* in your ‘unqualified’ form of life. Bare life exists between Woman<->Man<->Romani<->Gadjo. Bare life exists as stripped bodies, arms, and legs against the wall. It exists as “necropolitics,” of dead men, women, and children walking. It exists as the living dead, exceeding, the sovereign apparatuses of biopower (Braidotti 2007). Bare life exists as Taloche, and in Deleuzian grammar “becoming-animal,” of evasive tree climbing, momentarily triumphant, in resistance to Nazi capture and killing (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 238). Bare life is Romani Holocaust survivor, Ceija Stojka’s painting of “Mama in Auschwitz.” It is Stojka’s refuge in the warmth of the newly deceased bodies of the dead (L.H. 2016). Here, there, nowhere, in transit, Schmitt’s *Ausnahme* as “the state of exception,” is not necessitated as Agamben’s conceptualization of ‘camp’ (Agamben 1998, 19). In place, Stojka’s refuge incites ‘exception’ as a contested space within itself – ‘as conditions of possibility’ for an affirmative instantiation of difference that exceeds the mortal or immortal, the transcendental or sacred. As Deleuze (1983) states, “a thought that would *affirm* life instead of a knowledge that is opposed to life. Life would be the active force of thought, but thought would be the affirmative power of life. Both would go in the same direction, carrying each other along, smashing restrictions, matching each other step by step, in bursts of unparalleled creativity” (101). This insight introduces the life-affirming chronicle of Mikey Walsh.

Boot Camp

Mikey Walsh (2009) (a pseudonym, as are all names to protect the identity of his family) lives in a Romani ‘camp’ in Britain. He lives and has lived in many camps. Mikey details a narrative of “boot camp hell” in his memoir, his autoethnography

(*Gypsy Boy*) of site-specific Romani life (102). He describes his lived childhood experiences, his father's physical and emotional abuse. His 'boot camp' is surviving the persistent violence, his father's sadistic rage and accompanying weapons of abuse, "from a belt to a bamboo stick or the heel of his boot" (99). Mikey consistently, yet unintentionally provokes his father's violent attacks against him. He wets his pants at school, at the age of five and gets a beating from his father. He is then sent to school in "red-frilled knickers – a pair of my mother's – which my father had forced me to wear" (98). His humiliation and physical abuse by his father is initiated by the ritual bodily assault and battery of training for bare-knuckle fighting. Mikey's grandfather Noah "brought his sons up to be gladiators among Gypsies" (4). He'd say, "hit 'em so they'll never get back up. One. Good. Hit. Put out your man like a candle, he would repeat"

(5). Mikey explains:

That's why our family was considered special. The bare-knuckle crown had been in our family since my great-grandfather, Mikey, first won it. He had moved to Britain from Eastern Europe during the Blitz, poverty stricken and homeless, with his wife and their children: three sons and two daughters. The war had almost finished off the Gypsies, who were loathed and persecuted by the Nazis. Many in Europe were convinced that we had been wiped out, and would survive only as a mere footnote among the other cultures that had fallen prey to the Holocaust. But some defied the odds and so the years after the war, they regrouped and built up their communities once again (4). One such community is Reading, "a sprawling town outside London with no major landmarks or attractions, but its status as home to the Royal Berks made it the most popular destination in the country." (1)

Royal Berks is an abbreviated name for Royal Berkshire Hospital. It is a National Health Service hospital, funded by taxpayers. The health services require no insurance payments and are free, including maternity ward services. (Royal Berkshire Hospital n.d.). "Wherever they were, when the time to give birth drew near, traveling families would flock to one of the many campsites surrounding the town" (Walsh 2009, 2). He

explains, “the first thing my father did, in the minutes after I arrived was to place around my neck a gold chain with a tiny pair of gold boxing gloves on it” (3). His father begins training him at the age of four. “You need to show me how worthy you are of wearing these, my boy, alright,” his father says, referring to the gold boxing gloves (40). Mikey is continually confronted by other boys to fight and challenged to defend his family’s bare-knuckle championship. He fails to defend the championship, and his father’s ancestral tradition and heritage. The increasingly violent and ferocious training by his father escalates into a vicious cycle of physical abuse and reprisal for losing to other challengers. Mikey moves from campsite to campsite, bungalows to caravans, and yet is continually battered into his early adolescence. He describes an early training session:

Ready Mikey? I was never ready, and I was never less than terrified. I was not yet old enough to go to school, and I was expected to take hit after hit from a grown man, get off my backside when I fell and come back fighting [...] I closed my eyes, tensing my whole body, awaiting the next blow. I dived into my unconscious, searching frantically for a place to hide myself from what was coming. WHAM! Like a wrecking ball, his fist crashed into my guts and sent me hurtling across the floor. I tripped backward over my mother, who was lying on the floor, engrossed in a re-run of *Starsky and Hutch*. I crash-landed into the television set, pushing it off the stand. My mother got up and peeled me off the telly. That’s enough now, Frank. Her voice was tight and low. (42-43)

Mikey explicates: “almost all Gypsy men are violent, it’s ingrained in the culture and life they lead and impossible to avoid. My father had no doubt suffered as a child, and because of Old Noah and his motto, he grew up to be more violent than most” (42).

Mikey’s suffering becomes more horrifying. He is sexually molested and repeatedly raped by his father’s brother, Uncle Joseph. Initially trusting Joseph’s care of his physical injuries, Mikey is forced into Joseph’s company by his father. “For the next few years, I was sent to the scrapyard one day a week. Joseph had offered to ‘train’ me,

and Uncle Tory and my father were only too happy to leave me to him” (111). He details his personal narratives of suffering and horror with ethnographic accounts of Romani life in specific camp and work sites. And he expresses his isolation within the context of the isolation of Gypsy camp settlements, the mutual exclusion of Gypsies by *Gorgias* or also referred to as *Gorger* (non-Romani -outsider), and of *Gorgias* by Gypsies. Points of contact with the ‘outside’ world, encounters at school or work, are minimized by Romani orthodox cultural, social codes and practices, or restricted altogether. Though this is beginning to change, he states, “like all Gypsy children before us; we had been brought up not to trust *Gorgias*.” This cultural restriction includes educational opportunities in *Gorgia* schools, in “fear their children will be influenced by the *Gorgias*, learning too much of their lifestyle and changing them as people forever” (Walsh 2009, 66). He continues:

Five hundred years ago it was commonplace to see a Gypsy staked upon the London Bridge and during every religious war, Gypsies were first in the firing line, cast as heathens and godless magicians. In the Second World War, many were left as sitting ducks, banging on farmer’s doors for sanctuary during Hitler’s raids, thrown into prisons and concentration camps to be tortured and killed. Given this history, Gypsies believe, perhaps understandably, that they have only managed to survive by remaining insular and rejecting the rest of the world. And so, sadly, the prejudices on both sides have only deepened. It is tragic, both for the Gypsies who distrust and hate and for the other races that never get to see the more human, generous side of the Romanies. None of the other Gypsy children in our area went to school. For the most, Gypsies were left alone by education officials reluctant to set foot in the local camps. (66-67)

The significance of Mikey’s narrative is evinced further regarding points of contact beyond the ‘family camp’, to the ‘outside’ world. Hospitals and schools are regulatory sites of citizen-centric eligibility. Mikey, unlike other Romani children in his community, attends school until the age of eleven. His mother, who learns to write phonetically during her childhood, arranges and encourages his school attendance. She

is also mindful of potential Gorgia intervention and fearful of losing the custody of her children. Mikey reflects on his schooling. Though fraught with conflict and violence by Romani and non-Romani challenges to fight, the school provides a point of contact with the Gorgia world and temporarily protects him from his father's abuse. He describes his admiration of a caring and supportive teacher, Mrs. Kerr. She notices the signs of physical abuse on Mikey's body. She does not intervene by reporting it to school officials, aware of his temporary school enrollment status. However, Mikey experiences another set of entanglements and collisions at intersections of cultural identities. He describes the following encounter, before his family's departure to a new Romani camp settlement:

The night we finished school I sobbed myself to sleep. There were so many things I still had to learn. And I didn't want to leave Mrs. Kerr. In our final week, the class had gone to the Natural History Museum to see an exhibition about ancient Egypt. We Gypsy children were never allowed to go on school trips. Our parents didn't trust the teachers so that any permission slip would be chucked straight into the bin. This time, realising how much I wanted to go, Mrs. Kerr drove to Warren Woods to ask my mother. It was a brave thing to do. 'I can't tell you just how enthusiastic your wee 'un is about this topic, Mrs. Walsh. I personally would very much like to have him with me,' she said. Mother smiled politely. 'No.,' and that was that. Mrs. Kerr reluctantly gave up and left. Mother stared after her. (Walsh 2009, 150)

Walsh (2009) continues to describe the lack of his mother's trust in Mrs. Kerr.

In truth, Mrs. Kerr had blown any possibility of my mother's trust or approval a couple of months earlier when she had sent each of us home with a permission slip for us to view a sex-education video." He explains, "Any sexual term was banned, as was any reference to 'women's trouble' and mention of these would earn me a chop to the neck... It seems ironic that most sexual terms were banned, yet most Gypsies, both men, and women, used an abundance of foul language in almost every sentence, but that was the rule. (150-51)

In the following, I investigate further Romani rule of law – Romaniya.

Romani Rule

Romani traditional family and clan practices segregate gender roles. Site-specific

Romani family-clan and cultural subjectivities engage patriarchal and heteronormative ‘identity’ practices. Such traditional identity practices are rooted in Romaniya, Romanipen, Rombase, or “Gypsy law” (Weyrauch 2001, 256). Though context and site-specific, Romanipen code patriarchal practices as *marimos* subordinate Romani women to the needs and interests of the clan as *kris* (tribunal), and family affiliations as *kumpaniya* (Fonesca 1995, 4-9). Furthermore, as explicated in “Oral Legal Traditions of Gypsies,” the varying “effectiveness of the sanctions” in Romaniya could be compromised if Romani due to “past disclosures of taboo matters were to start to talk freely about intimate matters, as is commonplace among *gaje*” (another dialect spelling of *gadjo*-outsiders) (Weyrauch 2001, 256). Thus, Romani reluctance to send their children to school is in part related to “exposure of their children to courses on sex education and uninhibited communications with non-Gypsy children.” Accordingly, Walter O. Weyrauch (2001) states in *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, “gender and ethnic limitations of Romaniya are meant to prevent free communication of intimate matters among Gypsies and from Gypsies to the outside” (256). Notable here is Mikey’s exposition of his mother’s response to the sex education permission slip, Mrs. Kerr’s subsequent home visitation, and his mother’s reference to his teacher as the “nosey old witch” (150).

Not unlike Claude (Chouroro), the French Gadjo boy protagonist in the film *Korkoro*, Mikey’s narrative recounts a fragmented subjectivity and ways-of-being, becoming-in-the-world. His family camp boundaries are permeable to the outside, despite his clan’s efforts at maintaining an insular way of life. His direct, immanent contact and encounters in the Gorgia world problematize his identity knowledge

boundaries, as he inhabits spaces of in-betweenness. His subject eligibility moves in and along fissures, between inclusion and exclusion, yet also along intersecting trajectories of gender, race, class, and nation. He is a prisoner in the Romani camp, repeatedly, mercilessly a victim of his father's and uncle's abuse and violence. School is a temporary refuge from the abuse he suffers at home, yet school only offers limited protection from violence. Mikey is also confronted at school with the institutional demands and state-sanctioned codes of what constitutes 'qualified, worthy, life'. His increasing adolescent awareness of becoming physically and emotionally attracted to boys in his camp settlement violates the heteronormative requirements of the Romanipen code. He feels ashamed being gay and struggles to hide his attraction in social settings. His immediate survival concerns necessitate mediating Romani and Gorgia juridico-social orders, often contradictory and self-contesting in practice. Mikey calls attention to a paradox in his retelling of Romanipen norms. Sex education is a violation of Romanipen. Sexuality is sacred; any reference regarding sexual acts violates Romaniya (law). Sexual slurs and epithets, the profane, is considered acceptable. Alternately, the school's state-sanctioned disciplinary codes and authority focus on student attendance, yet turns a blind eye (teachers, including Mrs. Kerr) to Mikey's facial bruises and other visible signs of physical abuse. Mikey's life is not 'qualified life' from 'inside' or 'outside' the camp. His survival is equally or at greater risk in the liminal zones of 'in-betweenness'. Here, there, nowhere, Mikey straddles Agamben's conceptualization of 'camp' (as Schmitt's *Ausnahme* – 'state of exception'), and Stojka's refuge of 'exception' as contested space within itself. It is a dangerous 'place' to be.

“The state of exception enables this contradiction since it is neither inside nor outside the law” (Morgan 2007, 46). As Agamben notes, it is “a suspension of the juridical order itself” (Agamben in Morgan 2007, 46). However, it is not just “the absence of law, since law contains provisions for its own suspension.” This “paradox means that law functions unusually within the state of exception.” As Mikey’s narrative above explicates, the paradox of Romani law and the law of state authority, as the state of exception, “separates the law’s *force* from its application” (emphasis is mine) (Morgan 2007, 46). As a victim of child abuse, Mikey’s welfare is ignored within a juridical suspension between the autonomy of the Romanipen Code and the British Child Protection Act (2004).

Local non-Romani authorities do not intervene on the basis of physical/sexual abuse, and according to the European Roma Rights Centre, is a type of intervention often considered “off limits and beyond the sacred line of private autonomy, the family” (Cahn 2000). However, a 2012 report: *Human Rights of Roma and Travellers in Europe* indicates “policies and practices that separate Roma in education throughout the Council of Europe member states” (Council of Europe 2012, 124). Here, the force of law coincides with the employment of legal measures. Alternately, this separation between the law’s force and application results in “acts that are not authorized by any law,” yet “can employ the force of legal action” (Morgan 2007, 46-47). The non-Romani juridico-political order and coding practice become a form of ‘legal cherry-picking’. Living in a continual global state of exception, the state of law can no longer be reinstated, “for at issue now are the very concepts of ‘state’ and ‘law’” (Agamben in Morgan 2007, 46). The high-risk agency of the ‘camp’ dispositif is continually re-

pening to the indistinct, indeterminate zones of applicability between violence and law. *Violence* is continually imminent as the ‘state’ of the force of law or immanent to the state of exception, which deploys the force of legal action. And “in extreme situations ‘force of law’ floats as an indeterminate element that can be claimed by state authority...and by a revolutionary organization” (47). If Agamben’s perpetual state of exception is now a government paradigm, globally, then the force of human rights law has withered to a formality. In other words, it has been replaced by a ‘legal norm’ and force of action, as the ‘new normal’. In either ‘state’, the violence and law nexus is ‘instrumentalized’. Mikey’s struggle to mediate, negotiate Romaniya and Gorgia, non-Romani law, invites a closer examination of an important form and forum of Romani adjudication, noted previously, the *kris*.

Because of the general lack of territorial boundaries, each Gypsy group can determine its own form of adjudication. Although there are many words for ‘group’ in the Gypsy language, four primary associations can be identified: *natsia*, meaning nation; *kumpania*, an alliance of households not necessarily of the same *natsia* but of the same geographic area bound together for socioeconomic reasons; *vista*, or clan; and *familia*, which informally settles minor disputes, and extending to the larger units with increasing formality. (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 40)

Moreover, “when conflict emerges between Gypsies of different *vitsi* or *kumpania* (singular *kumpaniya*), a *divano* may assemble (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 41). However, “when the Roma cannot settle a controversy amicably in a *divano*, a *kris* may become necessary” (42). The ‘*kris*’ as a Romani tribunal and court system is specific to Romani speaking the “Vlax dialects or Danubian,” though not all Vlach Roma practice the *kris* system (Hancock 2010, 142). In particular, the *kris* is assembled by the Rom “who refer to themselves as the four nations of the *Kalderash*, *Lovari*, *Churari*, and *Machavaya*” (Acton, Caffrey, and Mundy 2001, 95). Romani speakers of “Vlax dialects such as

Kalderash or Lovari Romani” (traditionally blacksmiths, coppersmiths, and horse-traders), constitute “perhaps half of all Romani spoken,” and “are found all over the world.” Vlax “dialect groups” and their “ancestors were slaves in Wallachia and Moldova” (Hancock 2010, 142). Hancock estimates that there are more than sixty Romani dialects (142). The significance of dialect and site-specific Romani cultural identities and Romaniya (law) practices becomes evident in the following:

Sometimes in the portrayal of our people, and in films especially, characteristics typical of quite distinct Romani groups are all thrown together, so that in a scene which takes place in Ukraine or Lithuania, for example, the actors might be shown wearing Spanish Romani clothes and living in British Romani wagons. In novels, when the author wishes to include some of our language for authenticity, British Romanichal Romani words (usually traceable to the writings of George Barrow) are put in the mouths of Hungarian or Russian Romanies, or else British Romanichals will be described as participating in a *kris*, the internal legal system specific to Vlax Romanies. (108-109)

This observation is notable regarding Mikey’s autoethnographic telling of the Romanipen Code and the domestic/child abuse in his family. As British Romani, Mikey and his clan members do not practice the kris tribunal-based system of adjudicating grievances. The protection of his physical, emotional welfare is limited to the family (his mother), between families in his clan, and points of contact with the Gorgia world (his schoolteacher, Mrs. Kerr). Thomas Acton of ‘Romani Studies’ at the University of Greenwich, England, “posits a triangular model with the ‘democratic tribunal’ kris at one point, the ‘authoritarian, tribunal’ *Baro Shero* (Big Head) system at the second point, and the ‘blood feud’ at a third diametrically opposed to ‘tribunal’ called ‘avoidance systems of justice’.” The *Baro Shero* system and blood-feud system are site-specific Romani community practices of self-governance in the absence of the kris court-based system. The Romani elders presiding over the court, the *krisnitori* (*a*)

(plural), are male and head their households. Most of the adjudication concerns grievances against Romani women: such as “that a bride is not a virgin; allegations that a Romani wife has been unfaithful; or cases in which the wife has run off, causing the husband to sue the wife’s family” (Cahn 2000). However, sometimes a kris assembles to protect a Romani woman (her father initiates the proceedings) from her husband’s abuse. Often punishment by kris authority is monetary. Domestic violence and crimes against women rarely receive severe punishment, such as banishing, or in some cases expelling the perpetrator lifelong from the Romani community. The kris decision and punishment can’t be appealed and is legally binding. It is traditionally practiced in the “Vlach Romanes” dialect, though increasingly in some communities, non-Romani languages are permitted, including “participation via fax or mobile phone” (Acton, Caffrey, and Mundy 2009, 95). As such, this introduces the tensions between Romani traditional legal practices, ancestral stories as maritime legal code and contemporary articulations, relevant to human rights law.

Roasted Chicken

‘Traditional storytelling’ by clan and kinship groups, reaffirm Romanipen (code); Romaniya (law); and the kris (court) ‘authority’. It is a “legal culture that for about one thousand years” perpetuates cultural and identity knowledge practices through oral narratives. One of the primary links in Romaniya is “between the law and the human body,” and “consequences for the conduct of daily life” (Weyrauch 2001, 2).

Romanipen, as an unwritten legal code, articulates cultural practices constituting situated ethics, site-specific to varying Romani communities. For example, kinship and clan belief systems within the Vlach-dialect Romani diaspora vary in practice

geographically, and between families. Romani are ritualizing practices of sexuality, and marrying, binding idiosyncratic community law to the unspoken code of Romanipen. The adjudication and basis of Romaniya do not rely on abstract constructs and legalities, characteristic of majoritarian, dominant law cultures. Romaniya functions “on distinctions between practices that are pure (*vujō*) and polluted (*marime*)” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 29). These ‘pure’ and ‘polluted’ regulatory ideals function as hygiene and health measures “to prevent dissension and disease among people living in deprived and unstable conditions” (30). Romaniya dictates that the human body is pure above the waist and impure below the waist. For example, according to Romaniya, some *marime* (polluting) behavioral practices include: taking a bath – the lower body, the unclean (genitals, feet) contaminates the upper body, the clean (stomach, chest). “Pollution taboos” are site-specific to Romani communities and vary from clan to clan. (31). However, ‘purity’ practices are based on avoiding contact with ‘outsiders’ from without the clan, and avoiding contact with ‘contaminating’ bodily fluids, primarily blood, within the clan. This latter blood-based Romaniya purity law emphasizes *vujō* behavioral practices regarding menstruation, sexual intercourse, childbirth, marriage, and menopause (29). These practices raise significant questions regarding Romani cultural and legal practices oppressive to Romani women and problematizes the anthropological perspective within the framework of feminist discourse and human rights law. Two repetitious themes prevail in Romani cultural knowledge/regulatory practices, and majoritarian coded-cultural discourse, and policing. These themes mobilize along powerful subject trajectories of ‘identity’ politics that determine varying measures of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ membership status: purity – impurity; clean – dirty.

Romani articulations of ‘impurity’ as *marime* has two meanings: ‘pollution’ as a contaminating physical and social agency, as well as legal sentencing and punishment for disruptive behaviors, as violations of purity laws. Traditional storytelling (re)affirms the authority of Romanipen and *marime*. In *Roast Chicken and other Gypsy Stories*, the ‘roast chicken’ signifies the polluting agency of marital infidelity and ‘impure’ love, as well as compensation for the *marime* (polluted) violations of the Romanipen Code. A young man brings a young woman roast chicken in return for her ‘impure’ love – “when you have roast chicken you have everything,” and in the doing, alerts her husband of the violation (Čvorović 2010, 131). An ethnographic collection of Serbian Romani storytelling, this oral narrative among others, transmits ancestral kinship knowledge and reaffirms the unwritten, *marime*. “Gypsy history begins with stories” (40). Despite the impact of modernity on Romani communities and the subsequent shifting ethno-juridical relationship to their self-fashioning, storytelling continues as a primary communal practice. The following is a short story from *Roast Chicken*:

Once, there was this Rom [man] who people used to call Bilc, but his real name was Mihaljo. He worked as a craftsman, sometimes as a blacksmith. He worked in front of his house, while his wife used to help him. Our women always help with our jobs—that’s their duty. So, once, she went outside to help him; she was making underwear for him at the same time. She was supposed to make “*turevind*”, a special kind of male underwear that Muslims wear. It has one ‘extra’ part of textile on its back that sticks out. However, she didn’t make it correctly, it being too small or too big for her man, so when he saw that, he became very angry. So angry was he that he hit his wife on her forehead with his hammer. She fell dead instantly. It wasn’t his intention to kill his wife, but it happened. He got scared; what to do now, she’s dead, her family lives in the same village, her kin will kill him. He started thinking, and arrived at a solution; he will drag her body into the house and wait for night to fall. He did as his thoughts dictated. When night fell, his relatives came to visit. He told them everything, they were his kin, his blood, and naturally were willing to help. They conceived of a plan to take his dead wife to a nearby forest and bury her there. They covered her body with leaves. And that is how she remained – his dead wife. One day went by, another day went by, and another and another. Not being in her home, not showing her face, her relatives started to look for her: where is she,

what's going on? A couple of children finally found her, buried under a pile of leaves: the children were biding their cattle in the forest, and immediately reported the dead body to the local policeman. Bilc was arrested; however, he couldn't be taken to the official [Serbian] court since he belonged to the Roma community. The Roma however never really gave the matter too much attention: It was his wife's family who were to decide what his punishment should be. At that time, the Roma had their own committee, *kris*, for judging and sentencing. *Kris* still exists among some Gypsies today. Then his wife's brothers and his own brothers came to an agreement on his punishment: Bilc was to climb a high tree, to the top, cross his legs there and light up a cigarette. Should he fall, he is done with his life—they will kill him; if he does not fall, he will be forgiven. In the event, Bilc made it: he climbed up the tree, crossed his legs and lit up a cigarette and did not fall down. Everything was forgiven. This is a true story. It's how the laws were drafted among the Roma: to climb and cross legs without falling down. My grandmother told me this story; actually this fellow Mihaljo is a cross-cousin of mine, but this story has been transmitted through the generations in my family, and that's how I learned about it. Until modernization [electric power] came, we would sit around the fire and tell stories. We have no history [written records] other than this – at home. (41-42)

Kris as Romani “honor court” emphasizes the support of clan and family. The family of Bilc's wife adjudicates his violent and fatal attack. Within dominant case law and legal practices, the court sentencing of “climbing a high tree” appears ‘irrational’ and grossly negligent in punishing a man guilty of fatally attacking his wife (Čvorović 2010, 42). However, ‘irrationality’ is an ethnocentrically informed construct, implying that absolute measures and universal standards exist, resulting in conclusive value judgments. What appears self-evident in dominant majoritarian civil or criminal law, might for all ‘rational’ purposes assist in hiding the non-neutrality of state-sanctioned legal precedents, or further reinforce the stability of the paradoxically ‘irrational’ standards of the existing system. The interarticulations between the rationality-irrationality dyad of Western adjudication, reinvokes the ‘camp’ dispositif dialogically across ‘zones of indistinction’ and the ‘state of exception’, as suspensions between ‘legal’ “space and personhood” (Shapiro 1999, 89). And though distinctly different, legally, ‘dispositive’ facts reinscribe juridico-(bio) political rights articulations of

legitimate authority to settle a dispute. “Legal rationality,” as “rationality in law--how judges make decisions and how those decisions are weighed and reasoned within legal discourse—is a question not of pure logic, but of social experience.” Thus, “a full picture of judicial decision-making involves psychology, economics, and political theory, in addition to law” (Epstein 2014, 2). And “the received view of legal rationality does not appear capable of accounting for alternative theories of adjudication” (1). For example, in the novel, *Zoili* (chapter 1), as a comfortably nourished Slovakian journalist, “thinking how stupid it was to wear soft leather for this trip, not even good for a quick retreat” (McCann 2006, 5); as imagery juxtaposed to Interior Minister Hortefeux’s digital fingerprinting of Romani; (Saltmarsh 2010) billboards commissioned by Slovak National party depicting “a dark-skinned man with tattoos and an inflammatory message: ‘Vote SNS, so we don’t need to feed those who don’t work’,” evokes a stark montage of biopolitical significance (CNN 2010). As such, the marginalizing and criminalizing of Romani groups and clan members by a dominant socio-juridical culture seems to persistently turn to inherent Romani identity and innate ‘trait’ based ascriptions. Moreover, “much of the so-called criminal propensity ascribed to the Gypsies is based on disregard or ignorance of the rules of *Romaniya* that are followed by the Roma.” And “even if these rules are pointed out by expert witnesses, they tend to be dismissed as irrelevant by the police or the courts,” or are conversely “used to sustain convictions” (Weyrauch 2001, 6.). For example, inadequate personal identification, the lack or falsification of social security cards, and misuse of card numbers, under *Romaniya* are not based on ‘motive’ of illegal activities or wrongdoing. However, such actions are consistently submitted as evidence for Romani criminal

motives or intent.

Romani subjectivities are continually self-fashioning to encounter and event. Mobile subjectivities elide *a priori* categories of pre-experiential givens, and instead are empirical operations synthesizing subjectivity (Deleuze 1991, 110-11). Here the subject is constituted in the identifiable ‘things’ of experience and the senses, and the (social) relations external to ideas, destabilizing the presuppositions of the “synthetic unity of apperceptions” (Bell 2009, 35). “This confirms the idea that subjectivity is in fact a process, and that an inventory must be made of the diverse moments of this process.” In other words, “let us say that the subject is an imprint, or an impression, left by principles, that it progressively turns into a machine capable of using this impression” (Deleuze 1991, 113). Like Taloche in the film *Korkoro*, who stamps his bottom with passport authorization, Romani subjectivities exceed fixed registers of subject (de)legitimizing. Subjective becoming eclipses the reducibility of the subjective to the ‘givens’ by which it is constituted. Such ‘givens’ are driven in part by ‘value’ judgments as social and experiential intersubjectivity. One account by Gianni from the French Travelers or Gens du Voyage describes: “the people look at my face, and they see a Gypsy.” He collects, sells scrap metal and contends with “the scrap metal dealers on the Boulevard Félix Faure [...] now asking for a French ID card, which Gianni doesn’t have. All he has is a ‘worthless’ foreigner’s ID card from Spain, a piece of paper from Portugal, and a temporary Russian passport. The fact that he has been a citizen of the European Union since 2007 is also irrelevant” (Fichtner 2010). The specificity of spatiotemporal contingencies mobilizes diverse practices of Romani cultural subjectivities.

Many traditional ways of life are mediated, disrupted or lost to demands immanent in conditions of physical, economic, and social survival. Romani that were once coppersmiths, now collect scrap metal for a living. This dynamic engenders readily available conceits, and dismissals of Romani subjectivities and livelihood, as lazy, anachronistic, and nonconforming. Majoritarian cultural and socio-economic requirements for Romani assimilation within EU member states, subsume specific Romani clan allegiances and ancestrally informed trade craftsmanship. EU citizenship, within nationalist myths of cohesive cultural and racialized identity, demands a transnational Eurozone economic membership requirement. EU citizenship requires, and enacts a neoliberal rationale contemporaneous to Western legal reasoning: the typologies of group and identity-based membership, and who or what constitutes a productive, contributing member of 'society'. EU citizenship as a purported open-border and regional-economic member status, requires ID, as in Gianni's experiences of necessitated 'identification'. Despite his EU citizenship, Gianni's racialized identity as 'Gypsy', his mediated traditional livelihood, ID him as a 'non-productive' member of neoliberal or citizen-centric logic. He inhabits a liminal zone of 'qualified' life - legally, politically, economically, culturally, and physically. Juridical principles of 'reason' and 'identification' call an exception, because of, and despite the 'force' of law - Gianni is identified as 'Gypsy'.

Conforming to European jurisprudence and legal principles: 'relevance', 'rationality' and legal 'reasoning' have limited influence on Romani law. "The whole distinction between rationality and irrationality of rules may be irrelevant for the Roma." Furthermore, regarding Romaniya, "even if one were to call these rules irrational, their

binding force is not perceived to be tied to human reasoning, but to divine forces.” In other words, “a rule is there, so to say, because ‘it is’,” and “the *gaje* who look for explanations only demonstrate their fundamental ignorance. They are not ‘in the know’” (Weyrauch 2010, 3). Varying Romani traditional cultural practices and orthodox beliefs systems, not unlike Judeo-Christian cultures, contest demands to explain, to reason: rules are rules, and need to be followed. “Romaniya is really based on an ancient folk religion going back to Indian sources, and efforts to explain it contain the seeds of doubt.” If rules “require a rational basis, they can be attacked by examining their elements,” and in this way, destroys the entire ‘logic’ (5). This speaks to the aforementioned dominant juridico-political conceits of ‘rational’ - ‘reasoning’ in case or statutory law, as principle values, that “disguise” the very “move while making it,” suspending its own ‘logic’, separating the ‘force’ of law from its application (Ferguson 1993, 89). In other words, in this instance, dominant regulatory ‘bodies’ enact, and enforce their own ‘disbelief’.

