

Balázs Majtényi
György Majtényi

A CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF EXCLUSION

The Roma Issue in Hungary from 1945 to 2015

A CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF EXCLUSION

**A
CONTEMPORARY
HISTORY
OF EXCLUSION**

*The Roma Issue in Hungary from
1945 to 2015*

BALÁZS MAJTÉNYI

and

GYÖRGY MAJTÉNYI



Central European University Press
Budapest–New York

Copyright © by Balázs Majtényi and György Majtényi 2016

First published in Hungarian as
Cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1945–2010 (Budapest: Libri Kiadó, 2012).
English translation by Frank T. Zsigo.

Published in 2016 by arrangement with the Eötvös Loránd University, Eszterházy Károly University of Applied Sciences and the Center for Social Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.



EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Central European University Press

An imprint of the
Central European University Limited Liability Company
Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: +36-1-327-3138 or 327-3000
Fax: +36-1-327-3183
E-mail: ceupress@press.ceu.edu
Website: www.ceupress.com

224 West 57th Street, New York NY 10019, USA
Tel: +1-212-547-6932
Fax: +1-646-557-2416
E-mail: meszarosa@press.ceu.edu

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, without the permission
of the Publisher.

ISBN 978-963-386-122-6 cloth

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Majtényi, Balázs. | Majtényi, György.

Title: A contemporary history of exclusion : the Roma issue in Hungary from 1945 to 2015 / Balázs Majtényi and György Majtényi.

Other titles: *Cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1945-2010*. English
Description: Budapest: Central European University Press, 2015. | "The first version of this volume was published in 2012 under the title *The Gypsy Issue in Hungary, 1945-2010 (Cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1945–2010)*"—Acknowledgments. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2015036022 | ISBN 9789633861226 (hardbound : alkaline paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Romanies--Hungary. | Romanies—Hungary—Social conditions. | Marginality, Social—Hungary. | Romanies—Legal status, laws, etc.—Hungary. | Minorities—Government policy—Hungary. | Hungary—Ethnic relations. | Hungary—Social policy.

Classification: LCC DX223 .M34613 2015 | DDC 305.8914/970439—dc23
LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2015036022>

Printed in Hungary
by

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	1
Contexts of Gypsy/Roma identity and history	1
On the sources of Gypsy/Roma history	5
Who (what) is (was) Hungarian or Gypsy/Roma?	10
“Comrades, If You Have a Heart ...” The History of the Gypsy Issue, 1945–1961	31
The construction and spread of the state socialist system	31
Policy and Gypsies	32
Modernization and Gypsy communities	37
Disciplinary state	45
The impossibility of self-organization	50
Minority issue	52
Discourses on social policy and equality	53
“Life Goes On ...” The Hungarian Party-State and Assimilation	63
Social policy and the Gypsies	66
<i>Wage work</i>	67
<i>Housing</i>	70
<i>Social system</i>	73
<i>Education</i>	78
Scientific approaches	80
Gypsy images	84

The transformation of discourse	87
Disciplinary power, disciplinary society	92
<i>Police and agents</i>	92
<i>"Health supervisors"</i>	95
The national minority issue	96
National movement	99
The "ethnic interpretation" of history	106
 Roma Policy after the Regime Change	 119
Minority issue	125
Prospects for multiculturalism	128
Minority (self-)government?	131
Divide at impera — The opportunities and impossibilities of self-organization	136
Civic movement	140
National minority culture — national culture	143
Questions of equal treatment and equal opportunity	148
<i>Anti-discrimination</i>	148
<i>Equal opportunity</i>	152
Roma programs	153
<i>Education</i>	153
<i>Employment</i>	156
Social policy and the Roma	158
<i>Aid</i>	159
<i>Segregation</i>	162
Disciplinary society	166
The transformation of discourses	169
Research methods	170
 Panopticon: Roma Policy, 2010–2015	 187
The Hungarian National Cooperation System	188
The anti-egalitarian character of the system	189
Changing minority legislation	191
New social policy?	195
Violence	197
The shift	199
 Summary: Decades of Exclusion	 205
 Bibliography	 211
List of Photographs	233
Index	239

Acknowledgments

The first version of this volume was published in 2012 under the title *The Gypsy Issue in Hungary, 1945–2010* [Cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1945-2010], with the support of the National Cultural Fund. The National Cultural Fund was established by the state, and it was meant to be an independent financial fund to support cultural affairs. After the publication of this book, the director of the Fund appeared on television and stated that the minister responsible for culture had asked him how the Fund could support such a book, which was antagonistic to the government. Later, the same person stated in a pro-government newspaper that the book, “...especially in the last chapter concretely reviles the current government’s Gypsy policy.” The aim of the authors was not the above, but instead a critical analysis of discourses on Roma after 1945. The director’s statements, however, left us quite satisfied and encouraged our further efforts, as we felt that the book had reached one of its goals, that being affecting the dominant discourse. The aim of the expanded English language edition is the analysis of past and present discourses on Gypsies/Roma in the context of the so-called “Gypsy issue” in Hungary, as well as the general description of the situation of the Hungarian Roma to unfamiliar readers.

We are grateful to all those who provided us with advice and recommendations, foremost to Katya Dunajeva, Csaba Dupcsik, Mária Neményi, Péter Szuhay, Tünde Virág, and Frank T. Zsigo. All errors remain of course the authors’ own.

We would also like to thank Eötvös Loránd University, Eszterházy Károly University of Applied Sciences and the Center for Social Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for their financial support, which made the research and the publication of the book possible.

Introduction

Contexts of Gypsy/Roma identity and history

“Do not ask me who I am and do not ask me to remain the same”—this is what the French philosopher and cultural historian Michel Foucault thought concerning the relationship we develop with our own image and the image of us formed by others.¹ In the 1950s a Gypsy nail-maker bitterly explained what people in Hungary generally thought about Gypsies: “The *gadje* [non-Roma] don’t even know that the Roma work for them, so they can have fancy houses. Who makes staples? The Roma. Who makes Rabitz mesh? The Roma. Who makes thumbnails? The Roma. Who makes steel clasps? The Roma. Who makes corner pins? The Roma. And who knows that the Roma make all these things? The Roma. No one knows, all they know about is lice and theft.”² These two quotes illustrate the difference between social science theory and the real relativism of a citizen living as a member of a minority group. What we say and what is said about us are equally relative. The important question is whether we have a real influence on what is said and written about us: on the discourse.

Historians largely treat the view that the past endures in various texts and interpretations as an axiom. Writings that analyze discourses (texts that have come to life) are largely characterized by the relationship between power and knowledge. Powers-that-be oversee and take ownership of discourses through institutions: historical individuals and groups can lose their voice this way.³ A fundamental question is how various discourses—political, policy or scientific—influence the opportunity to express identity.

There exists a substantive interpretation, according to which the historical determination of identity is not significant in the case of Roma. This approach

holds that Roma are a people “without history,” who did not preserve and share with one another the memories of the past, and do not even conceptualize such memories for the sake of the future.⁴ As such, the source of Roma identity is primarily everyday life. According to such authors, Roma remember the past differently than do members of modern societies. Memory in its textual form exists to a lesser degree in their case. As such, memory is neither reflexive nor discursive, but implicit: current experiences define their social lives.⁵

A related interpretation holds that in the case of Roma, the nature of relations to the non-Roma world and the unity within Roma communities taken together define current group identity (many emphasize the former factor).⁶ This approach reflects Fredrik Barth’s anthropological theory, according to which the changing nature of borders separating social and ethnic groups is what determines group identity and—as an extension—its cultural content. It is worth noting that Barth described the social situation of Roma exclusively in terms of marginality, and characterized them as pariahs in the eyes of “majority” society.⁷ With one or two exceptions, writers who analyze Roma identity pay scant attention to the historical determination of such marginality.⁸

Many connect the identity of Roma to a common past and certain traditional elements, that is, to the practice of certain traditional Gypsy trades or a nomadic lifestyle. However, as is rather evident in modern times, old customs have lost much of their ability to provide solidarity. As Jean-Pierre Liégeois—one of the proponents of this thesis—stated when examining the fate of Gypsy communities after the war: “It is at this point that tradition—having lost its dynamism—turns into ritual: it is transformed from a pillar of identity and lifestyle into a rigid identity in itself, a sort of last refuge.”⁹ In the life of Roma communities, the role of traditions fading into obscurity, disappearing lifestyles and community cultures based on oral tradition is being taken over by commonly written history and a national past.

Recent decades have seen the publication of several Roma history books that describe the history of Roma communities from ethnogenesis to the present in the framework of a unified narrative. Eighteenth-century “majority”-led science established that Roma originated in India, and today this is treated as fact. The historian Ian Hancock connects the discovery of Indian origin to a Hungarian theology student’s career, who was discussing the Sanskrit language in a salon at university in Leiden with three fellow students from India. He thought Sanskrit words were similar to the speech used by Gypsy day laborers on his land. Through intermediaries, this observation was conveyed to György Pray, who sixteen years later wrote about it in the pages of the *Wiener Gazette*.¹⁰ The myth about Roma origin—which purportedly should be questioned as much as the unifying histories of any other people or nation’s origin—was discovered by Roma communities themselves in

various countries. (In the case of Roma, this myth resembles mostly that of the history of the Jewish diaspora, given its formation in conditions of scattering and exclusion.) In 1971, in the spirit of unification attempts, various Roma communities and churches, with the cooperation of the government of India, organized the first World Romani Congress, where delegates declared that the peoples of various Gypsy groups were members of one Roma nation, and went on to proclaim the symbols of national unity: a flag and an anthem.¹¹

Hancock generally emphasizes the significance of positive historical discourses that strengthened unity, for example that of discovering a common Indian origin.¹² As a result, there arose a need for history writers to form the conceptual Romani language of this history (and the writing thereof).¹³ Characteristically, many authors claimed that the genocide committed against Roma during the Holocaust (the murder of half a million people) was late in becoming a topic of scientific research and public discourse because of the implicit nature of Roma memory. Others, conversely, drew attention to the fact that the story-telling of collective traumas had already partially taken place, or was partially under way. The suffering of Roma was not documented, which is related to their marginal social position, and thus we must ask whether communities stayed silent or were silenced,¹⁴ or whether their voices went unheard because of their marginal situation. In any case, Roma history is being written now, independent of other histories. This is signified by arguments over what to call the Holocaust¹⁵ in Romani¹⁶ (the need for a unique name arose so that Roma could tell their own stories of the genocide). Not only the story of the origin, but further discussions and working through collective traumas have a role in the strengthening—i.e., the creation—of Roma national identity. From the point of view of identity politics, we feel that the integrative processing of Roma history within national history is just as important a task, and that this history should be rethought from the perspective of the minority itself.

Laying out Roma history has helped us formulate three general questions. The first is about opportunities, the second is about the modes of such, while the third concerns the role of the researcher.

(1) Through depicting Roma history we can question the borders of and difficulties associated with acquiring historical knowledge. Writing on common Roma history, which as a first step often deals with the issue of Roma origin, sees historians rely primarily on linguistic and archeological evidence. Even genetic research has become a largely cited source. These written resources are penned by outside observers about Roma. Due to the marginal historical situation of Roma groups, there are few sources about Roma and even fewer written by Roma themselves. This entails a number of research methodology issues.¹⁷

The exploration of such “realities” of the past necessitated the analysis of new kinds of sources—diaries, letters, recollections, oral history interviews,¹⁸ artistic creations—and a further rereading of archival documents that had previously been examined with “traditional” methods of history writing. Historical sources should be seen as “period-documents,” given that they are characterized by the official discourse and linguistic rule system of the given period. Such an approach makes a critical study possible and allows reinterpretation of state policy, providing a close-at-hand opportunity to reconceptualize the national histories of given countries. One of the pioneering works in this field is by Zoltan Barany, who analyzed the issue in various periods in the East-Central European context. (His starting point was that various political systems and country-specific situations determined state policies, and as a result explain historical changes in the situations of marginalized groups.¹⁹) This book makes use of similar sources, examining primarily official discourses and revealing state policies, in order to shed light on the situation of Roma.²⁰

(2) Roma history can be illustrated within the context of the history of given countries and—breaking somewhat from national histories—in the context of a unified Roma nation. These two approaches might be called the “integrationist” and the “separatist” depictions of Roma history.²¹ We can picture a combination of these approaches where the multiple identities of Roma communities would serve as a basis. We don’t feel the need to argue over the legitimacy of any of these approaches. The goal in this book is to examine the history of Roma in Hungary in the context of Hungarian national history. We make use of a critical and reflexive mode of integrative (or “integrationist”) discussion, which can be described as exploring events known in the country’s national history differently, from the point of view of the minority.

New directions in writing history—micro-histories that intersect at multiple points, historical anthropology, history of everyday life and new cultural history²²—aim at both examining other dimensions of the past and portraying unknown fields of meaning. The introduction of new topics, such as social gender, everyday life, or the study of ethnic minorities, serve to shake the earlier monolithic view of reality in historiography.²³ Approaches we call “counter histories” (following in the footsteps of Foucault) have appeared as critiques of traditional history-writing discourses.²⁴ Their fundamental goal has been to uncover the memories of oppressed and excluded groups and to criticize state power. The validation of this critical standpoint—in line with the values of the universality of human rights and equality—provides an opportunity for moral reflection on past and current issues of human social existence.

(3) A recurring question in Gypsy or Roma Studies is that of researcher activism.²⁵ We do not believe that there are only two research positions in exis-

tence—that of the distant “outsider,” on the one hand, and the committed activist, on the other—nor that these can be sharply distinguished from one another. All authors approach their research topic based on some choice of value. This can be discovered in the researcher’s self-reflection during writing and in the text. A frequently emerging question in Roma research today is the role of Roma researchers. In a similar vein, the issue of the necessity of research on non-Roma by Roma has come up (Tidrick has humorously named this approach “Gadzology”). This is the case because for Roma, it is often the non-Roma “majority” or the state itself, which categorizes and thus wishes to define the question of ethnic belonging.²⁶ We characterize our own role as follows: we present ourselves to the reader as non-Roma who seek to depict and equalize national history through the universal values of human rights. One of the goals of this book is to make the points of view of a minority that has been pushed to the periphery of society a fully integrated part of our shared history. For readers who are not well-versed in Hungarian and Roma history, this book offers insight into the history of the struggles of identity politics, as well as being an example of the reevaluation of Roma history in a national context.

Historical writing that considers itself objective and factual is paralleled by another interpretation of the role of the historian—one which to us is more appealing—whereby the historian is seen as an active participant in history, creating stories and writing messages.²⁷ All products of writing are unique accomplishments, and there is no such thing as an independent discussant. As such, it is advisable for writers to clarify the aspects and aims of their research at the beginning of their texts. The aim of this book is to present the origins and relativity of discourse on the Gypsies in Hungary.

On the sources of Gypsy/Roma history

In their 1993 publication János Báthory and László Pomogyi stated that “to this point Hungarian historical science has not dealt substantially with Gypsies.”²⁸ In the meantime, a number of Hungarian-language works have been published.²⁹ These include: Pál Nagy on the feudal period,³⁰ László Pomogyi on the history of the Gypsies in the so-called bourgeois decades in Hungary,³¹ and Csaba Dupcsik’s monograph on the history of the Gypsy-research projects of Hungary using social science methods.³² Summaries of Hungarian history to this day neglect or merely mention Hungary’s largest minority. According to the explanations of the authors listed above, Gypsies were always in a socially peripheral situation and lived outside the mainstream “majority” of Hungarian society. Despite this, they think that his-

torians who have silenced the fate of Roma have made a mistake, given “if we take historical science to be a model of historical reality, our documents would lead us to think there are no Gypsies living in Hungary.”³³ (Naturally we can express similar observations with regard to the history of other groups that can be considered minorities, like women and sexual minorities.)

What is the reason that the results of research on Gypsies, despite this justified criticism, still have not, or have hardly made their way into history textbooks (which are the mainstream of history), summaries and historical visual books? How can the results of new research be synthesized into Hungarian history? The easiest answer is to state that Hungarian history writing is not self-reflexive enough, and that there is a need to sensitize and draw attention to past discourses on equality.

Hungarian history textbooks largely present the acts of politicians and statesmen who are deemed significant, and offer little information on the endeavors and experiences of other actors. Reading archival sources and documents in state offices of the era, it is obvious that we are left with the impression that Gypsies/Roma are backwards, live in a situation of disadvantage and marginality, and thus are a social group that requires assistance and direction. From time to time we see them through “situations of conflict,” in police reports or as suspects in criminal cases. These documents present them from the point of view of the power of the state, public administration and the courts, i.e., from the “majority’s” position, where the operation of the power of the state is a reflection of “majority” norms.

These sources make Hungarian history appear unified, as it has long been presented from the point of view of the power of the state and the “majority.” However, sources derived from state institutions can be reinterpreted through the critical, reflexive modes described above. New research has placed the point of view of Gypsies/Roma into this unified framework and one-sided discourse, highlighting crimes and historical injustices committed against individuals, groups and the minority. Personal recollections and individual histories have supplemented an earlier rough image.³⁴ We must ask, however, whether wider discourses are able to maintain the memories of individuals and groups, or whether they will merely assimilate these memories and points of view into national history. According to Foucault’s well-known metaphor, “[O]ne can certainly wager that man would be erased, like a face drawn in sand at the edge of the sea.”³⁵ The questions, thus, are largely the following: Can realities outside the discourse be depicted? Can the viewpoints of others be presented? Must we resign ourselves to the fact that we will only hear the voices of those who are close to positions of power?³⁶

In Hungary the best known framework for the interpretation of Gypsy history is the “change in coexistence models” paradigm. According to this paradigm,



Gizella Faragó, family photo montage, 1990s

similar events and changes play out in Gypsy communities that are often independent of one another. Metamorphoses, movements and social and economic processes are results of internal regularities. External effects, according to this theory, fundamentally and uniformly rearrange the Gypsies' relationship to "majority" society and the state from time to time. Great economic and social changes and

consecutive periods of modernization cause challenges to the lives of these communities, and as a result the models of coexistence transform.³⁷ According to this logic, history has a main current to which all historical actors, individuals and groups must adapt. However, history as a linear process is but one imagining, and as such the past of minorities is more than just an illustration of this system of relationships.

In the following chapters we will present different pictures, events, and points of reference in the hope that they will refine and transform assumptions made in society and in the mainstream interpretation of history. Writing history according to new interpretations, as we have suggested, is not merely a reconstruction but a creative process that entails construction and elements of fiction, and further—not inconsequentially—a practice of forming and strengthening community. In Hungary, the primary task of those writing the history of Gypsies is to step outside the framework of the earlier anti-egalitarian and nationalist discourse, and to rethink common history by offering viewpoints that differ from that of those in power and the “majority.” By anti-egalitarian nationalism we mean the pre-modern form of nationalism that limits and does not recognize the opportunity for people to belong to the nation independent of his/her group membership (i.e., material position, place of residence, origin). This is related to a history-writing practice according to which there exists a culturally, politically, and economically unified national history—although this reflects only the points of view and the self-affirmation of those in power—to which all citizens of Hungary must or can relate.

In this volume we track stories from a historical turning point (1945, the end of the Second World War) to current times. We feel that the political regimes that replaced one another, or the historical periods of Gypsy policy and discourse, can be presented not only in terms of shifts but also in terms of continuity and persistence of legacies. The effects of continuity appearing in Gypsy policy (e.g., enduring marginalization) and turns following changes in political institutions or processes supporting such developments are worth presenting and interpreting. (In Hungary, for example, such a turn is signified—according to new sociological research—by the fact that since the regime change the “majority” opinion on Roma communities has moved toward fulfilling a view of the Roma as a “deepest evil.”³⁸ In this volume we will examine the historical reasons for this phenomenon.) When analyzing discourses the term Gypsy will denote times before the regime change, while the term Roma (Romani) will denote the period after. Until the regime change the term “Gypsy” (in Hungarian: cigány) was used in discourses. As such, this term was related to the choice of minority identity. Later the term was increasingly replaced in official documents with “Roma.” In our text we follow the use of Gypsy/Roma as found in various documents. When we speak of issues unrelated to Gypsy- or

Roma-policy, then we use the ethnic label that is adopted by the given organizations, researchers, or as Gypsies/Roma themselves when presented with the opportunity to take part in the discourse.³⁹ However, we believe that nowadays the terms Gypsy and Roma cannot be used simply interchangeably, especially in the context of identity and “identity engineering.” In Western states, since the 1970s, and in East-Central Europe mostly since 1989/1990, Roma is meant to signify a new cohort of educated, European Roma, with positive identity markers, whereas Gypsy is still considered derogatory within society (signifying for the most part a social or ethnic group marked by outsiders). Thus, concerning recent social grouping and minority identities, we use the term Roma. The use of various labels generally, and specifically in the case of the Roma, is never neutral in terms of the creation of identity and referential knowledge related to identity.

All dialogues—at least in part—are characterized by the creation of fiction, “narrativization,” or using various formations and plot structures. Our writings are continuously formed by intertextual relations (known texts, narratives). There are archetypal schemes,⁴⁰ which denote a basic pattern for narrativization.⁴¹ Hayden White, adapting Northrop Frye’s theory, distinguished four types of schemes: romantic, comic, tragic and satirical.⁴² The classic example of the tragic narrative is the discussion of Gypsy/Roma history when we approach the topic from current conflicts. Historians can, as such, speak of the breakdown of the relationship between “majority” and minority.⁴³ We can create a romantic mythos when we follow the steps of Gypsy/Roma heroes who struggle against their situation but generally fail. But should we change the point of view and the self-representation of the Hungarian state and society (or its representatives), or observe its factual acts, so that historians would naturally have a comic or satirical dialogue mode available to them?

In the following we do not attempt to use dry language, strive for impartiality, or aim at a scientific writing style. We do not feel one has to be insensitive or stand pat in a conflict between a state acting on the behalf of some kind of “majority” on one side and a factually excluded minority on the other. We are aware that the Hungarian state is not personified with independent characteristics, nor can it be described as having unified characteristics. However, we still refer to it as an individual third person and independent actor. We view and picture it as akin to Mr. Smith, the grey character in *The Matrix*, who must be fought, although he does not exist, as his being and actions are truly real in the lives of others.

The philosophical precursor to *The Matrix* film is Hilary Putnam’s “Brains in a Vat” essay.⁴⁴ In this piece Putnam imagines that someone (an evil scientist, the representative of a supreme power) has placed a brain in a vat, connects electrodes to it in the appropriate places, and then connects these to a computer. The com-

puter makes the brain believe that it is a real person in an existing and real world: it feels, moves, wants and acts. Then the philosopher asks the question: is it possible that we are all brains in a vat, that our operations are synchronized by a computer? He answers that no, this is not possible: the assumption “we are brains in a vat”⁴⁵ cannot be true. Signals do not live up to phenomena on their own volition, but through the conceptual schemes of a community, and that community is created by individual interactions. This does not work in reverse: meaning cannot be dependent on things outside of us. The collective acts of the community or the actions of the state always reveal individual wills and actions. This must by all means be kept in mind when we search for points of reference while interpreting floating texts, abstract expressions and the statements of others. There is no secure and common point. History itself is the Matrix.

Who (what) is (was) Hungarian or Gypsy/Roma?

Roma identity can be interpreted in various contexts. We can speak of the Roma identity in general terms, or that of regions (e.g., East-Central Europe or Southern Europe), or the Roma communities of given countries, or through the examples of small local communities. This choice of perspective defines the given—historical, linguistic, anthropological, sociological—conclusions of studies. In this book, as we have emphasized, we will examine the question within one country, that is, within a national context. Before moving on to a review of literature on Roma communities in Hungary, we will outline the contexts of this issue in the country.

Unified Hungarian history—like other national histories—is obviously a construction, a *post hoc* creation that is an important part of the Hungarian national identity. In the Middle Ages the majority of people living in the territory of Hungary likely spoke Hungarian, but this does not mean that they were Hungarians in the sense of our time. To be Hungarian primarily meant to fill a social position. In the Middle Ages Hungarians were the subjects of the king, and social differences distinguished the Magyars (Hungarians) from the Magyar-speaking Szeklers. Later sources reveal considerably more about the Magyars, which primarily implied a social position, an exceptional feudal class, and membership in the noble nation. This concept of Hungarian nation is clearly not the same as the modern egalitarian concept of the nation.⁴⁶ After the appearance of nationalism, all could in theory belong to the nation regardless of their social position, and the residents of the country—no matter what they thought—became members of a political nation through a construction of public law. This undoubtedly contributed to making society more egalitarian.⁴⁷

The anti-egalitarian social category interpretation of the pre-modern Magyars did not entirely disappear, given that over time it remained the basis of prejudice toward and exclusion of various minorities (e.g., Jews, Gypsies) and remains so to this day. According to Antal Örkény and György Csepeli, Hungarian identity as tied to social position was imposed on other groups. (Identity is not just a question of “who am I?” but also one of “who am I not?” As such it can be related to prejudices toward differentially situated social groups in “majority” society in an explicit fashion.) In the case of Jews, the basis of differentiation was success and wealth, while in the case of Gypsies the reason for differentiation was failure and poverty.⁴⁸ The transformation of identifying membership in a social group into belonging to the “majority” or minority resulted in the birth of “Gypsy” as a social category distinguished from the Hungarian “majority” within society and formed the history of the Gypsy issue.

István Bibó, a definitive figure in twentieth-century Hungarian political thought, wrote the following about the failure of the assimilation of Hungarian Jews: “Hungarian society, from the very beginning, assimilated or offered the opportunity to assimilate on dishonorable, disrespectful terms,”⁴⁹ given that the adoption of the Hungarian language or self-identification as a Hungarian did not result in the “majority” acknowledging one as a Hungarian.⁵⁰ We feel that Bibó’s observations pertain to Roma as well: the Hungarian “majority” obstructed the masses of self-defined as Hungarian, socially marginalized, and Hungarian-speaking Roma from the opportunity to blend in. By assimilation we mean not only linguistic melting, but similarly to Rogers Brubaker, a phenomenon that necessitates the social acceptance of a group, and thus which cannot be realized through the marginalization and exclusion of a group.⁵¹ Typically, lacking social acknowledgment in contemporary Hungary, those Roma who have been successful in the labor world are challenged when trying to assimilate (Margit Feischmidt brings up the example of micro-villages in southwestern Hungary and describes how economic success of Roma does not guarantee social acknowledgment⁵²). All questions concerning the integration of Hungarian Roma can be examined within national history, and these questions are—among other things—about the relations between members of a political community.

“There are 320.000 Gypsies living in Hungary today. ... This is a very large number in terms of proportion as well (one in every thirty Hungarians is Gypsy!) and an ever-growing number as well (one in every fifteen newborns in Hungary is Gypsy, and in fifteen years one in twenty-two Hungarians will be Gypsy), but looking at proportions this is a gigantic mass: if they stood hand-in-hand in a line they would stretch from Mátészalka to Sopron!”⁵³—this passage is quoted by Zsolt Csalog from a letter to him by a friend in the afterword of his 1975 sociology

Kilenc cigány (Nine Gypsies). His response was as follows: “Gypsies are various. If I had to summarize the message of this book in a single sentence, it would be: there are many kinds of Gypsies. I described them as *such*, and then as the very *opposite*, and in all kinds of ways to underline this important fact: they are *varied*.”⁵⁴ Csalog himself interpreted this plurality widely enough to include among his nine Gypsy speakers a “Szekler-Hungarian” woman whose husband and environment was Gypsy, meaning Csalog felt Gypsy was a social category, among other things.⁵⁵

To varying degrees, many authors refer to external markers that make the Gypsy/Roma population distinguishable within Hungarian society. From the point of view of Gypsies/Roma, this can be the basis for a feeling of difference and differentiation; circles of “majority” society for a long time have persistently clung to the position that Gypsies are recognizable based on visible “race markers.” Mainstream social science goes against this, and is characterized by color blindness, that is, researchers reject the view that Gypsies form a “visible minority” (neglecting for the moment cases of discrimination) and call for a (possible) debate on the question. We should note that in Canada, for example, there is a debate over the degree to which given minority groups should be considered visible minorities, within which various positions vie against one another.⁵⁶ Assumed heritage, however, is not necessarily equal to true identity. For historians, the greater challenge is to map struggles of identity politics and identity formation such as everyday ethnic categorization or the documentation of scientific practices in relation to the definition of ethnic identities.

Power relations generally define the constitutive conditions of knowledge and scientific cognition, and without analyzing these we cannot describe the history of social groups and conflicts. On the epistemological reading, the object of criticism is primarily not documented facts and earlier scientific results, but instead the operation and mutual effects of the power spheres that define their emergence, existence and effects.⁵⁷ According to this epistemological approach Gypsy policy, the Gypsy issue, and Gypsy (conceptual) existence can be described in this logical order. We feel that a back-to-front consideration of the “issue” is just as justified.

Many authors have shown that earlier folk names for Gypsies arose from conflicts between classifiers and the classified (i.e., “majority” institutions and the excluded), and as such negative or positive connotations about them or romantic origin myths arose. The creation and use of Roma as an ethnic identifier can be—contrary to the above—an attempt to erase social stigmas and to create a positive or neutral image. The expression and adaption of Roma identity is connected to Roma political activism, and the result of a political movement.⁵⁸ Regarding this movement, there are those who question the legitimacy of Roma nationalism. We must emphasize that positions that relativize a common past and origin are character-

istic of history construction of other peoples and nations, and not just the diaspora, including the history of the Hungarian nation, and thus all such movements deserve the same criticism. We hold that a constructivist approach to Roma history that is sensitive to the identity struggle that the minority wields against the state power of the “majority” is preferable. External “scientific” viewpoints do not question the legitimacy of identity struggle. (In this book the quotation marks around the term “majority” and the lack of such around the term minority are meant to signify that we aim foremost to rethink identities and policies formed vis-à-vis the minority.)

Our current knowledge of Gypsies/Roma is based on the work of social scientists who had state commissions or who stood up to official state policy, but still accepted such policy and its principles. Up until the most recent decades, their writings without exception aimed to summarize knowledge from the point of view of the state or of the “majority” when writing about Gypsies/Roma. They strove to be complete and representative, and to express basic truths. In all cases of social science research we must clarify who the researchers see as Gypsy/Roma. As such, this classification problem is the starting point of every research project. Although we may reject basic stereotypes, in Hungary the majority of researchers traditionally use “majority” judgement as the basis of categorization.

For a long time the national Gypsy population did not concern statisticians and social scientists with state commissions. Estimates of the number of Gypsies living within the borders of the Hungarian state date back to only the middle of the nineteenth-century.⁵⁹ In 1873 the Ministry of the Interior studied the Gypsy population and estimated its number at 214,000.⁶⁰ Twenty years later the first “Gypsy census” was conducted, in which statisticians put their number at exactly 272,776 persons;⁶¹ this study was conducted under the aegis of the Royal Hungarian Statistical Office in 1893.⁶² The social scientists taking part in the study were in fact searching for the roots of a social problem, trying to understand the problems with integration of Gypsies living a nomadic lifestyle. Regarding the definition, they used the position of the “majority” society, and defined the group according to their opinion through anthropological markers: “Public opinion and the knowledge of the people regularly and securely kept track of those of Gypsy origin, and the criteria of such was anthropological markers.”⁶³

Census data from the first half of the twentieth-century estimated the size of the Gypsy population based on mother tongue and language use, and as such did not assess their proportion within the population as a whole to be significant. The period between the two World Wars saw the emergence of estimates putting the Gypsy population at around 100,000, but these were not widely publicized.⁶⁴ Beginning in the 1950s, officials of the Hungarian state and social scientists once again began to estimate the size of the Gypsy population and summarize knowl-

edge about them. Their estimates, which adopted the definition provided by the “majority” as the basis, were consistently similar. After some time, state officials treated the data as a social fact, and they went so far as to predict the expected demographic processes of the Gypsy population. Measurements of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party based on the estimates of county councils held that 200,000 Gypsies lived in Hungary in 1961, 220–250,000 in 1970, 235 thousand in 1978 and 350–360,000 in 1983. Based on “demographic tendencies” the 1979 proclamation of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party’s Political Committee estimated that the Gypsy population would be 400–450,000 by 1990. In 1980–81, researchers estimated that by the year 2000 their numbers would reach 600–700,000.⁶⁵

Sociological research, which took place within the confines of the state-socialist ideology, started its attempt to estimate the proportion of Gypsies and to describe the population’s sociological characteristics from the 1960s. The Central Statistical Office’s 1963 income and stratification study saw statisticians estimate the Gypsy population at 222,000 persons, based on the number of homes in settlements. A representative sociological study in 1971 estimated the population to be 320,000.⁶⁶ The study led by István Kemény, taking place almost a hundred years after the first “Gypsy census,” also used the opinion of “majority” society as a basis: the project considered those people who were labeled as such by their “non-Gypsy” environment to be “Gypsy.”⁶⁷ Given that Gypsy origin was always a stigma in the eyes of the public, of all possible definitions this was the only designation upon which a “national representative study” could be executed. However, this definition suggested that the relationship of Gypsies with the “majority” population and their “separateness” was defined not by culture, the existence of a Gypsy nation/minority status or an identity choice, but by the exclusionary behavior of members of the “majority” society.⁶⁸ (The researchers asked social workers, village teachers, council employees, police and from time to time neighbors to point out those in the given settlement they considered Gypsy.)

After the regime change, between 1993 and 2003, in representative studies about Gypsies, methods similar to those in the 1971 project were employed. This approach can be summarized as follows: “... we had the research goal of examining the social position of people deemed Gypsy by their surroundings in that well-known social stratum in which those who do not view themselves as Gypsy but as members of the “majority” society firmly and clearly differentiate themselves from people they consider to be Gypsy.”⁶⁹ Based on the 1993 representative sociological study and school statistics, the number of people deemed Roma by the non-Roma environment at the beginning of the 1990s was about 455,000.⁷⁰ Ten years later, in 2003, sociological studies estimated this number to be 550–570,000.



Pál Schiffer in the field, circa 1970

The 1990s saw a vigorous debate over the Roma/Gypsy concept used—partly through necessity—in sociological research. The question was over which ascription to use: self-ascription of interviewees, definitions of the external “majority” or the immediate environment, opinion of the interviewer, or some combination of the above. The debate was not primarily about who is a Gypsy, but the nature and difficulty of social science categorization. The sociological approaches were based on the realization that in Hungary the “majority” category could be seen as a “social fact,” given that social actions and many varieties of attitudes had a defining effect.⁷¹ Studies led by István Kemény reflected this phenomenon. With the goal of acquiring knowledge, social scientists sharply distinguish groups from one another, or create other entities. The question arises: how does knowledge constructed in this fashion play out in the future? Thinking back on his 1971 research, Zsolt Csalog said the following: “... the whole time we faced the research dilemma of whether we should provide data to a dictatorship, because I couldn’t know what they would use the data for... we were afraid: would things go as we had hoped once we finished the study, or were we just stupid dupes, who through our best intentions would help the executioner perfect his work?”⁷² Today, in many cases, researchers refer to the fact that research is not independent of power, that Gypsies/Roma as a group cannot be sharply “distinguished” from “majority” com-

munities and is not uniform. However, these observations seem to lose their weight when their research results are utilized. In fact, data and groupings from categorizations based on “majority” delineations are taken into account in most, if not all, policy areas.⁷³ To a significant degree, all that we know about Gypsies/Roma is a result of research conducted with this approach and point of view.

In the second half of the twentieth-century state institutions (and hence the “majority”) began to perceive Gypsies as a significant “group” in society, one whose numbers were rapidly growing. We think there is another explanation for the perception of a mass Gypsy population of several hundred thousand—beyond demographic reasons, differences in categorization methods that made their number change and specific events (e.g., immigration)—whereby representatives of the state displayed the difference between “majority” and minority, “Hungarians” and Gypsies, on a national level and thus visibly drew a boundary between the two groups for all to see. Earlier, Gypsy communities were dealt with at the local level



Scene from filming of *Faluszéli házak* [Houses on the edge of town], 1972

by representatives of the Hungarian state (who tried to supervise the lives of these communities), but thanks to their peripheral social situation they were generally not thought of as a part of society, and as such the Gypsies did not become actors in discourses about Hungarian society. Differences and contrasts that earlier existed on the local level now were accessible for the entire society and were given a new dimension. Furthermore, this constructed community of unified Gypsy/Roma people was connected by researchers and state officials to various social phenomena, such as poverty, low levels of education or unemployment. This book seeks to clarify the social and political events of this process.

Theoretically, in any case when we attempt to answer the question of who may be a member of a given minority or ethnic group, the primary aspect and starting point should be the individual's free choice, or whether the individual ascribes him/herself as belonging to the minority or wishes to assimilate. In Hungary, however, the adoption of Roma identity, much like assimilation, has long been made difficult by an environment of prejudice and discrimination. For this reason many feel that when we speak of Roma, we must use sociological data as a foundation. The use of the results of such research does not mean that the methods of sociological classification are beyond criticism. We must mention that this approach to categorization is not typical in the cases of other minorities. We assume that there would be widespread dismay in Hungary if the size of the German minority in Hungary, or drafting of policies toward them, designated its members based on residential or visible markers in the eyes of the "majority."

The generalization of this starting point can serve to justify the daily practices of differentiation and can reinforce several stereotypes about the Roma as seen in circles of the "majority." It makes free identity choice impossible and obstructs the path to assimilation. We agree with Mária Neményi's position, who said the following: "I can accept the hard data of the national representative Gypsy study by István Kemény, Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Havas, when it comes to schooling, opportunities for employment, residential and housing situations and social service, because they draw attention to the systematic disadvantage suffered in all areas of life by the people of a group *signified by their bodies*, when facing the institutions of majority society. But I can't accept that this research is about *Gypsies ...*"⁷⁴

How people labeled as Roma/Gypsy see their own communities and culture, or the society and culture in contrast to which they are defined, is a fundamental question. It is our position that this separation can only be defined through changes in relations among the groups, that is, the Roma and the "majority" society. We cannot state that Roma identity awareness is independent of "majority" society or the behavior of the state. (This position is true in reverse: the self-identity of those

belonging to the “majority” contains an important aspect whereby members disassociate themselves from the minority.) The question of “who am I not?” can even precede that of “who am I?” Ethnic association is not only a question of accepting identity (or identities), but also depends on how outsiders classify the individual. As such, disassociation from the “majority” community became one of the fundamental characteristics of Gypsy identity.

Researchers have approached the “who am I not?” question in various ways. Michael Stewart tackled it while studying a Vlach Gypsy community in Hungary under state socialism. In his example Gypsies sometimes defined themselves and their communities in direct opposition to the “majority” ideology.⁷⁵ Further, in Hungary we can observe a process whereby extreme right-wing discourses on Gypsies have become increasingly mainstream, given that an ever-wider swath of society relates to these discourses.⁷⁶ Having conducted focus group and ethnographic research in three Hungarian villages, Feischmidt analyzed discourse on Gypsies as a discourse of otherness, and the effects of such on “majority” and minority identity.⁷⁷ The results of this research showed that the Gypsy-Magyar relationship reflected a power hierarchy of subordination and superiority, and that the “majority” is increasingly thinking in racial terms. As a consequence of this racist point of view, even if social difference declines, racist and mobility-obstructing thought can be an obstacle to integration.⁷⁸ The prejudiced environment obstructs social mobility, further weakening the egalitarian character of society.⁷⁹

Those researchers who reject definitions based on opinions formed within the “majority” seek “internal aspects” (language use, culture, identity, etc.) to define the minority. Often they too refer to “objective” characteristics. Contrary to the position that the Gypsy problem is equal to the problems of those speaking Gypsy languages, we must note that the proportion of people speaking a Gypsy language as a mother tongue is lower than the full Roma population, if by that we mean those with a Gypsy/Roma self-identity.

Hungarian census studies have traditionally estimated minority identity based on mother tongue. The 1893 Gypsy census held that only under 30 percent of Gypsies spoke a Gypsy language as their mother tongue.⁸⁰ Census statistics on the post-Trianon territory of the country showed that up until 1930 the number of “Gypsy as mother tongue” and “speaks Gypsy among others” respondents were both under 10,000. By 1941 these numbers were 18,640 and 9,587 respectively. (Gypsies who were later labeled Boyash were likely marked as Gypsies with Romanian as their mother tongue. For most of the twentieth-century Boyash speakers were automatically lumped in with “Gypsy as mother tongue” speakers.) After the Second World War census surveys continued to record the number of

those with Gypsy as their mother tongue and those who spoke Gypsy among other languages. Between 1949 and 1980 the number of the former group was between 20-30,000, where the latter group numbered between 10-12,000.⁸¹

Within the population deemed as Gypsy, the proportion of those speaking Gypsy languages did not change significantly since the time of the first Gypsy studies. In 1971 the fact that 71 percent of Gypsies living in Hungary spoke Hungarian as their mother tongue was considered a surprising result. (Between 1971 and 1993 the rapid linguistic assimilation of Boyash and Vlach Gypsies was observable. This trend eventually reversed for the Vlach group.⁸²) The data collected from the 2003 sociological study show that in that year the proportion of Roma who spoke Hungarian as their mother tongue was 87 percent. For Romani speakers it was 8 percent, and 5 percent for Boyash speakers.⁸³

The census of 1941 saw the introduction of questions on ethnic identity: at this time 27,033 respondents identified themselves as part of the Gypsy minority and this happened to match the total number of people who spoke Gypsy languages. According to data on minorities, the number of respondents claiming to be Gypsy was 37,598 in 1949, the number grew to 56,121 in 1960, and fell to 6,404 in 1980. (The last figure is explained by the fact that affiliation with the “Gypsy” minority was available only within the “other” category.⁸⁴) Data from the census of 1990 indicated that only 143,000 Roma lived in Hungary. The 2001 census showed 190,000 people who claimed Roma/Gypsy identity (among others).⁸⁵ Incorporating other kinds of census data as well, the Central Statistical Office also made estimates on the size of the Gypsy population. They considered all those who affirmed at least one of the four non-compulsory questions on minority status to be Gypsy. (The census questions were the following: What minority do you feel you belong to? Which minority’s cultural values and traditions do you relate to? Which language is your mother tongue? Which language do you speak among family and friends?) In other words, they labeled all who provided any information indicating Gypsy heritage as Gypsy, multiple answers/affiliations allowed for a presentation of an even higher number of Roma. Even with this mode of calculating, just over 30 percent of those considered Gypsy identified themselves as such. Consequently, the method of collecting data changed for the 2011 census. Questions pertained only to minority identity, mother tongue and languages spoken with family and friends. All three questions allowed for responses entailing dual affiliation.⁸⁶ The results of the census showed that the number of those identifying themselves as Gypsy (among other categories) grew to 315,000. This number, which reflected multiple identities, despite showing considerable growth, was still far below the numbers based on categorizations of the “majority.”⁸⁷

The 2003 sociological survey held that self-identification of those labeled as Roma did not match the opinions of the “majority”: 37.8 percent of respondents identified themselves as Hungarian, 29.8 percent as Hungarian Gypsy, 26.8 percent as Gypsy, 4.5 percent as Boyash and 1 percent as belonging to another minority.⁸⁸

Although the “majority” society traditionally view Gypsies as a unified group, those who identify themselves as Gypsies are significantly stratified. Researchers tend to identify three main linguistic groups, the “Hungarian-speaking Hungarian Gypsies or Romungro (people who see themselves as Hungarian Gypsies, Musician Gypsies or Muzsikus Gypsies), the bilingual Hungarian- and Gypsy-speaking Vlach Gypsies (who call themselves Roma or Rom), and the bilingual, Hungarian- and a pre-modernized, archaic version of Romanian-speaking Gypsies (who call themselves and their language Boyash – and accepting their self-definition, in this book we use only the Boyash designation, although they are usually called Romanian Gypsies/Roma in Hungary).”⁸⁹ However, to a degree these groups are constructions and groupings designed by researchers, based on external categorization and empirical analysis of the languages and identities of small communities. At the end of the 1950s ethnographer Kamill Erdős created and published a typology that has defined the linguistic-ethnic grouping of Gypsy communities ever since, and has in turn affected the self-definition and identity of Gypsies/Roma themselves (it is worth noting that he identified no less than eleven groups or “tribes” among the Vlach Gypsies).⁹⁰ The Boyash group that to this day is presented as unified speaks at least three dialects: Ardélan, Munćan and Tićan, each with its own vernacular.⁹¹

At the same time it is common for the cultural and linguistic differences between these groups to sometimes be hardly detectable in everyday life. Gábor Fleck and Tünde Virág’s case study gives the following account:

The vocabulary of the two dialects is almost uniform, in practice the Munćans and the Ardélan understand one another perfectly. However, when we asked, they stated that that is a completely different language, one they do not speak. This was well illustrated in the following story: during our field work a German priest visited the village, one who earlier has worked with Munćans and spoke the Munćan language. The locals asked for us to interpret through Hungarian, given they did not speak Munćan, only Ardélan. We encouraged them to speak with the priest on their own... They began talking and were happy to report that according to this, they speak Munćan.⁹²

In an interview, Károly Bari referred to the following historical parallel: “In the Reform Age the Hungarian language—which was spoken in countless dialects—

was made capable of handling the communication tasks of the day. Today the Gypsy language needs to be unified, modernized.”⁹³

The largest proportion of those deemed Gypsy/Roma speak Hungarian exclusively, and the majority of ethnographic and anthropological studies show they do not maintain customs that allow for their culture to be distinguished from that of the “majority.” At the local level there are more similarities between the traditions of minorities and “majority” communities living in close proximity to one another than there are among minority (or “majority”) communities that have little or no contact with one another. There are still those who feel that Gypsy culture and identity needs to be embedded in historical roots, traditions and shared lifestyles. This approach in social science is now less emphasized, perhaps because for a long time it was adopted by only those researchers who viewed “Gypsy lifestyle” as a negative phenomenon.⁹⁴ (It appeared that they wrote of the customs and solidarity of these communities, when in fact they characterized them as transgressors of norms and outsiders from a “majority” perspective.) Of course this does not mean that the solidarity of the various groups of Roma/Gypsies cannot be explained by ethnography or cultural anthropology. The Roma/Gypsy identity can be interpreted through culture, lifestyle and daily customs of various communities.⁹⁵ Ethnographic studies have revealed the uniqueness of this multicolored culture, which—as Péter Szuhay has put it—is based largely on oral culture, and is “in a state before cultural unification.”⁹⁶ In a 2014 study Ernő Kállai concluded that although the concept of a unified Gypsy minority could change in light of identity construction projects, at this point it “merely signifies a community constructed by the majority.”⁹⁷

There are several historical explanations for the birth of a Gypsy/Roma minority/national identity. The most common interpretation, as discussed above, presents Gypsies as a historical diaspora. Accordingly, historical roots and shared patterns of lifestyle bind them together. This approach is contradicted by those who follow the constructivist view, suggesting that the “Gypsy people” have been created by the work of those researchers who have studied the separating (categorizing) steps of governments, courts and church institutions; such scholars are also concerned with understanding the society and culture of groups that have been excluded from the given society’s system of relations, creating among these groups a kind of virtual unity. Those who ascribe to the third position focus on the identity policy struggles of the recent past. They hold the category of Roma to be a constructed category, to which no historically present entity, shared tradition or unique history can be realistically attached. According to these authors, Roma identity cannot be interpreted through common heritage, lifestyle or other group markers, but instead should be seen as a result of classification struggles fought by and between “non-Roma” and “Roma” for decades, if not centuries.

The various approaches clearly illustrate the variety of Gypsy/Roma images in social science. Naturally, it is important to name the group we are studying, but generally the various group labels are not distinct, precise descriptions, and often they do not pertain to concrete individuals or communities. The meaning of these group labels continuously changes from text to text, and they thus lose their true reference points. (In this book, where possible, we reflect on the given time, how and when, and to what extent sources treated Roma as a social or ethnic group.) The use of the Roma/Gypsy label will be developed over the course of this book: we will recreate the category several times. It is not the job of scientific research to create categorizations for daily use that are beyond reproach; however, researchers must always accept the critical and (self-)reflexive use of concepts.

Lately, history writing has accepted constantly changing, flexible and conceptually intangible formations of social groups.⁹⁸ Individuals create for themselves images of society when they invest meaning into their own worlds and phenomena beyond those.⁹⁹ External references for these group images are (or can be) provided by the conflux of individual ideas. All other (external) groupings transform—according to the interests of power and scientific goals—the individual (micro-level) construction of the existence (as opposed to experience) of groups. In the following chapter, in accordance with this argument, we will not aim to draw the (non-existent) boundaries of a non-existent group. Instead, we will treat the existence of the minority (minorities) as a fact and view the constructions of a homogeneous “majority” and a unified national history by modernity and the modern state as a floating and pliable image.

Notes

- 1 “What, do you imagine that I would take so much trouble and so much pleasure in writing, do you think that I would keep so persistently to my task, if I were not preparing—with a rather shaky hand—a labyrinth into which I can venture, in which I can move my discourse, opening up underground passages, forcing it to go far from itself, finding overhangs that reduce and deform its itinerary, in which I can lose myself and appear at last to eyes that I will never have to meet again. I am no doubt not the only one who writes in order to have no face. Do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same: leave it to our bureaucrats and our police to see that our papers are in order. At least spare us their morality when we write.” Michel Foucault, “Introduction,” in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, ed. Michel Foucault (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 17.
- 2 Tibor Bartos, ed., *Sosemvolt cigányország. Szegkövác cigány történetek* [There was never a Gypsy country. Tales from nail-smith Gypsies] (Budapest: Európa, 1958), 10–11.
- 3 Michel Foucault, “The discourse on language,” in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, ed. Michel Foucault (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 215–238.

