
Maja
ŠTAMBUK

SETTLE AND
REMAIN ROMANI

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) based in Budapest estimates that two million Roma have become citizens of the EU with its newest expansion. Moreover, in 2007, in the next expansion of the Union to Bulgaria and Romania, an additional two million Roma will be a part of Europe. Likewise, about thirty thousand more Roma will join them from the Republic of Croatia.

The majority of Roma from Eastern and Central Europe incontestably live in poorer living conditions compared to members of their people in richer countries of Europe. However, investment in improving their standard of living will not only be a problem of a united Europe but a political strategy of every member state on how to develop its nation and raise the quality of life for its inhabitants.

In any case, regardless of Croatia's status in relation to the EU, the very humble and poor quality life standard of the *majority* of Roma in Croatia is a problem that demands continual, expert, and financially demanding welfare of the state.

The World Bank implemented a "Decade of Roma Inclusion", which, in fact, started this year in 2005 and lasts until 2015. Undoubtedly, this organised welfare for the Roma will stimulate many states to use more quality measures to reduce poverty among the Roma. Prior to this decade of Roma inclusion, the Government of the Republic of Croatia implemented a National Programme for the Roma in 2003, which is committed to improving the standard of their housing and settlements. In accordance with these measures, the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction requested this study. The study was conducted by a group of researchers from the Institute of Social Sciences, *Ivo Pilar* as well as two external collaborators. The research results from this study are compiled in this book.

A specific objective of this research is to highlight the problem and standard of housing among the Roma, their

aspirations in view of family dwellings as well as the conditions, aspirations, models and possibilities of a long-term solution to problems related to level of equipment and facilities in settlements that have a large concentration of Roma. This research provides a scientific-expert basis for the development of a plan of continual long-term action that would improve the everyday life of Roma in many aspects.

Sociological studies of marginal groups (Šućur, 2000)¹ in Croatia until now have not paid special attention to minority groups. In research on interculturalism, principal attention has been directed to attitudes and views of particular populations (youth, pupils, students, etc.) towards marginal groups. Results show that the Roma do poorly on these scales (Magdalenić, 1998).²

Problems related to researching the Romani population, like other small numbered minority groups in Croatia, have resulted in a relatively poor level of exploration and mainly “incidental” engagement with them or treatment of them.³ The emergence of the Croatian state and participation of minority members in the Homeland War contributed to an awareness of national roots on a massive scale and reinforcement of self-awareness of one's own origin as well as activity towards social and cultural advancement. Even the Roma themselves, on their part, organised in a (too)large number of ethnic associations mainly encourage scientific and expert research to solve problems related to their status, not negating the efforts and successes of other social actors.⁴ State institutions still rely on empirical insights about the everyday life of individuals and Romani communities, their attitudes, opinions and aspirations to find a suitable solution for the improvement of their life and work conditions.

The position of the Romani population is inferior in every respect and bilaterally determined. On the one hand, the Roma often have to fight against prejudices that most members of other nationalities in their surroundings have of them or those that they come across in other ways. On the other hand, the Roma themselves in their social self-containment do not make an effort to get to know others better. Thus, the duty of the majority population is clear: it must try to reduce prejudices in every way, by acting through the school and media and by creating social and economic space in which the Roma can exchange their culture, knowledge and experiences with others.

Nomadic Roma surely live in Croatia and their problems are surely more complex. However, we did not research them in this study.⁵ In our research with sedentary

Roma concepts such as *space*, *territory*, *village* and *town* acquire special meaning. In any case, variants of these concepts undoubtedly shape these Roma quite differently from nomadic members of their minority community. Sedentary Roma show signs of feeling domiciled and emotional connection in relation to particular spaces. Concordant with their social group in particular spaces, they similarly link their individual and family needs and aspirations. They are very allied and most often aware of their heritage, culture and language. A settlement usually accommodates families that are of a similar socio-economic status. It is, in fact, this mutual similarity (of individuals and families) together with the settlement density in a limited space that facilitates the continuation of the community that constitutes an important precondition for its survival. Naturally, this is not the only prerequisite for a sedentary lifestyle of the Roma (Cifrić, 1998).⁶