Returning to Romani orthodox self-articulations in the *Roast Chicken* short stories, Bilc’s wife is murdered by her husband, as he attacks her with a hammer blow to the head. His violent rage results in fatal retaliation to her incorrect assembly of “a special kind of male underwear that Muslims wear” (Čvorović 2010, 41-42). Bilc’s violent act is adjudicated within the *kris* system of addressing Romani family *grievance*, and *shame*, not a judgment based on *guilt* and legal *conviction*. Romani subject articulations as gender, and religious affiliation, along which structures of hegemony move, both within and from without site-specific Romani clan practices, are not considered in the ethico-judicial order of the *kris*. As such, Bilc’s murderous rage is not considered a

religious or gender-based violent act against a woman, within Romaniya. The politics of identity representation, central to the jurisprudence of International Human Rights Law, is not ‘valid’ within the legal grievance system of Romanipen. Western legal constructs such as ‘domestic violence’, ‘hate crimes’, and ‘hate speech’, as juridically group-based definitions of violence against identity ‘categories’, are not considered within the ethico-juridical order of the kris. Rather, Romanipen also referred to as Romaniya ‘values’ are immanent to encounter and event. Romani code and law become ‘subject’ to Romani mobile objective (ities) of mediating, negotiating space and time. As such, Romani law as an unwritten legal narrative, as ancestral stories, and ‘chronotope’, functions as forms and forums of time. Chronotope “(literally ‘time-space’)” is “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” (Bakhtin 1981, 84). Deleuze (2006) states, “the spatial temporal frame of a narrative plays a key role in the production of meaning-making, roles, identities, values, boundaries and crossings, cultural classes of discourse and tools” (Auer 2015).

Romani mobile subjectivities are always already constituted by being-in-the-world, in relation to the object/Other. In other words, Romani site-specific cultural articulations along subject trajectories of gender, race, ethnicity, and nation, as singularities within encounter and event, speak to the ‘given’ of everyday experience, which ‘value’ is not ‘bracketed’ out. Romani everyday experience as ‘storytelling’, as mobility, is ‘data’ central to Romani law as oral legal narrative, and within the context of the ‘democratic’ kris system (differentiated from the ‘the big head’ tribunal, or blood-feud systems), heeds varying spatio-temporal disjunctures. As Michael J. Shapiro

(2001) notes in his reference to Bakhtin's description of the novel as "a distinctive chronotope," the retold story of Bilc, written, also "articulates time-space with a 'density and concreteness' [...] as biographical and historical time sequences juxtapose 'the time of life' with 'historical time,' allowing for a view of diverse and conflicting forms of attachment" (40). In this way, the Bilc narrative articulates alternate registers of familial and ethical coding, which contest state-centric, Western 'rights discourse', and jurisprudence in several significant ways: (1) Romani code and law are informed by divine forces rather than human 'reasoning'; (2) judgment is based on grievances by family and community members rather than guilt; (3) settlement of grievances is community and family-oriented, not rights-based legal classifications; (4) 'legal' evidence and 'data' are constituted by spatio-temporal and cultural disjuncture, which evince the primacy of conflicting family and community attachment. However, before I turn to investigate further how sacred cultural codes as Romaniya/Romanipen juxtapose to the dominant language of international human rights, I examine Romani practices of adjudication in greater detail.

As mentioned previously, Romani 'group' associations are bound in part by the rules of *marime* – 'impure' behavioral practices includes contact with non-Romani people, who are considered ignorant of Romani purity rules, and hygiene practices. Marime as code and practice, also regulates contact with animals. Cats and dogs are considered impure in their oral contact and transmission of fecal matter, however, are permitted as outdoor pets. Horses are considered pure, standing in a manner, above the feces. And the use of objects, primarily for the kitchen, bedroom, and bathroom, is also regulated. The complex rules of marime, divide impure practices that include hygiene

and social behavior. According to Weyrauch and Bell (2001), separation from majoritarian practices and society, has been crucial to Romani physical, and cultural survival. In part, marime functions and “stems from the Romani belief that non-Gypsies are in a state of defilement because of their ignorance about rules on purity and impurity,” regarding hygiene practices and social behavior (29). The centrality of marime to Romani code and law, regulating ‘impure’ practices that threaten physical or social survival, act as ironic contestations to non-Romani hate-speech references of Roma as ‘dirty Gypsies’. Jean-Marie Le Pen of the French right-wing party, the National Front, describes “the Roma community in Nice, France, ‘smelly’ and ‘rash-inducing’” and directly belies the Romani marime code (MacGuill 2013). This code includes both the polluting practices and the condition(s) of defilement, as well as being sentenced - ‘impure’. The potential consequence of such a grievance claim against a Romani perpetrator is shaming, and expulsion from the Romani community. However, marime codes and adherence to non-polluting practices differ between Romani communities, and “involve rules that are aspirational.” “Gypsies define themselves in part by their adherence to these cleanliness rituals” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 31). Elwood Trigg, in his work regarding European Romani, ‘classifies’ the rules of marime into the following categories: “(1) taboos directly or indirectly related to the fear of being contaminated by women; (2) sexual taboos; (3) things considered to be dirty or unhygienic; and (4) disdain of socially disruptive behavior” (32). However useful or not Trigg’s categorical determinations might be, they present a point of entry into how regulatory narratives, as contingencies of encounter and event, reiterating Deleuze, play “[...] a key role in the production of meaning-making, roles, identities, boundaries and

crossings, cultural classes of discourse and tools” (Auer 2015).

As stated previously, Romani orthodox marime rules consider contact with bodily fluids below the waist as risky and polluting, especially the transmission of blood. Specifically, according to *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture* (the text widely recognized by Romani rights activists), women could contaminate men during menstruation, pregnancy, and childbirth. This marime regulation and Romanipen code mobilize gender discrimination/practices in a number of ways. For example (1) Romani women must eat alone, and must avoid food preparation during menstruation; (2) Romani consider female reproductive organs, fluids, and genitalia as polluting and impure; (3) therefore, a woman should not walk past a man in a seated position, in the proximity of genitalia, and must undress facing away from her husband; (4) women’s clothes must be washed separately; (5) men should not walk beneath her garments drying on a clothesline; (6) a pregnant woman must not sleep in the same bed with her husband; (7) a woman is considered impure until six weeks after childbirth; (8) women and men must not share the same toilet, and; (9) women must cover and position their legs close together when sitting down (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 32-35). Again, adherence to this partial listing of marime rules is site-specific to Romani family and community practices. Though historically, marime regulating Romani cultural practices are strictly observed within orthodox communities, many contemporary Romani impurity articulations governing gender-based practices, and the discrimination against women, as ‘contaminating’ agents, remain. According to Weyrauch and Bell (2001), “even today, some Roma will not rent a lower floor apartment for fear that a woman living upstairs will at some point pollute them by walking overhead” (33).

In this way, Romanipen informs two conflicting ethico-judicial registers within the context of international human rights discourse. Specifically, Romani discriminatory gender-based regulations, and self-fashioning subjectivities employed *as* adjudication practices contest Western group/identity-rights-based reasoning. Therefore, marime as a set of beliefs/codes/practices collides with Western jurisprudence regarding “social transgressions” and the “administration of justice” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 39). Within Rancière’s conceptual framing, marime does so as a *dispositif*, mobilizing varying ‘insider’ to ‘outsider’ subjectivities of ‘policing’ and ‘surveillance’. “The police is, essentially, the law, generally implicit, that defines a party’s share or the lack of it. But to define this, you first must define the configuration of the perceptible in which one or the other is inscribed” (Rancière 1999, 29).

For example, Romani who exploit or steal from Romani community members are violating marime codes and considered “socially disruptive.” And Romani “consider crimes of violence and noncommercial associations with *gaje* [non-Romani] as crimes against Romani society as a whole and therefore *marime*” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 39). A Romani who transgresses against Romani society by breaking a marime rule is overpowered by evil, impurity, and is feared and rejected for being contaminating. In this way, marime becomes a label of condemnation, and a way of being-in-the-world, as ‘dirty’ subjectivity. Marime animates, mobilizes, and dislocates the Romani perpetrator, not only from within Romani society but if sentenced to expulsion from the group (most often for murder), from without also, as an ‘outsider’ into and in non-Romani society. Banished Romani exist and survive in a liminal zone of ‘qualified’ life, and biopolitical, juridical marginalization, compounded by existing hegemonic structures of national,

racial, gender-based, and economic exclusion. As such, Rancière's (1999) 'policing' "defines the allocation of ways of doing, ways of being, and ways of saying, and policing sees that those bodies are assigned by name to a particular place and task..." (29). Herein, the hierarchical social orders, the policing of allocation on how-to-be-in-the-world, gesture to my articulations of 'subjects of eligibility'. Inspired by Rancière's 'indisciplinary' subjects, specifically, Romani self-articulations that work "in explicit defiance of customary divisions." Rancière conceptualizes 'indisciplinarity' as a way of "questioning the distribution of territories, which is a way of deciding who gets to speak about what" (Tanke 2011, 9). Romani 'subjects of eligibility', speaks to "a way of framing, among sensory data, a specific sphere of experience," instantiating, reconfiguring, and embodying the 'political' "itself as distribution of the sensible" – a politics of aesthetics. "It is a partition of the sensible, of the visible and the sayable, which allows (or does not allow) some specific data to appear; which allows or does not allow some specific subjects to designate them and speak about them" (Rockhill 2009, 199).

Administration and Justice

Romani mobilized subjectivities as a way of being-in-the-world, as *marime*, reconfigure hegemonic policing, allocating and territorializing who gets to do the speaking and about what. Romani contest the dominant technocratic, bureaucratic order as legal *and* social justice. However, within Romani society, historical and ancestral narratives are constitutive of group and social justice and are therefore considered legally binding. For example, "a *marime* label can be removed by the forgiveness of the offended party, the passage of time, or by a Gypsy legal proceeding, *kris Romani*"

(Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 39). Romani laws and administration of social and legal justice are closely intertwined, due in large measure to communal participation. The historicity of Romanipen evinces customary adjudication practices that are flexible both in the cultural transmission of the unwritten legal tradition, and the gradual revision of site-specific Romani community regulations, as needs change (41). In this way, memory plays a vital role as legal practices, through the transmission of ancestral and contemporary storytelling, community gossip, and ‘judgment’. Romani instantiations of legal memory in kris proceedings rely on a form of private lawmaking that employs micronarratives amenable to kinship and group regulatory ideals (62-64). Though memory informs Western graphocentric lawmaking, written law employs legal abstractions amenable to juridico-political mechanisms of mass-social control. State-centric written law as document and archive, not only deploy materiality as static structural and institutional memory, printed law also renders a mass-scale transmission of statist regulatory ideals and control mechanisms. In the following, I examine in greater detail how the administration of Romani articulations of justice is implemented. In particular, I inquire how amenable or recalcitrant Romani juridico-discursive practices are to Western jurisprudence and human rights discourse.

As cited previously, the Romani group units associated with the administration of justice from major transgressions to petty crimes, are organized primarily in descending order of formality and may be identified: *natsia* - nation designated within a diaspora of linguistic, ethnic, and regional affiliations; *kumpania*, a socioeconomic alliance of households in a shared geographic area, though not always of the same nation; *vitsa*, the clan unit, and; *familia* – family (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 40). Vitsa (clan) leaders or

chiefs – “*rom baro*” (‘big man’) are elected, and in some Romani clans are self-appointed (41). Chiefs also act as liaisons between the Romani and non-Romani authorities and are chosen in part not only for their literacy, but also for physical height, stature, wealth, sense of fairness, and respect within the clan.

Kris authority is patriarchal. Romani women have decision-making power, but usually, this authority is limited to issues pertaining to women and children. (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 41). Most kris proceedings are conducted in the “Vlach Romanes” dialect spoken by Vlach Rom, a diaspora, site-specific to countries mostly in Southeastern Europe. (Acton, Caffrey, and Mundy in Weyrauch 2001, 95) The kris female-chief counterpart position is referred to as “*mami, daki-dei, or dadeski-dei*.” “Though she has substantial power as “guardian of the moral code,” her authority is unofficial (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 41). *Mami* is considered unqualified to hold equal chief-liaison authority, due to limited literacy skills. Historically, Romani, especially Romani girls and women, were banned from learning to read or write. As guardians and keepers of Romani sacred and cultural knowledge, women were and still are discouraged from developing literacy skills especially within Vlach Rom communities, and East European Romani articulations of the kris system. Romani orthodox restrictions on integration and contact with non-Romani society adheres to the marime code and deters transmitting sacred cultural knowledge to non-Romani outsiders.

A vitsa chief maintains patriarchal-clan authority for life, yet is replaced if he violates marime rules. Chiefs make decisions regarding the group or household alliance, by consensus, with equal participation and authority. Quotidian details and disputes between Romani, clans, and groups are often settled informally by an assembly of clan

chiefs called *divano*. Chiefs make recommendations to settle conflicts, and disputing parties are advised to heed corrective measures. Though disputants are not required to attend the proceeding, Romani who disregard *divano* recommendations, lose respect and honor within the community (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 41-42). The Western counterpart to this form of settling disputes resembles mediation or arbitration. If the dispute or controversy is not settled amicably, a *kris* is initiated and assembled. Unlike the Romani blood-feud system, as a form of retributive justice and personal vengeance, the *kris* is a community forum. The *kris* council is composed of elder men, knowledgeable and well-practiced in all matters of Romaniya – law, and function with legal authority similar to the attorneys general in the United States. The *kris* elders select eligible judges, the *kirsnitorya*. The aggrieved party, clan or individual, then selects the judge, *krisnitori*, to hear the case; though the defending party can reject the choice. If the aggrieved is too young, sick, or otherwise incapacitated, the closest male family member requests a *kris* proceeding and acts as representative. The *kris* court adjudicates violations of marime rules, domestic disputes, divorce, financial debt, defaults on loans and payments, property issues, murder, and other matters concerning honor, morality, and religion. However, in contemporary *kris* proceedings, most disputes deal with divorce, and economic settlements.

Romani who are assimilated into the majoritarian culture, as in Spain and the United States, and are indicted by the State criminal justice system, must still undergo a *kris* proceeding. Romani contemporary penal practices and sanctions usually impose the payment of fines. And in rare cases, corporal punishment, and lifetime banishment from Romani society is used to punish Romani wrongdoers. Romani courts have now

abandoned the use of the death penalty as retributive justice, “in fear of spirits and belief that the angry ghost of the deceased will take revenge upon the executioner” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 46). Romani belief in divine forces exceed legal rituals, as taking the oath, swearing-in, allegiance, customary in both Romani and Western legal traditions, albeit as syncretic faith-based and religious practices. Romanipen as code and law, employs belief in divine forces as legal ‘reasoning’. This Romani legal distinction from Western jurisprudence presents a critical disjuncture in the administration of justice. Divine forces as representatives of the ‘good’ against ‘evil’, employ their own “police order” as a (re)distribution of the sensible. Romani aesthetico-juridical practices mobilize the representatives of the divine order as the *represented*. (Citton 2009, 131). In other words, divine force exceeds the ritualized presence or testament to ‘truth’ in the kris forum. Romani spiritual cosmologies parse “perceptual forms of knowledge,” and thus, re-present divine force as legal truth and reasoning (Panagia 2009, 6). Romanipen as the divine force of law, re-presents ancestral and divine knowledge as the force of legal action. In this way, Romanipen does not suspend the law’s authority from its legal application.

However, the nexus between Romani juridical practices, Western rights-based and state-centric jurisprudence, is the kris. Unlike the Romani blood-feud system, as a form of private, personal vengeance practiced by Romanichals in the United Kingdom, and Kaale in Wales, the kris adjudicates social and economic transgressions as crimes against the community - with restorative justice and punishment. Romani legal codes contest state-centric legal classifications of civil law and criminal law. “Only when the community itself is actualized as the state, as a ‘fictitious bearer of right’ against whom

the individual can offend as well as against another individual, do we have criminals and criminal law.” As such, the kris functions as form and forum of communal law - as temporal and site-specific articulations of legality. “Private violence or revenge by a wronged person therefore could be as much an offense against the kris as the original wrong.” In this way, the kris is, in fact, “an embryonic state, ‘a fictitious bearer of right’” (Acton, Caffrey, and Mundy in Weyrauch 2001, 97). However, the kris adjudicates Romani law as experiential truths, mobilized by contingencies in cultural, ancestral knowledge practices, and daily experience. Romani subjectivities construct articulations of right and wrong, of truths, through personal obligations and communal law, *as* socio-economic circulations of exchange. Western juridical *a priori* assumptions, enact self-evident truth and universal ‘rights’ and wrongs, *through* socio-economic commodity relations, as law. This critical disjuncture between Romani and state-centric lawmaking presents ethico-juridical interventions within international human rights discourse.

A report by the European Roma Rights Centre, asserts the kris amenable to inclusion into state-centric legal systems, due to kris decision-making by consensus, and adjudication of crimes as offenses against the community. The ERRC reports that in cases of domestic and violent crimes against Romani women, the non-Romani legal system serves to strengthen women’s rights. And the primacy of “the authority of the kris appears to be in some instances breaking down,” engendering increasing cooperation between state legal systems and the kris (Cahn 2000). For example, in the United States, “by March 1987, local Roma in Southern California had reportedly established eighteen territorial jurisdictions, each with its own judge.” In this way, “the

kris would receive case referrals from the Californian state courts of civil and domestic disputes involving only Gypsies. The local kris would then refer nonbinding recommendations back to the California courts” (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, 45-46). Furthermore, Romani women are increasingly appealing to state courts regarding divorce and child custody disputes, since Romaniya (androcentric legal codes) awards custody to the father. As more Romani women appeal to state courts, the demand for integrating Romani and statist legal systems increases. The increasing demand and potential for Romani and statist cooperation and integration efforts are further highlighted in the ERRC report. The report cites Canadian legal initiatives of integrating Aboriginal courts, as a potentially exemplary approach for promoting the Romani kris system within the context of European legal systems. One such initiative, the “Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba,” restructured administrative and legal “delivery systems” by which “The First Nations policing were transferred from Indian Affairs to the Solicitor General of Canada.” Consequently, “in the Solicitor General of Canada the Aboriginal Corrections Policy Unit,” and in “Justice Canada,” the “Aboriginal Justice Directorate” is formed. As part of the “Aboriginal Justice Initiative,” these group mandates are “to advance Aboriginal justice interests, improve the response of conventional justice and facilitate greater Aboriginal direction of, and innovation in justice in Aboriginal communities.” According to the “Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples” in a 1996 report, these initiatives are part of a “new agenda” of developing “autonomy and legal pluralism” (Cahn 2000).

However, as the ERRC reports, on the nexus between minority-rights discourse and majoritarian jurisprudence, a creative tension exists within the context of Aboriginal

rights and self-governance in cooperation with the dominant administration of justice. Moreover, formal recognition of Romani instantiations of legal autonomy overlooks the reluctance by *kris* elders to participate in a “high profile” judicial proceeding within the “domestic legal order.” As noted previously, instances of domestic violence, divorce, and child custody disputes “would provide the ideal opportunity for such an institutional expansion.” The ERRC report states, “the development of a body of Romani case law intent on bringing justice to Romani abused would be a powerful factor in dissuading Romani women from seeking justice outside the Romani community” (Cahn 2000). Traditional situated Romani practices and Romanipen as law prohibits non-Romani interference in Romani family disputes. Moreover, site-specific Romani clan and family affiliations, allegiances necessitate the adjudication of domestic disputes and violence within the forum of the *kris* and patriarchy of clan elders. Romanipen practices collide with Western jurisprudence and rights-based discourse and principles as “a specific historical organization of social roles and communality” (Hinderliter et al. 2009, 1). Here, the collision “effects a redistribution of the sensible that is of the ways in which communities are ‘spontaneously’ counted as wholes divisible into their constitutive parts and functions” (Rancière 2010, 1). I return here to the concept above of subjects of eligibility, imbricated by Rancière’s exposition of ‘community of sense’ as a (de)territorializing, (re)partition of the sensible.

Community and Sense

As Rancière states, “community of sense” does not “mean a collectivity shaped by some common feeling.” Instead, as a reminder of his explication, ‘community of sense’ “is a certain cutting out space and time that binds together practices, forms of visibility, and patterns of intelligibility” (Rancière in Hinderliter et al. 2009, 31). In his reference

of the prose poem “White Water lily” by Mallarmé, he notes a dynamic of “being together apart.” Here, the poet’s riverboat ride to visit an elusive woman in the neighborhood, results in the detection of her proximity “as he hears a light noise of footsteps that might be the sign of the presence of the invisible lady.” He turns back, undetected, without seeing her or being seen. Rancière’s explication of Mallarmé’s ‘White Water lily’ speaks to “movement” which is “oriented towards a certain aim,” framing “a certain sensorium.” Significant to this framing, Rancière observes, is that the poet and an elusive woman “superimpose to that sensorium another sensorium organized around that which is specific to their power, sound and absence,” as a “conflict between two regimes of sense, two sensory worlds” (Rancière 2008).

Romani sensory ‘worlding’ as through the spatiotemporality of being-in-the-world, invokes intersectional trajectories along which biopolitical, juridical, and cultural governance moves. Romani worlding – (*das Weltern* which instantiates being-in-the world - *Dasein*, into world-making-worlds in Heidegger’s conceptualization) exceeds the binary constitutive of subject/object, interior/exterior segmentations of existence. My proposition of the ‘subjects of eligibility’, constitutive of an ‘indisciplinary’ contestation to the capture of identity and membership ascription, “tear bodies from their assigned places,” and “from all reduction to functionality” (Rancière 2010, 1). As such, Romani mobile subjectivities become continual rearticulations as ‘community’ in what Rancière terms as “dissensual figure” (Rancière 2008). The dissensual figure inhabits an ontological register of effectuating affect as passage, as ‘in-betweenness’ of a “combination of sense data.” In other words, the dissensual of communities of sense (affect) effect “not simply a reordering of the relations of power between existing

groups; dissensus is not an institutional overturning.” Rather, the dissensual figure as community “cuts across forms of cultural and identity belonging and hierarchies between discourses and genres, working to introduce new subjects and heterogeneous objects into the field of perception” (Corcoran in Rancière 2010, 2). Rancière’s egalitarian and emancipatory conceptual proposition as ‘community of sense’, work from the peripheral field of perception that dislodge plurality and collectivity from its ideological, and structural instantiations. His proposition works from the periphery to the center of possibilities aesthetico-political interventions and redistribution of the sensible engage. Such aesthetico-informed interventions speak to subjects of eligibility and “tear bodies away from their assigned places” in the way of “being together apart” (1). ‘Community’ as dissensual figure and the “effects of equality that they stage,” inevitably invokes “these activities on the very distinctions that they effectively call into question” (3).

The productive tension that arises between Romani aesthetic self-articulations along subject trajectories such as gender and spiritual practices; ‘community’, as “a combination of different senses of sense,” resists a categorical bracketing out of identity ascriptions. Instead, subjects of eligibility as ‘indisciplinary’, acategorical ‘identity’ qualifications, mobilize between and across sensoriums and aesthetico-political “regimes of sense” (Rancière 2008). The “blurring” of Romani identity qualifications and communal practices affirm and contest Romani subject cohesion as always already ‘being together apart’. However, as Rancière notes, the politics of aesthetics and the aesthetics of politics dislodge the partitioning of the sensible (‘community’) as pluralizing collectivity from institutional and structural instantiations. The recalcitrance

of ‘community of sense’ as dissensual figure, as always already ‘together apart’, mobilizes sensorial agency that eludes “new social orders,” yet at the same time stands alongside them (Corcoran in Rancière 2010, 3). It is the aesthetico-philosophical rendering of a way of being-in-the-world that presents a conceptual framing of the collisions, overlapping between sensory worlds. Here, “the philosophical proposition” attests “the tension between being together and being apart plays on a double level.” Therefore, “the community built by that dissensus stands itself in a twofold relationship with another community, a community between human beings” (Rancière 2008). ‘Community of sense’ does not mean publicly shared norms or conventional wisdom, or in the Kantian description, “universal assent”; “common sense” - *sensus communis* (Kant in Arendt 1992, 121). Alternately, ‘community of sense’ engages the ‘indisciplinary’. It so by introducing new heterogenous subjects and objects through the continuum “which political division into assigned roles and defined parts manifests itself” (Hinderliter et al. 2009, 1).

For example, my conceptualization of subjects of eligibility encompasses several registers of spatial, temporal, and aesthetic agency: (1) the ‘indisciplinary’ as question of ‘who gets to speak about what’; the aesthetico-political as sensory worlding that cannot be reduced to designated roles and the functionality of identity ascriptions; (2) the aesthetico-philosophical framing - agency of ‘community’ which pluralizing sensory worlds of ‘together apart’, gestures towards continual connecting and disconnecting affiliations, collaborations as “radical heterogeneity” (Rancière 2008); (3) dissensual figure as ‘being together apart’, which speaks to spatio-temporal paradoxes: as presence in absence, absence as presence; (4) presence-essence exceeds

the ontological register of “vulgar time” - *a priori*, rather it is the temporal ‘always-already’ as “the past’s belated reconstitution” (Gasché 1987, xi). (5) the dissensual figure exacts “a new set of vibrations of the human community,” yet continually evades itself, always-already heteronomy, splitting to create new articulations of visibility, intelligibility (Rancière 2008). For example, Rancière’s further explication of Mallarmé’s ‘White Water lily’ is relevant.

As stated previously, the dissensual community “is not simply a reordering of the relations of power between existing groups” (Rancière 2010, 2). The poet who searches for the elusive woman in ‘White Water lily’, hears light footsteps and leaves undetected without seeing her, and in disconnection, feels all the more connected to her. His rowboat ride in search of her estate along the river bank, “its very distance” and “in the absence of the ‘crowd’” relates a sensorium “specific to their own power, sound, and absence.” And “in the absence of the crowd,” the poet’s disconnection “is also a way of preserving” social connections and “its capacity of intervention” in the future.” “Mallarmé’s poetry aims at giving to the democratic community the ‘seal’ that cannot be brought about by the count of the votes” (Rancière 2008). The poet’s sensorium in relation to the crowd as dissensual figure and being together apart dislodges plurality and collectivity from its ideological, institutional, and structural instantiations. The community of sense as spatio-temporal redistributions of the sensible renders subjects of eligibility irreducible to designated roles and functionality. Subjects of eligibility as continually pluralizing, “tear bodies away from their assigned places” and elide disciplinary identification, and institutional qualification. Subjects of eligibility, as sensory worlding, work alongside and within ‘the crowd’ of social order and

functionality, evading temporarily, yet rarely eluding the ‘policing’ of assigned ‘proper place’. Romani mobile subjectivities as aesthetico-political articulations of self-fashioning and material practices on the ground, continually collide with institutional, structural assignments of time and place. However, the intersectionality of Romani mobile subject trajectories ‘in-between’ and along which structures of hegemonic domination move, in collisions with the social order of ‘the crowd’, also reinvigorate regulatory mechanisms of control. As such, Romani human rights activists stand at the center in recognition of these ‘crowd’ collisions. And Romani activists spotlight the juridico-political and socio-economic fissures as continuities of living along interstitial zones of ‘in-betweenness’. However, before I examine this further within the context of international rights discourse, I now turn to how sensory worlding (affect) effect with material conditions on the ground, and precepts of plural social order.

Up the Chimneys

Up the chimneys went the Rom –
with them they thought their story gone.
The dust it flew around the earth,
in the rains it settled on turf;
although the smoke has now gone
in the wind you can hear their song.
By our youth now the story will be told,
the Gorgias lies will then unfold
and the Gypsy flower grow more bold.

--Charlie Smith (England) (Hancock, Dowd, and Djurić 1998, 101).

On October 19, 2011, 80 families, about 400 Romani Gypsies living in the United Kingdom, Irish Travellers, were evicted from one of the largest Romani settlements in Europe of approximately 1,000 people, on Dale Farm in Essex County, East England.

More than 50 riot police enter the site, as “a caravan burns,” and manufactured homes - chalets, are eventually destroyed by a bulldozer or scorched to the ground. A Romani resident states, “we are staying until we are forced from our land because we have nowhere else to go. Everyone we know is here on Dale Farm, all our families, and friends,” [...] and the non-Romani are “tearing our community apart” (The Guardian 2011).

Irish Travellers are an ethnic group who are “traditionally nomadic” and “can be traced back to 12th Century Ireland, with migrations to Great Britain in the early 19th Century.” Other Traveller groups “such as the Scottish Travellers, Welsh Travellers and English Travellers [...] can trace a nomadic heritage back for many generations and who may have married into or out of more traditional Irish Traveller and Romany Gypsy families.” And “linguistic analysis of the Romani language proves that Romani Gypsies, like the European Roma, originally came from Northern India.” And “there were already indigenous nomadic people in Britain when the Romany Gypsies first arrived hundreds of ago and the different cultures/ethnicities have to some extent merged.” However, “there are also Traveller groups which are known as ‘cultural’ rather than ethnic Travellers, such as New Age Travellers” whose “culture grew out of the hippie movements and free-festival movements of 1960’s and 1970’s,” as well as “Bargee Travelers [...] who live on the UK’s 2,200 miles of canals” (The Traveller Movement 2015).