- 4 Alaina Lemon, *Between Two Fires: Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 3.
- 5 William Hirst, "The Remembered Self in Amnesiacs," in *The Remembering Self: Construction and Accuracy in the Self-Narrative*, ed. Ulric Neisser and Robyn Fivush (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), 252–277; Slawomir Kapralski, "The Aftermath of the Roma Genocide: From Implicit Memories to Commemoration," in *The Nazi Genocide of the Roma: Reassessment and Commemoration*, ed. Anton Weiss-Wendt (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013), 229–251; Michael Stewart, "Remembering without commemoration: The mnemonics and politics of Holocaust memories among European Roma," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, n.s., 10 (2004): 561–582.
- 6 Michael Stewart, having studied Vlach Gypsy communities, primarily emphasizes external determination: Michael Stewart, *The Time of the Gypsies* (Oxford: Westview, 1997).
- 7 "An extreme form of minority position, illustrating some but not all features of minorities, is that of pariah groups. These are groups actively rejected by the host population because of behaviour or characteristics positively condemned, though often useful in some specific, practical way. European pariah groups of recent centuries (executioners, dealers in horseflesh and -leather, collectors of night soil, gypsies, etc.) exemplify most features; as breakers of basic taboos they were rejected by the larger society. Their identity imposed a definition on social situations which gave very little scope for interaction with persons in the majority population, and simultaneously as an imperative status represented an inescapable disability that prevented them from assuming the normal statuses involved in other definitions of the situation of interaction. Despite these formidable barriers, such groups do not seem to have developed the internal complexity that would lead us to regard them as full-fledged ethnic groups; only the culturally foreign gypsies clearly constitute such a group." Source: Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, ed. Fredrik Barth (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1970), 31.
- 8 In his historical analysis Zoltan Barany also states that in various periods the situation of Roma was determined primarily by marginality: Zoltan Barany, *The East European Gypsies. Regime Change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 2; see also Jean Pierre Liégeois, *Roma in Europe* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2007), 98.
- 9 Liégeois, *Roma in Europe*, 98.
- 10 Ian Hancock, *Danger! Educated Gypsy: Selected Essays*, ed. Dileep Karanth (Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2010), 47–53.
- 11 Jean-Pierre Liégeois, *Roma, Gypsies, Travellers* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1994), 257–258; Liégeois, *Roma in Europe*, 213–214.
- 12 He emphasizes the identity-building significance of the consciousness of common Indian identity: Ian Hancock, *The Indian Origin and Westward Migration of the Romani People* (Manchaca, TX: IRU, 1998); Ian Hancock, "On Romani Origins and Romani Identity: A Reassessment of the Arguments," 2004, accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_b_history_origins&lang=en&articles=true.
- 13 For example, Hancock gave his book a Romani title and in his chapter titles named the periods and important events of Roma history in the Romani language: "O Teljaripe: The move out of India," "O Aresipe: Arrival in Byzantium" or "O Baro Porrajmos: The Holocaust." Ian Hancock, *We are the Romani People. Ame sam e Rromane džene* (Hatfield: Centre de recherches tsiganes/University of Hertfordshire Press, 2002).

- 14 Kapralski, "The Aftermath of the Roma Genocide," 230–232; Anna Marie Reading, "The European Roma: An Unsettled Right to Memory," in *Public Memory, Public Media, and the Politics of Justice*, ed. Philip Lee and Pradip N. Thomas (Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012), 121–140.
- 15 Historical and political science essays on Roma reveal the activist nature of their authors, see Yaron Matras "A conflict of paradigms: Review article," *Romani Studies* 14, no. 2 (2004): 196.
- 16 Ian Hancock recommended the use of the term *Porrajmos*: Ian Hancock, "Responses to the Porrajmos: The Romani Holocaust," in *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, ed. Alan S. Rosenbaum (Boulder: The Westview Press, 1995), 39–64. This is criticized in the following: Stewart, "Remembering without commemoration," 564. Other names or spellings are found in: Claire Auzias, *Samudaripen: le Génocide des Tsiganes* (Paris: L'Esprit Frappeur, 1999); János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma During the Holocaust* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2007); János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, ed., *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma during the Holocaust* (New York: International Debate Education Association, 2008); see also Chapter 1, footnote 8 in this book.
- 17 Sheila Rowbotham, *Hidden from History* (London: Pluto Press, 1992); Susan Tebbutt, *Sinti and Roma: Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998).
- 18 A number of oral history projects have been launched recently with a goal of gaining more complete knowledge of recent history. Books based on oral history projects concerning the fate of the Hungarian Roma are the following: János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, eds., *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma during the Holocaust*; Bernáth Gábor, *Zor-sila najaripe mashkar e Roma, 1940-1985 / Kényszermosdatások a cigánytelepeken, 1940–1985 / Forced bathings in Gypsy settlements, 1940-1985* (Budapest: Roma Sajtóközpont, Roma Sajtóközpont könyvek 3., 2002); Bernáth Gábor, ed., *Porrajmos: E Roma seron, kon perdal zhuwinde / Roma Holocaust túlélők emlékeznek / Recollections of Roma Holocaust survivors* (Budapest: Roma Sajtóközpont, Roma Sajtóközpont könyvek 2., 2000).
- 19 Zoltan Barany undertook a study of seven countries (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland, Romania and Slovakia) over four consecutive political systems (the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires /1500–1918/, authoritarian /1918–1945/, state socialist /1945–1989/ and the democratic regimes /1989–2000/) to examine changes in the general situation of Roma marginality. Zoltan Barany, *The East European Gypsies. Regime Change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- 20 We do not see a clear cause-effect relation between changes in state policies and the development of the situation of Roma. Instead, we have chosen to analyze the discourses of those who were in power, regardless of the regime type, which in an indirect way certainly had an effect on the situation and identity of the minority.
- 21 Matras, "A conflict of paradigms."
- 22 Summarized in: Alf Lüdtke, ed., *Alltagsgeschichte* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1989); Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); Edward Muir and Guido Ruggiero, eds., *Microhistory and the Lost People of Europe*, trans. Eren Branch (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).
- 23 Thomas Lindenberger, "Alltagsgeschichte und ihr möglicher Beitrag zu einer Gesellschaftsgeschichte der DDR," in *Die Grenzen der Diktatur. Staat und Gesellschaft in*

- der DDR*, ed. Martin Bessel and Ralph Jessen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 304.
- 24 Foucault called critical history writing that stood in opposition to dominant historical writing “counter history.” Counter history is an insurgent discourse aimed at the dominant discourse. It strives to integrate the points of view of groups that are pushed to the social periphery or are excluded from history writing (these include studies that give voice to the views of postcolonial, ethnic, or social gender groups). Michel Foucault, “Seminar: 28 January 1976,” in *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 66–84.
- 25 For example, in his book, Zoltan Barany goes beyond the regular researcher role and makes recommendations to policy makers, suggesting a long-term program of Romani integration for East European governments. Barany, *The East European Gypsies*, 344–53.
- 26 Heather Tidrick, “Gadzology as Activism: What I Would Have Ethnography Do for East European Roma,” *Collaborative Anthropologies* 3 (2010): 121–131.
- 27 See, for example, Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). One of the common critiques of ethnohistory is that it can become based on political views built on grievances. One of the foundations of this is that the authors consciously avoid several criteria that are found in “scientific” history writing. These criteria (impersonal approach, provident and dry style of writing, hiding one’s own position) we can view as content-free stylistic elements, which serve as self-justification and eventually mask the ideological nature of historical writing. All works of history bring up the issues of the *ability to illustrate and uniqueness*, or that of *knowability and understandability*.
- 28 János Báthory and László Pomogyi, “A történelemtudomány szerepe a cigánológiai kutatásokban I.” [The role of historical science in romological research, I.] *Kethano Drom – Közös Út* 6 (1993): 21.
- 29 For a bibliography of works published up to the 1980s see: László Pomogyi, *A magyarországi cigánység történetének válogatott bibliográfiája* [A selected bibliography of the history of the Gypsies in Hungary] (Budapest: ELTE Állam és Jogtörténeti TDK, Állam- és jogtörténeti bibliográfiák 5., 1983).
- 30 Pál Nagy, *A magyarországi cigányok története a rendi társadalom korában* [The History of Roma in Hungary during the Feudal Era] (Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola Társadalomtudományi Tanszék, 1998).
- 31 László Pomogyi, *Cigánykérdés és a cigányügyi igazgatás a polgári Magyarországon* [Gypsy question and the administration of Gypsy affairs in Hungary before 1945] (Budapest: Osiris-Századvég, 1995).
- 32 Csaba Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigánység története. Történelem a cigánykutatások tükrében, 1890–2008* [The history of the Hungarian Gypsies: History reflected in Gypsy research, 1890–2008] (Budapest: Osiris, 2009).
- 33 Báthory and Pomogyi, “A történelemtudomány szerepe a cigánológiai kutatásokban I.” [The role of historical science in romological research, I.], 21.
- 34 Examples include: Zsuzsanna Bódi, ed., *Soha többé... Visszaemlékezések a holokausztra* [Never again... Recollections of the Holocaust] (Budapest: Magyar Néprajzi Társaság, 2000); Zsuzsanna Bódi, “A cigánység történetének képi forrásai” [Pictorial sources of the history of the Gypsies], *Kethano Drom – Közös Út* 1 (1993): 12–13, 45–46; László Endre Hajnal, “Nagyvárosi cigányok. Fotóösszé” [Gypsies of city. A photo essay], *Tabula* 1, 1–2 (1998): 167–178; Péter Szuhay, *A társadalom peremén. Képek a mag-*

- yarországi cigányok életéből [At the margin of the society] (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum – Fővárosi Tanács VB, Cigány Szociális Módszertani és Művelődési Központ, 1989); Péter Szuhay, “A néprajzi kutatás forrásai” [The sources of ethnographical research], *Amaro Drom* 4, 9 (1994): 16–19; Péter Szuhay, ed., *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép. A Néprajzi Múzeum “Romák Közép- és Kelet-Európában” című nemzetközi kiállításának képeskönyve* [Illustrated book of the international exhibition “Roma in Central and Eastern Europe” organized by the Museum of Ethnography] (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1998); Péter Szuhay and Antónia Barati, *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. – “A világ létra, melyen az egyik fel, a másik le megy”* [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the twentieth-century: “The world is a ladder upon which some go up, some go down”] (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1993).
- 35 In French: “*On peut bien parier que l’homme s’effacerait, comme à la limite de la mer un visage de sable.*” Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses. Une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris: Gallimard, “Bibliothèque des sciences humaines,” 1966), 398; Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2002), 422.
- 36 Certain authors—following the work of Foucault—generally use the subsequent steps when analyzing discourses. It is necessary to distinguish who is speaking in given texts, what institutional forums the speech is taking place in, and what the actual position of the speaker is. This helps understand the array of enunciation (*l’énoncé*, “the statement”) variants. The next step is the examination of the connections of the enouncements, seeing who intervenes in the discourse at what point, and with what methods (with the help of rewriting and overwriting) the discourses are changed. This helps us understand the organization of the enouncement field. Finally, what follows is the most important step, namely the examination of the strategic field. This entails the presentation of the reasons behind individual choices and the uncovering of the strategies of those in power. Foucault, “The discourse on language”; Foucault, *The Order of Things*.
- 37 Pál Nagy, *A magyarországi cigányok története a rendi társadalom korában* [The history of Roma in Hungary during the feudal Era] (Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola Társadalomtudományi Tanszék, 1998); Mátyás Binder, “A cigányok vagy a cigánykérdés története? Áttekintés a magyarországi cigányok történeti kutatásairól” [The story of the Gypsies or of the Gypsy Question? An overview of the historical research of Hungarian Gypsies], *Regio* 4 (2009): 38.
- 38 Ernő Kállai, “Vannak-e cigányok, és ha nincsenek, akkor kik azok?” [Are there any Gypsies in Hungary, and if not, who are they?], *Regio* 22, 2 (2014): 117.
- 39 See: Saul Kripke, “Naming and Necessity,” in *Semantics of Natural Language*, ed. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1972), 253–355.
- 40 Assuming Northrop Frye’s theory on the existence of “pre-generic plot-structures, mythoi.” Northrop Frye, “The Archetypes of Literature,” in *Criticism: the Major Statements*. 3rd ed. (1st ed. 1980), ed. Charles Kaplan and William Anderson (New York: St. Martin’s, 1991): 500–514.
- 41 According to historical philosopher Hayden White, “fact” is in a symbiotic relationship with narrativity, given that the histories of historians are written based on narrative schemes. Hayden White, “The Burden of History,” *History and Theory* 5, 2 (1966): 109–134.
- 42 Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 29; Keith Jenkins, *On “What is History?”: From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White* (London: Routledge, 1995), 160–161.

- 43 Hayden White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," *Clio* 3, 3 (1974): 277–303.
- 44 Hilary Putnam, "Brains in a Vat," in Hilary Putnam, *Reason, Truth and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 1–21.
- 45 Putnam, "Brains in a Vat," 15.
- 46 Balázs Majtényi, *A nemzetállam új ruhája. Multikulturalizmus Magyarországon* [The new cloth of nation state: Multiculturalism in Hungary] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2007).
- 47 Ernest Gellner, "The Coming of Nationalism and its Interpretation: the Myths of Nation and Class," in *Mapping the Nation*, ed. Gopal Balakrishnan (London: Verso, 1996), 98–132.
- 48 György Csepeli and Antal Örkény, *The Making of a Minority: Competing claims of definitions of being Roma in contemporary Hungarian society* (manuscript, 2015).
- 49 István Bibó, "Zsidókérdés Magyarországon 1944 után" [The Jewish question in Hungary after 1944], in *Válogatott tanulmányok II* [Selected studies II], ed. István Bibó (Budapest: Bibó István örökösei, 1990), 746.
- 50 Writing about 1944, he emphasized the collective responsibility of Hungarian society for the annihilation of the Jews, and encouraged that social memory treat the Holocaust as a crime committed against members of the Hungarian nation, i.e., against itself.
- 51 Rogers Brubaker, "The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, 4 (July, 2001): 531–548.
- 52 Margit Feischmidt, "Kényszerek és illeszkedések. Gazdasági és szimbolikus stratégiák aprófalvakban élő romák életében" [Economic and symbolic strategies of Romani people living in Hungarian villages], *Szociológiai Szemle* 2 (2012): 54–84.
- 53 From the Eastern border of the country to the Western, a distance of approximately 500 km.
- 54 Zsolt Csalog, *Kilenc cigány. (Önéletrajzi vallomások)* [Nine Gypsies. (Autobiographic reports)] (Budapest: Kozmosz, 1976), 225–226, 239.
- 55 Csalog, *Kilenc cigány*, 179–224.
- 56 Anthony Synnott and David Howes, "Canada's Visible Minorities: Identity and Representation," in *Re-situating Identities: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Culture*, ed. Vered Amit-Talai and Caroline Knowles (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1996), 137–160.
- 57 Michel Foucault, *The Will to Knowledge* (London: Penguin, 1998).
- 58 Peter Vermeersch, *The Romani Movement: Minority Politics and Ethnic Mobilization in Contemporary Central Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), 13–15.
- 59 According to Austrian statistician Karl von Czörnig they numbered 93,000 in 1846, 143,500 in 1857 and 155,700 at the end of 1864. Quoted in: Dr. István Hoóz, "A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról és a cigány népesség számának alakulásáról" [The surveys on Gypsies in Hungary and changes in the number of Gypsy population], in *A cigányok számának és demográfiai helyzetének alakulása Baranya megyében* [Changes in the demographic situation of the Gypsies in Baranya County], ed. István Hoóz (Pécs: Janus Pannonius Tudományegyetem, 1989), 15–16.
- 60 Antal Herrmann, *Magyarországon 1893. január 31-én végrehajtott Czigány összeírás eredményei* [Findings of the census of Gypsies carried out on 31 January, 1893 in Hungary] (Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények, IX. 1895), 81.
- 61 During the 1880 census those with Romani as their mother tongue were placed under the "other" mother tongue category. According to the 1893 Gypsy study, a little under

- 30 percent of the study's subjects spoke Romani as their mother tongue. Those who spoke Romani (among other languages) numbered 94.769. Source: Hoóz, "A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról," 18–19.
- 62 Herrmann, 1893. *Czigány összeírás*, 11.
- 63 Herrmann, 1893. *Czigány összeírás*, 11.
- 64 Dr. László Gesztelyi Nagy, "A cigányügy rendezése" [The solution of the Gypsy issue], *Községyi Közlöny*, 25 (1929): 315–317; Dr. László Gesztelyi Nagy, *A magyarországi cigánykérdés rendezése* [The solution of Gypsy issue in Hungary] (Kecskemét: Első Kecskeméti Hírlapkiadó és Nyomda, 1940); Hoóz, "A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról," 89.
- 65 In 1981 7 percent of students in elementary schools and special schools were deemed Gypsy, and based on this, estimates of future changes in the population were made. Hoóz, "A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról," 3.
- 66 István Kemény, "A magyarországi cigány lakosság" [The Hungarian Gypsy population], *Valóság* 1 (1974): 63–72.
- 67 István Kemény, "A magyarországi cigányok helyzete" [The status of the Gypsies of Hungary], in *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó 1971-ben végzett kutatásról* [Report on research carried out in 1971 on the situation of Gypsies in Hungary], ed. István Kemény (Budapest: MTA Szociológiai Kutató Intézete, 1976), 7–67. The 1993–1994 national representative Gypsy study was based on the same principles. See Gábor Havas and István Kemény, "A magyarországi romákról" [On the Hungarian Roma], *Szociológiai Szemle* 3 (1995): 3–20. The Szelényi-Treiman study empirically confirmed that the number of Gypsies in Hungary was much lower when measurement was based on self-proclamation of ethnic identity and higher when the environment (in this case the interviewer) was able to categorize the subjects. See Iván Szelényi and Donald J. Treiman, *Social Stratification in Eastern Europe after 1989. General Population Survey* (Los Angeles: UCLA, Department of Sociology, 1993).
- 68 István Kemény expressed the following in his summarizing work: "... we cannot speak of a Gypsy culture or subculture, but of the subculture of the lower strata, within which the lifestyle groups of Gypsies provide various colours." Source: Kemény, "A magyarországi cigányok helyzete," 42. For more detail on the issue see Péter Szuhay, *A magyarországi cigányok kultúrája: etnikus kultúra vagy a szegénység kultúrája* [The culture of the Gypsies in Hungary: An ethnic culture or the culture of poverty] (Budapest: Panoráma, 1999).
- 69 Gábor Kertesi and Gábor Kézdy, *A cigány népesség Magyarországon. Dokumentáció és adattár* [The Gypsy population in Hungary: Documentation and statistics] (Budapest: Socio-typo, 1998), 15.
- 70 Kertesi and Kézdy, *A cigány népesség Magyarországon*, 96; István Kemény, Béla Janky and Gabriella Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003* [The Gypsies of Hungary, 1971–2003] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2004), 42.
- 71 Naturally the Gypsies/Roma, or the category of those people who were "deemed Gypsy by the majority" is also a construction. The border separating the two groups is malleable and crossable. Typically, even when sociologists use self-ascription of the individual as a starting point, they still incorporate the "majority" definition. For an analysis of the sociological approaches see: Csaba Dupcsik, *Megnevezés, meghatározás, megszámlálhatóság* [Denomination, definition, countability], 2011, accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.ideaintezet.hu/sites/default/files/Megnevezes_IDEA.pdf.

- 72 Zsolt Csalog, “Kaptam a romáktól emberi gazdagságot... Csalog Zsolttal Daróczi Ágnes beszélget” [I discovered the human richness that lies in Roma communities. An interview with Zsolt Csalog, by Ágnes Daróczi], *Beszélő* 10 (1997): 38.
- 73 Gábor Havas, “Cigányok a szociológiai kutatások tükrében” [Gypsies in the mirror of sociological research], in *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Gypsies in Hungary], ed. István Kemény. (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999), 21–44. See also János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, “Ki a cigány?” [Who is a Gypsy?], in *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], ed. Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau and Júlia Szalai (Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000), 179–191; János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, “Az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról” [On the objectivity of ethnic classifications], in *Cigánynak születni*, ed. Horváth, Landau and Szalai, 203–209; Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Gábor Kertesi, “A relatív cigány a klasszifikációs küzdötéren” [The relative Gypsy in the battle for classification], in *Cigánynak születni*, ed. Horváth, Landau and Szalai, 193–201; Gábor Kertesi, “Az empirikus cigánykutatások lehetőségéről” [On the possibility of empirical research on Gypsies], in *Cigánynak születni*, ed. Horváth, Landau and Szalai, 211–238.
- 74 Mária Neményi, “Kis roma demográfia” [Brief Roma Demography], in *Cigánynak születni*, eds. Horváth, Landau and Szalai, 278.
- 75 Michael Stewart, *Daltestvérek. Az oláh cigány identitás és közösség továbbélése a szocialista Magyarországon* [Brothers in song: Survival of the Vlach Gypsy identity and community in socialist Hungary], transl. Tamás Sajó, Zsuzsa Szarvas and Gábor Vargyas (Budapest: T-Twins, MTA Szociológiai Intézet, and Max Weber Alapítvány, 1994), 278.
- 76 Zsuzsanna Vidra and Jon Fox, “Mainstreaming of Racist Anti-Roma Discourses in the Media in Hungary,” *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 12, 4 (2014): 437–455.
- 77 Margit Feischmidt, “A mindennapi nacionalizmus és a másság cigányként való megjelenése” [Everyday nationalism and othering as a Gypsy], in *Nemzet a mindennapokban. Az újnacionalizmus populáris kultúrája* [Nation in everyday life: Popular culture of neo-nationalism], eds. Margit Feischmidt et al. (Budapest: L’Harmattan – MTA Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont, 2014), 401–447.
- 78 Feischmidt, “A mindennapi nacionalizmus,” 446.
- 79 Ernest Gellner, “The Coming of Nationalism and its Interpretation: the Myths of Nation and Class,” in *Mapping the Nation*, ed. Gopal Balakrishnan (London & New York: Verso, 1996), 98–132.
- 80 Herrmann, 1893. *Czigány összeírás*.
- 81 The number of “Gypsy as a mother tongue” respondents was 6,989 in 1920, then it was 7,841 in 1930 and 18,640 in 1941. The number of “speaks Gypsy along with other languages” respondents was 4,909 in 1920, then it was 6,632 in 1930 and 9,587 in 1941. Census surveys after World War II continued to measure these categories. The number of “Gypsy as a mother tongue” respondents was 21,387 in 1949, then it was 25,633 in 1960 and 34,957 in 1970, and later 27,915 in 1980. Numbers for the category “speaks Gypsy among other languages” were 9,958 in 1949, then 14,230 in 1960 and 17,613 in 1980. Data on minority populations recorded 37,598 people who identified themselves as Gypsy in 1949, with 56,121 in 1960 and 6,404 in 1980. Source: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Central Statistical Office], “1960. évi népszámlálás: Összefoglaló adatok” [Census of 1960: Summary], 13 (Budapest: KSH, 1964), 27–28; Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Central Statistical Office], “1980. évi népszámlálás:

- Demográfiai adatok” [Census of 1980: Demographic data], 21 (Budapest: KSH, 1981), 165; Hoóz, “A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról,” 19–21.
- 82 Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003*, 39.
- 83 For a summary of the data see Béla Janky, “A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete” [The income status of Gypsy families], in *Társadalmi riport* [Social report], ed. Tamás Kolosi, István György Tóth and György Vukovich (Budapest: TÁRKI, 2004), 400.
- 84 “Census of 1960,” 27–28; “Census of 1980,” 165; Hoóz, “A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról,” 19–21.
- 85 Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003*, 42.
- 86 Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Central Statistical Office], “Census of 2011: Individual census questionnaire,” accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/files/sharedUploads/Anyagok/2011/08_ho/313_Szemelyi_kerdoiv_ver5.pdf.
- 87 Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Central Statistical Office], “Census of 2011,” accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.ksh.hu/nepszamlalas/nemzetisegi_adatok.
- 88 Janky, “A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete,” 400.
- 89 Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003*, 37.
- 90 Kamill Erdős, “A magyarországi cigányok” [The Gypsies in Hungary], in *Erdős Kamill cigánytanulmányai* [Gypsy studies of Kamill Erdős] (Békéscsaba: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum, 1989), 42–56. Summarized in Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*], 157–158; Péter Szuha, “Akiket cigányoknak neveznek – akik magukat romának, muzsikusnak vagy beásnak mondják” [Who are called Gypsies – who think of themselves as Romani, Musician or Boyash], *Magyar Tudomány* 6 (1997): 665–666.
- 91 Andrea Szalai, “A mi és az ők határai, avagy a beások belülről” [The characteristics of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ opposition in the language use of Boyash Gypsies], *Regio* 1 (1997): 104–126.
- 92 Gábor Fleck and Tünde Virág, *Egy beás közösség múltja és jelene* [Past and present of a Boyash community] (Budapest: MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete Etnoregionális Kutatóközpont, 1999), 69. Quoted in Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*], 284–285.
- 93 Károly Bari, “A származás nem esztétikai kategória. Murányi Gábor interjúja Bari Károllyal” [Ancestry is not an aesthetic category. An interview with Károly Bari by Gábor Murányi], *HVG* 23 (June 12, 2010), 34.
- 94 A characteristic example of this is the work of József Vekerdí. See, for example, József Vekerdí, *A magyarországi cigánykutatások története* [History of Gypsy research in Hungary] (Debrecen: KLTE, 1982).
- 95 On the relations between Gypsy studies in Hungary and cultural anthropology, see Csaba Prónai, *Cigánykutatás és kulturális antropológia* [Romology research and cultural anthropology] (Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem – Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1995), 95–129.
- 96 Péter Szuha, “Cigány kultúra. A magyarországi cigány etnikai csoportok integrációjáról és a nemzeti kultúra megalkotásáról” [Gypsy Culture: Integration of Gypsy ethnic groups and constructing a Gypsy national culture], *BUKSZ* 3 (1995): 331.
- 97 Ernő Kállai, “Vannak-e cigányok?,” 142.
- 98 Patrick Joyce, “The End of Social History,” in *The Postmodern History Reader*, ed. Keith Jenkins (London: Routledge, 1997), 380–384.
- 99 Miguel A. Cabrera, *Postsocial History: An Introduction* (New York: Lexington Books, 2004), 28–29.

“Comrades, If You Have a Heart ...”

The History of the Gypsy Issue, 1945–1961

The construction and spread of the state socialist system

Like in many East-Central European countries, the brief period of parliamentary republicanism following World War II ended with the seizing of power by a communist party (the Hungarian Workers' Party) with the support of the Soviet Union. The single-party system began to form in 1948 and aimed to reorganize society according to Marxist-Leninist principles within a framework of political internationalism. While those in power between the two World Wars established their rule on the restriction of rights (e.g., Jewish laws),¹ the communist powers in theory declared the execution of an egalitarian society, where equality became a policy for which the working class, the co-operative peasantry and their allies in the intelligentsia would form a foundation. However, what ended up happening was that the anti-egalitarian nationalism that had gained strength between the World Wars persisted in the new political framework. State policy in Hungary based on differentiation received new content and form, and thereby a definitive role was played not by the restriction of the rights of Jews, but by prejudices and social/political passions toward the Gypsies, who were the biggest minority in the eyes of the “majority.”

The fate of Gypsies in the decades after 1945 was similar in all the countries of East-Central Europe. The new constitutions of state socialist systems, based on the Soviet model, appeared to guarantee equality to all citizens. The various Gypsy communities in these countries generally lived under poorer conditions than the average standard of living of the “majority” society, and this had a strong effect on how society judged them, even under state socialism.² Consequently, from the 1950s these countries had to begin dealing with them.³ At the local level, the social boundaries that existed between non-Gypsies and Gypsies in the decades before

1945 began to become visible at the national level, largely as a result of discourse on Gypsies. These discourses on the one hand demarcated the borders of the “majority” that was loyal to the state, along with the advantages and higher social positions that came with membership in the “majority” vis-à-vis others, while on the other hand they practically excluded Gypsy communities from the “socialist society.”

Policy and Gypsies

“How many were lost, we still don’t know. I couldn’t find any Hungarian newspapers that figured it would be worth mentioning the decimation of the people that live among us—meaning that from centuries of hatred in the Danube Valley we haven’t reached the minimum of human solidarity”—these are the words of poet György Faludy, who was the only person to challenge Hungarian society to face up to its crimes against Gypsies.⁴

Generally the number of victims in the European Roma Holocaust is estimated at between 200,000 and 500,000 persons;⁵ since the 1990s the latter number has become the more accepted, although international Roma organizations speak of 1.5 million victims.⁶ Researchers on Roma began to work on the history of the Roma Holocaust in the 1970s,⁷ and as mentioned above, they strove to write an expressly Roma Holocaust history in contrast to works that had excluded them before.⁸ A similar group of historians, later, after the regime change (1989–90), began to elucidate the history of genocide⁹ committed against Hungarian Roma.¹⁰ One of the goals of such research was to resurrect the “forgotten” history of an “invisible” minority group in discourse on the country’s past. This would on the one hand strengthen the identity of minority communities, and on the other hand it would transform the societal perception of its own collective responsibility. In the 1950s ethnographer Kamill Erdős estimated the number of Hungarian Gypsy victims at 50,000. In the 1970s the Committee on the Victims of Nazism judged that a number of 28,000 was likely.¹¹

In his 1992 book historian László Karsai used archival sources to estimate a total of 5,000 persons who were removed and/or executed.¹² Very often no documents were prepared during the deportation of Roma because in many cases these were considered “disciplinary” acts of local authorities, and were the results of surprise and violent maneuvers. Therefore, a number of tens of thousands is more likely. Oral history research after the regime change naturally cannot produce an exact number of Roma victims. The number, compared to the tragic nature of the event, the documentation of the genocide and the need to inform non-Roma and Roma public opinion, is of secondary importance.



Holocaust survivors with family portrait, circa 2000

In the years after the Second World War and after the horrors of the Nazi death camps, Hungarian Gypsies received no reparations and no apologies for the genocide. The actual achievements after 1945 hardly affected the Gypsies. Furthermore, they were largely excluded from land redistribution programs.¹³ Democratic parties did not deal with their situation, nor did they compete for their votes.¹⁴ One of the reasons for this is undoubtedly that the Hungarian state had very little knowledge of Gypsies. Censuses, which collected data on the number of people speaking Gypsy as a mother tongue, did not indicate that the Gypsy people—pushed to the periphery of society—were very significant in number.¹⁵

The new political elite was completely oblivious to them, and the danger of postwar epidemics served to increase prejudice.¹⁶ The party's social science periodical, *Társadalomtudományi Szemle* (Social Science Review), published a piece by András Kálmán calling for Gypsy rights in 1946. The author, who was a communist émigré returning from the West,¹⁷ referred to the Soviet Union's minority policy and argued that the question of "unassimilated" Gypsies was a national issue. In the 1930 census little more than 8,000 respondents declared themselves as native speakers of Gypsy. Conversely, András Kálmán estimated the country's Gypsy population at 80–100,000. He felt that Gypsies, along with Slovaks, formed Hungary's largest national minority group. He recommended a new policy: he envisioned putting Gypsies to work and integrating them into heavy industry. He thought this was the only way to fold (or essentially assimilate) them into Hungarian society.¹⁸

Gypsies were hardly mentioned in public forums in the period of transition. The state socialist system for a long time did not have a Gypsy policy. As such, these issues only turned up on the desks of state administrators, county and district councils and party committees as occasional administrative issues. The Party announced the unity of a “socialist society” and used all means at its disposal to obstruct self-organization, refusing to support the foundation of minority organizations. In 1957 the Party showed nothing to indicate it would recognize Gypsies as a national minority. Reports and recommendations on the situation of Gypsies collected dust in unread piles of documents, waiting for department heads in ministries, local council presidents and party secretaries. When functionaries grew tired of the towering pile of documents, or when they were satisfied with “domestic” or “social welfare” programs, they would place these piles in archives or put them in the “finished” drawer. From the smoke-filled world of local authorities, public issues were slow to advance. As to what life was like and what really happened within the walls of administration, we have very little information.¹⁹

The leading bodies of the state party, the Hungarian Workers’ Party, which had powerful decision makers, finally put the Gypsy issue on the agenda in 1956, after receiving a submission from the Ministry of People’s Education and from the National Police Headquarters. The Party’s given departments wrote a proclamation plan based on the received recommendations, which can be interpreted as an official position. Like most previous documents, this one also mentioned “Gypsy crime,” Gypsy stereotypes, the idea of dispersing Gypsies, as well as ideas for “elevating” the Gypsies.²⁰ Typically, this document described the general situation of Gypsies as such: “Most of the Gypsies live on the periphery of society, or are often parasitic.” The Party’s highest directive body, the Politburo, did not accept this directive. More important issues had come to the fore. The submission was forgotten for good in the time of the restoration after the 1956 Revolution.

In 1957, staff at the Ministry of Labor conducted a study on the situation of Gypsies, which referred to several forms of exclusion. The Planning and Balance Department’s staff measured “the numbers and employment situation of Gypsies in Hungary”; they based their work on estimates provided by local councils as well as the opinions of other officials working in state administration. Through the Foreign Ministry they asked for information on how the Gypsy situation was progressing in other state socialist countries.²¹ The finished report contained recommendations on improving the living environment of the Gypsy population, all while claiming that Gypsies did not constitute a national minority.²²

György Pogány and Géza Bán considered Gypsies an “ethnic group.”²³ They claimed: “[W]e do not need to artificially develop them toward nationhood or national minority status,” and “...we must not place obstacles to their assimila-



Rudolf Bukovits during construction of the Sió canal, 1947

tion.”²⁴ The authors of the study were bureaucrats conducting a state commission, who were executing a task and a given goal for their writing. From today’s perspective their words must be seen otherwise, unlike analyzing them in their own context and times. Characteristically, the ethnographer Kamill Erdős, who had great sympathy toward the Gypsies in his writings, had a similar view of their future. In 1960 he wrote: “The essence of the Gypsy question: there is no Gypsy question.”²⁵ Gypsy national (or national minority) identity did not exist in its current state, and it cannot be assumed—even in light of knowing and analyzing Gypsy politician Mária László’s actions—that Gypsy groups or Gypsy intellectuals demanded minority rights and self-government in any unified way in the 1950s. Admittedly, given the dictatorship, there was no means of doing so.

The director of the Planning and Balance Department, Pogány and Bán’s superior, finally recommended to the Salary and Labour Force Management General Department that the task be split up among various “social organizations” and ministries, and that a special committee be set up to solve the problem. He initiated a joint submission with the Agricultural Ministry to the government, which would distribute tasks among state organizations according to spheres of competence.²⁶

Party coordinators at first put aside the social action plan. Based on the Soviet model, they proclaimed the Gypsies a national minority. In the summer of 1957 the National Minorities Department was established in the Ministry of

Culture, which would oversee national minority associations (Slovak, Romanian, German and Southern Slav). In October the leaders of the Ministry established the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies, based on the example of the other national minority associations.²⁷ In the initial period the association was led by Mária László, whose goals, among others, were the support of Gypsy literature and music and the care of Gypsy languages. The organization actually dealt foremost with individual complaints. Mária László, who was always proud of her Gypsy heritage, worked as a journalist before the war. In 1937 she organized a protest in the village of Pánd, and was in turn arrested for incitement. In 1945 she became a member of the Social Democratic Party. In the first half of the 1950s she wrote to ministries and the Council of Ministers, requesting permission to establish an independent Gypsy organization. In the latter part of the '50s, as secretary general of the Association, she often tried to stand up to state authorities in the interest of Gypsies and Gypsy communities. In late 1957 Mária László learned of the Labor Ministry's developing plans and wrote a letter to the Secretariat of the Ministry, asking them to nominate a staff member she could liaise with.²⁸ On the surface, the authorities had assigned tasks related to the Gypsy issue to the Association, but in the meantime various ministries were preparing a slew of recommendations on how to "solve" the Gypsy issue.

In the early days of operation, the Association effectively tried to become a viable interest group and to help redress individual complaints and problems. This, however, was often a losing battle with authorities. Given the times, the work of the Association was not given enough publicity. It also had limited opportunities, but the interest-protection role and the activity of the secretary general were making those in power uncomfortable. In 1959 Mária László was removed as the head of the Association.²⁹ The key reason for this, as indicated in Erna Sággy's report, was the Gypsy politician's opposition to the internment of Gypsies during the post-Revolution retaliation period. She protested at the Ministry of the Interior and the Attorney General's office: "We suggest that there are mistakes in the current process of internments." The letter was signed by Mária László on June 16, 1958, at the height of official retaliations following the 1956 Revolution.³⁰ It was the day the revolutionary Prime Minister Imre Nagy and his fellow martyrs were executed. The leaders of the party at first placed a trustworthy bureaucrat at the head of the Association,³¹ and then in 1961 the Association was formally disbanded.

Sometimes quite openly and sometimes in a more clandestine manner, state socialist systems all executed unique nation building policies: under the cloak of vulgar Marxism they consciously sought to linguistically and culturally homogenize society. The concept of a unified nation state did not die out in Hungary either. It could no longer be an official point of reference, but as a principle of develop-



Family photograph, 1960

ment and a force for organizing society it continued to be implemented, all while serving the strategic interests of the party.³²

Modernization and Gypsy communities

Analysis of the phenomenon called nation building, or the relationship between the birth of the modern state and nationalism, shows that nations are not fixed and perpetual actors in history. In the age of modernization, nationalism was on the one hand a means to legitimize ruling elites, and on the other hand, and in a related fashion, a way to strengthen the state's spatial, administrative and economic powers.³³ Modernity or modernization can be seen as an organizing principle through which power fundamentally changed the relationship between individuals and society. All those who were left out of the reorganization or "nationalization" of society became the so-called internal outsiders. Members of excluded and marginalized groups maintained their own historical time and space, and as such created for themselves spaces for "survival" within society.³⁴

The paradigm for analysis of Western history is the theory of modernization, and some historians describe the plans of social engineering of socialist states as a top-down modernization attempt. It was in the interest of the "socialist" state to



Gypsy settlement, circa 1950

create a social foundation for its policies and future grandiose plans. Undoubtedly, part of the propaganda of these systems was to announce that “socialism” would bring economic and social development and welfare to the countries of East-Central Europe. Thus, changes in the life of Gypsies under state socialism can be interpreted within the modernization paradigm, should we accept its validity.

In Hungary Gypsies were the only minority group given a special status—one lying outside “socialist society”—by the state power. The leaders of the party-state, besides seeking quick and violent solutions to social problems, viewed the Gypsy population as a backup labor force for extensive industrialization and rapidly developing heavy industry. For several decades state propaganda emphasized that social “integration” (or to use an older expression, fitting in) of Gypsies could not proceed because they migrated within the country’s borders and traditionally made a living from “begging.” (In official forums this was offered as an explanation for the existence of prejudice in “majority” society.) This argument served foremost to cover up the fact that no matter who was in power, the representatives of the Hungarian

state had done painfully little to improve the social situation of Gypsies, or to help along their social assimilation (which was called “pliancy”—*beilleszkedés*—in Hungarian in official documents, but the contemporaneous meanings of this word were a far cry from the sense of the recent term “integration”).

With the first “Gypsy study” in 1893, 13,000 Gypsy smiths were recorded, who, along with their family members (presumably 60,000 people), made up more than one-fifth of the Gypsy population at the time. The data from the study also indicated that 23 percent of smiths at the time were Gypsies.³⁵ (In several cities smiths’ guilds were suing Gypsy smiths, but in villages, where there was no competition, the work of Gypsies was irreplaceable.) The traditional Gypsy vocations (smithing, woodworking, spoon carving, basket weaving, adobe work) were already vulnerable to modern industry’s expansion at the beginning of the century, and this was later exacerbated by extensive industrialization and nationalization.

Between 1948 and 1952 nationalization came to a boiling point, and the state virtually decimated local industry and commerce. As a result many Gypsies were stripped of their traditional means of making ends meet. Although it was always a goal to incrementally nationalize industry and trade in general, this nationalization was not supposed to affect Gypsy traders and artisans. The representatives of power declared that Gypsies could not receive craftsman licenses, and they tried to “solve” the Gypsy problem by criminalizing traditional Gypsy occupations. All this was done to speed up the forceful assimilation of Gypsies. In 1956 the Party leadership ordered “policing organizations” in order to “cooperate with the appropriate councils and economic organizations to examine migrant industries, to use appropriate full-time job provision to ensure that migrant craftsman licenses that beget unwanted begging not be granted to Gypsies... The operations of Gypsy horse traders must be stopped, and Gypsy barter commerce and rug- and tablecloth selling, which is widespread in cities and is a cover operation for thieves, be brought to an end.”³⁶

Over modern times the representatives of the Hungarian state have viewed Gypsies as a group that stands outside of the world of modernity, and explained their outsider position by pointing to their traditional occupations. However, the work and income of village artisan Gypsies conformed to the needs of village residents for centuries. The traditional trades, from the social science point of view, were “ceded occupations.”

Hence, such work was “ceded” by local communities and handed over to Gypsies, who depended on these communities. But from another point of view, from that of local Gypsy communities, these were instead acquired trades, and being daytaler in nature afforded a higher degree of freedom to Gypsies within the local community. However, when demand for products of Gypsy masters



Gypsy woman making a net, 1957

decreased, the village poor usually succeeded in excluding Gypsies from farm labor, and thus within local society they found themselves in a position of dependence. Later, during the period of industrialization, they were put into similar positions in factories and workers' hostels, and had to maintain their communities under such conditions.³⁷ At first these job opportunities were obviously "ceded" positions, but their meaning changed over time: in a changing world Gypsy communities had to once again experience the distance separating them from the rest of society, to reorganize their lives, and to *acquire* their freedom.

The situation of individuals and groups was basically defined not by survival strategies but by positions held in the local community and more generally in society. Social position was experienced by individuals and members of minorities and the "majority" in numerous ways. Though we can see and present Gypsy communities as either vassals, victims of constant oppression, or the embodiment of freedom, reality is better served by acknowledging the wide array of behaviors, adaptations and forms of resistance. This pluralism, however, can only be alluded to, but it can in no way be illustrated. Contrary to the homogenizing (majority-

building) efforts of the state—and as a result of the diction and point of view of the authors of this book—Gypsies and Gypsy communities are presented as heroic fighters in a lopsided but not hopeless struggle for freedom, those who represent the exception as opposed to the average, those who are different as opposed to the all-encompassing same, or those who are free as opposed to the powerful.

Under state socialism one of the goals of violent and forced actions was to bring all social groups under the control and supervision of the state. State interventions, however, had their limits or their “social borders.” When nationalizing small industry and small commerce the state had to make concessions because of reduced capacity. Because of increased challenges in providing for village populations certain forms of local commerce and household industry were tolerated, while others the state could never successfully eradicate. For example, nail smiths produced unique products that expansive industry could not, or could only produce at prohibitive costs. Nationalizing the work tools of Gypsy smiths would have been in vain, given that they used traditional methods, forming their heated metal with hammers on anvils. Gypsies could use almost any scrap metal to do their work. In several places, in the interest of pulling Gypsies into the state nationalized economy, nail smith collectives were formed. Naturally, the press of the time emphasized the help offered by the state.³⁸ From today’s point of view, the estab-



Gypsy settlement, late 1950s

lishment of the collectives can be interpreted as successful resistance and as a sign of protecting their own interests.

Over the twentieth-century several waves of modernization swept over local societies, including those in Hungary. According to the logic of modernization theories, these changes were similar everywhere and always pointed in the same direction. Statistical data of the time appears to reflect a mass migration of the population involved in agriculture (of dirt roads and adobe shacks) to the factories, smoggy cities, sooty milieus and jungles of concrete and cranes. In reality, it was a fundamental interest of factories in the 1950s to have a large proportion of skilled laborers. Unskilled workers were generally given seasonal work in large projects. Workers themselves often migrated between various work locations. When they found other means of making a living, they “voluntarily exited” and terminated their work contracts. It was also typical for many of them to keep their previous streams of income and hence just occasionally take on work in the factory, per labor contract.

In general, the majority of Gypsies were forced to give up their traditional occupations or their main streams of income. András Faludi, the author of a book published in 1964, acknowledged the tragic situation through the example of a Gypsy community in Rákospalota, and had the following to say about the “achievements” or effects of state actions, and the dismantling of local industry and commerce: “Most of them [the members of Gypsy community of Rákospalota] had used up the horse’s value and were unable to buy a new horse. They were stuck and had to go to work. From month to month they drank away their income, or spent it, later buying a few pieces of furniture, clothing, and the only mark they’ve left is their orphaned wagons: with proper interventions, and a bit of force, migration can be stopped.”³⁹

The advance of modernization, however, did not move at a regular pace and did not bring changes as drastic as we might think today. In villages the news of large factories seeking workers was often verbally announced in the main square. Unemployment continued to be a serious problem, yet the new powers tried to keep it secret. In the 1950s local councils administered unemployment assistance. The Ministry of Labor tried to use administrative means to limit the number of beneficiaries, though investigations ordered from above generally found no breaking of the rules. In fact, the “socialist” state did not offer job opportunities for all,⁴⁰ and the unemployed disappeared from national statistics. The writers of “labor force balance sheets” did not want to and could not track daily changes in labor trends, nor calculate proportions of permanent and temporary workers or part-time workers on collective farms.⁴¹ When necessary, individuals were able to procure proof of employment to show the authorities. It was in the interest of the “socialist” state to create the illusion of full employment.

Forced industrialization certainly transformed the traditional lifestyle of most Gypsies, but it did little to change their situation within society. “Socialist” industry generally viewed them as unskilled labor, and as such most Gypsies filled the lowest positions in nationalized industries, while some were able to maintain their profession in areas where difficult conditions and low pay led to labor shortages. Thus, large numbers worked in road construction, building construction and mining. Many were forced to leave their earlier homes and migrate to industrial zones, move into workers’ hostels, or commute.⁴² In the 1950s the modernization logic of so-called “industrializing principles” came into play in city planning. The first encompassing plan was prepared in 1950, calling for the development of a “unified, socialist city and community network,” with 1,291 settlements labeled as “unfit for development.”⁴³ With this move the state practically defined a group of settlements and residents that would not benefit from the achievements of “socialist” modernization.

The continued existence of traditional communities caught the attention of ethnographers.⁴⁴ In the period of industrialization the archaic lifestyle of certain Gypsy communities offered a chance to portray the remnants of the old, “pre-socialism” days. In these pieces Gypsies were portrayed as the last heralds of the time before “socialism” (or “socialist” modernity), as if they lived outside the “socialist” world. But such phenomena exist neither alongside one another, nor one after another, nor as a result of one another. They exist in their own time. They



Building of the Mecsek Mining Industry Trust, circa 1955



Pál Vajda Sr., Gypsy voivod, 1961

cannot be understood in their own realities if we analyze them as parts of the same process, using a traditional linear sense of time.⁴⁵

Ethnographic research, while fitting in well with the dominant narrative of the time, speaking of the emancipation of society and “socialist” development, still worked according to the principles of getting to know groups and understanding them. Tibor Bartos’ collection of stories and histories from Gypsy nail smiths, called *Sosemvolt cigányország* (There was never a Gypsy country) was published in 1958. The afterword was written by an ethnographer who attempted to refute the image of Gypsies that had developed in Hungary: “Gypsies live in common knowledge as people who never got used to regular work, who are lazy, untrustworthy and vacuous, but who are at the same time like a dodgy and laughable but remorseful figure in a musical or a folk tale: someone who anyone can play the worst kind of trick on with the least amount of remorse.”⁴⁶

Today, a portion of social scientists continues to accept the value system of modernization, and in turn views the past through, at least in part, the linguistic and conceptual frameworks of the state socialist ideology and capitalism characteristic of the nation state system. As emphasized earlier, the emancipatory future vision is what the two ideologies have in common. Often states view themselves and their time as the beginning of the future and as its depositories, which is a logic echoed by principles of modernization theory. The basic phenomena associated with modernization—industrialization and urbanization—are viewed as the only possible logic for social progress.⁴⁷ Recent historical studies, however, refute the validity of this narrative. The theory of multiple modernities and studies inspired by this theory draw our attention to the fact that modernization was not a singular phenomenon, and it affected various social groups and actors in divergent ways.⁴⁸

Disciplinary state

“Every gendarme unit has his area. When we come across Gypsy caravans in that area, we beat them up and escort them to the border of the next area. There another unit will discover them, beat them up, and escort them to the next neighboring area. And it goes on like this for eternity”—this is a quote from a Szabolcs County Gendarmes officer and printed in the pages of the social science periodical *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century) by Béla Bergstein in 1910. The author furthermore claimed: “Where there is an economic need for the work of Gypsies, questions of public administration seem to solve themselves. Roles reverse. The physical brutality of public administration is replaced by economic exploitation.” Starting from the point of the Gypsy residents of the town of Pelsőc, he surmised

that “permanent job opportunities and the continuing search for laborers will bring about the settlement of the Gypsies and their continued assimilation.”⁴⁹

Politicians of the expanding single-party system initially treated the Gypsy issue as a public order issue, like before 1948. State socialism was also characterized by police brutality when authorities confronted Gypsies. The declared goal in such instances was to force them into salaried work, or in the case of migrant groups to settle them. When in 1956 the Hungarian Workers’ Party Administrative Department wrote a recommendation on “the solution to the Gypsy issue in Hungary” to the Politburo, the police were to be granted a significant role in carrying out public administration tasks, given their “deep knowledge of the Gypsy problem.” The recommendation declared that the police should offer help in “solving the many types of tasks that crop up for local bodies when solving the Gypsy issue.”⁵⁰

Voivods, or Gypsy judges, were allowed to remain active in Gypsy communities under state socialism, which they could attribute to their longstanding relationship with figures of power over time. Traditionally, these designated leaders of Gypsy communities were more representatives of local power than of their own communities. A typical case is of one city Voivod, who in May of 1947, not forgetting the months of Arrow Cross Party rule, recommended to the mayor of Győr that he send the “responsibility-evading” Gypsies “to work camps, if you please.”⁵¹ Local councils and party organizations in the 1950s tried to use their chosen Gypsy representatives (Voivods and Gypsy judges) to supervise and control Gypsy communities.⁵² As a result, such representatives were viewed in their own communities as informers, or people of the police, councils, or the Party.