The causes and consequences of their social and economic position are not always easy to establish. Nevertheless, it is beyond doubt that this ethnic group is in an undesirable “state of general need”. We can problematise the position of the Romani minority in Croatia at two basic levels:

1. The first is at the state level. Evidently, the existing institutional mechanisms cannot be (completely) effective in situations where there is social exclusion of the Roma. The insensitivity of mechanisms to specific problems of the Roma and other marginal groups indicate the need for their adaptation. Namely, they need to be responsive to solving specific problems. Basic rights to employment, health protection, social welfare protection and other rights for the Roma should also be included. This is not (only) a discussion about the Roma as members of an ethnic minority but as members of a minority whose behaviour markedly differs from others. This is evident because of traditional elements that are prevalent in their everyday social, family and working life.
2. The second is at the level of the Romani minority. They are inadequately organised and weakly connected (even though there are a number of associations and networks). For this reason, it is very demanding and expensive to ensure internal consent and articulation of *Romani minority demands*. At this level, when this concerns the Roma, it is difficult to solve problems which can otherwise be solved within the minority. Another problem is that they are spatially dispersed, which does not create suitable conditions for the organisation of local self-government.

In fact, it is this “lack of condensation” that hinders the systematic building and maintenance of a cultural identity and this stands out as a special problem of the Romani population. Therefore it is difficult to ensure basic institutional assumptions of identity shaping. The Roma “on the outside” are usually experienced and treated like an exceptionally recognisable, unique ethnic and cultural whole while on the other hand, their image of themselves does not sufficiently identify all members. The transnationality of their identity and the non-existence of a Romani national state expose them to the dangers of assimilation and gradual oblivion about themselves. However, considering this position from a different perspective, adequate stimulation for secure and more solidarity-based linking of quite different subgroups among the (Croatian) Roma can be found. Undoubtedly, this principal would be worth arguing for in their organisation. The basic objective of every common action should be the development of a greater “amount” of solidarity both outside and among the Roma (Avsec, 1998).⁷

A previous study conducted in 1998 on the *Social Status of the Roma in Croatia*⁸ (the results of which are also presented in this book) can also be classified as empirical research although it had different aims. Since the Roma in Croatia have been poorly researched, this study is indispensable to “provide” a wider perspective on the problems of the Romani population.

The purpose of the mentioned study was to provide an empirical base for state institutions to develop and operationalise a concept to help the Romani population in Croatia; to realise more suitable social, cultural and economic roles within the framework of available possibilities. Accordingly, the research was supposed to offer a short and clear strategy of improving Romani status. The obtained results were intended for governmental as well as non-governmental institutions and associations for the conceptualisation of applicable and more effective strategies to solve problems within the Romani minority group as well as the problems of their relation towards the social environment.

Other aims of this field study were to obtain an insight into their spatial dispersal and subsequently detect prerequisites for a better quality of life and a more appropriate organisation of social “branch” institutions of the state. Finally, in the long-term, it is worthwhile to identify desirable actors among the Roma as well as outside the constituted community, who are willing and want to be involved in changing the existing social and economic cir-

cumstances of the Roma.⁹ The following was anticipated from the research: first, to contribute to enriching the information and data on marginal groups as well as the methodology of their research with special emphasis on small and spatially scattered ethnic communities. Second, expectations were towards specific activities: how to inspire ideas on solving problems, including problems related to their ethnic-cultural identity.

The purpose of every study on the Roma (including this one) is to show how their marginal social and economic position can be attributed to some features of their population. They also try to attribute this position to inappropriate long-term relations on the part of the government. It is only possible to include the sedentary Romani population in this type of research, even though it can be assumed that at least some members of sedentary families leave their “permanent address” for seasonal work or for a few years. Clébert (1967) considers the Roma, first and foremost, as nomads whose way of life shows a nomadic character even when they are obviously sedentary. They “always leave the impression that they are temporarily camping”. Namely, their dwellings are always full of boxes, suitcases, and bundles of all kinds. They sleep on blankets, down quilts, and rugs. Nevertheless, spatial stabilisation is the first prerequisite for the social integration of the Roma. While they are nomads, they remain on the margins of basic social institutions.

A number of attempts to stabilise and integrate the Roma into the majority population have not succeeded. As a rule, members of other ethnic groups avoid places or quarters that are inhabited by the Roma. During our field study, we noticed that there is always some physical barrier that separates Romani settlements or quarters from other neighbourhoods. Most often this is a creek, river or railway tracks.