The eviction of Romani Gypsies in 2011 from Dale Farm is the result of a battle between local residents in the area and Romani families that “were allowed to live beside an illegal scrap yard in Essex” in the 1970s . At the time, non-Romani residents

accepted this settlement arrangement until 1996, when an Irish Traveller family purchased Dale Farm for 122,000 British Pounds. “By the time of 2011, there were twice as many illegal plots at Dale Farm as the 40 authorised ones” (Cawley 2016). The documentary film *The Big Gypsy Eviction* (R. Parry 2011) interviews Romani families on the site and non-Romani residents in the Crays Hill neighborhood. Len Gridley, a non-Romani resident, concerned about the devaluation of his adjacent property, leads the neighborhood effort to evict Romani from Dale Farm. He mobilizes non-Romani, Cray Hill residents to attend the Basildon District Council meetings to vote on the eviction notice and enforcement of unauthorized Traveller encampment from the Dale Farm site. He also documents the Traveller construction of physical barriers to protect their land and homes. Though the Travellers own the land, permission is not granted by the district council to extend settlement development further into the greenbelt property. The initial council authorization of Traveller settlement on their purchased property does not extend to new Traveller arrivals and plot sites joining their families on Dale Farm. Len Gridley, spearheading the eviction of new Romani families, who Traveller children nickname “Grizzly,” spends a significant amount of his resources renting helicopters for aerial documentation of the post-eviction farm site. He observes, “It looks like a bomb site” (R. Parry 2011). The non-Romani eviction plan also puts in motion the initial justification for over fifty riot police entering Dale Farm by force, to secure the area for bailiff eviction work. Initial Romani and supporting non-Romani activist resistance develops from primarily non-violent resistance and civil disobedience into violent direct action, as police reinforcement forcibly enter Dale Farm in riot gear. Riot police with shields use Tasers and batons against Romani protestors and activists,

and 45 are arrested (Cawley 2016).

As a highly publicized event in British media coverage, with Romani activist appeals to the House of Lords in the protection of minority cultural practices and rights, “Caroline Spelman, secretary of state for environment, food, and rural affairs,” declares in a press statement to BBC 2, “you can’t have one law for the traveling community and one law for the settled community.” And “we operate in a democracy where we need to abide by the law.” As the House of Lords decides in favor of the Basildon council vote, Spelman declares, “everybody knows you can’t just occupy a piece of greenbelt land, rip off the turf and build what you want on it. You have to have planning permission.” Following Romani activist complaints against illegal police action and eviction procedure, the BBC reports, “an inquiry will now be launched into issues of reasonable force which saw police pelted with bricks and some protesters urinating on officers” (The Guardian 2011). Romani protestors and “supporters quickly erected barricades inside the site as police held the line, securing the rear area” (R. Parry 2011). However, as Spelman seemingly fails to mention, Traveller occupation is inhabiting land they ‘legally’ own, with no apparent acknowledgment of her reference to binary classifications between traveling and settled communities. Some Traveller families reside in manufactured homes, living on the same site for many years. Other Travelling family practices reside in permanent single-family homes in non-Romani neighborhoods, moving to new homes every couple of years (R. Parry 2011). The distinctive ethnocultural practices of Traveller families and clans is considered irrelevant, dismissed by and within the juridical, social order of precepts as regulatory ideals of ‘democracy’ – Mallarmé’s ‘the crowd’. Spelman’s press statement is

legitimated, as a High Court judge rules in favor of the Basildon council. The council decides Traveller caravans can be removed from 49 of the 54 plots at Dale Farm, pending the lifting of a High Court injunction. In response, a lawyer for Travellers and Romani activists apply “for judicial review to stop the clearance of their homes” (BBC 2011). One Crays Hill and anti-Dale Farm resident, shouts, “if this was France, they’d have the water cannons in there blowing them the hell out.” Yet notes another resident, “they [the evicted residents] are now all over the place, it was a terrible experience for the children,” and “there wasn’t a problem when people were living here.” With nowhere else to go, Travellers who were evicted from Dale Farm, find new sites at supermarket parking lots to station their trailer homes, and at other illegal unobstructed lot sites. (Cawley 2016).

Six years later, in a UK Sunday Times article, June 23, 2017, the headline states, “we’re facing a new Dale Farm said council chief.” According to the article, “Basildon council has been fighting since last year to remove travelers from the land in Wickford, Essex, arguing that they did not have permission to turn the area into a caravan site” (Johnston 2017). The BBC reports, “the Hovefield site – which is subject to a High Court injunction preventing further development – is less than three miles (5km) by road –from the Dale Farm traveler site in Wickford” (BBC 2017). “The High Court is the third highest court in the UK,” and “is bound by the decisions of all the courts above it in England and Wales” (the Court of Justice of the European Union, the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal) (In Brief n. d.). According to “Jill Walsh of the Hovefields Residents Association,” in Wickford, “if the council does not prosecute over this and deal with the situation urgently they will have a Dale Farm II, but bigger.” Phil

Turner, Basildon council leader notes, “we share the frustrations of residents, but the council does not have the powers of arrest and must follow the proper legal process.” And a police statement assures, “Essex Police is aware of an unauthorized traveler development on land near Hovefields Avenue.” “We are liaising with the local authority and will continue to monitor the situation” (BBC 2017).

In a review of various British county council websites in Flintshire, Leeds, and Surrey that address ‘unauthorized camping’, the Woking Borough Council website succinctly summarizes legal contradictions in policy implementation and enforcement. Similar to the information provided on the Flintshire, Leeds, and Surrey council websites, legal questions regarding Romani camp authorization encompasses two primary questions: trespassing, and police authority. The Woking Council information states, “trespass on land itself is not a crime – it is a civil matter. Prevention of trespass is the responsibility of the landowner, not the Council nor the Police.” However, the website also states, the police have the authority to evict “under section 61 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to require Gypsies and Travellers to leave.” The police can do so “where they are satisfied that two or more people are trespassing on the land, and the landowner has taken reasonable steps to make them leave (and they have failed to do so).” Furthermore, “one of the following also has to apply: damage has been caused to the land or property, or threatening, abusive or insulting behaviour has been used against the occupier, his family or agent, or the trespassers have six or more vehicles” (Woking Borough Council 2018).

Council statements regarding what qualifies and constitutes civil law and criminal law, appear to confound trespassing as a matter of legal permission to occupy land with

land use (as in the Dale Farm evictions). In the Dale Farm instance, land legally owned by Travellers, land use is equated with property damage (ripping turf) in clearing sites for caravans. Moreover, the question regarding police jurisdiction appears to contradict the distinctions between civil and criminal law. Trespassing is a civil issue, yet becomes criminal if trespassing violates the landowner's will and is without permission; this is the definition of trespassing. Yet even if the landowner does not consider Traveller encampment as trespassing, the landowner is potentially violating county council planning requirements. How does trespassing become a criminal issue, enforceable by police? According to the aforementioned criteria, trespassing enters the domain of criminal law enforcement not only in cases of property damage or abusive behavior, but with the critical distinction, trespassing with six vehicles or more. The specification of conditions constituting 'criminality' appear to be group-oriented, as two or more persons, six vehicles or more (including caravans). The 1968 Caravan Sites Act requires county councils to "allocate sites for the Gypsies and Travellers in their area," in response to the 1960 Caravan Sites Act, "directed against private permanent caravan sites" (Woking Borough Council 2018).

However, with increasing privatization of land use and development, the lack in number of adequate campsite allocations forces Travellers and Romani Gypsies onto unauthorized sites, including roadside stops. In addition, under the 1968 Act, Travellers were banned from "keeping animals or trading, thus destroying the traditional Traveller way of life and source of income." In the 1980s government efforts and grants to provide more authorized sites for Travellers resulted in a public backlash, and competition for stopping sites with non-ethnic New Travellers. Subsequently, the 1994

Criminal Justice and Public Order Act was implemented, with little consideration of Traveller self-identification and ethnocultural practices. In the UK, “Romany Gypsies were recognized as a distinct ethnic group under the 1976 Race Relations Act. Irish Travellers were accorded this status in 2000” (Minority Rights Group n.d.).

In a 2015 document from the UK Department for Communities and Local Government, the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice: “dealing with illegal and unauthorized encampments: a summary of available powers” – the 1960 Caravan Sites Act (the Caravan and Control of Development Act 1960); the 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; are all reinvigorated as protocols of criminal law enforcement. The 2015 document states, “public bodies should not gold-plate human rights and equalities legislation.” In other words, this 2015 UK government document undermines human rights legislation by stating public institutions “should not gold-plate” or guarantee equal access and opportunities for housing. The 2015 document presents legal enforcement authority under these acts so “that the state may enforce laws to control the use of an individual’s property where that is in accordance with general public interest” (Ministry of Housing 2015). In a 2015 article in *The Independent*, the headline reads “settled Gypsies could be forced back on the road by new planning laws: Travellers must prove they are itinerant to stay on sites” (Dugan and Green 2015). The discriminatory legal proposition enacts Romani nomadic cultural practices, as a legal litmus test for rights-based ethnic minority protection. Moreover, the majoritarian requirements regarding any frequency of Romani movement not only forces Travellers into binary identity ascriptions of ‘traveling’ versus ‘settled’ within Romani clans, it also does so externally, between Romani, and the external

‘settled’ county residents. Romani are stuck ‘in-between’ (un)authorized occupancy and land use codes on private, rural, recreational land areas, as well as (un)authorized occupancy and land use codes on public, recreational, urban land areas. In other words, Romani are prohibited from ‘moving’ or ‘settling’.

This biopolitical enactment of state power is evinced in an analysis of *Critical Legal Thinking* – “Protecting Public Space: The Gypsy and Traveller Community.” For instance, in July 2017, “a community of Travellers pulled up to Preston Park in Brighton. The council and police soon descended on them to inform them that they were ‘trespassing’, as the land is covered by a Public Space Protection Order [PSPO], introduced in 2014.” As part of the 2003 “Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime, and Policing Act, PSPOs enable councils to criminalise particular, non-criminal, activities taking place within a specified area they deem to have ‘a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality’.” Caught between the paradox of “Gypsies as ‘vagrants disturbing the social order,’” yet idealized as “wandering strangers” resisting the grid of industrial society, the trope of ‘legal objectivity’ articulates a spatio-temporal logic of surveillance, permission, and prohibition. The legal paradox of ‘equal application under the law’ determined by majoritarian jurisprudence, results in laws prohibiting Romani movement with the “Vagrancy Act 1824 and the Highway Act 1835.” However, the Caravan Sites Act of 1960, prohibit Romani settlement without council permission, even on Romani owned land or with non-Romani landowner consent. As an extension of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act, PSPO’s deploy the ethico-juridical and (neo)liberal order of ‘valued’ land, and ‘legitimate’ occupancy. In an alternate analytical register, “case law suggests the boundary line of the sedentary spatial order is unrelenting...” as

an “illegitimacy myth preserving the sedentary order which allows violent racism to masquerade as protection of the land by self-defined locals acting in favour of the preservation of public space.” And, “the Gypsy and Traveller community is obliged to have respect for a system which both marginalizes and excludes them” (Patchett 2017).

Concluding Thoughts

Contesting regulatory ideals and precepts of the juridico-social order, Romani mobile subjectivities “are now all over the place,” a Crays Hill, non-Romani resident states (Cawley 2016). As Traveller families flee their ‘legal’ land claim (Dale Farm), to ‘illegal’ sites such as store parking lots, and public parks, forced displacement strategies continually (re)enact interiorities and exteriorities of ‘community’, refuge, and ‘sheltering-in-place’. The ethico-juridical order of policing, ‘camps’, and institutional codes of legitimation, require ‘identity’ ascriptions in designations of ‘proper time and place’. The ‘community’ as a social order of precepts necessitate “identity politics’ location of race and class,” gender, and national “solidarity as a precondition for collective consciousness formation and political action.” This “approach extrapolates the ‘coherence’ [quotation emphasis is mine] of the individual political subject and projects it onto the agency of a community” (Hinderliter et al. 2009, 17). Alternately, aestethico-political articulations as ‘community of sense’, present “the possibility of a positive/constructive strategy” of heterogeneity (17, 19).

Miwon Kwon (2002) critiques “the ideal of community,” in *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*, “because it assumes the transparency of unified concepts of subjectivity and identity and reproduces differences to homogenous collectives” (17). For the “unchosen features of our lives are not simply

given; they are given in history and in language, in vectors of power that none of us chose” (Butler 2015, 96). And as vectors of ‘power and mobility’, the politics of mobility is also peripatetic, temporarily attaching to the nodal of nomadic worlding, injecting a toxin of subject fixity, of paralysis: there are these communities, and there are those communities – traveling ones, and settled ones; they all have to abide by the same planning permission code in ‘community’ development. The world of world-making is spatio-temporal travel through mobile subjectivities, foreclosing Spelman’s enclosure of the commons. Her ascriptions conflate a ‘one-size-fits-all’ community policing as an ‘equal’ policy approach, with what Michael J. Shapiro (1997) describes “the limits of already inscribed normativities” that “deny the subjects preexisting debt to alterity” (201, 200). Romani alterity articulations encompass Romani ethnicity and culture as aesthetic (re)partitioning of the sensible. And ‘community,’ “in the domain of writing,” carries an imperative to “confront the closures of community” and resist “the violence of identity politics which seeks to make names stick” (201). Romani mobile subjectivities as migrations of people, place, and time across the European continent adopt new and orthodox aesthetico-cultural articulations of history and language “to create new possibilities of collective enunciation” (Opondo and Shapiro 2012, 11). This insight introduces a particular instantiation of Traveller enunciation, as ‘screenplay’, for a British drama television genre.

In the television series, *Peaky Blinders* (2013) creator and writer Steven Knight, articulates a cast of characters “born from the stories Mr. Knight heard about his father’s uncles, members of the real Peaky Blinders group in Birmingham.” The television series centers on the main relationship “between Tommy and Ms. McCrory’s

Polly,” which is “emblematic of the show’s strong female characters.” Mr. Knight’s writing “was inspired by American westerns, specifically the way they turned what was fundamentally ‘19th-century agricultural labor’ into a heroic genre full of chivalry and myth.” Knight states “I wanted to apply that sort of boldness to the city where I came from and my parent’s family. It’s a good way into history because it’s through the imagination and the feeling, rather than through the bricks and mortar of it” (Egner 2017).

The Peaky Blinder’s series depicts “a notorious gang in Birmingham, England,” which “is led by the fierce Tommy Shelby” (Cillian Murphy), “a crime boss set on moving up in the world no matter the cost” (Netflix n. d.). The main protagonists, a Birmingham Traveller clan, “the Shelby family, which also includes Aunt Polly (Helen McCrory), Tommy’s brothers Arthur (Paul Anderson) and John (Joe Cole),” contend with “escape, with a particularly British point of view: Can you escape where you’re born.” Knight, the writer for the entire series, states “Season 4 is a very literal pulling back of the entire family to where they’re from, so they can re-evaluate who they are in the environment they were once in” (Egner 2017). In the series first episode, “following the Great War in 1919, the Peaky Blinders, led by Thomas Shelby, appropriates a consignment of guns which have been stolen from the local arms factory.” Detective Campbell (Sam Neill), is assigned “from Belfast to Birmingham by Winston Churchill to find and retrieve the guns” (Peaky Blinders TV series n. d.) Peaky Blinders, a gang who derive their name from “sewing razor blades into the peaks of their caps,” are notorious “for making money from illegal betting, protection, and the black market” (Duffy 2016). And in addressing Tommy, “when an auctioneer sneeringly asks him

what he does, his answer is ‘import and export. But I also sell pegs and tell fortunes’” (Le Bas 2014). Tommy’s self-articulations continue throughout the series on alternating registers of Traveller economic survival, and “adherence to beliefs passed down through his Romany heritage.” His belief in “curses” is evident as his horse dies, “witchcraft” as he seeks medical treatment, as well as in “absolution” from Madame Boswell; blaming himself for the death of his wife, having failed to remove her cursed necklace. Though he is familiar with the Catholic faith and marries his wife in the church, he rejects “organized religion” and uses Romany beliefs “as a means of getting himself out of a situation” (Alvarez 2016). Tommy’s faith-based articulations blend majoritarian religious practices with Romany belief practices.

The film series in its framing and treatment of plot narratives, exceeds Tommy’s situated contingencies of enunciation, the progression of the gang’s illegal activities to social respectability - with slow-motion sequences, dark, vivid, exaggerated color hues, and contours (similar to what McCrory sees as a “graphic novel”) (Egner 2017). The director’s framing of episodic sequences stand alone as freeze-frames; a pulling or highlighting past into moments, as protagonists negotiate spatio-temporal registers of alterity and personhood. This ‘cinematic’ treatment of character mediation reflects what Shapiro (2016) describes in *Politics and Time*, in referencing Deleuzian privileging of time: “the ‘instant,’ articulating ‘the minimum time’ of the instant with ‘the maximum time’ of unlimited duration [...] the pure instant grasped at the point at which it divides itself into the future and the present” (9-10). Interestingly, the film series cast character complexities as resiliency, such as the physiognomy and stoic faciality of Tommy; articulations specific not only to Romany marginalized subjects and poverty but within

registers of historicity rarely depicted. For example, when Romany return as war veterans. Tommy's stoic 'fixity' as resiliency to encounter and event, is rearticulated through Knight's televised 'graphic novel' as "the basis for those moments that constitute an 'ethics of the event'" (10). As Cillian Murphy notes, having lived among Romany in Birmingham after being introduced by Knight, in listening to Romany stories – "a revolution was taking place in the city." And "at the same time, these young men were returning from the war (WWI), damaged. They were spat back into society and expected somehow get on with their lives" (Duffy 2016). Moreover, the momentary seizure and paralysis by war trauma, split as varying subject trajectories of being 'in place and time' engender "conditions of possibility [...] that new discourses or practices in various genres can 'counter-actualize'...". Loci of (self) enunciation can counteractualize "...what is fixed by mimicking a given actualization in order to 'double the actualization [and thus] liberate it for other times'" (Shapiro 2010, 10). Shapiro (1997) notes, that within Jacques Derrida's analytical register, 'community' "seeks to go beyond community as already enclosed within the conceptual practices of a collectivity." And that 'writing' practices as an "ethics of encounter," inform "a resistance to everything that would bring community to completion" (201). I conclude by juxtaposing these insights with the Irish Traveller community and the inter-textuality of Chrissie Ward's rendering, her poem:

Author' note: This poem is about boulders blocking every traditional camping ground used by Travellers in the Republic of Ireland. The authorities, by use of these stones, have left no camping space for the Travellers and have forced the Travellers into houses as a way of getting rid of both them and their traditions.

The Stone

Take away the cruel stone
longer and larger than life
the black dark stone
of envy, death and greed.
Everywhere you go
Before you turn the wheel
it's the black stone you'll meet
driving you from light
taking over your life
ruling over your world
burying you deep.

Take away the stone
That holds back our freedom
killing the only life
we've ever had
Envy-stone without a heart
cold and hard, no feelings has it
haunting us travelers every day.
A chain of black stones
around the green shamrock:

What once was ours
is no more

The dark black stones:
there's a curse upon them
from the prisoners of those stones.
So take away the stones
free our souls
let us live in light
The black is the enemy
blocking our spirit
in the summer time
killing our freedom without a gun
ruling the hearts of everyone.

Born free, but light shines no more
the stones have locked the door
to the hearts of everyone.
Wish to be free
and away the stones
that watch our wild Irish land

and let the travellers' spirit
the living and the dead
Be free again.

--Chrissie Ward (Ireland) (Hancock, Dowd, and Djurić 1998, 119).

Chapter 4: Human Rights and Romani Women

To a gorger unworthy, I will not battle you on your field; you will battle me on mine.

--Anonymous (2013)

There must be those among whom we can sit down and weep, and still be counted as warriors.

--Adrienne Rich (1983)

Prologue

The feature film *Papusza* (Krauze 2013), is based on the life and work of the Polish-Romani poet and singer, Bronislawa Wajs, born in Lublin in 1910, though some accounts note her birth year as 1908 (Baltic Worlds 2015). It is a black and white film chronicling how 'Papusza' (played by Jowita Budnik) negotiates encounter and event specific to her Romani clan in Poland between 1910 and 1971. The film sequence and narrative is nonlinear, reflecting site-specific instances as intertwined experiential histories of her life. One of the main protagonists in the film is landscape, with panning and tracking shots of rivers, meadows, and roads along the forest edge. Initial depictions of the surroundings, frame idyllic, harmonious scenes of nature. The landscape acts as 'attendant' to the scene, as horse-drawn caravans cross the expanses of countryside along unpaved roads at a leisurely pace. I articulate this 'attendant' function with Shapiro's (2006) cogent insights and neo-Kantian analytic:

Illustrating the attendant function, Deleuze observes the presence in some of [Francis] Bacon's canvases of a figure or figures that have no narrative relationship to the central figure. An attendant serves as 'a constant or point of reference,' a 'spectator,' but not in the ordinary sense. The attendant is a 'kind of spectator' who 'seems to subsist distinct from the figure.' Deleuze's attendant provides the basis for determining the facticity of the scene, or in his words, 'the relation of the Figure to its isolating place,' or 'what takes place,' because the attendant 'indicates a constant, a measure of cadence' and thereby serves to direct the (Kantian) fragile synthesis by being the basis of measurement for a scene that foregrounds the 'thing to be measured'. (37)

Introduction

In this chapter, I aim to apply, in part, a post-hermeneutic approach, which neo-Kantian turn and analytical practices in the prologue, gestures towards the politics of aesthetics. I also employ feminist theory, critical (race) theory, and postcolonial theory, in the application of intersectionality, specific to Romani encounter with state-policy event. My inquiry method juxtaposes Romani documentary film, feature film, poetry, ancestral ‘stories’, personal narrative, ethnography, interviews, historical documentation, documentary analysis, and discourse analysis. These genre sites and sources, present ‘data’ as situated subject knowledge, and lived experience. As Romani archive of encounter and event, genres reorient “the regimes of perception that seize our attention, so that we can no longer assume the legislative authority (or logical priority) of any one form of perception” (Panagia 2010: 42). Singularities of subject (re)positioning, as in the poetry of the Polish Romani woman, Papisza, and the film *Papisza*, presents a life-writing of violence she experiences, both from within and from without her Romani clan. I examine the hybridity of Romani mobile subjectivities as diversifying self-articulations, and identity practices. As such, Romani singularities of embodied, cultural, and material survival, inform this chapter. Hybrid, Romani subjectivities, associate by way of communal or kinship affiliations, whose diaspora disrupt structures and forces of domination. They disrupt statist control mechanisms, phallogentric regulatory discourse, state-centric assimilation narratives, and historical acculturation. Thus, I investigate how Romani diverse and site-specific subjectivities, inter- and intra-articulate with the binding grammar and patriarchal practices of domination, and citizen-centric subject eligibility. More specifically, I focus on the

intersectionality between gender, race, class, nation, sexuality, ethnicity, and language, and how these subject trajectories inform and engender violence against Romani women. I employ three site-specific instantiations of violent encounter and event against Romani women: forced sterilization in Slovakia; EU human rights policy as omitted intersectionality; and Romani historiography as encounter and event. However, before further detailing these instantiations, I return to the film *Papusza*, which foregrounds two critical analytical registers throughout this chapter, ‘nomads’ and ‘method’.

Papusza

The opening scene in *Papusza* (Krauze 2013) marks the year 1910; a pregnant woman gazes into a store window showcasing a white dress. The film reveals her as *Papusza*’s mother, in a subsequent scene. The camera centers a field of brush revealing movement. The camera angle remains constant, slightly elevated, as a spectator to the *mise-en-scène*. The camera lingers, as the cinematic viewer searches for the source of movement, in the continuing sound of rustling vegetation in a forest clearing. At last, we hear a young girl’s voice calling “Mama” with increasing urgency and volume. It is the voice of *Papusza*’s mother calling for her mother. Zooming in slightly with the camera, we search for human form, yet rustling brush continues to provide cover without betraying the source of activity. The ambiguity of the landscape acts as an aesthetic agency that conditions the viewer. The landscape is viewing us in the absence of human subjects, and re-inflects traces of our purview to the *mise-en-scène* of the field’s movement. The field enacts a foundation/basis of measurement foregrounding that which is being measured: the spectator - as Romani observer, as intruding stranger,

the film viewer as a passive voyeur? The spectator function calls into question methodological concerns that supersede the reliability of 'objective' observation. Deleuze's exposition on Immanuel Kant's revolutionary discovery is pertinent, and necessitates repeating in this chapter: "I do not perceive objects...it's my perception which presupposes object-form" (Shapiro 2006, 34). In other words, the subject does not passively observe or perceive but is also actively involved in legislating understanding (34-35). Moreover, the inquiry develops from "Kant's reliance on a subject of consciousness" to Martin Heidegger's question, "'how' subjects are situated in the world such that things emerge as things for them" (34). For example, in the subsequent scene, as day turns to night, the attendant landscape yields aesthetic comprehension. During a campfire scene near the forest edge, an older woman blesses a baby girl – "may you go light as a feather." Disapproving of the name 'Papusza', translated to mean 'doll', perhaps signifying a toy "mute and discarded," the elder woman, perhaps Papusza's grandmother, assisting with the birth, remarks the child will "bring everyone either great pride or shame." (Fonesca 1995, 9). Here, the film 'thinks' between scene cuts, which linkage of significance is not readily or immediately available to the viewer. The filmic agency registers a "mobile geography of knowledge," and inter-articulates with Kant's nonfulfillment in establishing the imperative of the subjective (Shapiro 2006, 35).

In the *Critique of Judgment*, Kant's staging of an encounter between the faculty of reason and the work of imagination renders unstable the perspective from which understanding can occur. Although he wanted to establish consistent and universal loci from which 'higher' 'faculties' could legislate understanding, as the world of phenomena are synthesized, Kant's aesthetic explorations deepened his commitment to the subjective action involved in comprehension. Although he failed to push his discovery very far toward to its pluralistic implications, his third critique creates the conceptual basis for a mobile geography of knowledge.

The ultimate implication of Kant's last approach to comprehension is that there is no one central place from which a calculus for synthesis can occur. (35)

How then, are Papsza's mobile subjectivities foregrounded by juxtapositions to attendant land-scapes, historical encounter, and event? How does the filmic "decentered aesthetics" – "Jean-François Lyotard's substitution of a conflict of genres for Kant's conflict of faculties" - pluralize Kant's "subjective action involved in comprehension"? (Shapiro 2006, 34). The scene following the *mise-en-scène* of the field's movement registers a Romani ancestral childbirth practice. Papsza's mother gives birth to her daughter in the forest, away from the company of her husband and other men; it is a segregated event. The birth of her daughter is interarticulated with cultural and androcentric shaming practices, dictated by the clan women's adherence to *marime* purity "categories" and codes. Women's sexuality or bodily fluids below the waist are considered impure and 'dirty'. Romani 'mahrimé' categorizes practices "related to the female body, hygiene, food, illness, death, and the relationship with the non-Roma." Romani adherence to mahrimé segregates women from men "such as when a woman was menstruating or giving birth and thus is considered unclean" (French 2015, 13).

The film switches from the landscape of this 1910 Romanipen-informed sequence to an institutional environment in 1971, showing an unknown woman ringing a prison gate bell. The filmic transition indicates a homology between Romanipen regulatory-purity ideals "or *magherdi* among Polish Roma," regarding the female body, to 'contagion' contact with non-Romani outsiders (Fonesca 1995, 9). "The whole prison environment, being conceived and administered by non-Gypsies, is severely polluting, although the criminal sentence as such carries no stigma to the Roma" (Weyrauch 2001, 7). Upon

entry and meeting with the administrative official, the woman appeals for Papisza's release. Papisza is incarcerated for an extended period as a repeat offender. Her crime is stealing chickens, often upon her husband's request, and initially as a young girl in exchange for reading lessons from a Jewish woman shopkeeper. The film foregrounds her ambition to learn to read and write with her significant childhood discovery in the forest, in 1921. While playing in the woods, she observes a woodpecker near an opening in the trunk of a tree. She reaches in and finds a bundle of items, including a label which wording she attempts to decipher. Her mother finds her and warns, "drop it there's gadjo 'spells' in it – those who know how to 'spell' can do anything – they can turn you into a pig or a dog." Within "Romanipen any contact with dogs is polluting, dogs (and cats) being perceived as inherently unclean animals." Furthermore, "potential physical contact with police dogs is consequently viewed as a frightening threat, not because of fear of attack as the police may surmise, but because of concern of being polluted" (7). Moreover, her mother's utterance (un)wittingly implicates a word game on 'spells', as a performative articulation or speech act, "that creates events or relations in the world," and subjecthood within situated Romani ancestral knowledge (Young 2016). Papisza's mother sources 'spell' letters as a homology of the supernatural, and non-Romani harmful practices. Undeterred by her mother's warning, Papisza continues to pursue reading and writing lessons after watching the shopkeeper write on a storefront sign. The shopkeeper asks her, "education is costly, can you pay?" Papisza's literacy becomes well known in her Romani community.

In a subsequent Romani camp scene, a Romani man asks her, and her mother, "want to sell us out to the gadje – want her to teach the gadjo how to harass our people?" Her

chicken theft from a non-Romani gadjo breaks state law. Moreover, the orthodox Romani law prohibits learning to read and write. She is caught between linkages of differing world-making-worlds of justice, neither having the resources to defend herself in accordance with androcentric state law or within the patriarchal Romanipen unwritten law. In either system of jurisprudence legally erasing her suffering, her appeal for justice is inadmissible. Papusza's subject positionalities, as a young Romani girl stealing chickens, subordinates her within disparate Romani and non-Romani registers of embodied 'guilt'. Her guilt dictated by Romanipen is her exchange of stolen chickens for 'learning to read and write'. Non-Romani jurisprudence reverses the legal order of determining guilt, leading with 'chicken theft'. In either articulation of Romani and non-Romani jurisprudence, no legal rule exists as a basis for her to request a petition to appeal, and present admissible proof of cruel, discriminatory treatment. Her predicament speaks to what Jean-François Lyotard describes in his work *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*.

Lyotard (1983) begins his chapter "The Differend," with a Faurisson citation describing the 'double bind' of presenting "proof" for the "existence of gas chambers" in the Nazi's "so-called Final Solution" (3). The 'plaintiff's' "argument is: in order for a place to be identified as a gas chamber, the only eyewitness I will accept would be a victim of this gas chamber; now, according to my opponent, there is no victim that is dead, otherwise, this gas chamber would not be what he or she claims it to be. There is, therefore, no gas chamber" (3-4). Lyotard turns to "the Holocaust as a grid for political intervention which both justifies in advance those with advanced military power and disempowers, indeed de-legitimizes, movements that take place from below..." (3). He

argues, “the [grand] narratives we tell to justify a single set of laws and stakes are inherently unjust.” Social movements ‘from below’ encompass diversifying communities with multiplicities of site-specific articulations of meaning-making. In this way, “culture is made up of a collection of genres of discourse, each with its own specific rules and ends.” These discourse genres “consist in their turn of phrase regimens and approved linkages between the phrases they contain, the proviso being that these linkages have purchase only within their particular regimen.” As such, discourse genres “can and do clash, which is how differends emerge” (Sim 2011, 54).

