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The Situation of Roma between Human Rights and Economics

If the dominant focus of documents on Roma published by intergovernmental organizations in the 1990s was on providing redress for past violations of human rights and protection from future discrimination, this is no longer the case as of early 2014. Over the last decade, it has become increasingly common for calls to improve the situation of Roma to be justified in terms of economic benefits for society as a whole.

Eben Friedman, March 2014
ECMI Issue Brief # 31

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context

Visible attention to the situation of Roma on the part of intergovernmental organizations active in Europe has increased gradually since the 1990s. Whereas documents on Roma published by such organizations in the 1990s tended to emphasize human rights as a basis for calls for measures to improve the Roma’s situation, since the first several years of the current millennium similar calls have been increasingly rooted in the proposition that improvements in the situation of Roma can be expected to provide economic benefits for the general populations of the countries in which Roma live. That some relevant policy documents deploy these two lines of argument concurrently begs questions both of the relationship between human rights and economic discourses in relation to Roma and about the actual and potential consequences of these discourses for attempts to improve the situation of Roma. This paper explores both sets of questions while also relating human rights and economic discourses to two earlier approaches to Roma: extermination and assimilation. In so doing, the paper covers the four approaches accounting for the largest body of policies explicitly targeting Roma (or, more accurately from the standpoint of policies aiming and extermination or assimilation, Gypsies) since Roma’s arrival in Europe.2

1.2. Approach

With an eye to laying the groundwork for the critical examination of human rights and economic discourses in the paper’s last three sections, the two sections immediately following this introductory one treat approaches aiming at extermination and assimilation, respectively. For each type of approach, a brief examination of main tenets and implications for Roma and non-Roma is followed by an overview of some of the more significant historical applications of the relevant approach, including a summary of actual effects on Roma. As will become apparent from the presentation of historical examples in these two sections, while extermination and assimilation are in principle mutually exclusive approaches, there has been some oscillation between them. The respective sections devoted to extermination and
assimilation close with a brief look at the current status of related discourses, with attention given to the provisions of international conventions which in principle rule out these approaches from consideration in most (but not all) member states of the Council of Europe.

The central questions of this paper are treated primarily in Sections 4, 5, and 6. Section 4 consists in an examination of human rights-based approaches to Roma, while Section 5 focuses on approaches based in economic considerations. As in Sections 2 and 3, Sections 4 and 5 begin with a look at basic premises and expectations related to the roles of Roma and non-Roma, as well as to relations between the two populations. Next in these two sections comes a presentation of relevant examples from Europe after 1990. Also discussed are liabilities of each approach as they have manifested themselves in contemporary European societies, with particular attention given to the approaches’ vulnerability to attempts by opponents of measures for improving the situation of Roma to shift the burden of proof to those who view Roma as legitimate rights bearers and/or who assert that the general population would benefit more from improvements in the situation of Roma than from other courses of action (or inaction). The concluding discussion in Section 6 offers an assessment of the extent to which human rights and economic discourses on improving the situation of Roma can and do coexist and briefly examines evidence suggesting that a shift from human rights to economic discourse is underway and what this could mean for attempts to improve the situation of Roma.

2. EXTERMINATION

The Gypsy question is for us now primarily a question of race. Just as the National Socialist state solved the Jewish question, so will it need in principle to regulate the Gypsy question. 3

2.1. Definition and assumptions

This section treats the most radical of approaches to Roma: policies aiming at the physical elimination of Gypsies. Both founded on and seeking to maintain an absolute boundary between Gypsies and non-Gypsies, approaches of this kind treat Gypsies exclusively as objects of policy; although Roma could in principle participate in the design and implementation of such policies, to do so would ultimately be suicidal. Given the goal of approaches in this category, it is clear that issues of Roma’s well-being – whether as members of a minority or simply as human beings – and of future relations between Roma and non-Roma are moot. Non-Romani populations, on the other hand, are expected to benefit from the physical elimination of Gypsies, with their anticipated involvement in implementing relevant policies ranging from active participation to passivity (depending on the regime and policy).