The low concentration of the Roma in comparison to the majority population prevents them from obtaining a more significant position, role or function in a developmental sense. Thus, their contribution is more significant if it is individual rather than collective. At the individual level, well-known limitations are evident when it comes to the Roma. There are incessant dangers that threaten them “from the outside”, especially from different temptations of assimilation or undesirable types of integration. Moreover, based on the internal organisation of their lives (particularly family structure that links the wider family among the Roma) they readily accept inter-dependence in which there is not much room for individuality. For ex-

ample, a singles' household is almost an unknown institution in the Romani community. On the other hand, very low inclusion of Romani children in primary education (not to mention higher levels of education) is discriminating already at the beginning and does not provide the same starting points available to the rest of the population in a professional sense. Today, this is noticeable more than ever. This is because schooling in a contemporary structured society is nearly the only channel of social promotion for the individual. With reference to a community (wide or narrow), it can be shown that a community is more advanced, successful, richer, and promising inasmuch as the average level of education among its members is higher. *The insistence on education and shifts in this direction are long-term, expensive and difficult but only this will give results in the future. In this sense, this is the most rational.*

In pre-industrial times, the Roma did not differ significantly from other populations with respect to formal education. Many were competitive and required for their traditional trades (as copper-smiths, basket-makers, producers of wooden objects, musicians, horse traders, blacksmiths, shoeing smiths, bear tamers, etc.). However, modernisation of society (especially industrialisation and the larger role of education) created greater distances between the Roma and the majority population. The interest for their services and products decreased and they themselves did not capably "retrain" on time. Most of them have held onto a nomadic or half-nomadic lifestyle until recently. Thus, since traditional trades have died out, there is not much reason for many Roma to lead a nomadic way of life. Nevertheless, as a rule, the influences of tradition on the Roma are small. However, the influence of tradition is stronger in socially, culturally and economically threatened Romani groups compared to populations in their surrounding environment. They are more or less closed and only oriented towards their surroundings only to survive.

With reference to the Roma, one can almost talk about a tradition of "wild entrepreneurship",¹⁰ which is, again traditional, tolerated and "understood" and includes the good and bad services of this population.¹¹ Namely, the visibility of very poor life opportunities that characterises most of these "social" spaces where the Roma live like their tendency to have temporary addresses and jobs as well as the type of activities from which they obtain a means of living make the Roma untouchable. It is an enormous job to fix and "collect" their fiscal, social, health, retirement and communal obligations and rights.

Even though this survey was exclusively conducted in spaces where the Roma are settled, their opportunities are far from optimistic. A “clearer” situation is found among those that are employed full-time of which there are few.

It is interesting that among non-Romani peoples, modernisation processes of urbanisation and industrialisation increased the general and social standard of life as well as the distance to work (in kms) while among the old nomadic Romani people this distance started to decrease. Increasingly, by choosing a sedentary lifestyle they try not to distance themselves too much from their permanent addresses. On the contrary, a larger concentration of the population in towns facilitates begging as an additional source of income.

The concentration of Roma increases other phenomena as well. Data analysis within the framework of the project “Socio-demographic and phenomenological characteristics of delinquency among youth in the County of Međimurje” established that the rate of delinquency among Romani youth is far higher (15 to 20 times higher) than the average rate for this county (Magdalenić, 1995; 1998).¹² It would be fruitful to see if this type of data exists for other areas and if the situation in these other spaces is similar or different. This is certainly a sphere of activity for particular services at the county and town level.

More than any other ethnic group, the Roma are talked about as specific. And this is probably true. It is possible to mention a number of different factors with regard to the ways in which they are special. It should be noted that it is possible to find each one of these factors or these aspects among other peoples as well. However, when we identify the majority of these special qualities within one ethnic population, then it is really a special and complex cultural, sociological, demographic and economic phenomenon. Based on this framework, the Romani people are incessantly confronted with difficult problems especially related to their social, economic and “settlement” position. A long-term attempt to preserve the basic components of their ethnicity is linked to two complex levels of their contemporary position:

1. On the one hand, they have preserved their ethnic identity by isolating themselves from the majority (and other minorities) that they live among,¹³ and
2. On the other hand, they have “lost” many of their members who following schooling or desired another or different life framework through some other channels. These processes, that are not easily detectable in surveys, hinder the Romani people from shaping their

own elite that would besides knowledge and the necessary measures of enthusiasm take on a great deal of responsibility for the “state of the nation”.