The ‘clash of phrases’ also operates on another register. In recalling the film’s 1921 sequence, Papusza’s mother articulates ‘spell’, as a clash of phrases: ‘to spell’ as a homology ‘to cast spells’, mobilizes a disparate regimen between Romani ancestral knowledge, and non-Romani epistemologies. Romani accepted linkages between ‘spell’ as a writing and reading practice with being cursed, captures purchase by marime as Romanipen legal code. ‘Spell’ as a semiotic coding, engages a Romani orthodoxy of ‘impurity’ as ‘polluting’ agency. Romani contact with non-Romani and their ‘spelling’ practices, is not only contaminating, but the discordant exchange of meaning-making also circulates as a ‘particular regimen’ of polluted dehumanization. As cited previously, Romani marime articulations consider the dog unclean. Romanipen prohibits practices as embodiments of ‘unclean’ contact. To ‘spell’ as an embodied practice, incarnates Romani ‘guilt’ of unclean ‘shame’, and subsequent marime as sentencing is to exist as a cursed inhuman ‘dog’. Romani orthodox identification of ‘unclean’ embodied practices, however, paradoxically interarticulate with the non-Romani semiotic coding of dehumanizing effect (e.g., ‘dirty’, ‘dog’).

The film's rendering of the 1971 prison release-interview depicts Papausza stating, "I never wrote no poems." Prison officials return her items, including a feather. Feathers enact an assemblage of aesthetic meaning-making and 'aesthetic comprehension', eclipsing symbolic representation, throughout the film. The woman who blesses infant Papisza: "may you go light as a feather," and the items young Papisza finds in the tree, as well as a good-luck packet – *bakhtalo*, she gives her non-Romani translator, Jerzy Ficowski (Antoni Pawlicki), include a feather. The filmic instantiations and appearances of the feather present a form of measurement and "registers the contingencies and fragilities associated with the understanding that the 'synthesis' is meant to effect" (Shapiro 2006, 35). Feathers appear to constitute an attendant meaning-making, site-specific to the historicity of encounter and event. The feather's aesthetic agency, "aesthetic movement," cinematically, "is based not on a hierarchy but equality," and (re)partitions the sensible. The director's cinematic framing as an aesthetic agency of the political dislodges "the perceptual and conceptual order in which social arrangements are embedded." Aesthetic agency "consists above all in the framing of a 'we', a subject of collective demonstration whose emergence is the element that disrupts the distribution of social parts" - it is not limited to the arrangement of power within a social order (T. May 2010). As film viewers, 'we' become unsettled by Papisza's retrieval of the feather from the opening in the tree. The film's aesthetic rendering of nonlinear time and space, cutting across all time and space, between the camera's 'eye' and the film viewer, destabilizes the 'we' of 'acting' - as community of sense – and as 'acted upon'. The cinematic aesthetic agency as non-chronological time leaves us wondering if Papisza's discovery of the feather and worded label in the tree,

was placed in the trunk opening by Papisza, herself. Is it the same feather all along, from her childhood play in the forest to the item returned upon her release from prison some fifty years later? Perhaps, the film's aesthetic agency renders this question as less significant, alternately, by aesthetic association.

The film returns to events in 1949; she speaks the following verse, "In the wind green grass sways..." quietly in front of a campfire, stroking a child's head laying in her lap. We associate her tender gesture to signify a mother-child relationship. The cinematic narrative reveals the significance of this scene within a later sequence, cutting back to preceding World War II events showing Papisza hiding in the woods, observing in fear. As a spectator, we stand directly in front of her without seeing what she is observing. The film's WWII sequence reveals her discovery of dead family and clan members, murdered by German soldiers, and possibly by Ukrainian nationalists during Poland's Nazi occupation, in the historically contested region of Volhynia. She walks, despondent, and among the corpses, she finds a surviving infant. She carries the infant with a new found joy, soothing him in her grief and shock, overwhelmed by a sublime experience of horror and pleasure, stumbling in her disorientation towards a clearing. The Kantian 'sublime' is germane to this cinematic sequence. Shapiro (2016) lends further insight on Kant's "Analytic of the Sublime":

[T]he temporality involved in the experience of the sublime, as the subject undergoes the process of moving from the initial apprehension of a sublime event to a degree of comprehension (where what initially strikes and confounds the subject's imagination yields – in Kant's narrative – to the higher faculty of reason). [And] "of the interplay between apprehension and comprehension that an encounter with the sublime precipitates, Kant refers to a breakdown that imperils comprehension. Treating the temporality of the sublime experience, Kant notes that the first moments of one's apprehension of a 'sublime' (*absolutely great* object or event) attenuate because 'apprehension has reached a point beyond which representation of sensuous intuition

in the case of the parts first apprehended begin to disappear from the imagination [...] and for comprehension we get a maximum which the imagination cannot exceed'." (162-63)

The film switches to scenes of trees rustling in the wind, to the primordial forest, river, and swaying grass. Papisza is overwhelmed by feelings beyond her articulation, as she bears witness to the murder of her family and clan. Her sense apprehension is juxtaposed to the indifferent landscape acting as a register of facticity, as a meter foregrounding the occurrence(s) of the scene(s). The land is indifferent to her suffering, yet serves as a refuge from persecution. The forests and fields as stoic landscape-features, express and gauge the primary facticity of Papisza's lived experiences of historical persecution, exile, and survival. The land is always already constituted by discordances, a register of contingencies as event - personally-impersonal or vice versa (Shapiro 2006, 36-37). For example, the film shows her clan suffering greatly during the bitter cold of winter months, some freezing to death despite forest shelter, yet she returns for cover from advancing German soldiers. Moreover, she returns to the company of trees for help and solace. In one such instance, shortly after she is forced into a child-marriage ceremony to her step-uncle, she runs into the woods, scarring her face with a knife and pleading: "Father forest, great forest – Have mercy on me, seal my womb." The forest enacts an aesthetic agency of comprehension that eclipses "one central place from which a calculus" of "the world of phenomena are synthesized" (35). The trees act "as a kind of spectator" to her historically situated and experiential knowledge of desirability and commodification evinced by her bride price, jewelry, money, and a ring (Shapiro 2009, 52). Papisza repeatedly refuses Dionýzy's advances and marriage proposals, and his subsequent complaints elicit the suggestion from a male

clan member - “just steal her.” Forced marriage is distinguished from an arranged marriage, with the latter implying the bride’s ‘acceptance’ of the family sanctioned choice. The large old-growth trees appear as a stoic presence, cutting across time and space, gauging Papisza’s resistant verse, and subsequent Romani exile. The forest as Event unfolds contingencies as aesthetic comprehension tied to understanding, that the fragile synthesis of phenomena effect. Papisza’s sensory worlding and concomitant contingencies, continually rupture the synthesis resting on the basis “in the world such as things emerge as things” for her (34-37). The cinematic rendering and meaning-making of Papisza’s worlding at the campfire draws the viewer from the observer into the situatedness of her utterance. We are there as her as she speaks quietly in the dark, to the campfire:

In the wind green grass sways,
Young oak to the old oak bowing
A leaf speaks, a wandering heart dies
as a black crow mourns it going
the big forests singing softly
black earth thanks, grieving wholly
To the young boy’s death unwelcome
as he shuts his black eyes slowly

She does not regard her words to be a poem, as Ficowski asks “whose poem is it?” The boy, her adopted son (Tarzan) replies, “It’s not a poem, it’s something mommy made up.” Papisza stands by this claim throughout the filmic framing; she relates her verse closer to song. As a genre, song is a more familiar form of expression in the musical heritage and livelihood of her Romani clan. After her prison release in 1971,

she is forced to attend a non-Romani symphony performance of Romani music. Directed to dress up for the occasion by her husband Dionýzy Wajs, he threatens her initial resistance with his walking stick - "I'll give you a wallop." She submits to his coercion, sitting in 'proper place and time' among the non-Romani middle-class audience. The camera zooms in on her face swept with deep sorrow, as the music's racing tempo collides into her faciality, making intelligible another violence as part of her lament. Papusza experiences in this instant, the overwhelming grief, and pain upon the discovery of her murdered family by German soldiers.

Dionýzy exemplifies patriarchal dominance within the Wajs clan. He exerts his power over Papusza's with repeated threats of striking her down. In one such instance, after being summoned by the elder clan leader, who reprimands Dionýzy for Papusza's verse publication, he returns home angrily to assault her, only to be stopped by Tarzan, the son. Dionýzy yells, "you didn't cut off your tongue, now it'll cut off our heads." He refers to their potential exile and survival outside the clan, dependent on the kris proceedings. We then hear subsequent whispering outside her tenement unit, and a shattering window, as a brick lands in her kitchen. In post-war, communist Poland, state authorities coerce Romani to settle in unit tenement blocks in a forced assimilation program. The Great Halt of 1952 stops clans from traveling livelihoods selling handcrafted wares, horses, tarot card readings, or musical performances. "By the order of the Office of Internal Affairs – 29th August 1949, settling activities regarding the Gypsies begin as planned." There is "no appeal." If "you want to travel in caravans, your chickens will have to go to school." Furthermore, "all Gypsies will be counted." Dionýzy despairs in his newly settled life, not only in efforts to obtain licenses required

for his harp music performances but in his destruction of their valued traditional family caravan. The Wajs clan and family livelihood are based on their famous mobile harp performances. He uses the caravan wood for home-heating material, becoming increasingly despondent, helpless, and reliant on Papisza for care. They survive with government welfare money, and the modest income given to her by Ficowski for the publication of her verse. She continues to write her verse for herself and tends to her household chores. When Tarzan gets sick from the fungus in the tenement apartment, she tells the doctor her cure of “raspberries are best.” She pawns a valuable pen Ficowski had given her for writing verse, to purchase upon the doctor’s insistence, prescribed medicine for Tarzan.

Ficowski, a Polish poet, met Papisza in 1949. The film depicts him as a man on the run from Polish communist authorities, after a physical altercation with a police officer. He resists the fascist and Stalinist control of Poland, yet becomes (un)wittingly involved in the coercive ‘Great Halt’ settlement program. Fleeing from state police, Ficowski chooses to take refuge by living among and traveling with the Wajs clan. The Wajs family initially suspect him of being a “police snitch,” and declare “he’ll put a spell on the horses,” yet grow to trust him in his refuge from the law. Accepted as part of the clan, he receives a Wajs clan baptism; a family cloth offered to wipe the perspiration from his forehead. “Now you are a real Gypsy,” exclaim the curious and excited Wajs children. Upon Ficowski’s arrival to the family camp, Papisza remarks to her husband, “the hen and chickens in the sky – one is missing again – just like before the war in Volhynia – a great trouble is afoot.” She apprehends the disruption of clan life by Ficowski’s arrival. As Ficowski listens to Papisza speak her verse by the campfire, he

notices her talent. They discuss her verse, and Papisza elaborates, “in the Gypsy tongue, yesterday and tomorrow are one word, ‘taishia’.” “Poems are something to let me recall tomorrow what I felt yesterday.” Ficowski reflects, “your people are strong, mine are weak.” She replies, “because we have no science or memory. Maybe that’s for the better, if Gypsies had memory they would all die of worry.” He remarks, “the state it’ll do what it wants.” In response to his persistent requests, she writes down her verse with the pen she receives from him as a gift. He collects the verse she writes and sends it to Warsaw. The film shows Ficowski in Julian Tuwim’s apartment, surrounded by the rubble of postwar Warsaw. Ficowski and Tuwim, also a Polish poet, discuss Papisza’s writing in his apartment library, “there are no line breaks, she just writes until she runs out of space.” Ficowski notes further, “when you are young from hope and young at heart, you throw the world wide open with any key you’ve got.” As they discuss her introduction to the non-Romani world, Tuwim proposes, “we will need a ruse of some kind” as in “will you let me interview you for a Warsaw newspaper?” He continues, “it will be a plot by two poets conspiring to save a third one.” He adds, and “no monograph on Gypsies has ever been published in Poland, some amateur sketches at most, the last one in the nineteenth century.” Ficowski chimes in, expressing his knowledge of Romani exclusion from the Western canon: “Yes, Husserl excluded them from his European spirituality, and it stuck.” Tuwim encourages Ficowski to “write a line or two” regarding his time and travel with the Wajs clan, to which Ficowski replies, “I already have the first five chapters.”

A little more than a year later after Ficowski’s chance encounter with Papisza, some of her verse is published in 1950 by Tuwim in the periodical *Problemy*. The publication

includes an interview of Papusza (Fonesca 1995, 7). Isabel Fonesca indicates in reference to Papusza's verse, that the recurrent theme of Romani song is nostalgia. "nostos is the Greek for 'return home'; the Gypsies have no home, and, perhaps uniquely among peoples, they have no dream of a homeland. Utopia –ou topos—means 'no place.' Nostalgia for utopia: a return home to no place. *O lungo drom*. The long road" (5). She notes, perhaps Ficowski confuses this 'return home', with a generalizing assumption about a Romani desire for a 'settled life'. In reference to Papusza's published verse and her interview: "there is talk of the ills of 'wandering'." Ficowski links Papusza's sedentary life in 1950, with her most productive writing period. He attributes her productivity to a time "after she abandoned the nomadic way of life." Fonesca notes, "her poems constitute an elegy for that life—not so much abandoned as confiscated." Ficowski's first book on the *Polish Gypsies* (1953), in its first edition, "includes a chapter called 'The Right Way'," supporting "the government policy of settlement for the fewer than fifteen thousand Polish Gypsies who had survived the war." The government of postwar communist Poland "aspired to build a nationally and ethnically homogeneous state" (7). He then publishes *Songs of Papusza* (1956), translating her verse from Romani (Hübschmannová, n.d.). In the film, she asks Ficowski about his book as he visits her in the tenement, "won't that book hurt Papusza's heart?" "Doesn't it betray Gypsy secrets?" Ficowski replies the book will help her out of poverty. Standing in the entrance doorway of her apartment, watching the rain, she replies "You're right – someday these secrets will be taught at the university." Before departing, Ficowski invites her to Warsaw, but she refuses, stating that there is nothing there for her.

After her nervous breakdown following her kris tribunal, banning her from her Romani community, the film depicts Ficowski visiting Papisza for the last time in a “Silesian psychiatric hospital,” where she remains “for eight months” (Fonesca 1995, 9). He attempts to give her the poems mailed to his residence in Warsaw. She responds, “if I hadn’t learnt to read, I would have been happy.” She appears forlorn and despondent, dressed in a white hospital gown, sitting on a courtyard bench. During his visit, Ficowski crosses paths with her husband, who upon seeing Ficowski, informs him she is forbidden by psychiatric physicians to see her poems. He tells Ficowski, who offers him a renewed license to play the harp anywhere in Poland, “go away, you’re dead to us.” The film casts Ficowski as an ambiguous character, as Papisza’s verse appears to indicate. After he publishes her songs/poems, she is ostracized and exiled by her Romani community and clan elders. She visits him in Warsaw and implores him to stop the publication and release of the book, *Songs of Papisza*. He refuses, unwilling to destroy the five-thousand book copies already printed. She returns home to destroy most of her remaining verse. The film depicts the Waj clan elders and some children assembled for a kris tribunal. The clan elders pass her book around, written in Romani and Polish: “folks, the woman has betrayed all our secrets. The police will know everything; we are lost. She switched on us, sold out our tongue.” They continue, “fellow Gypsies do you see, she has betrayed us, made us ashamed of her before our Śero Rom” - a Romani clan head or chief (Romani-English Glossary - Arnes 1998). “She can’t go living among us. Are we Gypsies or not? She took our honor; she took everything.” The kris elders declare, “those who know she is not to blame, let them speak! Let her explain herself before us.” Ficowski, upon arriving at the kris

proceedings attempts to defend Papisza. He speaks in Romani, having learned the language. “Papisza is innocent; I only took her poems.” The kris elders reject his defense as a non-Romani, and angrily reproach him, “and quit talking in our tongue.”

One of the film’s last sequences depicts Papisza plucking chicken feathers at her husband’s Catholic funeral. As she sits quietly plucking next to her husband’s open casket, we see Ficowski appear to pay his respect. Feathers reappear in the film, juxtaposed to Ficowski’s presence. Again, feathers seem to act as attendant to the scene, as a measure to the final judgment day of her husband’s burial and all those present. “It is said of the Roma that their real faith is an interesting symbiosis of the religion of the majority society and their own ‘superstitions’ which they brought with them from India.” “The Roma believe that a person’s soul survives them and exists even after the body leaves the world.” For example, “this can be seen in their extremely strong traditional belief in the soul of their dead ancestors – *mule* – which the Roma consider intermediaries with God [in the Romani language God is ‘*o Del*’].” According “to their beliefs, the souls of the dead, come back to the living, the good ones to visit their relatives, and offer advice, the bad ones to make to make trouble (during the birth of children for example).” Some Romani communities and clans worship “*Kali Sara*, the Romani Black Madonna or Goddess,” and the worship ceremony has been noted by Indian scholars to be associated with the “*Durga Pooja* of India,” a “Hindu religious custom” (Balazova 2000).

According to Romani scholar, Ronald Lee (2002), “the Roma who attend the [annual worship ceremony of Black Sara] pilgrimage to *Les Saintes Maries* in France and in other related ceremonies elsewhere honouring black female divinities, are in fact

continuing to worship *Kali/Durga/Sara* their Goddess [Black Virgin] in India” (Lee 2002). Kali Sara is “the Protectress who will cure sickness,” and bring “fertility” (The Black Madonna 2014). And, “Muslim Roma described ceremonies similar to those of *Kali Sara*, where a female deity *E Gugli Sagiya* [...] was worshipped” by Romani “in the South Balkans (former Rumelia) in order to bring health, luck, and success” (Lee 2002). Despite her exile, Papusza continues plucking feathers much like Dionýzy plucking of harp strings, preparing afterlife sustenance by making “sorrel soup.” All that is missing is her song.

Polish Sorrel Soup: 6 cups cold water, 1 large peeled and sliced carrot, 1 bunch parsley, 1 bay leaf, 3 peeled and cubed medium potatoes, 1 chicken or vegetable bouillon cube or 1 tablespoon Vegeta, 1 tablespoon butter, ½ pound fresh sorrel, washed, stemmed as for spinach and chopped, 1 cup sour cream, 1 tablespoon all-purpose flour, salt and pepper to taste, chopped fresh dill or parsley, 2 hard-cooked eggs cut into quarters.

In a large saucepan or Dutch oven, place 6 cups cold water, carrots and parsley. Bring to a boil and add bay leaf, potatoes, and bouillon cube. Bring back to boil, reduce heat and simmer until vegetables are tender.

In a large skillet, melt butter and sauté sorrel for 10 minutes. Transfer to soup and bring to a boil. Reduce heat. Remove bay leaf.

In a heatproof bowl or measuring cup, fork blend sour cream with flour and temper with a few ladles of hot soup, whisking constantly until smooth.

Transfer tempered sour cream-flour mixture to soup, stir well and simmer until thickened and just under the boiling point. Adjust seasonings. Portion soup into heated bowls and garnish with chopped dill or parsley and egg quarters. Enjoy.

(Rolek 2018).

Nomads and ‘Method’

The Roma ‘Gypsy’, which etymology is traced to the Greek word for Egyptian, and mistaken as people originating from Egypt, defy identity fixity. Mobile trajectories as subjects ‘becoming’, problematize how Romani ‘do’, how they practice bio- and

geopolitical survival: physical, political, cultural, and economic. Though Romani mobile subjectivities contest hegemonic, normative practices and strategies of subject 'identification', such mobility also speaks to what Kathy E. Ferguson (1993) describes as "the central trajectories of gender, race, class, nation, and erotic choice, along which powers of domination move" (160). Scholastic and feminist resistance against humanist conceptualizations of static, uniform identity, is in part exemplified by Rosi Braidotti's (1994) writing on 'nomadic subjects' (1). Such subjects are "nomadic becomings" which "are the affirmation of the unalterably positive structure of difference meant as a multiple and complex process of transformations..." (Braidotti 2006, 145). As Braidotti (1994) well summarizes, "the nomadic subject I am proposing is a figuration that emphasizes the need for action and both at the level of identity, of subjectivity, and of differences among women. These different requirements correspond to different movements, that is to say, different locations in space, that is to say, different practices." (171). In this way, Braidotti informs my dissertation methodology that seeks to "try to grasp subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects," with respect to discursive, regulatory ideals and practices that seek to objectify Romani subjectivities. (Foucault 1980, 97). In particular, I examine how site-specific instantiations of patriarchal cultural practices, and state-centric governance, including commitments to, or omission of language, perpetrate trauma and violence against Romani women.

I begin my initial inquiry with the beginning formation of Romani human rights activism in the 1990s to early 2000. One such instance is a Romani Rights Conference in 2001, documented by a journal report in the *Essex Human Rights Review* (Oprea

2004). On the discussion agenda is the practice of involuntary sterilizations of Romani women in Slovakia, framed solely within the language of a racist attack against Romani. This discussion agenda introduces my use of the four-part documentary film *Slovakia: the Sterilisation of Roma Women* (Journeyman Pictures 2003) and featured open-ended interviews, situated historically and politically after the dissolution of Czechoslovakia in the post-communist era. Significant to this inquiry is how forced sterilization and violence against Romani women are addressed as a crucial social-justice issue, and framed within the legal language of the European Court on Human Rights (ECHR), especially as Slovakia applies for European Union membership status. By examining specific ECHR policy provisions and language, I interrogate how human rights discourse develops regarding reproductive rights justice for Romani women. Moreover, my discourse analysis foregrounds not just site-specific evidentiary material but pivots to an alternate archive of language and agency: how Romani self-articulate along vectors of power. I present a Romani ‘talking back to’, contesting state-androcentric, and neocolonial agency that objectify or omit Romani subject trajectories between bio- and geopolitical requirements. I begin with the documentary film, *Slovakia: The Sterilisation of Roma Women*.

Forced Sterilization

As Andrea Buckova recounts, “at the Third World Conference against Racism, in 2001,” (Oprea 2004) Roma women highlighted three issues they wanted to discuss: involuntary sterilization, unemployment, and violence against women. Buckova, a Romani participant from Slovakia, remembers how Romani male leaders only allowed them to discuss involuntary sterilization. Involuntary sterilization is framed as a racist

attack against Romani, stripped of any gendered meaning” (Oprea 2004). Enisa Eminova, “a Macedonian Roma” (one of only a few well-known women Romani activists) and consultant to the Roma Women’s Initiative, states, “we should not have to choose between being a woman and being Roma” (Clift 2005). The intersectionality between gender and race splits into numerous trajectories between Romani activists, scholars, artists, and the women in Hermanovce. The anthropological perspective “turns a blind eye” to patriarchal practices that harm Romani women. Virginity testing, child marriage, bans on Western education and birth control are part of the Romanipen Code, as ‘traditional’ practices within site-specific Romani clans and affiliations. However, as Alexandra Oprea remarks, “this acceptance is tainted by the racist assumption that practices harmful to women unequivocally constitute a homogenous Romani culture” (Oprea 2004). “It is important to understand that women’s aspirations to be treated equally are indigenous to every culture” (Clift 2005). Oprea’s statement seems to confuse “culture” with local patriarchal practices within site-specific Romani culture.

Within the context of this intersectional query, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (2008) lends her insights on “cultural translation”: “anthropologists must, of course, attempt to describe cultures as a doctor must medicalize bodies. But in a context where radical Europeans are attempting to be responsible and benevolent toward their former subjects, culture is the last thing that can be known or translated.” “Cultures cannot be known, languages can be known” which leads to “a certain lingual memory” and “begins to make you participants in a cultural production.” She argues for ‘culture’ as process, a negotiation “of largely unacknowledged assumptions loosely held by loosely outlined groups of people” which “meaning-making comes from the speaker.” The “historical

differences between languages” and “the historical differences between the production of cultural power” speaks to “culturing,” which exceeds “national-cultural adjectives.” And beyond the “global” in lived experience, is competition, “for an equal share in the world’s goods: political, military, religious...” – where ‘religious’ functions as a vector of power mapping “the sacred and the profane by way of the relationship between the sexes,” and “where gender comes in.” Spivak’s ‘culturing’ encompasses “subject formation” as an “area of the instrumentalization of sexual difference” which she contends “is the only material plus/minus with which cultures build an entire semiotic system.” In other words, the historicity of languages-cultures-religions as semiotics articulate that “gendering is not something outside that you factor into your cultural descriptions.” Furthermore, “cultural translators” which neglect the historicity and local precisions of “gendering” and language, appear to advance the ‘global’ of Spivak’s “world goods.” As intermediaries, agents/agencies of ‘cultural translation’ which neglect Spivak’s “material plus/minus,” translators, who themselves occupy a positionalization, instrumentalize essentializing cultural assumptions. They do so by (un)wittingly enacting the global ‘body’ of (cultural) capital-expertise, as “translators,” between administrators/managers of capital distribution and transfer, to marginalized communities of the working poor (Spivak 2008).

Paradoxically, cultural translators that negotiate as/with communities of ‘common sense’ work against their own work by essentializing identity. As such, translators instrumentalize difference as preceding differentiation, sex as preceding sexism, race preceding racism, nation preceding nationalism, state preceding statism, the noun preceding the verb. Ta-Nehisi Coates contends, “when we say “race” as opposed to

“racism,” we reify the idea that race is somehow a feature of the natural world and racism the predictable result of it” (Coates in Morrison 2017, xi). “If ‘race’ is the work of genes or the gods or both, then we can forgive ourselves for never having unworked the problem” (xi-xii). In this way, transnational rights organizations may racialize poverty, racialize gender, region, nation, class, language, and religion. Identity determination as ‘biology is destiny’, is implicated in part within ‘cultural’ translation discourse, deployed by non-Romani NGO or IGO liberal reform measures. As such, well-intentioned Romani rights advocacy, negotiating between state-centric policy administration and marginalized communities, operate within ‘identity economies’ already undermined by the global of capital and labor.

Romani encounters of ‘identity politics’, as ‘culturing’, evoke in part, male-dominated narratives as Romani practices within activist forums; within Romani communities; and selective majoritarian ambivalence towards harmful practices against Romani women. For example, as noted earlier, these sited/sighted contestations and horrors are recorded by the documentary, *Slovakia: The Sterilisation of Roma Women* (Journeyman Pictures 2003). The initial film sequence begins with an introduction of the physical border of a river separating the town of Hermanovce into the Romani sector and white Slovak sector. Here “Roma babies are twice as likely to die as white babies up the road.” A Romani couple is getting married. They enter the church after the white Slovaks leave. Rosalea (the last name is not provided) is no longer able to bear children. She is asked why, Rosalea replies, “they didn’t say much; they asked me how many children I had, I said I had one, and this is my second, and then they just told me I would have a cesarean” (Journeyman Pictures 2003). After some time, Rosalea is

perplexed as to why she did not get pregnant again. Barbara Bukovska, a lawyer, working for the Centre for Civil and Human Rights investigates. She issues a report on the medical files of Romani women like Rosalea, who after childbirth is no longer able to bear children. In Rosalea's case, during a 'necessary' cesarean section, her fallopian tubes were tied without her informed consent.

According to Bukovska, whose report cites over 100 cases of the forced sterilization of Romani women, it is a pervasive practice by many doctors, in many hospitals throughout Slovakia. When women ask her why they can't conceive children, she checks their medical files with their permission. Animating Foucauldian 'surveillance', if they are Romani, "the file" indicates so with 'R'. Bukovska notes that the overwhelming majority of complaints are by Romani women. Rosalea's medical file states she requested to be sterilized, and a signature is indicated. Rosalea states the signature is not hers. She wants to have more children. She states, "the doctor never explained anything to me; he asked what name to put on the birth certificate, Robert for a boy, Jitka for a girl." She adds, "I went in, they gave me an anesthetic; they gave me an injection; I didn't sign anything" (Journeyman Pictures 2003).

The documentary journalist (whose identity, professional and personal background are not provided) interviews Veronica, a Romani woman 19 years of age. Her youngest child is four years old. She arrives at the hospital in pain. The doctor informs her it would be dangerous to have another baby. She is told that she or the baby would die, and that is why she has to sign the sterilization form. She does not know what sterilization means and signs the form. She asks the doctor after the birth of her child if she can have more children. The father of her children has left her, now that her two

children are four and seven years old. She states, “while they were small, things were fine, when they got bigger we started having problems” (Journeyman Pictures 2003). Her mother wants her to have more children. The documentary interviews one more Romani woman, Ingrid. The journalist states Ingrid’s last name. Ingrid’s last name is not shown in the subtitles. Ingrid is sterilized at 16. She is now 18 and is one of two Romani women who files criminal charges against the hospital. The local and international press, report her ordeal. The local police take her and another woman to the station. They tell her she will be taken to jail if she cannot prove her claims. They tell her a false declaration means three years in prison. Local government officials prove her claims are false. They cite her signature in her medical file as proof. The file also indicates ‘R’.

I pivot here to Kathy E. Ferguson’s (1993) edifying analytic in her book *The ManQuestion: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*. Ferguson states, “particular positionalizations are both the products and producers of discursive and institutional practices, both the outcomes of the operations of power and the starting points for the practice of resistance” (159). In the *Slovakia* documentary, Ingrid’s sterilization and dehumanization, her specific “positionalization” is on the surface indices of cultural ‘identity markers’ and of material conditions. She shares some of these vulnerabilities with Rosalea and Veronica. As Ferguson states, “thematizing the subject as mobile suggests a way to harness respect for difference with attention to the concrete, without eliminating either the desire for or the recognition of commonalities” (159). In the documentary interview, Ingrid states, “I want everyone to know what I’ve been through and how I feel, now that I can’t...now that I’m empty and I can’t give the life to a

child.” She continues, “I could have had the joy and the pain of it...I can’t express it.” It is startling she states this with a seemingly happy facial expression. I thought about her expression much in a way as a freshly painted rainbow, across which she glides her fingers; her ‘identity colors’, thoughts, affect, effect seeping into one another, into infinite hues and shades. Within the documentary framework, she is one more dehumanized Romani woman. The police construct Ingrid as one more ‘subject’ of control. Ingrid says, “They asked me how much I was paid for bringing charges against the doctor, I told them I hadn’t been paid any money at all” (Journeyman Pictures 2003). As Trinh T. Minh-ha (1990) states, within colonial and hegemonic contexts of domination, “impurity and marginalization have always had strong bonds; the more one strengthens these, the more one’s position proves to be fragile” (Parmar and Minh-ha 1990, 5).