2.2. Historical Examples

Europe in 16th-18th centuries

While the best-known example of an initiative to physically eliminate Gypsies is Nazi Germany, policies targeting Gypsies for mass killing were elaborated in parts of Europe from at least the sixteenth century, with the various anti-Gypsy regulations sharing the absence of a requirement that Gypsies commit any particular offense. 4 In the Holy Roman Empire, persecution of Gypsies was initially founded on accusations that Gypsies were Ottoman spies, with the 150 anti-Gypsy edicts issued within the Empire in the period from 1500 to 1750 including some aimed at elimination. 5 Elsewhere in Europe, Louis XIV (King of France and Navarre) called in 1682 for the sterilization of Gypsy women, while in
Prussia King Friedrich Wilhelm I issued an Instruction in 1725 to hang all adult Gypsies without trial. In the Netherlands of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Roma were killed in “heathen hunts” (heidenjachten) organized by police with the help of military forces. Gypsy hunts were also organized in Hungary in the seventeenth century.

Nazi Germany

In Nazi Germany, sterilizations of Gypsies began in 1933, with a law prohibiting marriages between Gypsies and Aryans in force from 1935. Classification of Gypsies as an “alien race” (artfremde Rasse) in 1936 provided a formal basis for further negative eugenic measures, including the prohibition issued in the same year on all marriages involving Roma and Sinti. Although considerations including Roma’s Aryan origins made for an absence of consistent Nazi policy toward Gypsies until the last few years of the regime, by 1938 a decision had been taken to resolve what the regime called “the Gypsy question” according to racial principles in much the same way as “the Jewish question.” Ultimately, the Nazi program of extermination through work did not eliminate Roma, but resulted in the deaths of at least 250,000 persons classified as Gypsies on biological grounds.

2.3. Current status

The approaches described above are covered by the United Nations’ Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which defines genocide as attempts “to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethical, racial or religious group” by killing members of the group, causing the group’s members “serious bodily or mental harm,” creating living conditions designed to bring about the group’s physical destruction, taking measures to prevent births within the group, or taking away children from the group for transfer to another. Insofar as all members of the Council of Europe with the exception of Malta have ratified the Convention, it is not surprising that there is no evidence of such approaches to Roma receiving official consideration by policymakers in the present day. Nonetheless, apparent advocacy of extermination occasionally surfaces on the margins of officialdom, as in the January 2013 statement by a journalist close to the ruling party in Hungary that most Roma are animals who should not be allowed to exist, or the remark by a French deputy mayor in July 2013 that “[m]aybe Hitler did not kill enough of them”.

3. ASSIMILATION

“Either we will respect the particular comportment of the Gypsies and will let them live as parasites and wander on our roads[,] or, in their interest and in ours, we will try to give them the same economic and cultural levels as the populations among which they live.”

“Work transforms gypsies directly in a miraculous manner.”

3.1. Definition and assumptions

Different from extermination discourses in prescribed method if not in their aim of eliminating Gypsies are approaches aiming at assimilation. Approaches in this category accordingly emphasize destroying the characteristics defining Gypsies as a group without killing the group’s members, such that Gypsies are to cast off their Gypsy identity in a process of absorption into another population. As is the case with approaches aimed at extermination, discourses around the assimilation of Gypsies leave no room for
Gypsies to participate in the design and implementation of relevant policies as (Gypsy or Romani) subjects, making Gypsies exclusively objects of policy; while there is nothing to prevent assimilated former Gypsies from taking an active part in making and realizing relevant policies, this is in principle possible only to the extent that they are no longer Gypsies. Different from approaches aimed at extermination, however, is the attention to Gypsies’ putative well-being inherent in assimilationist approaches; in fact, the elimination of Gypsies is presented as in the Gypsies’ own interest as human beings. This line of thinking is exemplified in the following statement by a Polish ethnologist in defense of the Communist regime’s attempts to sedentarize and assimilate the Gypsies:

“Those who regret that there will no longer be any romantic nomads do not realize the injustice and ignorance that were inseparably bound up with this so-called “romantic” way of life. They do not realize that in our struggle against ignorance and illiteracy we cannot leave out a single citizen, nor can we dream of reservations when we are dealing with men and not bison. It is a good thing that in the future we shall see the Gypsy fires only in the Gypsy theatre.”