The new and old representatives of state power and public administration found novel methods to follow Gypsies who continued to lead migrant lifestyle and to keep them under strict police surveillance. In 1953 the Minister’s Council—on the recommendation of the Politburo of the Hungarian Workers’ Party—ordered the introduction of personal identification documentation, which was to be distributed by June 30, 1955. On June 17, 1955, a meeting at the Ministry of the Interior decided “wandering Gypsies” would be granted “temporary identification documents that were different in form and content.” The so-called black IDs had to be renewed every year. They were eventually revoked in the first quarter of 1961, when all general IDs were changed.⁵³ The authors of the recommendation quoted above said the following: “A large proportion of the Gypsies truly lives on the periphery of society, and is often parasitic. The large majority does not have regular work, a part of them (!) still has traditional Gypsy occupations...”⁵⁴ In the 1950s not only the police, but also county councils kept registers of Gypsies.⁵⁵

Despite the public order decrees, Gypsy caravans continued to criss-cross the entire country. Court records of the time show that these caravans occasionally



Police viewing Lenin's photograph, 1957

had encounters with “socialist law.” The Supreme Court judged that Fardi Rostás’ Gypsy caravan had traversed the land between the Danube and Tisza rivers in the cold and snowy winter of 1959, moving an average of 10 km per day. The representatives of state authorities (councils, attorney’s office, and courts) described their life as “a typical criminal lifestyle.” They viewed the theft of wood as a characteristic crime, and Gypsies needed wood as their caravan often camped under the stars and they lit campfires. The court estimated that in two months they had burned at least two quintals of wood. “Avoiding work” and begging were similarly deemed as crimes in that time. While migrating, an infant passed away, and according to the accusation the Gypsies had taken the child to the doctor, but failed to give appropriate care afterwards. When the child died, they buried the body in a tree trunk. The defence claimed that their behavior should be measured against their own traditions, which was accepted by the court, and as such they did not commit a crime.⁵⁶ It is clear that the acts of Gypsies only go against norms when



Gypsy caravan, 1950

those acts are seen by the representatives of the state as harmful or dangerous to the “majority” (i.e., themselves).

Alongside the Ministry of the Interior, the staff of the Ministry of People’s Welfare was also active in “solving the Gypsy issue” in the 1950s. They introduced the institution of health sanitation designated for “Gypsy settlements” in the 1950s. Along with health officers they supervised these settlements, and where they deemed it necessary they ordered “forced bathing and disinfection” (at first they used a chemical designed as a pesticide to do this).⁵⁷ It should be noted that many Gypsy Voivods were complicit in the execution of these forced bathings.⁵⁸

Organizations of the Ministry of the Interior, familiar with the Gypsy issue, and their experts appear in documents from the period. Our sources—official documents of the time—present these violent acts as humane, people’s welfare interventions: “KÖJÁL’s⁵⁹ mobile bathing and disinfection service has this year [1959] washed 2339 Gypsy persons and disinfected their clothes. There was some opposition to the bathing in the beginning, but this has ceased, and there are places where they request it. Everywhere, children are very happy about the washing.”⁶⁰ Recollections provide a different reading of how the “forced bathings” took place. An old man, decades after the fact, remembered the following:

We went into the tent, and we all had to strip naked. We stood in line. Someone came in and we had to show our palms, and they squirted a very smelly chemical into our hands. All they said was it would make our hair nice, it would shine, we would be nice and clean. We had to put it in our hair and rub it over our bodies... It was so strong that when the soldiers went away the grass never grew back where the tents stood, the whole area turned yellow, even the weeds died... There was one shower area with six shower heads. First they sent in the men and boys. Then the women, girls, old women... They didn't care how inhumane this all was, that Gypsies are shy. On more than one occasion, when the women and girls were showering, someone made up some excuse and a man or two went in there, gave instructions, and asked whether "there is enough of the chemicals."⁶¹

Institutions and institutional systems are never independent of the social environment of state interventions. The disciplinary mechanisms of state power of the time



Mounted police, 1957

did not merely seep into everyday life. Sources indicate that violent state interventions were generally acceptable in the circles of the “majority” society. We can assume that they were rooted not only in the intentions of those in power, but were at least partly rooted in the web of relations of local societies. As László Kardos stated about the local function of “extreme nationalism,” in the Horthy era its function was to compensate “for the low social prestige” of the poorest with “the principle of belonging to the Hungarian nation.”⁶² Although such extreme principles based on race theory were not given state sanction in public forums, this trend persisted under the decades of state socialism.

The impossibility of self-organization

In 1958, in the village of Hernádvécse, the local shepherds established a Gypsy cultural organization. After their first show they had a difference of opinion with the local secretary of the party-state’s youth organization (the Communist Youth Alliance, known as *KISZ*). The secretary issued an ultimatum. They could only play shows if the income from the show was given to *KISZ*. The organization was not willing to do this, and thus the local council secretary and the *KISZ* secretary obstructed them from doing a second show. They denied the necessary police authorization and claimed that the cultural organization was not a member of any umbrella organizations. The shepherds resisted and rejected the offered *KISZ* membership, which would have drained their income (the leader of the group was forty-eight years old, while the oldest member was fifty-six years old). They were offended that the young Gypsies, as they put it, would be “earmarked members of *KISZ*.” They could have joined the Women’s Council, but the cultural group contained only one female member, while the other nine were men. They applied to the People’s Front⁶³ but were rejected. They met again and decided that they would form the Pasture Company cultural group. The council president and *KISZ* secretary blocked this as well. Eventually, they performed in another village, where the district police captain granted authorization. Given their treatment, the shepherds turned to the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies.⁶⁴

It was a transient time in the history of Hungarian Gypsies, when a Gypsy organization could truly defend the interests of Gypsies; this is why the documents left to us are of particular interest. These individual submissions and letters of complaint give us a snapshot of the lives of those people who apparently left only a faint print on history, but whom in reality were forgotten by the writers of history.

Besides fighting with offices and local authorities in the interest of Gypsies—and given the balance of power these fights were often hopeless—the Association

also dealt with individual cases and seemingly minute issues. For example, the soccer club of Alsószentmárton—which won its first match in the county championship playing barefoot—needed shoes. The Association also received letters in which the complainants wrote directly to János Kádár, the First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, showing trust in the all-encompassing power of the state. These documents nicely characterize the period's paternalistic style.⁶⁵ Some addressed Kádár as “Dear Regent” (this was the rank used by Miklós Horthy, who ruled the regime between the two World Wars), while some signed their letters as “the new Hungarians of Döge village”: “We ask Comrade Kádár to make sure that we are not denied our rights and that we may sing the song of truth, ‘Let the world sing! Long live! Long live Comrade Kádár!’”⁶⁶

The appropriate authorities regularly forwarded to the Gypsy Association those problems they did not want to deal with, and a peculiar situation developed—which, considering the period, was quite surprising—whereby complaints arriving from members of the “majority” society were directed to the Gypsy association. The authors of these kinds of submissions generally requested the expulsion of Gypsies from their towns.⁶⁷ In the town of Pácin, Hungarian residents asked the Minister of Health to move the village Gypsies to another town.⁶⁸

In this period Gypsies did not have many opportunities to protect their interests or organize themselves at the local level. Democracies that were emerging after the Second World War, as shown by Kymlicka, were nation-building states in the sense that their citizens were tied to institutions that projected the vision of a unified nation state.⁶⁹ Given the nature of dictatorship, it was not a stretch for state socialist regimes to also aim for the homogenization of society. State socialism continued to institutionalize identities, with the main difference that these were exclusive, and citizens had no public recourse to communicate their separateness. Individuals were stripped of the opportunity to act as a collective.

Characteristic of the time, nail smith collectives—given that the state had acknowledged them, for reasons explained above—often took action in the interest of local Gypsy communities. Complaints clearly show that the members of small industry production collectives (*Ktsz*) were consistently harassed as soon as they left the area where the authorities knew them. The Nail Smith *Ktsz* of Rákospalota held a get-together in a pub in 1959. Their complaint claims that the workers of the collective behaved according to the “rules of socialist coexistence,” but they were beaten by police in the pub. Mária László took the collective's letter addressed to the Budapest Police Precinct, and forwarded it to the Attorney General and the Secretariat of the Ministers' Council of the People's Republic of Hungary. The authorities did not bother to respond.⁷⁰

Minority issue

“At the beginning, the Association’s work, for a long time, was based on an erroneous principled position. Gypsies were viewed as a national minority, and the Association as an interest organization, and given this malformed starting point we took malformed measures”⁷¹—responding to pressure described above, the leaders of the Gypsy Association wrote these thoughts into their work plan for 1960.

In the 1950s Mária László took several steps to support the use of Gypsy languages as official languages, to teach them in kindergartens and schools, and to establish a Gypsy-language press. She requested support for Gypsy culture and worked for official recognition of its existence. In August of 1954 she turned to the Budapest Party Committee, while on January 9, 1956, she turned to the Ministers’ Council (i.e., the executive body) to seek support for Gypsy culture and the Gypsy people. In the latter case she attached letters from famous Gypsy musicians (Sándor Járóka, Kálmán Oláh, Vince Lakatos, Gyula Toki Horváth, József Pécsi), as well as a submission written in the name of Gypsies of the village of Pánd. In this submission the Gypsies of Pánd asked to be taught to read and write, and learn trades (most of the forty-two signatories, instead of signing their names, wrote three “x”-s): “We would like to be citizens with equal rights, and we feel it is our duty to become so. Our lives are dark and sad, and we are excluded and scorned. We ask for help to rise up as persons.”⁷²

Mária László, as the general secretary of the Gypsy Association, urged that Gypsy communities be able to form “artist groups” and that they perform the works of Gypsy writers. She used all means possible to support Gypsy musicians who had lost their work thanks to the nationalization of the hospitality industry, and planned the establishment of a “Hungarian Gypsy folk troupe.” She sought to popularize Gypsy culture in Hungarian villages alongside the “ancient, original culture” of the Hungarian people, in order to show the connections and common themes among them.⁷³

Even later on, she saw national minority culture as the road to the “elevating” of Gypsies, which could increase solidarity within society. When she died, she left notes behind for a Gypsy language textbook and dictionary, a manuscript on Hungarian Gypsy musicians, and notes for a book on Gypsy history. The attitude of Kádár’s state to these efforts, however, is characterized by the fact that the Gypsy politician, having fallen out of favor, was put to work at the Post Office, and retired as a head cashier.⁷⁴

The granting of minority status in the 1950s was naturally just window dressing. When the leaders of the Association took steps to protect the interests

of Gypsies, they were consistently rejected. In 1960, after Mária László had been removed, the Gypsy Association wrote about a role in its work plan, whereby the Association would write an “informative situation report” for the Party and would work out the “principled theses of the Gypsy issue.” Before the work plan was accepted, it was debated at a meeting with the representatives of various ministries. The Ministry of Education warned the leaders of the Association not to work on reports without the involvement of the Party bodies and Ministries, and to refrain from making public any material on principles. They also recommended studying the Gypsy policies of “friendly countries” (with the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia serving as models).⁷⁵

Discourses on social policy and equality

“Rise, Hungarians / With the flag high / So the people of the world / May see, may see / Who is Lord on earth / With the flag on high / So everyone will know / The red flag has won. / The Party and the people are victorious / Let the world see / All peoples, may they read / The word of liberty / Long live the people / Long live the Party”—this poem was sent by the distressed young man István P. to the Ministry of Labor in 1958. He sent another poem, which began as follows: “The question of going to a party or the Party, is not an indifferent one.”⁷⁶ A question was included with the poems: “I would like to know if the comrades would take me to music school or acting school.” In his short letter he wrote that his father had “died a heroic death on the Russian front” (the lad was clearly not aware of the rules of political correctness at the time), his mother had grave heart disease, he had two siblings and no opportunity to study. “I am as orphaned as an oak leaf,” he wrote to close his letter. He asked the “comrades,” “if you have a heart, help me.”⁷⁷

We know nothing about what followed for the author of the letter. All we know about the letter itself is that the Ministry forwarded it to the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies, even though nothing—neither the Party-patriotic poems nor anything else for that matter (like the boy’s name)—indicated that the boy was a Gypsy or of Gypsy descent. The question is, what inspired the authorities, or what was it in the poor social situation or spelling and grammatical errors that led the bureaucrats at the time to label someone as Gypsy? The question of whether we should be serious about finding an answer, despite the poetic introduction, is not rhetorical. Why was social policy made under an ethnic marker at the time? Why and how did the “Gypsy question” become social policy in the discourse of the time? How did these discourses become tools for discrimination and segregation?



Police at construction site in Salgótarján, 1952

In the 1950s social policy was hardly regulated centrally. Under state socialism working class equality was supposed to emerge, and thus, in principle, underclasses could not have existed. In 1949–50, despite the political changes, the charitable institutions (caring for the poor) of the Horthy era were still in operation.⁷⁸ In the Rákosi era local authorities defined social policy through ad hoc decisions. The decisions of the councils followed the old patterns, which were based on personal networks and acknowledgment of local hierarchy. Surviving council documents show that the authorities still had to deal with phenomena that had in theory disappeared, like unemployment and begging.

City workers often equated Gypsies with begging, and prejudice toward Gypsies and official behaviors of bureaucrats were embodied in how beggars were dealt with. Consequently, when local authorities asked for reports on beggars, these texts attributed the root of the problem to Gypsies. Their texts and interventions were subdued by the authors of summary reports.⁷⁹ In Szombathely, for example, the city's local council's social committee's leader reported that the Gypsies could not be given lunch at the soup kitchen. He laid out his concept concerning Gypsies as follows: "The only way we can reach a solution here is to put their children in

state care and put their parents into forced labor. However, forced labor, as such, does not exist here.”⁸⁰ This enthusiastic bureaucrat was commended for his work.

In principle the Party’s social policy was to serve nothing but to assure the equality of workers within the “socialist society.” However, a rather wide and flexible interpretation of the whole concept formed, which excluded certain groups. In other words, while public discourse maintained the equality of given social groups, below the surface earlier differences, Hungarian society’s traditional relations and old conflicts—for example deeply rooted ethnic animosities—persisted. For the state it became increasingly urgent to somehow care—or at least present the illusion of caring—for individuals and groups pushed to the periphery of society in the interest of quelling tensions. In 1961 the Party leadership of the Kádár era issued a decree on the “situation of the Gypsy population.” (This document, which defined a new era in Gypsy policy in Hungary, will be discussed in the next chapter.) According to surviving documents, the primary model for this decree was the Gypsy policy of Czechoslovakia, where in 1958 the “socialist” state had begun the forced assimilation of Gypsies. Those in power declared that Gypsies had no ethnic culture and no traditions.⁸¹ The authorities forced those still migrating to settle, and it appeared that the Gypsy population was led *en masse* into industrial labor.⁸²

Notes

- 1 An authoritarian yet parliamentary style (i.e., with limited party competition) regime under the leadership of Regent Miklós Horthy developed in Hungary between the two World Wars and was in place until 1944. On October 15, 1944 Miklós Horthy was forced to resign and power was taken over by Arrow Cross forces (Hungary’s national socialists) with German backing.
- 2 Zoltan Barany, *The East European Gypsies*, 112–156.
- 3 In 1948 the Czechoslovak state revoked their minority status. From the 1950s they disappeared from official statistics in Bulgaria. In comparison, in 1957 in Hungary they were able to form a minority organization within the state institution system for a short period. We will return to this episode below. Actions toward them were various, but from the middle of the 1950s the “Gypsy situation” became an important question for the state, and the expressed goal was short- or long-term assimilation. Barany, *The East European Gypsies*, 115–116.
- 4 György Faludy, “Végtisztesség a cigányoknak” [Piety to the Gypsies], *Haladás* (június 6, 1946): 9, second publication: *Phralipe* 1, no. 1 (1990): 6–7.
- 5 See <http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005219> and <http://www.romasintigenocide.eu/en/home>.
- 6 Ian Hancock, “1938 and the Porrajmos: A Pivotal Year in Romani History,” *Global Dialogue* 15, no. 1 (Winter/Spring–Genocide, 2013).
- 7 Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe’s Gypsies* (London: Chatto Heineman, Sussex University Press, 1972), new edition: *Gypsies under the Swastika* (Hat-

- field, UK: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2009); Ian Hancock, "Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust," *Shmate: A Journal of Progressive Jewish Thought* 17 (1987): 6–15; Ian Hancock, *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution*, 2nd rev. ed. (Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers, 1988); Ulrich König, *Sinti und Roma unter dem Nationalsozialismus* (Bochum: Brockmeyer Verlag, 1989).
- 8 For more on this issue see Hancock, "Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust"; Hancock, "Uniqueness of the victims: Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust," *Without Prejudice: International Review of Racial Discrimination* 1, no. 2 (1988): 45–67; Ian Hancock "Responses to the Porrajmos"; Ian Hancock, "Uniqueness: Gypsies and Jews," in *Remembering for the Future: Jews and Christians During and After the Holocaust* (Oxford: The Pergamon Press, 1988), 2017–2025.
- 9 The most common names for the Roma Holocaust in international literature are *Porrajmos* and *Samudaripen*. In 2000 in Hungary, Roma intellectuals protested against the use of the term *Porrajmos*, claiming that within circles in Hungary of those who speak Roma language it does not mean "devouring," but "gender self-revelation." (See the letters between József Ráduly, József Choli Daróczi, György Rostás Farkas, Imre Vajda and Gábor Bernáth, *Beszélő*, November, 2000, 121–124.) As a result, János Bársony recommended use of the term *Pharrajimos*, meaning "cutting up" or "destruction." For a summary see: Csaba Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 128.
- 10 For a presentation of the *Pharrajimos*: the history of the Roma Holocaust based on interviews and written testimonies see: János Bársony, Ágnes Daróczi, *Pharrajimos: Romák sorsa a Holocaust idején* [Pharrajimos: The fate of the Roma in Hungary during the Holocaust] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2005); János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, eds., *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma during the Holocaust* (New York: International Debate Education Association, 2008); and a project based on oral history interviews: Gábor Bernáth, ed., *Porrajmos. Recollections of Roma Holocaust Survivors* (Budapest: Roma Press Center, 2000).
- 11 Kamill Erdős, *A Békés megyei cigányok. Cigánydialektusok Magyarországon* [Gypsies of Békés County. Gypsy Dialects in Hungary] (Gyula: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum Kiadványai, 1959), 4; János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, eds., *Pharrajimos. Romák sorsa a nácizmus idején, I-II* [Pharrajimos. The fate of Roma during Nazism I-II] (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2004), 32.
- 12 László Karsai, *A cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1919-1945. Út a cigány Holocausthoz* [The Gypsy question in Hungary, 1919–1945. Road to the Gypsy Holocaust] (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1992). Karsai's estimate was criticized by many as they felt that his calculations relativized the weight of crimes committed against Roma during the Holocaust. Aladár Horváth, "Sorsunkat közrefogja a közöny" [Our fate is limited by apathy], *Népszabadság*, August 17 1998, 10; János Bársony and Ágnes Daróczi, "Roma Holocaust – tények és tagadások" [Roma Holocaust – facts and refutations], *Népszabadság*, September 14, 1998, 12. For a summary see: Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 134. For a historical discussion of the history of the Hungarian Holocaust, see: Randolph L. Braham, *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).
- 13 House plots and one or two acres of plowing fields were given to "worthy" Gypsies in a handful of villages. Pál Nagy, ed., "Ugyanolyanok, mint mindenki más ember." *Válogatás a Szabolcs-Szatmár megyei cigányság történeteinek forrásaiból (1951–1961)* [Selection from the resources of Roma history in Szabolcs-Szatmár County (1951–1961)] (Nyíregy-

- háza: Szabolcs–Szatmár–Bereg Megyei Levéltár – Szent István Egyetem Gazdaság- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, 2010), 37.
- 14 János Bársony, “Romák sorsa az 1940-es évek második felében Magyarországon” [The fate of Roma in the second half of the 1940s in Hungary], *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 229–231, 233.
 - 15 The 1900 census counted 54,449 people with Gypsy as mother tongue in the territory of Hungary, and 108,825 people in 1910. János Váradi, “A magyarországi cigány népesség számának alakulása 1850–1910” [The development of the Gypsy population in 1850–1910], *Regio* 4 (2009): 77–78.
 - 16 Bársony, “Romák sorsa az 1940-es évek második felében,” 239–244.
 - 17 His life history is described in Bársony, “Romák sorsa az 1940-es évek második felében,” 237–238.
 - 18 Like others, he did not emphasize the securing of minority rights. András Kálmán “A magyar cigányok problémája” [Problems of the Hungarian Gypsies], *Társadalmi Szemle* 8–9 (1946): 656–658.
 - 19 Many attempts have been made to reconstruct this history: Zsuzsa Vidra examined the situation in Ózd based on life history interviews and local documents. Zsuzsa Vidra, *De l’invisibilité à la visibilité. Politiques d’intégration et stratégies identitaires des Tsiganes de Hongrie dans une ville (post)-industrielle*. PhD Dissertation, manuscript, 2008.
 - 20 The submission of the Hungarian Workers’ Party Central Leadership Administrative Department to the Politburo on the ordering of the Gypsy issue in Hungary. Budapest: Hungarian National Archives (from here on HNA) M-KS 276 fond (from here on f.) 91/85 folder (from here on fold.) (April 9, 1956). Published by: István Feitl, “A cigányság ügye a napirendről lekerült. Előterjesztés az MDP Politikai Bizottsága számára 1956 áprilisából” [Submission to the Politburo from April, 1956], *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 266–272.
 - 21 The “College” of the Ministry was the first body to debate the report. HNA XIX-C-5 3. cartoon (from here on in c.). 34.160/1957.
 - 22 György Pogány and Géza Bán, *A magyarországi cigányság helyzetéről* [On the situation of Gypsies in Hungary] Manuscript, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, MD 11 488. 1958; György Pogány and Géza Bán, “A magyarországi cigányság helyzetéről” [On the situation of the Gypsy population in Hungary] *Munkaügyi Szemle* 5 (1958): 42–45. Erna Sággy, “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években” [The policy towards Gypsies in Hungary in 1950s and 1960s], *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 275–276.
 - 23 In the report they claimed: “An ‘ethnic group’ is one that is at a developmental stage further than that of those based on blood lines (tribal, national minority), a social group (community) that contains class differences, but lacks one or more criteria for becoming a nation.” Pogány and Bán, *A magyarországi cigányság helyzetéről*, 14.
 - 24 *Ibid.*, 15.
 - 25 Kamill Erdős, “Gondolatok a cigányproblémákról 1960-ban” [Thoughts on the Gypsy problem from 1960], in *Erdős Kamill cigánytanulmányai* [Gypsy studies of Kamill Erdős] (Békéscsaba: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum, 1989), 190.
 - 26 HNA XIX-C-5 3. c. 34.160/1957.
 - 27 Sággy, “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években,” 278.
 - 28 On November 22 the Ministry assigned György Pogány to the task. HNA XIX-C-5 3. c. 34.329-1957.
 - 29 Erna Sággy, “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon, 1945–1961” [The policy towards Gypsies in Hungary 1945–1961] *Regio* 1 (1999): 20–27; Sággy, “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években,” 289.

- 30 HNA P 2153 2. c. 986.
- 31 From November 1958 to March 1959 the organization was led by György Gere, who was followed by army officer Sándor Ferkovics.
- 32 Ignác Romsics, *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században* [Nation, nationality and state in Central and South-East Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth Centuries] (Budapest: Napvilág, 1988).
- 33 Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 1–62; 136–143; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: On the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 11–49; Brendan O’Leary, “Ernest Gellner’s diagnoses of nationalism: a critical overview,” in *The State of the Nation. Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism*, ed. John A. Hall, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 40–90.
- 34 Angus Brancroft, *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2005), 18, 51.
- 35 Herrmann, 1893. *Czigány összeírás*.
- 36 Recommendation to the Politburo on the ordering of the Hungarian Gypsy issue. HNA M-KS-276. f. 96. cs. 87. doboz/ 300. fold.
- 37 Gábor Havas, “Korábbi cigányfoglalkozások” [Earlier Gypsy occupations], in *Cigányvizsgálatok* [Gypsy research], ed. Mihály Andor (Budapest: Művelődéskutató Intézet, 1982), 181–202; Tünde Virág, “Az átengedett munka. Megélhetés és munkavállalás két cigányok lakta faluban” [*Ceded work. Subsistence and work in two Gypsy villages*], in *Etnicitás. Különbségteremtő társadalom* [Ethnicity. Distinction and difference in the society], ed. Margit Feischmidt (Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010), 254–255.
- 38 For example, in 1978 the paper *Nógrád* printed a report on a “metal collective in Nógrád County” which had been formed 28 years previous by “a few strong-willed Gypsy men.” The county president of KISZÖV (another county’s industrial collective) announced an investment of 16 million forints that would “move a social segment that has had a strong will for the past quarter-century and wants to move up, out of the old world and fossilized lifestyles.” The report was about those who “dare to change, want, and know”; as the reporter states: “Here in Megyer the Gypsies are flooded with the light of security.” T. Pataki László, “Haza a Hajnal-völgyben” [A home in the Hajnal valley], *Nógrád* (6 April, 1978): 5.
- 39 András Faludi, *Cigányok* [Gypsies] (Budapest: Kossuth, 1964), 195–196.
- 40 In September of 1957, for example, by the order of the Minister of Labor, council administrative heads in counties, Budapest and large cities conducted investigations to determine whether city or village councils were giving unemployment aid to those who were not entitled to it. HNA XIX-C-5 3. c. 27.229/1957.
- 41 Miklós Füzes et al., eds., *Dokumentumok a baranyai cigányság történetéből* [Documents from the history of Gypsies of Baranya County], (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2005), 53.
- 42 Péter Suhay, “Foglalkozási és megélhetési stratégiák a magyarországi cigányok körében” [Strategies for employment and living among Gypsies in Hungary], in *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Roma in Hungary], ed. Ferenc Glatz (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999), 43–44.
- 43 HNA XXVI-A-1 2. c. “A fejlesztés szempontjából számba jövő települések” (Settlements deemed significant in terms of development), July 11, 1950.
- 44 Ferenc Bakó, “A tiszai cigányok fémművészete” [Gypsy metal-work in Tiszaigar], *Néprajzi Értésítő* 36 (1954): 239–258; Ilona M. Ladvenicza, “A csobánkai cigányok

- szegkövácslósa“ [The nail-smith Gypsies in Csobánka], *Néprajzi Értesítő* 37 (1955): 227–241; Béla Gunda, *Néprajzi gyűjtőúton* [On an ethnographic research trip] (Debrecen: Alföldi Magvető, 1956); Péter Apor, “Cigányok tere: kísérlet a kommunista cigánypolitika közép-kelet-európai összehasonlító értelmezésére, 1945–1961” [The Space of the Gypsies: An Interpretation of the birth of the communist Roma policy in East-European comparison, 1945–1961], *Aetas* 24, no. 2 (2009): 69–86.
- 45 Jean Leduc, *Les historiens et le temps, conceptions, problematiques, ecritures* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1999).
- 46 The volume’s afterword was written by Ilona M. Ladvenicza. Bartos, *Sosemvolt cigányország*, 85–86.
- 47 Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991); Fredric Jameson, *A Singular Modernity: Essay on the Ontology of the Present* (London: Verso, 2002). Reinhart Koselleck, “‘Spaces of Experience’ and ‘Horizon of Expectation’: Two Historical Categories,” in *On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985; 1st ed. Frankfurt, 1979), 267–288.
- 48 Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, “Multiple Modernities,” *Daedalus* 129, no. 1 (Winter, 2000): 1–29; Patrick Williams, “Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities: Theorizing Modernism and Empire,” in *Modernism and Empire*, ed. Howard Booth and Nigel Rigby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 13–38; Nancy M. Wingfield, “The Problem with the Backwardness. Ivan T. Berend’s Central and Eastern Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,” *European History Quarterly* 34 (2004): 535–551.
- 49 Béla Bergstein, “A cigánykérdés megoldása” [The resolution of the Gypsy issue] *Huszadik Század* 9 (1910): 189–190.
- 50 Javaslat a Politikai Bizottsághoz a magyarországi cigánykérdés rendezésére (Recommendation to the Politburo on solving the Gypsy question in Hungary) HNA M-KS-276. f. 96. group (from here on g.) 87. c./ 300. fold. At the same time the authors of the document acknowledged: “In certain places the state bodies do not treat the Gypsies humanely, and use demeaning methods against them.”
- 51 József Bana, “A helyzet fokozódik – Lakatosék a szocializmus időszakában” [The situation is intensifying: the Lakatos family in the period of socialism], in *Cigánysors. A cigányság történeti múltja és jelene 2*. [Gypsy fate. The historical past and present of the Gypsies 2.], ed. Attila Márfi (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2009), 113.
- 52 Emília Molnár, “A beilleszkedéstől az önkormányzatisáig. A roma önszerveződés intézményesülésének története Békésen” [The history of Roma self-organization in Békés], in *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [Minority among the minorities: Human and political rights of Roma in Hungary], ed. Mária Neményi and Júlia Szalai (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005), 458–489.
- 53 Gyula Purcsi Barna, “Fekete személyi igazolvány és munkatábor. Kísérlet a cigánykérdés megoldására az ötvenes évek Magyarországn?” [Black identity cards and labor camps: Attempts to find a solution to the Gypsy question in the 1950s in Hungary], *Beszélő* 6 (2001): 26–37.
- 54 Javaslat a Politikai Bizottsághoz a magyarországi cigánykérdés rendezésére (Recommendation to the Politburo on solving the Gypsy question in Hungary) HNA M-KS-276. f. 96. group 87. c./ 300. fold.
- 55 Council of Zala County Executive Committee Administrative Committee Decree on keeping records of Gypsies. Zalaegerszeg, May 12, 1959. The leadership of this council

- stated: “Every Gypsy person (with the exception of Musician Gypsies), regardless of age and gender, must be included in the public records.” HNA P 2153 3. c. Individual and family forms were filled out for the Roma. These mapped out family relations, health and personal data.
- 56 Zsuzsanna Mikó, “Cigánykaraván a jog szorításában az 1950-es évek Magyarországon” [Gypsy Caravan in the 1950s Hungary], in *Cigánysors* (A cigánység történeti múltja és jelene 2.) [Gypsy fate. (The past and present of the Gypsy population)], ed. Attila Márfi (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2009), 135–140.
 - 57 Gábor Bernáth, *Zor-sila najaripe mashkar e Roma, 1940–1985 / Kényszermosdatások a cigánytelepeken, 1940–1985/* [Forced bathings in Gypsy settlements, 1940–1985] (Budapest: Roma Sajtóközpont, Roma Sajtóközpont könyvek 3, 2002), 12–14.
 - 58 Gábor Bernáth and Laura Polyák, “Kényszermosdatások Magyarországon” [Forced bathings in Hungary], *Beszélő* 6 (2001): 38–45.
 - 59 State Institution on Public, Health and Epidemics.
 - 60 Report on the cultural situation and employment problems of Gypsies living in the county. Executive Committee of the Békés County Council. Békéscsaba, November 5, 1959. HNA P 2153 3. c.
 - 61 In 2001 and 2002 the staff of the Roma Press Center looked up Roma who had been through, or suffered through, these violent acts. (The site www.rroma.hu and its partner site www.ciberom.hu are held by the Roma Press Center. They contain oral history collections and documents, as well as a photo archive.)
 - 62 László Kardos, *Tiszaigar. Egy tiszántúli falu életrajza, 1744–1944* [Tiszaigar. Biography of a village of the Trans-Tisza region 1744–1944] (Budapest: Mentor–Szanator, 1997), 256.
 - 63 The Patriotic People’s Front was an organization founded in Hungary in 1954. Its declared goal was to assist in the formation of “socialist national unity” among the “working people.”
 - 64 HNA P 2153 2. c. 505–508. pp. 576/1958.
 - 65 HNA P 2153 2. c.
 - 66 The “new Hungarians of Döge” wrote a letter complaining of the hygienic condition of the settlement and the exclusionary behavior of the local Executive Committee Secretary, who claimed “we will not hire Gypsies to work machines.” HNA P 2153 2. c. 1031–1032.
 - 67 In such cases Mária László would listen to complaints and the Roma on site, and then ask the responsible state and council bodies to deal with those local problems in which she saw the roots of the ethnic conflicts.
 - 68 Pácin, April 4, 1958. HNA P 2153 2.c. 1002. Or the letter from the residents of Bicske, of August 13, 1958, to the Complaints Office of the Ministers’ Council of the People’s Republic of Hungary, which landed at the Association. HNA P 2153 2.c. 1030.
 - 69 Will Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1–3, 17–27, 294–300.
 - 70 The collective wrote a complaint to the Budapest Police Precinct, a copy of which was sent by the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies to the Attorney of District XV of Budapest, the Attorney General and the Ministers’ Council of the People’s Republic of Hungary. According to the authors of the letter, the collective held a get-together at a pub on August 11, 1959. “The goal of the get-together was to provide an opportunity for the galvanized group of new member workers to get to know the old workers of

the Collective. Our membership spent the evening in a relaxed environment, with no disturbances and in accordance with the rules of socialist coexistence until the incident described below took place." A drunk police officer provoked them in the pub, and then seven or eight other policemen appeared. The letter continues: "One of the members of the group of police saw our group, immediately used his billy stick and began beating the president of our collective's oversight committee, Mihály D. At the same time the police present began to push and tousele the members of our collective, our women workers, and used reprehensible language: 'damn slut Gypsies, trash tramp hooligans, just wait, you'll be exterminated, just come on into the precinct, you'll get what you deserve.'" The letter writers claimed that the police had lined up several people and harassed them later. "We must note that our collective was formed in March of 1957 with the goal of providing a proper, humane solution to our Party and Government on the minority, or say Gypsy issue. Our collective is a 'Gypsy collective' and serves to integrate into socialist production work the large numbers in Rákospalota who do not yet have full time work." HNA 2153 2. c. 925.

71 The 1960 work plan of the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies. Budapest. May 2, 1960. HNA P 2153 4. c.

72 Sággy, "Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években," 277.

73 Ibid., 282–283. Outline of the work plan of the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies. *Dokumentumok a "Magyarországi Cigányok Kulturális Szövetsége 1957–1960" életéből* [Documents from the life of the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies 1957–1960], 12–19.

74 Sággy, "Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években," 280.

75 Earlier, the Association had been informed of Western Gypsy policy as well. Among others, the following translations can be found in the Association's archived materials: "The European Council and the minority issue," Freiburg Federal Representative Hermann Kopf's presentation; "They don't want to be second-rate citizens. In Frankfurt a Central Committee covering the entire territory of the Federation was established for the Gypsies." *Frankfurter Rundschau*, March 15, 1960; "Propaganda material on Roma policy in Czarist Russia and the Soviet Union," Vaclav Kopecky's introduction (Opening speech on the Gypsy issue for the national meeting, November 20, 1958); "Work conducted among the Gypsy population." Education and Culture Minister Dr. František Kahuda's presentation in Bratislava, at the meeting on February 26, 1960 (Chapter from the publication *Work conducted among the Gypsy population*); "On questions concerning work conducted among the Gypsy population of Czechoslovakia (Report presented by Otakar Zeman, CKP KV Secretariat at national assets meeting on November 20, 1958); "Cultural education work among the Gypsy population," Eva Bacikova's introduction; "Most important tasks in the education of Gypsies." Deputy Minister Jindrich Kotal's presentation. Source: HNA P 2153 2. c. On the recommendation of Sándor Vendégh, Department Head at the Ministry of Education it was decided to use the "foreign materials" to draft a joint position; and instead of a situation report a decree recommendation be prepared which the appropriate Party bodies could submit to the higher Party leadership. "Work plan of the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies Labor Committee." Budapest. May 23, 1960. (Following this, on May 24, by the Education Committee's meeting, then by the the meeting of the Health Committee on the 25th.) Source: HNA P 2153 4. c. At the May 24 meeting the following was stated: "The goal is to provide some initial momentum for the social elevating of the Gypsy population. The

- comrade from Hajdu-Bihar recommended melting in or separation. We do not use this terminology. We must assist the social assimilation of the Gypsy population. This is not an easy thing to do, but the goal is clear." HNA P 2153 4. d. For a general overview of the Gypsy policy of state socialist countries: Apor, "Cigányok tere: kísérlet a kommunista cigánypolitika közép-kelet-európai összehasonlító értelmezésére, 1945–1961" [The Space of the Gypsies: An Interpretation of the Birth of the Communist Roma Policy in East-European Comparison, 1945–1961], 69–86.
- 76 The question of going to a party or the Party / is not an indifferent one / These are two things / Two that cannot be / I say to you go / to the Party, listen to me / It is not indifferent / Whether you learn or play / But I say learn / Two cannot be. / I say learn / Little one." HNA P 2153 (former Archive designation: HNA XXVIII-M- 8) 2. c. 787.
- 77 HNA P 2153 2. c. 786–788.
- 78 Tibor Valuch, "Szegény ember vízzel főz... Adalékok a magyarországi szegénység történetéhez a XX. század második felében" [Contributions to the history of poverty in Hungary in the second half of the 20th century], in *Megtalálható-e a múlt? Tanulmányok Gyáni Gábor 60. születésnapjára* [Is the past findable? Studies dedicated to Gábor Gyáni to commemorate his 60th birthday], ed. Zsombor Bódy, Sándor Horváth and Tibor Valuch (Budapest: Argumentum, 2010), 270.
- 79 Sándor Horváth, "A társadalmi gondoskodás gyakorlata: szociálpolitika Szombathelyen a szocialista korszakban (1950–1973)" [The practice of social care: social policy of the socialist era in Szombathely (1950–1973)], in *Tanulmányok Szombathely történetéből, 1945–1990* [Studies on history of Szombathely, 1945–1990], ed. Tibor Valuch (Szombathely: Szombathely Megyei Jogú Város, 2010), 233–235.
- 80 Vas County Archives, XXIII-526/a/3. Szombathely VT Vb. Minutes of July 31, 1957. Quoted in: Horváth, "A társadalmi gondoskodás gyakorlata," 235.
- 81 David Crowe, "Conclusion," in *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, ed. David Crowe and John Kolsti (London: M. E. Sharpe, 1991), 156.
- 82 Josef Kalvoda, "The Gypsies of Czechoslovakia," in *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, ed. David Crowe and John Kolsti (London: M. E. Sharpe, 1991), 97–99.

“Life Goes On...”

The Hungarian Party-State and Policies of Assimilation

“It is clear that the Gypsies cannot be regarded as a national minority,” noted János Kádár, the First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party (MSZMP)¹ when offering his opinion on the submission on “improving the lives of the Gypsy population.” The first time the highest echelon of Party leadership meaningfully dealt with the situation of the Gypsy population was June of 1961.

In this chapter we will continue to interpret the history of Hungarian Gypsies in the context of Hungarian national history. But as indicated above, this history is connected at points to other East-Central European countries, like Czechoslovakia, for example. Of course this history could also be interpreted through the lens of or in light of the history of the international Roma movement, which emerged in the 1950s in Western Europe, but this additional interpretation is beyond the scope of this book.² In this period state socialist power continued to use all means necessary to obstruct the self-organization of minorities, including Roma.

In Hungary the MSZMP’s Central Committee’s Politburo released a decree, which for a long time defined state policy toward Gypsies. The document declared that Gypsies “...despite having some ethnographic uniqueness, do not constitute a national minority,” and dealt with the “Gypsy issue” as a social policy question. The decree also stated the following: “Work and settlement have a definitive role in the development of the situation of the Gypsy population.”³ The execution of both these aspects meant the further spread of state control. The decree aimed to execute the assimilation of the “Gypsy population” from above through social policy. The stated goal was total assimilation, and the starting point of the document was the acknowledgment that without “the improvement of the situation of

the Gypsy population” the assimilation strategy could not be successful. The dictatorial system—given the nature and ideology of the regime—did not attempt to acknowledge or consider the positions of individuals and groups in terms of their desire to assimilate or their choice to live as a national minority.

Historians tend to read party decrees and resulting actions as a reflection of the good will of the Hungarian state, Party leaders and the charismatic leader, János Kádár himself. Contrary to this, we must emphasize that given their social situation in Hungary, it was Gypsy communities who were able to maintain the greatest independence from centralizing state powers, independent of whether the Gypsies themselves interpreted their actions as a kind of resistance or not. The dictatorial power viewed separateness and independence in any form as an act of rebellion. Everything that happened after the 1961 party decree is similar to the second wave of collectivization.

One of the main goals of the state power was to break the remaining independence of the peasant population through collectivization of agriculture. Collectives were first organized based on the Soviet model during the Rákosi years, when peasants were forced into collective farms through violent means. Between 1959 and 1961 the full collectivization of agriculture took place, when members were given various benefits, such as farming machinery. The circle of social security beneficiaries was extended to include collective farm members. Historians have long claimed that the Kádár system won over the previously resistant peasantry by offering compromises. Micro-level research, however, indicates that the new wave of actions was violent in nature. This was previously covered up by a propaganda-laden language of slogans, which was characteristic of documents produced at the highest levels of Party leadership.⁴

Based on the reports of local party committees, the party decree briefly described the situation of the Gypsy population in Hungary. The summary was put together based on reports of local councils and party organizations, along with data they provided. The document referred to 200,000 Gypsies; the Gypsy population was broken into subgroups according to the viewpoints of the single-party state, thereby based on their living conditions and how they had adapted to the nationalized economy. The proportion of Gypsies who had assimilated was estimated at thirty percent of the total Gypsy population. According to the party decree, it was they who had “attained the average economic and cultural level of the population, left behind the Gypsy lifestyle and have become more scattered (in terms of place of residence).” The next group was made up of “Gypsies who are undergoing assimilation,” and their proportion was the same as the previous group’s. Those labelled as such were actually members of the Gypsy population who were residentially segregated: “They live in separate settlements, at the edge



Forest settlement in the film *Houses at the Edge of a Village*, 1972

of villages or cities, in slums, most of them have only state jobs, and their cultural level is very low.” According to this logic, though, increase of “cultural level” was marked by moving away and accepting industrial work. The authors of the document estimated there were 2,100 Gypsy settlements in the country at the time. They also estimated that 40 percent of Gypsies continued a migratory lifestyle. There is no reason to believe this number was backed up by facts, but it shows that even after thirteen years of constructing a “socialist” system in Hungary, numerous local groups lived almost completely independently and outside of the state and the entire system of power. This report in and of itself should make us suspicious of the efficacy of state interventions, as well as the success and rapid spread of successful “socialist” modernity.

The party decree of 1961 mapped out those social policy interventions that would help to “solve” the situation.⁵ According to the system’s propaganda, the new type of job opportunities, or assimilation into “socialist” heavy industry, would in itself make it possible for Gypsies to “blend” into the “socialist society.” Michael Stewart described the desired model of assimilation in the period as “the following simple equation”: “(Gypsy) + (socialist wage work + housing) = (Hungarian

worker) + (Gypsy folklore).”⁶ The question becomes the following: What was the real goal of those in power? Was it the assimilation of the Gypsies or an emphasis on the “added value” in the equation? During the debate on the party decree, János Kádár laconically stated the following when discussing the model interventions: “Life goes on and will move things in the direction of the solution.”⁷

Social policy and the Gypsies

According to the propaganda of the time, “assimilation” of the Gypsies would be solved through providing them with work in “socialist” large-scale industry. There is a position among some scholars on the issue, which maintains that Roma



Worker at the Kaposvár Metalworks, 1986

(Gypsy) identity is tightly connected to the practice of “independent trades.”⁸ Consequently, further consideration of this thesis can lead us to believe that giving up traditional occupations (by force) would lead to a loss of Gypsy identity.

Wage work

The largely untrained Gypsies who moved into the industrial sphere in factories or construction sites were generally given the hardest and lowest-paying work. Their applications to collective farms were often voted down by members.⁹ Following the party decree, the dismantling of Gypsy small-scale industry collectives was undertaken. These interventions were at best symbolic, given that estimates of the time held that Gypsy collectives had a total of 1500–1800 members. For example, most nail-smith collectives were folded into a larger metalworker collective. One or two collectives remained intact until the time of the regime change. A large number of Gypsies were employed by the state corporation that operated garbage dump sites (Residual and Waste Collective, or MÉH), and as such the state attempted to force metal and feather collectors to come under its control.¹⁰

The Colari Gypsy (traders) communities of metal traders and traders survived the “socialist” transformation of the economy. After nationalization, most Colari Gypsies became feather collectors under MÉH. Although they had labor papers



Power plant in Tatabánya, circa 1975



The Pfeifer family's shooting range, circa 1970

that authorized their place in the “socialist” system, feather collection was still conducted by going from house to house and trading in garments, which did not change after the 1961 decree. The state intervened in their lives on several occasions, sometimes forcibly moving entire communities, sometimes accusing individuals of profiteering or embezzlement, and sometimes, when individuals did not have registered jobs, punishing them as “work-avoiders,” who posed a threat to the public. The Colari Gypsies, though, moved with the times; they adapted to the changing conditions. In the 1960s they switched from horse carriages to hackney carriages, and in the 1980s they moved to using their own cars.¹¹ They adapted to constantly changing circumstances, and maintained their separateness despite waves of state interventions. The autonomy of Gypsy communities is also characterized by the fact that a group of Boyash in the Great Hungarian Plain region called their Voivods “entrepreneurs,” given that their role was to garner work and orders for their communities, and to sell their products.¹²

The total assimilation experiment of the Kádár regime did bring about visible results, confirmed by the fact that great majority of the society was forced into the control of state companies and state institutions. However, this happened without fully breaking the autonomy of social groups, or their opposition and separateness.¹³ Michael Stewart, who between 1984 and 1986 studied and lived among a Vlach Gypsy community in Hungary, stated that based on the examples he knew,



Spare baskets arriving, 1978

the Gypsy community was able to maintain its identity even after having been forced into wage labor. They always reformulated their “Gypsiness” to adapt to the circumstances at hand.¹⁴ In the case of other communities, the ties that kept groups together could be torn apart by migration, but co-dependence in workplaces created new communities. Thus, as one explanation for the survival of marginality and exclusion in the workplace, Roma recreated solidarity again and again in ways that adapted to quickly changing environments. Representatives of the state at the time spoke of “assimilation” in public forums, but in reality they blamed the failure of assimilation on Gypsies, claiming that they did not want to take advantage of new opportunities.

Housing

The execution of the social policy goal stated in the party decree, namely the improvement of the social situation of Gypsies, or their “assimilation,” implying the conditions for assimilation, did not bring about quick results. This was first discussed by the Politburo in 1963. The writer of the report claimed that given that the opportunity to acquire free housing had ceased, and the conditions for credit from



István Vilovits, retired mason, helps build the Rontó family’s house, 1963



Shanty in winter, circa 1980

the state's financial institutions (National Savings Bank, or OTP) could not be met by a significant portion of the Gypsy population, "...community councils do not see how to go about with dispersion." The Ministry for Construction and Finance took on the task of working out conditions to enable "the construction of simpler homes with better credit conditions."¹⁵

There were two types of settlement dismantling: "state authority moves," or housing trades based partly on own resources. "Dispersal" in this period was seen as one of the key tools of assimilation. However, change of residence interventions led by public administration bodies were mostly violent acts and did not lead to a decrease in segregation: old Gypsy settlements were replaced with new ones. Moreover, Gypsy families were often moved into groups of barracks or old agricultural buildings.¹⁶

A number of government decrees were passed that tried to dismantle Gypsy settlements through schemes of "supported home construction." Gypsies could get discounted credit from OTP to construct "cs" homes, where "cs" meant lower-value (the Hungarian for reduced, *csökkentett*, begins with the letter *cs*). Thanks to the limited material resources available to the Gypsy population, fewer made use of the credit than was hoped.¹⁷ The discounts were defined in a way that those with the most pressing needs could not become beneficiaries. Initially, discounted credit

could be given to those residents of settlements who had two or three years of continuous work, and a monthly income of 1000 forints, or to those collective farm members who had attained the “prescribed labor unit” for the given year and who could prove “long-term” employment. Entitlement was determined by the executive committees of councils: applicants had to provide 10 percent of their own resources, and the maximum credit was 65,000 forints.¹⁸ (The prescribed level of income was a little more than half the average income at the time, and as such it was not the main obstacle to credit. The main obstacles were the 10 percent own resources, permanent job, and a lack of access to information.) The residents of Gypsy settlements generally could not meet the conditions. As such, the bureaucrats of local councils truly controlled who could receive credit, as they decided who was worthy.

Most of the time “*cs*” houses were constructed on plots suggested by the councils (i.e., the local branches of public administration) that were out of the way, of poor quality, and unsuitable for gardening. Generally, the councils parceled out such construction lots in bundles, and as a result we can interpret the “*cs*” in several council document stacks as reading “*c*” (for “*cigány*,” or Gypsy) instead. The terminology used by such authorities also indicated that forced moves and new construction did not decrease residential segregation.¹⁹ In fact, from the mid-1970s a Council of Ministers decree allowed for the discounted purchase of empty Gypsy homes in villages with OTP credit. This was an option primarily in those villages where “socialist” modernization effects were disadvantageous, and where outward migration was significant as a result.²⁰

The number of families living in segregated settlements in 1961 was estimated at 33,828 and according to the plans 946 of them, or less than 3 percent, would receive new homes through moves or construction.²¹ Council reports show that in the first year (1961–1962) new Gypsy settlements had formed²² and traditional *pise* shacks were still being built in villages.²³

Gypsy settlements were to be eradicated in the period of the “fifteen-year housing development plan,” or by 1975. The luminaries in power, however, wanted a quicker way to present an impressive sight of “socialist development.” The original 1964 vision stated that the first Gypsy settlements to be bulldozed should be the ones that were most visible: “among the settlements the priority should be to eradicate those that are alongside key transportation and railway routes, and further those in exceptional areas, in the centers of settlements, or those in areas that have touristic value.”²⁴

In 1970 state authorities prepared a report on “settlements that do not reach adequate social conditions,” or on the dismantling of slums. The bureaucrats established that the entirety of Gypsy settlements could not be eradicated within the

foreseeable future during the fourth, fifth, or even sixth economic plan. According to the study, the country contained 755 Gypsy settlements and 435 “mixed” settlements. The authorities labelled everything from cave dwellings to tenement buildings in Budapest to shacks at the edge of villages as “settlements.”²⁵ The authorities essentially viewed the social issues of people living in segregated settlements or districts as Gypsy issues, just as they viewed social issues generally. However, to the Party, the Ministries and officials in councils it was clear that it was not only Gypsies who lived in poor social conditions in Hungary. However, due to reasons explained above, state interventions were planned for the demolition of “Gypsy settlements” only. Consequently, to solve the Gypsy issue several other social interventions that were deemed necessary were carried out under the banner of eliminating Gypsy settlements.

In the 1960s and 1970s, city and village planning was defined by hierarchical categories, and there were minute villages that were deemed unfit for development. The National Settlement Network Development Concept (OTK), accepted in 1971, earmarked 2,037 settlements for atrophy. In the meantime, significant investments were directed toward large cities and industrialized regions. The development of collective farm centers and the reorganization of agriculture followed a similar path. A number of village collectives would be agglomerated into a larger one, thus giving certain settlements a greater role. Furthermore, local councils were transformed into districts and then amalgamated, which denied small villages the opportunity to protect their own interests. As a result of these processes, migration out of such villages sped up or rapid population exchange occurred. Industrialization and commuting on the surface seemed to decrease the differences in terms of living standards between village and urban populations, but in the reality of ordinary life such differences could also grow and become unbridgeable.²⁶ Settlements in peripheral situations could offer seasonal work only; poverty remained long-term and unmanageable. As a result of these social processes and exclusion, the ethnic make-up of lagging villages began to change, with an influx of Gypsy populations. That is to say that in the eyes of the “majority” these villages were becoming Gypsy slums.