It is known that the Roma are a special people; that they have their own history, culture, language and that in their long-term migrations they left India relatively late compared to other European peoples. Their current position as a “non-territorial people” may be attributed to this lateness and the toilsome journey that brought them to an already inhabited and “occupied” Europe (*Narodi Europe*, 1997). In the consciousness of this unique traveller-people, a memory of movement has been preserved and even today, nostalgia for the nomadic lifestyle has remained among those that are sedentary (Coupry, 1999). This is combined with stronger feelings of domicile. Thus, the Roma have become a people with two different aspirations with regard to choice of lifestyle: *as travellers* and *having a house and home*.

We can add to this that they did not write about their historical journeys because they were and still are a people that rely on “oral” tradition. They are often experienced as a very old legend that we are not familiar with yet, but with a degree of considerate curiosity, without too much personal effort, we learn it and retell it in our own way.

Many will say that the Roma are not connected to a village, town or settlement; that their nomadic or half-nomadic nature continually stimulates them to move so that they can live freely. In this way, they can ignore the laws, remain unattached to space and live their realities in their myths. Moreover, that they do not show (enough) interest in “our” reality so that misunderstanding and all the consequences of this are inevitable in coexistence.

Their exact number is unknown; they are called differently in different countries (which is the result of a nomadic history and contact with a large number of peoples and languages). All those that declare themselves as Roma largely do not integrate in the societies in which they live; they are wary of assimilation processes that would undoubtedly weaken their identity.

The Roma (Gheorghe, 1991)¹⁴ are a “special non-territorial people with their own history, language and culture” (*Narodi Europe*, 1997). Their history is mainly unrecorded, their language has many forms, and it is possible to recognise influences of the peoples that they had contact with during migration in their culture. Linguistic analysis has established that the Roma are from India (Arayici, 1998)¹⁵ and that they left more than a thousand years ago (Arayici, 1998).¹⁶

Among the peoples of Europe, the Roma are the most nomadic. However, their greater connection to space and that they are less nomadic than they were in the past can be observed.¹⁷ Their social organisation has always been based on the family and in this way they differ greatly from other nomadic groups. Today, there are more sedentary Roma than those without addresses. This process has had an impact on the Roma in Croatia as well.¹⁸ More live permanently in settlements and houses (barracks, huts) or flats while less ceaselessly move and survive in a traditional Romani way.

However, it is important to bear in mind that the Roma are not a homogeneous group. They differ according to many features. Unfortunately, research on the Roma in Croatia has not explored their heterogeneity, so we can only speculate on their differences. We can only mention that during our research we learned about linguistic research currently being conducted as well as work on a Romani dictionary and grammar. This is a possible difference of Romani (sub)groups.

Do we have to completely understand or do we have to learn to be tolerant of differences? What and how much does each side have to and want to learn as well as do to qualitatively develop the relation between the Roma and non-Roma (majority population)?

In research until now, problems such as: material standard, especially housing standard as well as level of equipment and facilities of localities predominantly settled by Roma has been treated as an “independent variable”. Namely, as a factor that influences the type, intensity, form of some other problems and phenomena (a very high correlation is often found), but not as an “autonomous” socio-cultural and economic acute phenomenon that for more reasons has to be emphasised and a “suitable” framework for its solution needs to be found. For this reason, it is important to determine the needs and aspirations of the Romani minority population – and all their capacities to participate in solving problems and on the other hand, the needs and possibilities of the state at all levels from the Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction to county offices for spatial planning to the local communities in towns or in municipalities.¹⁹

Based on research experience and data, it is clear that the domiciliary status that the Roma express and show with regard to their relation to a particular space where they live together with their family and community with other Roma is exceptionally important. Especially in

towns, there are often other peoples in Romani areas so it is difficult to talk about a “Romani settlement” (a syntagm that we do not consider to be entirely accurate, but one that we chose for its practicality and with this we show that which is officially called “location of settled Roma”). An attempt to provide a typology of locations where the Roma have settled is the topic of a separate chapter.