If Gypsies are expected to cease to be Gypsies as their situation improves, non-Roma have their own responsibilities for ensuring the success of the assimilation process, from which they, too, benefit. On the one hand, they are expected to serve as good examples to be emulated by the Gypsies. On the other hand, non-Roma are expected to accept assimilants as their equals.

3.2. Historical Examples

Habsburg Hungary

While explicitly assimilationist policy aimed at Gypsies was elaborated most systematically in (some of the) East European Communist regimes, it was not without historical antecedents. The reign of Maria Theresa (1740-1780) brought a qualitative change in Habsburg policy toward Gypsies from attempts to drive Gypsies away to a series of decrees designed to settle and assimilate the Gypsies. The first of these required Gypsies to settle in government-supplied huts and subjected them to taxes and compulsory services to the manor lord, also prohibiting Gypsies from owning horses and wagons and allowing travel outside the village of residence only with express permission. A second decree required Gypsy youths sixteen and older to perform military service while assigning boys between twelve and sixteen to a master tasked with teaching them a craft; Gypsy girls were to serve in the homes of (non-Gypsy) nobles, townspeople, or peasants. This same decree also mandated the replacement of surnames meaning ‘Gypsy’ with German and Hungarian equivalents of ‘new citizen’, ‘new farmer’, ‘new Hungarian’, and ‘new settler’. Among the provisions of a third decree were prohibitions on distinctions in dress, speech, and occupation, with Maria Theresa’s fourth and final decree on Gypsies prohibiting marriages among Gypsies, subsidizing mixed marriages for Gypsies who met financial, service, and knowledge requirements, and mandating removal of Gypsy children older than five from their parents to be raised by non-Gypsy families. Another set of decrees issued by Maria Theresa’s successor, Joseph II, continued and extended the assimilationist approach to Gypsies in the Habsburg lands. Overall, however, while the policies of Maria Theresa
and Joseph II likely resulted in the nominal settlement of 40,000-50,000 nomadic Roma, the effectiveness of Habsburg assimilation policies was limited by persistent social distance between Romani and non-Romani populations, as well as by financial considerations on the part of the local nobility responsible for enforcing the policies.  

**Communist responses to the ‘Gypsy Question’**

Consistent with Stalin’s (1942) prescriptions for subordinating questions of national liberation to broader proletarian liberation, most Communist regimes initially classified Gypsies as an ethnic or social group arising out of the political and economic conditions characterizing feudalism.  

Resolving the “Gypsy Question”, as it was often called in these regimes, was accordingly a matter of eliminating the social space for Gypsiness which the feudal system had maintained in order to bring about the Gypsies’ assimilation into a nascent proletarian culture. Communist policy makers in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania thus marked a reified Gypsy way of life for destruction through policies of sedentarization, permanent employment, subsidized housing, and free, obligatory education.  

On the surface, the initiative to settle Roma and to attach them to waged work was moderately successful. At the same time, however, the shortages of consumer goods and services characteristic of Communist economies led authorities to tolerate participation in nominally illegal informal economic activities and thus the maintenance of trading relationships to which many Roma were habituated well before Communism. Moreover, many Roma continued to perform menial jobs which non-Roma tended to avoid, serving as a pool of cheap unskilled labor and moving from place to place as jobs ran out in one location and appeared in another as a result of chronic labor shortages. Thus, while the activities associated with Gypsies were officially condemned, the political economy of Communism nonetheless left a space in its margins for those activities and thus for the maintenance of ethnic distinction; “allegiance to basic value standards will not be sustained where one’s own comparative performance is utterly inadequate”.  