Social system

With the experience of the 1956 Revolution behind them, the Kádár regime strove to control society effectively; however, even with various tools of force and imaginative use of violence, the regime could not drive all citizens into the nationalized economy. Beginning in the 1960s the state constructed a wide system of social benefits. While this seemed to be similar to interventions typical of welfare states, due



Gypsy settlement, 1969



The Gypsies of Rozsály had an independent music and dance group, 1977

to the paternalistic nature of the state it did not decrease but instead strengthened social inequalities. The state's goal in offering social benefits to the poorest was to chain them to the state and ensure dependence and control over excluded groups. The creation and spread of social security was not accompanied by a backdrop of "socialist" or "communist" principles, and was not a set of social policy aspirations, but was a means to gain power through increasing social control. This background goal not only defined the essence of the operation of the new social system, but went on to define social relations after the regime change: it sealed the fates of disadvantaged and excluded social groups for an inestimable period of time. Although in state socialism social benefits were in theory the right of all, they only ended up increasing both dependence on the state and inequality (for example, through price controls and support for housing, the state offered benefits to "privileged" persons and groups, mainly the elite of the era).



Young bride serving lunch, 1968



Portrait of a married couple, circa 1970

Party and state leaders had relatively wide information on poverty. The National Planning Authority released a report in 1979, which pointed to “strata who are disadvantaged in numerous aspects” (one of the euphemistic descriptions of the poor at the time), whose bad social situation resulted from the state benefits and redistribution system permanently keeping people in a situation of disadvantage.²⁷ At the end of the 1970s this segment of the population already numbered one million, or ten percent of the population, while the proportion of Gypsies in the total population was estimated as far less than this, at three to three and a half percent.²⁸ Characteristically, social scientists who at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s claimed that poverty and disadvantage existed in “socialism” were severely punished (we will return to this below). To claim that inequality was not just a “remnant of the previous system” but a phenomenon that was continuously reproduced by the current social mechanisms was also taboo.

In the minds of party officials, Gypsies were seen as those who were not able to take care of themselves. In various party forums the idea of paying family support and social benefits to Gypsies not in money but in coupons was often considered.²⁹ These recommendations made their way to higher official levels. The Council of Ministers, when debating the execution of “decrees affecting the Gypsy popula-



Boy playing guitar at the edge of a settlement, circa 1970

tion” in 1976, stated the following tasks: “The Minister of Labor—in cooperation with affected Ministers and leaders of national bodies—when working out state social policy concepts, should examine how that part of social benefits designed to support children and youth, raising children, education—in the interest of making more effective use of social support and ensuring appropriate utilization—should make support conditional on the performance of certain civic duties (e.g., mandatory school attendance, permanent employment of the guardian).”³⁰

The staff of affected state institutions (Labor Ministry, National Council of Unions, Ministry of Justice, etc.) were to quickly brainstorm opportunities. The National Council of Unions and the Ministry of Justice staff pointed out that tying social benefits to job retention “would negatively affect not only the Gypsy population and other disadvantaged strata, but a wide circle of workers.” This is precisely what finally obstructed a radical denial of social benefits. Tightening the conditions for childcare support and parental support was not backed by the social policy luminaries in legal or “humanitarian” terms, and finally only a legal option to temporarily suspend family support was created.³¹

Education

After the 1961 party decree, changes initiated in the education sector also led to further segregation. The decree held that as large a group of Gypsy children as possible should be schooled. In many places Gypsy classes were organized for children who had been left out of school, whereas in other areas new schools were built for them. In other locations they were simply directed into special education schools. Furthermore, in 1960 a system of educational advisors was created in Hungary. Initially, these institutions had an ideological role similar to those of youth protection supervisors, to filter and reform children who were “difficult to raise,” and later they had a declared goal of protecting children and families. In reality, with one or two exceptions, they became tools for segregation and stigmatization. Since 1971 these educational advisors have been “measuring” the ability to be educated.³² Local and county-level party reports consistently reported that they had directed Gypsy students into ancillary classes.³³ In Heves County statistics showed that in the academic year 1972–1973, 446 children were in special education programs in 19 settlements, and of them 374, or more than 80 percent, were “Gypsy students.”³⁴

The Minister of Education officially ordered the organization to separate Gypsy classes, study groups and daytime activities. Having recognized the unequivocally damaging social effects of these interventions, in the 1970s a debate began over whether such classes truly help young Gypsies assimilate, or whether they are merely tools of segregation.³⁵



Girl in school, circa 1970



Gypsy school in Sükösd, 1960

Overall, while until the 1950s Gypsies were largely seen as a group lying outside society, in the 1960s the state appeared to do much for them. It seemed as though they too would find a place in the “socialist” society. Later, however, it became clear that this integration was not real. The old situation was preserved through workplaces with the lowest prestige, long commutes (many workers had to commute between their place of residence and their workplace, and could only visit home on weekends), workers’ hostels and habitation on the perimeters of villages. Gypsies, in other words, remained Gypsies. All that really changed is what the “majority” viewed as Gypsy work, Gypsy slums, Gypsy schools and Gypsy classes. Social interventions—although somewhat improving the life conditions of Gypsies and sparking material and social differentiation within Gypsy communities—were neither able to put an end to workplace, residential and school segregation, nor change the general situation of disadvantage faced by the Gypsy population.

Scientific approaches

“When in 1971 we conducted the Kemény research, we knew that we were doing politically incorrect mining work. We experienced taking a stand against the system. That we were uncovering one of the shocking scandals of the system... Of course the primary goal was to help the fallen, the hungry, the impoverished. But it was also very important to be a splinter in the eye of the system”³⁶— reflected Zsolt Csalog in 1997 on his experience as one of the researchers in the first representative sociological Gypsy studies, as well as on the motives and goals of the team.

Sociology, as an institutionalized discipline, was only authorized to exist in state socialist Hungary from the sixties. The field became an independent social science discipline, which the Party leadership later often criticized for uncritically adopting “Western bourgeois sociological” methods. The work of researchers until the regime change was restricted by ideological limitations, given that the single-party state continuously tried to control the direction and conclusions of social science research.³⁷ A broad understanding of the Gypsy population in Hungary was first provided by a study led by István Kemény in 1971. The researchers estimated the Gypsy population at 320,000. They also estimated that two-thirds of the Gypsy population still lived in Gypsy settlements, with more than two-thirds of them in pise or mud-brick shacks. 44 percent of their homes did not have electricity, while only 8 percent of homes had running water. Among Gypsies who were older than fourteen, the proportion of those who were illiterate was estimated at 39 percent. It was easy for all to draw the conclusion that these research results signified the total failure of the state’s Gypsy policies,

announced in 1961 through the party decree, as well as social policy generally.³⁸ In 1979 a Politburo decree labelled the sociologists who conducted this research as “new leftists.”³⁹

In “socialist” Hungary the poor could not officially exist; one could not talk of groups excluded from society, especially those individuals with “multiple situations of disadvantage” or “struggling with integration difficulties.”⁴⁰ After István Kemény gave his infamous talk at the Hungarian Academy of Science on poverty, with the euphemistic title “Study of the life conditions of the population with low income,” he was temporarily removed from the Institute of Sociology. This study practically treated Gypsy culture as a culture of poverty, given that the sociologists were not primarily interested in the ethnographic characteristics of various Gypsy groups. The final report of the study, which was written in 1972, was made secret and locked in the safe of the president of the Statistical Office. Characteristically, copies of the study made their way round social science circles of the time. Simultaneously with this research project, István Kemény led a so-called Gypsy study group. The affiliated researchers, stepping out of their spheres of familiarity, acquired shocking knowledge on how the dictatorship operated. Decades later Gábor Havas reflected on his experience:

For me the definitive experience in the research project was that wherever I went to see a Gypsy slum, the police would show up in a couple of minutes. I was checked for ID countless times. I was even arrested and taken into the border patrol barracks in Siklós, where I had to spend the night. I had a letter authorizing my research, they told me it meant nothing. The degree to which the police watch over the Gypsies, over Gypsy communities, the kind of police oppression they bear, that was a fundamental experience for me. I understood that every settlement had a *vamzer*, a built-in police assistant or informant, who made it possible to keep watch over the slum. For example, when I showed up the informer would take steps to ensure that the police would arrive within a few minutes to check on me and make sure I was authorized to be there.⁴¹

It was at this time that researchers provided a precise diagnosis of the various problems and poverty faced by Gypsies, on the “reproduction” of “multiple situations of disadvantage,” all when poverty was a taboo⁴² and when the state consistently claimed it was dealing with the Gypsy situation by providing state support to them. In the article summarizing the results of the study the authors provided a general picture of the disadvantaged social situation among Gypsies, which was one and the same as a critique of the Party’s social policy. The social scientists clearly

rejected the point of view of the state, although they too characterized Gypsies through their disadvantageous social position, just following from the power- and socio-critical attitude of the research. As such, in reality they described and constructed the social status of Gypsies, as the political sphere had done before them. At the same time, in the summary report of the Gypsy research program István Kemény stated that in itself the Gypsy population does not constitute a separated social group.⁴³

The research connected a specific social problem, that of poverty, and its associated phenomena to the Gypsy population. This was the beginning of a dialogue that would last for decades—first in front of a limited audience, and later openly between those in power and social scientists—over the Gypsy population and a set of social problems. The false messages of the state power and the sociological facts that contradicted those provided a framework for public discourse about Gypsies. Despite the appearance of answers given to questions pertaining to the living conditions of



Girl in her home, 1974



Edit Lettrich, social geographer in the field, 1983

Gypsies and the efforts of the Party to help them, which stood in stark opposition to one another almost in a true-false dichotomy (sociological research strove to show the real circumstances of the Gypsy population and at the same time to confute party propaganda) the central topic of the debate never changed. The topic remained the social situation of Gypsies. This discourse further strengthened the vision of a hierarchical relationship between “majority” society and the minority.

The poverty and Gypsy researcher István Kemény was banned from publishing in 1973. In 1977 he was coerced into immigrating to Paris, and only returned to Hungary after 1990. Many of his research topics were considered taboo in light of mainstream academic social science until the regime change: poverty could not be discussed, nor could excluded or lagging social groups. Sensitive topics covered by sociologists, as mentioned above, were often tampered with euphemistic descriptions: “situation of multiple disadvantage,” “struggle with integration difficulties,” and “deviance.”⁴⁴ Certain literary creations⁴⁵ were able to fill unique roles in this discursive field, as did sociographic literature describing the everyday lives of those “lagging behind” or “excluded.” Photographic, literary and sociographic depictions of Gypsies had a similar role.

Gypsy images

“Central European societies also created their own ‘blackness’ and ‘wildness’ in groups and individuals, through distant and nearby colonies. In the Central European panoptic regimes of modernism it was ‘Gypsies’ who became the ‘primitive’ pedants akin to Western European blacks and Asians,” claimed Éva Kovács when analyzing the Gypsy image in arts before the Second World War.⁴⁶ Although the image of the wild and romantic Gypsy had appeared in the arts of the 1930s and ‘40s representing the world beyond civilization, sociophotographic images of the poor did not treat Gypsies as distinct. Kata Kálmán’s *Tiborc* and *Szemtől szemben* (Eye to eye) volumes presented pictures of Gypsies and the poor generally as part of the same world of images. In the new system, the ideology of socialist realism dominated the image of society in the arts for a long time. As such, sociophotographic pictures were hardly taken in the 1950s and 1960s.



Forest settlement, circa 1970



Poster for the film *Mit csinálnak a cigánygyerekek?*
 [What are the Gypsy children doing?], 1973

After the Gypsy study led by István Kemény examined and introduced the “Gypsy issue,” the Gypsy issue itself became the most general expression of reflections on poverty. Consequently, photo essays on the lives of Gypsies depicted the failure of “socialism” and poverty during the “socialist” period. For instance, this is illustrated by photographs on poverty in documentaries by Tamás Féner and Pál Schiffer.⁴⁷ The photographs of everyday life in Gypsy settlements depicted them as outside of society and modernity, as an unknown “other.” As such, traditions of Gypsy depictions from before WWII were reintroduced (as it was common to represent Gypsies as the quintessential other).

Documentary film makers approached the topic with similar goals. Sándor Sára’s 1962 short film *Cigányok* (Gypsies) documented improvements in the lives of Gypsies, but also included images of impoverished Gypsies.⁴⁸ From the beginning of the 1970s the documentaries of Pál Schiffer were the most influential, in particular, he dealt with the so-called “Gypsy issue” in Hungary. *Fekete vonat* (Black train) from 1970⁴⁹ was about the real life of industrial workers, showing images of the commuters who traveled from their villages to Budapest every week on workers’ trains, while *Faluszéli házak* (Houses on the edge of town) from 1972 showed the difficulties of reaching some settlements. *Mit csinálnak a cigánygyerekek?* (What are



Images from the film *Cséplő Gyuri*, 1978

the Gypsy children doing?) from 1973 presented the world of schools. Director Pál Schiffer filmed the chances of breaking out of a Gypsy slum through one life story in *Cséplő Gyuri* (1978), and later through a second life story in *A pártfogolt* (On Probation) (1981) he presented the impossibility of such.⁵⁰ These films that showed Gypsies and the life of Gypsy individuals did more than depict a topic: they became tools with which to pass on implicit criticism of the system.

Literary sociographic writings dealt with summarizing what was known about Gypsies, and by using individual life histories they tried to make Hungarian Gypsies visible. Zsolt Csalog's literary sociography presented the situation of Gypsies through nine life histories. Later he conducted a single life history project with an elderly Gypsy woman in the volume *Cigányon nem fog az átok* (Curses don't work on Gypsies) (1988).⁵¹ Ágnes Diósi's *Cigányút* (Gypsy road) is made up of personal recollections and episodic stories mixed with presentations of information on Gypsies, which she tried to summarize with the completeness of a monograph.⁵²

These works were similar to those anthropological research projects that aimed at gathering knowledge about unknown worlds and so-called "unusual phenomena," and today they are unquestionably historical resources that help us understand the social relations of the period. With an eye to social critique the authors would present the existence of another world outside that of modern "socialist" Hungary. They hoped to confront the "majority" population with the fact of their discovery, that the image of society created by those in power was a false one. Artists almost without exception criticized the execution of the state's (modernization) goals. As a result, they used a widely accepted value system (akin to a middle class value system) to evaluate the situation of groups outside the mainstream society in the "socialist" world. They hardly reflected on the reality of their image of the future, which the Party outlined and according to which taking on industrial work and moving to the city would serve as a path to upward mobility.

The transformation of discourse

"Anyone who has not encountered that prejudiced opinion that would put Gypsies behind barbed wire fences, into work camps, would sterilize them in order to put an end to the 'threat to the Hungarians', or that among city tenement dwellers calls the police at the very sight of a begging Gypsy child, raise your hands!"—asked the president of the Red Star Collective in the town of Barcs in 1981, in front of the members of Somogy County's Executive Committee. He then continued: "We are convinced that the only way to label Gypsies is to say that there are all kinds. We are

against all kinds of generalization, [we feel] that they can only be judged as individuals, the clean as clean, the lazy as lazy, the hungry as hungry, the criminal as criminals. It is our position, given that they are people, that they have the right to our help in order to escape the generalizing label of Gypsy or any other label that weighs them down.”⁵³ (The president of the Red Star collective, who had great rhetorical skills, had likely read Zsolt Csalog’s volume *Kilenc cigány* [Nine Gypsies], the afterword of which contains the following: “They can only be judged as individuals, the clean as clean, the lazy as lazy, the hungry as hungry, the criminal as criminal, the beautiful as beautiful—because being people, they have the right to take off the letter “C” and all other labels that generalize them.”⁵⁴) This well-prepared politician of the time was critical of the fact that the Party had indeed not done everything it could to help Gypsies assimilate. However, he did not question the basic assumption that Gypsies wanted to become “socialist workers” (i.e., Hungarians) through “socialist” emancipation. He viewed their situation from the outside, from the perspective of the state.

The different statements were made in official discourse to a socially and institutionally controlled audience. In fact, an integral part of the mechanism of exclusion at the time was the operation of official discourses (which also recreated and maintained the separation of the Gypsies within society by emphasizing their special social status and state support). However, it is also clear that sources from various levels of institutional hierarchy offered divergent images of the state’s attitude toward Gypsies. The study of documents from that time about various groups



Premier of *Fekete vonat* [Black train], 1970



Costume contest in a Young Pioneers camp: young girl dressed as a Gypsy, 1959

shows how this phenomenon of “censorship” worked in the Kádár era. Opinions were shut out of the public canon by the discourse of those in power, state institutions behaved in a hidden violent manner and methods of covering up the failures of Gypsy policy were employed.

After accepting the Party decree of 1961, the Party’s county, city and regional committees occasionally prepared reports on the execution of the decree, increases in employment and steps taken to improve housing. These documents, besides describing the situation of Gypsies at the time, also reflected the undying prejudice of the state’s apparatchiks: “For a long time we believed that the Gypsy issue—like a number of other social policy issues—would be automatically solved by developing toward a “socialist” society. We felt that the change initiated in 1945 would include Gypsies as participants, and that by the end they would melt into society, be redefined, and would cease to be Gypsies, thus bringing about the end of the Gypsy issue.”⁵⁵

Prejudiced thinking was more or less hidden in the text of reports. The writers of these reports always found ways to express their views: they used their own prejudices as a rhetorical handle while emphasizing the higher moral value of the state’s Gypsy policy, or, using accusatory language, informed the audience of the mistaken views of the population. In one report we read: “These days the biggest problem is caused by the aggression of the Gypsy population... social organiza-



BERNÁT CIGÁNY, -SZEME KANCSAL,
KARIKA A LÁBA, -
SARAT DAGASZT ŐREG PINTÉR
TÁGAS UDVARÁBA.

A KEMENCE-TAPASZTÁSBAN
BERNÁT CIGÁNY, MESTER!
AKKURÁTUS MUNKÁT VEGEZ,
FUSERÁLNI RESTELL.



ÓVATOSAN KÖRÜLKÉMLEL
HOL VAN A TYŰK FÉSZKE?
HÁT EGY ŐCSNA SZECSKAVAGÓ
ÉPEN MARADT RÉSZE.

MÉGVIZSGÁLJA, HOGY MI MARADT
A TYŰK UTÁN VISSZA?
HIHALÁSZIK EGY FRISS TOJÁST,
ÉGYBŐL MI IS ISSZA!



MATATNI KEZD A FÉSZEKBN
-MINTHA ŐSZTŰN LENNE,-
KÖVÉ MERED! AZ ŪTŐ IS
SZINTE MEGÁLL BENNE!

VÁSZONZACSKÓT HÚZOTT ELŐ,
HŪHA, MENNYI BANKÓ!
NEM LÁTOTT MÉG CIGÁNY ANNYIT,
SE KŐCZÉ, SE DANKÓ!



VOLT SZERETŐM TIZENHÁROM...
BERNÁT ŐBÉGATJA,
ÉS MÁR ÉPPEEN FOLYTATNÁ, HOGY
„EBBŐL TÍZ ELHAGYTA”.

HOGY MEGLÁTJA PINTÉR PISTÁT
ELSZORUL A TORKA,
SOSE TUDJUK MEG, HOGY MI LETT
A HÁROM LÁNY SORSA.



AZ ASZETALON VAGY SZÁZ PALACK
-MI LEHET AZ ÁRA ?-
SZÁZ FORINT VAN RAGASZTVÁ A
PRÍMÁS HOMLOVÁRA.

MÁSÍK SZÁZAS A VONÓBAN
ÉS HIDERŰL NYOMRAN!
VAN SZÁZAS A NAQYBŐQŐBEN,
MEG A CIMBALOMBAN...



A BRÁCSÁS MÁR AUG PISLOG,
A VENDEGLŐS ASÍT.
PISTA NEM SZŐL...BERNÁT EBBŐL
MERIT VÍ SVRÁZSÍT:

-EGY LITER BORT, TORMÁS VIRSLIT
IFJABB PINTÉR ŪRNAK!
PRÍMÁS! HŪZZAD A NŐTÁJÁT,
ESS NEKI A HŪRNAK!

Credit union slide show using a Gypsy as a negative example, circa 1970



Credit union slide show using a Gypsy as a negative example, circa 1970

tions, despite the phenomena mentioned before, acknowledge the importance of education, public opinion formation, employment, settlement, etc. At the same time the villages inhabited by Gypsies have public sentiments that are strongly against the Gypsies, with prejudices and a wish to exclude them... The solution is seen by many in more disciplinary actions (forced labor, settlement in separate camps, intimidation by authorities).⁵⁶ Moreover, in 1961 the daily press printed numerous articles on the Gypsy issue. A 1962 Party document judged the majority of these to be “superficial reports emphasizing positive phenomena” and concluded that “a part of the readers of articles written in this way respond with letters containing Fascist principles.”⁵⁷

Power propaganda hammered away at the principle of equality and tried to make a number of earlier phenomena (poverty, prejudice, exclusion) invisible. In the limited public sphere of the time, emphasizing the single-party state's

own viewpoints along with highlighting aid provided to Gypsies, a discourse was created that to this day defines public speech and feeds the prejudices of “majority” society. The speech and writing modes used to legitimize the previous system, as well as its set of conceptual categories, thus have an effect to this day: they live on in public thinking, language, and society.

In theory the party-state was supposed to protect people from the dangers of poverty. According to the official doctrine, exclusion from society could only be the fault of the individual or group in question. By the 1980s, one of the leading explanations of the time for poverty in the public sphere—which was still ruled by official discourse—was Gypsy heritage and Gypsy culture. Given that Gypsy ethnic or national minority status or culture was not recognized, the concept of Gypsy took on a strong social content, and became synonymous with social periphery. When the Gypsy minority was discussed publicly, the earlier connotations (poverty, lower levels of education, poor health situation, etc.) almost immediately took on an ethnic meaning, and certain phenomena and observations were almost automatically connected to the easily recognized “social group” by the majority of people. The ethnic content of the politics of exclusion created (or reinforced) a community on the other side of an artificially drawn border among “Gypsies.” In this community, social distance and separateness also took on an ethnic meaning.

Disciplinary power, disciplinary society

Police and agents

“At around 9 a.m. we purchased a grey horse from the Gypsy from Bácsalmás, Balázs Rostás, for 1800 forints. While negotiating and paying the deposit János Kovács said that the horse was bought together with Antal Sárközi (Guszt), who was not there at the transaction. János Kovács put down a deposit of 500 forints at the market, fifty 10-forint coins were given to Balázs Rostás, saying the rest of the money was with his partner, Antal Sárközi. Balázs Rostás saw the small coins and asked why he was being paid in small change. János Kovács did not answer. Later I saw János Kovács and Balázs Rostás leave the market. I discovered that they had gone to János Kovács’ home, where Balázs Rostás received the rest of his money.”

The methodological study on the operative procedure on “Gypsy criminals” used this case as an example of the best results of the operation of the agent network. The state socialist powers—much like the authorities in the Horthy period—viewed Gypsies as having “criminal lifestyles” and used police and state security tools to try and regulate them.



Police check at the entrance to a market, 1959

Physical violence and police brutality were characteristic of how authorities behaved toward Gypsies in the Kádár era as well. (True, official discourse hid this from the public.) The 1961 party decree had to be communicated to the police, which right away created its own “interior affairs interpretation.” The National Police Directorate wrote the following instructions to its officers: “Alongside aid and differentiated interventions you must demand that the Gypsies follow the law as well. Make sure to separate the criminal elements from individuals who are honest but live in economically and culturally deprived conditions. In the interest of doing this, reinforce your battle against criminal elements...”⁵⁸

After the party decree and having stated that the Gypsy population is not a national minority but a social group, the term “Gypsy” became an accepted and utilized social category in almost all fields of operation of the state. As such, various forms of social phenomena were ethnicized by authorities and armed forces. This was the beginning of the term “Gypsy crime” in public discourse, which has had an infamous history ever since. “Gypsy crime” thus clearly reflects a racist position, referring to certain forms of crime (e.g., like certain crimes against property) as if those are characteristic primarily of the Gypsy population. The Ministry of

the Interior's periodical *Belügyi Szemle* (Interior Affairs Review) published a 1963 volume in which several authors wrote about the Gypsy issue, with the majority of them accepting the dominant view of the time; according to this view, the entirety of Gypsies were not seen as criminal, but only certain groups among them, and the issue could not be solved with law enforcement methods alone. The authors generally used the term "Gypsy crime," which for the next two decades became a recurring topic in the studies published in the Review.⁵⁹

From the end of the 1970s, with varying degrees of emphasis, many legal experts, sociologists and criminologists in Hungary pointed out that empirical data proves the non-ethnic nature of criminality, but rather certain criminal behavior can be related to the social situation of individuals.⁶⁰ Despite this, the category of "Gypsy crime" became a part of professional police jargon and beginning in 1974 it was used in official statistics.⁶¹ In statistics on criminals, foreign citizens and "Gypsy criminals" were listed in a separate column.⁶² In Békés County, for example, there was an investigation into an unknown criminal, where the police profiled the sought-after suspects using the following principles: the potential suspects are "youth with experience in stealing bicycles and motorcycles, and vandalizing vehicles, Gypsy criminals experienced in trespassing, pickpocketing, theft, cheating, and dangerous criminals with break-in and entry and burglary experience."⁶³ Certain types of behavior and phenomena (for example car ownership, which at the time meant social prestige) were considered non-criminal. Yet if the group defined as Gypsies engaged in such behavior, they were nevertheless criminal suspects in the eyes of the police: "I report that in the area of the county 5 Gypsies have personal cars. These were bought in person, used but in good condition, for 25,000–60,000. Despite the fact that there is no data indicating that the vehicles are being used for criminal purposes, the car owners are being kept under tight watch."⁶⁴

Division I-2 of the Second Group of the Ministry of the Interior dealt with so-called "Gypsy crime," which could be utilized as an operative tool: "T" apartments (which were used by state security for secret operative meetings) were set up and collected data for the police and put together files on certain individuals. In addition, the Ministry of the Interior's professional services were given unique names: an agent placed with a Gypsy music group preparing to travel abroad was called "Ildikó Barna" (translator's note: *barna* means brown);⁶⁵ the so-called secret investigation into Zsolt Csalog—partly inspired by his writings on Gypsies—received the code name Csalogány (Nightingale, which in Hungarian rhymes with "cigány," meaning Gypsy); an agent with a Gypsy codename collected information about an Egyptian man.⁶⁶

Another task of the police precincts was to occasionally hold educational presentations for the Gypsy population. A Red Cross worker said the following about

a Gypsy survey in Gönruka (Borsod County, district of Encs) in 1978, where a police officer and a doctor gave educational talks: “The atmosphere was ruined at the very beginning, as police used radio cars to gather Gypsies for the talk, coming in at 8:45 when the talks were to begin at 8:00. The careful, considered, and well-prepared speech style necessary for such events, that should characterize public talks, was completely missing. As such, the speech was either incomprehensible, pedantic and exaggerated (for example, ‘We are all here today to raise your level of consciousness!’) or condescending, high-minded, and often insulting. ‘You people are all the same.’”⁶⁷ As part of a similar project, council health workers presented a puppet play on “anti-alcoholism topics” in Gilvánfalva, in Baranya County.⁶⁸

“Health supervisors”

“The majority of them characteristically have brown—often dark brown—skin, brown eyes and smooth and black beards. Curly hair is a sign of mixing. Their body type is short or medium, their skulls are flat at the top, their faces are narrow, their face types range from the mesoprosopia to the leleptropozopia. They have small and straight noses, full lips, but not as full as those of negroes. The listed anthropological characteristics are easily recognizable among those Gypsies living primitive lives”—despite the existence of the Party’s 1961 decree, the “scientific” authors of the periodical *Antropológiai Közlemények* (Papers in Anthropology) defined the key characteristics of Gypsies in Hungary in the lines above.⁶⁹

The Ministry of the Interior and police were not the only bodies involved in solving the Gypsy issue: the Ministry of Health and the Red Cross were also involved. As a result, the ethnic point of view made its way into the health care sector. Period documents saw the rise of expressions like the following: “The very good news is the fact that the advance of urbanization and the gradual transformation of lifestyle will bring about a gradual decline in [Gypsy] births.”⁷⁰ In 1974 in Baranya County, according to a council report, “the health organizations have worked out a 3-year plan with the goal of implementing mechanical birth control in all Gypsy women of childbearing age after having 3 children.”⁷¹

Until 1985 the state maintained the institution of forced bathing. Health supervisors would examine Gypsy settlements every two weeks (the “health supervisor” was a successor to the voivod, and was the representative or agent of the state in the settlement), with district doctors doing so once a month, and a district health team doing so every quarter year. A decree by the Minister of Health in 1955 held that the reports of the above could allow the ordering of “the shaving off of hair and body hair together with delousing,” for which the authorities could bring in the police.⁷² In 1962, when evaluating the execution of the party decree, the rep-

representative of the Ministry of Health reported that they had “worked out a disinfection procedure that would be used not on the entirety of Gypsies, but only on those with lice.”⁷³ In the winter of 1961/62, the Ministry organized a complex campaign of forced bathing in the interest of “defending against rash typhus.” Apparently they took precautions against the cold as well: “In wintertime group bathing can only take place in adequately heated spaces, or in heatable and heated bathing tents. Women’s bathing can be assisted only by female workers (obstetricians, health visitors, district nurses, female Red Cross activists).” However, in official state documents and archives we find reports of “abuse” and “taking advantage” of the situation.⁷⁴ Such atrocities were regular until the regime change. The position of Gypsies within society clearly had hardly changed since the pre-War period. The behavior of those in power—whatever system they served—was characterized by the same acts, although in the Kádár period constant violence was covered over with rhetoric about helping Gypsies.⁷⁵

As we have emphasized, power is not only tied to state institutions, but is a part of micro-relations as well. On the local level Gypsies encountered oppression from the descendants of traditional peasant families, who were now forced into collective farms, and from the representatives of better-off worker groups at industrial sites and workers’ hostels. This is illustrated by the survival of spatial segregation in villages, which was reproduced in workers’ colonies and hostels. Further, most state institutions, such as schools, media, churches, military and police were all agents of the party-state and served the national “majority” society.

The national minority issue

“This too would lead Gypsies to separation”—claimed László Orbán when backing up his recommendation during the debate on the party decree in 1961 that the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies be disbanded.⁷⁶ The association, like those of other national minorities, was subordinate to the Ministry of Education’s National Minorities Department, and its very existence was an acknowledgment that the party-state viewed Gypsies as a national minority. However, discriminatory treatment of Gypsies continued: the rhetoric of power referred to forced assimilation as “the social assimilation of the Gypsies.” Gypsy organizations could not exist at this time. There were no institutional frameworks through which Gypsy cultural integration could take place. Moreover, there was no forum that could have decreased prejudice in the circles of the “majority” by at least informing them about the everyday life of local communities. The “channels” of social advancement were controlled by people who belonged to the “majority” society. Among circles

of apparatchiks period reports showed attitudes of “handling the issue as a race issue, impatience in education, generalization...”⁷⁷

In other words, Gypsies were excluded from being masters of their own fate. As such, it was the job of the Party, the state, and councils to “bring them up.” Based on previous experiences the Party leadership was not apt to put the development of Gypsy policy in the hands of Gypsy intellectuals. Instead, the Gypsy issue was to be solved within the parameters of state institutions, through the monopolization of information.

Another oppressive mechanism was that the Gypsy culture was not officially recognized, and thus all expressions of it had to be interpreted in terms of the values and norms of the “majority.” This system of norms was in reality formed by the representatives of the party-state in the interest of creating a kind of virtual unity of the society. In this social milieu it was natural that attempts to make people “fit in” would affect members of minorities more so than members of the “majority.” The conditions for acceptance were assimilation, taking on the “habits” of the “majority” and identifying with the “majority’s” (or the state power’s) norms. Yet at the same time, in the eyes of “majority” society, regardless of their acceptance of party-state norms, identity, or lifestyle, they remained “Gypsies.”

The party leaders felt that the assimilation policy was a failure, and from the end of the 1970s the question of whether to recognize Gypsies as a national



Farewell in Csátka, 1975

minority returned to the agenda. A 1979 report on the situation of the Gypsy population reflected the contradictions within the official position, when—trying to square the circle—the Gypsies were described as an “ethnic social stratum.”⁷⁸ The accepted party decree at the same time reinforced the official position, whereby the Gypsies did not constitute a national minority.⁷⁹ The representatives of power, however, continued to think of Gypsies as a unified group. What’s more, the Party supported a number of studies that took a “genetic” approach to Gypsies. From 1979 medical biology research was launched to gain knowledge of the Gypsy population. The declared goal of the researchers was to reconstruct the “original genetic makeup of the Gypsies.” They hoped that this would provide an opportunity to “analyze the differences between Hungarians and Gypsies at a deeper level.”⁸⁰ A state initiative in 1981 assembled a research team that would aim to “become knowledgeable of the Gypsy ethnic group’s uniqueness,” among other things.⁸¹

Finally an ostensible debate was launched within party-state organs over whether Gypsies should be granted national minority rights. From December 13 to 15, 1985, at the congress of the People’s Patriotic Front, Imre Pozsgay, as secretary of the Front at the time, announced the formation of the National Gypsy Council by proclaiming that in the case of Gypsies “social problems and ethnic, linguistic and cultural issues are intertwined.”⁸²

Later, in an interview in a volume on Gypsies, when asked whether Gypsies constitute a national minority, the functionary said: “this is a question that must be discussed... It is in the air. It is not a taboo.”⁸³ Then, on May 30, 1985, the National Gypsy Council was formed “beside”—this practically meant “under”—the National Council of the People’s Patriotic Front.⁸⁴ The task of the Gypsy Council was to organize county-level Gypsy councils and a national activist network that would “have an effect down to micro-communities.” This organization, which seemed to provide an opportunity to protect interests, continued to treat Gypsy issues as primarily social policy problems. The report on its first two years of operation states, among other things, that “Gypsy policy today must be primarily policy concerning masses of physical workers.”⁸⁵

In the 1980s the state provided more opportunities than before for the maintenance of Gypsy culture (for example, several publications appeared in Gypsy languages), and Gypsy organizations were established under the aegis of party-state organizations.⁸⁶ A 1984 Party document gave a detailed report on the earlier situation of Gypsies, indirectly reported on the failure of the party-state’s Gypsy policy, and detailed how earlier positions were mistaken. One of the results of the report was the reintroduction of the idea of a Gypsy cultural association, as well as the need to make an effort to “preserve Gypsy cultural values.”⁸⁷ This cultural organi-

zation, the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies, was established in 1986 within the Ministry of Education (and received the same name as the association established in 1957). The association also published a newspaper with the title *Romano Nyevipe* (Gypsy Newspaper).⁸⁸ Its main task, according to its founding document, was “to serve the social assimilation of the Hungarian Gypsy population, to acquire related national and ethnic culture, and further to protect the cultural interests of the Gypsy community and maintain its progressive traditions, all based on the policy of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party.”⁸⁹

The genie of minority rights still managed to escape the bottle, no matter how carefully it was sealed. In the 1980s Gypsy intellectuals were politically socialized in *Cikobis* (Gypsy Coordination Committees, which were established in the 1960s) as well as in the Gypsy club movement, established in the 1970s, and in the institutions of the People’s Patriotic Front.⁹⁰ The Gypsy House (*Romano Kher*) institution was established by the Budapest Council. *Romano Kher* had a significant role in the Gypsy national movement and the establishment of Gypsy national culture, and it was led by Jenő Zsigó until its demise in 2009. All the while, the state employed state security and operative means against the formation of Gypsy intelligentsia.⁹¹

Minority self-organizations formed at the time of the regime change in order to defend the group from the prejudice of the “majority.” A series of national, regional and local organizations were established, as were the first ethnic political parties. Péter Szuhay holds that the Gypsy minority arrived at “that social history period” in which “the Gypsy intellectuals expressed the need for integration among various Gypsy ethnic groups with great precision, and began the ‘formation’ of a national Gypsy culture.”⁹²

National movement

In the mid-1970s Jakab Orsós—an oil industry technician and writer—sent a letter to his friend, the poet Károly Bari, in which he included the lyrics to a Boyash song he had transcribed. He was only able to write down the consonants, because he had never learned to write in Boyash. Károly Bari translated the Boyash folk song into the following lines: “The forest is green, and so is the mountain / luck comes and goes / the knife of worries cuts our flesh / the world has become hypocritical.” The part of the song—which since has gained the status of anthem—that refers to God resembles the following line of the Hungarian anthem: “Pity, O Lord, the Hungarians / Who are tossed by waves of danger”; compared to “Lord, take mercy on us, don’t let our people suffer any longer.”⁹³

Despite seemingly omnipresent state control, a Gypsy intelligentsia still emerged. The national emancipation movement led by Gypsy intellectuals can be dated back to the 1970s. “Majority” or state power logic still holds that progressive nationalism did not exist in the second half of the twentieth-century. However, the meaning of the cultural and political acts of Gypsy intellectuals is different when viewed in their own context. These acts paint a picture similar to those of the well-known heroic struggles of the Hungarian national movement in the time of the Enlightenment and the Age of Reform. This epochal framework makes possible a discussion of the events of this struggle.

In 1970 Hungarian literary circles discovered young Gypsy talents. Poet Károly Bari had his first collection of poems published when he was a seventeen-year-old high school student.⁹⁴ Critics unanimously praised his work. For political reasons, however, the young artist was slandered and imprisoned. After his release he lived in uncertainty for years. His story is evidence that embracing Gypsy artists was not a primary goal of the state.⁹⁵ In an interview Károly Bari stated: “heritage is not an aesthetic category... I see myself as a poet with Gypsy heritage. Miklós Radnóti [an iconic figure of twentieth-century Hungarian poetry] never denied his Jewish heritage and never contributed poems to Jewish anthologies, even if they damned him for doing so.”⁹⁶ This statement is a good illustration of the fact that the works of Gypsy writers are considered an indivisible part of Hungarian literature, and that in the realm of arts, heritage has no role in the judgment of the value of pieces of art. At most the author’s own identity—and in some cases the self-representation of minority groups within national culture—can make his/her heritage significant.

Menyhért Lakatos became a well-known literary figure unexpectedly, much like Károly Bari. His story *Füstös képek* (Smoky Pictures) had a significant impact when it was published in 1975, as it describes the history of the deportation of Hungarian Gypsies during the Holocaust.⁹⁷ In the 1960s Lakatos was the director of a Gypsy brick factory. Then, from 1969 to 1973 he worked in a sociological research group in the Hungarian Academy of Science as a Gypsy expert. (Interestingly, in 1971 he participated in István Kemény’s Gypsy study. This research project can be viewed as one of the cradles of the intellectual opposition movement.) According to his account, the director of Magvető Publishing encouraged him to write “a large-scale book” about the Gypsy community.⁹⁸

In 1972 Ágnes Daróczi made a grand appearance on *Ki mit tud?* (Who can do what?, a television talent show) with her unique poetry recitals. The show was followed on television by much of the Hungarian public. Daróczi recited poems in two languages, first in Romani and then in Hungarian. One year later she became a member of the Monsoon Group (Monszun Együttes) led by János Bársony. The

PATAKY ISTVÁN
MŰVELŐDÉSI KÖZPONT
Budapest X., Pataky István tér 1-7



AUTODIDAKTA CIGÁNY
KÉPZŐMŰVÉSEK
ORSZÁGOS KIÁLLÍTÁSA

1979. június 1-től június 30-ig
Megtekinthető: naponta 14–20 óráig

Poster for the First Exhibit of Self-Taught Gypsy Fine Artists, 1979

group visited workers' hostels and presented Gypsy folk music, poems and stories. In 1976 they established the Romano Glaso Gypsy folklore ensemble, and in 1978 the band Kalyi Jag (Black Fire). Another emblematic personality of the national movement, Jenő Zsigó, worked as a Gypsy family care provider. He established a club in Rákospalota that provided an opportunity for Gypsy children to play music and dance together, and to become familiar with various Gypsy groups, that is, one another's traditions, songs and dances. In 1984 this community gave rise to the



Sándor Pintér: *Facial Gallery of Roma Artists*.
Tamás Péli, Menyhért Lakatos, József Choli Daróczi, 2000

Ando Drom (On the Road) band. The art of Ando Drom blends various Gypsy song and dance cultures—Lovari, Colari, Gulvari, Kalderash, Romungro—into a unified Gypsy music creation.⁹⁹

Emphasizing the importance of establishing Gypsy fine arts, the 1970s saw the emergence of several artists. In 1972 two Gypsy artists were included in an exhibit on Hungarian naïve arts in the National Gallery: Vince Horváth, who was a wood carver, and János Balázs, who was a painter. In 1979 Ágnes Daróczi organized the First National Exhibit of Autodidactic Artists, where works of twelve Gypsy artists were exhibited. Among them, Tamás Péli could in no way be considered a “naïve artist,” but the state in its official arts policy did not acknowledge the existence of independent Gypsy arts, and thus treated all Gypsy artists as naïve artists. Péli had studied at the Amsterdam State Fine Arts Academy and had consciously striven to create a uniquely Gypsy mode of expression and theme for art. After returning to Hungary he painted a more than forty-two square meter piece called *Birth* (Születés). The painting portrayed the mythology, history and culture of the Gypsy people.¹⁰⁰

Besides creating a national culture, Gypsy intellectuals took steps to linguistically integrate various Gypsy groups and create a Gypsy literary language. One of the potential *lingua francas* was naturally Hungarian, which is the mother tongue of the Romungro. The most direct ancestor to the supposed former common Gypsy language was the Lovari dialect of Vlach Gypsies, which became the basis for the literary Gypsy language. József Choli Daróczi translated certain passages of the Bible, the Communist Manifesto and works of Hungarian literature to “Lovari”

and wrote poetry in this language. György Rostás-Farkas and Ervin Karsai edited dictionaries, grammar textbooks and readers.¹⁰¹ In 1975 József Choli Daróczi launched a Gypsy periodical: *Rom Som* was published for four consecutive years. In 1981 he edited one of the first well-known anthologies of Gypsy poetry, *Fekete Korall* (Black Coral).¹⁰²

The state had few qualms about having a handful of Gypsy intellectuals appear in front of the Hungarian and international public. Menyhért Lakatos along with poet József Choli Daróczi were able to participate in the first Romani World Congress in 1971 and in the Geneva congress in 1978.¹⁰³ However, throughout, the party-state ensured that the acts of the Gypsy intellectuals were limited to a controllable sphere and obstructed real self-organization.

In the 1970s the national movement of the Gypsy intellectuals made its voice increasingly heard vis-à-vis the policies of the party-state.¹⁰⁴ The nation-building movement was advanced by independent Gypsy music, fine arts, literature, a literary language, the creation of unique symbols, and national paraphernalia. However, the national solidarity encouraged by Gypsy intellectuals remained weak due to the divisive policies of the Hungarian state. While the leaders of official Gypsy organizations, established in the middle of the 1980s by the state, were for the most part representatives of the artistic intellectuals that appeared in the 1970s (József Daróczi Choli, Menyhért Lakatos, Tamás Péli), nevertheless the state took all possible steps against those young Gypsy intellectuals the state considered “radical” (e.g., Károly Bari, Ágnes Daróczi, Jenő Zsigó). In April of 1989 the Phralipe Independent Gypsy Association was established, which in its program called for an end to the party-state’s Gypsy policy and for true representation of the Gypsy community.¹⁰⁵

Besides efforts to form a national minority or a nation, it is noteworthy that Roma and non-Roma intellectuals took joint action against attempts to forcibly relocate the Gypsy population in Hungarian cities. The Anti-Ghetto Committee was established in Miskolc—a city in northeast Hungary that was known for segregation—under the leadership of Aladár Horváth on February 2, 1989. The Committee’s goal was to obstruct the establishment of a segregated housing estate, where several inner-city Gypsy families were to be removed. This very day should be considered the birth of the Roma civil rights movement.

The public sphere, according to Habermas’ discursive approach, represents not only social interests, but also executes the regulative-supervisory function of public power.¹⁰⁶ This was especially the case under dictatorship. The efforts of the so-called “radical” Gypsy intellectual group received only limited publicity. They could be visible to the public through the Party’s policy, which distorted them, as if they were making statements on behalf of some kind of extremist nationalism



Tamás Péli: *Birth*, 1983



or separatist movement. Through controlling the public sphere the party-state attempted to obstruct the development of a Roma civil rights movement. Using the same method it tried to isolate movements struggling for the democratization of society.

The “ethnic interpretation” of history

The regime change can be viewed as a shift in periods at which we can review the effects of state Gypsy policy since 1945. The policy of assimilation, as evidenced by the self-organization of the Gypsy intellectuals and the changes in party-state Gypsy policy, was a clear failure. Related to this failure many emphasize the rise or birth of “ethnic consciousness” among Gypsies.¹⁰⁷

Overall, we can establish that the interventions arising from the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Central Committee Politburo’s 1961 decree did not bring an end to the disadvantageous treatment of the Gypsy minority. Instead what we see is a marked continuity in Gypsy policy from the interwar period through the Rákosi and Kádár periods. Only the official discourses changed. Benefits supplied to Gypsies existed primarily in official discourse, the fundamental goal of which was to divert attention from oppression and exclusion, and in turn to strengthen the legitimacy of the system. The propaganda of the party-state continued to advocate prejudices, while emphasizing that in a “socialist” society everyone had opportunities, and all one had to do was to take advantage of them. In terms of the Gypsy issue this propaganda uninterruptedly stressed the social benefits that were offered them. Despite visible social injustices, in public consciousness Gypsies were seen as beneficiaries of social policy or even as profiteers.

To a significant degree Gypsies were the losers of the regime change. From the end of the 1980s, when the system of full employment collapsed, they were the first to lose their livelihood and end up on the street.¹⁰⁸ After the regime change, they had to confront the “changing faces” of poverty and new forms of exclusion.¹⁰⁹ Unemployment among Gypsies was higher due to their lower level of education, their habitation in regions and settlements (from urban centers to villages) that were worst-hit by unemployment, where they were overrepresented, and for many their employment in anachronistic and dying industries. Furthermore, they were hit by workplace discrimination. Subsistence could only be found in the grey and black economies, if at all.¹¹⁰ Characteristically, statistical analyses showed that after 1989, of the Gypsy populations in all the former “socialist” countries in East-Central Europe, labor market exclusion was suffered worst by those in



Motorcycle owners, 1985



Child labor, 1992

Hungary (given that it was here that their proportion among the unemployed was highest).¹¹¹

In the eyes of those who were “falling behind,” “failure” and a disadvantageous social position took on an ethnic meaning, and were interpreted as results of being a member of the minority. In 1971 István Kemény already warned that a one-sided change in the relationship between “majority” and minority could have dramatic consequences. The study that summarized the results of the research project referred to the consequences of forced moves and the poorly planned razing of settlements with fear of ethnic conflicts as follows: “the danger of the new emerging settlements is that thanks to their strong isolation they are threatened with becoming colorful ghettos.”¹¹² Under state socialism, despite the mistakes and ineffectiveness of state policy, there were signs that Gypsies effectively protected their own interests. For instance, employment strategies of Gypsies adapted to economic opportunities. From the 1960s and 70s the old, traditional Gypsy occupations were replaced by occupations that were allowed under new flourishing private trade (feather collection, scrap metal collection, shipping) that also offered a more liberated lifestyle. The wealth of Gypsy traders started to increase from the 1970s.¹¹³



House with lion fence, 2009

Meanwhile Hungarian state policy alternately tolerated and banned the private sector. Continuous state interventions forced Gypsy entrepreneurs, who had to develop livelihood strategies in light of a hostile state power, to the edge of lawfulness. (The reordering of market relations later naturally entailed that family business be given a legal foundation.¹¹⁴) Studying the activity structure of some settlements with Gypsy communities, Péter Szuhay claimed: “Being at the top of the hierarchy of the Gypsies, business-mindedness takes on an ethnic meaning, which is expressed more or less by claiming that the value of a person is measured in his independence, independence from the economy of others, large income gained through little work, and well-being.” According to the author, Gypsy entrepreneurs aimed to maintain their “independence and liberty” while moving above the average standard of living in Hungary.¹¹⁵ Success also meant satisfaction in the face of exclusion and collective affronts.

From the point of view of the Gypsies, these phenomena could be interpreted as seeing survival that is only possible by taking advantage of a hostile state power, or by fooling it. Gypsies were right in feeling that social institutions and the state were not protecting them. Stories reporting on family strategies likely became char-

acteristic in the eyes of the “majority” population. For the state or the “majority,” Gypsies became identifiable or visible not only when they were forced out of but also when could step out of the conglomerate that can be called the social middle, which for the “majority” symbolized the value system, lifestyle and standard of living that was appropriate for average citizens.

The “ethnic interpretation” of Hungarian history shows that Gypsies in Hungary always had to live as a group that was excluded, weighed down by the prejudices of “majority” society, and a group that had to express its own identity in the face of the violent interventions of the state and the exclusionary behavior of the “majority” society. It is important to reiterate that Hungarian history appears quite different from the “majority” and minority points of view. There is no elaborated memory of common history, which can incorporate the history and viewpoints of minority communities. Hungarian history writing is traditionally one-sided: it communicates the point of view of those who happen to be in power.

At best, historians can seek to examine the past in itself (as removed from the present) when they feel that they are capable of breaking from the question of how the past appears in the present, or how it lives on. In this case we can assume that what we are writing is an “objective” history, or the reality of how the Gypsy issue emerged. Given the above, this book has no such ambitions. Remembrance (the recording of personal experiences), however, always establishes a connection between past and present frames of interpretation.¹¹⁶ In places of memory, as explained by Pierre Nora, we find contact points in which everyday memory, living tradition and history meet, thereby connecting a created image of the past with a truly existing tradition. The current sense of exclusion can create an image of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in which the problems of the past seem current, and in which current problems are shown to have roots in the past. We can only break from this if the personally—individual and collective—shared experiences continuously contradict occurrences.¹¹⁷ Today maybe the only possible framework for discussing Gypsy history is that of images of oppression and exclusion.