It is often thought that the “nomadic” component of their identity facilitates change of address among the Roma even when there is no special reason for this. However, results from this research (that deals with “the Roma with addresses” as nomads are difficult to research and this was not the objective of this research) show that they are quite connected to space and that their eventual spatial aspirations do not extend far beyond the existing locations. Relatively few of them would move from their current settlement or region for better conditions of life and work. Uncontroversially, this finding shows that shifting the Roma for whatever reason, even if this is justified is an exceptionally traumatic experience and that the commencement of new wild “Romani settlements” should be prevented.

This type of settlement, first of all, almost exclusively constitutes their *life sphere* because most often this is not a place of work for the Romani population. This is a place to live but not to work and as a result “Romani settlements” are “deprived” of one form of sociability that is created in other smaller settlements whether this is in villages,²⁰ or in smaller towns. This is applicable to all common forms of “Romani settlements”.

Insight into this feature of *locations of settled Roma* can serve as a guide on ways of improving housing conditions towards establishing suitable activities within or at the margins of the locality, especially those with a greater number of inhabitants. Namely, the absence of employment/work opportunities in the settlement or nearby forces those who are more educated and entrepreneurial to find work elsewhere. In this way, the potential of the community to shape a complex social structure in the settlement is weakened. This is needed to make the life of the local community more dynamic and would also create a level of solidarity and unity that transcends the family. There is an absence of roles that are based on “professional position” or some special function in Romani settlements.²¹ Or they are not visible.

For this reason, fieldwork provides another possibility to researchers; to acquire a wider insight into the social

structure than was planned. Namely, it is recommended to all who deal with life problems in particular “territorial and spatial communities” to spend more time in research areas for access to this wealth of information.

Although our focus of interest was not the social structure of Romani communities, these were evident. A few of these insights are outlined in the following section:

1. The Romani community does not have its own autochthonous socio-cultural elite that could mediate in relations between “global” society and their small minority society. Thus, there is no elite that is shaped *within* the Romani population – based on social history, peoples’ culture, ways of organisation, the Roma value system that is simultaneously integrated in the system of the majority, especially in the promotional system of education, work, politics as well as the rest (health, retirement, etc.) *Individuals exist, but there are few. In fact, the result of their involvement shows how useful they are. The absence of this stratum makes every form of cooperation with regard to solving all types of problems related to minorities more difficult*, and the socially active Roma are too burdened with work for the benefit of their people and as a consequence they do not have formal (or usual) rights to mediate for or represent their community.
2. Besides this lack of prominent active individuals, there are multiple problems that confront the Romani population. For more successful resolution of this problem, it is necessary to seek local Romani mediation, because every “foreign” effort is less effective and (as much as they would not like to admit to this) a little suspect and under special scrutiny of the Romani community.
3. For this reason, individuals are found *outside*, i.e., the state and its institutions or civil associations that are willing (and who undoubtedly find their own legitimate interest) to mediate between the Roma and these institutions. In this way, a group of individuals who are on the outside, not inside are shaped through schooling and work. They acquire a reputation among their people and become in a way, “legitimatised” to represent the Roma. In this way, the traditional Romani structure that is based on a strong family hierarchy and the result of a nomadic lifestyle is transformed out of necessity. Being closed to the surrounding society protected the Roma from changes brought about by modernisation processes but also contributed to a weakening of ties and an incompatibility of Romani and surrounding development. Many Romani experiences have

been lost. Less known the traditional Romani trades and arts. We can no longer hear Romani music; there are no shoeing smiths, pot and umbrella repairers, knife sharpeners, and basket-makers. Their disappearance from Croatian villages (especially) has meant that their services have not as yet been replaced in many places. The Roma have lost some elements of (higher) social position, which they once had thanks to their traditional trades. They were integrated in their social environment because they met many of the specific needs of non-Romani and rural populations. They based their social organisation on the family which differentiated them from other nomadic groups. Today, there are more sedentary Roma than those without addresses. This same process is occurring in Croatia. They often appear in smaller or larger groups (sometimes they are very populated settlements) so a need for a new type of social organisation is a necessity. The family per se is too weak to be a “collocutor” in relations with mainstream society and its institutions.