If the aspects of the political economy of Communism described in the previous paragraph are useful in accounting for the persistence of a distinct ethnic identity among those labeled Gypsies by authorities, Communist assimilation policy failed also because the expectations on the non-Romani population were not fulfilled. Closely related to the maintenance of an occupational niche that was filled in large part by Roma, daily life under Communism afforded few opportunities for non-Roma to encourage assimilation by serving as proletarian role models; as Stewart has argued, Communist bureaucrats can be seen as potential targets of their own Gypsy policies, for they produced nothing themselves “but spent their time calculating which way the wind was blowing and orienting themselves accordingly to benefit from policy changes.” Moreover, Communists’ preferential treatment of Gypsies in the areas of education, employment, and especially housing provoked what Ulč has called “white socialist backlash,” worsening relations between Roma and non-Roma and thereby compromising the expectation that non-Roma would accept assimilants.

### 3.3. Current status

The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities stipulates that states party “shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation of persons belonging to national
minorities against their will”. Most members of the Council of Europe have ratified the Framework Convention, but, as shown in Table 1, among the eight countries which have not done so are four member states of the European Union (EU) and three countries with estimated Romani populations numbering more than 100,000. Additional evidence suggesting that the level of acceptance of assimilation as a policy goal may be higher than that of extermination in the present day are the use by some governments of definitions of integration which approach assimilation and the open-endedness in principle of economic approaches to the situation of Roma (treated in Section 5 of this paper).

Table 1. Romani populations of Council of Europe member states not party to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Estimated Romani population</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Council of Europe

4. HUMAN RIGHTS

“To adopt and implement national strategies and programmes and express determined political will and moral leadership, with a view to improving the situation of Roma and their protection against discrimination by State bodies, as well as by any person or organization”.

4.1. Definition and assumptions

The approaches examined in this section ground calls for improving the situation of Roma in notions of human rights. Whereas all take into account the rights of Roma as individuals, some also attend to rights stemming from Roma’s status as a minority. For the purposes of this paper, human rights approaches are divided into those focusing on violations – usually of civil and political rights – and approaches rooted in a putative right to development which includes access to economic resources.

Notwithstanding the considerable differentiation within the broad category of human rights approaches to the situation of Roma, the different approaches share similar implications for Roma on the one hand and non-Roma on the other. Unlike the extermination and assimilation discourses treated in the previous sections of this paper, the human rights approaches reviewed in the current section allow Roma to benefit from relevant policies as Roma. Moreover, Roma’s role is not restricted to serving as the objects of policy, as they may also participate in the design and implementation of relevant policies as subjects. For their part, non-Roma are expected to accept Roma as subjects (and not only objects) of policy. Non-Roma are further expected to accept targeted measures to improve the situation of Roma on the grounds of an entitlement rooted in Roma’s very humanity.

Human rights-based arguments for improving the situation of Roma are in principle...
compatible with three possible modes of relations between Roma and non-Romani society. The first of these is integration, understood for the purposes of this paper as “peaceful cohabitation and the retention of separate ethnic identities.” A second possibility is assimilation, which occurs when Roma cease to identify themselves and to be identified by non-Roma as Roma, becoming incorporated into the non-Romani population. The third mode of relations between Roma and non-Roma possible under the human rights approaches examined here, separation, is a scenario in which Romani and non-Romani populations live in parallel to one another, with little interaction between them.

4.2. Examples in contemporary Europe

Violations

An emphasis on protecting Roma against discrimination and violations of their rights as individuals and as members of a minority is discernible in documents published since the early 1990s by intergovernmental organizations active in Europe. Among the first such documents was the UN Commission on Human Rights’ (1992) Protection of Roma (gypsies), which invites states to eliminate discrimination against Roma and offers the Centre for Human Rights to support efforts in that direction. The following year, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) issued a Recommendation containing the assertion that “[r]espect for the rights of Gypsies, individual, fundamental and human rights and their rights as a minority is essential to improve their situation.” Five years later, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance noted that Roma’s fundamental rights were “regularly violated or threatened”. The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination’s General Recommendation XXVII on Discrimination Against Roma adds to the more familiar appeals to avoid discrimination and respect Roma’s rights and identity in the present a call “[t]o acknowledge wrongs done during the Second World War to Roma communities by deportation and extermination and consider ways of compensating for them”.