When I investigate state-centric ‘assimilation’ projects, I ‘encounter’ events of coercion of embodied diversity, the nexus of gender, race, class, ethnicity in neocolonial violence and subjugation of women. I think about Veronica becoming a mother at age 12, and no longer able to conceive due to forced sterilization, the father of her children as she states, who leaves “to have other children” (Journeyman Pictures 2003). It is a terrible situation for a woman to encounter, irrespective of ‘cultural sensitivity’ norms or ‘outside’ emancipation narratives. Such narratives also speak to neocolonial articulations of ‘cultural sensitivity’ and ‘outsider objectivity’ as articulations of “Gendered Orientalism,” homogenizing site-specific subjectivities and alterity, examined by Lila Abu-Lughod (2013) in *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* (2002). According to Fae Chubin (2017), Abu-Lughod’s critical inquiry investigates the

“colonial mindset” as part of “the international classification of ‘harmful cultural practices’ in defining ‘honor killings.’” It is a homicidal crime committed primarily against women, since “women’s bodies are considered repositories of family honor,” though “honor cultures do not have a monopoly on violence against women” (Chubin 2017, 135). “An honor killing or shame killing is the homicide of a member of the family, due to the perpetrator’s belief that the victim has brought shame or dishonor upon the family, or has violated the principles of a community or religion, usually for refusing to enter an arranged marriage, having sex outside a marriage, becoming the victim of rape, engaging in non-heterosexual relations or renouncing a faith” (Honor Killing n.d.).

“Abu-Lughod (2013) works to criminalize violence against women,” yet points out that “such violence and abusive behavior is attributed to culture only when referring to ‘other’ cultural, racial, national groups” (Chubin 2017, 135). Though patriarchal systems of domination and the ‘culture of violence against women’ exists in the Global North and South, androcentric practices that subjugate women are dominant in site-specific patrilineal communities and societies. However, Abu-Lughod’s inquiry interrogates Western rights discourse regarding violence against women in Muslim communities as a “moral crusade” which is “authorized” and produced “by cultural, legal categories” (Abu-Lughod Interview 2013). “The crusade has justified all manner of intervention from the legal to the military, humanitarian to the sartorial” (Abu-Lughod in Time.com 2013). “Do all forms of transnational activism and global framing need to be disruptive of local self-determination in the process?” (Chubin 2017, 136). What are the underlying ethical, cultural, and legal assumptions of ‘universal’

Eurocentric rights discourse, intersecting site-specific vectors of ‘indigenous’ Othering? As Homi Bhabha (2004) describes with respect to “[t]he ‘other’,” which “is never outside or beyond us; it emerges forcefully, within cultural discourse when we *think* we speak most intimately and indigenously between ourselves” (4). In other words, embodied identity is continually fragmented by way of varying sources of power trajectories. Two such subject trajectories are gender and culture. “Being, no longer conceived as simple identity, is identity-in-difference, or, equivalently, self-relatedness through time.” Furthermore, “identity does not ‘contain’ difference as if some spatial relation adhered between the two; identity is now defined as flux itself, the perpetual ‘disquiet’ of the self.” Thus, subjectivities are mobilized “not as personal and political agency within the individual, but in and through the complex cultural exchanges among bodies in which identity itself is ever-shifting” (Butler 2006: 84).

Within Romani ethnocultural affiliations and practices, mobile subjectivities exceed fixity distinctions between gender, race, and religion. Rather, situated Romani cultural articulations speak to a material agency of community, and economic contingencies ‘on the ground’ - as assemblages of new and ‘customary’ practices. In returning to the critical analytic, a creative tension emerges between (1) ‘anthropological perspective’ - ‘blind eye’ acceptance of patriarchal hegemonies (2) Alexandra Oprea’s contention that women’s aspirations to be treated equally is not culturally exclusive (3) And Abu-Lughod’s recognition that women’s rights advocacy (re)produce the universalizing of rights grammar, of homogenizing identity ascriptions, and Orientalism. This tension, however, engenders new possibilities for community-specific feminist reform, exceeding the one-size-fits-all ‘common sense’ approach.

Subject Membership

One example that engages this feminist analytic is by the NGO ‘awareness’ campaign; *I’m a European Roma Woman* (Amnesty International 2011). It features among other identity declarations, the testimony of ‘Ostalinda’. A subtitled introduction describes her as an “anthropologist, lawyer, a human rights activist.” She appears in western and ‘traditional’ Romani attire, declaring, “identity is a very complex thing. Mine has many different sites. I’m Spanish, Mexican. I’m also European and a Roma woman” (Amnesty International 2011). Ostalinda’s self-declarative ‘identity profile’, her elevated socio-economic and educational status, “establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated” (Butler 2006, 203). As ‘woman’, she attests to her success within a categorical ethos of gendered, classed, multicultural, and ethnic ‘integration’. This video portrayal illustrates in part, exposure of normative narratives and codes of intelligibility. It reveals “generative political structures” in its process of coding identity as “naturalized foundations,” as ‘woman’, as an ideal of Romani identity, captured by statist/static regulatory norms of subject membership (81). Alternately, the immanent, material ‘facts on the ground’, specific to the socio-economic conditions of varying Romani communities, reveal subject trajectories which are continually self-diversifying to meet the demands “within the context of a dynamic field of cultural [and economic] relations” (173). This video appears to deploy normative codes of static identity markers within Euro-centric narratives. Ostalinda’s identity markers are clearly delineated and defined by what Butler (2006) terms as “compulsory order” and category appears ready-made for the assimilation of statist multicultural projects (8). This form of ‘public relations’ campaign, affirms the message

that however you self-articulate your identity, as woman, as Roma, make sure you follow the regulatory ideals of how to look, behave, and sound like one. Promulgated as ‘reinforcing a positive (self) image of Romani women’, it does little to empower Romani women, for instance in Bratislava, Slovakia, where access to reproductive health care is limited to one day in the week.

Totalizing normative identity discourse also turns a blind eye to traditional Romanipen Code patriarchal practices as *marimos*, which subordinate Romani women to the needs and interests of the clan as *vitsa*, and family affiliations as *kumpaniya* (Fonesca 1995, 4-9). Though context and site-specific, Romani women are still banned in most Romani communities from learning to read or write. According to Isabel Fonesca (1995), as late as the 1920’s, “literacy among Gypsies was almost unknown” and if a Roma girl or woman “was caught reading she was beaten with her books and magazines were destroyed.” “Even today, around three-quarters of Gypsy women, are illiterate” (4). There are other forces at work, concerning educational access. Romani cultural practices and historically situated knowledge articulates unwritten ancestral-knowledge stories. Barriers to educational access are systemic to the workings of state and local bureaucracies, due in large measure to discrimination against women and the Romani, other discriminatory attitudes, socio-economic and linguistic marginalization, identification, and residency requirements. Romani and non-Romani discrimination based on Romani sexuality, or self-articulations as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, ally, in site-specific communities, is a daily encounter and event. Communities that adhere to Romanipen consider Romani whose sexuality does not conform to heteronormativity, afflicted with a ‘sickness’.

Romani living in *gadjo* communities, whose sexuality is not heteronormative encounter additional discriminatory practices along intersectional trajectories, not limited to gender, race, class, and nation. How is Romani intersectionality articulated within the context of self-identification practices and self-governance in human rights discourse?

EU Human Rights and the Neocolonial

The European Roma Rights Centre (Goodwin 2004) in the following report states: “no principle of international law is more contested or controversial than, nor perhaps as important as, that of self-determination.” The “International Romani Union” movement, with some disagreement among other Romani social movements, is seeking international rights recognition for self-determination as a ‘people’ with “claim to non-territorial nation-status.” Though Romani subject articulations and practices are site-specific to people, place, and time, “Roma across the world emphasise how they share fundamental linguistic, cultural and historical commonalities that tie them together as, what is today by many Roma argued, a non-territorial Romani nation.” And “the crucial issue is whether the principle may be held to apply in post-colonial situations and, if so, when and to whom.” “Article 2 of the 1960 Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Territories” - General Assembly Resolution 1514 states, “all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development.” Some years later, “the interpretation that self-determination applies beyond the colonial context is supported by Article 1(1) of the 1966 International Covenant on civil rights and Political Rights (ICCPR) and International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESR), Article 1 (1), which states, ‘all peoples

have the right to self-determination’.” Therefore, “there is a strong case for suggesting that self-determination is applicable in situations outside other than those of decolonization,” since it “is one of the essential principles of international law,” by a 1995 ICJ (International Court of Justice) ruling. Thus, “it is precisely when self-determination is taken out of the colonial context that much of the uncertainty arises.” As the UN Charter “non-intervention” principle in Article 2 (7) cannot be applied to “situations of colonial oppression,” UN “non-intervention” can be applied to claims of self-determination based on marginalization other than colonial situations. Therefore, States who fear the possible destabilization of self-determination recognition, and secessionist incursions against their “territorial integrity” (also a UN Charter principle), act to limit or restrict recognition applied in the “post-colonial” situation. The State also justifies non-recognition of Romani self-determination “so that a ‘people’ is understood only in terms of the population of an already constituted State.” In other words, “[self-determination] does not extend to claims for independence by minority groups in a non-colonial world” (Goodwin 2004).

“The 1970 Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States” (General Assembly Resolution 2625) has “specified other peoples beyond the colonial context” having the right to self-determination and “it includes those subjected to alien subjugation, domination, or exploitation.” The UN 1970 Declaration places a great burden of proof on the Romani self-determination movement, as suffering “a high threshold of abuse” in the “post-colonial” context, to “be considered ‘*internally colonized*’ [the emphasis is mine] and thus entitled to invoke the provisions of G.A. Resolutions 1541 or 2625.” Moreover,

minority groups are not included within the definition of a people,” in “that a ‘people’ can only be understood as referring to the people of a state in its entirety.” In other words, since the UN and the EU designate Romani self-articulations and cultural affiliations as minority groups, within the context of the “post-colonial” State, they are not considered ‘people’, with a right to self-determination. It appears that Romani communities within the context of the ‘postcolonial’ State, where self-identity articulations are limited to the citizen-centric state, have no international right to collective self-determination, internally or externally. Currently, the only legal recognition of Romani self-determination is individually based on citizenship as fixed State identity. A Romani activist response: “We negotiate from the position of our own experience in that knowledge is unique to us” (Goodwin 2004). This response reflects a Romani activist articulation that citizenship is an active, participatory process, by which self-determination is not a static endpoint. Instead, self-governance is realized by engaging in the process of ongoing negotiation. ‘Democracy’ is hollow, if Romani are refused a seat at the negotiating table. Despite increasing Romani international human rights representation, Romani voices are often rendered ineffective within the juridico-political double-bind of what constitutes ‘human’ rights, or ‘people’.

In addition to fighting for the Romani right to self-determination as a non-territorial nation, the European Roma Rights Centre addresses LGBTQIA interests by providing a blog forum. The EU however, has yet to recognize the human rights of Romani women. Further, with respect to global rights initiatives, a report prepared for the UN Office of the Commissioner on Human Rights and the High Commissioner on National Minorities, omits policy provisions in the Section IX Recommendations or Appendix

Questionnaire, that address practices relevant to gender (Cahn and Gould 2008). However, in its concluding observations on Slovakia, the UN Human Rights Commission, expressed “concern at reports of forced or coerced sterilization of Roma women, with similar reports coming out of the Czech Republic.” In “2011, the HRC [Human Right Council] once again expressed concern regarding the ‘lack of information or concrete measures to eliminate forced sterilization of Roma women in Slovakia’” (Sifris 2014, 133). Moreover, the Council of Europe and its European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) indicate “that prosecutions of the perpetrators of forced sterilization against Roma women [part of an apparent systemic abuse pattern the former Eastern bloc, and Sweden] will be successful only if the cases are framed as ‘crimes of assault’ or of inflicting ‘grievous bodily harm’ as opposed to cases of ‘genocide’. That is, the Commission is not denying that the cases, in fact, meet the criteria for genocide, but rather suggesting that a downgrading of the crime to a simple or aggravated bodily assault is a precondition for any chance of prosecutorial success in the domestic courts.” And “that the ECRI maintains that this is because the proof is not sufficient for a claim of genocide.” Though the “forced sterilization of Roma women as part of a widespread systemic discrimination against, and persecution of the Roma people” is evident, “are the elements *present* [emphasis is mine] for ICC” (International Criminal Court), Crimes of ‘Genocide by Causing Serious Bodily or Mental Harm (Article 6 (b),’ and “Genocide by Imposing Measures Intended to Prevent Births (Article 6 (d), as well as the Crime against Humanity of ‘Enforced Sterilization’ (Article 7 (1) g-51?” (xxii) (Grover 2010, 116).

A more recent European Court of Human Rights ruling regarding the forced

sterilization of Romani Women in Slovakia follows, and I cite the summary in its entirety:

On November 13, 2012, the European Court of Human Rights issued its latest judgment in a series of cases dealing with the involuntary sterilization of Roma women. The court unanimously found that two applicants were the victims of coerced sterilization in violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment) and Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) of the European Convention on Human Rights. The applicants were sterilized while undergoing a cesarean section, and it was not until years later, during an investigation, that the applicants learned that the documents were requests for sterilization. Additionally, the two applicants were legally minors at the time of the procedure, and the hospital also failed to obtain the consent of their legal guardians. The Court followed the reasoning from its two recent decisions on the same subject: *V.C. v Slovakia* (2011) and *N.B. v. Slovakia* (2012). Finding that the sterilizations were not life-saving medical interventions and that they were performed without the requisite informed consent, the court held that this treatment was incompatible with the requirement of respect for human freedom and dignity, and amounted to degrading treatment. Additionally, the Court found that the State had failed in its obligation to protect the reproductive health of women of Roma origin, and did not comply with its Article 3 obligation to conduct a prompt and reasonable investigation. (Sprung 2012)

Juxtaposing this ECHR ruling and language regarding forced sterilization, to the aforementioned UN and ICC policy provisions, a dramatic shift develops in the framing of rights discourse. Forced sterilization of Romani women is no longer a human rights violation addressed and adjudicated on the basis of inflicting physical harm, crimes against humanity, or genocide. Instead, forced sterilization is framed within the language of human rights violation specifically against “women of Roma origin” (Sprung 2012). The grammar: women ‘of Roma origin’, seemingly re-inscribes the gendered, racialized formation of social, juridical, historical mechanisms of control it seeks to redress. And within the context of the Romani diaspora, human rights discourse may conflate Romani ‘reproductive rights’ with state-centric discriminatory policy practices. Romani adherence to Romanipen articulations regarding birth control is

family- and clan-specific within the context of self-diversifying Romani identities. Forced sterilization is addressed as a human rights violation against women in Romani communities, within the parameters of institutional, state-centric agency, and legal discourse (e.g., hospital, Slovakia, medical interventions).

Moreover, evidence of site-specific violations of human rights against women *within* Romani communities in the Czech Republic is cited by the Romani activist group, Romedia Foundation (2013): “Between 1971 and 1991 in former Czechoslovakia [...] ‘reduction of the Roma population’ through surgical sterilization, performed without the knowledge of the women themselves, was a widespread governmental practice.” And “the Czech ombudsmen estimated that more than 90,000 women from former Czechoslovakia became infertile as a consequence of such interventions.” The Romedia Foundation website notes site-specific resistance movements in the Czech Republic, and demonstrations against forced sterilization at a hospital in Ostrava, are organized by victims, as well as activists such as Elena Gorolova, for women with little or no access to reproductive justice (Rimedia Foundation 2013). Romedia reports the “majority of Czech ministers agreed [that] a mechanism should be developed by the end of 2013, as part of the already existing legal framework” for compensating sterilization victims. Though the European Court of Human Rights ruling is a significantly progressive measure towards addressing forced sterilizations of women in Romani communities, it is limited to holding government/institutions accountable, “and does not deal with single individuals who have committed crimes” - i.e., doctors, politicians (Rimedia Foundation 2013). Financial incentives or political gain for stakeholders in discursive regimes of social,

cultural governance during the communist and post-communist era, remain rooted in deeply entrenched discriminatory discourse, and nationalist identity myths.

Some human rights advocates are quickly aroused in their condemnation of Romani child marital practices, advanced further into the field of moral indignation, by recent widely publicized reports of a ten-year-old Gitano girl in Spain, giving birth (Journeyman Pictures 2003). In this way, European human rights organizations, function as a network of universalized conduits. They function to align the “situated ethics” of Romani practices and articulations of identity into objectified, meta-applicable indices that make more available programmatic strategies of remediation (Ong 2009, 159). Often recalcitrant to the assimilation projects of late modernity and late capitalism, Romani subject trajectories mobilize along and within the interstitial spaces of bio- and geopolitical demands. Romani identity constellations confound further considerations regarding their integration into the market economy. Incongruent with the ethico-political appeals and treatment of migrant labor, by NGOs, EU/EC, and the UN, advocacy efforts on behalf of many Romani communities, present an open-ended endeavor. The variably encompassing neoliberalist ‘state of exception’ is rendering its verdict: how to contend with ‘the Roma problem’ – expulsion and deportation (Agamben 1998, 91-103). With the attenuated demands on the symbiotic ethos of democracy-capitalism, the bio- and geopolitical integration of the Romani ‘body’ remains with little a bargaining chip by international, regional local rights and ‘welfare’ organizations.

In an interview with Brad Evans, Gayatri Spivak states, “another problem with these organizations is the way they emphasize capitalism’s social productivity without

mentioning capital's consistent need to sustain itself at the expense of curtailing the rights of some sectors of the population." Spivak adds, "the human rights lobby moves in to shame the state, and in ad hoc ways restores rights. But then there is no democratic follow-up, and these organizations rarely stick around long enough to see that." She notes, "the passing of a law and the proof of its existence is not enough to assure effective resistance to oppression. Some of the gravest violations of rights occurred within legal frameworks" (Evans and Spivak 2016). However, concomitant efforts by neoliberal state-centric strategies, governmental and non-governmental organizations continue to promulgate the autonomous citizen-centric narrative, as a 'focus of enunciation'. Furthermore, totalizing subject narratives and underlying assumptions by European human rights and women's rights organizations, mobilize political economies engaging objectified identity markers. The global economy of identity-rights ascriptions based on national 'origin', religious affiliation, gender, and race, and more, are contentiously and discursively (re)embedded.

As Lila Abu-Lughod cites the phrase "women's rights are human rights" within the matrix of international human rights organizations, transnational rights discourse (re)produces a central "claim to universal values." Generalizing discourse and grammar "with the purity of the language of universal rights," such as "choice, consent, and freedom" engage a "common sense" network of "imperial interventions" and "ideals [which] have become hegemonic." (Abu-Lughod 2013, 203). She instructs a reexamination of 'rights grammar' by which "we might be forced to take account of contexts that are not as disconnected from our worlds and our lives as we think" (202). The 'common sense' approach she distinguishes as a human rights methodology, works

paradoxically as a hegemony/taxonomy of mechanisms of emancipation. Pertinent and useful, are Gilles Deleuze's (1990) insights in *The Logic of Sense*, where he states, "paradox is initially that which destroys good sense as the only direction, but it is also that which destroys common sense as the assignation of fixed identities" (3). "In other words, it is called 'common', because it is an organ, a function, a faculty of identification that brings diversity in general to bear upon the form of the Same" (77-78). For example, Abu-Lughod reorients her critique of 'common sense' to investigate the situated and lived experience of Muslim women. Her accounts of Romani Muslim women invoke open-ended interviews and personal narratives. Each Romani narrative presents varying situated articulations of religious practice. Romani Muslim articulations and practices are "not a cultural universal but rather developed under specific historical and political conditions" (Spivak 2008). "The history of the Muslim Roma is quite long and detailed"; I present a brief historical context, as my analytic focus is on activist and feminist interventions to neocolonial narratives.

"The first arrival of Roma Muslims in the Balkans is linked to the Ottoman conquest and the Establishment of the Ottoman Empire during the 14th and 15th century. Some of them were directly taking part in auxiliary army units or as craftsmen serving the army." Currently, within the context of settlement and migration to the European continent, in the "Republic of Macedonia where the majority of Roma are Muslim, it is thought that there Roma have conserved most of the identity." And "major cultural minorities of Muslim Roma are found in Turkey, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Croatia, Southern Russia - the Caucasus, Greece (a small part of Muslim Roma focused in Thrace), Egypt, Kosovo, Republic of Macedonia, Bulgaria, Romania (a very small

Muslim Romani group exist in the Dobruja region of Romania)” (Spivak 2008).

Specific to Romani migration and mobile subjectivities, Abu-Lughod (2013) refers to how cultural articulations are contextually “shaped by global politics, international capital, and modern state institutions” (202). Furthermore, with political economy in mind, Spivak notes, “however much you want to, you simply cannot do it through wild anthropology and a desire to transculturate” (Spivak 2008).

Impactful to this critical analytic of neocolonial praxis, is how Kathy Ferguson’s (1984) work makes “intelligible the structures and processes of power in bureaucratic society,” and its “overall discourse” (x). Her inquiry is instrumental in deconstructing bureaucratic hegemonies of and resistance to articulations of ‘cultural governance’. I employ cultural governance in this instance, as gendered and racialized subject formations within top-down processes of subordination. Within the bureaucratic complex that is discourse forging, ‘managing’, and implementing international human rights, NGOs, IGOs, and NPOs (non-profit organizations) engage regimes of cultural governance, which I later examine in greater detail. However, first, a clarification of the term ‘bureaucracy’ is necessitated. I begin with Ferguson’s comprehensive definition of bureaucracy:

Following [Max] Weber, the modern bureaucracy is usually described as an organization having the following traits: a complex rational division of labor, with fixed duties and jurisdictions; stable, rule-governed authority channels and universally applied performance guidelines; a horizontal division of graded authority, or hierarchy, entailing supervision from above; a system of written record-keeping, based on scientific procedures that standardize communications and increase control; objective recruitment based on impersonal standards of expertise; predictable, standardized management procedures following general rules; and a tendency to require total loyalty from its members toward the way of life the organization requires. (7)

In *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*, Ferguson (1984) states, “the utility of various liberal reforms should be evaluated on the basis of their ability to challenge, not simply extend, the language and the practice of bureaucratic capitalism.” Since feminists have “successfully challenged” many “legal barriers to women’s public activity,” women’s “entry into public life has come to mean acceptance of the rules of the game of bureaucratic discourse.” In other words, “liberal feminism used to be, in Foucault’s terms a voice raised against the dominant discourse; it has now largely become a voice subservient to that discourse.” She states, “the requirements of living/surviving in the world at hand prohibit feminists from simply ignoring the juridico-legal realm, however despite its inherent limitations” (193). Furthermore, “reform efforts such as the battles for reproductive freedom in the legislatures and the courts are crucial for feminism because they make other struggles possible” (193-94). Ferguson’s inquiry is critical in making intelligible how hegemonies of bureaucracy operate in public administration and the corporate workplace. Moreover, her inquiry makes accessible, inquiry into how subjects of systemic control, internalize and take up discourses/practices of subordination:

After internalizing and acting on the rules of bureaucratic discourse for most of their adult lives, how many women (or men) will be *able* to change? After succeeding in the system by using those rules, how many would be *willing* to change? The conformity that bureaucratic participation requires is, by their own account, much more than skin deep; it affects the way one thinks, feels, responds to others, and conceives of and presents oneself” (192-93).

Her inquiry is germane to postcolonial discourse and decolonizing methodologies (regionally, historically specific), and critical interventions by Romani women activist regarding bureaucratic/language and EU human rights practices. I investigate the

'neocolonial' as a re-embedding of Western dominance and androcentric-discourse practices, (re)implementing cultural governance in relation to vectors of power. For example, Ashis Nandy argues that "the structures of colonialism contain rules by which colonial encounters occur and are 'managed.'" Thus, "the different ways in which these encounters happen and are managed are different realizations of the underlying rules and codes which frame in the broadest sense what is possible and what is impossible" (Tuhiwai Smith 1995, 8). One of the primary critiques by Romani scholars and feminist activists is the neocolonial practice of 'Othering', engaged as a bureaucratic rights discourse of "mono-focal identity" policy (Angela Kóczé 2017). For example, The Dangerous Women Project.org engages Romani rights discourse as a call to "untying global sisterhood," and "naming names" (Dangerous Women Project 2016). More specifically, this project unsettles static identity and universalizing liberal-reform language and strategies. Human rights policy within juridical and political parameters might better serve situated Romani communities by differentiating the agency of 'commonalities' shared by Romani women, from the essentializing universality of identity language. Adrienne Rich (1984) in "Notes Toward a Politics of Location", presents a useful counter-imaginary to the fixity of totalizing subject formation. She speaks of a childhood memory of addressing a letter to a girlfriend from her specific name and location from street to city to country to continent to hemisphere to planet to solar system to universe. She writes, "you could see your own house as a tiny fleck on an ever-widening landscape, or as the center of it all from which the circles expanded into the infinite unknown" (212). In building on Rich's work, Elspeth Probyn (1990) adds, "in creating our centers and own locals, we tend to forget that our centers displace

others into the periphery of our own our making” (176). Furthermore, “Rich points out that we need to replace the assumptions of universalism and construct a feminist theory that starts from the fragments of one’s own body.” Romani mobile subjectivities as diversifying embodiments of identity articulations, speak to her insights, moving along hierarchies of ‘location’ from the site-specific, to the particular, to the general, to the infinite. Probyn appears to interrogate hierarchies of subject formation and ‘positionalizations’ within a Foucauldian analytic. She states, “in its hierarchical moment, location insists on a taxonomy of experience. One doesn’t have to scratch the surface very deeply to find that class, race, and gender have a lot to do with whose experiences are on top” (Probyn 1990, 177).

Romani women’s experience, in place of affixed identity, “is indivisible from what came before and which knowledges stand as previously sanctioned” (Probyn 1990, 184). For example, The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) website cites a 2014 “Budapest conference, ‘Nothing About Us Without Us? Roma Participation Policy Making and Knowledge Production’” (European Roma Rights Centre 2015). Though the conference encourages “Romani feminist and LGBTQIA scholars and activists to come together and share their knowledge and ideas,” it appears “there was a lack of understanding that the complexity of Romani people’s identities needs to be recognized within Romani political discourses” (Fejzula 2015). The ERRC advocates that Romani activist movements/organizations must also mobilize rights discourse against hegemonies of domination beyond gender, race, ethnicity, class, nation, religion, persons with disability, and language, to include Romani lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, intersex and asexual, ally, from within and outside

Romani communities (European Roma Rights Centre 2015). Recent work regarding Romani human rights by policy-makers and activists indicates intersectionality is ‘missing’, primarily within bureaucratic and linguistic categories of ‘minority rights’ of EU member states and citizenship. Scholarship by Romani women activists, such as *Missing Intersectionality: Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Class in Current Research and Policies on Romani Women in Europe* (2009), by Angela Kóczé and Raluca Maria Popa, addresses the absence of intersectionality in minority rights language and provisions (Kóczé and Popa 2009). Another example is ‘The Council of Europe’ (CoE) document, *Strategy on the Advancement of Romani Women and Girls* (2014-2020) that states, “despite notable actions by many international organisations in addressing concerns of Romani women and girls, Romani women are still excluded from most policy-making processes at [the] local and national level” (The Council of Europe 2014, 2). The CoE addresses the exclusion of ‘Romani women’ not only from policy language but also to a great extent: (1) exclusion of Romani women from juridico-political life (2) exclusion from public life, as androcentric hegemonies within situated Romani traditional cultural articulations, and within non-Romani public forums (3) exclusion from helping formulate international rights policy (in)directly impacting Romani women.

As Kathy Ferguson (1984) states, “the feminine role is inherently depoliticizing, in that it requires women to internalize an image of themselves as private rather than public beings. Women have largely been spectators rather than participants in public life, and the more firmly they have been integrated into the feminine role, the more removed they have been from the public realm” (94-95). However, she notes, “women

are not powerless because they are feminine; rather, they are feminine because they are powerless, because it is a way of dealing with requirements of subordination” (95).

Ferguson’s analytic illuminates my investigation regarding how Romani rights, and more specifically Romani women’s rights, are subordinated within legal authority as ‘minority rights’, and ‘freedom of movement’ language in international human rights law and policy. Within “international human rights law relevant for minorities [...] “non-discrimination,” “freedom of movement” and “special rights/measures” are identified within the United Nations; Council of Europe, and the European Union (Ravnbøl 2010, 2). I cite the relevant summaries in their entirety:

Non-discrimination is generally established in international human rights law. The main features of discrimination that concern minorities are distinction, exclusions, restrictions or preferences on unwarranted grounds of race, ethnic or national origin, language and religion. The essence of non-discrimination follows the principle of equality of treatment. This includes the rights of minorities to equality before the law and before courts, equal access to public services, work and education etc. It also includes fundamental freedoms. Freedom of expression, [(UDHR, Article 18; ICCPR, Article 18; EHCR, Article 10)] freedom of association [(UDHR, Article 20; ICCPR, Article 22; EHCR, Article 11)] and assembly [(UDHR, Article 20; ICCPR, Article 18; ECHR, Article 10)], the right to information in preferred language, the right to hold religious beliefs of own choice and freedom of movement are all crucial freedoms for the protection and promotion of identities and cultures of minorities. In particular, “The right to free movement is one of the basic rights of EU citizens [...] Recognition No. 492/2011 on freedom of movement for workers within the Union. The [Freedom of Movement] Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the member states.” (12-15)

The European Union Treaty requirements prohibit discrimination regarding the freedom of movement “based on the nationality between workers of the Member States as regards employment, remuneration, and other conditions of work and employment” (Citizens Information n.d.) However, these ‘free movement’ provisions are “subject to limitations justified on the grounds of *public policy, security, or public health* [...]