Notes

- 1 After the defeat of the 1956 Revolution in Hungary, János Kádár became the definitive political leader of the newly organized state party—the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party—for over thirty years until his replacement in 1988.
- 2 The first organizations appeared in West Germany in the 1950s. In April of 1971 the first World Romani Congress was organized in London, where, as mentioned in the introduction, delegates approved the term Romani (Roma) to describe the people and language, and further accepted a Roma national anthem and a national flag. Five com-

- mittees were established to deal with common issues affecting the Roma nation: social issues, education, investigation of war crimes, Roma linguistics and culture.
- 3 Submission on tasks related to the improvement of the situation of the Gypsy population. Meeting of the Politburo on June 20, 1961. HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1961/233. fold. Following this the Politburo had several debates on the issue: Report on the execution of the decree on various tasks regarding the improvement of the situation of the Gypsy population, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Politburo June 20, 1961. Meeting of the Politburo, March 5, 1963. Plan on improving the housing situation of persons living in Gypsy settlements. Meeting of the Politburo on November 12, 1963. Recommendation on improving the situation of the Gypsy population and coordinating Interministerial Committee work. Meeting of the Politburo, October 15, 1968. Report on the situation of the Gypsy population. Meeting of the Politburo, April 18, 1979.
 - 4 József Ö. Kovács, "Ekkora gyűlölet még nem volt a falunkban, mint most.' Szövegek és kommentárok az erőszakos kollektivizálás befejező hullámáról" [Texts and commentaries on the concluding wave of forced collectivization], *Századvég* 13, no. 47 (2008): 37–69.
 - 5 HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1961/233. fold.
 - 6 Stewart, *Daltestvérek*, 71.
 - 7 HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1961/233. fold.
 - 8 For an explanation of the theory see Judith Okely, *The traveller Gypsies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
 - 9 Archives of Nógrád County. XXXI 51 c Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party meeting of the Executive Committee of Nógrád County. May 24, 1963. 176. fold. Report on the situation of employing the Gypsy population in Nógrád County 32, 26.
 - 10 Report of June 20, 1961 Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Politburo meeting on the execution of the decree on various tasks related to improving the situation of the Gypsy population (October 11, 1962). HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
 - 11 Mihály Máté, "Abroszárusok – A colári cigányokról, Magyarország legkisebb cigány csoportjáról" [About the Colari Gypsies, the smallest subgroup among Gypsies living in Hungary] *Beszélő* 10 (2009): 50–61.
 - 12 Margit Békefi's data as reported by: Csaba Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigánység története. A magyarországi cigánység a cigánykutatások tükrében, 1890–2008* [The history of the Hungarian Gypsies, history reflected in Gypsy research, 1890–2008] (Budapest: Osiris, 2009), 172.
 - 13 The state has tried to handle the issue of peddlers since the age of the Dual Monarchy. At the end of the Horthy period this activity was more strictly limited, and in 1944 the Minister of Trade banned the peddling of garments. Máté, "Abroszárusok."
 - 14 Stewart, *Daltestvérek*, 252–254.
 - 15 HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1963/293. fold. The "experiences of executing various tasks related to improving the situation of the Gypsy population" were debated again in 1968. HNA M-KS-288. f. 41/1968/100. fold.
 - 16 István Kemény, "A magyarországi cigányok helyzete" [The status of Gypsies in Hungary], in *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó 1971-ben végzett kutatásról* [Report on research carried out in 1971 on the situation of Gypsies in Hungary], ed. István Kemény (Budapest: MTA Szociológiai Kutató Intézete, 1976), 27–31.
 - 17 Government decrees 2014/1964 and 2047/1967 ensured the opportunity for discounted home construction and the dismantling of Gypsy settlements. There was credit available for the construction of 800 homes per year, but only 67% of the funds

- earmarked for this goal were made use of. The 1964 decree stated that the dismantling of settlements must be fully achieved in the fifteen-year housing plan. The 1967 decree established that this would take longer, offered new discounts, and was authorized in a decree in 1969 (Government decree 2019/1969). The dismantling of settlements that did not conform to the conditions of socialism, 1964-67. HNA XIX-D-3-o. For related sources see: HNA M-KS-288. f. 36/1972/45. fold.; Berey Katalin, "A szociális követelményeknek meg nem felelő telepek felszámolása" [The eradication of isolated settlements not fulfilling social requirements], in *Esély nélkül* [Having no chance], ed. Katalin Berey and Ágota Horváth (Budapest: Vita, 1990), 5-72.
- 18 Plan to improve the housing situation of those living in Gypsy settlements. HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
 - 19 For example, in Baranya County the use of the term "c-type" housing was in effect. Attila Márfi, *Cigánysors, cigánykérdés; a vályogtelepek felszámolása Baranyában a tanácskorszak idején* [Gypsy Fate, Gypsy Issue], 345.
 - 20 Virág Tünde, "Az átengedett munka. Megélhetés és munkavállalás két cigányok lakta faluban" [*Ceded work. Subsistence and work in two Gypsy villages*], in *Etnicitás: Különb-ségteremtő társadalom*. [Ethnicity: Distinction and difference in the society], ed. Margit Feischmidt (Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010), 62-63.
 - 21 Plan to improve the housing situation of those living in Gypsy settlements. HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
 - 22 Report of June 20, 1961 Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Politburo meeting on the execution of the decree on various tasks related to improving the situation of the Gypsy population (October 11, 1962). HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
 - 23 Márfi, *Cigánysors, cigánykérdés*, 351.
 - 24 Appendix to the intervention plan on the execution of governmental decree 2014/1964 on the dismantling of residential areas that do not meet adequate social conditions. Construction Ministry. Decree 17/1964. ÉM.
 - 25 According to the plans 43 settlements would have been razed during the 4th five-year plan, 536 during the fifth, 288 during the sixth, and the remaining 323 after 1986. HNA XXVI-D-1-c (16. c.).
 - 26 Tünde Virág, *Kirekesztve: Falusi gettók az ország peremén* [Excluded: Rural ghettos at the edges of the country] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 2010), 27, 56-57.
 - 27 National Planning Authority Long-term Planning Department submission to the Economic Policy Committee, "The composition of strata that are multiply disadvantaged, the reasons for their reproduction and modes for improving their situation" (basic study, October, 1979), 9.
 - 28 In the quoted document the following statement is written: "It can be gathered that the multiply disadvantaged population at the end of the 1970s approaches 1 million persons. This group, when we add people severely affected by a single aspect of disadvantage, numbers between 1.2 and 1.5 million." National Planning Authority Long-term Planning Department, "The composition of strata," 7.
 - 29 Position of the Somogy County party meeting of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on the guiding principles of the XIIth Congress of the Central Committee. Meeting of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Somogy County Party Committee (XXXV.1.b.) 1980. 46. fold. February 20, 1980. 8.
 - 30 HNA XIX-C-5 1045. c.
 - 31 Debate material on the Ministry of Labor's plan no. 6528/1977. HNA XIX-C-5 1045. c.

- 32 Jerne Szűgyi, “Numerus nullus. Szegregáció és deszegregáció a magyar közoktatásban” [Numerus nullus: Segregation and desegregation in the Hungarian public education system], *Beszélő* 9 (2008): 85.
- 33 Meeting of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Nógrád County Executive Committee XXXV. 51 c. October 21, 1975. 511. fold. 1666.
- 34 Heves County Archive. Meeting of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Heves County Executive Committee. 22.3. 437. fold. Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting. December 4, 1973.
- 35 For a summary see István Kemény, “Tennivalók a cigányok/romák ügyében” [Some proposals on the Gypsy/Roma question], in *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Gypsies in Hungary], ed. Kemény István (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999), 244–245; Gábor Havas, István Kemény and Ilona Liskó, *Cigány gyerekek az általános iskolában* [Gypsy children in primary school] (Budapest: Oktatókutató Intézet – Új Mandátum, 2002), 7–20.
- 36 Zsolt Csalog, “Kaptam a romáktól emberi gazdagságot... Csalog Zsolttal Daróczi Ágnes beszélget.” [I discovered the human richness that lies in Roma communities... An interview with Zsolt Csalog by Ágnes Daróczi] *Beszélő*, 10. (1997): 41–42.
- 37 György Majtényi, “Texts, Structures and Experiences,” *Socio.hu. Online Journal of the Institute for Sociology, Centre for Social Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*. Special issue in English no. 2 (2014): 96–117.
- 38 For a summary of the research results see Kemény, “A magyarországi cigányok helyzete.” A report written in 1974 on the situation of the Gypsy population used data from the 1971 study and shed light on the gaps in executing Politburo decrees. HNA M-KS-288. f. 41/1974/226. fold.
- 39 MOL M-KS-288. f. 5/1979/770. fold.
- 40 Júlia Szalai, “A társadalmi kirekesztődés egyes kérdései az ezredforduló Magyarországon” [Social outcasts in twenty-first century Hungary], *Szociológiai Szemle* 4 (2002): 35.
- 41 Ágnes Havas Diósi, “A cigányság ügye a demokratikus ellenzék történetében. Interjú Havas Gáborral” [The Gypsy issue in the story of democratic opposition. An interview with Gábor Havas], *Esély* 11, no. 6 (1999): 84.
- 42 István Kemény, “Megfelezett élet. Csizmadia Ervin beszélgetése Kemény István szociológussal” [A split life. An interview with sociologist István Kemény by Ervin Csizmadia], in *Közelről s távolból* [Close view from a distance], ed. István Kemény (Budapest: Gondolat, 1991), 183.
- 43 Kemény, “A magyarországi cigányok helyzete,” 10.
- 44 Szalai, “A társadalmi kirekesztődés,” 35.
- 45 *Rozsdatemető* (Rust Cemetery) by Endre Fejes tried to break the image of the idealized working class.
- 46 Éva Kovács, “Fekete testek, fehér testek – A ‘cigány’ képe az 1850-es évektől a XX. század első feléig” [Black Bodies, White Bodies: The ‘Gypsy’ image from the 1850s until the first half of the 20th century], *Beszélő* 1 (2009): 84.
- 47 Anna Csongor and Péter Szuhay, “Cigány kultúra, cigánykutatások” [Gypsy culture – studies on Gypsies], *BUKSZ* 2 (1992): 235–245. Péter Szuhay, “Az egzotikus vadember-től a hatalom önnön legitimálásáig – a magyarországi cigányokról készített fotók típusai” [From the exotic wild man to legitimizing power – Types of photos taken of Hungarian Gypsies], in *A Roma Kultúra Virtuális Háza. Multimediális DVD-ROM* [Virtual House of Roma Culture DVD ROM], ed. Gábor Fleck and Péter Szuhay (Budapest, 2006).

- 48 Sándor Sára (director) 1962.
- 49 “Black trains” transported Roma who were industrial workers to the capital city of Budapest, the location of large industrial sites. Some of them traveled 300 km back and forth every week.
- 50 Schiffer (director) 1970; 1972; 1973; 1978; 1981. Before filming *Cséplő Gyuri* the director was looking for a young Gypsy who could characteristically present through a life history the migrant lives of the poorest workers from villages, working in construction. Later, surveys were conducted nationwide in workers’ hostels and universities on the educational film. Having shot the film, György Cséplő returned home for a short time; he arrives at the Gypsy slum by taxi, armed with gifts. He then once again went out into the outside world. Having completed the filming, Gyuri (short for György) Cséplő worked one more month in a Budapest brick factory, after which he could no longer handle the work. He was given worker’s compensation for a heart condition. With a loan he began to build a house in Németújfalú, and began farming. In September of 1978, soon after the film’s debut, he passed away at the age of twenty-five. In the next film, *A pártfogó* (On Probation), János Kitka was the protagonist. He was the son of one of the commuting workers in *Fekete Vonat* (Black train). He was freed from youth prison and like Gyuri Cséplő, in the film he flirted with the idea of employment in Budapest. His efforts consistently failed, and in the last scene of the film he is again at home, in the garden of the croft.
- 51 Zsolt Csalog, *Kilenc cigány (Önéletrajzi vallomások)* [Nine Gypsies: Autobiographic reports] (Budapest: Kozmosz, 1976); Zsolt Csalog, *Cigányon nem fog az átok* [Curses don’t fulfil on Gypsies] (Budapest: Maecenas, 1988).
- 52 Ágnes Diósi, *Cigányút* [Gypsy road] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1988).
- 53 Meetings of the Somogy County Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Committees (XXXV.1.b). 1981. 49. fold. September 16, 1981. 197–198.
- 54 Csalog, *Kilenc cigány*, 239.
- 55 HNA M-KS-288. f. 36/1970/26. fold. Report of the Party Committee of Nagykatá.
- 56 HNA M-KS-288. f. 36/1972/45. fold. Report of the Party Committee of Tolna County.
- 57 Report of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Politburo on the execution of various tasks related to improving the situation of the Gypsy population. (October 11, 1962) HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
- 58 HNA XIX-B-14 585. d.
- 59 Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 162–167.
- 60 István Tauber, “A cigányok által elkövetett bűncselekmények kriminológiai kutatása” [Criminological research of crimes committed by Gypsies], *Belügyi Szemle* 5 (1979): 49–57; István Tauber, *A hátrányos társadalmi helyzet és a bűnözés összefüggései, különös tekintettel egyes kisebbségi csoportokra* [The relationship between underprivileged social status and criminality in regard to the case of certain minority groups] (Budapest: ELTE Jogi Továbbképző Intézet, Tankönyvkiadó, 1986.); József Vigh, István Tauber and Imre Madácsi, *A hátrányos társadalmi helyzet és a bűnözés kapcsolata* [Relationship between underprivileged social status and criminality] (Budapest: BM Könyvkiadó, 1988). Analyzed by: Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 225–229.
- 61 Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 222.
- 62 Meetings of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Budapest Party Committee XXXVI.a.3. June 24, 1986, 207. fold.
- 63 Békés County Archives. Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Békés County Executive Committee Meetings. March 11, 1981. 618. fold.

- 64 HNA XIX-B-14 585. c. (1970)
- 65 Historical Archives, 3.2.4. K-586.
- 66 Historical Archives. 3.2.4. K-586.
- 67 HNA P 2130 The situation of the Gypsy population.
- 68 Miklós Füzes et al., eds., *Dokumentumok a baranyai cigányság történetéből* [Documents from the history of Gypsies of Baranya County]. (Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2005), 233.
- 69 Károly Balogh and György Huszár, “Cigányok gerostomatológiai vizsgálata” [Gerostomatological investigation of Gypsies], *Antropológiai Közlemények* 1–2, 3–4 (1962): 7–8, 3–4.
- 70 HNA P 2130 The situation of the Gypsy population.
- 71 Füzes et al., eds., *Dokumentumok a baranyai cigányság történetéből*, 136.
- 72 1/1955. (I. 13.) Ministry of Health decree on execution, order 101/1955 /EÜ.K.2./ Eü.M. sz.
- 73 Report to the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Politburo, June 20, 1961 on the execution of tasks related to the improvement of the situation of the Gypsy population (October 11, 1962). HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
- 74 Ministry of Health, Health Education Center observations on the fieldwork report. HNA XIX-J-4-g 46. c. 66.
- 75 Péter Bernáth and Laura Polyák, “Kényszermosdatások Magyarországon” [Forced bathings in Hungary], *Beszélő* 6 (2001): 38.
- 76 HNA MOL M-KS-288. f. 5/1961/233. fold.
- 77 HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1963/293. fold.
- 78 HNA M-KS-288. f. 41/1979/318. fold.
- 79 “Gypsies cannot be considered a national minority, but instead an ethnic group which is gradually integrating into our society, or assimilating.” HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1979/770. fold. (The Politburo decision as reported in: Barna Mezey, László Pomozyi and István Tauber, eds., *A magyarországi cigánykérdés dokumentumokban, 1422–1985* [Documents of the Gypsy question in Hungary, 1422–1985] (Budapest: Kosuth, 1986), 265–275.)
- 80 Nagyezsda Tauszik and György Tóth, “A hazai cigányság és a nem cigány lakosság dermatoglyphiai tulajdonságai közötti különbségek” [Dermatoglyphic distinctions between the Gypsy and the non-Gypsy population in Hungary], *Beliügyi Szemle* (June, 1987): 111–115.
- 81 HNA M-KS-288. f. 50/1982/12. fold.
- 82 VIII Congress of the People’s Patriotic Front, December 13–15, 1985. PPF. Budapest, 1986. 67. HNA XXVIII-M-4.
- 83 Imre Pozsgay, “A szociológiai és történeti tények szava. Beszélgetés Pozsgay Imrével” [On sociological and historical facts. An Interview with Imre Pozsgay], in *Egyszer karolj át egy fát. Cigányalmanach* [Gypsy Almanac], ed. Murányi Gábor (Budapest: Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat, 1986), 10.
- 84 A 1966 plan recommended that tasks related to “coordinating activities of state administration and social organizations affecting the Gypsy population” be moved from the Ministry of Education to the People’s Patriotic Front. HNA M-KS-288. f. 41/1966/56. fold. The leader of the given party organ, László Orbán, opposed this, saying “things are unchanged in the Gypsy issue, where the interventions in health and education areas are definitive, which belong to the sphere of authority of councils and which require

state action and decisions.” HNA M-KS-288. f. 41/1966/57. fold. The Secretariat of the People’s Patriotic Front debated “movement” work in the interest of improving the situation of the Gypsy population in 1978. In the fall of 1980 a Gypsy forum was established beside the National Presidency, and a county-level “Gypsy committee” was established in Szabolcs-Szatmár County. HNA XXVIII M-4 HNF. Situation of the Gypsy population 1986-1988. 19. c. On May 30, 1985, as a successor to the Gypsy forum a Gypsy council was established beside the National Presidency. Among other things the task of the council was to work out a cooperation program for the Interministerial Coordination Committee, established in 1968. (See: HNA M-KS-288. f. 5/1968/474. fold.) and the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies. Sources: Beszámoló az Országos Cigánytanács tevékenységéről [Report on the activities of the National Gypsy Council] XXXVIII-M-4 HNF Imre Pozsgay’s notes. 1987. c. 18. A cigány lakosság helyzete és a Hazafias Népfront feladatai a cigány lakosság segítségével [The situation of the Gypsy population and the tasks of the People’s Patriotic Front in helping the Gypsy population] December 3, 1984. Javaslát az Országos Cigánytanács működésére [Recommendation on the operation of the National Gypsy Council] April, 1985. HNA XXVIII-M-4. HNF. Imre Pozsgay’s notes. 18. c.

- 85 HNA XXVIII-M-4 (People’s Patriotic Front), István Maróti’s material, 22. c.
- 86 MOL M-KS-288. f. 50/1982/12. fold.; MOL M-KS-288. f. 41/1984/434. fold. MOL M-KS-288. f. 41/1984/434. fold. MOL M-KS-288. f. 41/1986/468. fold.
- 87 MOL M-KS-288. f. 41/1984/434. fold.
- 88 MOL M-KS-288. f. 41/1986/468. fold.
- 89 Ibid.
- 90 The *Cikobiks* were county organs set up by the Interministerial Coordination Committee, which was set up as a response to the 1968 Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party Agitation and Propaganda Committee’s report entitled “Experiences of executing various tasks related to improving the situation of the Gypsy population.” The Gypsy club movement grew in the 1970s, parallel with the folklore movement. Molnár, “A beilleszkedéstől az önkormányzatiságig,” 461, 467, 489.
- 91 Historical Archives, 3.1.2. M-41684.
- 92 Szuhay, “Cigány kultúra,” 330.
- 93 Ágnes Daróczi, “Bari Károly haragja” [Anger of Károly Bari], *Élet és Irodalom*, February 14, 2003.
- 94 Károly Bari, *Holtak arca fölé* [Above the face of the dead] (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1970).
- 95 Károly Bari, “A származás nem esztétikai kategória. Murányi Gábor interjúja Bari Károllyal” [Ancestry is not an aesthetic category. An interview with Károly Bari by Gábor Murányi], *HVG* 23 (June 12, 2010): 34. For a summary of writers and poets with Gypsy identity: József Choli Daróczi, “A magyarországi roma irodalom” [Hungarian Romani literature], in *Romológiai alapismeretek* [Basics of Romology], ed. Elemér Várnagy, 49–53 (Budapest: Corvinus Kiadó, 1999); Péter Szuhay, “A cigány irodalom” [Gypsy Literature], in *A magyarországi romák* [The Hungarian Roma], ed. István Kemény (Budapest: Press Publica, 2000), 37–41.
- 96 Bari, “A származás nem esztétikai kategória,” 35.
- 97 Menyhért Lakatos, *Füstös képek* [The Color of Smoke] (Budapest: Magvető, 1975).
- 98 Interview with Menyhért Lakatos. Edit Kőszegi and Péter Szuhay, dir., *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép. Dokumentumfilm* [Gypsy picture - Roma picture. Documentary], Népra-

- ji Múzeum (2002); Sára Balázs, dir., *Lakatos Menyhért* (portréfilm) [Portrait of the writer Menyhért Lakatos], 2002. In his study of (self)representation in Gypsy/Roma art, Szuhay draws attention to the fact that the first emphatically Gypsy works were the result of encouragement from “majority” intellectuals. Péter Szuhay, “Ki beszél? Cigány/roma reprezentáció a képző és fotóművészetben” [Gypsy/Roma representation in fine arts and photography], in *Etnicitás. Különbőségetermető társadalom* [Ethnicity: Distinction and difference in the society], ed. Margit Feischmidt, (Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010), 367–391.
- 99 Máttyás Binder, “*Felébredt ez a nép... A magyarországi romák/cigányok etnikai-nemzeti önszerveződési folyamatairól*” [“The people have awoken.” On processes of the ethnic, national self-organisation of the Hungarian Roma/Gypsies], in *A múlt feltárása – előítéletek nélkül* [Exploration of the past – without prejudices], ed. Gergely Jenő (Budapest: ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, 2006), 61–81.
- 100 Daróczi Ágnes and Karsai Zsigmond, eds., *Autodidakta Cigány Képzőművészek Országos Kiállítása* [National Exhibit of Self-Taught Gypsy Artists],. Budapest: Kiállítási katalógus, 1979; Ágnes Daróczi and István Kerékgyártó, eds., *Autodidakta Cigány Képzőművészek II. Országos Kiállítása* [2nd National Exhibit of Self-Taught Gypsy Artists], (Budapest: Kiállítási katalógus, 1989). The third exhibit was given the title “Roma artists” and was presented after the regime change: Ágnes Daróczi, Éva Kalla and István Kerékgyártó, eds., *Roma képzőművészek III. Országos Kiállítása* [The 3rd National Exhibition of Roma Artists], (Budapest: Magyar Művelődési Intézet, 2000), 199–214. Kerékgyártó István, “A cigány képzőművészet Magyarországon” [Gypsy fine arts in Hungary], in *A Magyar Művelődési Intézet évkönyve, 1993–1994* [Yearbook of the Hungarian Institute for Culture, 1993–1994], (Budapest: Magyar Művelődési Intézet, 1994), 199–214; István Kerékgyártó, “A cigány képzőművészet és a hagyomány” [Gypsy Fine Arts and Tradition], in *Cigány-kép - Roma-kép. A Néprajzi Múzeum ‘Romák Közép- és Kelet-Európában’ című nemzetközi kiállításának képeskönyve* [Gypsy-Image - Roma-Image], ed. Péter Szuhay (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1998), 96–97; Kőszegi and Szuhay, *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép*; István Gábor Molnár, *In memoriam Péli Tamás (1990–1994)*. Portréfilm. [In memoriam Tamás Péli (1990–1994). (Portrait)] (Budapest: Eötvös József Cigány–Magyar Pedagógiai Társaság, 2004).
- 101 József Choli Daróczi and Levente Feyér, *Zhanes romanes? Cigány nyelvkönyv* [A Gypsy grammar textbook]; Ervin Karsai and Rostás-Farkas György, *Sityovas te ginavas. Olvasni tanulunk. Kenyva Kiponca. Képes szótár* [We learn to read. Visual dictionary] (Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984).
- 102 József Choli Daróczi, ed., *Fekete korall. Verses antológia* [Black coral. Poetry anthology] (Budapest: Tánicsics Könyvkiadó, 1981).
- 103 Interview with Lakatos Menyhért. Edit Kőszegi and Péter Szuhay, *Kései születés* [Late birth]. Documentary (Budapest: Fórum Film Alapítvány, 2003).
- 104 Binder, “*Felébredt ez a nép,*” 73–74.
- 105 Márta Blaha, Gábor F. Havas and Sándor Révész, “Nyerőviszonyok. Roma politikatörténet.” [Winner relationships. Romani political history] *Beszélő*, 19 (1995): 20–28, 21–24.
- 106 Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1962).
- 107 Katalin Forray R. and András Hegedűs T., *A cigány etnikum újjászületőben. Tanulmány a családról és az iskoláról* [The rebirth of Gypsy ethnicity. A study on the family and on school] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1990), 13.

- 108 Péter Szuhay, *A magyarországi cigányok kultúrája: etnikus kultúra vagy a szegénység kultúrája* [The culture of the Gypsies in Hungary: an ethnic culture or the culture of poverty] (Budapest: Panoráma, 1999), 43–44; Kemény, “Tennivalók a cigányok/romák ügyében,” 251–252.
- 109 See: János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, *A kirekesztettség változó formái* [The changing forms of exclusion] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2004), 137–158.
- 110 István Kemény, “Előszó” [Preface], in *A romák/cigányok és a láthatatlan gazdaság* [The Roma/Gypsies and the invisible economy], ed. Kemény István (Budapest: Osiris – MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely, 2000), 28–29.
- 111 János Ladányi, “Romaügyek pedig nincsenek!” [There are no Roma Affairs] *Egyenlítő* 1, no. 1 (April 2003), 22.
- 112 Kemény, “A magyarországi cigányok helyzete”, 31.
- 113 Szuhay, *A magyarországi cigányok kultúrája*, 51.
- 114 István Kemény, “Előszó”, 35.
- 115 Péter Szuhay “Foglalkozási és megélhetési stratégiák”, 160.
- 116 Maurice Halbwachs, *La Mémoire Collective* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Frances, 1950).
- 117 Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire,” *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989 [1984]): 7–25.

Roma Policy after the Regime Change

In 1989–90, the countries of East-Central Europe once again embarked on the path of democratic transformation. In light of this, they rewrote their policies on minorities. After the 1989 regime change the Hungarian state recognized national identity as an individual choice. Thus, in theory, the individual was free to choose assimilation or opt for minority status, free of coercion. In practice, even in a democratic state with the rule of law, the degree to which the state intervenes in these processes, the possibility of obligation and the material tools associated with its preferences bear some impact on possible choices. As Charles Taylor stated: “Nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted and reduced mode of being.”¹ Following the title of the Charles Taylor article cited above, state policy ensuring minority status, or in better cases Roma policy ensuring minority status and minority rights, were called the coefficients of “the struggle for recognition” by Júlia Szalai. The term “the politics of recognition” applies aptly to Hungary.² Roma movements in Hungary were able to reflect not only on domestic phenomena after the fall of the Iron Curtain, but since the 1970s they were also able to take part in the emerging Roma international movement, which strove to unify Roma communities from different countries on a national basis by creating a common culture.

In this chapter we will primarily analyze the policies of alternating conservative and left-wing liberal governments from the years 1990 to 2010. Since we saw continuity in these policies, we consequently did not break the period down into smaller units.³ Governments with divergent political commitments consistently faced the question of whether the state should transform its Roma policy into a

minority policy or treat the situation of Roma as a social (and minority) issue. As a result, the fundamental principles of such policies were never obvious. Was the goal to guarantee minority rights, support and integrate minority culture, or find solutions to social issues, entailing support for assimilation? In Hungary, after the regime change the mixing of various concepts and policies, along with the lack of political support and political will to carry them out, in many cases have led to disfunction and incomprehension in minority policy.

The expression *social integration* is frequently used in social science research but defined in different ways; in this book we use the term to refer to one of the fundamental questions of organizing a democratic society, and specifically how various communities can be unified within a society (it is by no means a synonym for assimilation). The integration policy of liberal democracies cannot limit the free choice of identity for individuals. In theory, the state cannot interfere in the decisions of individuals and communities: the state cannot deny minority rights as happened under state socialism when the adoption of minority identity was virtually impossible, and cannot grant minority rights and yet continuously treat social situation as a criterion for membership in the minority, which also limits the possibility for free choice of identity. The effects of state socialist Gypsy policy showed that when poverty takes on an ethnic meaning, it then works against social integration and as a result reduces prospects for assimilation. It is generally true that under the rule of law, the basis of integration is the policy of recognizing the choices of individuals and communities. An improperly understood minority policy, thus, can work against social integration.

In 1990, after the democratic elections, the new government established the Office for National and Ethnic Minorities, the main task of which was to prepare the Minority Act. In 1993 the Parliament passed the act on the rights of national and ethnic minorities.⁴ The Act recognized thirteen domestic minority groups and included Roma on the list of national and ethnic minorities. The Parliament also established new institutions: minority self-governments, and later the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities (with a specialized ombudsperson for national and ethnic minorities). By adopting this Act the democratic state hoped to live up to foreign expectations⁵ and wanted to set an example for neighboring countries with high Hungarians minority populations.

Indeed, Hungarian politicians thought that passing the progressive Minority Act would be a point of reference in international debates on the situation of cross-border Hungarians.⁶ Beginning in the 1990s, official documents contained numerous passages and references that confirmed this position. For example, Government Decision No. 1120 of 1995 (XII.7.), which established a Coordinating Council on Roma Issues (only of historical interest today, as it is



Bricklayers, 1992

now defunct), appointed the chairman of the Government Office for Hungarian Minorities Abroad to be a member of the nationwide council. It is also revealing that in the course of the parliamentary debate on the Minority Act, politicians often referred to the assumed or real problems of Hungarians living abroad. In fact, the Act was intended to be a kind of “model child,” setting an example for policy makers in neighboring countries. Hungarian minority policy after the regime change—at least in part—became (ethnic) Hungarian and neighborhood policy. This perspective also demonstrates that the Roma point of view (and that of other minorities), in line with established traditions, was not truly taken into consideration, and numerous questions remained unresolved. Those showboating and demonstrative efforts that reached across the borders and diverted the attention of politicians away from the real questions indicate not only a lack of expertise but also true naiveté.

A turn against the official policies of earlier periods, which did not acknowledge the minority status of the Roma, probably played a role in recognizing the Roma minority. The securing of minority status represented (or could have meant)



Construction, 1992

a kind of compensation for historical disadvantages. But only a few years had to pass for it to become clear that the new period had not brought an essential change in the relationship between the Roma minority and the “majority.” Having recognized this, the state interpreted and reinterpreted its Roma policy from time to time. As a result the still unresolved question of assimilation cropped up again and again. Today it is difficult to strike a balance between competing concepts (assimilation and/or ensuring minority rights) in the case of the Hungarian Roma. On the one hand it is not clear which policy would be successful, and on the other hand experience does not clearly falsify or verify any of them. It is possible that the premises of the choice (principles, norms) are in order, but the concrete steps to be taken are not (should the principles be executed poorly and without care in practice).⁷

It is well known that after the regime change, unemployment and poverty became prevalent phenomena in society and hit Roma the hardest, leaving the group with a heavy burden to carry. Although their social integration was promised with grand statements in the Kádár era, these promises were never kept. Roma policy after the regime change appeared a failure in the eyes of the state, the “majority” and minority communities alike. The ensuing democratic governments tried to intervene in processes based on earlier experience. A government decision released in 1995 was the first to claim the government saw the Gypsy issue as both a minority and a social issue.⁸ Opposed to this approach, under state socialism the process of assimilation or “blending in” emphasized invisibility. Gypsies were to free themselves of all that distinguished them from the “majority,” to melt into “majority” society. On the contrary, the new integration policy in principle offered the opportunity to keep, maintain, and build traditions, or the choice to become visible.

This decision prescribed that the ministries work out some action plans. In 1996 the Coordination Council of Gypsy Affairs⁹ was established, its main mandate being the harmonization of Roma policy across ministries and national-competence bodies.¹⁰ However, this activity existed only on paper. The decision makers—with an eye to civil society initiatives and EU expectations—thought in terms of Roma programs.¹¹ Then, in 1997 the government accepted the “medium-term action plan to improve the life situation of the Roma community,”¹² and later released new governmental decisions announcing new Roma programs.¹³ From this point, cultural, social, and discrimination issues were not treated separately, but were to be solved with overarching interventions. Éva Orsós, the president of the Office on National and Ethnic Minorities, played a key role in the Roma Programme and the PHARE Programme that were worked out in 1997. The successive governments are responsible for the passing of political documents, which



Horse cart, settlement of Péro, 2014

were often full of inconsistencies, without following up with legal changes or concrete policy execution.¹⁴

After the regime change, the first time the government took a concrete step to assist the social integration of those living in Gypsy settlements was in 2005. The “model program” launched at the time was meant to solve the housing and social problems of those living in situations of multiple disadvantage. Municipal governments with ideas on comprehensive programs to solve housing, employment, health, social and education could submit proposals for government support. In the first year of the program, between 2005 and 2006, nine municipalities received support for development, infrastructure and social, education and employment programs. The financial sum of the program was much less than what local needs called for and was a drop in the bucket compared to national needs.¹⁵

In 2005 Péter Medgyessy summarized the programs of his left-liberal government in a report to Parliament suggesting that by this time, the Hungarian state had acknowledged that “[t]he severe problems of the Roma population have to be

managed within the framework of social policy. In the long term we must ensure that social and minority policy issues be clearly separated when dealing with interventions affecting the Roma minority. But this does not mean that there is no harmonization between such interventions.”¹⁶ This position was not sustainable in the long term. Characteristically, governmental resolutions from between 1998 and 2005 most often used the term “those in disadvantaged situations, among them Roma,” while a newer governmental resolution from 2007 used the term “Roma and the disadvantageously situated” population.¹⁷

The democratic system approached the social integration of the Gypsy community using the new motto “the improvement of the social situation of the Gypsy population.” These integration programs, however, brought only superficial results. The main state oversight arm for spending public funds, the State Audit Office, estimated that between 1996 and 2006 governments spent 120 billion forints on integration. From 2002 these amounts spiked thanks to accessing European Union funds. However, despite domestic and international publicity, these programs should not be seen as gigantic in scale. Their scale and extent should be compared to other types of expenditures: it is half the amount that the state spends in one year on maintaining fields, woods, fisheries and hunting grounds; the State Railways receives 190 billion forints per year from the budget.¹⁸ Independent of the amount spent, difficulties cropped up: according to the State Audit Office, which is the Parliament’s main body for supervising financial and economic governance in Hungary, the proportion of funds that actually reached the supposed beneficiaries could not be estimated. The Hungarian state, therefore, did not access all available European funds in this field.

Minority issue

During the preparation of the Act on National and Ethnic Minorities, the question of whether to include the Jewish minority in the list of national and ethnic communities came up. Most Hungarian Jewish organizations rejected the possibility. The recognition of the Jewish minority as a national minority would have created the illusion that Hungarian policy was trying to artificially turn back the process of assimilation. At the time of the regime change, new Roma organizations without exception demanded minority rights, unlike their Jewish counterparts and despite their experiences in the past. That is to say they demanded inclusion among Hungary’s national and ethnic minorities.

Since the passing of the Minority Act the question of whether it was wise to include Roma among national and ethnic minorities crops up from time to time,

even in expert circles, although as time passes almost all think the decision is irreversible. Consider for instance an essay by István Kemény and Béla Janky comparing the situations of the Hungarian Romungro and the Jewish minority. The authors highlight the fact that the mother tongue of both groups is Hungarian and the majority of both groups declared themselves Hungarians in the 2001 census.¹⁹ Comparing 1993 and 2003 sociological research data, Kemény and Janky concluded that, as an effect of separation and discrimination, the majority of the Romungro distanced themselves from assimilation during the last years.²⁰ Regarding Vlach and Boyash Roma groups there was a reverse tendency, as more of them declared themselves Hungarian than before.

Belonging to a minority, or defining who belongs to a group that is burdened by prejudice, became a serious issue for lawmakers. The state is more or less compelled to define who belongs to a given minority given the nature of law. This is necessary so that positive interventions can actually be directed at the members of the given target group.²¹ The primary aspect taken into account is minority identity, that is, who declares him/herself to be a member of the given community. While everyone has a constitutional right to freely choose his/her identity, practice shows that people can take advantage of this right. In Hungary after the 1993 enactment of the Minority Act anyone could be the member of a minority self-government. In other words, one could run for office as a representative of a national or ethnic minority without even belonging to that minority. There is evidence that many did so in the hope of material gain, with an eye to taking advantage of the special rights granted to the minority. No one could debate the ethnic or national identity of the elected representative after their appointment. The misuse of minority rights as a phenomenon was dubbed *ethnobusiness* in Hungary. Further, given that minority self-government elections were held at the same time as municipal elections, anyone could vote in minority elections. To solve these problems, a minority voters list was introduced in 2005. From this point on minority candidates and voters could be drawn only from such lists, that is, they had to register themselves beforehand. (According to the principles of data protection, in the majority of cases conscientious and informed consent legitimates the handling of protected data, in accordance with information self-determination.²²)

At times, the state can take points of view into consideration. When the state uses anti-discrimination interventions to protect, or equality of opportunity actions to assist members of a disadvantaged minority, it can acknowledge the opinion, evaluations and day-to-day categorizations employed by the “majority.” The state must protect those individuals who are discriminated against or become victims of crimes based on their assumed heritage. (The reasons for differentiated treatment can be various: appearance, family name, address, social situa-



Electors voting, 1995

tion of disadvantage.) In all such cases the true motives of the perpetrators must be made public along with the state's response to racism. To this day this has not been achieved in Hungary, despite the existence of appropriate legal options. Up until 2009 no one had been sentenced for a racially-motivated crime against Roma.²³ However, some Roma had been charged and sentenced for attacks against "Hungarians."²⁴

Whereas a precise definition of the notion of minority is not absolutely necessary, the delimitation of the scope of persons belonging to a minority group is indispensable in certain cases of regulation. The category of minority is one that is beyond the scope of law. It would be difficult to find a single definition that applies to all situations and groups, and perhaps this should not even be a task for the state. It is common to argue for the necessity of coming up with a definition for the concept of minority by claiming that if we do not do so, it would be easier for the state to shirk responsibilities. Regarding this, we can claim that states—in lieu of international legal commitments and whether or not they define the minority concept—have a free hand in developing who they view as members of a minority in practice. International law is by no means unified in such cases either. United Nations documents hold that rights must be granted to all members of minorities, and this must go beyond those who hold citizenship in said states.²⁵ Most European states grant special rights to those citizens who are members of minorities, and do not extend

these to foreigners, refugees and stateless persons.²⁶ Some states that recognize minorities distinguish “old” minorities from immigrant minority groups. Those in charge of defining the concept must be aware of their responsibility, given that state delineations mark out the borders of groups and in some cases create new groups.

In international documents, definitions of the concept of minorities can only be found in soft law documents and drafts.²⁷ Domestic legal systems are generally content to simply list minorities living on their territories, and similarly national regulations are satisfied with listing those minorities to whom minority special rights are granted. The Hungarian Minority Act belongs to those exceptions that define the notion of “national and ethnic minorities,” and it lists autochthonous minorities living in the country.²⁸ For instance, the Act on Nationalities of 2011, which replaced the Minority Act, took a similar approach, and in the new law the label changes to national minority.²⁹ The list and the definition of the concept are hardly harmonized. The criteria in the Hungarian Act include own language and a hundred-year presence in Hungary, while some of the minorities listed in the law can barely meet these requirements.³⁰

Ethnic groups are considered in some of the social science literature pre-industrial heritage-based communities, while nations and national minorities are considered products of modernity.³¹ The text of the 1993 Minority Act differentiates between “national” and “ethnic” minorities based on the notion that ethnic minorities, unlike national ones, do not have a mother country. This legal difference was completely unnecessary, given that Hungarian law granted both types of minority the same rights. Of the thirteen groups listed as national and ethnic minorities in the Minority Act, only Ruthenians and Roma are seen as ethnic minorities.³² Even though they received the same rights, until 2011 the differentiated use of terms left the impression that the identity and as a result the status of minorities in Hungary was split into two levels.

Prospects for multiculturalism

In the West, after the Second World War, in the spirit of liberal nationalism, states attempted to harmonize the aspirations of minority and “majority” nationalisms. Thus, policy for this purpose can be interpreted as the project of multiculturalism. If these goals were attained, theoretically multiculturalism would be realized within a democratic state. In fact, the realization of multiculturalism—as the ideology and politics of national pluralism—can be interpreted on many levels. In this volume we approach the concept from the point of view of whether those in power recognize ethnically organized groups and open the system of institutions and state support to

them. In our view, which is admittedly somewhat contradictory, lawmakers attempted to implement multicultural policy in Hungary after the regime change.³³ This policy was halted when the new Hungarian constitution came into force on January 1, 2012.

The 1989 constitution recognized national and ethnic minorities as sub-political communities within the political community, and committed itself to the model of multiculturalism in the area of minority rights. Several scholars attempted to analyze the new policies. For instance, having mastered the topic, János Kis wrote of multinationalism and of a co-nation taking the place of the nation state.³⁴ Joseph Raz characterized the phenomena as liberal multiculturalism.³⁵ Generally, Will Kymlicka called the group status that arose as a result of the policy of recognition “differentiated citizenship.”³⁶ The implementation of multicultural policy, however, can only be fruitful when a number of various criteria are met.³⁷ A fundamental precondition is that the members of various cultures be aware of and respect one another’s cultures. It is also decidedly important that they break “the relationship between poverty, lack of education and ethnicity.”³⁸ The realization of the policy of multiculturalism requires on the one hand generous support from the state, and on the other for various cultural institutions as well as the public sphere to adapt to all the cultural groups, thus securing the coexistence of tolerant groups. The politics of tolerance can only be limited in the sense that communities are kept from oppressing their own members, and this rule must apply to all groups (“majority” and minority). The state must take steps to obstruct communities from practicing intolerant behavior *vis-à-vis* outsiders, and to make it possible for individuals to exit from groups. In other words, in the interest of ensuring human rights, state authorities must intervene in the lives of communities, as communities cannot be fully left to their own devices.

Should politics fulfill all the criteria, multiculturalism can lead to the emergence of a new, common culture, which in turn can result in the emancipation of multi-layered identities in society. Whether multiculturalism is an appropriate model for a society like that of Hungary’s, which is more or less ethnically homogeneous—whether to execute a polycultural political community—is an open question. Joseph Raz states that multiculturalism should not be employed toward cultures that have lost their ability to sustain themselves, that is, cultures that have assimilated yet still keep traditions to some level.³⁹ By the time the Minority Act of 1993 came into force, minorities in Hungary were already in an advanced stage of assimilation. Today, minorities represent a relatively small percentage of the overall population, and they are to a large degree linguistically assimilated. Moreover, minorities are thinly scattered throughout the country to the extent that they usually form minorities even at the local level. In 1989 in the Republic of Hungary, among national and ethnic minorities, only Roma faced the challenge



Multiculturalism in Hungary. Three banners, circa 2000

of true social integration, which nevertheless remained an unsolved problem. Preposterous regulations for Roma were comprised of a multicultural policy guaranteeing a framework of minority self-government that did not provide a true option for integration.

The model of a multicultural state, which was intended to be introduced in Hungary, has been greatly criticized after reflecting on the recent ethnic and religious conflicts in Western Europe. Such criticism, however, does not offer new solutions, and the majority of critics would be presumably satisfied with the adjustment of the model. Nevertheless, Hungarian multiculturalism in support of national minorities failed not because of the assumed or real deficiencies of the idea, but because of inappropriate implementation and malfunctions of legislation. To paraphrase Julius Paulus, it might be said that not the law, but its realization is in error.⁴⁰ Put otherwise, in order for the undoubtedly limited means of law to be useful in protecting minorities, the legislator should apply them correctly. However, the practice of multicultural policy in Hungary did not take place in this way. This is illustrated in the operational disfunction of the key legal organization of the multiculturalism model, namely the system of minority governments.


Minority (self-)government?

A typical example of minority elections in 2002 serves to illustrate the previously discussed issues. The citizens of Jászladány voted out the members of the minority government who were protesting against segregated education. They were able to do so only because the mayor's wife and supporters were voted into the minority self-government on the back of "majority votes."⁴¹

A necessary condition for minority autonomy and self-government is for the state to use its public authority to empower citizens who are members of minorities to democratically establish associations. Autonomy requires functioning institutions decidedly elected by the minority. Minority autonomy and self-government are deemed as expressly important because minority representatives elected this way can consequently participate in the public sphere. The central power of the government, regardless how much good will it shows toward national and ethnic minorities, cannot be seen as ethnically neutral. In fact, various representatives of states are often biased in favor of the "majority." As a result, those who are members of minorities have a legitimate claim to establish public (state-sanctioned) institutions in certain areas of public life.⁴² This is also important because in the "public officer-client" relationship they tend to fill the latter role. Minority autonomy allows them to turn to their own organizations within public administration, which



Voter in front of the ballot box, 2007



Election poster for Lungo Drom



Orbán Kolompár, Roma politician, Kinga Göncz, minister without portfolio for equal opportunities, László Teleki, Roma politician, 2004

can be more effective in taking steps to protect the interests of the community. This can secure minority participation in state decision making and the practice of minority and “majority” association.⁴³

In Hungary, following the establishment of minority self-governments in 1995, a theoretical possibility opened for the Roma to represent their interests in accordance with deliberative or participatory democracy—with elected, publicly empowered organizations—in the context of the democratic state. However, minority self-governments at the local level became subject to the whims of municipal governments. At the national level, the government in power easily ensured that loyal (to those in power) minority bodies be established when it was necessary.⁴⁴

Bleeding from numerous wounds, the 1993 version of the minority law’s most obvious flaw was the fact that voting rights were not restricted to members of minorities, and it remained so until 2005. One cannot speak of true minority self-government if the authorities decide who the minority representatives will be, nor if the entire population can take part in minority elections. Although the minority law attempted to ensure Roma representation in the state sphere, in reality the right to delegate representatives was transferred from the hands of the state to the hands of the “majority.” Based on the number of votes cast at earlier elections, it can be safely claimed that a significant number of citizens who were not members of any minority voted for minority candidates: at the first election 1,777,299 people, at the second 2,657,722 people cast their vote for some minority candidate.⁴⁵ This way, the rights of minorities as defined by the constitution were violated, given that it was not they who established their minority self-governments.

After the first minority self-government elections in 1994–1995, a total of 817 local minority self-governments were established. Of these, 477 were Roma self-governments. Of the 1,363 minority self-governments established in 1998, 771 were Roma. In 2002 the numbers were 1,841 and 1,004 respectively. Although the institution of minority self-government received well-deserved criticism, the growth in numbers is worthy of attention, as it may indicate a strong local need and interest in operating such institutions among minority groups, particularly the Roma. A questionnaire and interview research project conducted in 2000–2002 showed that Gypsy minority self-governments—departing from the identity politics and cultural mandates set out for them in the law—basically strove to solve social problems and to raise the level of education for young Roma.⁴⁶ This indicates on the one hand that the minority self-government system was not functioning in accordance with its original mandate, and on the other that the operation of the state and municipal social system was ineffective, to say the least. Despite abuses incurred during their elections, besides creating infrastructure and opportunity

for interest representation, minority self-governments fulfilled functions that were important at the local level and which diverged from the spirit of legal regulations.

Thanks to the phenomenon of *ethnobusiness*, as mentioned earlier, the Minority Act was amended in 2005, and minority voter registration was established. From this point only those Hungarian citizens could vote and be elected during minority self-government elections who declared their identity, had the right to vote in municipal elections, and were included in the minority voter register.⁴⁷ The modification aimed to have minority self-governments elected by the members of minority groups themselves. Its real effect was to make the establishment of municipal-level minority self-governments easier. Elections could be held if the number of names in the minority voting register reached thirty. They could even be held if in the meantime this number fell below thirty. If no one beyond the candidates themselves takes part in the election (the law demands that the candidates also be on the voters' list), or only one among them participates who casts a ballot for every candidate, then in theory his/her vote could be enough to establish the minority self-government. The text of the modified law states the following: "the candidate who did not get any votes cannot become a representative." This wording implies that a candidate might get into the body of representatives even with one single vote, which could be his/her own vote or the vote of any another candidate.⁴⁸

In Hungary, as a result, the only candidates who could not become minority representatives were those who received no votes at all, not even from him/herself. This situation undeniably questions the foundations of the institutional system of representation. A scenario where representatives are voted in by themselves and represent themselves is unique, to say the least.

The concerns expressed in 2005 over the regulations came to the fore in the 2006 minority elections. For example, in the Ruthenian minority elections in Pomáz, altogether four persons cast votes, thereby electing five members into the minority self-government. Representatives elected in this way (with a minimal number of votes, or with their own vote) have the right to act as electors in the county, Budapest, and national-level minority self-government elections. The regulations for establishing local and national self-governments were also rather forgiving: a quorum of sixteen persons was enough to establish a minority self-government at the national level.

The basic question remains: how can Roma politics and its organizations be protected from the "majority" at the local level, or from politics-at-large at the national level? There are discussions about other institutions that could be introduced concurrently with the existing minority self-government system. One option that has been considered recently is a quota system, which would be a



László Gargya, Roma police staff sergeant, 2003

kind of affirmative action procedure or a so-called “strengthening process.” With the understanding of the current practice of *ethnobusiness*, we cannot state that a quota system based on self-identification, similar to that in the United States, would work in Hungary. Consider, for example, a case where the only way to gain

an advantage in admission to a university is to proclaim that one is Roma. In theory a quota system could be introduced to function in tandem with the current self-government system, or it could work independently of it. Expressions reflecting this approach appear in contemporary official documents.

Divide at impera — The opportunities and impossibilities of self-organization

“When the sea no longer gives
nor the land nor the deeps of the woods
enough food, we will die
like pelicans did during the great hunger
we will die such that our last wishes
our last sorrows our own craws
will be torn up by our crack-mouthed brothers in arms
into insatiable hunger, we will die
slowly in tiny pieces
we will feed ourselves, like pelicans.”