If rights discourse in relation to Roma first appears in intergovernmental organizations’ documents in the 1990s, a broadly similar discourse was in use within the international Romani movement two decades earlier. Perhaps not surprisingly, the birth of this movement was prompted in large part by the perceived denial of basic rights to Roma even after the conclusion of the Second World War. The international Romani movement’s official debut on the international political scene came in 1971 in the form of the first World Romani Congress, which was support by Indian and Yugoslav governments. Since that time, one organization laying claim to representing the movement, the International Romani Union, has secured official status in Council of Europe, OSCE, UNICEF, and the United Nations.

A more recent example of rights discourse emphasizing protection against discrimination and violation comes in the 2004 Partnership Agreement between the Council of Europe and the European Roma and Travellers Forum. Established for the purpose of “oversee[ing] the effective exercise by Roma and Travellers of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as protected by the legal instruments of the Council of Europe,” the Forum is headquartered in a building of the Council of Europe, which also contributes to the Forum’s staff and funding. Taking into account the institutional relationship between the
European Roma and Travellers Forum and the Council of Europe, the Partnership Agreement may be seen as a convergence of discourses present in the international Romani movement and in documents issued by intergovernmental organizations.

Development

The conceptualization of Roma by intergovernmental organizations active in Europe as bearers of a broad set of rights including not only protection against discrimination and violations, but also access to resources needed for development, appears to begin in the early 2000s. Drawing explicitly on a general policy document issued four years earlier which characterized civil and political rights as interdependent with economic and cultural rights, the United Nations Development Programme’s 2002 report Avoiding the Dependency Trap grounds a call for a change in approach to issues of the integration of Roma “going beyond the prevailing “violations” discourse to address the root causes of Roma problems and propose adequate, sustainable policy solutions” in a conviction that “[w]ithout development opportunities, human rights are incomplete.” In a Recommendation issued the same year, PACE reiterates its call of nearly a decade earlier for respect for Roma’s rights as citizens and as members of a minority while adding that “[t]he majority population and Roma share responsibility in society to an asymmetrical measure in the light of their capacities and their economic, political, cultural and social resources,” such that the former has an obligation to “support Roma as a disadvantaged social group” while the state has an opportunity to provide “appropriate conditions, encouragement and incentives”. A similar approach is apparent in the 2010 PACE Recommendation The Situation of Roma in Europe and Relevant Activities of the Council of Europe, which refers to “the moral and legal duty” of all Council of Europe member states to work to improve the situation of Roma and emphasizes access to education and housing as “the first decisive steps towards breaking the vicious circle of discrimination in which most of the Roma are locked.”

The treatment of access to resources as a human right is present also in the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area. Explicitly rooted in international and regional human rights law, the Action Plan makes note of a need for action “to ensure that Roma and Sinti people enjoy social and economic rights on a par with others,” and calls for “combining human rights goals with social policies”. With its pledge to “work toward eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society,” the declaration signed by the prime ministers of the countries participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion also appears to belong to this category. In much the same way, the Decade’s Terms of Reference define the initiative as “a political commitment by Governments to combat Roma poverty, exclusion, and discrimination within a regional framework”.

In a reflection of the increased attention to Roma at the level of the EU apparent at the end of the first decade of the 2000s, the 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion characterize economic development together with non-discrimination and equality of opportunity as core values of the Union to be incorporated in policies for promoting the inclusion of. The same document also rules out compromise in relation to fundamental human rights. Consistent with these principles, the European Agency for Fundamental Rights
(FRA) notes in a 2009 report the need for initiatives to reduce discrimination in relation to the allocation of resources where Roma are concerned. More recently, FRA Director Morten Kjaerum states in a 2012 report that “the nature of the challenges many Roma are facing in the EU requires policy responses which articulate development efforts within a rights-based approach. Such policy responses must tackle the socio-economic barriers that Roma face while also ensuring that their fundamental rights are respected”. Less clear in their orientation relative to this second variant of human rights discourse on Roma (but clearly not an example of the first variant) are the reports on Roma published by the World Bank in the first few years of the 2000s. Apparently the World Bank’s first publication on Roma, the 2000 report *Roma and the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe* observes a shift in the focus of international attention from “immediate human rights concerns” to “issues related to economic development and social conditions” and prescribes overall economic development as key to addressing Roma’s poverty. A report published three years later calls for “[p]olicies of inclusion [which] would complement rights-based approaches by tackling the economic and social barriers which Roma face”. While this formulation suggests an understanding of human rights as limited to the civil and political, it does not provide information on the broader principles on which the “policies of inclusion” should be founded. On the other hand, the observation that “[c]ountries also cannot ignore the growth of Roma long-term unemployment and poverty, which will undermine competitiveness over the longer term” rests on the economic considerations which constitute the focus of Section 5 of this paper.