4. *Dual membership of the mediator* facilitates communication between the Romani local community as well as the state and its institutions. This relation on both sides must be clearly established to avoid misunderstandings that would slow down the resolution of everyday problems of settlements and their poor inhabitants. In any case, it would be worthwhile to agree to a mechanism of choice and activity of the mediator.²²

Many researchers have found that the way/nature of belonging to a community determines the quality of social participation and identities. “Belonging, in a social sense, proceeds from the relation of the individual and collectivity. This in turn shapes sociability and essentially shapes the way of existing *within* the group; symbolic exchange or participation. The *territory* where the group, collectivity, lives is most often is ‘the work of human hands’ so it indicates a space of organised social life that contributes to its understanding as an important component of all features of culture, sociability and identity.” (Akoun and Ansart, 1999)

The position of the minority group is regulated legally and is different in diverse political systems. Democratic systems that, as a rule, are tolerant towards difference offer a few models with regard to minority groups: according to one, the emphasis is on *the rights and duties of the individual*, a second model is more oriented towards *multiculturalism* and a third stresses *the cultural whole and approaches that shape and develop this social unit* (Akoun and

Ansart, 1999). The model that is chosen depends on the wider social and economic opportunities.

On the whole, the Croatian model is closest to the third that emphasises development of the minority but not to the detriment of individual rights.

Sociological interest has been in research on the relation between a minority and the majority as well as in research on the shaping and functioning of the minority and its positioning in society. Searching for suitable ways for the minority to make their demands and for demands to be exchanged is also of interest.

As it has already been mentioned this study was initiated by the state with the aim of highlighting difficult housing problems, settlement planning and aspirations of the Romani population with regard to housing. On the one hand, beyond doubt it is the desire and duty of the state to ensure minimum housing and a technical and social standard of the settlement. On the other, most localities of settled Roma, have a low level of sanitation that is a lasting potential source of disease. Evidently, following this simplified account, it is evident that the state needs to be actively involved in solving problems in localities of settled Roma throughout the country. If we want to emphasise the necessity of solving the mentioned problems, we can show that housing as a necessary prerequisite of “civil” life is the material foundation of democratising society.

It can be expected that every organised activity including those connected to housing problems and settlement planning *activates the minority group* to do more together. In other words, a passive group, at least when this is related to housing and putting the settlement into order transforms into an active community that is not indifferent to how and where they live.

“A settlement is... a reflection of the society that lives in it” (Mendras, 1986). This statement is related to a peasant society in which the author wants to show how they mutually differ and how because of these differences (linked to ecological conditions), in that a suitable (and possible) system of production shapes different types of settlements. Romani settlements do not differ (much). Some are bigger, some are smaller some are on the edge of a village; as a rule, they are not connected to a special type of production, because their work is mainly outside of the settlement.

As already mentioned it is intended that the results of this study will outline the conditions of housing among the Romani population as well as their aspirations with re-

gard to housing their families. Insights on the models and the potential of a long-term solution to problems related to level of equipment and facilities in settlements that have a large concentration of Roma will also be presented. It is anticipated that this research will also provide the basis for the development of a plan for continual long-term action that would improve the everyday life of the Roma population in all spheres.

In this demanding task *the help of local leaders* is necessary who will within groups promote ideas about healthy, tidy and sustainable housing. This work needs to be well-planned and requires time. Moreover, it should not be of the campaign type but continual work armed with patience.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Marginal groups are considered to be social groups that do not participate in key social processes, first and foremost, economic, social, cultural and political processes (Šućur, 2000: 214).

² Magdalenić (1998: 78) recently conducted research among a female student population on the problems of social distance towards members of 29 different nations. He found that the Roma “were at the bottom of the scale with regard to the degree of proximity the respondents were prepared to accept with ‘typical’ members of these nations”.

³ The first social scientific research of the Roma in Croatia was conducted by the Institute for Social Research in 1982.

⁴ For example, the Committee for Pastoral Roma of the Croatian Bishops' Conference recently organised a study of the Roma.