Article 27 (2) [emphasis is mine]” (Citizens Information n.d.). And EU Treaty provisions state “every citizen of the Union shall have the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States subject to the limitations and conditions laid down in the European Commission (EC) Treaty and the measures adopted to give it effect” (Citizens Information n.d.) The TFEU, Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2007), Article 45 which originates from The Treaty of Rome (1958), articulates the EC limitations: “the Provisions of this article shall not apply to employment in the *public service* [emphasis is mine].” However, the European Court of Justice (CoJ) “has ruled that it only covers restrictions of access to certain posts in the public service to nationals of the host Member State.” Thus, the CoJ adjudicates on a case-by-case basis what ‘public service posts’ are not covered by the right to Freedom of Movement. Though, the Freedom of Movement does not apply to “posted workers, who are not availing themselves of their free movement rights: instead, it is the employers who are making use of their freedom to provide services in order to send workers abroad on a temporary basis.” In other words, the CoJ rules on a case-by-case basis what constitutes ‘public service employment’, with definitive freedom of movement restriction for ‘posted workers’. “For any other aspect of access to a post [...] equal treatment of migrant workers and national workers must be guaranteed” (European Commission 2010).

The Free Movement Directive (FMD) 2004/38/EC, cited previously, in relevant summary, “grants a right of entry (art. 5) and a right of residence of up to three months (art.6).” After three months, the EU citizen may stay, but must demonstrate (art. 7 (1): (1) they are self-employed in the “host Member State,” (2) they do not “burden the

social assistance system” of said state, and have comprehensive health insurance.. (3) they are “enrolled in a private or public establishment” for “a course of study, including vocational training,” (4) or they are family related to “a Union citizen” satisfying the requirements of (1), (2), or (3) (European Commission 2010). In a recent European Parliament resolution in January 2014, the “right of free movement” of workers cannot be “associated” with “social aid programs” (welfare assistance programs). FMD article 7 provisions (1) and (2), are in part open to member-state interpretation, specifically regarding what constitutes ‘self-employment’, which definition is open to EU member state-centric legislation (Directive 2004/38/EC, 2004). Does this self-employment definition include Romani practices of traditional livelihood? This question also speaks to Article 45 of the Free Movement Directive, which prohibits free movement to persons employed in some not yet fully defined ‘public service employment’. This calls into question what defines ‘public service’, again within the context of Romani traditional livelihoods. The debate regarding Romani self-employment and public service is ongoing among (non)Romani Freedom of Movement rights advocates. For example, do Romani public performances of dance, song, and music, fit the ‘self-employed’, and ‘public service’ categories?

One of the more challenging European Commission directives (FMD) regarding Romani mobility between member states, is Article 27, limiting movement based on ‘public security’ and ‘public health’. Article 27 elicits non-Romani racialized, gendered, criminalized, and ‘contaminated’ subject ascriptions as constructions of Romani subjectivities. Non-Romani discourse actively legislates Romani as threatening to public security and public health. Article 27, which articulates freedom of movement

rights between internal EU member-state boundaries, relegates the interpretation of public security and health to the State, much like the UN Charter on the right to self-determination as a matter of state jurisdiction. Also, Article 27 and the freedom of movement, is framed in the language of non-discrimination within minority rights, as ‘crucial’, which EU/EC directive is based on ‘nationality’, as cited previously. The linkages between UN provisions regarding the right to self-determination, and EC directives on the right to free movement, collide within the international human rights category of ‘minority rights’. Public security, public health, free movement, and self-determination, remain in the jurisdiction of individual member-state assessment protocols and legislation. In other words, the international ‘human rights body’ undermines the very rights safeguards it aims to guarantee and protect. International human rights language provides the grammar of minority rights exception and omission, directly invigorating the State’s discourse practices with provisions of ‘territorial integrity’ and state autonomy ‘rights exceptions’. Though UN and EU non-intervention principles regarding the State, arise within the context of postcolonial ‘territorial integrity’ considerations (in response to colonial intervention in countries, justified as a humanitarian concern), the non-interventionist stance becomes problematic within the framework of ‘internally colonized’ people. Also, minority rights are based on nationality as a population of the State. This ‘nationality’ criterion removes the ‘group’ rights criteria for people, as ‘people’. The State decides people qualify as ‘people’ as an entire nation-state population, or as inhabitants ‘externally’ colonized. In this way, international rights articulations invoke and prompt logics of the ‘common sense’ community reifying normative social order, and reinvigorating the neocolonial of ‘who

gets to speak about what'. International rights discourse variably replicates hegemonies of cultural governance specific to public security, public health, public service, freedom of movement, and self-governance.

The EU 'minority rights', and 'freedom of movement' derives the 'nationality' identity criteria from the 1985 *Schengen Agreement*, signed in 1990, "of the Convention implementing that Agreement," with actual implementation in 1995, and applicable to over 400 million people. Initially, 'free movement' as a concept stems from economic interests between European nation-states, simplifying border controls and travel for workers. Though "it fell short of abolishing border controls," collaborative efforts between several European countries led to the signing of an agreement, in Schengen, Luxembourg. The Schengen Agreement and its implementation led to a gradual termination of shared-border control checks. However, "if there is a serious threat to public policy or internal security, a Schengen country may exceptionally, temporarily reintroduce border control at its internal borders for, in principle, a limited period of no more than thirty days." However, in doing so, "other Schengen countries, the European Parliament and the Commission should be informed, as should the public." The Schengen Area is currently comprised of "26 countries" (European Commission n. d.).

Returning to the aforementioned international human rights law relevant for minorities, I presented a summary of the non-discrimination provisions and analysis. I now turn to the special rights/measures provisions:

Special rights/measures are the second area of important rights for minorities that can be identified within international human rights law. [(UDHR, Article 26 and ICESCR, Article 13; Convention on the Punishment and Prevention of the Crime of Genocide (1948); UNESCO's Convention against Discrimination in Education (1962); CERD (1966); United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC,

1989); UNESCO's Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice (1978); and the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief (1981)] Few special rights can be interpreted out of general human rights law. Such are particularly elaborated in the minority-specific instruments where negative obligations of non-interference are supported by positive obligations for the state to ensure the effective realization of human rights for minorities through special measures [(UNDM, FCNM and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages)]. (Ravnbøl 2010, 14).

Intersectionality is omitted from international human rights law within minority rights provisions, including 'special rights and measures'. Romani human rights as minority rights and the UN 'Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) can be employed by Romani women as a litigation strategy and "legal instrument to redress the gender-based discrimination Romani women experience in society and also internally in their own communities that conflict with their individual rights as women" (Ravnbøl 2010, 24). However, negotiating between the disaggregated minority rights language, which is "gender-neutral," and discourse as either 'Romani' or 'women', is at best challenging, and serves to reinforce the separation of gender and race. "This criticism raises questions to whether the traditional separation in the international field of human rights between issues of gender and minorities in practice has become a gap that can isolate groups such as minority women from human rights attention." Furthermore, "where the Vienna Conference in 1993 underlined the doctrine of indivisibility and interrelation of all human rights, and where mainstreaming of gender and minority perspectives is increasingly an area of priority, it is rare that minority and gender issues are combined" (3). However, "special rights/measures [...] are supported by positive obligations for the state to ensure the effective realisation of human rights for minorities," in contrast to minority non-

discrimination “instruments where negative obligations of non-interference are supported...” (14). And special rights provisions emphasize cultural, “civil and political rights” in the areas “of education, language, culture, and religion.” International human rights law is written and implemented to protect primarily rights of the individual, and thus realized within a ‘group’. “However in some instances, direct group rights are established, notably in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) which also allows groups-communications under the complaint mechanism.” Yet “neither the Human Rights Committee (HRC) nor the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) have jurisdiction to decide on group complaints” (15).

‘Intersectionality’ as a methodological tool, conceptualized by Kimberlé Crenshaw (2017), is missing from (1) international human rights discourse (2) site-specific instantiations of Romani women’s resistance against rights abuses within their clans or communities (3) within Romani social movements. Crenshaw elaborates, “intersectionality is a lens through which you can see where power comes and collides, where it interlocks and intersects. It’s not simply that there is a race problem here, a gender problem here, and a class or LGBTQ problem there. Many times that framework erases what happens to people who are subject to all of these things.” She states, “I build on these observations here by exploring the various ways in which race and gender intersect in shaping structural, political and representational aspects of violence against women of color” (Crenshaw 2017). As the vectors of power, not limited to gender and race, “work together to create specific experiences for people in in the complexity of power relations,” gender and race do not “occur in isolation from each other (European Roma Rights Centre 2015). Crenshaw notes, “[a]lthough racism and sexism readily

intersect in the lives of real people, they seldom do in feminist and anti-racist practices” (Crenshaw 2017). Crenshaw expands on Patricia Hill Collins work by indicating “that multiple forms of oppression connect to form a ‘matrix of domination’ – just as identities overlap, so too do the hierarchies which structural power imbalance is maintained” (Crenshaw 1991). Crenshaw’s exposition on structural, political, and representational intersectionality is informed by Collin's conceptualization on hierarchies of domination. “Many Romani women activists criticize the international community, the global Romani movement and the global movement for not specifically addressing Romani women’s problems” (Ravnbøl 2010, 3). Moreover, Romani women also encounter oppression specific to their clan’s adherence to Romaniya patriarchal laws and practices:

For the greater part of the Romani community, the honour of the family is the most important thing, and the chastity and the purity of women is central to that honour. Public opinion is a very important part of the life of the Roma. To maintain a good public image, Romani parents exercise strict control over the girls of the family from an early age. (3).

Romani orthodox cultural practices of ‘virginity testing’ is bound to the bride’s and groom’s honor and the honor of their family. If the Romani bride does not pass the test, she is shunned by all and her community. An online article by *The Women’s International Perspective* describes if a Romani women loses her virginity before marriage, she will “pour animal blood on the bed after consummating her marriage.” The blood is proof of a ruptured hymen that was ‘intact’, an elastic, thin vaginal membrane that tears during sexual intercourse, and sometimes by a “fall” or “athletic activity.” “After the wedding, they will wait outside the bedroom all night and ask to see if there is blood on the bed sheet.” Without the proof of blood, “the husband’s family will return the disgraced bride to her family’s home.” To avert this situation, the

fiancé or her family request a physician's confirmation of her virginity. Romani women also undergo reconstructive plastic surgery - hymenoplasty, or hymen repair; a measure met to remain 'worthy' of the groom's affection and marital commitment (Myrzaeva 2011). Moreover, in non-Romani society, "Roma experience exclusion from health care" (Ravnbøl 2010, 6). For Romani women, this also limits access to (reproductive) health care by (1) site-specific discriminatory practices within public hospitals (e.g., limited birth-control methods and information, racial segregation in maternity wards, forced sterilization) (2) distrust of non-Romani medical interventions. Furthermore, Romani women experience exclusion from human and civil rights discourse, both within clan-specific Romani patriarchal codes/practices, and within international minority-rights policy. And representationally, Romani women are subordinated to the dictates of Romaniya for clan and family 'survival', and outside their communities within fragmented protection provisions of international minority rights.

One example of how the 'matrix' of marginalization operates, is how poverty is racialized, naming names such as 'dirty Roma', living in conditions without access to clean water and adequate waste disposal. And within some Romani communities, women bear an additional burden without access to clean water, in adherence to Romanipen 'purity codes' regulating women's bodies, 'hygiene', childbirth, and food preparation. Furthermore, the ascription of 'dirty' Romani woman, as gendered, sexualized, racialized, classed discourse practices, mobilizes patriarchal naming and shaming. 'Dirty' enacts assemblages, monitoring and coupling 'bodies' with sexual desire, and 'impurity' with nonconforming sexuality. Within Romani traditional cultural articulations as Romaniya, this includes virginity testing and its requirements.

Romaniya patrilineal regulatory codes are reinscribed by non-Romani (hetero) normative claims and specific faith-based beliefs. Informed in part by a Foucauldian analytic, the discourse on sexuality is based on relationships of power, interpersonally and publicly, and as part of the male gaze – “erotic ways of looking and spectacle” (Mulvey 1989, 14). The historicity of surveillance domains and control of ‘bodies’, evinces a continuum of developing cultural, institutional, regulatory ideals, and constructions of ‘sexuality’. One such locus of sexual regulation is deployed by religious authorities compelling “personal examinations of conscience” to verbal confessions (Wiesener-Hanks 2000, 6). Following the Foucauldian analytic, discourse practices regarding sexuality develop in part as modern-state apparatuses of biopower, deployed in the assessment/management of the ‘population’. Within this context of pervasive degradation, violence against Romani women, and human rights violations, I refer back to what mechanisms of control and domination ‘do’, how they affect/effect ‘people’, Ildi Guylas interarticulates her everyday life and lived experience.

In A Romani Women’s Anthology

“What is in a Name?”

Ildi Guylas

I moved to Canada when I was ten years old, excited and unaware that it was to become my new home. I loved my home – Eastern Europe, Hungary-the friends, the family, the comfort, the house, all of it. It was 1990, and communism was ending throughout the Eastern Bloc. Borders were opening, but the collective mind was slowly narrowing. Nationalism, pride and anti-other sentiments increased. I was not aware of any of it.

I tried connecting with the Toronto Roma community, but I was once told that I was not Roma enough because I did not speak the Romani language. I was crushed. It seemed that I was not Hungarian enough, not Roma enough, not Jewish enough, and also not Canadian enough. At the time, I did not understand colonialism or know that Hungary had outlawed the speaking of Romani. I hadn’t understood that my

lack of language was not my fault, nor had I the confidence to challenge the notion that I was not Roma enough.

Then one day, I was at my dorm room in university when a friend came to visit. We had a nondescript conversation that I cannot even recall, but I remember him referring to not being a “dirty Gypsy.” Like a stab through the chest, tension, flush, embarrassment, shock, shame, guilt. I retreated, yet again, from pride back to shame. (Gulyas 2017, Kindle).

‘Difference’ and the former Eastern Bloc

In speaking on the ‘subject’ of gender and neocolonial identity, Trinh T. Minh-ha states in an interview by Pratibha Parmar (1990) in the *Feminist Review*, “if one sees a fragment as being the opposite of the whole, then I have no affinities with the term... But if the fragment stands on its own and cannot be recuperated by the notion of a totalizing whole, then fragmentation is a way of living with differences without turning them into opposites, nor trying to assimilate them out of insecurity” (Parmar and Minh-ha 1990, 5). I think about the differences between selves, between the selves of women, between the selves as ‘woman’. ‘Difference’ is an epistemological model often entrapping the writer, the thinker, the viewer, and reader, in its positionality as an oppositional referent. Alternately, another form of critical analysis leads one to query if identity and difference is a process, and as such, continually diversifying and mobile as articulations of self-expression, of subjectivities. If so, as a process it resists what Minh-ha describes as a “nonunitary notion of subjectivity.” The self-reflexive question “is no longer: who am I - but *when, where, how* am I (so and so)?” (4). This contextually driven inquiry unsettles the question of ‘being’ this or that; it unsettles stable identity categories such as ‘Roma woman of Romanian national origin’. For example, census questionnaires regarding Romani self-identification based on national, racial, and ethnic

categories are often rendered ineffective, as measures for the purposes of census takers, global human rights workers, feminist activists, local, state, and regional policy officials. Persistently, questions regarding the Romani continue to be posed in homogenous terms as who are ‘they’, where do they belong to, how do we count ‘them’ and what do ‘we’ do with them? Since varying Romani affiliations are oriented by clan, family, and cultural practices, in large part for their survival due to current and historical persecution, questions regarding ‘nationhood’, and ‘race’ often do not apply. Romani subjectivities are mostly self-articulated as community members in a site-specific diaspora, by way of cultural practices and ethnic affiliations. However, if the questions of difference exceed static identity constructions, and are posed as questions of situated identity practices, as with practices of gender identity, ‘as woman’, or ‘as woman of color’, this linguistic repositioning articulates identities as becoming, mobilizing ‘selves’, forming coalitions along identity trajectories within encounter and event, as living daily experiences. This repositioning engenders a dynamic Minh-ha might consider “a point of redeparture for those of us whose ethnicity and gender were historically debased” (6).

Returning to the forced sterilization of Romani women within the context of Dr. Caselli’s interview documented in the film *Slovakia: The Sterilisation of Roma Women* (Journeyman Pictures 2003), his narrative presents Romani reproductive practices as a question of hygiene, which is inherently fixed and dependent on place and ethnically-based identity criteria. Caselli’s narrative ignores any considerations regarding the restricted access to the Bratislava hospital for Romani women, as well as access to advocate for their own reproductive health rights and education. Apparently, in his

perspective, access to, and situated control over informed decision-making regarding reproductive health by Romani women is not related to institutional and patriarchal barriers. Thus, 'woman' becomes constituted as categorically informed and hygienically childbearing, and within Caselli's narrative, reproductive practices are dependent on the Romani ascription, how 'developed' the Romani are, psychologically, socially and culturally. He juxtaposes these identity constructions in contrast to 'those' Roma living in the city near the proximity of the urban, White residents:

Hospital near Bratislava – March 2003.

Doctor Caselli: The Roma are different. The main difference is that the one from the settlements are very much behind the question of hygiene, social, cultural, and psychological development. Those from the cities are just like the whites. The ones who live in communes aren't interested in anything and don't attend school. They haven't developed the habit of basic hygiene.

Vilma: During my visit with the doctor, he turned his back. He said yuck, dirty Gypsy. He didn't want to touch me.

Doctor Caselli: They don't go to the prenatal clinic. They're sick and give birth to children like that. Take her to see the hydrocephaly case.

Vilma: They talk about my baby on financial terms. This is my eighth child. I don't have children for money. I asked the doctor (during her prenatal visit), do you think 270 crowns covers the cost of raising my child?

Head Pediatrician: (She points to the baby not expected to live more than a few months due to hydrocephaly.) This is the baby of a mother not yet 16. She didn't go to the prenatal clinic because she didn't want to. In the past, they had to go to the clinic a few times in order to get the childbirth and family allowance. Now they get it anyhow, so only a financial penalty would have an effect.

Journalist: Is there a solution that would allow women to take better care of themselves?

Head Pediatrician: A better approach, responsibility, and their maternal instinct (she points to herself) I don't know...the maternal instinct has to wake up inside of them.

Head Nurse: They are a degenerate race. They have sexual relations between brother and sister, father and daughter, mother and son and so on. It goes from one generation to another, and the latest one is degenerate. We have the impression that they keep making these children more and more for financial reasons because they might get extra family allowance. They segregate themselves. We've tried to put them together with white patients, but they refuse to be with them.

Jud Nirenberg: (NGO worker) I think we need to look at the problem when there are doctors and nurses who think that Roma aren't human beings. They don't think Roma are even mammals. Is there a mammal that lacks a maternal instinct? (Journeyman Pictures 2003).

Jud Nirenberg is an American. He works for the NGO, The Carpathian Foundation. This is his tenth year of employment. He lives in Slovakia. In the (2003) documentary he states, "it seems the state is more interested in punishing victims for having embarrassed Slovakia, for speaking out, than punishing people who misbehaved." Barbara Buckova's report on the forced sterilization of Romani women has engendered this government 'embarrassment'. Nirenberg adds, "I'm surprised the EU is as nonchalant as it is." A government spokesperson for the Ministry of the Republic of Slovakia is interviewed on the matter. He asserts, "our aims are to uncover the real truth in all this, and if we find a law has been broken, we will prosecute the persons responsible," and he continues, "fear mongering will not be tolerated in any way." In the meantime, the press publicity surrounding Ingrid's sterilization is met with resistance. The hospital Ingrid presses criminal charges against, including the doctor and nurses responsible for her sterilization, refuse to provide care for the Romani children in her village. If the children are brought to Emergency, they are turned away. As one Romani woman remarks, "they say we belong to Gelnica; they won't treat our kids" (Journeyman Pictures 2003).

In her interview, Minh-ha (1990) speaks of non-unitary and fragmented subjectivities as woman. This rearticulation of subjectivity by Minh-ha affords a point of entry into a counter-narrative that resists the unitary category of woman. If 'woman' is "essentialized as an end point, a point of 'authentic' arrival, then it only narrows the struggle down to a question of 'alternatives' that is, a perpetuation, albeit with a

reversed focus, of the notion of ‘otherness’ as defined by the master, rather than a radical challenge of patriarchal power relations” and other forces of subjugation (6). However, if for example the identity markers as Romani woman of the Slovak Romani clan are situated, identity is not necessarily a static referent, but is a becoming of everyday lived experience, specific to movement, to place, to time. In this way, difference becomes affirmations of identity, our ‘selves’, in place of a difference as negation, one that has to be fixed, recovered, assimilated, and unified. Perhaps difference is working through the selves, or as Rosi Braidotti (1994) states in *Nomadic Subjects*, “like the gradual peeling of old skins, the achievement of change has to be earned by careful working through; it is the metabolic consumption of the old that can engender the new. Difference is not the effect of willpower, but the result of many endless repetitions. Until we have worked through the multiple layers of signification of *Woman*—phallic as it may be—I am not willing to relinquish the signifier” (171). As a dynamic affirmation of working through the selves, ‘difference’ as a constellation of fluid identities self-diversifying within encounter and event, is constituted in part by contingencies specific to people, place, time, and movement. In this way, difference is continually (re)articulated as an assemblage of ‘selves’ within the framework of spatio-temporal configurations, and conditions of possibility. Historical and cultural sites (as place, as a genre) of identity practices, and subject articulations of intersectionality, continually re-inform the presencing of the past in oral ancestral history and personal narrative. This dynamic of ‘culture’ as ‘culturing’ speaks to site-specific narratives of Papis, verse as Romani historiography, poems, and songs as archives of gendered performativity. However, as such, her articulations of lived experience, of difference as

identity practices, talks back to difference as negation, and the coerced assimilation by cultural hegemonies.

Concluding Thoughts

Papusza's subject trajectories articulated as an oral and written chronicle evinces a cartography of patriarchal domination in her community, and andro- and state-centric violence. Forces of domination, coursing through movements of subject intersectionality, not limited to gender, sexuality, race, class, nation, and language, continually subordinate embodied identities, specific to encounter and event. The cultural intelligibility of violent acts against women in Romani communities is site-driven and discursively embedded. The intelligibility of violence in its singular and collective instantiations, its visibility and invisibility, exceeds regulatory static identification, and the juridical dispositif of control. Identity readily 'recognizable', facilitates varying articulations and practices of regulatory discourse, and cultural governance. Papusza's personal narrative and poetic identity articulations mobilize the acategorical of self-knowledge and 'central locus' of experience, as aesthetic (re)partitions of the sensible, as multiplicities of becoming. Her mobile, self-diversifying subject trajectories collide with and contest how hegemonic power does its work, both within and outside her Romani community.

Transformative Romani scholarship and activism, affected/effected by mobile subjectivities and aesthetic agency, supersedes the 'who' and 'what' questions of power. Romani interrogation of UN and EU human rights policy investigate juridico-political metanarratives constitutive of bureaucratic rights discourse, the omission of intersectionality, and reproductive-rights-language of 'birth control'. This discourse

analysis speaks to *how* the categories of ‘human rights’ and ‘minority’ are constituted within the broader framework of legal language. How does ‘mono-focal’ identity coding, and fixity, qualify ‘subjects of eligibility’ for UN or EU human rights protection clauses? In examining some of the relevant UN principles and EU provisions, I find, rights-protection clauses have limited authority to implement protection for collective/group rights within the context of State ‘territorial integrity’. And, international regulatory bodies function to a greater extent as regimes of human rights advocacy and ‘promotion’. Thus, human rights adjudication mobilizes rights protection to a greater extent on an individual case-by-case basis. Therefore, Romani activists are increasingly monitoring site-specific developments with a focus on the intersectionality of rights discourse and monitoring diversifying-trajectories of hegemonic power. Romani subject mobilization specific to space, place, and time, is critical both as an agency of self-determination and self-governance, as well as an agency of contestation to the mobilities of cultural hegemonies and mechanisms of control.

The forced sterilization of Romani women in Slovakia and subsequent critical inquiry interrogates the ‘anthropological perspective’ in its blind-eye complicity with violence perpetrated against women. As the analysis shifts from Romani activist forums to site-specific non-Romani majoritarian narratives at the Bratislava hospital, the perpetrators of forced sterilization invert the justifications of violence against women: from a state- and androcentric practice of violence, to violence perpetrated as legitimate, sanctioned practices on behalf of ‘Romani welfare’ and aid. ‘Culture’, within these instantiations of violent encounter and event, encompasses non-Romani ‘assessments’, defining Romani affiliations and traditional clan practices, and as coercive practices of

‘Romani birth control’. Patriarchal practices by non-Romani also racialize, ethnicize women’s reproductive rights within the social order of cultural governance. In this way, mechanisms of governance as bureaucratic and publicized discourse on ‘the Roma problem’, appears to replicate in state and regional human rights policy. As ‘woman’, diverse self-articulations/affiliations as identity practices, inform and are informed by the making and exchange of cultural-knowledge. Disavowal of this mobile subject trajectory appears to be an effective hegemonic practice of domination.

Chapter 5: Romani Community Practices and the State

How minorities are treated is the measure of democracy and social values as well as the condition of EU membership.

--Romani Rose

The Gypsies, Mrs. Hersh said, What culture have the Gypsies got?

No culture? Adam said, To hell with them.

--Raphael (1977)

Prologue

This chapter examines the discursive entanglements of migratory flows of ‘bodies’ and commerce, in relation to the hegemonic logic of neoliberalism, and site-specific Romani community practices of contestation in Germany to the Schengen Agreement. Romani subject encounters are also explored regarding human rights policy and implementation within the context of the European Union; the Council of Europe; and NGOs as Amnesty International and the European Roma Rights Centre. Further interrogation investigates the macropolitical implications in connection to capital markets and state membership eligibility, concerning the EU and IMF, in juxtaposition to Romani micropolitical encounter and event.

Introduction

In this chapter, the considerations above on migratory flows of ‘bodies’ and capital are investigated by critical, discursive intervention to normative institutional and statist regulatory practices. Specifically, this critical inquiry employs fieldwork; participant observation; document and discourse analysis. In the following, my inquiry evokes two alternating registers of analysis within the context of site-specific Romani community practices, contestations, and cooperative affiliations. The first register of analytical

inquiry examines sites of contestation by Romani transnational migrations, both political and economic, and how they relate to citizen-centric and EU policies, as well as NGO and Romani activist organizations. The second analytical register deploys Romani community encounter and event in site-specific juxtaposition to the hegemonic logic of neoliberal globalization or market fundamentalism.

The contextual terrain within which Romani communities encounter forced expulsion, persecution, and appropriations of cultural forms in capitalist systems by some EU leaders and citizens of member states exacts a spatio-temporal cartography of mobility. (Brown 2012b) Currently, the ‘unification’ of Europe, with the opening of borders, common European Union citizenship, and the common currency coexist with increasing internal fragmentation, and regionalism - as in the 2016 Brexit vote regarding Britain’s exit - alongside claims of post-national identity. “Micro”- and “hypernationalism,” right-wing nationalism, and ethnocentrism disrupt the ongoing European integration of ethnic diversity and ‘common democratic values’. “Sociological categories” such as “marginal”, and “migrants”, or “minorities”, are no longer adequate in the shifting landscapes of advanced capitalism, global diasporas, transnational flow of capital, and the emergence of alternate, multi-layered, mobilized subjectivities (Braidotti 2011, Kindle). Instead, subject (re)positioning of and by mobile subjects are continually articulated as self-reflexive, situated practices of contestation and contradiction. ‘Difference’ may no longer be articulated as ‘multiculturalism’, but instead difference emerges as an affirmative “transculturality” and “pluriethnic fragmentations within the same culture (Sassen quoted in Braidotti 2011, Kindle). In Deleuzian grammar, it is a “becoming minoritarian” process of Europe, as a way of both

bypassing the binary global or glocal fusion, and as a destabilizing of established definitions of Euro-centric hegemony in its construction of social, economic, and political collective identity (Gilles Deleuze quoted in Braidotti 2011, Kindle). The racializing of 'European identity' by some EU actors marginalizes Romani forms of cultural self-articulations and subjectivities by programmatic directives and policy administration. In some ways, it elides the increasing complexity of fractionated assemblages, affiliations between global capital exchange and intersecting alliances of trans-, post-national identities. However well-intentioned, EU agency posits itself as a regulatory and structural 'body' inhabiting an identity 'problematic'. Nevzat Soguk's analytic in *Globalizations* elucidates:

The insurrectional politics that migratory movements give rise to may not be centrally orchestrated nor ideologically articulated but they do collectively challenge citizenship and border regimes that are increasingly global and closely orchestrated. Migratory movements, for example, generate common narratives of the migrant experience that link diverse political struggles of refugees, asylum seekers, and undocumented workers despite their location in contexts within diverse geographic, cultural, and economic dimensions (Soguk 2015, 830).

Discursive Interventions

My ethnographic work regarding Romani practices and trajectories of social, political, and cultural economies of self-articulation employs fieldwork notes in Germany. However, as the information becomes relevant in the analysis regarding regional governance and EU policies, other national policy approaches and interests will be analyzed. In this way, to refrain from generalizations or broader determinations

regarding local, state, national, and regional interventions, my analysis is site-specific when situated to the larger queries regarding Romani subject and community practices. These questions are framed within the context of the Schengen Agreement, and the site-specific expulsion regarding Romani communities. Contextually relevant loci of contestation drive my investigations regarding site-situated articulations of subject trajectories such as gender, race, class, and nation. Unless otherwise indicated, the information I present is based on my field notes pertaining to the structural or institutional dynamic at given site visitations. I cite specific information regarding dates, names, quotations, and policy-based provisions. What follows is a brief introduction to the constitutional and ideological debates that currently inform developing situational contingencies regarding Romani human and civil rights debates in Germany.

Constitutional and Ideological Considerations

The Romani movement emerged in response to the extermination of 1.5 million Romani and Sinti in Nazi death camps. The Holocaust Museum in Heidelberg, Germany is located at the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma. It is also the site of the central office or *Zentralrat*, an activist and legal advisory board regarding Romani civil rights issues in Europe. I visited this site and had the opportunity in my conversations with those affiliated with the central office, to access information regarding constitutional and ideological considerations framing Romani ‘refugee’ debates in Germany. The *Zentralrat* has regional offices in other federal states or *Bundesländer*, except the participating regional offices in Hamburg and Lower Saxony. With the support from the Society for Endangered Peoples, the *Zentralrat* was

able to gain support politically and financially from the SPD under Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's Social Democratic Party in 1982 (Matras 1998, 56). During this period, the German Federal Government accepted responsibility for the Romani Holocaust.