This poem above by Hungarian Roma poet Béla Osztojkán can serve as a motto to lead into a chapter on—extremely fractured—Roma policy since the regime change.⁴⁹ It has never been truly in the interest of the government to create unity among Gypsy organizations. However, it is indeed in the interest of the government to divide them according to the needs of the state, or to appropriate Gypsy politics. Principles of multiculturalism thus exist mostly at the level of declaration and have little effect on politics-as-usual. As a result, various organizations have been unable to take common action to serve common interests. Before the regime change the basic question was how Gypsy politicians related to the Patriotic People’s Front, and to the political and cultural organizations established under the aegis of the Ministry of Education. (The Patriotic People’s Front was a unique organization under Hungarian communism, which on paper unified and represented all elements of the political system of the time, including the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party, mass organizations and social and cultural associations.) At the beginning of the 1990s the front that divided Gypsy politics formed in a way that split activists into two camps: one side was a collection of those who cooperated with the government of the time, while the other consisted of those who kept their distance from the government or allied with the opposition. A later fault line formed along judgments of minority self-governments.

Back in April of 1989 oppositional Roma and non-Roma, who supported the endeavours of Roma, established the Phralipe Independent Gypsy Organization at the Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) Department of Aesthetics. Members of the first Executive Committee body were: Béla Osztójkán, secretary chargé d'affaires, who also remained the key person in the organization, Jenő Zsigó, Aladár Horváth, Antónia Hága, Attila Balogh and a number of non-Roma intellectuals, such as Gábor Havas, Guy Lázár, Otilia Solt and Sándor Révész. As a counterpoint, the government of József Antall offered indirect support to several other new organizations. Most of the politicians active in these were drafted from those who had been active in the Patriotic People's Front, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the National Gypsy Council and the Democratic Alliance of Hungarian Gypsies (MCDSZ).⁵⁰

The Gypsy politicians of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party were active in the final years of the party-state and attempted to form a Gypsy organization that was loyal to those in power. In November of 1988, Gyula Náday announced the formation of the MCDSZ, which was essentially a grouping of Gypsy politicians who were active in the Patriotic People's Front. On January 16, 1989, the MCDSZ held its inaugural meeting. The MCDSZ survived the regime change and with the support of the National Gypsy Council it stated during its assembly of August 26 that it wished to operate as a "national minority association," and would represent the Roma in national minority terms from here on in. Later, in the fall of 1990, Flórián Farkas and his group exited the organization and formed Lungo Drom. The leaders of Phralipe released a statement emphasizing that a minority can only be represented by a body democratically elected by members of that minority. Until the establishment of a self-government system, they hoped to establish a common forum and a parliament for Gypsy associations, which was essentially based on the model of the opposition coordination forum (Opposition Roundtable) in the late 1980s, a definitive institution during the regime change and the transformation of public law.⁵¹

Phralipe finally managed to unify the rather divergent organizations. The establishment of the Roma Parliament was announced on January 19, 1990, at its founding congress. The leaders of Phralipe were at the fore of the forum: Aladár Horváth was the president, Béla Osztójkán was the secretary general and Jenő Zsigó was the spokesperson. The unified front they created was attractive neither to old political enemies, nor to the new government. As a response, at the beginning of 1991 there was a counter-organization established, the Gypsy Organizations' Interest Alliance. In addition, the Roma Forum was founded at the end of the year. Finally the Coexistence Alliance of Hungarian Gypsies was established at the beginning of 1992, and the MCDSZ was expelled from the Roma Parliament

at the beginning of the same year. The rivals to Phralipe exited from the Roma Parliament one by one, and the solidarity that kept Phralipe together also evaporated. In February of 1993, at the third Congress of the Roma Parliament, Béla Osztójkán was squeezed out of the leadership group. Afterward, Phralipe quit the Roma Parliament, and the leaders of the Roma Parliament quit Phralipe. The Roma Parliament and Phralipe became rival organizations.⁵²

In 1990 the democratic government appointed József Báthory as government coordinator for Gypsy policy, who was earlier partly responsible for defining Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Gypsy policy. The goal of those in power, it seemed, was to strengthen organizations that opposed Phralipe and then the Roma Parliament. One of the possible explanations of this was that those now in power hoped to see leaders in Gypsy organizations who voluntarily accepted puppet status, were controllable and loyal, and were further incapable of real political action or defending their interests.⁵³ In return they were offered positions and material opportunities.

The National Gypsy Minority Self-Government was first established in 1995. The victorious candidate was a Roma politician who had a subject-like relationship with the representatives of the powers that be. Of the eleven national self-governments that were elected that year, ten held their votes in the assembly hall of the Budapest Municipal Government. The National Elections Office authorized Gypsy representatives to assemble at Lungo Drom's center in the town of Szolnok, in the local sports hall. The vote took place in a crowded hall that was impossible to supervise. Lungo Drom's well-organized voting block controlled how events unfolded. As a result, politicians who stepped up to defend the minority in the years of state socialism were not elected to the self-government, even though these were the politicians who despite harassment from state security services still established the first independent organizations, fought for national minority status for Gypsies during the regime change, cooperated with others to ensure that minority rights were included in the constitution and assured that minority self-governments become possible. The candidate receiving the most votes was the leader of Lungo Drom, Flórián Farkas, who had numerous connections to the old regime.⁵⁴

There were many indicators that in general, political socialization and inside knowledge of closed institutions of the party-state was advantageous for a successful career in post-transition politics, more so than previous involvement in the opposition movement or democratic thinking under state socialism. Keeping this in mind, it is interesting to consider the Hungarian Parliament's financial support decisions in 1992. The Roma Parliament was not supported at all by the politicians in office, while their political opponents received significant state funds. The largest sum was granted to the loyal Lungo Drom, led by Flórián Farkas.⁵⁵ In 1993 Lungo



Flórián Farkas, Roma politician and Viktor Orbán, prime minister, 1998

Drom received eight times more funding than Phralipe, and in 1994 this level was doubled. And this is not to mention indirect support and money accessed through foundations that were close to the government. Flórián Farkas stated the following in the daily *Népszabadság* before elections: “Lungo Drom was often criticized as having too close a relationship with the MDF [Hungarian Democratic Forum—a conservative party which led the first coalition government after the regime change] and the MSZP [The Hungarian Socialist Party, a left-wing social democratic party and a successor to the MSZMP] governments.” This means nothing more, Farkas continued, than the fact that “Lungo Drom seeks both expert and political relationships.”⁵⁶

In December of 2001, Lungo Drom signed an election agreement with the FIDESZ-MDF alliance. Flórián Farkas has been a member of Parliament with FIDESZ since 2002.⁵⁷ As a result of this agreement three Gypsy politicians became members of Parliament in 2002, while the leader of the National Alliance of Gypsy Organizations also entered the assembly through the MSZP list.⁵⁸ The dominance of Lungo Drom, allied with state powers, in Gypsy politics was only temporarily broken by a coalition of Gypsy politicians who formerly engaged in democratic opposition. At the electoral assembly for the election to the National Gypsy Self-Government on January 11, 2003, the Democratic Roma Coalition secured a majority, but Lungo Drom had quit the assembly beforehand, as the National Election Office had rejected its complaints. As a result, the Supreme Court ordered a new election, and of the 4,592 empowered electors only 1,347 participated in



Orbán Kolompár gives a speech, 2007

the electoral assembly. The repeated election once again produced a victory for the Democratic Roma Coalition. Aladár Horváth became its leader, and Orbán Kolompár, the president of the Forum of Gypsy Organizations in Hungary, became the *chargé d'affaires*. In the same year, Aladár Horváth was removed as the head of the body, whereafter Orbán Kolompár took over.⁵⁹

With this, the two key poles of post-transition Gypsy politics, which played out at both the minority self-government and Parliamentary levels, were formed. The new cleavage was drawn along organizational loyalties tied to the two biggest political parties, FIDESZ and MSZP. Aladár Horváth established the Roma Civil Rights Foundation on the African-American civil rights movement model. The civic sphere became the main area for independent Roma politics, and the struggle against the state resumed.

Civic movement

After the regime change many Roma organizations and their leaders were soon swept up in the tide of national politics and/or minority self-government politics. Of the civic organizations that were set up at the time, many later found it impossible to operate. Inappropriate legal frameworks led to a situation where the civic

and public (municipal, parliamentary) activity of the Roma organizations could not become independent in personal and organizational terms, even though this was true in national politics and the civic sector in general.⁶⁰

Among the best known Roma civic organizations are the Hungarian Roma Parliament and the Roma Civil Rights Movement, both of which run legal aid programs. These two organizations are led by known and respected Roma leaders (Jenő Zsigó and Aladár Horváth, respectively), who participated in national politics, minority politics and civil rights movements.⁶¹ Understandably, these organizations are unable to prioritize between Roma rights violations and Roma complaints, and as such a major part of their activities focus on social issues. State agencies charged with legal protection and organizations responsible for interest representation were also forced to primarily deal with social disadvantages that weighed on the community. In other words, institutions mandated to represent Roma interests and protect them, such as minority self-governments or the minority ombudsperson (specialized ombudsperson for national and ethnic minorities), are active in social issues, even though neither has a legal mandate to do so.

The management of anti-discrimination cases that were not directly related to Roma policy and interest protection, and thus not apt to the minority self-government system, was taken up by civic organizations active in the sphere of minority legal protection. The Hungarian Helsinki Committee (established in 1989) and the National and Ethnic Minority Legal Protection Office (NEKI) became institutions for legal defense against discrimination, and both organizations run full-time legal aid programs. It has been mostly these two organizations that have taken steps to protect minorities in important, strategic anti-discrimination court cases.⁶² When it was established, NEKI hoped to tackle discrimination against minorities in a general sense. However, given their situation in Hungary the organization developed to where it primarily dealt with cases affecting the Roma minority. (The institution of minority ombudsperson, which was the key institution for state minority protection, followed a similar path toward a focus on Roma issues, although this was never acknowledged publicly. The institution was shut down in 2012.) Chance for Children Foundation (CFCF) is an organization established in 2003, which ensures equality of opportunity for Roma children in education. This NGO has largely been managing lawsuits against schools. Even though several Roma intellectuals have taken on significant roles in the activities of the Foundation, it has not become active in Roma politics per se. The key area for civic self-organization after the regime change took place in the field of media. *Amaro Drom*, a Roma newspaper connected to the Roma Parliament, was launched in 1991, and was published until 2010. Roma Press Center, an independent press agency, was founded in 1995. Radio C, a Roma radio station, began broadcasting in 2001.⁶³



**Aladár Horváth, Roma politician
and reformer, 2009**



**Jenő Zsigó, Roma politician
and reformer, 2007**

Among regionally active international non-governmental organizations, the European Roma Rights Center, which has consultative status in the Council of Europe, is of particular note. This organization was registered as a foundation in Hungary in 1996, and quickly became renowned across Europe for its rights protection activities. Other human rights NGOs that take their work seriously cannot be indifferent to Roma rights. The increasing activity of civic organizations is indicative of the severe dysfunctions in the operation of the rule of law in the field of minority rights. One of the detrimental experiences of post-socialist life lies in the fact that Roma and intellectuals allied with Roma must continue their daily struggle against the discriminatory practices of the “majority” as well as the national and local powers. The model of solidarity based on the Miskolc anti-ghetto committee (1989) had to be revisited in Székesfehérvár and in 2002 in Paks, in order to obstruct the eviction plans of authorities there. What happened there is the municipal governments demolished homes inhabited by poorly situated Roma without having planned for new housing, or hoping to transfer them out of the city to villages.⁶⁴

The town of Zámoly became infamous in 1997 when the local authority illegally bulldozed the houses of Roma families and then moved the families around various temporary facilities, where the local community did not accept them. In

July of 2000, the families decided to leave the country, applied for political asylum in France and asked for legal protection from the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) of the Council of Europe. As an important gesture on March 9, 2001, thirty-eight well known public figures (including Péter Eszterházy, György Faludy, István Kemény and János Kis) thanked the Prime Minister of France and the French nation for granting the Roma of Zámoly political asylum in the midst of bigoted public dialogue.⁶⁵

National minority culture — national culture

At the time of the regime change, Roma emancipation represented by Roma intellectuals would obviously have included Roma national culture and the establishment of a Roma nation. The development of Lovari as a literary language continued (the Romani language developed from the Lovari, the language of the Vlach community, is used as an international Gypsy language), and the same process began for Boyash.⁶⁶ The first books summarizing national history in the Romani language were published.⁶⁷ In short, Roma and non-Roma intellectuals made efforts to canonize Roma culture. Today, it is near impossible to grasp the breadth of academic and non-academic works, literature, fine arts and musical compositions about and for the Roma community. Several anthologies attest to the presence of Roma artists in Hungary.⁶⁸ The demand for the creation of unified Roma arts appeared most forcefully in the areas of fine arts and music.⁶⁹

Roma artists have been organizing joint exhibitions in Hungary since 1979, and several museums and exhibition spaces, including the Ethnography Museum and Romano Kher (Gypsy House) have significant collections of works by Roma artists.⁷⁰ Works representing Roma culture to this day are deemed naive, shabby, faked or genuinely uninteresting and of little value from the external professional point of view. A related question may be whether external “majority” point of view representations are acceptable to Roma. The series of published Roma literary anthologies and rows of fine arts exhibits are testament that Roma art is not understandable in the context of “majority” culture only, but should be viewed in its own Hungarian context and in an international Roma context as well. However, no canon has developed that can establish an inner hierarchy for such works, one that can make this art valued based on a more or less accepted set of values of a single culture and common tradition. Will such art become part of a cultural system that is jointly worked out and generally accepted by the Roma community?⁷¹ To this point, the Hungarian state has not offered appropriate support for Roma intellectuals and artists to execute this kind of canon building. In 2006 the Roma Gallery

Roma Képzőművészek III. Országos Kiállítása

The 3rd National Exhibition of Roma Artists



David Bevil (Papp) from Károlyi, 1999

2000. július 7.-augusztus 7.

Pataky Művelődési Központ
Budapest, X., Szent László tér 7-14.

Poster for the Third National Exhibition of Roma Fine Artists, 2000

and Library opened in Budapest in the headquarters of the National Gypsy Self-Government,⁷² but to this day there is no national Roma museum, library, research center or theater.

The lack of clarity in state policy toward the Roma and uncertainty in use of terms are reflected in Hungary's accession to the Council of Europe's Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 1999.⁷³ Hungary accepted responsibility for only six minority languages,⁷⁴ even though the Constitution and the Minority Act demanded equal rights for all thirteen minorities in Hungary. Another interesting point is that Hungary did not offer legal language protection to very small minori-



Concert of the 100 *Tagú Cigányzenekar* musical ensemble, 2010

ties and to Roma. It is important to note that census data indicated that Roma constitute the largest linguistic minority in the country. While Roma in Hungary experienced strong linguistic assimilation, nevertheless a 2003 sociological study showed that 40–43,000 people use the Boyash language and 97–102,000 use Gypsy languages. The 2003 study holds that a significant “language resurrection” has taken place, but the main reason for the upturn may be that those speaking Gypsy or Boyash as a mother tongue respond at a higher rate than before.⁷⁵ The state only accepted obligations under the Charter for Minority Languages extending to Gypsy languages in 2008.⁷⁶

Additionally, after the regime change some attempts were undertaken to create Roma national minority education. Yet, there is still no expert consensus on the legitimacy of national minority schools. Due to the general uncertainty on the minority status of Roma and confusion in legal regulations, it is not surprising to hear opinions that minority education is a tool of educational segregation. It is also not surprising that Roma students are sometime separated or “encouraged to catch up” under the aegis of minority education.⁷⁷ The terms are intentionally mixed. In any case, it is worth debating whether there is a method and real need for mother tongue education in the Roma languages. We have serious reservations about whether the few existing high-quality national minority schools are in themselves tools to combat the disadvantages experienced in the sphere of education.



Mara Oláh: Cigányország [Gypsy country]



Mara Oláh: *Kiféredve* [Whitened Out]



József Fenyvesi: *Drótos család* [Tinker family]

Questions of equal treatment and equal opportunity

Anti-discrimination

In 1999, for claimed public health reasons—namely lice—the directors of the municipal school in Tiszavasvári banned Roma students from using the gym for the duration of their studies. Their graduation ceremony was also organized separately from that of the “majority” students. The parents protested in vain. The school directors threatened the parents, saying that if the students did not take part in the separate graduation ceremony they would not receive their diplomas. The students of class 8/c—who were the plaintiffs in the lawsuit—had their graduation ceremony held on June 15, 1999 at a time separate from the rest of the students. The Supreme Court declared this unlawful in 2001.⁷⁸

The recognition of segregation as a social problem first arose in the United States in the nineteenth-century. The “Plessy vs Ferguson” case, which centered on a railway company whose services could only be used by whites and blacks separately, is well known. The Supreme Court declared that segregation is only illegal if there is a difference in the quality of service offered to whites and blacks. Should

no inequality be shown in such cases, as they claimed, then the separation was constitutional.⁷⁹ In the second half of the twentieth century the civil rights movement of African-Americans set an important goal of eliminating this type of discrimination through legal means. A milestone in this struggle was the Supreme Court's "Brown decision" that deemed the school segregation of blacks unconstitutional.⁸⁰ The decision stated with finality that segregation is degrading, unjust and damaging in its very nature, independent of the quality of service. With considerable delay, the victories of the African-American anti-segregation civil rights struggle made their way to Hungary with the help of the European Union regulation. The use of strategic court cases in Hungary launched by civic associations and based on the American model began in the late 1990s.⁸¹

In Hungary, before the passing of Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment and Promotion of Equal Opportunities, the ban on discrimination was not uniformly regulated.⁸² (The name of the Act is misleading, as it hardly deals with equality of opportunity: it is in truth a law for anti-discrimination.) Earlier the codexes of various areas of law, such as Labor Code, Civil Code, Criminal Code, and procedural law all banned negative differentiation.⁸³ These did not lose their force when the new law was passed. An important tool for the fight against discrimination can be criminal law,⁸⁴ given that the most serious cases of racially motivated crimes can be punished through the Penal Code. However, this method was not used until 2008 in cases where Roma were the victims.

The Act was passed by the Parliament to meet commitments regarding European Union directives on Racial Equality (2000/43) and Employment Equality (2000/78), among others, along with legal system harmonization requirements. In turn, Parliament set up the Equal Treatment Authority.⁸⁵ In accordance with principles of EU regulations the Hungarian Anti-Discrimination Act defines both direct and indirect discrimination, among other issues. Unlawful separation, as a specific form of direct discrimination, is named separately, which is presumably justified based on the segregation that burdens Roma.

An important step in the struggle against discrimination was the anti-discrimination law's creation of *actio popularis claim* institution, which enables those who are not in a position of disadvantage to sue. In Hungary, this opportunity has been pursued mainly by civic associations. The Chance for Children Foundation, the European Roma Rights Center, and the Legal Protection Office for National and Ethnic Minorities have launched several strategic lawsuits. For example, the Chance for Children Foundation launched a lawsuit against the municipal government of Hajdúhadház over segregation. The vast majority of the town's non-Roma students attended school in one of two well-equipped local schools in modern buildings. Roma students, almost exclusively, attended school in a dilapidated



**Ágnes Daróczi, minority researcher, activist, stereotype embodied:
“the old pipe-smoking Gypsy woman”
From the exhibit *Politics of the Roma Body***

building that did not meet the minimal standards. In the interest of covering up segregation under the guise of national minority education, the children were taught Roma folklore. The first court to hear the case (the Court of Hajdú-Bihar County) established that the school had transgressed the ban on segregation, which was later reinforced by the Supreme Court in 2006.⁸⁶

Less obvious cases of indirect discrimination occur when procedures that appear neutral and unbiased, which sometimes are indeed unbiased, put a definable group protected from discrimination in a situation of disadvantage. Before the birth of the anti-discrimination law, the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities, specialized ombudsperson for national and ethnic minorities, established that the local government decree of Tiszaújváros, which made “rummaging through garbage” illegal, had caused indirect discrimination on an ethnic basis. According to the ombudsperson, given that a significant portion of the area’s Roma community scavenged to make a living, this seemingly



Mária Bogdán, media researcher, a stereotype embodied: “Gypsy palm reader”
From the exhibit *Politics of the Roma Body*

neutral decree that applied equally to all, undoubtedly affected Roma disproportionately more than non-Roma.⁸⁷ In Hungary, examples of indirect discrimination also include municipal resolutions such as the one in the town of Monok that made workfare a condition for receiving social benefits, although this decision was later revoked.⁸⁸ Similarly, local authorities disproportionately burdened Roma with this step and there is little doubt that this was the goal of such provisions.

Individuals and groups can also be burdened with multiple forms of social disadvantage (intersectionality). For example, Roma women are multiply disadvantaged on the labor market. Furthermore, the UN’s committee on discrimination against women⁸⁹ criticized Hungary in 2006 for the sterilization of a Roma woman.⁹⁰ The case, once again, was taken up by civic associations: the European Roma Rights Center and the Legal Defense Bureau for National and Ethnic Minorities submitted a complaint in 2004. According to the papers A.S., a Roma patient, had a procedure done on her in a public health facility, where she was

sterilized. She was made to sign the authorization for this without having been informed of its contents. Eventually, the committee established that Hungary had violated the UN agreement on “the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.” In addition, the committee also demanded that the Hungarian government pay compensation to A.S., as well as review the rights of patients and the regulation pertaining to patients’ rights in Hungary. As a result, the Hungarian law on public health was modified to ensure that patients receive orientation allowing them to make informed decisions on operations.⁹¹ Overall, this case is indicative of multiple disadvantages that Roma women face.

Equal opportunity

The legal fight against negative differentiation in itself will clearly not lead to the elimination of social inequalities, while legal tools are undeniably necessary. In other words, factual and formal equality of those citizens belonging to the minority cannot be carried out through legal means alone, but importantly necessitates a change in society’s point of view and attitude. Inequality in the case of Roma is not exclusively a problem of the present, but it has clear historical roots.⁹² Consequently, equality of treatment alone is not enough to eliminate the disadvantages of certain groups, thus anti-discrimination and equality of opportunity interventions are implemented. Essentially, the state must take responsibility in assisting those who have “unjustly fallen into a situation of disadvantage” in education, employment and business. It is the job of the Hungarian state to take real action and to use material resources in order to create the economic conditions for such groups.

According to the equality of opportunity approach accepted under the rule of law, only people in similar situations need to be given identical treatment; consequently, in certain cases those who are disadvantaged can be offered benefits and advantages. It follows that the state can offer special support to members of a disadvantaged group if it is possible this way to compensate for various inequalities. For example, a student who is a member of an ethnic minority can only speak of equality of opportunity in school if he/she can study in his/her mother tongue, as it is the case for members of the “majority.” This, however, requires positive action from the state in the interest of using minority rights to grant true equality of opportunity.

In this sense, equality of opportunity policy means the concurrent utilization of legal and policy tools that allow the members of disadvantaged groups to compete with equal chances or be treated equally in various fields of life, such as education, health care or employment. In cases where interventions are aimed at individuals and not communities, legal rules and official documents name the

beneficiaries as “those in a situation of multiple disadvantage.” If the target group is truly the Roma minority, then this is not an appropriate solution. A situation of social disadvantage in itself cannot be labeled discrimination affecting the Roma, and such solutions confuse social rights interventions.

Roma programs

Private individuals and civic associations have launched several education and employment programs since the regime change. For instance, the Foundation for Self-Reliance was established in 1991 to support local community management initiatives. The Open Society Foundation (OSF, formerly known as Soros Foundation) founded by George Soros has also advertised several tenders of a social nature under the auspices of the Roma support program that was launched in 1993. OSF Roma programs have generously supported civic initiatives⁹³ and had an effect on government action. The first state Roma programs essentially followed or mimicked civic initiatives. In 1995 the government established the Public Foundation for Hungarian Roma (MACIKA). The Foundation on the one hand supported self-reliance and local economies, and on the other hand granted scholarships to Roma students.⁹⁴ The government, however, after accepting and embracing civic initiatives, later moved to control them and in many cases distort them.

The weakness of the civic sphere meant that associations always struggled with finances and were in need of material support from the Hungarian state. In the sea of state support systems and then EU tenders, the ships of civic associations became rickety dinghies, especially in comparison with the pinnacles of the state and local authorities. State intervention essentially took the wind out of the sails of civic initiatives, which at times just slowed progress, but at other times it steered non-governmental organizations completely off course.

Education

Leaders of schools, set up through civic initiatives, struggled with financial difficulties from the very start. In 1993 civic associations and private individuals established the Gandhi Secondary School in Pécs, which was led by János Bogdán and Tibor Derdák. The founders of the school on the one hand hoped to improve the further study opportunities for Roma students, and on the other hand wanted to maintain Roma (including Boyash) identity and teach the Boyash and Lovari languages. The non-profit sector could not fund the school on its own, and they turned to the state for support. Consequently, since 1995 the Gandhi Public



Tibor Derdák teaches French to Hungarian and Roma students, 1989

Foundation has been covering operating costs. In September of 1996 private individuals, with the financial support of Hungarian and foreign churches, founded Collegium Martineum with the goal of creating an opportunity for disadvantaged youth to participate in integrated education. Students of the Collegium studied in public (municipal) schools and staff had to be able to speak Boyash.

Beginning in 1987, Romano Kher, led by Jenő Zsigó, had started supporting Roma secondary school students along with college and university students with scholarships. In 1996 the Roma Civil Rights Foundation initiated Romaversitas as “a training and educational program for Roma youth studying in higher education.” As a first step, they organized a summer university in 1997 at the Gandhi Secondary School. The Romaversitas Invisible College launched in February of

1988. Another pioneering project was the Mentor and Scholarship program, supported by OSF, beginning in 1997. As part of this program, poor and disadvantaged Roma secondary students were given monthly support, and their studies were supplemented with mentors. Interestingly, the Ministry of Education and Culture later launched the Útravaló (For the road) Program in 2005, based on the model of the program that the OSF supported.

In 1996 the government prepared its first all-encompassing program on fighting against disadvantages encountered by Roma in education. The Ministry for Learning and Public Education released the Gypsy Education Development Program, which prescribed several concurrent steps to create equality of opportunity. The government concept included plans on building a network based on the people's college model⁹⁵ to assist talented students. Instead, the authors of the concept later recommended the establishment of a network of national minority secondary schools. The model institution throughout was the Gandhi Secondary School, which was the first well-functioning Roma national minority school. As a result of Roma education projects, vocational schools were transformed, whereby most of them made it possible to matriculate. Examples of this are the Roma Esély (Roma Chance) School in Szolnok that was later renamed András T. Hegedűs Secondary School, the Work School in Edelény and the Kalyi Jag Vocational School, all of which were based on a national minority model.⁹⁶ In 1998 a Catholic and national minority kindergarten was established in Alsószentmárton.⁹⁷ From the end of the 1990s essentially two concepts were critical in the formation of Roma education programs: Roma public education institutions founded on national minority school models were accompanied by integrative solutions that aimed at both disadvantaged groups and Roma students, supported by an increasing number of actors.⁹⁸

The Arany János Program was launched in 2000. In theory, it sought to support disadvantaged students, those living in towns with a population of less than 2000, those living in crofts or peripheral areas or those who were talented and in the eighth grade. However, studies indicated that the program failed to reach the children of the poorest families. For this reason in 2002 the government established the Collegium Basic Program within the framework of the Arany János Program, with the participation of five institutions (Gandhi Secondary School, Collegium Martineum, the college in Ózd that had just been established in the Borsod region, and colleges in Baktalórántház and Ibrány). Per capita financing meant that the already functioning model institutions could work with a reliable financial background. All institutions participating in the program had to initiate a grade-zero class. For this reason, the original concept in Collegium Martineum—namely integrated education—was compromised. The institutions designed to

target model programs at the secondary school level for Roma youth are not spread evenly throughout the country. Most of them are not even in the most underdeveloped parts of the country, but in Southern Transdanubia and primarily in Pécs. Recent years have seen the establishment of the Dr. Ámbédkar School in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County or the Pista Dankó Elementary, Vocational Secondary School and High School in Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County.⁹⁹

The Kis Tigris (Little Tiger) Secondary School and Trade School was opened in Alsószentmárton (a town with an all-Roma population) by Tibor Derdák with the support of the Buddhist Church in 2004. János Orsós helped establish the Dr. Ámbédkar School in Sajókazán in 2007. The founders named the school after Bhimrao Ramdasi Ámbédkar, born a casteless pariah and untouchable in India who received a chance to go to school. He later became a lawyer, civil rights activist and then a government minister.¹⁰⁰

Employment

After the regime change several researchers and non-governmental organizations suggested that low-skilled Roma could make a living in the agricultural sector. The social land-use programs launched in 1992 by municipal governments with the backing of the ministry served, or were meant to serve, this goal. The programs saw land, and thus the opportunity to be self-sufficient, granted to multiply disadvantaged families in the hope that this would provide extra income to supplement social benefits. However, the majority of these farming projects were not functional for internal and external (e.g., lack of funds and expertise) reasons. Then, at the beginning of the 2000s many organizations initiated Roma entrepreneurial programs. Government funds financed the National Employment Fund (OFA), the European Social Fund-PHARE, the Public Foundation for Hungarian Gypsies, or the Roma Entrepreneurial Development Program of the Széchenyi Programme. Several initiatives of the Foundation for Self-Reliance were civic parallels.¹⁰¹

After joining the EU, civic associations working to further Roma integration had in theory the chance to apply for funding from a pool of billions of euros. According to a report by the State Audit Office, between 2002 and 2005 “resources for improving the situation of the Gypsy community” rose from 7.6 to 21.8 billion forints “mostly thanks to the increase in annual EU support between 2003 and 2004 and the rapid increase in funds available for developing employment.”¹⁰² Following EU commitments, the right-wing government led by Viktor Orbán established the Roma Employment Program (RF Program) at the end of 2001. This framework consisted of three types of support: (1) tenders were announced for existing small and medium enterprises to encourage the employment of Roma,

(2) state compensation was offered for workfare programs in underdeveloped municipalities, and (3) investment and employment programs were announced for Roma community enterprises.¹⁰³

The majority of NGOs tried to adjust to the changes in opportunities. Prior to EU enlargement, Western supporters began exiting the country en masse, referring to the approaching accession. This is how the Foundation for Self-Reliance lost its earlier sources and became a transfer organization for EU support programs. The preparation of such proposals required specialized expert knowledge and a relatively large apparatus. There were some PHARE support programs with lengthy contracts of 150 pages (without appendices). The basic goal of the government was to justify successful tenders and to manipulate the distribution of funds. The primary tool for doing so was to influence employment data with superficial programs. More specifically, due to a change in regulations six- and twelve-month work contracts fell under the category of “long-term” employment. Previously, long-term employment assumed a work contract of an unspecified duration. At the time of the left-wing Medgyessy government, the RF Program advertised by the Orbán government continued in a similar vein. The 65 percent Roma unemployment rate was suddenly reduced to 15 percent, although the Hungarian government never took steps to create jobs. Despite this, the state received 47.7 million euros for the project.¹⁰⁴

The left-wing government headed by Ferenc Gyurcsány decided on a “new model public work program”: from 2005 municipal workfare programs were financed under the heading “municipal government resource supplementation.” Another unique occurrence was that between 2002 and 2006 every third municipal government in Hungary relabeled itself a “disadvantaged” settlement, and as such became qualified to receive higher state compensation for its workfare programs. Otherwise, municipal governments were on the hook for 60 percent of their workfare costs. But with the RF Program they could apply for “surplus support” after financing only 25 percent. The invested municipal funds were thus returned in four years. The number of Roma workfare participants under the duration of this program rose to 60,000, but after a six-month employment period, they once again lost their temporary jobs.¹⁰⁵

Importantly, mayors had political connections they could mobilize and an apparatus big enough to write project proposals. Compared to NGO actors, it was in addition easier for them to come up with the self-financing portion of funding. Mayors could also solve financial issues caused by post-hoc funding. In reality, the executed programs were workfare programs. In 2003–2004, PHARE support financed the “Struggle against exclusion from the world of work” program, where the vast majority of supported partners were municipal governments or public-purpose associations founded by municipalities. The recipients of funds earmarked

for education, for instance, spent the funds on financing the training of park maintenance staff, lawn-mower operators and medicinal plant experts. Not surprisingly these professions offered little opportunity for future employment.

Overall, Hungarian governments spent billions in EU support without creating a single job. Yet at least temporarily, the roads in Hungary's poorest villages were lined with English-quality lawns because Roma people mowed the grass and trimmed the hedges as long as workfare programs could be financed through project support.¹⁰⁶ In reality, mayors became new landlords and distributed support according to their own whims. Later, when these temporary jobs were no longer available, the illusion that local relations could change faded away.

Social policy and the Roma

The term "project" in daily usage has taken on a "mystical" meaning, referring to something between by-the-letter religious rituals and magical passwords of yore, with which communities tried to influence their own future. László Tenigl Takács claims the word has become a "social policy mantra." (Of course there are



Goat in a village doorway, 1996

other curse-repelling magic words, like “budget,” “action plan,” “execution” and “success.”)

A typical and likely accurate story has it that after the regime change, within the framework of a project, the poverty-stricken residents of a Hungarian village were given goats. The idea was that the locals could produce milk, cottage cheese and cheese, and thus a market and commerce would evolve, followed by a bit of income. However, people had been starving for some time. A few of the animals were quickly butchered, while the remainder began feeding on the village’s fruit trees, because the locals did not know that they ought to be leashed or penned in. When the goats were finally leashed, hungry dogs attacked and tore them apart at night. Finally, the few remaining animals were then butchered and consumed by the locals. Nothing remained of the goats, and the project petered out in its execution phase.¹⁰⁷

The story is a good illustration of the general puzzlement that ensues when dealing with poverty or the poor. Jenő Zsigó calls this the “bead effect.” After the regime change, members of the elite and middle class often wondered about the social relations of those in (increasingly) underdeveloped regions, often from a position of good will. Their gestures were similar to the behavior of white travelers in the past exploring distant lands in America, Africa or Oceania, who handed out shiny but worthless beads to win over the natives.¹⁰⁸

Aid

State socialism preserved pre-war poverty. Former servants, poor peasants, the proletariat class and their descendants became traveling unskilled workers or trained workers in collective farms and state plants.¹⁰⁹ After the regime change they became the victims of “new poverty”: that is, unemployment. It became clear that poverty was not simply an issue of inequality, but a “disintegration problem.” In Hungary, state socialist order created a system of dependence on the state that applied to all. Those who were most at the mercy of this system were unable to connect to the market economy, which had begun appearing in the state socialist period. Now, much like during the late “socialist” period, reliance on the state persists. Although they appear to receive significant support from the state, the poor are most fettered by the relations of dependence and feudal-type ties.¹¹⁰

Today in Hungary social division means that equal citizenship still cannot exist. Júlia Szalai, when analyzing the social system, argued that we in fact have first- and second-rate citizens. In other words, separation means that the majority of Roma are locked into the group of second-rate citizens, and social benefits received by the poor are means of expressing and extending their exclusion. The state is eter-



Closed mine in Bódvarákó, 2004

nally present in their lives through its various institutions. The residents of regions undergoing ghettoization are characterized by living off benefits and a “single-pillar life situation.” Thus, the primary function of the current system of aid is to separate and maintain the society of the excluded. This system created the insular world of the poor, who have a dire need for the very institutions that exclude them and force them to the periphery.¹¹¹

The result of exclusion is banishment from the social relation system of “majority” society and an almost complete denial of rights.¹¹² In Hungary, social processes are visibly moving in a direction of a society split in two. Starting with the 1960s, the social institution system has been filled with ethnic content to a degree. Sociological measurements show that the majority of poor are not Roma, but the majority of Roma are forced into deep poverty through the practice of institutions of exclusion. What’s more, in Hungary Roma heritage (i.e., being born into a family considered Roma) has become “a factor increasing the chances and being

an explanation of” exclusion.¹¹³ According to 2006 estimates, Roma made up about 30 percent of the poor. It should also be noted that domestic studies that were labeled “secret” in “socialist” Hungary in the 1970s came to similar conclusions.¹¹⁴ The data from a representative sociological study in 2003 showed that 56 percent of Roma households were in the lowest tenth in terms of household income, that is, among those living in deep poverty their proportion is the highest.¹¹⁵ Articles on poverty, however, do not provide a complete picture of the situation of Roma in Hungary. János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi’s research shows that at the turn of the millennium one-fourth of Roma were members of the middle class.¹¹⁶ Whether the “majority” members of the imagined middle class deem better situated Roma as members of the same group, or whether this is simply the result of sociologists describing society in “objective” terms is a different question altogether. (Comparing data from these studies is also difficult because authors use various versions of the concept Gypsy/Roma and different classification systems.)

The law on municipal government passed in 1990 once again gave local settlements the right to govern themselves. Later, the breadth of municipal rights widened again. The 1993 act on social policy decidedly decentralized the social benefits system and transferred a part of related tasks to municipal governments (i.e., aid for the poor and distribution of benefits). At the same time the financial situation of municipal governments was worsening. When transforming the distribution system, lawmakers likely did not think that local politicians and power-broking groups would limit the rights of individuals and groups in the minority in the name of the “majority.” Probably with past failures in mind, the state delegated decisions (and problems) to the lower levels of administration. From this point on municipal governments could use local resolutions to define the practice of social aid. Local authorities were thus able to force individuals and groups into a situation of dependence. This all reinforced and further constructed the power hierarchy that had always existed at the local level—independent of the nature of the central powers—along with client-patron relations.¹¹⁷ As such, conflicts resulting from social policy that formed along local society’s fault lines often appeared as antagonism along ethnic lines.¹¹⁸

From 2005, since the passing of the new social policy law¹¹⁹ the state has managed benefits under various titles in a uniform manner, and has been calculating the sum of social aid according to a unified system.¹²⁰ Still, both the state and municipal authorities are increasingly giving voice to their approach to distributing benefits, whereby social aid should be conditional to either forcing people to work, sending children to school, or the like.¹²¹ At the end of 2008 the government tightened up the conditions for aid under its “road to work” program. These attempts can only be interpreted as steps taken against the minority, that is, as a “gesture” to the “majority.”

Segregation

Many signs of disadvantage that Roma face are visible in the labor market, education and residential segregation. In the first few years following the regime change, 40 percent of Roma income earners lost their full-time jobs and were excluded from the labor market.¹²² In 1993 unemployment in their circle was three and a half times that of the “majority.”¹²³ This unexpected and dramatically rapid process showed that superficial assimilation as created by the Kádár party-state was actually unsustainable, despite interventions designed to tackle the symptoms.

According to various studies, school and residential segregation of Roma has increased significantly in recent years. Research on Gypsies shows that between 1993 and 2003 the number of Roma children deemed mentally challenged and thus sent to a special school or class increased: a 2003 study indicated that 20 percent of Roma children attended such schools or classes.¹²⁴ In Hungary today there are 180 segregated schools and 3,000 segregated classrooms.¹²⁵

International comparisons are often questionable, given that it is difficult to collect comparable data across institutions that function quite differently. However, it is important to note that in the first decade of twenty-first-century Hungary, about the same proportion of children are sent to special education institutions as were sent in Nazi Germany. In Germany, after Hitler took power, this proportion



Bulrush weaving, 1992

reached about 7 percent. In Hungary at the beginning of the 2007/2008 academic year the number of elementary school children in special education was a bit higher than this (7.1 percent), while the average for Western Europe was 2.5 percent.¹²⁶ The education system trains consultants who filter the minority from the “majority,” collaborating with kindergartens and schools. A 2004 study counted 1,253 homogenous Roma classes countrywide, with 799 Roma special education classes within those. Of all special education classes about one-quarter were Roma classes. 15 percent of Roma students attended special schools.¹²⁷

Educational segregation begins in the lowest levels, but disadvantage in student body composition is most visible in secondary learning institutions. The opportunity to move from elementary school into secondary school is a sharp dividing line in today’s Hungarian society, one which separates the long-term poor, excluding them from the rest of the “majority” society.¹²⁸ Studies show that currently only 10 percent of Roma children write secondary school matriculation exams.

The space we call the social periphery, but which actually denotes a kind of “outside of society” condition, is ever widening. Exclusion and segregation affect an increasing number of people. After the regime change only superficial efforts were made to stem this process, and even the executed slum-razing programs failed to strengthen social integration. A project costing 120 million forints in the Bodva Valley saw the state buying up peasant homes and moving former residents of Gypsy slums into them. The result was that the non-Roma peasant families moved away, turning the entire village into a Gypsy settlement.¹²⁹

A 2003 national study showed that about 6 percent of Roma, or 36,000 people, lived in Gypsy settlements. Official government documents estimate much higher numbers, but even the research referred to above estimates that more than 70 percent of Roma live segregated.¹³⁰ Old segregated rows of Gypsy homes have not disappeared. Instead, they have outgrown their original streets and taken over entire villages. Villages undergoing ghettoization begin to form connected regions, creating ever larger ethnic ghettos. Demographic and social processes in these villages diverge from national trends: the population is growing and poverty has become inescapable and long-term. In some villages, people who had moved from the village to the city, then forced from the city back to the village, are now starting to form a majority.¹³¹ In these villages, state institutions and municipal governments continue to represent and guard the power of the “majority.” It is difficult to say on what grounds local societies more or less accept the authority of these institutions even today. Possible explanations are numerous methods of rule (e.g., punishment, reward) and personal reasons (e.g., interests, habit, apathy, or fear).

In summary, the decades of industrialization can be interpreted as the creation of “simple modernity,” a linear and uni-dimensional process of rationaliza-



Children in the courtyard of a District VIII tenement, Budapest, 1995



Street scene. Settlement of Péró, 2014

tion. The basis for this notion is that society produces, and can produce, an ever increasing number of goods. According to Ulrich Beck, “reflexive modernization,” or the questioning of this principle, has brought about a shift in the basis of industrial modernity. This involved the birth of the “risk society”: the notion of a kind of goal-oriented rationality driving social processes has disappeared. Social inequalities have not only strengthened to a degree, but have become individualized as well. The foundations of political and social institutions have weakened to the point that what we once thought of as rock solid now flows through our hands like sand. This leads us to the question of whether new challenges can be met with the use of earlier nation-state institutions, or whether such institutions should be transformed or outright demolished.¹³² Returning to Ulrich Beck, he sees the phenomenon called “reflexive modernism” as individual-centric, and he believes there is a need for intensified social control, the humanization of institutions, a self-critical society and generally a move away from the traditional value systems of modernity.

Disciplinary society

“Roma organizations must distance themselves from criminals,” said Prime Minister Gyula Horn to an audience of Roma politicians in 1997.¹³³ According to an urban legend someone in the back row retorted: “We expect the same of the Hungarian government.”

The stereotype of “Gypsy crime” in Hungary was—at least in part—created and maintained by the institutional system of law enforcement. After the regime change, the so-called Gypsy lines ceased within the police forces, although they continued to use “Gypsy background” as a unique marker in investigations. The national Chief of Police apparently put an end to this practice with an internal order in November of 1996. Researchers—taking a stand against well-known prejudices—had proven in the 1980s that crime statistics are not affected by ethnic affiliation, but that certain criminal acts are related to social situation. However, this influences neither public opinion nor the speeches of politicians. At times it seems that in Hungary ethnic affiliation of only the Roma sparks interest in the news.

Under democratic rule of law it is politically incorrect to discuss higher criminal tendencies within an ethnic group, or “unfavorable ethno-social circumstances” of various neighborhoods. If a public servant engages in such rhetoric, there are generally consequences.¹³⁴ In Hungary, no such rule limits the speech of politicians or high-ranking state officials. Beyond being simple reflections of prejudice, discourses on “Gypsy crime” in most cases have a goal of pandering to the “majority” population in order to increase the popularity of public figures. This does not mean, however, that various ethnic groups cannot be related to certain social situations that can have an effect on criminality statistics; criminality is not ethnicity-specific, but it affects the behavior of all citizens equally, including those who are not members of the minority. It is a fact that “Gypsy crime” as such does not exist and has never existed. It must be noted, however, that the proportion of Roma perpetrators in certain crime categories does truly exceed their proportion in the population as a whole. Considering a different point of view, this can also be explained by the situation of the minority within society and the state. Namely, the incomplete and insufficient delivery of state public services, prejudice within the police (which is evident in random identity checks and backed up by empirical data) and ensuing discrimination, among other things, are all contributing to this trend.¹³⁵

Under state socialism thoughts that were openly hateful and racist could hardly be expressed publicly. But because the past was never properly confronted, social attitudes and patterns of racist behavior were preserved. They not only survived past the regime change, but also gained strength afterward. Sadly, extremist and

racist principles soon escaped the political quarantine that the democratic regime-changing powers had shut them in. In the history of the Third Republic, the visible advance of the minority-hating far right is tied to the success of the Hungarian Truth and Way Party (MIÉP) in the 1998 parliamentary elections.¹³⁶ More precisely, this far-right radical party was formed by István Csurka in 1993, who had earlier been expelled from the Hungarian Democratic Forum. In 1999 mostly university students established a radical organization called the Right-Wing Youth Community, or Jobbik. In 2003 the organization became a political party, and it soon grew to challenge MIÉP. In the 2002 parliamentary election MIÉP won no mandates, at which point it established an election alliance with Jobbik and the Smallholders called “MIÉP - Jobbik the Third Way.” Even together they did not reach the parliamentary threshold. However, among the various radical organizations the increasingly radical Jobbik slowly established a leading role. The party’s 2007 Gábor Bethlen Program contained a demand to use the armed forces to combat “Gypsy crime,” which was supplemented by the idea of establishing gendarmes. This became a central element of the radical party’s rhetoric: “The establishment of an organizational unit within the police to prevent and investigate Gypsy crime in crisis-stricken counties.”¹³⁷ (The Royal Hungarian Gendarmes was a law enforcement arm organized on military principles in the age of the Dual Monarchy and the Horthy era, and in 1944 it played an active role in collecting Hungarian Jews.)

The Jobbik barge was soon home to paramilitary organizations based on violence against minorities. These tendencies first became visible on the political stage on August 25, 2007, with the establishment of the Hungarian Guard Tradition-Keeping and Cultural Association and the related paramilitary Hungarian Guard Movement, both with organizational ties to Jobbik. Of the two organizations only the former was a legal entity, and as such the movement could not be sued in court. The president of the association was Gábor Vona, whom the association named Chief Captain of the Guard. Jobbik’s earlier founding president joined two other founding members to release a statement following the establishment of the Guard, calling the paramilitary organization “an unmeasurable and unacceptable source of risk,” and later left the party.¹³⁸ The united Guard members did not make hide the fact that they organized to fulfill state law enforcement roles, and they developed an inner hierarchy typical of armed forces, based on ranks. The movement swore in thousands of members in various locations. To instill fear, the Guard held marches in settlements populated by Roma. For example, in December of 2007 the Guard marched in Tatárszentgyörgy to support “rural public security” but in fact to threaten the local Roma. The organizers routinely used this framework to step up against “Gypsy crime.”

With the strengthening of the extreme right and increasingly serious ethnic conflicts, the country was shocked by a series of murders of Roma.¹³⁹ According

to one charge in the current court case, four men were involved in an armed robbery in Besenyszög, fired shots on the refugee camp in Debrecen, and attacked Roma with arms and Molotov cocktails in nine settlements: on July 21, 2008 in Galgagyörk, August 8 in Pirics, September 5 in Nyíradony, September 29 in Tarnabod, November 3 in Nagycsécs, December 15 in Alsószolc, then February 23, 2009 in Tatárszentgyörgy, April 22 in Tiszalök and August 3 in Kisléta. The attacks in Kisléta and Tiszalök resulted in one death each, while those in Nagycsécs and Tatárszentgyörgy resulted in two deaths each. As an effect of the attacks, Roma felt more threatened. During this period, Roma “patrol groups” were established in several settlements.¹⁴⁰ The residents of small villages were right in thinking that they could not rely on the protection of the state. In the 2009 attack in Tatárszentgyörgy, where the the Guard had been present since 2007, a 27-year old father and his 5-year old son were shot by the racist serial murderers while trying to escape their burning home. The absolute ineffectiveness of the work of the doctor, firefighters and police that arrived on the scene is illustrated by the statement of the Pest County Police District after the attack: “the initial opinion of the firefighting investigators is that an electric short caused the fire in which two lives were lost.”¹⁴¹ The series of Roma murders, the tangible spread of racism and the ineffectiveness of state legal protection once again led non-governmental organizations to broaden their activities to include the legal protection of the Roma minority. For instance, in 2010 the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union launched an independent program to assist the protection and execution of the rights of Roma.¹⁴²

Jobbik gained 15 percent of the popular vote in the June 2009 European Parliament elections and sent three representatives to the European Parliament. One of the party’s MEP’s, Csanád Szegedi, accepted his European Parliament mandate wearing the Hungarian Guard uniform of a vest emblazoned with a lion and an Árpád crest. On July 2, 2009 the court established that the operation of the Guard was illegal and demanded it be disbanded. The court decision stated that the association’s organizational unit encompasses the Hungarian Guard, and thus its decision extends to both organizations.¹⁴³ The particular reason the court ordered disbanding was the Guard’s 2007 meeting in Tatárszentgyörgy, an inciting event that used the terms “Gypsy crime” and “Gypsy terror.” However, legal disbanding did not bring the expected results. On July 25, 2009, shortly after the decision, a membership similar to that of the Guard formed the New Hungarian Guard Movement, which in its founding document stated “given that New Hungarian Guard Movement is a long name,” they would continue using the name Hungarian Guard.¹⁴⁴ On August 22, 2009, at the first initiation event of the New Hungarian Guard, 620 members were sworn in, and a “gendarmes squadron” was established. Jobbik has held mandates in Hungarian Parliament since 2010.

The transformation of discourses

Surveys conducted in 1987 and 1992 show that approximately one-third of those questioned felt “Gypsies will never fit into Hungarian society.” According to Guy Lázár’s research results, the “majority” forms its prejudices regarding Roma primarily in accordance with its own image: the “Gypsies” have become a kind of negative reference group. “Hungarians” came to define their positive characteristics vis-à-vis “the traits of the Roma.”¹⁴⁵

Since 1993, Gallup has been conducting surveys on prejudice. Since 1995 these surveys have shown that inhibitions regarding open anti-Gypsyism have disappeared, and this is clearly not independent of processes taking place in the public sphere. Although laws and official documents continue to use the term Gypsy, after the regime change the more politically correct term became Roma, given that the former name carries racist connotations when used in “majority” language. Politically correct speech, however, has not put an end to the prejudices of “majority” society but has instead exempted its users from such criticisms.