⁵ These problems that pertain to the empirical investigation of the Roma (e.g., spatial dispersal, non-existence of data, etc.) are elaborated in the methodological remarks. To cite Clébert: “Gypsies are aware of the age-long taboo that prohibits them from revealing most of their rituals to the *gadje*. Believe me this is not some kind of joke that would conjure up the gypsy myth into a ‘mystery’. In any case, this is not a joke, not even to Gypsylogists that are continually confronted with a wall of silence or, what is even worse, with deliberate lies. Pose the same precise question to Gypsies twenty times and you will get twenty different answers!” (Clébert, 1967: 157)

⁶ A right to a living space is one of the basic rights. This right contains the duty to protect this space not according to narrow, local standards but according to global regulations. In this way, human responsibility for living space is strengthened (See I. Cifrić, 1998: 35-53).

⁷ This is achieved in different ways. One of the ways to overcome mutual distrust between the Roma and the majority population was tested by Slovene “activists”, who in 1990 established a project aimed at integrating the Roma into the social environment, that is, the community. The starting point was that problems were on both sides and that it was worth acting on both sides to reduce or eliminate prejudices, stereotypes and intolerance. See: Tatjana Avsec (1998: 93).

- ⁸ This research was conducted a team of researchers at the Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar.
- ⁹ Researchers at the Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar had discussions with prominent individuals who are very familiar with circumstances in the settlement. In addition, we examined some data that was collected in other studies that deal with the Roma from different perspectives and needs. The settlements that were included in the research are: Kozari putovi – Zagreb, Capraške Poljane – Sisak, Kotoriba, Vodnjan and Bjelovar.
- ¹⁰ Of course, this type of tradition can be found among other peoples.
- ¹¹ One needs to broadly understand the advocated “positive discrimination” and behaviour towards illegal forms of entrepreneurship so that they can be subsumed.
- ¹² It is worth noting that the author in a qualitative analysis of the committed crimes established that “Romani” youth delinquency “comprises mostly petty theft, forest theft and similar crimes, mainly that which can be reduced to “delinquency out of necessity”.
- ¹³ To tell the truth, we must mention that many ethnic minorities that have integrated into Croatian society have preserved their identity by finding employment and accepting obligatory duties.
- ¹⁴ Rom (plural: Roma) is an endonym, a name they call themselves. All other names are egzonyms, given to them by the Non-Romani.
- ¹⁵ The causes and details with respect to the beginnings of the great migration are still being researched. However, the Romani Indian roots remain unquestionable.
- ¹⁶ “...in the post-Sanskrit period...” The causes of their movement are still unknown. It is thought that they needed about hundred years to get to the area of the Byzantine kingdom (XI century).
- ¹⁷ A particular fascination with the Roma as a “strange and inexplicable” people, with their slow rate of change regardless of difference and objective strength of influence, has long interested non-Romani researchers. See, for example, Francesco Predari: *Origine e vicende dei Zingari*. Bologna: Tornì Editore, published in 1841. The author mentions sources that confirm that the Roma appeared near the Black Sea in 1417 (on their journey towards the north). A year later, Switzerland is mentioned and then Italy in 1422 (p. 55). The author mentions the discovery of documents according to which the Roma are mentioned in Hungary in 1250 as soldiers (Cingarorum...) in a battle in which the Czech king defeated the Hungarian King Bel (p. 56).
- ¹⁸ It is possible to notice an inter-level between the nomadic and sedentary way of life in Romani settlements. Namely, sedentary Roma can move in large groups from one state to another or from one part of the country to another more easily than others.
- ¹⁹ The problem of hygiene can be mentioned here; i.e., sanitation of the Romani settlement that is essentially two-sided: on the one side health and quality of life of the Roma, and on the other health and quality of life of the immediate social surroundings. Of course, health reasons are not the only issue here but wider understood issues related to protection and appearance of the surroundings.
- ²⁰ Especially in traditional ones in which inhabitants predominantly work in farming or trades.
- ²¹ Usually the “boss” is somewhere else. It would be interesting to investigate the system of social power in Romani populations. Even tho-

ugh, this was not the theme of our study, it is justifiable to assume that the “boss” is undisputedly an important social actor and that developmental activities would be more successful if a suitably influential person was available in Romani settlements.

- ²² The Romani minority, due to their spatial dispersal, but most probably for other reasons, have (too) many associations that weaken their negotiating status and reduce the possibility that someone from their side is responsible for affairs within the community.