This set in motion the establishment of Bundesländer government supported offices to address the reparation claims made by Romani Holocaust victims. It became the basis from which Romani activist organizations were mobilized and formed under the legal provisions of German national and legal identity. Other Romani activist groups and organizations in central and eastern EU member states were formed and based on socioeconomic issues, and grassroots efforts regarding site-situated Romani community initiatives. Individual Romani assistance requests based on material concerns and needs in German communities spawned further administrative coalitions and efforts by the Bundesländer affiliated offices. Organizational efforts are aimed at short and mid-term measures to improve the socio-political status of Romani communities, backed by financial and institutionally based structural support. The Zentralrat Romani activists work in cooperation with the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) based in Budapest, Hungary. Their cooperative affiliation is in part mobilized by former appeals to the European Union and European Commission on structural recognition, policy provisions and financial support for European regionally situated concerns. According to Robert Kushen, Director of the ERRC, formal appeals currently focuses on the educational segregation and institutional discrimination of Romani children (European Roma Rights Centre 2010). National and regional structurally based educational discrimination are further complicated by local Romani clan-based considerations such as linguistic differences within and between local communities. For example, Gigi (a pseudonym),

who identifies herself as a German Romani poet, from Romania, speaks a dialect specific to her clan affiliation in a community in Bucharest. She describes her linguistic practices and affiliations as a Creole based on her clan and Kalderasha dialect, and Romanian and German language attributions. She lives and works in Heidelberg in an administrative position at the university, and considers herself an “EU citizen of Romani descent and heritage” (Heidelberg field notes: June 15, 2011).

The contestation sites of Romani community practices and subject trajectories splinter into varying articulations of self-diversification and presents debates concerning local, national, and regional loyalties regarding Romani rights-based advocacy. In my conversation with an activist at the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma in Heidelberg, he describes himself as a Sinti, an affiliation and Romani dialect based on, but not restricted to “Germanophone soil” (Matras 1998, 70). He states that the goal of the Zentralrat is to assist “German Roma” (Heidelberg field notes, June 15, 2011). This nationality criterion has caused debate among other activist cooperatives as in Hamburg. I spoke by phone with an advocacy worker at the Roma National Congress. She like others requested I withhold her identity, apprehensive of jeopardizing their organizational efforts with other Bundesländer offices. She stated, “I think that excluding Roma requests based on national allegiance is very misguided. To tell my Rom sisters that I can’t help them is something I refuse to do. My efforts here formally and informally are daily, seven days a week; why should I limit my outreach based on German citizenship requirements?” (Berlin field notes, June 3, 2011). She identifies herself as “a stateless Kalderasha Rom with legal residency in Germany” (Berlin field notes, 2011). She immigrated to Germany from Russia over six years ago

and attained her 'legal' status with her brother's assistance, who is now a German citizen. She states that under the EU amended Schengen Agreement, providing 'freedom of movement' with an EU identity card or passport, German legal residency is easier to attain. Germany is part of the EEA (European Economic Area), differentiated for example, by the EFTA (European Free Trade Association). State membership in one EU organization does not necessitate nor grant membership in another. For example, Switzerland chooses singular EFTA member-state status under EU policy provisions. Germany however, has the full EU membership status, which under regional and German federal law expedites the granting of EU citizenship (Schengen Agreement 2017). As such, an individual who emigrates from an EU non-member state into an EEA member state is with immediate family affiliation and employment, student status, or other indices verifying self-sufficiency, eligible to become to become an EU citizen . After five years of self-sufficient or employed residency, Germany under its *Freizügigkeitsgesetz* (Berlin field notes, 2011) - a partial national implementation of EEA policy provisions (Schengen Agreement 2017) - grants permanent residency status to an individual applicant on a case-by-case basis (Berlin field notes, 2011).

The contestation sites of Romani membership eligibility within local, state, national, and regional parameters are interconnected with Romani geographic trajectories, community practices, and interarticulations. At issue in the debate central to the Zentralrat's advocacy focus on German Sinti, and Romani is continued federal government recognition and financial assistance, based on Romani advocacy efforts, and as victims and survivors of the Holocaust. Appeals for assistance from Romani diasporic immigrants, and socioeconomic refugees from the EU Balkan member states

and responsive local, national, and regional efforts led to the development of the pan-European identity. Divergent Romani community grassroots efforts to this effect arose from varied directions and ideological approaches. Within the German national context, this pan-European identity became engendered out of pragmatically located efforts (as in the Hamburg based Roma National Congress) to assist transnational economic and political Romani refugees from war-torn states, such as those of ‘Yugoslavia’ or ‘Czechoslovakia’. Within the context of the current situation regarding political and economic refugees from war-torn Syria, and North Africa, German federal assistance is made even less programmatically ‘available’ and accessible to Romani communities. EU economic and political integration efforts, alongside its own organizational and ‘mission-based challenges’ can be articulated as neglecting Romani communities and their integration advocacy concerns as a highly prioritized issue on the EU policy implementation agenda.

One such instance emerges in a 2009 Romani migration study within Italy, initiated by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The Council of Europe Report concludes, “the Roma and Sinti are still widely considered by Italian public to be a nomadic population, even though the majority of them have in fact been settled for a long time” (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2008, 13). This CoE report equates the ‘nomadic’ ascription as a public misconception of Romani ‘lifestyle choice’. This report neglects to mention that nomadic cultural practices are specific to Romani clan affiliations and livelihoods, and not to the country of residence. Therefore, due to public misconceptions and prevailing negative opinions regarding ‘nomadic’ Romani communities in Italy, the report notes that many Romani

have been placed in camps instead of gaining access to regular housing. Regional EU human rights discourse has addressed the Romani housing issue, such as article 3EHCR, which is based on the judgment by the European Court of Human Rights Grand Chamber in the case of *Cyprus v Greece*. “In particular, the court has established that if a population was condemned to live under debasing conditions which violated the very notion of respect for the human dignity of its members, such discriminatory treatment amounts to degrading treatment under Article 3 of the Convention” (Amnesty International 2010, 24). Despite further decisive language for various policy recommendations and review, as the “follow-up plan of its plan for the integration of Roma people”, adopted by a High Level pan-European Ministerial meeting in Strasbourg 2010, the call for urgent action by (former) EU Commissioner Viviane Reding may likely be tabled by other economic priorities. (Enterprise Europe Network 2011). Overshadowed by discussions on the Danube River, its transport of liquefied gas through “EU’s industrial core,” priorities as this often sideline ‘action’ regarding the implementation of Romani community rights discourse and practices. Despite the availability of 13 billion euros from the European Social Fund, between 2007 and 2013, to finance Romani housing and education programs, the European Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs, Laszlo Anders stated, “at the end of the day not much has really changed’ (Deutsche Welle 2010). “European Union efforts to integrate the Roma minority group has failed, according to a study by the EU’s Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA). “The FRA on Tuesday published results showing that eighty percent of Europe’s Roma were living below the levels designated as the poverty line in their countries of residence” (Deutsche Welle 2016). Exemplary of the Western policy

milieu, as well as the complexity of competing cosmologies and orders of social and political economies, alternate Romani community-based practices and rights-based coalitions (e.g., discussed previously within Hamburg and Heidelberg) may serve better the needs and concerns reflected by advocacy initiatives.

Further debate and questions remain as well over the use of regulatory discourse ascriptions and category ‘nomadic’ within existing EU human rights discourse on housing, which equivocates the term ‘nomads’ as an ethnic slur specific to Italian Romani communities, in order to substantiate appeals to rights claims for “regular housing” (Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights 2008, 13). The semiotic over-coding of state-centric subject eligibility discourse with membership rights language by the European Commission points to a critique leveled by the non-governmental agency, the European Roman Rights Centre. “Considering that the itinerant lifestyle is part of Roma identity, nondiscrimination in access to public housing as in principle imposed by Directive 2000/43/EC (Article 3 AS 1, h) should be understood as obliging the authorities to provide sufficient places for caravans.” The critique, “the Roma should be able to choose an itinerant or semi-itinerant lifestyle, even where there are justifications for country planning legislation, which in principle denies them stopping places for their caravans,” equates state-centered socioeconomic interests with ‘country planning’. (European Roma Rights Centre 2004). In some instances, it appears human rights discourse by the EU or NGOs confound socioeconomic interests with concerns of Romani ‘autonomous’ choice and community based cultural self-governance and practice. Implicated further in this dynamic of EU/EC administrative challenges is the dissolution of the former Soviet bloc countries,

as well as the territorial and administrative priorities of East German integration, still significant in 2018, regarding employment and housing (Lippert, Stevens-Strohmann, and Gunther 1993, 1-38).

Working outside of Germany's constitutional and state policy formulations, pan-European organizations such as the International Romani Union (IRU), and the World Romani Congress (the ninth since 2017), continue their community work across clan, local, state, national, and regional boundaries. Also, by seeking multilateral policy recognition and intervention from the Council of Europe and the United Nations, in part as political and financial support, pan-European practices/articulations of Romani diasporic, political integration dramatically diverged from the Zentralrat's appeasement of German federal immigration requirements (Matras 1998, 58). This ideological split is based in part on the argumentation "that there was no state in which the Roma were granted protection" (59). Germany's interarticulation of EU citizen rights by the Schengen Agreement for freedom of movement and 'gainful employment', is a site-situated, nationalistic coding of citizenship and ethnicity requirements. Such policy entanglements appear as systematically exclusive of the immigrant rights EU citizenship is stipulated to protect. Within the context of the aforementioned critical inquiry into Romani and state-centric sites of contestation, this is central to the debate of the EU rights narrative, EU member-state sovereignty and the integration of economically and politically displaced and marginalized peoples. As Nevzat Soguk states, "the truth claims as to the permanence of, naturalness, and self-evidence of the sovereign state (as the sole spatiopolitical site of life activities) and the citizen (as the sole proper subject of the state's political site) having been exposed, the task of

statecraft seems now much more difficult and much more contingent than ever before” (Soguk 1999, 43).

Pan-European advocacy efforts eventually won over the Zentralrat’s resistance against the ‘statelessness’ argument, convinced that it merely reinforced the ‘nomad’ Romani stereotypes and that it would whittle away its initial efforts to gain Romani and Sinti rights protection based on their minority status in Germany. However, increasing appeals for assistance by Romani transnational economic refugees from Eastern Europe, as well as increased calls for cooperative efforts between Bundesländer affiliates, resulted in the Zentralrat’s participation in pushing for international Romani rights resolutions (Heidelberg field notes, June 13, 2011). The founding of EUROM in 1990, as an international Romani community organization, structurally engaged the push for support of Romani rights by the United Nations Human Rights Commission in 1992, and one year later by the Council of Europe (Matras 1998, 61).

The Global Economic Crisis

In Brussels, September 14, 2010, then Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, stated, “let me be clear, discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin or race has no place in Europe, It is incompatible with the values on which the European Union was founded. National authorities who discriminate ethnic groups in the application of EU law are also violating the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, which all Member States have signed up to” (Reding, 2010, 2). Viviane Reding’s declaration does not mention discrimination against women, more specifically Romani women. In stark contrast and juxtaposition to Reding’s formal declaration, according to the 2010 Amnesty International Report on the

forced return of Romani to Kosovo: “Two young Romani men in their early 20s who had returned on the same plane from Germany in May of 2010, had been involuntarily taken from their homes in the early hours of the morning. On arriving in Kosovo, one had been given six months rent and financial assistance from the Organization for Migration, of 350 euro.” Another report states, “Florim an Ashkali man was returned to Kosovo from Germany in April of 2010. “I lived in Germany for 20 years. All my five children were born there and went to school there. I worked there until we didn’t have the right to work because of all the Germans that were unemployed. We were granted *Duldung* (tolerance) status. My wife and children were returned on 17 March 2010” (Amnesty International 2010, 19).

As such, the granting of *Duldung* status (relevant to the expulsion of the Romani men cited in the previous report) by German government officials is an example of site-situated enforcement of state-policy event. It is fraught with tensions that speak to the erosion of EU member-state sovereignty (within the contextual implementation of the Schengen Agreement) and the euro area counterweight, implemented as a logic of employment analysis and market-based values. The fraught and complex dynamic necessitates a closer examination of the larger contestations between ‘social democratic’ ideals, and the neoliberal globalization project, regarding the migratory flows of ‘bodies’ and commerce, as well as the varied ethnopolitical orders and spatio-temporal entanglements it engages. For example, one such development enacted within the political economy of the EU’s current debt crisis invokes a brief overview of counterweight eurozone/area measures employed by the European Central Bank. It raised interest rates in efforts to calm fears of further inflation in Germany, burdening

southern countries already struggling with debt. Some months later, the debt crisis escalated, exacerbated in part by governments' imprudent borrowing practices, and regulators who allowed banks to treat bonds as a no-risk proposition. Investors who did not make distinctions between bonds of troubled economies such as Greece further escalated the banking crisis. It became the new sub-prime and lured investors from the U.S. looking for what was considered a safe calculation. The 2008 financial crisis that struck global markets tested the efficacy of the euro area states and the EU to find counterweight measures to deal with the fiscal emergency. One response to address the crisis was a series of eurozone meetings, as EU leaders converged in the European Council to renew their single market commitments and stimulate recovery while maintaining public spending. An overhaul of the global financial system it was decided was desperately needed, and the G20 transferred 832 billion euros into the International Monetary Fund to assist those states (such as Greece and Italy) in need. Street protests erupted in response to more government-imposed austerity measures. In May of 2010, in response to the Greek situation, the EU and the IMF structure a financial assistance plan of 110 billion euros for a period of more than three years. Protestors in Greece, however, were not impressed, and now included the EU and IMF as protest targets. EU leaders leery of a domino effect that could include Portugal, Ireland, Italy, and Spain, in addition to Greece, opted for the bailout plan. If Greece left the euro area it is feared, the EU and the U.S. economies would feel the aftershocks (Bache 2011, 217).

The Greek economic crisis is pertinent to emergent EU member states such as Kosovo (not yet fully recognized as a state by all EU member states) and developing countries. Its post-war economy is too weak to meet the immediate public assistance

and human welfare needs of Syrian, and North African refugees, let alone Romani expelled from Germany. It also places states on notice which are in the planning phases meeting EU requirements to gain entry as member states. European Union membership is not necessarily a panacea for economic ‘integration’ such as Greece, as it contends with new leadership; partial shutdowns of state and city services, and debates of self-determination outside the euro area. Hans-Peter Friedrich, former Federal Minister of the Interior in Germany, states in a television interview “within this European solidarity, it is necessary for the individual country to first face its responsibility.” Angela Merkel’s German coalition government is becoming increasingly unpopular (having since dissolved and in March 2018 regained ‘coalition’ status), specifically, her “CDU led-coalition” which lost the election in Baden-Württemberg, a state known for its consistent conservative Christian Democratic support since 1952 (Kulich 2011). The German electorate appears to be quick to anger in matters considered to be the fiscal and ‘shared’ responsibility of other EU member states. This sense of indignation, however, does not seem to resonate regarding forced Romani deportations. “In this renationalization of European countries, and the rise of ethnonationalism, governments are very careful toward new migration flows,” states Catherine de Wenden, Director of Research at the Center of International Studies in Paris. “At the same time, this is contradictory with liberal European models and the needs of the labor force in most European countries” (Kulich 2011). However, in the wake of terrorist attacks in several European cities, exploited by right-wing populist parties, ethnonationalists and neo-fascists are gaining alarming strength in EU member states, with Germany’s AfD (Alternative für Deutschland) securing 13.3 % of seats in the German Federal

Parliament – *Bundestag* (Clarke 2017).

Berlin Field Notes

In my attempts to inquire about the forced expulsion procedures of ‘Duldung (tolerance) status’ Romani in Neuköln, Berlin, I was asked by a police precinct officer if I wanted to file a complaint. I expressed my inquiry be based on questions of ‘procedure’, and was informed unless I wanted to file a formal complaint, no further assistance was necessitated (Berlin field notes, May 23, 2011). Two days later, I visited the Ministry of the Interior in Berlin and was denied access to the building. I presented my U.S. passport at the entrance checkpoint and was asked about the reason for my visit. I introduced myself, and my dissertation work and purpose. I was informed unless I had a specific reason, my access would be denied. I inquired if I could schedule an appointment with someone there regarding “matters of public inquiry.” I was denied, however, registration for a guided-group tour was possible. I made a follow-up phone call requesting by name to speak to an entry-level official. I was asked the phone-extension number. I had no such number and again was denied access (Berlin field notes, May 25, 2011).

On the following day, after several repeated unsuccessful attempts to contact a Ms. Rosenberg by phone at the Romani Union in Berlin, I visited the office located on Kyffhäuserstrasse. The office had been vacated. After various inquiries regarding a forwarding address to no avail, I received assistance from an art gallery director in an adjacent space. I gave him the phone number associated with the present location. There was no answer. He subsequently contacted the building landlord, who also had no information to provide (Berlin field notes, May 26, 2011). This lack of information

pattern persisted as I visited the EU/EC offices in Berlin's city center the following week. I asked for information regarding their knowledge on the Duldung status deportations of German Romani. I was given a bulky packet and quickly returned to my hotel (Berlin field notes, May 31, 2011). The packet included data analysis on topics titled 'Dynamic Progress' and 'Globalized and Interdependent'. It contained various glossy brochures and pamphlets with member-state per capita wealth and income distributions and information regarding the European Union that states: "The EU acts out of enlightened self-interest just as much as global solidarity. On an increasingly interconnected planet, supporting economic development and political stability in the wider world is an investment in one's future" (European Commission 2007). I pivot here to turn to a critical intervention by juxtaposition with two additional document citations.

The first document, the OSCE (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) report from the office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities, October 2010 states:

The Schengen Borders Code also provides for the abolition of intra-Member State border controls. Under this provision, no controls are permitted at EU internal borders (Article 21). Police checks within the territory of a state are permitted, but they must: not have border patrols as an objective; be based on general police information and experience regarding possible threats to *public security* [emphasis is mine], and aim to combat cross-border crime. The checks must be devised and executed in a manner distinct from systematic checks on persons and only be carried out as spot checks (Cahn and Guild 2010, 28).

In the context of recent events regarding Syrian refugees entering Europe, and xenophobic articulations as 'public security' concerns, EU border 'provisions' are site-specifically ignored; for example, with the installation of razor-wire fencing guarded by

soldiers along the border of Italy and Austria (Baczynska and Ledwith 2016). The compromised ‘freedom of movement’ provision is now implemented as a renewed form of border control for EU citizens and non-citizens. The second document, the Official Journal of the European Union: Directive 2004/38/EC of The European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 states:

Expulsion of Union citizens and their family members on the ground of public policy or public security is a measure that can seriously harm persons who, having availed themselves of the rights and freedoms conferred on them by the Treaty, have become genuinely integrated into the host Member State. The scope for such measures should, therefore, be limited in accordance with the principle of proportionality to take account of the degree of integration of the persons concerned, the length of their residence in the host Member State, their age, the state of health, family and economic situation and the links with their country of origin.” (Directive 2004/38/EC, 28)

EU documentation and Romani community/activist articulations attest to sites of contestation and contradiction. Ongoing violence against the Romani diaspora is manifest in the destruction of Romani camps on the outskirts of many cities, including Paris and Lyon. Both President Hollande like his predecessor Sarkozy, orders the expulsion and deportation of ‘illegal’ Romani and the Élysée Palace confirms legislation to ensure the process “for reasons of public order” (Saltmarsh 2010). Thus, a European Roma Rights Centre report asks, “Will Macron Turn the Tide on Roma Evictions?” (European Roma Rights Centre 2017). The ERRC states:

The latest report on France’s policy of forcibly evicting Romani families was released today... [10 August 2017] It shows concerning evidence of France continuing to systematically evict Roma regardless of the so-called Equality and Citizenship law which came into force on 27th January 2017 and applied a ‘winter truce’ on the dismantling of makeshift housing, as well as an extension of deadlines for proceeding with evictions. We want to stay here during the winter because we have children. Please, let us stay here until March-April, we have nowhere to go... We are families who want to integrate; we want to find a job, to enroll our

children in school, to have a better life, not live in misery.” – said [Romani] inhabitants of Boulevard Ney, Paris in an open letter to authorities on 23rd January. (European Roma Rights Centre 2017)

To maintain ‘public order’, then Interior Minister Brice Hortefeux under President Sarkozy states, “he would use decrees to dismantle about 300 illegal camps, of which 200 belong to Romani, citing such camps as the source of illicit trafficking, children exploited for begging, prostitution or delinquency.” Furthermore, “those in France illegally or who have committed public order offenses will be sent ‘almost immediately’ back to their countries of origin without the possibility of returning [...] promising the use of digital fingerprinting technology toward this end.” Countering such claims, Le Ligue des Droits de l’ Homme states the government is “mixing up the situation of European Roma with the Travelers who have French nationality,” and “as a result of a few cases, are developing the idea that there is an ethnic solution to the problem of delinquency” (Saltmarsh 2010). Romani activist organizations are monitoring, and awaiting President Emmanuel Macron and his centrist party’s response to Romani community appeals. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights; the International Convention on the elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination, and other international human rights interventions and directives appear within these site-specific instantiations to lack an agency of policy implementation.

Concluding Thoughts

Often recalcitrant to the integration projects of late modernity and the market fundamentalism of neoliberal globalization, Romani community practices are mobilized along and within interstitial spaces of bio- and geopolitical demands. Romani identity practices and trajectories confound further considerations regarding their integration

into the market economy. Incongruent with the ethico-political appeals and treatment of migrant labor by NGOs, EU/EC, and the UN, community advocacy efforts by and on behalf of many site-situated Romani communities, presents an open-ended endeavor. Such contingencies of encounter and event and conditions of possibility, recruit specific articulations and embodiment as Romani community and cultural practices. The situated specificity of spatio-temporal contingencies, mobilize discursive community practices and economies regarding Romani mobile subjectivities. Many traditional 'ways of life' and agency are mediated, disrupted or lost to demands of immanent conditions of physical, economic, social, and cultural survival. As such, this dynamic often engenders the conceits of regulatory, institutional ideals and mechanisms, marginalizing Romani community practices. Romani subject trajectories that are articulated as varying practices of family coherence, traditional gender roles, specific clan allegiance and self-designation, oral ancestral narratives, performance, and trade craftsmanship, is ascribed within the hegemony of neoliberal logic, as anachronistic and nonconforming. This ascription engenders further critical provocations regarding discriminatory objectification of Romani identity practices (e.g., uneducated, dirty, thieves, lazy) and gestures towards objectified identity markers and meta-applicable indices of state-membership eligibility.

The politics of global, regional, national, state and local capture of subject membership (e.g., EU; IMF; UN) unfold as contentious debates of constitutional and ideological primacy. The liberal left of Western democratic ideals of freedom, human rights, a globalized free flow of commerce and movement of 'bodies', counters and substantiates the further radicalization of right-center regimes, in and by tighter

centrifugal privileging of regional, national, and ethnocentric fervor. The primacy of Western and Eurocentric rights and democracy discourse over-codes the habitus of locally embodied, situated economies of encounter and event. The global ‘democratization’ of technology, and increasing access to digital modalities of varied economies of exchange, confounds further socio-economic interests, with abstractions of ‘freedom’ in relation to autonomous agency and choice. “In so far as neoliberalism values market exchange as ‘an ethic in itself, capable of acting as a guide to all human action and substituting for all previously held beliefs’, it emphasizes the significance of contractual relations to the marketplace” (Harvey 2005, 3). It directly calls into question the increased criminalization of poverty in Romani communities, the erosion of the welfare state, and rifts various competing cosmologies of (de) legitimating constructions of subject eligibility. Paradoxically, the socio- and ethico-political orders of subject and community intelligibility, as static productions of transnational and state-centric discourse and practices, pronounce the tenuous and destabilized ‘status’ of embodied ‘subject sovereignty’. In *Reading Adam Smith: Desire, History, and Value*, Michael J. Shapiro states, “the European Union and increasingly, the state-as-coherent-actor or unitary entity has been destabilized as various ‘subnational’ or tribal and ethnic groups have asserted desires to reoccupy old sovereignties that preexist the current geopolitical map” (Shapiro 2002, 31). I close with a poem by Leska Manuš (Latvia):

The Roads of the Roma

Each night, my God, as I close my eyes,
I see before me the roads of the Roma.

But where, my God, is the long-lost road,
the one true road, the one first-travelled?

The countries of Europe are riddled
with roads: across Russia and Poland,
Lithuania, and Latvia they weave,
They criss-cross Scandinavia,

These are roads I roam each night,
in search of the one true road,
the road the travellers first travelled,
the road of my Romani forebears.

Through Germany and the Balkan hills
of Hungary and Romania I wander,
reaching the land of that ancient empire,
Byzantium. In centuries gone by,

the Roma migrated here, lived cheek by cheek
with Greeks, Jews, Slavs, and Turks.
They live here still, still poor and plotless,
Travellers from some distant land.

From Europe I follow the roads of the Roma
into the orient: to Armenia and Iran where
the Sassanids once ruled, and before them
the Achaemenids. From here the road leads

to another land where the Indus-river flows
to the land where the Kushans once held sway:

This was called Gandhara, or Roma-land, here lay
the estates of the Sindhu, where our elders walked,

performing great works in sunlit fields.

Farther my road does not go; it only
goes backward into time, diving deep into
the centuries. Here, five thousand years ago,
was a land of thriving towns, Harappa

and Mohenjo-Daro among them, a land whose peoples
lived as peers, the place where our travels
began. Everything started here. What used to be
and what will converge at this point: at the end

of that first Romani road lies the fate of my people.
(Manuš in Hancock, Dowd, and Djurić 1998, 24-25).

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2013. "Do Muslim Women Need Saving?" Harvard University Press. October 10, 2013.
- _____. 2013. Do Muslim Women Need Saving? Interview. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uYAM7gMEd1g>.
- _____. 2013. "Do Muslim Women Need Saving? The Western Crusade to Rescue Muslim Women Has Reduced Them to a Simplistic Stereotype." *Time*. November 1, 2013. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honor_killing.
- Acton, Thomas, Susan Caffrey, and Gary Mundy. 2001. "Theorizing Gypsy Law." In *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, edited by Walter O. Weyrauch, 88-116. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Alisch Johannes, Marc Bickel, Serene Liu, and Sandra Müller. dir. 2009. *Rom Som: Lebenswirklichkeiten von Sinti und Roma*. Mannheim, Germany: Education and Antiziganism Research GmbH.
- Alvarez, J. F. 2016. "A Peaky Blinders Review: Romany Culture and Tommy Shelby's Otherness." *A Peaky Blinders Fangirl Archive/Blog*. <https://apeakyblindersfangirl.com/my-peaky-blinders-blog/peaky-blinders-review-romany-culture-displacement-faith-or-why-does-tommy-need>.
- Amnesty International. 2010. *Not Welcome Anywhere: Stop the Forced Return of Roma to Kosovo*. London: Amnesty International Publications.

- _____. 2011. *I'm a European Roma Woman*. Mundiromani. Video. 3:52. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mI_RWXwbFqI.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 2001. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*, edited by Simon During, 220-230. New York: Routledge.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1992. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Edited by Ronald Beiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Auer, Alpha. 2015. "Chronotope." *Snippets, Quotes and Ideas*. <https://snippetsquotesandideas.wordpress.com/2015/08/13/chronotope/>.
- Bache, Ian, Simon Bulmer, Stephen George, and Owen Parker. 2011. *Politics in the European Union*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baczynska, Gabriela, and Sara Ledwith. 2016. "How Europe Built Fences to Keep People Out." *Reuters*, April 4, 2016. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-europe-migrants-fences-insight/how-to-keep-people-out-idUSKCN0X10U7>.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination*, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. 84-258. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Balazova, Jarmila. 2000. "Religion among the Roma." *Roma in the Czech Republic*. <http://romove.radio.cz/en/clanek/18906>.
- Baltic Worlds. 2015. "Papusza: The Story of a Polish Roma Poet." <http://balticworlds.com/papusza/>.

BBC. 2011. "Dale Farm: Evictions 'Can Go Ahead' but Injunction Remains." October 3, 2011. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-essex-15153060>.

_____. 2012a "Merkel Opens Roma Holocaust Memorial in Berlin." <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-20050780>.

_____. 2012b "Vigilantes Burn Roma Camp in Marseille, France." <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19756468>.

_____. 2017. "Wickford Residents Fear Dale Farm II is Underway." March 7, 2017. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-essex-39195455>.

Bell, Jeffrey A. 2009. *Deleuze's Hume: Philosophy, Culture and the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bersani, Leo, and Ulysse Dutoit. 2004. *Forms of Being: Cinema, Aesthetics, Subjectivity*. London: BFI.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

_____. 2004. "Introduction: Narrating the Nation. In *Nation and Narration*, edited by Homi K. Bhabha, 1-7. New York: Routledge.

Black Madonna. 2014. "Today Roma Honor the Goddess-Saint Kali Sara." *Gypsyrepresent: Thinking Critically about Romani Representation in Pop Culture*. <https://gypsyrepresent.wordpress.com/tag/the-black-madonna/>.

Brah, Avtar. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora: (Gender, Race, Ethnicity)*. London: Routledge.

Braidotti, Rosi. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects; Embodiment and Sexual Difference*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 2006. *Transposition: On Nomadic Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

_____. 2007. "Bio-power and Necro-politics." Published as "*Biomacht und nekro-Politik.. Überlegungen zu einer Ethik der Nachhaltigkeit.*" In *Springerin, Hefte für Gegenwartskunst*. Band XIII Heft2:18-23.

http://www.academia.edu/854914/_Bio_Power_and_Necro_Politics_.

_____. 2011. "Nomadic European Citizenship." In *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Braidotti*. New York: Columbia University Press. Kindle.

Bronislaw Wajs. n.d. Last modified September 2, 2017.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bronis%C5%82awa_Wajs.