**4.3. Liabilities**

One weakness of human rights discourse in relation to improving the situation of Roma is its disconnection from the lived experiences of many Roma, who may find talk of rights suspect for this reason. Perhaps more problematic, though, is that the ostensibly hermetic nature of human rights appears to drive some opponents of rights-based policies targeting Roma to call into question Roma’s very humanity. An indication that questions of this kind are receiving attention at the European level comes in the form of the claim by EU Vice President Viviane Reding to the European Parliament in October 2013 that “Roma are human beings,” followed by the observation that “[t]his might not be agreed by everybody in this house” and a reminder to MEPs that politicians at all levels have the same obligation to help Roma as they do to help other EU citizens in need.

Talk about Roma in terms of human rights also appears often to have struck a raw nerve among non-Romani populations more broadly: “The language of rights is exhausted and what we can see in the last years is the decline of civil society and the rise of uncivil society”. A particularly explicit example of this backlash in relation to the application of human rights discourse to Roma comes from Slovakia, where Prime Minister Robert Fico has publicly lamented that the introduction of “non-standard” measures to remedy the ineffectiveness of standard measures targeting Roma would place the country on a blacklist of human rights violators and thus prevent Slovakia from accessing EU funding in future. Especially taking into account current levels of support for populist politicians in much of Europe, the continued deployment of human rights discourse as used to date in relation to Roma thus risks deepening divisions between Roma and non-Roma.
5. **ECONOMICS**

Unless Roma employment and wage rates substantially improve, a smaller working age population in which many Roma are without jobs will not be able to carry this rising fiscal burden. 67

5.1. **Definition and assumptions**

Whereas the previous section focused on calls for improving the situation of Roma based in notions of human rights, the approaches examined in the current section attend primarily to the economic benefits for society as a whole expected to result from future improvements in the situation of Roma. Like the rights-based approaches examined above, the economics discourse treated in this section leaves space for Roma to participate in the design and implementation policy as subjects rather than as mere objects, as in the case of the extermination and assimilation discourses. At minimum, non-Roma are expected to accept Roma as subjects of policy to the extent that Roma’s participation contributes to bringing about the anticipated improvements for both Roma and the broader society.

Another similarity to human rights discourse distinguishing both human rights and economics discourses from extermination and assimilation discourses is the compatibility of economic approaches with benefits for Roma qua Roma; in other words, the arguments reviewed in Section 5.2 are premised on the possibility of Roma benefiting from targeted measures which also serve broader societal interests in the medium to long term. At the same time, the economics discourse as illustrated above is more restrictive than is human rights discourse in its implications for compatible modes of relations between Roma and non-Roma: Whereas rights-based approaches are compatible in principle with separation between Roma and the general population, the economics discourse’s emphasis on the role of Roma as a workforce (whether actual or potential) rules out a scenario in which Roma support and benefit from their own institutions. At the same time, like human rights discourse, the economics discourse is compatible not only with a combination of peaceful cohabitation and retention of distinct ethnic identities, but also with the abandonment of Romani identity through absorption of Roma into the non-Romani population.