A 2006 sociological survey in Hungary showed that “Pirezians”—members of a group that in reality does not exist—are the subject of similar, if not in some cases worse, rejection in Hungary.¹⁴⁶ A significant proportion of respondents would not have let Pirezians into the country, despite the fact that they could not have had any personal experiences with them. Typically, the survey showed that over the years antagonism to Pirezians—or spontaneous, unwarranted hatred of foreigners—actually increased.¹⁴⁷

The legal system to protect minorities in Hungary thus had to function in a social climate that was ever more prejudiced. This context also explains the insufficient use of laws in practice. In some cases the prejudiced environment itself may have been the primary reason for the failure of legal protection. Beyond the speeches of politicians and state officials, an analysis of the current extreme right discourse and a detailed examination of the relationship between state and far-right discourses could prove useful. We should mention that extreme right-wing political writers use literary works—works they are clearly not deeply familiar with—to describe their chosen enemies (e.g., hobbits and orcs) in order to protect themselves from being accused of hate speech.

Perhaps it is the lack of a dialogue that leads to politicians and the public believing that those social scientists and intellectuals who show solidarity with Roma are biased, out of touch with reality and elitist. Today, unlike in the Kádár era, sociology is unable to have a direct dialogue with the political sphere. When acting in the wider public sphere, politicians speak foremost to voters, keeping their

popularity in mind, while scientific and solidarity-based statements and positions are deemed unrealistic and an intense form of concession to political correctness. Questioning the credibility of experts has become commonplace, and social scientists are regularly charged with distorting reality.¹⁴⁸ This phenomenon, as Csaba Dupcsik shows, forces social scientists, rights activists and civil rights defenders into a role in which the conceptual language of social science is mixed with that of political movements.¹⁴⁹ Consequently, studies on the situation of Gypsies have increasingly become “activist” in nature, while chances that political decisions will be based on expert background reports is minimal, thanks to the political sphere’s apathy toward the pertinent minority and social science research.¹⁵⁰

Research methods

In the summer of 1961 a Belgian anthropology professor left Brussels. He was looking for a Kalderash Roma man called Yanko and his family, like a needle in a haystack. He found no trace of him, even though he had traveled through Hungary and Yugoslavia all the way to Istanbul, Turkey. Given that the anthropologist did not speak Romani or the languages of the countries he traveled through, he employed a guide-interpreter for the trip, one who had lived with Yanko’s family years before. It would only have taken the guide a few phone calls to discover the whereabouts of the Kalderash family, or he could have just asked in one of the Brussels cafés frequented by Roma. He did neither. Apparently, he did not want to compromise the anthropologists’s curiosity and sense of adventure, and the exciting research trip came to an end without having reached its goal.¹⁵¹ This story and the Belgian social scientist’s failure is a good illustration of the divide separating researchers from their subjects.

After the regime change, given its nature, classifications within social science began to distinguish “ethnic,” “social,” “linguistic,” “cultural,” “census,” and other categories when describing Gypsies. In the age of modernity another, considerably more uniform image of Gypsies could have been created, but public discourse about them—related to social processes—in Hungary only began in earnest at the end of the twentieth century. The postmodern fragmentation of this knowledge about Roma, or the fact that there is no narrative that is able to weave together the various types of knowledge, signifies not only that the group being studied is not unified, but also that the discourse about Roma has not consolidated into a whole. Scientific discourses further weaken the chances that Roma might be discussed as a unified group or minority, albeit Gypsy minority existence obviously contains a very real daily experience for individuals and com-

munities. Mainstream social science considers efforts of nation building by Gypsy politicians and intellectuals illusory.

Csaba Dupcsik studied “Gypsy images” in scientific discourse in his historical monograph. From the 1990s, he writes, Roma research was characterized primarily by its critical-descriptive approach, which was deviance-oriented and emancipatory. More specifically, those who were writing about deviance searched for reasons for the breaking of norms and crossing of limits. Those writing of emancipation researched opportunities for social integration. In particular, essentialist, structuralist and naïve scientific works can be distinguished from one another based on methodological and political aspects. Essentialists explain divergent systems of norms through cultural underdevelopment, situations of disadvantage and in some cases improper thinking and behavior, or by their interpretation of essential Roma characteristics (e.g., racial or ethnic). The structuralist approach—according to Dupcsik’s piece—interprets the situation of Roma through the lens of opposition and contrast between a “majority” and minority.¹⁵² Most of these analyses present Roma as a group defined (or potentially defined) from the outside (i.e., from the perspective of the “majority”). The naïve scientific approach is characterized by the assumption that there is a value divergence between interpretations that appear naïve and those that are strictly scientific.

There is certainly methodological knowledge—knowledge that is hard to define given the plurality of various approaches—that differentiates these works from one another. In terms of style and content, these pieces of research are often very similar to one another given that all try to create the illusion of objectivity when they write about Gypsies/Roma from their own points of view. Interestingly, the essentialists try to legitimate their work, which has the illusion of being scientific, in the same way. One of the signs of unscientific nature of such works is the complete lack of self-reflection in texts, albeit with a few exceptions.

Given the existing scientific approaches, this book has mostly followed the tradition of the emancipatory structuralist approach in a way that stays open to possibilities of other approaches and, to the degree possible, stays open to self-reflection when making claims. Our goal was to present the epistemological assumptions of *mainstream* social science about Roma, and to make their relativity clear. New concepts, themes and approaches always make it possible to revise earlier canons, theories and research methods. Thus, the use of any point of view that embraces scientific pluralism and multiculturalism will always have a transformative effect.


Clifford Geertz’s witty claim holds that scientific communities are as closed, and as big, as an average village.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, sharing the inner set of relations with outsiders can do no harm, as it helps to interpret these pieces. Researchers relate not only to the world of academic life, but also to their own daily commu-

nities. While those who research Gypsies and related social groups appear to be unified in using a structuralist approach, in most cases their writings do not reveal whether they approach other groups, for example the “majority,” in the same way. In our view, in order to study people labeled Gypsy/Roma scientifically, it requires not only methodological self-reflection, but also the marking of points of reference (given the effect of research on forming reality).

It has slowly become a scientific cliché to claim “the Roma are not an ethnically homogeneous group, they cannot be defined from within or from without, but they cannot be seen as a heterogeneous group either. At the end of the day only one thing makes the Roma an ethnic group, and that is the labeling judgment of the “majority” Hungarian point of view that decides who is Roma and who is not.”¹⁵⁴ While studies on Roma since the 1970s may have had a significant role in shaping the state’s view about Gypsies as a unified group, today these studies actually question even the unification efforts of the Roma, as these are deemed illusory. We feel that today, seeing Roma as a unified group is in reality not acceptable within critical social science, but it is not necessary to take a position on the unification efforts of Roma. Today’s scientific approach simultaneously and continuously creates as well as questions knowledge about Gypsies.¹⁵⁵

It seems that even the structuralist approach (which attributes the situation of the Roma to the dynamic mutual effects of Roma and “majority” societies), had a doctrinaire interpretation whereby the relativist position only applies to one minority. Some researchers reject approaches for describing the minority that are generally accepted for analyzing “majority” society. It appears as if no one has any objections to treating Hungarian culture, society or history as unified. The unified Gypsy folk has never existed, it is only a construction—claims social science in its exalted voice. But this approach is hardly used when discussing the so-called Hungarian “majority,” which, of course, also could be interpreted as an imagined community.¹⁵⁶ In fact, just like Hungarian history, Gypsy history is also an invention. We are more comfortable questioning “majority identity” formed against minority identity than vice versa. If the “majority” as such does not exist, then it is impossible to act, speak or write in its name. To be even more precise: it is only such reflective comparison that makes the “majority” a real entity.

The pursuit of science is a privilege of the middle class or the elite. Thus, from the point of view of Roma living in dire poverty researchers cannot describe and interpret the characteristics of the Hungarian nation, or the social status of the “majority,” its familiar and strange customs, tribal rituals and ethnic culture of “majority” communities. The exception to this inability in Hungarian academic literature is Sándor Rácz Romano’s memoir-sociography. The author complements his own life history and personal stories with analysis of scientific questions about



Poster for the 1993 photo exhibit titled
“The world is a ladder upon which some go up and some go down”

Roma, from the point of view of a Roma man. There is a clear need for articles that interpret and judge the social relations of the “majority” from the perspective of minority existence.¹⁵⁷ An issue that arises is that research on the internal reasons for Roma separation can become a point of reference for extremist essentialist authors, or putting scientific euphemisms aside, racist authors, who blame the minority for integration failures. For example, Ian Hancock’s Roma history book, *We Are the Romani People*, dedicates a whole chapter to beliefs that the minority holds about the “majority” (“Our stereotypes of non-Roma”). Indeed, prejudices are not directed at the minority only. Hancock notes: “Very many [Roma] believe that non-Roma are happy to speak openly with strangers about the most hidden aspects of their private lives; that they announce to all their intention to go to the bathroom, and that they do not wash their hands.”¹⁵⁸

Rogers Brubaker questions whether we are right to artificially create groups in order to understand social phenomenon; Brubaker calls this “groupism.”¹⁵⁹ Of course all groups are artificial, yet when examining social formations, is “groupism” the only tool at hand? A careful reflection on the artificial creation of groups serves no purpose, given that social sciences by necessity categorize. Furthermore, this results in the tendency to treat national minorities and nations as if they were solid entities with their own interests and actions.

The latest social science research, for the most part, does not use the conceptual dichotomy of the nation contra national minority to study the question of ethnicity. There are groups living in marginal spaces that have flexible national boundaries, that are open in space and time, and which as such have uncertain ethnic identities in many regards. The practice of classification in modern social science leaves such groups beyond reach.¹⁶⁰ Acknowledging this can help us understand that other ethnic categories (e.g., national minority, nation) are also constructions. As opposed to the concept of fixed ethnic identity and the primordial understanding of nationhood and belonging, social and ethnic categorization (or identity) can be situation dependent: “Ethnicity has a defined emergence but an undefinable content.”¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, politicians and social scientists like to interpret belonging dogmatically.

Notes

- 1 Charles Taylor, “The Politics of Recognition,” in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 25.
- 2 Júlia Szalai, “Az elismerés politikája és a cigánykérdés” [The politics of recognition and the ‘Gypsy question’: On some contemporary problems of the majority-minority relations], in *Cigánynak születni*, ed. Horváth, Landau and Szalai.

- 3 After regime change, between 1990 and 1993, a right-wing coalition government led by Prime Minister József Antall (Hungarian Democratic Forum–MDF) and consisting of the Hungarian Democratic Forum, the Independent Smallholders' Party (FKgP) and the Christian Democratic People's Party (KDNP) was in power. After Antall's death Péter Boross became the prime minister. After the next round of elections Gyula Horn led a coalition government backed by a two-thirds parliamentary majority and consisting of the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP) and the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ) between 1994 and 1998. Later, between 1998 and 2002 another right-wing coalition government formed, which was made up of the Alliance of Young Democrats (FIDESZ), FKgP and MDF. After 2002 Péter Medgyessy led a new MSZP and SZDSZ coalition government. Medgyessy was replaced by Ferenc Gyurcsány who was Prime Minister until 2006. After an election victory in 2006 the MSZP–SZDSZ coalition continued to govern. A constructive vote of non-confidence submitted by Gyurcsány himself led to his resignation, whereby the coalition government was led by Gordon Bajnai between 2009 and 2010. In 2010 a two-thirds parliamentary majority backed Viktor Orbán's FIDESZ–KDNP coalition government.
- 4 Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities was adopted by Parliament on July 7, 1993.
- 5 International organizations tend to support minority rights. This approach is visible in the documents of the Council of Europe. One of the Parliamentary Assembly's recommendations includes the following: "Roma must be treated as an ethnic or national minority group in every member state, and their minority rights must be guaranteed" (Recommendation 1557 [2002] The Legal Situation of Roma in Europe, point 6).
- 6 Balázs Majtényi, *A nemzetállam új ruhája: Multikulturalizmus Magyarországon* [New cloth of the nation state: Multiculturalism in Hungary] (Budapest: Gondolat, 2007).
- 7 Niklas Luhman, *Legitimation durch Verfahren* (Suhrkamp, Frankfurt 1983).
- 8 Government decision No. 1125/1995 (XII. 12.) on the most urgent tasks regarding the situation of the Gypsy community. This first governmental decision that aimed to improve the situation of the Gypsy community can be considered the government decision that laid a foundation for later medium-term projects. The decision laid out a one-year deadline for affected ministries to work out detailed action plans in education, culture, employment, social provision, regional development and agriculture. It further set a goal of introducing anti-discrimination projects. Based on this, it demanded the preparation of a medium-term action plan with a deadline of June 30, 1997. Action plans were written and integrated into a medium-term plan by the deadline. The 1995 governmental decision established the theoretical opportunity for the government to map out a well-prepared plan and to execute an effective Roma policy. It is worth noting that until the medium-term action plan was prepared the government did not dedicate significant resources to finance projects expressly aimed at improving the situation of the Gypsy community.
- 9 Government decision No. 1120/1995. (XII. 7.)
- 10 This was replaced in 1999 by the Interministerial Committee on Gypsy Issues, which in the interest of executing the medium-term action plan was given a coordination mandate. In 2002 the Gypsy Issue State Secretariat was established within the Prime Minister's Office, also to harmonize the activities of various ministries, and it was led by László Teleki.
- 11 Balázs Wizner, "Osztok, keverek. Cigány programok és roma szervezetek finanszírozása a rendszerváltás után" [Financing Roma programs and organizations after the trans-

formation of the political system], in *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [The minority of minorities: The human and political rights of the Roma in Hungary], ed. Mária Neményi and Júlia Szalai (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005), 430–457.

- 12 Government Decision No. 1047/1999 (V.5.) on Medium-term Measures to Improve the Living Standards and Social Position of the Roma Population. Based on the preparatory work described above, the document would have served to make decisions on planned sub-programs and their execution, while also making fiscal resources available for them. The government decision, however, did not live up to these criteria. Characteristically, the appendix to the decision expressed the tasks in the following terms: “should look into,” “measure in the framework of a study,” “should measure,” “a comprehensive program and financing plan are necessary,” “should work out a concept.” The only concrete target in the document was the workfare tender to manage Gypsy settlements, but the municipal governments that could have applied for the project did not take advantage of the opportunity. When setting out who was responsible for what task, often several—and in some cases five to six—ministries were designated. This led to the erosion of the framework of actual responsibility. Moreover, this phenomenon characterized later governmental decisions as well.
- 13 Government Decision No. 1093/1997 (VII. 29.) on the Medium-term Package of Measures to Improve the Living Standards of the Roma Population; Government Decision No.1047/1999 (V. 5.) on the Medium-term Package of Measures to Improve the Living Conditions and Social Position of the Roma Population; Government Decision No. 1073/2001. (VII. 13.) on the Modification of Government Resolution No.1047/1999 (V. 5.) on the Medium-term Package of Measures to Improve the Living Conditions and Social Position of the Roma Population; Government Decision 1051/2002 (V. 14.) on the Unified Expert and Financial Post-consequences System of Government Decision No.1047/1999 (V. 5.) on the Medium-term Package of Measures to Improve the Living Conditions and Social Position of the Roma Population; Government Decision No. 1186/2002. (XI. 5.) on the Cooperation Principles and Organization Framework for Developing the Social Ontegration of the Roma; Government Decision No. 1021/2004 (III. 18.) on the Governmental Program Developing the Social Integration of the Roma and Related Interventions.
- 14 Wizner, “Cigány programok és roma szervezetek” [Financing Roma programs and organizations], 437.
- 15 In 1998 the State Auditor Office prepared a report claiming that the common characteristic of these programs was that they demarcated tasks too generally and did not define who was responsible for their execution, nor did they ensure monitoring of the programs. Gyula Pulay and János Benkő, *A magyarországi cigányság helyzetének javítására és felemelkedésére a rendszerváltás óta fordított támogatások mértékéről és hatékonyságáról* [Rate and efficiency of expenditures spent for the improvement of living conditions of the Roma in Hungary, since the regime change] (Budapest: Állami Számvevőszék Fejlesztési és Módszertani Intézet, 2008), 23.
- 16 A sum of 680 million forints was spent, which is half of what was applied for (Model program for the housing and social integration of those living in Gypsy settlements, 2006). In 2006, eleven more municipalities were granted 500 million forints and in 2007 further 660 million forints was earmarked for another nine municipalities. When choosing municipalities the decision makers employed the typology designed

by Gábor Havas and Péter Szuhay during the program's preparation phase. The experts had differentiated between the following types of settlements: wild ranches, manorial yards and workers' colonies, leftover slums, "szocpol" (supported housing construction) slums, urban segregated areas, and villages undergoing segregation. Gabriella Lengyel, "Cigánytelepek egykor és ma" [Roma colonies in the past and today], in *Átszervezések kora. Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2002–2006* [A Roma's Life in Hungary. Report 2002 to 2006: The Age of Reorganization], ed. Ernő Kállai and Erika Törzsök (Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2006), 90.

- 17 Typically, the text of the law on education of the time used the terms "Roma" and "Gypsy" sparingly, while the term "disadvantageously situated" was used 29 times. Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 297.
- 18 Summary evaluation study on the rate and efficiency of aid used since regime change for the improvement of the situation and advancement of Roma in Hungary. State Audit Office, Institute for Development and Methodology, 2008 [include to bibliography].
- 19 Regarding mother tongue, three Roma groups are defined: Hungarian-speaking Romungro, Hungarian and Vlach (Romani)-speaking Vlach Roma, and Hungarian and Boyash (an archaic version of Romanian)-speaking Boyash Roma.
- 20 István Kemény and Béla Janky, "A 2003. évi cigány felmérésről" [On the 2003 Gypsy survey], in *A magyarországi cigány népesség helyzete a 21. század elején* [The Hungarian Gypsy population in the beginning of 21st century], ed. Ernő Kállai (Budapest: MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2003), 24–25.
- 21 For more on this issue see: Balázs Majtényi and András László Pap, "Uniformizáltak-e az etnikai adatok?" [Eltérő helyzetek az etnikai adatok, információk kezelésénél] [Are ethnic data uniform? Legal options for ethnic data processing], in *Lejtős pálya. Antidiszkrimináció és esélyegyenlőség* [Slippery slope – Antidiscrimination and equality policies], ed. Balázs Majtényi, (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009), 89–110.
- 22 Ethnic data collection in the interest of executing fundamental rights is tied to the conditions and rules for protecting personal data. Individuals are provided with guaranteed protection, but in the majority of cases the creation of ethnic data and the use of it by state authorities is not ruled out. As such, the rules protecting personal data can be interpreted as defining the authorization of data handling, and excluding the possibility that those unauthorized would have access to the data, and in some cases later, when the handling of such data is no longer necessary, it will be erased.
- 23 In January of 2008, a five-person group attacked a Roma woman and her daughter in Szigetvár. The perpetrators were sentenced by the first instance court for truculence. In April of 2009, after an appeal to the Baranya County Court, the higher court passed a sentence on violence against the group, in accordance with the Criminal Code (174/B). For more information see: Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), "Addressing Violence, Promoting Integration. Field Assessment of Violent Incidents against Roma in Hungary: Key Developments, Findings and Recommendations," report on a field assessment in Hungary in June-July 2009 (Warsaw: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2010).
- 24 After murders in Tatárszentgyörgy, Gypsies in Miskolc attacked a car that was "patrolling" near their homes. The car damage was estimated at 100,000 forints, and the passengers were lightly injured. The court sentenced the eleven charged for a total

- of forty-one years imprisonment. In September of 2009, a group of mostly Gypsies harassed a student in Tavaszmező street in Józsefváros (an inner district of Budapest): seven persons charged were sentenced a total of twenty-nine years in prison.
- 25 This approach reflects situations outside Europe as well. For example, in Canada non-assimilated immigrant groups are considered minorities.
- 26 A few EU member states—like France and Greece—do not recognize minorities at all.
- 27 The two most famous definitions are the one written by Francesco Capotorti and embraced by academics, and that of the Council of Europe’s Recommendation 1201. For more on this issue see: Francesco Capotorti, *Study on the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. 1979, Un Doc E/CN.4/Sub. 2/384/Rev.1.; RECOMMENDATION 1201 (1993) on an additional protocol on the rights of national minorities to the European Convention on Human Rights Article 1.
- 28 According to the former Minority Act (Art. 1(2)), “a national or ethnic minority (hereinafter ‘minority’) is an ethnic group which has been living on the territory of the Republic of Hungary for at least one century, which represents a numerical minority among the citizens of the state, the members of which are Hungarian citizens, and are distinguished from the rest of the citizens by their own language, culture and traditions, and at the same time demonstrate a sense of belonging together, which is aimed at the preservation of all these, and at the expression and the protection of the interests of their historical communities.” According to the Act (Art. 61(1)), the following groups qualified as autochthonous national or ethnic groups: Bulgarian, Roma, Greek, Croatian, Polish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serb, Slovak, Slovenian and Ukrainian.
- 29 Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the Rights of Nationalities.
- 30 The majority of Greeks in Hungary, for example, are not descendants of families who lived in the territory of the country hundreds of years ago and since assimilated. Rather, most of them are Greek communist partisans and their offspring who came to Hungary after losing the civil war. (In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Orthodox Christians from the Balkans who settled in the country were often called “Greeks,” but it is likely that the majority of them did not speak Greek as their mother tongue.) The Armenians who speak Armenian in Hungary are not the descendants of Armenians from Hungary in the nineteenth-century, but instead the descendants of those who fled the Armenian genocide in 1916 and came to Hungary.
- 31 Clifford Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 255–310; Mátyás Binder, “Beások, etnikai mobilizáció és identitás” [The Hungarian Boyash Gypsies, ethnic mobilization and identity] *Kisebbségkutatás* 18, no. 2 (2009): 207–228.
- 32 The first Appendix to the Minority Act left the list unchanged but replaced the term Gypsies to Roma.
- 33 Majtényi, *A nemzetállam új ruhája*.
- 34 János Kis, “Beyond the Nation State,” *Social Research* 63, no. 1 (1995): 224–237.
- 35 Joseph Raz, “Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective,” *Dissent* 41 (1994): 78.
- 36 Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 174.
- 37 Joseph Raz, “Multiculturalism,” *Ratio Juris* 11, no. 3 (September 1998): 193–205
- 38 *Ibid.*, 198.
- 39 *Ibid.*

- 40 “The law is not to blame, but its application”. Paulus (Digest, XXVI. II. 30).
- 41 For more on this issue see: Vera Messing, “Egymásnak kiszolgáltatva. Inter-etnikus konfliktusok és a média” [At the mercy of each other. Interethnic conflicts and the media], in *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [Minority among the minorities: Human and political rights of Roma in Hungary], ed. Mária Neményi and Júlia Szalai (Budapest: Új Mandátum Kiadó, 2005), 316-353.
- 42 Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship*.
- 43 Bruno De Witte, “Politics versus Law in the EU’s Approach to Ethnic Minorities,” European University Institute Working Paper, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, no. 4 (Florence: European University Institute, 2000).
- 44 Jenő Kaltenbach, interview by György Kerényi. “Fontos, hogy ne veszítsem el a jóérzésű közvélemény bizalmát’ Kaltenbach Jenő kisebbségi ombudsmannal Kerényi György beszélget [An interview with Jenő Kaltenbach, parliamentary commissioner for minority rights, by György Kerényi] *Fundamentum* 2 (2000): 37; Ernő Kállai, *Helyi cigány kisebbségi önkormányzatok Magyarországon* [Local Gypsy self-governments in Hungary] (Budapest: MTA Etnikai-nemzetiségi Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gondolat Kiadói Kör, 2005).
- 45 Mária Demeter Zayzon, ed., *Kisebbségek Magyarországon, 1999* [Minorities in Hungary, 1999] (Budapest: Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Hivatal, 2000), 42.
- 46 Emilia Molnár and Kai A. Schafft, “A helyi roma/cigány kisebbségi önkormányzatok tevékenysége és céljai Magyarországon 2000–2001-ben” [The activities and goals of local Roma/Gypsy minority self-governments in Hungary in 2000 and 2001], *Szociológiai Szemle* 1 (2003): 79–99.
- 47 According to Act LXI of 2002 on the modification to the Constitution of the Republic of Hungary Act XX of 1949, § 7, the active voting right of all citizens in national and ethnic minority self-government elections was suspended, effective May 1, 2004. Later, the voting requirements for national and ethnic elections were defined in Act CXIV of 2005, § 2. The rules established in 2005 were the foundation for Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the rights of nationalities.
- 48 Balázs Majtényi, “Mi lesz veled ‘bezzeggyerek’? Változóban a kisebbségi jogi szabályozás” [What Has Happened to Our Model Child? The Amendments of the Hungarian Minority Law], *Fundamentum* 3 (2005): 109–120; Balázs Majtényi, “What Has Happened to Our Model Child? The Creation and Evolution of the Hungarian Minority Act,” *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 5 (2006): 397–419.
- 49 Béla Osztójkán, “Mint a pelikánok” [Like Pelicans], in *Fekete korall. Verses antológia* [Black Coral. Poetry anthology], ed. József Choli Daróczi (Budapest: Táncsics Könyvkiadó, 1981), 96.
- 50 Márta Blaha, Gábor F. Havas and Sándor Révész, “Nyerőviszonyok. Roma politikatörténet” [Winner relationships. Roma political history] *Beszélő* 19 (1995): 23–24.
- 51 *Magyar Nemzet*, August 28, 1989; September 4.
- 52 Blaha, Havas, Révész, “Nyerőviszonyok,” 25–26.
- 53 *Ibid.*, 24–25.
- 54 Sándor Révész, “Hosszú útról visszatérni” [Returning from a long way] *Beszélő* 13 (April 1995): 6–7.
- 55 Wizner, “Osztok, keverek,” 433.
- 56 *Népszabadság*, April 3, 1995. Quoted in: Révész, “Hosszú útról,” 7.
- 57 On the colonization and logic of Roma politics see: Révész, “Hosszú útról”; Aladár Horváth, “A hűbéres cigánypolitika folyamatosága” [The continuity of vassal Gypsy

- policy], *Amaro Drom*, special issue based on “Humán Rajt” conference presentations (Székesfehérvár, May 14, 1995), 5
- 58 Ernő Kállai, “Válogatás a magyarországi romákat érintő legfontosabb eseményekből, 2002–2006” [A selection from the most important events concerning the Hungarian Roma], in *Átszervezések kora. Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2002–2006* [A Period of Reorganizations: Being a Gypsy in Hungary – Report 2002–2006], ed. Ernő Kállai and Erika Törzsök (Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2006), 15.
- 59 After the 2006 minority self-government elections the Hungarian Roma Parliament, led by Jenő Zsigó, found itself in a minority position in the Budapest Gypsy Minority Self-Government. In March of 2007 István Makai, the head of the Roma Civic Group, was elected president of the Budapest Gypsy Minority Self-Government.
- 60 For further details on the NGO’s human rights movement in Hungary see: Lilla Farkas, “Kis magyar jogvédelem-történet” [Short Hungarian story of human rights NGO activism], *Fundamentum* 4 (2009): 161–167.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 161.
- 62 Farkas mentions the Roma Civil Rights Movement’s case on the segregated graduation ceremony in Tiszavasvári as an example. *Ibid.*, 161.
- 63 There are many more media outlets that have appeared since the regime change that are for Roma, about Roma or produced in the name of Roma. These include *Glinda*, *Lungo Drom* and *Világunk* periodicals; C-Press press agency; and romapage.hu, romaweb.hu, romnet.hu and recently sosinet.hu websites.
- 64 Aladár Horváth, “A leggyorsabban megtérülő befektetés a szegényekben van. Horváth Aladárral a Roma Polgárjogi Alapítvány elnökével, miniszterelnöki tanácsadóval Révész Sándor és Zádori Zsolt beszélget” [An interview with Aladár Horvath President of the Roma Civil Rights Foundation, advisor of the Prime Minister, by Sándor Révész and Zsolt Zádori], *Beszélő* 11 (2002): 36–42.
- 65 Several asylum seekers were granted political asylum in March of 2001. The European Court of Human Rights declared that the plaintiffs had not exhausted all legal opportunities and deemed the complaint unjustified on June 8, 2001. The full ECHR procedure is laid out in: Tamás Bán, “Az Emberi Jogok Európai Bíróságának ítéleteiből” [On the judgements of the European Court of Justice], *Fundamentum* 3 (2001): 112–113.
- 66 For example: Mihály Máté *Lovári nyelvkönyv. Lovareski shib* [Lovári textbook] (Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1994); Anna Orsós, *Beás nyelvkönyv kezdőknek. Pályimbá bájásilor* [Boyash textbook for beginners] (Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1994); Ervin Karsai and Ilona Sztojók, *Romano–ungriko alavari. Cigány–magyar kisszótár* [Concise Gypsy-Hungarian dictionary] (Medgyesegyháza: Anda Romani Kultúra Alapítvány, 1998); Ervin Karsai, *A cigány nyelvjárások. Le romane dialekturi I–II* [Gypsy dialects] (Medgyesegyháza: Anda Romani Kultúra Alapítvány), 1999.
- 67 Ervin Karsai and György Rostás-Farkas, *A cigányok története. Le romengi historija* [The history of Gypsies] (Budapest: Művelődési és Közoktatási Minisztérium – Cigány Tudományos és Művészeti Társaság, 1992).
- 68 The periodical *Rom Som*, which was relaunched in 1995, included a volume named *Romane poetongi antológia*, in which the poems of Gypsy poets from Hungary and abroad were published. The three-language publication was a message from Roma artists claiming that their art was connected not only to Hungarian literature but to international Roma

literature as well, and that it should be understood in this context. József Choli Daróczi, József Hontalan Kovács, and Gusztáv Nagy, eds., *Romane poetongi antológia* [Anthology of Gypsy Poets] (Budapest: Ariadne Kulturális Alapítvány, 1995). In 1996 Károly Bari published an anthology of European Roma poets—including Hungarian Roma—entitled *Madarak az aranyhegedűn* [Birds on the golden violin] (Budapest: Romano Kher, 1996). In 1998 József Choli Daróczi edited the second volume of an anthology of Roma artists' works under the title *Fekete korall II. Antológia* [Black Coral Anthology II] (Budapest: Choli, 1998). In the same year Gusztáv Nagy published an edited volume of pieces by Roma writers under title *Az idő szekerén* [On the wagon of time] (Budapest: Ubipressz Bt., 1998.). In 2001 a publication representing Roma culture was printed, selected by Gusztáv Nagy and József Choli Daróczi, entitled *Roma kincses kalendárium 2001 / Romano kalendari 2001* [Romani Calendar], (Budapest: Széphalom Könyvműhely, 2001).

- 69 For a summary of the social and cultural roles of Gypsy musicians see: Ernő Kállai, "A cigányzenészek helye és szerepe a magyar társadalomban és a magyar kultúrában" [Status and role of Gypsy musicians in Hungarian society and culture], in *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből* [Space and Field. Studies on ethnicity and identity], ed. Nóra Kovács and László Szarka (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2002), 327–345; Ernő Kállai, "Cigányzenészek" [Gypsy Musicians], in *Roma migráció* [Romani migration], ed. András Kovács (Budapest: MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Nemzetközi Migrációs és Menekültügyi Kutatóközpont, 2002), 72–90.
- 70 Péter Szuhay provides an overview of representations in Roma fine arts and photographic arts. Based on his study the main stations in the process of (self-)representation since the regime change are as follows: the Ethnography Museum opened an exhibit called "Images of the Hungarian Gypsy community from the history of the 20th century" in 1993 and "Roma in Central and Eastern Europe" in 1998. The latter—with an eye to the self-representation efforts of Roma artists—sharply distinguished Gypsy images by members of the "majority" and works of Gypsy self-image representation. On the 60th anniversary of the Roma Holocaust in 2004, thirteen Roma artists contributed to a joint project called "Common Memories." In the spring of 2005 a review exhibit called "Images, Gypsies and Gypsy images" opened in the exhibit hall of Millenáris Park in Budapest. It covered photographic images of Gypsies in Hungary and provoked a spirited debate in the press over whether outsider "majority" representations are acceptable to the Roma. A private initiative in 2009 saw the formation of the fresco village in Bódvalenke, within the framework of which Hungarian and foreign Roma painted frescos on the walls of village houses. In 2007 Tímea Junghaus organized the Roma pavilion exhibit at the Venice Biennale. In 2007 an exhibit put together from photos of the Chachipe Photo Contest were displayed at the Central Gallery of the OSA Archives, in a move against the presentation of Roma stereotypes. Szuhay, "Ki beszél?" 373–386.
- 71 Szuhay, "Cigány kultúra," 329–330.
- 72 Ernő Kállai, "Válogatás," 55.
- 73 Act XL of 1999 on the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, announced in Strasbourg on November 5, 1992.
- 74 These were: Croatian, German, Romanian, Serbian, Slovak and Slovenian.
- 75 Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003*, 42.
- 76 Act XLIII of 2008 on the extension of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages to Romani and Beash languages as a liability undertaken in the European Charter.

- 77 For more see: Lídia Balogh, “Jog a kultúra őrzésére – vagy ürügy a szegregációra? A roma nemzetiségi oktatás mint kétélű kard Magyarországon” [Right to safeguard culture – or an excuse for segregation? Roma minority education in Hungary as a double-edged sword], *Pro Minoritate* 20 (Spring 2012): 207–223.
- 78 Published dossier of the Supreme Court, EBH 2001. The decision of the court contained the following: “The legality of the decision...to justify banning all Roma students from using the gym for good based on the occasional infection of some Roma students (even if this infection was at times quite significant).”
- 79 *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- 80 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- 81 See: Lídia Balogh et al. *Antidiszkriminációs és esélyegyenlőségi alapismeretek* [Fundamentals of antidiscrimination and equal opportunities] (Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2010), 19–20.
- 82 For more details see: Botond Bitskey and Tamás Gyulavári, “Az antidiszkriminációs szabályozás reformja” [The new framework of the anti-discrimination law], *Acta Humana* 4 (2004): 13–40.
- 83 *Ibid.*, 15.
- 84 See for example Constitutional Court decision 41/2007. (VI. 20.).
- 85 Article 13 of the European Union Directive on Racial Equality committed Hungary to establishing a separate institution for the execution of equal treatment principles. The Equal Treatment Authority began its operations on February 1, 2005, even though Hungary—just like the other countries that joined the EU at the same time—should have passed the Act carrying out the directive immediately. The Authority is expected to be “independent,” but this is compromised by the fact that it is under the aegis of a ministry. Among other things this authority—should it discover breaches of the law—can order a cessation of the breach, mete out fines (of a sum between 50,000 and 6 million forints), or make use of legal consequences laid out in other laws. It further has the ability to launch communal suits (it has not used this right), offer its opinion on bills, offer its recommendations to government, provide information and aid in the effort to confront trespasses of equal treatment.
- 86 Judgment 6.P.20.341/2006/50.
- 87 Országgyűlési Biztosok Hivatala [Parliamentary Commissioners’ Office], “Beszámoló a nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségi jogok országgyűlési biztosának tevékenységéről” [Report on the activities of the Parliamentary Commissioner on the rights of national and ethnic minorities], 2001, 83–86.
- 88 See the 2008 report of the Minority Ombudsperson: Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Jogok Országgyűlési Biztosa [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities], “Jelentés a szociális ellátásokat szigorító egyes helyi önkormányzati rendeletek kisebbségi jogi szempontú vizsgálatáról (a ‘monoki modell’)” [Report on municipal resolutions making social services stricter from the point of view of minority rights (the ‘Monok model’)].
- 89 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, U.N.T.S. Vol. 1249, 1979, 13. Executed in Hungary through Decree 10 of 1982.
- 90 *A.S. v. Hungary*, Communication No. 4/2004, CEDAW/C/36/D/4/2004.
- 91 UN CEDAW Communication No. 4/2004.
- 92 József Oláh, “Romák társadalmi kirekesztése vagy társadalmi befogadása?” [Inclusion or Exclusion of the Roma in Society?], *Regio* 1 (2006): 211.

- 93 Some examples: the establishment of the Roma Parliament's crisis management and legal aid office in 1994; the organization of the Roma Press Center's information center in 1995; the magazine *Amaro Drom* in 1996; the launch of Romaversitas in 1997. Source: <http://romaprogramok.soros.hu/index.php?id=121>.
- 94 For a summary of the tendering system see: Wizner, "Osztok keverek"
- 95 People's colleges operated in Hungary from 1945 to 1949, and enabled talented young people from poor—mainly peasant—families to gain a university degree.
- 96 R. Katalin Forray and T. András Hegedűs, *Cigányok, iskola, oktatáspolitiká* [Gypsies, school, education policy] (Budapest: Oktatókutató Intézet – Új Mandátum, 2003), 157–160.
- 97 Diósi, *Szemtől szemben*, 85.
- 98 Forray and Hegedűs, *Cigányok, iskola, oktatáspolitiká*, 160; Tünde Virág, "Hátrányos helyzetű cigány fiatalok középfokú oktatási intézményei és lehetőségei" [Secondary schools and possibilities of underprivileged youth], *Iskolakultúra* 12 (2009): 102–115.
- 99 Virág, "Hátrányos helyzetű cigány fiatalok,"
- 100 Source: <http://www.ambedkar.hu>; <http://www.kistigrisgimi.extra.hu/>.
- 101 Gábor Fleck and Vera Messing, "A roma foglalkoztatáspolitiká alakváltozásai" [Metamorphosis of the Roma employment policy], in *Közlekp. Munkapiaci diszkrimináció*, eds Anna Lovász and Álmos Telegdy (2009), 84; accessed April 8, 2015, <http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt09/hu/kozelkep.pdf>.
- 102 M. László Ferenc, "Önerőt merítették – Roma foglalkoztatási programok I." [Roma employment programs I], *Oknyomozó* (2009), accessed April 8, 2015, <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/38>.
- 103 Zsuzsa Szóke, "A roma (nem)foglalkoztatási program" [The roma (non)employment program], *Beszélő* 1 (2010): 35.
- 104 *Ibid.*, 35–36.
- 105 *Ibid.*, 35; Szilvia Varró, *Céltalanul – Az MSZP–SZDSZ kormányok romapolitikája 2002 óta* [Without aims. Roma policy of the MSZP–SZDSZ government] (2009), accessed April 8, 2015, <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/22>.
- 106 M. László Ferenc, "Sziszüphosz a Csereháton – Roma foglalkoztatási programok II." [Roma employment programs II], *Oknyomozó* (2009), accessed April 8, 2015, <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/39>.
- 107 László Tenigl Takács, "Korunk mantrái" [The mantra of the era], *Mozgó Világ* 2 (2010): 70–78.
- 108 Jenő Zsigó, "Feltárni és megnevezni az elnyomások direkt rendszerét" [To disclose and name the direct system of subordinations], in *Kisebbségek kisebbsége* [Minority among the minorities: Human and political rights of Roma in Hungary], ed. Mária Neményi and Júlia Szalai (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005), 7–41.
- 109 Júlia Szalai, *Uram! A jogaimért jöttem! Esszék, tanulmányok* [Sir! I am claiming my rights! Essays and studies] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998).
- 110 *Ibid.*, 58.
- 111 Júlia Szalai, *Nincs két ország? Társadalmi küzdelmek az állami (túl)elosztásért a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon* [There is but one country? Social struggles for (excessive) state redistribution in Hungary during the transition] (Budapest: Osiris, 2007): 48–19, 60, 172, 195.
- 112 Amartya Sen, *Social Exclusion: Concept, Application and Scrutiny*. Office of Environment and Social Development, Asian Development Bank, Social Development Papers No. 1 (June 2000).

- 113 Monika Mária Váradi, “Szegénység, kirekesztettség” [Poverty, exclusion], in *Közösségtanulmány. Módszertani jegyzet* [Community Studies. A methodological handbook], ed. Éva Kovács (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum – Pécsi Tudományegyetem BTK Kommunikáció- és Médiatudományi Tanszék, 2007), 69–87.
- 114 Éva Havasi, “Megélhetési nehézségek, anyagi depriváció” [Subsistence Difficulties, Material Deprivation], in *Feketén, fehéren* [Black and white], ed. Péter Szívós and István György Tóth (Budapest: Társki, Monitor jelentések, 2006), 59–82.
- 115 László Bass et al., *A szegénység és kirekesztés változása, 2001–2006* [Changes in poverty and exclusion, 2001–2006] (Budapest: MTA KTI Gyerekprogram Iroda, 2007).
- 116 János Ladányi and Iván Szelényi, “Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában” [Gypsies and poor people in Hungary, Romania and in Bulgaria], *Szociológiai Szemle* 4 (2002): 72–94.
- 117 Tünde Virág, *Kirekesztve: Falusi gettók az ország peremén* [Excluded: Rural ghettos at the edges of the country] (Budapest: Akadémiai, 2010), 133–135.
- 118 *Ibid.*, 141.
- 119 Act CLXX of 2005 on the Amendment of Act III of 1993 on Social Administration and Social Welfare Benefits.
- 120 Virág, *Kirekesztve*, 147.
- 121 *Ibid.*, 150–151.
- 122 Gábor Kertesi, *A társadalom peremén. Romák a munkaerőpiacon és az iskolában* [On the edge of society. Roma in school and the labor market] (Budapest: Osiris, 2005), 105.
- 123 *Ibid.*, 17.
- 124 Béla Janky, “A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete” [The income status of Gypsy families], in *Társadalmi riport* [Social report], ed. Tamás Kolosi, István György Tóth and György Vukovich (Budapest: TÁRKI, 2004), 402; Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság*.
- 125 Emília Molnár and Csaba Dupcsik, *Country Report on Education: Hungary, 2008*, 17–18, accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/documents/edumigrom_background_paper_hungary_educ.pdf.
- 126 Jerne Szűgyi, “Numerus nullus. Szegregáció és deszegregáció a magyar közoktatásban” [Numerus nullus: Segregation and desegregation in the Hungarian public education system], *Beszélő* 9 (2008): 87; Jerne Szűgyi, “Labirintuspróba. A fogyatékosná nyilvánítás útvesztői” [The labyrinth test. The road to declaring disability], *Beszélő* 3 (2009): 48.
- 127 Gábor Havas and Ilona Liskó, *Szegregáció a roma tanulók általános iskolai oktatásában* [Segregation of Roma students in primary schools] (Budapest: Felsőoktatási Kutatóintézet, 2005).
- 128 Kertesi, *A társadalom peremén*, xviii.
- 129 Judit Durst, “Minden évben máshogy fordul a világ. A telepfelszámolástól a szegregált cigány faluig” [From the elimination of the Gypsy settlements to the segregated Gypsy village], *anBlok*, 4 (2010): 34–38.
- 130 Kemény, Janky and Lengyel, *A magyarországi cigányság*, 57; Janky, “A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete,” 402.
- 131 János Ladányi and Virág Tünde, “A szociális és etnikai alapú lakóhelyi szegregáció változó formái Magyarországon a piacgazdaság átmeneti időszakában” [Changing forms of social and ethnic-based housing segregation in Hungary in the transitional period of the market economy], *Kritika* 8–9 (2009): 2–8.

- 132 Ulrich Beck, *Die Erfindung des Politischen: Zu einer Theorie reflexiver Modernisierung* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1993), 72–80.
- 133 Roma Sajtóközpont [Roma Press Center], “Köznapi események krónikája 1997” [Chronical of Everyday Events, 1997] (Budapest: Magyar Helsinki Bizottság – Roma Sajtóközpont, 1998).
- 134 Source: http://www.hirtv.hu/belfold/?article_hid=256286.
- 135 For more on this topic: András Kristóf Kádár, Balázs M. Tóth and András László Pap, “Diszkrimináció az igazoltatási gyakorlatban – egy empirikus kutatás eredményei” [Ethnic profiling in the stop and search practices of the Hungarian police – Results of an empirical study], *Rendészeti Szemle* 57, no. 9 (2009): 50–67; András Kristóf Kádár, Zsófia Moldova, Balázs M. Tóth and András László Pap, “Igazolt igazoltatás” [On police stop and search], *Rendészeti Szemle* 56, no. 5 (2008): 106–132; András Kristóf Kádár and András László Pap, “Police Ethnic Profiling in Hungary – An Empirical Research,” *Acta Iuridica Hungarica* 50, no. 3 (2009): 253–267.
- 136 MIÉP garnered 5.5% of the popular vote in the 1998 parliamentary elections.
- 137 “Gábor Bethlen Program,” point 9., Order is the soul of all things. The full text of the program is available at: http://www.jobbik.hu/rovatok/bethlen_gabor_program/bethlen_gabor_program.
- 138 “Lemondott a Jobbik három alapítója a Magyar Gárda miatt” [Three Jobbik founders quit because of Hungarian Guard], <http://portal.jobbik.net/index.php?q=node/5734>. For a summary of events surrounding the Hungarian Guard: B. Attila Hidvégi, “Gárdaszellem” [Garda’s Spirit], in *Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2007* [A Roma’s life in Hungary. Report 2007], ed. Törzsök Erika, Paskó Ildi and Zolnay János (Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2008).
- 139 Anita Danka, “Rossz helyen lenni rossz időben, avagy mit üzennek a gyűlölet-bűncselekmények?” [Wrong Times, Wrong Place: What is the Message of Hate Crimes?], *Föld-rész* 3–4. (2009): 92.
- 140 FigyelőNet: “A romák tovább járőröznek” [The Roma continue to patrol], August 25, 2009, http://www.fn.hu/baleset_bunugy/;20090825/ro_mak_tovabb_jaroroznek.
- 141 Report on the circumstances of the double murder in Tatárszentgyörgy on February 23, 2009 and the ensuing investigation: European Roma Rights Center, Legal Protection Office for National and Ethnic Minorities, Hungarian Civil Liberties Union joint report, p. 8, http://www.nwki.hu/attachments/487_TSZ_Jelentes.pdf.
- 142 The program saw the establishment of legal aid offices in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County and Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County.
- 143 On July 2, 2009, the appeal court confirmed the decision of the lower court: during deliberation it referred to the European Convention on Human Rights (Rome Convention) Article 5 (right to freedom and security) as well as the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) Article 4, point b (banning organizations agitating for racial separation). Court of Budapest, decision no. 5.Pf.20.738/2009/7. Full text available at: http://www.itelotabla.hu/fileadmin/fajlok/fovaros/2009/mg_itelet090716.doc.
- 144 Founding statement available at: http://magyargarda.hu/alapito_nyilatkozat.
- 145 Guy Lázár, “A felnőtt lakosság nemzeti identitása a kisebbségekhez való viszony tükrében” [The national identity of the adult population in the light of its relation to

- minorities], in *Többség – Kisebbség. Tanulmányok a nemzeti tudat témaköréből* [Majority – Minority: Studies on national identity], ed. Guy Lázár, Judit Lendvay, Antal Örkény and Ildikó Szabó (Budapest: Osiris – MTA–ELTE Kommunikációelméleti Kutatócsoport, 1996).
- 146 TÁRKI – Omnibusz-research, 2008.
- 147 In Hungary in 2006, 59 percent of respondents did not want to accept Pirezians, while a repeated survey in February of 2007 showed that anti-Pirezianism increased to 68 percent. It decreased to 63 percent in June of 2009. See: <http://www.tarki.hu/hu/news/2009/kitekint/20090708.html>.
- 148 “Kimondva, kimondatlanul” (Szerkesztői bevezető) [Said without saying it (Editorial introduction)], *anBlok* 4 (2010): 4–5; Angéla Kóczé and Éva Kovács. “Ezt még igazából nem dolgoztuk föl.” Beszélgetés Kóczé Angélával és Kovács Évával, a Méltóságot Mindenkinnek Mozgalom tagjaival. Készítette: Horváth Kata és Kovai Cecília [An interview with Angéla Kóczé and Éva Kovács, members of the movement *Dignity for everyone*, by Kata Horváth and Cecília Kovai], *AnBlok* 4 (2010): 26–27.
- 149 Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 336.
- 150 Of course a lack of high-quality expert studies is not the reason that Hungary does not use evidence-based policy making. The opposite is true: there is no political and policy pressure on decision makers to make use of social science research results.
- 151 Michael Stewart, “A roma/cigány ‘ethnicitás’ az antropológiai vizsgálatok homlokterében” [Roma/Gypsy ‘ethnicity’ in the foreground of anthropological research] in *Etnicitás. Különbségtéremtő társadalom* [Ethnicity. Distinction and difference in the society], ed. Margit Feischmidt (Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010), 36.
- 152 Dupcsik, *A magyarországi cigányság története*, 20–26, 249–267.
- 153 Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge* (Basic Books, New York 1983).
- 154 Vera Messing, “Gondolatok Rogers Brubaker: Csoportok nélküli etnicitás c. könyve kapcsán” [Some thoughts on Rogers Brubaker’s book *Ethnicity without Groups*], *Regio* 1 (2006): 217.
- 155 It seems as if the question of when a body of research constructs and then deconstructs, all while Roma communities change with the passing of time, depends primarily on science’s own sense of time (on the context defining scientific text). As Vera Messing put it: “There is a new Roma/Gypsy identity forming in a generation with strong consciousness and ethnic affiliation, of which the science and politics of the majority does not take note. The process of forming identity and community is by all means worth analyzing.” Messing, “Gondolatok,” 217.
- 156 Anderson, *Imagined Communities: On the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*.
- 157 Sándor Romano Rác, *Cigány sor* [Gypsy quarter] (Budapest: Osiris, 2008).
- 158 Ian Hancock, “On Romani origins and Romani identity: A Reassessment of the arguments” (2004), p. 118, accessed April 8, 2015, http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_b_history_origins&lang=en&articles=true.
- 159 Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).
- 160 Fredrik Barth, “Boundaries and connections,” in *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Identities*, ed. Anthony P. Cohen (London: Routledge, 2000), 17–36.
- 161 Anthony Cohen, “Culture as Identity: An Anthropologist’s View,” *New Literary History* 24, no. 1 (1993): 195–209.

Panopticon: Roma Policy, 2010–2015

There are many ways of conceptualizing the state: some explain it through its operations, existence and institutions. In Foucault's writing we encounter a concept borrowed from Bentham: the metaphor for the state is the panopticon. This word is derived from ancient Greek for "all" (pan) and "view" (opticon). According to this approach institutions create a unique order in society. A massive building in the form of a ring encircles a central tower. It contains small cells, each with two windows, one looking outward and the other looking in, one letting light in from outside, the other making the prisoner visible to those in the tower. This is the modern institution of control, with the essence of cell life being full-time control. To see and to be seen in the light have different meanings, given that all are visible from the tower, which appears as scanning everyone and everything. The imprisonment is real, but the view and image created are illusions of power; it is a simple and uniform image. In other words, our view of the individual changes when he/she is locked in a health care, housing or education institution "cell." The essence of locking people up is not the presentation of "reality" but the securing of state control, of legitimizing power.¹ The power of the state exists in our lives as long as individuals are visible through the institutions of power. As Michel Foucault states, "The Panopticon is a marvelous machine which, whatever use one may wish to put it to, produces homogeneous effects of power."²

In this closing chapter of the book we describe and reflect on policy since 2010, which in our view is a shift in the entire political system and in Gypsy policy from the main direction of policy in the period between 1989 and 2010, which supported liberal democracy.