Brown, Bettina J. 2011. Field Notes: Ethnography, May 9 to June 22. *The Romani in Germany*.

_____. 2012a. "Roma Community Practices as Subject Encounters with State-Policy Events." *Journal of Community Positive Practices*. Catalactica NGO. no. 2: 156-169. ISSN 1582-8344 (printed version); ISSN 2247-6571 (electronic version).

_____. 2012b. "*Roma Rising: The Genre Aesthetic and Mobile Subjectivities of Rom Som.*" GSO Conference Paper Call, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Bunescu, Ioanna. 2016. *Roma in Europe: The Politics of Collective Identity Formation*. London: Routledge.

- Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1999. *Subjects of Desire: Hegelian Reflections in Twentieth Century France*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____. 2006. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2015. *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cahn, Claude. 2000. "Nexus: Domestic Violence, Romani Courts and Recognition." European Roma Rights Centre. <http://www.errc.org/article/nexus-domestic-violence-romani-courts-and-recognition/644>.
- Cahn, Claude and Elspeth Guild. 2010. "Recent Migrations of Roma in Europe." *Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe*. <https://www.osce.org/hcnm/78034?download=true>.
- Candea, Matei. 2016. "Arbitrary Locations: In Defense of the Bounded Field-site." In *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*, edited by Mark-Anthony Falzon, 25-46. London: Routledge.
- Cawley, Laurence. 2016. "Dale Farm Evictions Five Years On." *BBC News*, October 19, 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-essex-37628558>.
- Chandler, Daniel. 2017. *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge.

- Chubin, Fae. 2017. "Sisterhood in the Age of Imperialism: Women's Movements Engaging in Transnational Activism in Postcolonial Muslim Societies of MENA." In *The New Global Politics: Global Social Movements in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Harry E. Vanden, Peter N. Funke, and Gary Prevost. 128-139. New York: Routledge.
- Citizens Information. n.d. "Freedom of Movement in the EU."
http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/moving_country/moving_abroad/freedom-of-movement_within_the_eu/freedom_of_movement_in_the_eu.html.
- Citton, Yves. 2009. "Political Agency and the Ambivalence of the Sensible." In *History, Politics, Aesthetics Jacques Rancière*, edited by Gabriel Rockhill and Philip Watts, 120-139. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Clarke, Sean. 2017. "German Elections 2017: Full Results." *The Guardian*. September 25, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2017/sep/24/german-elections-2017-latest-results-live-merkel-bundestag-afd>.
- Clift, Elayne. 2005. "Gender Lens on Gypsies." *Boloji*.
<http://www.boloji.com/index.cfm?md=Content&sd=Articles&ArticleID=5624>.
- CNN World. 2010. "Burned Girl a Symbol of Roma Hate and Hope."
<http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/...index.html>.
- Coates, Ta-Nehisi. 2017. Foreword to *The Origin of Others*, by Toni Morrison, vii-xvii. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cockcroft, Barry. 1979. *A Romany Summer*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.

- Connolly, William E. 2011. "The Vicissitudes of Experience." In *A World of Becoming*, 43-67. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Coole, Diana, and Samantha Frost. 2010. "Introducing the New Materialisms." In *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, edited by Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, 1-46. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Corcoran, Steven. 2010. Editor's Introduction to *Dissensus*, by Jacques Rancière, 1-24. London: Continuum.
- Corradi, Laura. 2018. *Gypsy Feminism: Intersectional Politics, Alliances, Gender and Queer Activism*. New York: Routledge.
- Council of Europe. 2010. "The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma." *Ministers' Deputies CM Documents*. http://unipd-centrodirittiumani.it/public/docs/the_strasbourg_declaration_on_roma.pdf.
- _____. 2012. "Segregation of Roma Children." *Human Rights of Roma and Travellers in Europe*. 1-25 Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
http://www.coe.int/t/commissioner/source/prems/prems79611_GBR_CouvHumanRightsOfRoma_WEB.pdf.
- _____. 2014. *Strategy on the Advancement of Romani Women and Girls (2014-2020)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 1-12.
<file:///C:/Users/Bettina/Documents/Prems%20155214%20GBR%201490%20StrategyAdvancementRomaniWomenAndGirls%20WEB%20A5.pdf>.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color."
<https://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/mapping-margins.pdf>.

- ____. 2017. "Intersectionality More than Two Decades Later."
Columbia Law. <http://www.law.columbia.edu/news/2017/06/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality>.
- Crowe, Cameron, dir. 1996. *Jerry Maguire*. Los Angeles: Gracie Films, Vinyl Films, December 6, 1996. Motion Picture.
- Čvorović, Jelena. 2010. *Roast Chicken and other Gypsy Stories: Oral Narratives Among Serbian Gypsies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH Internationaler Verlag Der Wissenschaften.
- Dangerous Women Project. 2016.
<http://dangerouswomenproject.org/2016/06/05/romani-women/>.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1983. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Michael Hardt. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ____. 1986. *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ____. 1991. *Empiricism and Subjectivity: An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*. Translated by Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ____. 1990. *The Logic of Sense*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas. Translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ____. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

- ____. 2003. *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Translated by Daniel W. Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze Gilles, and Felix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ____. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deutsche Welle. 2010. "EU Searches for Answers in Roma Integration Debate." <https://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0..6107407.00html?maca=en-rss-en-all-157-rdf>.
- ____. 2016. "Report: EU Failing to Integrate Roma." <https://www.dw.com/en/report-eu-failing-to-integrate-roma/-a-3657418>.
- Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament. 2004. *Official Journal of the European Union*. EUR-Lex. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/oj/direct-access.html>.
- Downey, Anthony. 2013. "Exemplary Subjects: Camps and the Politics of Representation." In *Legal, Political, and Philosophical Perspectives*, edited by Tom Frost, 119-142. London: Routledge.
- Duffy, Claire. 2016. "TV News: Cillian Murphy Lived with Gypsies to Prepare for New Drama *Peaky Blinders*." *entertainment.ie*. <http://entertainment.ie/tv/news/Cillian-Murphy-lived-with-gypsies-to-prepare-for-new-drama-Peaky-Blinders/211674.htm>.

Dugan, Emily, and Chris Green. 2015. "Settled Gypsies Could Be Forced Back on the Road by New Planning Laws: Travellers Must Prove They Are Itinerant to Stay on Sites." *The Independent*. September 19, 2015.
<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/settled-gypsies-could-be-forced-back-on-to-the-road-by-new-planning-laws-10509414.html>.

Egner, Jeremy. 2017. "'Peaky Blinders': The Disparate Ingredients of a Cult Hit." *New York Times*. December 21, 2017.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/21/arts/television/peaky-blinders-netflix-bbc-cillian-murphy.html>.

Enterprise Europe Network. 2011. "Hungarian d. Foreign Minister, 2011 EU Chair Ivan Baba to EuroFora on EU Priorities: Economy and Danube."
<https://eurofora.net/newsflashes/news/hungarianeu2011chair.html>.

Epstein, Daniel Z. 2014. "Rationality, Legitimacy, and the Law." *Washington University Jurisprudence Review* 7. no. 1: 1-39.
https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1103&context=law_jurisprudence.

European Commission. 2007. "Soft Power." *The EU in the World: The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Brussels. Directorate-General for Communication.

_____. 2010. "Common Staff Working Document: Free Movement of Workers in the Public Sector." *Europa – EU*. Brussels. file:///C:/Users/Bettina/Documents/COMM_working_document_free_movement_public_sector_EN.pdf.

_____.n.d. "Schengen Area." *Migration and Home Affairs*. Last modified October 4, 2018. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen_en.

European Roma Rights Centre. 2004. "EU Experts Recommend Directive on Roma Integration: European Union Network of Experts in Fundamental Rights Calls for Roma Integration Directive. <http://www.erc.org/cikk=1921>.

_____. 2007. "Anti-Romani Speech in Europe's Public Space: The Mechanism of Hate Speech." www.errc.org/article/...2912.

_____. 2010. "Europe's Highest Court Rules Roma School Segregation by Language Illegal." <https://errc.org/article/europes-highest-court-rules-roma-school-segregation-by-language-illegal/3569>.

_____. 2015. "Roma Rights 2: Nothing about us without us? Roma Participation in Policy Making and Knowledge Production." <http://www.errc.org/roma-rights-journal/roma-rights-2-2015-nothing-about-us-without-us-roma-participation-in-policy-making-and-knowledge-production>.

_____. 2017. "Will Macron Turn the Tide on Roma Evictions? New Report Shows Thousands of Roma Made Homeless in 2017." <http://www.errc.org/article/will-macron-turn-the-tide-on-roma-evictions-new-report-shows-thousands-of-roma-made-homeless-in-2017/4592>.

Evans, Brad, and Gayatri Spivak. 2016. "When Law is Not Justice." *New York Times: Opinion Pages*, July 23, 2016. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/13/opinion/when-law-is-not-justice.html>.

Fejzula, Sebijan. 2015. "Muslim Romani Women's Experience Must Be Intersectional." *Romalitico Policy Analyses*. <http://romalitico.org/new/index.php/content/item/51-muslim-romani-women-experience>.

- Ferguson, Kathy E. 1984. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- _____. 1993. *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Fichtner, Ullrich. 2010. "Driving out the Unwanted: Sarkozy's War Against the Roma." *Spiegel Online*. September 15, 2010. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/driving-out-the-unwanted-sarkozy-s-war-against-the-roma-a-717324.html>.
- Fonesca, Isabel. 1995. *Bury Me Standing: the Gypsies and Their Journey*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge: And the Discourse on Language*. Translated by Alan M. Sheridan-Smith. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1977. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard. Translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. New York: Cornell University.
- _____. 1980. "Two Lectures." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Writings 1972-1977*, edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. 2010. *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Vintage Books.

- French, Lorely. 2015. *Roma Voices in the German-Speaking World*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Gasché, Rodolphe. 1987. "Reading Chiasms: An Introduction." In Andrzej Warminski, *Readings in Interpretation: Hölderlin, Hegel, Heidegger*, ix-xxvi. Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press.
- Gatlif, Tony, dir. 1997. *The Crazy Stranger - Gadjó Dilo*. Paris: CNC, Princess Films, and Canal+, August 17, 1998. Motion Picture.
- _____.dir. 2009. *Korkoro*. Paris: France 3, March 25, 2011. Motion Picture.
- Glass, James. 1997. M. *Life Unworthy of Life: Racial Phobia and Mass Murder in Hitler's Germany*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goodwin, Morag. 2004. European Roma Rights Centre. "The Romani Claim to Non-Territorial Nation States: from an International Legal Perspective."
<http://www.errc.org/roma-rights-journal/the-romani-claim-to-non-territorial-nation-status-recognition-from-an-international-legal-perspective>.
- Grover, Sonja C. 2010. *The European Court of Human Rights as a Pathway to Impunity for International Crimes*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Guardian. 2011. "Dale Farm Evictions – Wednesday 19 October 2011."
<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/blog/2011/oct/19/dale-farm-evictions-live>.
- Gulyas, Ildi. 2017. "What is in a Name?" *A Romani Women's Anthology*, edited by Hedina Tahirović-Sijerčić and Cynthia Levine-Rasky. Toronto: Inanna Publications And Education. Kindle.

Gypsy Lore Society. 2018. <http://www.gypsy/loresociety.org>.

Hancock, Ian. 1998. *The Roads of the Roma*, edited by Ian Hancock, Siobhan Dowd, and Rajko Djurić, Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

_____. Siobhan Dowd, and Rajko Djurić. 1998. "Up the Chimney," by Charlie Smith. In *The Roads of the Roma*, edited by Ian Hancock, Siobhan Dowd, and Rajko Djurić. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

_____. 2010. *We are the Romani People: Ame sam e Rromane džene*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

_____. 2014. "Ian Hancock: 500,000 Romani Holocaust Victims? There Could Have Been Twice That." Prague: ROMEA. <http://www.romea.cz/en/news/world/ian-hancock-500-000-romani-holocaust-victims-there-could-have-been-twice-that>.

Harding, Sandra. 2016. In Joey Sprague, *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers: Bridging Differences*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heinschink, Mozes F., and Michael Teichmann. 2003. "The Stojka Family." *Rombase*. Graz, Austria. <http://www.rombase.uni-graz.at/cgi-bin/art.cgi?src=data/pers/stojkas.en.xml>.

Hinderliter, Beth, William Kaizen, Vered Maimon, Jaleh Mansoor, and Seth McCormack. 2009. Introduction to *Communities of Sense: Rethinking Aesthetics and Politics*, edited by Beth Hinderliter, William Kaizen, Vered Maimon, Jaleh Mansoor, and Seth McCormack, 1-28. Durham: Duke University Press.

Honor Killing. n.d. Last modified April 4, 2018.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honor_killing.

Horátová, Agnesa 2005. In Chad Evans Wyatt, *Roma Rising: Romske Obrozeni*: Praha: Argo.

Horváth, Mária, dir. *The Gypsy Woman and the Devil*. 2014. Video, 7:32. July 18, 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vh21NiHBVLg>.

Hübschmannová, Milena. n.d. "Papusza (Bronislaw Wajs)." *Rombase*. Accessed July 8, 2011. <http://rombase.uni-graz.at/cgi-bin/art.cgi?src=data/pers/papusza.en.xml>.

Human Rights Watch. n.d. "HRW Protests Deportation of Roma to Kosovo." <http://www.ww4report.com/node/9215>.

In Brief. n.d. "The High Court." *In Brief: Helping with Life's Legal Issues*. <https://www.inbrief.co.uk/legal-system/high-court/>.

International Roma Youth Network. 2015. "Recognition: Roma Genocide Remembrance Initiative." <http://2august.eu/the-roma-genocide/recognition/>.

Johnston, Neil. 2017. "We're Facing a New Dale Farm, Said Council Chief." *Sunday Times*. June 23, 2017. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/we-re-watching-a-new-dale-farm-said-council-chief-k9jmvslpq>.

Journeyman Pictures (SBS Dateline). 2003. *Slovakia: The Sterilisation of Roma Women*, Filmed May 2003. Documentary film. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fcavqgpG9xU>.

Klemm, David E. 2002. "Searching for a Heart of Gold: A Ricoeurian Meditation on Moral Striving and the Power of Religious Discourse." In *Paul Ricoeur and Contemporary Moral Thought*, edited by John Wall, William Schweiker, and W. David Hall, 97-116. New York: Routledge.

Kóczé Angela. 2017. "Open Lecture by Angela Kocze on Transgressing Borders: Feminist Activist-Scholars Pursuing Critical Knowledge." Central European University: Romani Studies Program. <http://rap.ceu.edu/article/2017-09-13/open-lecture-angela-kocze-transgressing-borders-feminist-activist-scholars>.

Kóczé, Angela, and Raluca Maria Popa. 2009. *Missing Intersectionality: Race /Ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Current Research and Policies on Romani Women in Europe*. Budapest: CEU University Press.

Korkoro. n. .d. Last modified April 2, 2018. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korkoro>

Krauze, Krzysztof, and Joanna Kos-Krauze, dir. 2013. *Papusza*. Poland: Argomedia Productions, November 15, 2003. Motion Picture.

Kulish, Nicholas. 2011. "Norway Attacks Put Spotlight on the Rise of Right Wing Sentiment in Europe." *New York Times*, July 23, 2011.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/world/europe/24europe.html>.

Kwon, Miwon. 2002. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Le Bas, Damian. 2014. "A Blinding Bit of Telly." *Traveller's Times Online*.
<https://www.travellerstimes.org.uk/features/blinding-bit-telly>.

Lee, Ronald. 2001 "The Rom-Vlach Gypsies and the Kris-Romani." In *Gypsy Law:*

Romani Legal Traditions and Culture, edited by Walter O. Weyrauch, 188-230.
Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 2002. "The Romani Goddess Kali Sara." *Kopachi*.
<https://kopachi.com/articles/the-romani-goddess-kali-sara-ronald-lee/>.

L.H. 2016. "Ceija Stojka, Painter of the Roma Holocaust." # *Womensart*.
<https://womensartblog.wordpress.com/2016/08/13/ceija-stojka-painter-of-the-roma-holocaust/>.

Lippert, Barbara, Rosalind Stevens-Strohmman, and Dirk Gunther. 1993. *German Unification and EC Integration: German and British Perspectives*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

Local France. 2012 "EU warns France over Roma Camp Purge."
<https://www.thelocal.fr/20120810/eu-warns-france-over-roma-camp-purge>

Lorde, Audre. 2007. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House."
In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, 110-113. Berkeley: Crossing Press.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1988. *The Differend*. Translated by Georges Van Den Abbeele.
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacGuill, Dan. 2013. "Roma Group to Sue Le Pen for 'Smelly' Remarks." *The Local France*, July 18, 2013. <https://www.thelocal.fr/20130718/roma-group-charges-le-pen-over-smelly-comments>.

Matras, Yaron. 1998. "The Development of the Romani Civil Rights Movement in Germany 1945-1996." In *Sinti and Roma Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature*, edited by Susan Tebutt, 49-64. New York: Bergham Books.

May, Todd. 2010. "Jacques Rancière, Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics." *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews: An Electronic Journal*. July 1, 2010.
<https://ndpr.nd.edu/news/dissensus-on-politics-and-aesthetics/>.

McCann, Colum. 2006. *Zoli*. New York: Random House.

Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government, Home Office, and Ministry of Justice. 2015. "Dealing with Unauthorised Camp Sites." *A Summary of Available Policies for Tackling the Formation of Illegal and Unauthorised Camp Sites*. Published March 27, 2015. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dealing-with-illegal-and-unauthorised-encampments>.

Minority Rights Group International. n.d. "World Directory of Minorities, Roma, Gypsies, Travellers." <http://www.minorityrights.org/minorities/romanigypsies>
Travelers.

Morgan, Benjamin. 2007. "Undoing Legal Violence: Walter Benjamin's and Giorgio Agamben's Aesthetics of Pure Means." *Journal of Law and Society* 34, no. 1: 46-64.
ISSN: 0263-323X.

Mufti, Aamir, and Ella Shohat. 1997. Introduction to *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Mulvey, Laura. 1989. *Visual and Other Pleasures*. New York: Palgrave.

Myrzaeva, Gulayim. (2011). "Women in Kyrgyzstan Challenging Stereotypes and Virginity Testing." *The WIP – Women's International Perspective*. The Middlebury Site Institute. <http://thewip.net/2011/02/18/women-in-kyrgyzstan-challenging-stereotypes-and-virginity-tradition/>.

Netflix. n. d.. *Peaky Blinders*. Accessed March 2, 2018. Television Series.

<https://www.netflix.com/title/80002479>.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. 2008. High Commissioner on National Minorities. *Assessment of the Human Rights Situation of Roma and Sinti in Italy: Report of a Fact-Finding Mission in Milan, Naples and Rome on July 20-26*.

Ong, Aihwa. 2009. "A Bio-Cartography: Maids, neo-Slavery, and NGOs." In *Migrations and Mobilities: Citizenship, Borders, and Gender*, edited by Seyla Benhabib and Judith Resnik, 157-186. New York: New York University Press.

Opondo, Samson O. and Michael J. Shapiro. 2012. "Introduction: The new violent cartography: geoanalysis after the aesthetic turn." In *The New Violent Cartography: Geo-Analysis after the Aesthetic Turn*, edited by Sam Okoth Opondo and Michael J. Shapiro. New York: Routledge. Kindle, doi: 9781138789876.

Oprea, Alexandra. 2004. "Re-envisioning Social Justice from the Ground up: Including The Experiences of Romani Women." *Essex Human Rights Review* 1, no. 1: 29-39. <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=re-envisioning-social-justice-from-the-ground-up-oprea.pdf&site=41>.

Orosz, Anna. 2017. "Gypsy Tales: Animation Cartoon Series from the Perspective of Contemporary Roma Artists." The Romedia Foundation. January 17, 2017. <http://www.romediafoundation.wordpress.com>.

O'Sullivan, Simon. 2006. *Art Encounters: Deleuze and Guattari*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Paczolay, Gyula. 2002. *European Proverbs in 55 Languages with Equivalentents in Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Chinese and Japanese*. Hobart, Tasmania: De Proverbi.

- Palladino, Mariangela. 2016. "'It's a Freedom Thing': Heterotopias and Gypsy Travellers' Spatiality." In *The Globalization of Space: Foucault and Heterotopia*, edited by Mariangela Palladino and John Miller. London: Routledge.
- Panagia, Davide. 2009. *The Political Life of Sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Papusza. 2015. "The Story of a Polish Roma Poet." *Baltic Worlds*.
<http://balticworlds.com/papusza/>.
- Parmar, Pratibha, and Trinh T. Minh-ha. 1990. "Woman, Native, Other." *Feminist Review* 36, no.1: 65-74. <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/fr/journal/v36/n1/full/Fr199046a.html>.
- Parry, Richard, dir. 2011. *The Big Gypsy Eviction*. London: BBC One. July 21, 2011. Documentary film. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DAYyCte8nHQ>.
- Parry, Tom. n.d. "Slovakia Plans Forced School for Roma Children." *The Mirror*. Accessed July 27, 2011. <http://...mirror.co.uk.../slovakia-plans-forced-school-for-roma-children>.
- Patchett, Emma. 2017. "Protecting Public Space: The Gypsy and Traveller Community." *Critical and Legal Thinking: Law and the Political*.
<http://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/07/12/protecting-public-space-gypsy-traveller-community/>.
- Peaky Blinders* (TV series). n.d. Last modified April 7, 2018.
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peaky_Blinders_\(TV_series\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peaky_Blinders_(TV_series)).
- _____. 2013-2017. Steven Knight. Katie Swindon. BBC Two.

- Probyn, Elspeth. 1990. *Travels in the Postmodern: Making Sense of the Local*. New York: Routledge.
- Pusca, Anca M. 2010. "The 'Roma Problem' in the EU: Nomadism, (in) visible architectures and violence." *Borderlands*, 9(2): 1-17. [Article]: Goldsmiths Research Online. http://www.researchgate.net/publication/277057485_The_Roma_Problem_in_the_EU_Nomadism_invisible_architectures_and_violence.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1999. *Dis-agreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Translated by Julie Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- _____. 2004. *The Politics of Aesthetics*. Translated by Gabriel Rockhill. New York: Continuum.
- _____. 2006. "Thinking Between Disciplines: An Aesthetics of Knowledge." *Parrhesia*, translated by Jon Roffe. no.1: 1-12.
https://www.parrhesiajournal.org/parrhesia01/parrhesia01_ranciere.pdf.
- _____. 2008. "Jacques Rancière and Indisciplinarity." *Arts and Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods*, translated by Gregory Elliott. 2, no. 1.
<http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v2n1/jrinterview.html>.
- _____. 2009. "Contemporary Art and the Politics of Aesthetics." In *Communities of Sense*, edited by Beth Hinderliter, William Kaizen, Vered Maimon, Jaleh Mansoor, and Seth McCormick. Durham: Duke University Press.
- _____. 2010. *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. Translated by Steven Corcoran. New York: Continuum.

- Raphael. 2010. In Ian Hancock, *We are the Romani: Ame sam e Rromane džene*. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Ravnbøl, Camilla Ida. 2010. "The Human Rights of Romani Women: Romani Women's Rights from a Perspective on International Human Rights Law and Politics." *International Human Rights Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 17. 1-45.
<http://graduateinstitute.ch/files/live/sites/iheid/files/sites/mia/shared/mia/cours/IA010/Ravnbol%202010.pdf>.
- Reding, Viviane. 2010. "Statement on the Latest Developments on the Roma Situation." Brussels. https://www.europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-10-420_en.pdf.
- Reidy, Jessica. 2014b. "Unite and Celebrate: International Roma Day: The Band of Roma." *Quail Bell Magazine: The Real – The Unreal*. April 8, 2014.
<http://www.quailbellmagazine.com/the-real/unite-and-celebrate-international-roma-day>.
- Reidy, Jessica. 2014a. "Even More Gypsy Writers." The Romedia Foundation. July 16, 2014. <http://www.gypsyrepresent.wordpress.com>.
- Revolvy. n.d. "Ceija Stojka."
<https://www.revolvy.com/main/index.php?s=Ceija%20Stojka>.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1983 *Sources*. Woodside, California: Heyeck Press.
- _____. 1994. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979-1985*. New York: WW Norton and Co.

Rockhill, Gabriel. 2009. "The Politics of Aesthetics: Political History and the Hermeneutics of Art." In *History, Politics, Aesthetics Jacques Rancière*, edited by Gabriel Rockhill and Philip Watts, 197-215. Durham: Duke University Press.

Rolek, Barbara. 2018. "Polish Sorrel Soup (Zupa Szczawiowa) Recipe." *The Spruce*.
<https://www.thespruce.com/polish-sorrel-soup-recipe-zupa-szczawiowa-1137117>.

Romani-English Glossary - Arnes. 1998. "Romani-English Glossary."
<http://www2.arnes.si/~eusmith/Romany/glossary.html>.

Romani People. n.d. Last modified April 5, 2018.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romani_people.

Romani Society and Culture. n.d. Last modified April 2, 2018.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romani_society_and_culture.

Romedia Foundation. 2016. "Forced sterilization of Romani Women – Persisting Human Rights Violation."
<https://romediafoundation.wordpress.com/2013/02/07/forced-sterilization-of-romani-women-a-persisting-human-rights-violation/>.

Rose, Romani. 2012. "Archive/Library, Quotes," The Romani Elders.org.
<https://www.the.romanielders.org/elders/2/7/>.

Royal Berkshire Hospital. n. d. Last modified December 3, 2017.
http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Royal_Berkshire_Hospital.

Saltmarsh, Mathew. 2010. "Sarkozy Toughens on Illegal Roma." *New York Times*, July 29, 2010.

Saul, Nicholas. 2007. *Gypsies and Orientalism in German Literature and Anthropology of the Long Nineteenth Century*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association and Maney Publishing.

Schengen Agreement. 2017. "Schengen Agreement." Last modified October 26, 2017. https://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schengen_Agreement.

Shapiro, Michael J. 1997. *Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

_____. 1999. *Cinematic Political Thought: Narrating Race, Nation and Gender*. New York: New York University Press.

_____. 2001. *For Moral Ambiguity: National Culture and the Politics of the Family*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

_____. 2002. *Reading "Adam Smith": Desire, History, and Value*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

_____. 2006. *Deforming American Political Thought: Ethnicity, Facticity, and Genre*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

_____. 2007. "After Kant: Re-thinking Hermeneutics and Aesthetics." In *The Good Society*, no. 1: 7-10. doi: 10.1353/gso.2007.0009.

_____. 2009. *Cinematic Geopolitics*. London: Routledge.

_____. 2016. *Politics and Time: Documenting the Event*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Sifris, Ronli. 2014. *Reproductive Freedom, Torture and International Human Rights: Challenging the Masculinisation of Torture*. New York: Routledge.
- Silverman, Carol. 1995. "Persecution and Politicization: Roma (Gypsies) of Eastern Europe." *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine*. June 1995.
<http://www.culturalsurvival.org/publication/cult...zation-roma-gypsies-eastern-europe>.
- Sim, Stuart. 2011. "Discourse." In *The Lyotard Dictionary*, edited by Stuart Sim, 53-57. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Smith Tuhiwai, Linda. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Soguk, Nevzat. 1999. *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- _____. 2015. "Insurrectional Politics: Theories and Practices of Contemporary Insurrections." *Globalization* 12, Issue 6: 829-833.
 doi:10.1080/14747731.2015.1100852.
- Southern Nights. 2012. "Louis Althusser: Aleatory Materialism."
<https://socialecologies.wordpress.com/2012/12/18/louis-althusser-aleatory-materialism/>.
- Spiegel Online. 2010. "Politicians Say Deportations Will Remain Exception."
 September 20, 2010. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/roma-in-germany-politicians-say-deportations-will-remain-exception-a-718708.html>.

- Spivak, Gayatri. 2008. "More Thoughts on Cultural Translation." *European Institute for Progressive Cultural Politics*. <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0608/spivak/en>.
- Sprung, Andy. 2012. *Reprohealthlaw: International Reproductive and Sexual Health Law Program*. Faculty of Law, University of Toronto.
<https://reprohealthlaw.wordpress.com/2012/12/19/european-court-of-hr-ruling-slovakia-forced-sterilization-of-roma-women/>.
- Stojka, Ceija, 2015. "I Remember Auschwitz Every Waking Moment of My Life," *Human Rights Blog*. <https://gmablog.org/2015/02/page/2/>.
- Tanke, Joseph J. 2011. *Jacques Rancière: An Introduction Philosophy, Politics, Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.
- Teichmann, Michael. 2001. "History of the Vlach Roma." *Rombase*. Graz, Austria.
<http://rombase.uni-graz.at/cgi-bin/art.cgi?src=data/pers/stojkas.en.xml>.
- Thibodeau, Gigi. 2003. "Growing New Skin: the Life and Poetry of Papusza."
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gipsyroad/message/23>.
- Traveller Movement. 2015. "The Cultural History of the Traveller Movement."
<http://travellermovement.org.uk/cultural-history/>.
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). n.d. Last modified March 7, 2018. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_on_the_Functioning_of_the_European_Union.
- Walsh, Mikey. 2009. *Gypsy Boy*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

- Weyrauch, Walter O. 2001. "Oral Legal Traditions of Gypsies and Some American Equivalents." In *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, edited by Walter O. Weyrauch, 243-276. Berkley: University of California Press.
- _____. 2001 "Romaniya: An Introduction to Gypsy Law." In *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, edited by Walter O. Weyrauch, 1-10. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Weyrauch, Walter O. and Maureen Anne Bell. 2001. "Autonomous Lawmaking: The Case of the 'Gypsies'." In *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, edited by Walter O. Weyrauch, 11-87. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Windham, Antje. n.d. "A Roma Teen's Fight to Stay in Germany." *Spiegel Online*.
<http://www.spiegel.de/.../0,1518,727542,00html>.
- Woking Borough Council. "Unauthorised Encampments: Frequently Asked Questions." Last modified January 2, 2018.
<https://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/envhealthservice/control/unauthencampfaqs>.
- Wyatt, Chad E. 2005. *Roma Rising: Romske Obrozeni*. Praha: Argo.
- Young, Stephen. 2016. "Judith Butler: Performativity." *Critical Legal Thinking: Law and the Political*. <http://criticallegalthinking.com/2016/11/14/judith-butlers-performativity/>.