5.2. **Examples in contemporary Europe**

As noted in Section 4.2, considerations of the economic significance of the situation of Roma are evident already in World Bank reports on Roma from the first few years of the 2000s. Further, the World Bank appears to be the only intergovernmental organization to produce publications containing considerations of this kind before 2009. In the interim, however, two reports including analyses of expected returns on investments in the education of Roma were published by the Roma Education Fund. 68 The first of these, which draws explicitly on a broader literature on the expected benefits of investments in children in the US in an attempt to supplement arguments based on social equity with a financial rationale, estimates the net benefit of the allocation of additional resources sufficient to enable Roma in Hungary to complete secondary education. 69 The second such report offers an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of streaming Romani children into special education in Slovakia, calculating and comparing the hypothetical payback periods of several educational paths. 70

The kinds of economic considerations sketched in the World Bank reports on Roma
published in the first few years of the 2000s find a thorough elaboration in the 2010 World Bank policy note *Roma Inclusion: An Economic Opportunity for Europe.* The general line of argument is explicit from the beginning: “The focus of this report is on the economic benefits of Roma integration. In particular, it asks the question *How much larger would the economies be, and how much higher would government revenue be, if Roma enjoyed the same labor market opportunities as the majority populations?*” The report concludes on the basis of an analysis of quantitative data from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Romania, and Serbia that “the fiscal benefits alone far outweigh the investments of closing the education gap between Roma and non-Roma,” such that “[a]ggregate economic benefits are substantial across the four countries.”

Arguments emphasizing the future economic benefits for society as a whole resulting from current or potential efforts to improve the situation of Roma appear also in documents issued by the European Commission. In the 2010 Communication *The Social and Economic Integration of the Roma in Europe,* such arguments share space with considerations of human rights. Thus, on the one hand, the Communication notes the need for the basic values of the EU as enshrined in the *Charter of Fundamental Rights* to be put into practice in order to improve the situation of Roma as the largest ethnic minority in the EU, while on the other hand promising that “[t]he full integration of Roma will have important economic benefits for our societies, especially for those countries with a shrinking population that cannot afford to exclude a large part of their potential labour force.” The warning included in the Communication also combines considerations of rights and economics: “Roma exclusion entails not only significant human suffering but also significant direct costs for public budgets as well as indirect costs through losses in productivity.”

Considerations of both rights and economics are also present in the *EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020.* With regard to the latter, the EU Framework makes note of the “significant and growing proportion of the school age population and therefore the future workforce” comprised by Roma in many Member States, as well as of the economic impact of this state of affairs already apparent in some Member States. In a later passage of the same document, however, it appears that economic well-being is a means to higher ends: “Economic integration of the Roma will also contribute to social cohesion and improve respect for fundamental rights.” Moreover, ensuring non-discrimination and breaking the intergenerational poverty cycle are presented as obligations of Member States. Bringing these two types of considerations together, the EU Framework notes that “[i]ntegrating the Roma people will not only bring social benefits, but will also economically benefit both Roma people as well as the communities they are part of”.

The Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly’s Recommendation 1927 of 2013 differs from previous PACE documents in relation to Roma in incorporating considerations of economics. Observing that discrimination against Roma in Europe is widespread, the Recommendation grounds a call for addressing on an urgent basis discrimination against Romani children in an expectation that “[i]f Roma are given equal opportunities during their childhood, as adults they will be in a position to contribute to the workforce and economic activity in Europe as qualified professionals.” In this manner, a declared need to address what had been presented in previous PACE
Recommendations on Roma as a violation of human rights is now justified in terms of economic benefit for society as a whole.

George Soros takes a similar approach in a November 2013 column entitled “Empowering Europe’s Roma”. In the column, Soros characterizes investment in education as the only way out of the current vicious circle of marginalization of and contempt toward Roma and asserts that such an investment “would pay enormous social dividends,” particularly given that Roma account for more than one in five persons entering the labor force in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia. In a parting shot, Soros conveys a sense of urgency:

"[G]iven the increase in its Roma population, Europe’s long-term prosperity depends on reversing current trends -- and getting started right away."

The frequency with which economic arguments for improving the situation of Roma are advanced appears to have increased in recent years not only among actors at European level, but also among researchers and advocates beyond official circles. Thus, the early childhood expert John Bennett notes that “the inclusion of Roma is not merely an obligation in terms of human rights, but also an economic necessity in Europe,” explaining that “Roma children will be an extremely valuable asset if they can be protected, educated and brought into the skilled work force at increasingly higher levels”. In broadly similar fashion, a report commissioned by the Romanian Romani NGO Impreuna contains a statement that Roma should be considered “a resource whose development Romania’s welfare and its European economic, political and social route depend on”.

5.3. Liabilities

Although the economic arguments presented in Section 5.1 are clearly directed toward improving the situation of Roma, they introduce an element of contingency which opens the door also to similarly grounded arguments against improving the situation of Roma and ultimately even to arguments for killing them. In the accounts presented above, non-Roma are expected to accept investments in improving the situation of Roma in the expectation of future return. To the extent that the deciding factor in designing policy aimed at Roma is the benefit for society as a whole, however, the key underlying question becomes one of Roma’s value for society. This in turn leaves room for attempts to shift the burden of proof by demanding arguments in favor of Roma’s continued existence (whether as Roma in particular or as human beings in general). In the absence of non-economic considerations, there is nothing to prevent policymakers from estimating the economic benefits of extermination as a basis for comparison with other policy options.

Short of inviting consideration of extermination as a policy option, the use of economic arguments for improving the situation of Roma risks sharpening divisions between Roma and non-Roma as ‘takers’ and ‘givers’, respectively. Indications of such sharpening in recent years come in the form of coercive measures ostensibly grounded in considerations of broad societal prosperity and which can be expected to affect Roma disproportionately even where relevant policies do not target Roma explicitly. Thus, in the Czech Republic, a reduction in the number of labor offices was accompanied in 2012 by a requirement that persons with a long history of unemployment was accompanied in 2012 by a requirement that persons with a long history of unemployment register regularly to “Czech Points” located in post offices and town halls not in order to
receive assistance in finding suitable employment, but for the sole purpose of reporting. In Romania, able-bodied recipients of social assistance are required to participate in community work at the request of the local mayor, but do not receive support aimed at long-term employment. Finally, since 2011 over 400 mayors in Slovakia have signed on to a movement aimed at demolishing Romani settlements (and evicting their inhabitants) on the basis of environmental legislation.

6. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION: RELATIONS AMONG DISCOURSES

If the dominant focus of documents on Roma published by intergovernmental organizations in the 1990s was on providing redress for past violations of human rights and protection from future discrimination, this is no longer the case as of early 2014. Over the last decade, it has become increasingly common for calls to improve the situation of Roma to be justified in terms of economic benefits for society as a whole. Moreover, human rights and economic discourses can be found together in policy documents on Roma issued by the European Commission. The deliberate nature of this juxtaposition is illustrated in the following statement made by EU Commissioner on Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion László Andor in November 2011: “Societies where Roma do well will be more cohesive and more prosperous too. There is no trade-off between economic efficiency and social equity”.

Although presumably intended to build support for measures to improve the situation of Roma, the coexistence of human rights and economic discourses is not necessarily an easy one. On the one hand, rather than address the ongoing backlash against human rights discourse, the juxtaposition often simply adds considerations of economics. On the other hand, combining human rights arguments with economic ones does not provide explicit guidance on how to adjudicate between the two in case of conflict. In this light, declarations about the compatibility of equity and efficiency are better understood as statements of ideology than as practical guidance for designing and defending concrete policies.

As the coexistence of human rights and economic discourses in some documents on Roma indicates, the deployment of economic arguments need not amount to giving up on human rights. Further, the non-exhaustive analysis of Sections 4 and 5 of this paper is insufficient to ground a conclusion that a sea change from human rights to economics is underway. Nonetheless, the increasing frequency with which economic arguments are deployed and the exclusively economic argument for combating discrimination against Romani children apparent in PACE Recommendation 1927 of 2013 suggest at the very least a need for vigilance to prevent the backsliding on human rights commitments which is implicit in discussion of assimilation or extermination as a policy option in the present day. In the longer term, however, most promising as a basis for attempts to improve the situation of Roma is the promotion among non-Roma of a broad understanding of human rights as including the economic and cultural as well as the civil and political. While this could perhaps best be accomplished as an integral part of compulsory education, making human rights discourse credible for Roma can be expected to depend on concrete improvements underpinned by unequivocal recognition of Roma among non-Roma as legitimate rights bearers.
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