The Hungarian National Cooperation System

In May of 2010 the National Assembly of the Republic of Hungary accepted the government program of the Fidesz-KDNP party alliance that obtained more than two-thirds of mandates in the parliamentary election.³ Shortly thereafter, in June 2010, the National Assembly approved the Declaration on National Cooperation as a political document, in which it declared that “a new social contract was laid down in the April general elections through which the Hungarians decided to create a new system: the National Cooperation System.”⁴

The Hungarian Parliament passed Hungary’s new constitution (entitled the Fundamental Law) on April 18, 2011, which entered into force on January 1, 2012 and superseded the previous constitution (Constitution of 1989). The Fundamental Law and its five amendments were passed by members of the Parliament belonging to the governing party alliance, without the support of the opposition parties.

The government has increasingly committed itself to the majoritarian conception of democracy, meaning that nobody and nothing, not even independent state institutions, can stand in the way of the will of the “majority” serving national interests.⁵ Following the restriction of powers of independent state institutions (e.g., the Constitutional Court, ombudspersons, judiciary), from August 2013 on, actions were taken by the government and state bodies against independent NGOs, including tax inspections and criminal procedures, in a manner familiar in authoritarian states.⁶ According to many, the speech of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán delivered before an ethnic Hungarian audience on July 26, 2014 in Băile Tușnad (its Hungarian name is Tusnádfürdő), Romania, clearly defines the character of the new Hungarian constitutional system, the so-called “National Cooperation system”: “We have abandoned liberal methods and principles of organizing society, as well as the liberal way to look at the world [...] We are [...] parting ways with Western European dogmas, making ourselves independent from them [...]. This is about the ongoing reorganization of the Hungarian state. Contrary to the liberal state organization logic of the past twenty years, this is a state organization originating from national interests.”⁷

The Prime Minister presumably wished the speech to be symbolic, since it was presented in a part of Romania inhabited mostly by Hungarians. As opposed to the liberal conception of democracy, Orbán argued for an illiberal, majoritarian conception, thereby opening a new chapter in the constitutional history of Hungary after the political transition in 1989.⁸

The anti-egalitarian character of the system

The Hungarian Constitution of 2011 is introduced by a lengthy preamble (National Avowal), which defines the national identity of the state. The preamble provides a premodern list of non-neutral cohesive values such as fidelity, faith and love,⁹ belonging to the Christian Church and belonging to the Hungarian ethnic nation, while it does not mention, for instance, the principle of equality.¹⁰

The Preamble introduces an ethnic concept of the nation as a source of state power.¹¹ This is made clear in the very first sentence of the preamble: “We, the members of the Hungarian nation, at the beginning of the new millennium, with a sense of responsibility for every Hungarian, hereby proclaim the following...”¹² As János Kis points out, the Fundamental Law defines the nation “as a community, the binding fabric of which is intellectual and spiritual,”¹³ and it links the nation to Christianity, stating that “we recognize the role of Christianity in preserving nationhood.”¹⁴ There is not a single reference to the political nation: the phrase “we the people” and the sense of identity expressed therein do not appear.¹⁵ National and ethnic minorities could not participate in the creation of the constitution. Moreover, in 2010, the Hungarian Parliament adopted an amendment to the Act on Hungarian citizenship and in light of the ethnic concept of nation it introduced a new naturalization procedure for ethnic Hungarians living outside Hungary’s borders. It offered extraterritorial citizenship for ethnic Hungarians living abroad, arguing that the new citizenship policies serve symbolic “national reunification beyond borders.”¹⁶

There is no facing the past in Hungary. As János Kis stated, “The Fundamental Law only recognizes the (pre-1944) glorious pages of Hungarian history, but does not acknowledge the acts and failures that give cause for self-criticism. It only holds to account the—reputed or genuine—injuries to the Hungarian people by foreign powers, and does not wish to acknowledge the wrongs committed by the Hungarian state against its own citizens and other peoples.”¹⁷ The discourse on history is thus a means for the struggle of identity politics, and in turn it shapes political identity. In specific, considering and emphasizing aspects of constitutionality and equality strengthens democratic political culture, while incorporating anti-egalitarian values weakens it. Historians and politicians who participate in the process of shaping national identity must be held responsible for their choice. Currently, the interpretation of national history in the Fundamental Law weakens democratic political culture.

The passages of the Fundamental Law not only anticipate the dismantling of the welfare system but also foreshadow and/or demand social processes that will



On the way to Munich. Lawyer Henrietta Dinók reads the first comments on the Fundamental Law. Budapest – München international train, 2012

lead to the exclusion of the Roma. The Fourth Amendment of the Fundamental Law contains Article XV Paragraph 4 using the term “catching up” alongside equality of opportunity: “By means of separate measures, Hungary shall promote the achievement of equality of opportunity and social catching up.” The earlier term “upgrading,” which envisions state intervention was replaced by the term “catching up” by the government, entailing a concept whereby the efforts of the individual are necessary for success.¹⁸ Purportedly to avoid international criticism the official English translation of the Fundamental Law, the term “catching up” was simply translated as “inclusion.”

The Fundamental Law has provisions that are explicitly against the Roma minority and support the mainstreaming of prejudiced discourse.¹⁹ For instance, Article V states the following: “Everyone shall have the right to repel any unlawful attack against his or her person or property, or one that poses a direct threat to the same, as provided for by an Act.”²⁰ The article is denounced for protecting the ethnic Hungarian middle class from the socially excluded, among whom Roma are overrepresented. Kriszta Kovács points out, “this article is about a right to self-defense in a state of nature described by Hobbes, and not a basic right in a constitutional state.”²¹

Changing minority legislation

The Fundamental Law addresses only Hungarians (the ethnic nation), who thus constitute the subjects of the constitution. In turn, this leads to the erosion of the theoretical basis of minority rights on which the former constitution was based, namely the fundamental principles of the multicultural model.²² It follows that members of recognized “nationalities” (national minorities)²³ such as the Roma, become secondary citizens, and other, non-ethnic Hungarians who do not form a national minority, such as Jews, become third-rate citizens; they are an unequal part of constitutional power. According to the Fundamental Law, national minorities only “form part of the Hungarian political community and are constituent parts of the State.”²⁴ In contrast, the former constitution also mentioned that national and ethnic minorities “participate in the sovereign power of the people.” The new text does not contain this provision. The Hungarian state is harbinger of a new national policy based on exclusion, and the preamble of the Fundamental Law cannot serve as a point of reference for policies and interventions aiming at integration.


Surprisingly, despite changes to the concept of the nation, the document leaves the minority self-government system based on the principle of personal autonomy intact.²⁵ Also, restoring historical names of national minorities, the new constitution uses the term “nationalities” instead of “national and ethnic minorities.”



**Time of the Voivods? Csaba Kállai is declared the national
Voivod of Hungarian Gypsies, 2006**

According to the 1989 constitution, the institution of ombudspersons is based on the conception of equality in rank, namely between specialized ombudsperson for data protection, specialized ombudsperson for future generations,²⁶ and specialized ombudsperson for national and ethnic minorities. The 1989 constitution specified that the Parliament can create ombudsperson positions for the protection of any fundamental right, or interrelated fundamental rights, pertaining to sensitive social issues, provided that the everyday violation of rights threatens the freedom of citizens. Furthermore, the various positions and responsibilities of ombudspersons (minority and data protection, freedom of information) also served to reinforce the implementation of relevant EU directives. This system is now replaced by the institution of one ombudsperson and his/her deputies, thereby the number of independent opponents of the government were reduced. The ombudspersons for future generations and national minorities became deputies of the general ombudsperson, and with this reshuffle they lost their right to conduct independent investigations.

Instead of being a new piece of legislation, the Nationality Act (2011)²⁷ adopted on December 19, 2011 is rather an amendment of the earlier Minority Act (1993),²⁸ with changes aimed mostly at eliminating the dysfunctions of the



Roma children in Parliament, 2005

minority self-government elections. Though many provisions of the new Act are difficult to interpret, it is clear that the rules of the minority self-government elections are changing, first of all by reintroducing the preferential minority mandate for local government elections. The name Gypsy has been changed to Roma, and in the future census data will be used to detect abuses in minority self-government elections.²⁹ The exact method is not clear yet because of the deficiencies of the Act,³⁰ which is loaded with internal contradictions.³¹ In the case of the Roma and the Armenian minorities, for example, the use of the Hungarian language is accepted as a minority language, whereas the definition of nationality includes a condition whereby every nationality should have its own language. Further, it is difficult to understand Article 158 of the Act, which lists the articles of the law that can only be changed by a two-thirds majority in Parliament,³² whereas Article 158 itself does not require this two-thirds qualified majority. This means that it is possible for a simple majority to modify in ways that require a supermajority.

It is further not clear which parts of the text have already entered into force, and which will enter later and when. Some parts of the Act entered into force with the date of its promulgation, other parts on January 1, 2012, and again other parts on March 31, 2012, September 1, 2012, January 1, 2013, September 1, 2013, and some in 2014, at the time of minority and municipal elections. In general, the reconstruction of the legal order since 2010 has led to significant legal uncertainty.



Ernó Kállai. “Last notes and we close the door” from the Ombudsman’s website archive, 2011

The Nationality Act and the Act on the Election of the Members of Parliament introduced representation of nationalities in Parliament, thus allowing all thirteen nationalities acknowledged by the Nationality Act to attain representation in the Parliament at the expense of mandates from the national electoral list. Under a preferential quota, a minority mandate can be won by one-quarter of the number of votes required for mandates from the electoral list. If someone votes for the nationality list, they can of course cast their vote for an individual (district majoritarian) candidate as well. Despite the existence of the preferential quota, nationalities did not succeed in sending a representative to the Parliament in the 2014 elections. This regulation will not be able to exclude the possibility of minority rights abuse because of aforementioned problems of minority voter registration.

Clearly, there is no harmonization between the country's domestic and international and/or EU-level policies. During its EU presidency Hungary announced that the development of the European Union Roma strategy would be a priority during its term.³³ A new national Roma strategy focused on development policy passed in 2011, and is intended to implement profound changes in the situation of Roma by 2020.³⁴ Still, this document deserves serious critique. It resembles a ministerial background report, or a collection of studies on the situation of the Roma minority in Hungary, rather than a strategic program that defines the government's actions. The document lacks concrete ideas: legal solutions and sections on financial resources crop up only occasionally. Later, however, the government made the topic of dire poverty and child poverty taboo, and as such used a new subtitle in a 2014 document: "Long-term dependents – children living in poor families – Roma."

New social policy?

Today, in accordance with the provisions of the Fundamental Law, state representatives envision massive public works programs and construction programs. Meanwhile, in the name of the new concept on fundamental rights, they are also dismantling the institutional system of social aid and breaking through the dyke that was constructed earlier, after the regime change, to obstruct exclusion and segregation in education.

As part of the right to work, Article XII of the Fundamental Law stipulates the obligation to work according to one's abilities and possibilities: "Everyone shall be obliged to contribute to the enrichment of the community through his or her work, in accordance with his or her abilities and possibilities." This provision has the potential to be directed against the Roma community, which is, as shown earlier, afflicted by unfavorable social conditions and widespread prejudices. The

provision removes those fundamental rights guarantees that prevent the introduction of measures that bind unemployment aid to work or to activity deemed to be socially useful.³⁵

The government has put aside the welfare state model to create a new “workfare society” in accordance with the new constitutional framework.³⁶ This approach has a negative effect on those living in dire poverty, especially the Roma.³⁷ Article XIX of the constitution limits the rights of the unemployed, who are only entitled to social aid if they experience “unemployment for reasons outside of his or her control.” Paragraph 3 of the same Article states the following: “The nature and extent of social measures may be determined in an Act in accordance with the usefulness to the community of the beneficiary’s activity.” In the name of the workfare society, in 2011 the workfare program entitled the National Work Plan was passed, which was later renamed the Hungarian National Work Plan. The rationale for the program was the mistaken and prejudiced idea that unemployment is caused not by external circumstances but by a situation whereby it is more advantageous for an individual to exploit social aid and perhaps work in the black market on the side. Thus, it is assumed that the only people who don’t work are those who do not want to. (A more vestigial form of the concept was found before 2010 in the 2009 “Road to Work” program, supported by the socialist-liberal government and Prime Minister Ferenc Gyurcsány.) However, those excluded from the labor market are forced to take on work that will not result in their returning to the labor market (e.g., removing ragweed, mowing grass, cleaning parks and tidying woods). If they do not perform this type of work, they will be denied the minimal benefits.

The “public purpose” program that practically forces people into physical labor and the laws that support it bear a resemblance to both state socialism and the dictatorial heritage from before World War II. On the one hand, the program echoes the state socialist desire to reach full employment and the treatment of employment as a social problem. On the other hand, the attempt to tie social rights to work is reminiscent of authoritarian times. At the same time there are differences also: the social benefits system constructed under state socialism, which served to increase dependence on the state, as we have explained above, has been dismantled. It appears that there was a need to put the poor in a submissive position, while the real goal of social policy was to create a “majority” society and win over the middle class. This was done by exploiting anti-Gypsy and anti-poor sentiments prevailing in society, as well as separating, disciplining, and excluding disadvantaged and minority groups. It is easy to see the parallel between the present program and the policies of pre-WWII authoritarian Horthy regime, given that the current program received the same name as the National Work Plan passed in 1932 under Prime Minister Gyula Gömbös, a

well-known racist. The Gömbös plan subjugated the interests of the individual to those of the nation and sought to offer support to the poor in return for work.

This type of workfare tied to forced labor³⁸ is denoted in legal regulation (Act CVI of 2011), where, following the principle of aid for work, it is stated that those who do not take part in the workfare program for at least thirty days in the given year can be excluded from receiving social benefits. In the same vein, those who do not send their children to school and do not keep their homes and gardens in order are to be excluded from workfare, which pays significantly less than minimum wage. Relatedly, the government lowered the mandatory education age from eighteen to sixteen and dismantled the system for retraining and adult training, making success in the labor market even more difficult and further weakening the chances of the poor to study, find meaningful employment, and attain equality of opportunity in general.³⁹ Recently, lawmakers attempted to dismantle legal obstacles to segregation. The law on public education was modified in 2014, allowing the Minister of Human Capacities to authorize separated education for Roma children in certain cases.⁴⁰

In April of 2015 the Hungarian Supreme Court decided that the educational segregation of Roma children living in dire poverty, under the guise of religious education, was legal. This case was first pushed by the Chance for Children Foundation (CFCF) as an anti-segregation case affecting the Roma residents living in the Huszár section of the city of Nyíregyháza, which is a Gypsy settlement. Responding to pressure from CFCF the municipal authority shut down the school in 2007, but then reopened it in 2011 as a Greek Catholic institution. Minister of Human Resources Zoltán Balog, whose portfolio includes education, has consistently taken the side of the pro-segregation school.

Violence

As we stressed in the Introduction, extreme right-wing and anti-Roma discourse has lately become increasingly mainstream in Hungary, given that an ever larger part of society relates to such discourse.⁴¹ Constitutional provisions are an indirect form of discrimination against socially marginalized groups, and thus also contribute to a violent climate. This is all especially dangerous in this time of open ethnic conflict, when paramilitary groups “patrol” Roma-populated areas of small settlements, and extremist movements incite for action and vigilantism against “Gypsy crime.”

This was all observable in an incident in 2011, which reflected the ever more overt ethnic conflict at the local level. Between March 1 and March 15,



Police check, 2000

2011 members of the Better Future Civic Association,⁴² the Outlaw Platoon and the Defence Force paramilitary groups, all in military-styled outfits, patrolled the streets of Gyöngyöspata, a town of 2,500 people in northeast Hungary.⁴³ The clothing of the Defence Force closely resembled the uniform of the Hungarian Guard, consisting of a white shirt, black vest, boots and outer layer with a coat of arms with Árpád stripes.⁴⁴ (The flag with Árpád stripes was a medieval flag of Arpádházi dynasty in Hungary; in modern Hungarian history it has also become a symbol of extremist right-wing movements.) The patrolling plan was reported to the police ahead of time, who acknowledged it. At the same time the extreme right-wing Jobbik party held a party function on March 6 against “Gypsy terror,” in which local residents appeared alongside party sympathizers from across the country. The aim of the event, when it was announced, was the following: “We are demonstrating at the request of the residents of Gyöngyöspata who are terrorized by the strata of the local Gypsy population living off of crime...we demand the investigation and sanctioning of illegal acts.”⁴⁵

The village, in fact, has a long history of segregation. In 2014 the Chance for Children Foundation successfully sued the municipal council (with a Jobbik majority), the local school and the state maintaining the educational institution,

given that the local Demeter Nekcsei Elementary School had been illegally segregating Roma children based on their ethnicity between 2004 and 2012. Parliament responded to the violent events against Roma by modifying the Criminal Code, although after the conflict only Roma were taken into custody. Referring to the situation in Gyöngyöspata, the former mayor resigned and a member of Jobbik took over as mayor following a by-election. The Jobbik mayor led the town from 2011 to 2014, which in 2014 elected a new mayor, a candidate of the FIDESZ-KDNP governing coalition. At the local level it is apparent that Roma–non-Roma differentiation not only signifies social hierarchy and subject-superordinate relations, but unequivocal power relations as well, which are emblematic of exclusion and its maintenance with any tools necessary.

The shift

At the time of the regime change there was a consensus among democratic parties that the earlier state socialist system could only be left behind with the creation of a new system, based on democratic rule of law and a market economy, where individual initiative and responsibility rather than the will of the “majority” or state would drive progress forward. Today, the concept of egalitarian democratic rule of law guaranteeing human rights has been replaced with an anti-egalitarian vision of majoritarian democracy, which adopts labor, municipal and educational segregation, and builds an increasing number of obstacles to the integration of the Roma minority.

It is an oft-cited viewpoint that the archetypal liberal subject of human rights protection was the white Christian male propertied citizen,⁴⁶ or, more generally, persons who did not belong to a vulnerable group. This was so because regulation promising equal rights to all was not capable of handling the social disadvantage of minority groups. Therefore, nowadays international and European law, as well as constitutional democracies, attempt to compensate vulnerable subjects and take measures to achieve the equality of these groups. One of the main questions is “how to take into account the position of vulnerable groups”⁴⁷ in the framework of human rights protection, that is, how human rights protection can grapple with not only the formal but also the substantive concepts of equality. Against this trend the Hungarian illiberal constitution does not take into account the substantive, let alone the formal concepts of equality, and has a clear anti-egalitarian character.⁴⁸

This situation is reminiscent of underclass societies and in many ways of one-time colonial societies that were split in two (“world cut in two”).⁴⁹ The latter par-

allel is illustrated by a quote exemplifying the divided world of a former colony: "The dividing line, the frontiers are shown by barracks and police stations. In the colonies it is the policeman and the soldier who are the official, instituted go-betweens, the spokesmen of the settler and his rule of oppression."⁵⁰ If we replace settler with "majority" Hungarian, and barracks with villages, then the division into two and the metaphor of frontier become appropriate to describe social relations between non-Roma and Roma in Hungary. To the excluded residents of slums (defined as Roma), the state stands for nothing more than an institution of oppression. Given this state of affairs and a society that is based on extreme exclusion and the complete rejection of integration, Hungary can no longer be described in terms of equality and the rule of law. Beyond the denial of equality and the rule of law, segregation and exclusive racial and ethnic categorization generate the risk of ethnic conflicts. In other words, racial tensions and categorization as socially excluded can turn the minority against the "majority." If the minority group is labelled an enemy, then the minority group itself will view the "majority" as an enemy, one that, due to real segregation, appears to truly exist and be truly unified.⁵¹

Post-colonial theory suggests that the narrative of colonization created the institutions and infrastructure that maintained it.⁵² Later approaches hold that colonization is not necessarily tied to history, time and space of colonization.⁵³ Oppressive and controlling technology as laid out in the stories of colonization is familiar to those who have observed how European societies have subjugated and oppressed the Roma.⁵⁴ The current system in Hungary is colonial in the sense that the subjugation based on difference is a condition that seems to be unchangeable. The social practice, whereby social and cultural differences between the "majority" and minority are organized in a hierarchical system and interpreted as such, has been institutionalized.⁵⁵ In the daily practice of state institutions this means the division of citizens into those who have the right to state support and those who do not: those who are "worthy" and those who are "unworthy."⁵⁶ Consequently, loyalty structures that are tied to the practice of exclusion have developed.

Today, the Hungarian state has returned to historic times, even though "majority" Hungarian history and the specific Hungarian nation they wish to see again never existed in reality and has never been real and just: it is merely a reference point for whoever is in power. The authors of the Fundamental Law, by legalizing their story-like view of history, limiting human rights, dismantling institutions for legal protection and making their functioning impossible, have closed a chapter in the history of Roma in Hungary. The story that began with the regime change has come to an end. The Hungarian state has once again moved into the central tower of the Panopticon.

Notes

- 1 Jeremy Bentham, "Panopticon, or the Inspection House," in *The Panopticon Writings*, ed. Miran Bozovic (London: Verso, 1995), 29–95; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon, 1977), 201–217.
- 2 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 202.
- 3 See Gábor Halmai, "An Illiberal Constitutional System in the Middle of Europe," in *European Yearbook of Human Rights 2014*, ed. Wolfgang Benedek et al. (Vienna: Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2014), 512.
- 4 Political Declaration 1 of 2010 (16 June 2010) of the Hungarian National Assembly on National Cooperation, (accessed 20 December, 2014, http://www.kulugyminiszterium.hu/NR/rdonlyres/1EC78EE5-8A4B-499C-9BES-ESFSD5DC2C0A1/0/Political_Declaration.pdf.)
- 5 Zoltán Miklósi, "Demokrácia: liberális, alkotmányos és egyéb" [Democracy: Liberal, Constitutional and Other], accessed 13 November, 2014, <http://szuveren.hu/politika/demokracia-liberalis-alkotmanyos-es-egyeb>.
- 6 TASZ [Hungarian Civil Liberties Union], "Governmental attacks against Hungarian NGO sphere," accessed 13 November, 2014, http://tasz.hu/files/tasz/imce/timeline_of_gov_attacks_against_hungarian_ngos_20140921.pdf
- 7 Speech of Viktor Orbán on July 26, 2014 in Băile Tuşnad (Tusnádfürdő).
- 8 Gábor Halmai, "The Rise and Fall of Hungarian Constitutionalism," in *The Democratic Disconnect: Citizenship and Accountability in the Transatlantic Community*, ed. Seyla Benhabib, David Cameron, Anna Dolidze, Gábor Halmai, Gunther Hellmann, Kateryna Pishchikova and Richard Youngs (Washington: Transatlantic Academy, 2013).
- 9 "Our fundamental cohesive values are fidelity, faith and love" ("National Avowal," Fundamental Law).
- 10 Kriszta Kovács, "Equality: The Missing Link," in *Constitution for a Disunited Nation. On Hungary's 2011 Fundamental Law*, ed. Gábor Attila Tóth (Budapest: CEU Press, 2012), 186.
- 11 Gábor Halmai and Kim Lane Scheppele, eds., "Opinion on Hungary's New Constitutional Order: Amicus Brief to the Venice Commission on the Transitional Provisions of the Fundamental Law and the Key Cardinal Laws" (2012), 7, accessed 20 December, 2014, <https://sites.google.com/site/amicusbrieffhungary>; Zsolt Körtvélyesi, "From 'We the People' To 'We the Nation,'" in *Constitution for a Disunited Nation Hungary's New Fundamental Law*, ed. Gábor Attila Tóth, (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2012).
- 12 "National Avowal" (Fundamental Law).
- 13 "We promise to preserve the intellectual and spiritual unity of our nation torn apart in the storms of the last century," "National Avowal" (Fundamental Law).
- 14 "National Avowal" (Fundamental Law).
- 15 Körtvélyesi, "From 'We the People' To 'We the Nation,'" 22.
- 16 Szabolcs Pogonyi, "Non-Resident Hungarians Get Voting Rights" (2012), accessed 13 November, 2014, <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/search-results/591-non-resident-hungarians-get-voting-rights>.

- 17 Fleck et al., “Opinion on the Fundamental Law of Hungary,” p. 10, accessed April 8, 2015, <http://lapa.princeton.edu/hosteddocs/amicus-to-vc-english-final.pdf>.
- 18 Balog Zoltán beszéde – Felzárkózás-politika a XXI. században [Speech of Zoltán Balog, minister of human resources], accessed April 8, 2015. <http://www.balogzoltan.hu/balog-zoltan-beszede-felzarkozas-politika-a-xxi-szazadban/>.
- 19 Kovács, “Equality,” 190.
- 20 Ibid., 190.
- 21 Ibid., 190.
- 22 See e.g., B. Majtényi, “Model Child,” 397.
- 23 The following ethnic groups qualify as national minorities (nationalities) of Hungary in the Act on Nationalities: Bulgarian, Roma, Greek, Croatian, Polish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovakian, Slovenian and Ukrainian.
- 24 “National Avowal” (Fundamental Law).
- 25 “Nationalities living in Hungary shall have the right to establish local and national self-governments,” paragraph (2) Article XXIX “Freedom and Responsibility” (Fundamental Law). The former Constitution nominated the same rights verbatim as the Fundamental Law in Paragraph (4) Article 68.
- 26 This specialized ombudsperson was responsible for environmental issues.
- 27 Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the Rights of Nationalities.
- 28 Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities.
- 29 For instance, there are several municipalities where nobody identified themselves as a member of any minority group, according to the national census, yet numerous minority candidates were registered.
- 30 See, for instance, Article 56 Paragraph (1) of Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the Rights of Nationalities.
- 31 Article 1 (1) Act CLXXIX of 2011 on the Rights of Nationalities.
- 32 According to the Fundamental Law the new name of two-thirds majority acts is Cardinal Acts.
- 33 European Union Roma strategy is an EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020. Council Conclusions 10658/11.
- 34 National Social Inclusion Strategy: Extreme Poverty, Child Poverty, the Roma, 2011–2020. Budapest, December 2011, Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, State Secretariat for Social Inclusion, accessed April 8, 2015, <http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/20000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF>.
- 35 Fleck et al., “Opinion,” 16.
- 36 The term workfare society (“munkaalapú társadalom”) is used in the speech of Viktor Orbán on July 26, 2014 in Băile Tuşnad (Tusnádfürdő).
- 37 Dorottya Szikra, “Democracy and Welfare in Hard Times: The Social Policy of the Orbán Government in Hungary between 2010 and 2014,” *Journal of European Social Policy* 24 (December 2014): 486–500.
- 38 Balázs Berkovits, “A közmunka mint fegyelmezés” [Workfare as a disciplining tool], accessed April 8, 2015, <http://szuveren.hu/tarsadalom/a-kozmunka-mint-fegyelmezes>.
- 39 Dorottya Szikra, “Produktív szociálpolitika” [Productive social policy], accessed April 8, 2015, <http://szuveren.hu/tarsadalom/produktiv-szocialpolitika>.
- 40 Act 2014 of CV on the amendment of the Public Education Act under paragraph (§ 25 (5) of Art.Z).
- 41 See e.g., Vidra and Fox, “Mainstreaming,” 437–455.

- 42 The association was founded by eleven former members of the disbanded Hungarian Guard; the president was the Békés County President of the New Hungarian Guard.
- 43 Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Jogok Országgyűlési Biztosa [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities], "A nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségi jogok országgyűlési biztosának jelentése a 2011 márciusában történt gyöngyöspatai események és a hasonló jelenségek veszélyeiről" [Report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the National and Ethnic Minority Rights on the incidents happened in Gyöngyöspata in March, 2011], Budapest, 2011, accessed 11 November, 2014, <http://www.kisebbségiombudsman.hu/data/files/203198066.pdf>.
- 44 Ibid., 9.
- 45 Ibid., 14.
- 46 Ratna Kapur, "Human Rights in the 21st Century: Take a Walk on the Dark Side," *Sydney Law Review* 2006/28: 673.
- 47 Alexandra Timmer, "Report state-of-the-art literature review human rights, democracy and the rule of law," Work Package No. 3 – Deliverable No. 1. (FRAME: Fostering Human Rights among European Policies, 2013), 10, accessed 11 November, 2014, www.fp7-frame.eu/wp-content/materiale/reports/01-Deliverable-3.1.pdf, 37.
- 48 Kovács, "Equality."
- 49 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 38.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).
- 53 Peter Childs and R. J. Patrick Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* (London: Prentice Hall, 1997).
- 54 Angéla Kóczé and Nidhi Trehan, "Postcolonial Racism and Social Justice: The Struggle for the Soul of the Romani Civil Rights Movement in the 'New Europe,'" in *Racism, Post-colonialism, Europe*, ed. Graham Huggan (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 50–77.
- 55 See, Walter Mignolo, "Delinking: the rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality, and the grammar of de-coloniality," *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2 (2007): 449–514.
- 56 Herbert J. Gans, "Über die positiven Funktionen der unwürdigen Armen. Zur Bedeutung der 'underclass' in den USA," in *Armut im modernen Wohlfahrtsstaat*, edited by Stephan Leibfried und Wolfgang Voges (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992), 48–62.

Summary: Decades of Exclusion

This book illustrated the history of the Gypsy issue in the context of Hungarian national history based on state policy documents. The many kinds of public discourses about Roma and their various interpretations shaped the relationship between the “majority” and minority, and helped in understanding the social context of the emergence of the “Gypsy issue” along with the local and national power relations that defined it. A critical analysis of official positions on Roma can create tension in the dominant discourse, which is one of the goals of the book.

Contrary to the definitive and dominant narrative on knowledge of the Gypsy/Roma minority in Hungary, this book—as we emphasized in the preface—presents a “counter-history.” One of the goals of the book is to shake the dominant discourse from its position and to critically examine earlier knowledge. In this light, we shared texts that demonstrate how the state pushed Roma communities in Hungary to the periphery, later blaming Roma for social problems and then presenting them as an antagonistic minority. We felt it was important to present the Roma not just as victims throughout history, but also—as far as the sources would allow—as active participants, for example as defenders of freedom against the dictatorial state. The argument advanced in the book is that othering of the Roma influences “majority” identity. Facing the history of Roma exclusion, considering non-dominant points of view and presenting hidden dimensions of Roma history can assist the reconstruction of “national” identity that to this point has been defined by patterns of exclusion. Based on this, the book offers not only a counter history of the official discourses, but also a comprehensive and critical assessment of Roma-related policies, with a blend of top-down and bottom-up perspectives.



View. Settlement of Péro, 2014

Through analyzing source material, the book asked how the borders and cleavages between “majority” and minority within the Hungarian nation formed, and how power discourses created and/or strengthened those. From an ethnic standpoint, in the historical period after 1945 society largely saw itself as ethnically homogeneous, and the representatives of power in local- and then national-level discourses began to describe Gypsies/Roma as a unified minority, separable from the “majority” society. During this period ethnic boundaries within Hungarian society were redrawn, though in reality the Gypsy community, identified based on the “majority” concept of otherness, was ethnically, socially and culturally diverse, just like the “majority.” Increasingly, the idea of Gypsies as Hungary’s largest and fastest growing minority became a “social fact.” From a “majority” point of view, they were in a disadvantaged social position. To acknowledge this, local level experiences were generalized through power discourses, with wholly constructed knowledge—including a large part of social science knowledge and research on the Gypsies/Roma—tied to the prejudices of “majority” society.



Gathering elderberries, 2014

Politics, scientific discourses and social practices all reinforced one another. Not only persons belonging to the “majority” but also the self-identity of minorities was clearly influenced by the discourses about them. Discourses on Roma were consciously hiding inequality, oppression and exclusion, and aimed at covering up real social problems and constructing a new social “reality” that would legitimate those in power. In Hungary under state socialism, state power created a separated, and therefore unequal, status for the Gypsy community on a national (or all-societal) level. On the one hand, the state “socialist” system used this status to consolidate its own legitimacy, dividing society into winners and losers, thereby emphasizing to the “majority” its relatively better social position. On the other hand, the unequal status of Roma served to portray poverty and exclusion as the fault of the groups whom it affected, emphasizing an image whereby the state did everything it could for those who had not yet enjoyed the fruits of the socialist system. In reality, Roma did not become the beneficiaries of social policy, while in discourse they indeed were the key beneficiaries, despite quite visible daily injustices. From the 1960s those in



Family in the courtyard of a District VIII tenement. Budapest, 2015

power appeared to be working toward eradicating inequality, but in truth the reproduction of social difference morphed into an intricate ethnic question.

During state socialism, the “majority” was presented as the winner of the “socialist” transition (modernization), while the minority, if it was presented at all, through its own fault was the loser of transition. After the regime change, in theory, the unifying state policy that excluded the minority came to an end, and the developing liberal democracy seemed to provide space for minority self-organization. However, the phenomenon of exclusion remained. It became clear that social practice that imagined national unity had instead split society into constructed groups of Roma and non-Roma “Hungarians” based on power hierarchy. With this, Roma became excluded from the nation and a basic fault line was drawn in Hungarian society. After 1989–90 a series of social phenomena that the “majority” automatically connected to the minority (e.g., poverty, exclusion, unemployment, homelessness) became visible. Despite the homogenizing discourse and the real social disadvantages they suffered, the Roma are made up of heterogeneous groups, much like the “majority” that was also presented as unified and opposed to Roma. The key

group-producing force in Hungary has always been the “majority” society, and consequently it is the “majority” that judges how to label who is Gypsy/Roma. As we emphasized, power discourses created the image of a unified minority that could be distinguished from the “majority” in the interest of creating the image of a unified “majority,” or a Hungarian nation that appears unified.

The colonization efforts of the Hungarian state within Roma policy further squelched initiatives of Roma self-organization, thereby obstructing the emergence of alternative interpretations of exclusion, independent of the state. The practice of exclusion to this day is related to the daily practice of the state and municipal authorities. Discourses that consolidate their legitimacy continue to maintain the image of a unified “majority” and minority, along with their separateness and antagonism. Since 2010, Hungary has been constructing illiberal “majoritarian” democratic institutions in which state policies and the attitudes of the representatives of the state are increasingly similar to those of the dictatorial past. The political system has become post-colonial in the sense that it treats exclusion, the hierarchical relationship between “majority” and minority, and subject status as a static foundation.

This book has attempted to reinterpret Roma history defined by official discourses that constructed Roma according to the viewpoints of state power, and which further determined scientific discourse from a perspective of equality and human rights. The main challenge was the fact that the discourses and earlier power relations analyzed had developed specific interpretive frameworks of social science dealing with Roma. The debate over the relationship between “majority” and minority involves critical examination of the representatives of power, which often means the redevelopment and rethinking of established concepts and categories. Referring to the quote from István Bibó at the beginning of his study of Jewry, our task is to create solidarity between groups in conflict and to put an end to the practice of exclusion, which has its roots in the past and has taken on a colonial nature. The concept of the nation must again encompass members of excluded groups. The authors of this volume hoped to make this more possible by putting Roma history in the context of a common past or a national history. Like all history, it is part of an identity struggle and multifold changes that go along with that struggle.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: On the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Apor, Péter. “Cigányok tere: kísérlet a kommunista cigánypolitika közép-kelet-európai összehasonlító értelmezésére, 1945–1961” [The Space of the Gypsies: An interpretation of the birth of the communist Roma policy in East-European comparison, 1945–1961]. *Aetas* 24, no. 2 (2009): 69–86.
- Auzias, Claire. *Samudaripen: le Génocide des Tsiganes*. Paris: L’Esprit Frappeur, 1999.
- Bakó, Ferenc. “A tiszai cigányok fémművészete” [Gypsy metal-work in Tiszaigar]. *Nép-rajzi Értesítő* 36 (1954): 239–258.
- Balogh, Károly and György Huszár. “Cigányok gerostomatológiai vizsgálata” [Gerostomatological investigation of Gypsies]. *Antropológiai Közlemények* 1–2, 3–4 (1962): 7–8.
- Balogh, Lídia, András Kristóf Kádár, Balázs Majtényi, and András László Pap. *Antidiszkriminációs és esélyegyenlőségi alapismeretek* [Fundamentals of antidiscrimination and equal opportunities]. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2010.
- Balogh, Lídia. “Jog a kultúra őrzésére – vagy ürügy a szegregációra? A roma nemzetiségi oktatás mint kétélű kard Magyarországon” [Right to safeguard culture – or an excuse for segregation? Roma minority education in Hungary as a double-edged sword]. *Pro Minoritate* 20 (Spring 2012): 207–223.
- Bán, Tamás. “Az Emberi Jogok Európai Bíróságának ítéleteiből” [On the judgements of the European Court of Justice]. *Fundamentum* 3 (2001): 112–113.
- Bana, József. “A helyzet fokozódik – Lakatosék a szocializmus időszakában” [The situation is intensifying. The Lakatos family in the period of socialism]. In *Cigánysors. A cigányság történeti múltja és jelene* 2. [Gypsy fate. The historical past and present of the Gypsies 2], edited by Márfi Attila, 113–115. Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2009.
- Barany, Zoltan. *The East European Gypsies. Regime change, Marginality, and Ethnopolitics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Bari, Károly. “A származás nem esztétikai kategória. Murányi Gábor interjúja Bari Károlyl” [Ancestry is not an aesthetic category. An interview with Károly Bari, by Gábor Murányi]. *HVG* 23 (June 12, 2010): 34–35.

- Bari, Károly. *Holtak arca fölé* [Above the face of the dead]. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1970.
- . *Madarak aranyhegedűn: Európai cigány költők és írók művei* [Birds on a golden violin: Anthology of Gypsy poets and writers]. Budapest: Romano Kher, 1996.
- Bársony, János. “Romák sorsa az 1940-es évek második felében Magyarországon” [The Fate of Roma in the second half of the 1940s in Hungary]. *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 222–256.
- Bársony, János, and Ágnes Daróczy. *Pharrajimos: Romák sorsa a Holocaust idején* [Pharrajimos: The fate of the Roma in Hungary during the Holocaust]. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2005.
- . *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma During the Holocaust*. Budapest: CEU Press, 2007.
- , eds. *Pharrajimos: The Fate of the Roma during the Holocaust*. New York: International Debate Education Association, 2008.
- Barth, Fredrik. “Introduction.” In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, edited by Fredrik Barth. London: Allen & Unwin, 1970.
- . “Boundaries and connections.” In *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Identities*, edited by Anthony P. Cohen, 17–36. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Bartos, Tibor, ed. *Sosemvolt cigányország. Szegkovács cigány történetek* [There was never a Gypsy-country. Tales from nail-smith Gypsies]. Budapest: Európa, 1958.
- Bass, László, Ágnes Darvas, Ilona Dögei, Zsuzsa Ferge, and Katalin Tausz. *A szegénység és kirekesztés változása, 2001–2006* [Changes in poverty and exclusion, 2001–2006]. Budapest: MTA KTI Gyerekprogram Iroda, 2007.
- Báthory, János, and László Pomogyi. “A történelemtudomány szerepe a ciganológiai kutatásokban I–II” [The role of historical science in romological research, I–II]. *Kethano Drom – Közös Út*, 4–5, 6 (1993): 21–25; 55–60.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Die erfindung des politischen: Zu einer theorie reflexiver modernisierung*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1993.
- Bentham, Jeremy. “Panopticon, or the Inspection House.” In *The Panopticon Writings*, edited by Miran Bozovic, 29–95. London: Verso, 1995.
- Berey, Katalin. “A szociális követelményeknek meg nem felelő telepek felszámolása” [The eradication of isolated settlements not fulfilling social requirements]. In *Esély nélkül* [Having no chance], edited by Katalin Berey, and Ágota Horváth, 5–72. Budapest: Vita, 1990.
- Bergstein, Béla. “A cigánykérdés megoldása” [The resolution of the Gypsy issue]. *Huszedik Század* 9 (1910): 186–190.
- Berkovits, Balázs. “A közmunka mint fegyelmezés” [Workfare as a disciplining tool]. *Szuverén*, accessed April 8, 2015. <http://szuveren.hu/tarsadalom/a-kozmunka-mint-fegyelmezés>.
- Bernáth, Gábor, and Laura Polyák. “Kényszermosdatások Magyarországon” [Forced bathings in Hungary]. *Beszélő* 6 (2001): 38–45.
- Bernáth, Gábor, ed. *Porrajmos. Recollections of Roma Holocaust*. Budapest: Survivors, 2000.
- , ed. “Porrajmos: E Roma seron, kon perdal zhuvinde / Roma Holocaust túlélők emlékeznek / Recollections of Roma Holocaust survivors.” Budapest: Roma Sajtóközpont, Roma Sajtóközpont könyvek 2, 2000.
- . “Zor-sila najaripe mashkar e Roma, 1940–1985 / Kényszermosdatások a cigánytelepeken, 1940–1985 / Forced bathings in Gypsy settlements, 1940–1985.” Budapest: Roma Sajtóközpont, Roma Sajtóközpont könyvek 3, 2002.
- Bibó, István. “Zsidókérdés Magyarországon 1944 után” [The Jewish question in Hungary after 1944]. In *Válogatott tanulmányok II* [Selected studies II], 621–797. Budapest: Bibó István örökösei, 1990.

- Binder, Mátyás. “*Felébredt ez a nép... A magyarországi romák/cigányok etnikai-nemzeti önszerveződési folyamatairól*” [The folk has been awoken... On processes of ethnonational self-organisation of the Hungarian Roma/Gypsies]. In *A múlt feltárása – előítéletek nélkül* [Exploration of the past—without prejudices], edited by Gergely Jenő, 61–81. Budapest: ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, 2006.
- . “A cigányok vagy a cigánykérdés története? Áttekintés a magyarországi cigányok történeti kutatásairól” [The story of the Gypsies or of the Gypsy Question? An overview of the historical research of Hungarian Gypsies]. *Regio* 4 (2009): 35–39.
- . “Beások, etnikai mobilizáció és identitás” [The Hungarian Boyash Gypsies, ethnic mobilisation and identity]. *Kisebbségkutatás* 18, no. 2 (2009): 207–228.
- Bitskey, Botond, and Tamás Gyulavári. “Az antidiszkriminációs szabályozás reformja” [The new framework of the anti-discrimination law]. *Acta Humana* 4 (2004): 13–40.
- Blaħa, Márta F., Gábor Havas, and Sándor Révész. “Nyerőviszonyok. Roma politikatörténet” [Winner relationships. Roma political history]. *Beszélő* 19 (1995): 20–28.
- Bódi, Zsuzsanna. “A cigánység történetének képi forrásai” [Pictorial sources of the history of the Gypsies]. *Kethano Drom – Közös Út* 1 (1993): 12–13, 45–46.
- , ed. *Soha többé... Visszaemlékezések a holokausztra* [Never again... Recollections of the Holocaust]. Budapest: Magyar Néprajzi Társaság, 2000.
- Braham, Randolph L. *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Brancroft, Angus. *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2005.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- . “The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, no. 4 (July, 2001): 531–548.
- . *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Cabrera, Miguel A. *Postsocial History: An Introduction*. New York: Lexington Books, 2004.
- Capotorti, Francesco. *Study on the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. 1979, Un Doc E/CN.4/Sub. 2/384/Rev.1.
- Childs, Peter, and Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Choli Daróczi, József, and Levente Feyér. *Zhanes romanes? Cigány nyelvkönyv* [Zhanes romanes? A Gypsy grammar textbook]. Budapest: TIT, Magyarországi Cigányok Kulturális Szövetsége, 1988.
- Choli Daróczi, József, József Hontalan Kovács, and Gusztáv Nagy, eds. *Romane poeťongí antológia* [Anthology of Gypsy Poets]. Budapest: Ariadne Kulturális Alapítvány, 1995.
- Choli Daróczi, József. “A magyarországi roma irodalom” [The Hungarian Romani literature]. In *Romológiai alapismeretek* [Basics of Romology], edited by Elemér Várnagy, 49–53. Budapest: Corvinus kiadó, 1999.
- , ed. *Fekete korall. Verses antológia* [Black coral. Poetry anthology]. Budapest: Tánacsics Könyvkiadó, 1981.
- , ed. *Fekete korall II. Antológia* [Black coral. Anthology II]. Budapest: Choli, 1998.
- Cohen, Anthony. “Culture as Identity: An Anthropologist’s View.” *New Literary History* 24, no. 1 (1993): 195–209.

- Crowe, David. "Conclusion." In *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, edited by David Crowe, and John Kolsti, 151–157. London: M. E. Sharpe, 1991.
- Csalog, Zsolt. "Kaptam a romáktól emberi gazdagságot... Csalog Zsolttal Daróczi Ágnes beszélget" [I discovered the human richness that lies in Roma communities. An interview with Zsolt Csalog by Ágnes Daróczi]. *Beszélő* 10 (1997): 36–46.
- . *Cigányon nem fog az átok* [Curses don't fall on Gypsies]. Budapest: Maecenas, 1988.
- . *Kilenc cigány (Önéletrajzi vallomások)* [Nine Gypsies (Autobiographic reports)]. Budapest: Kozmosz, 1976.
- Csepeli, György, and Antal Örkeny. *The Making of a Minority: Competing Claims of Definitions of Being Roma in Contemporary Hungarian Society*. Manuscript, 2015.
- Csongor, Anna, and Péter Szuhay. "Cigány kultúra, cigánykutatások" [Gypsy culture, studies on Gypsies]. *BUKSZ* 2 (1992): 235–245.
- von Czörnig, Karl. *Ethnographie der Österreichischen Monarchie*. Wien: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof. und Staatsdruckerei, 1855, 1857.
- Danka, Anita. "Rossz helyen lenni rossz időben, avagy mit üzennek a gyűlölet-bűncselekmények?" [Wrong times, wrong place: What is the message of hate crimes?]. *Föld-rész* 3–4 (2009): 92–96.
- Daróczi, Ágnes, and Zsigmond Karsai. *Autodidakta Cigány Képzőművészek Országos Kiállítása* [National exhibition of self-taught Gypsy artists]. Budapest: Kiállítási katalógus, 1979.
- Daróczi, Ágnes, and István Kerékgyártó. *Autodidakta Cigány Képzőművészek II. Országos Kiállítása* [2nd National exhibition of self-taught Gypsy artists]. Budapest: Kiállítási katalógus, 1989.
- Daróczi, Ágnes, Éva Kalla, and István Kerékgyártó, eds. *Roma képzőművészek III. Országos Kiállítása* [3rd national exhibition of Roma artists]. Budapest: Magyar Művelődési Intézet, 2000.
- Daróczi, Ágnes. "Bari Károly haragja" [Anger of Károly Bari]. *Élet és Irodalom*, February 14, 2003.
- Demeter Zayzon, Mária, ed. *Kisebbségek Magyarországon, 1999* [Minorities in Hungary, 1999]. Budapest: Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Hivatal, 2000.
- Diósi, Ágnes. *Cigányút* [Gypsy road]. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1988.
- . *Szentől szemben a magyarországi cigánysággal* [Eye to eye with the Hungarian Gypsies]. Budapest: Pont, 2002.
- . *A magyarországi cigánykérdés rendezése* [The solution of the Gypsy issue of Hungary]. Kecskemét: Első Kecskeméti Hírlapkiadó és Nyomda, 1940.
- Dupcsik, Csaba. *A magyarországi cigányság története. Történelem a cigánykutatások tükrében, 1890–2008* [The History of the Hungarian Gypsies. History reflected in Gypsy research, 1890–2008]. Budapest: Osiris, 2009.
- . "Megnevezés, meghatározás, megszámlálhatóság" [Denomination, definition, countability], (2011). Accessed April 8, 2015. http://www.ideaintezet.hu/sites/default/files/Megnevezes_IDEA.pdf.
- Durst, Judit. "Minden évben máshogy fordul a világ. A telepfelszámolástól a szegregált cigány faluig" [From the elimination of the Gypsy settlements to the segregated Gypsy village]. *anBlok* 4 (2010): 34–38.
- Dworkin, Ronald. "Introduction." In *Freedom's Law: The Moral Reading of the American Constitution*, 1–38. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. "Multiple Modernities." *Daedalus* 129, no. 1 (Winter, 2000): 1–29.
- Erdős, Kamill. "A magyarországi cigányok" [The Gypsies in Hungary]. In *Erdős Kamill cigánytanulmányai* [Gypsy studies of Kamill Erdős], 42–56. Békéscsaba: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum, 1989.
- . "Gondolatok a cigányproblémákról 1960-ban" [Thoughts on the Gypsy problem from 1960]. In *Erdős Kamill cigánytanulmányai* [Gypsy studies of Kamill Erdős], 190–202. Békéscsaba: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum, 1989.
- . *A Békés megyei cigányok. Cigánydialektusok Magyarországon* [Gypsies of Békés County. Gypsy Dialects in Hungary]. Gyula: Gyulai Erkel Ferenc Múzeum Kiadványai, 1959.
- Faludi, András. *Cigányok* [Gypsies]. Budapest: Kossuth, 1964.
- Faludy, György. "Végtisztség a cigányoknak" [Piety to the Gypsies]. *Haladás* (June 6, 1946): 9. Second publication: *Phralipe* 1 no. 1 (1990): 6–7.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Farkas, Lilla. "Kis magyar jogvédelem-történet" [Short Hungarian story of human rights NGO activism]. *Fundamentum* 4 (2009): 161–167.
- Fátyol, Tivadar. "Cigányzene, cigány népzene, zenész cigányok" [Gypsy music, gypsy folk music, musician Gypsies]. *Napút* 6 (2010): 97–101.
- Feischmidt, Margit. "A mindennapi nacionalizmus és a másság cigányként való megjelölése" [Everyday nationalism and othering as a Gypsy]. In *Nemzet a mindennapokban. Az újnacionálizmus populáris kultúrája* [Nation in everyday life: Popular culture of neo-nationalism], edited by Margit Feischmidt, Rita Glózer, Katalin Kasznár, Zoltán Ilyés, Ildikó Zakariás, 401–447. Budapest: L'Harmattan – MTA Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont, 2014.
- . "Kényszerek és illeszkedések. Gazdasági és szimbolikus stratégiák aprófalvakban élő romák életében" [Constraints and adaptation. Economic and symbolic strategies of Romani people living in Hungarian villages]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 2 (2012): 54–84.
- Feitl, István. "A cigányság ügye a napirendről lekerült. Előterjesztés az MDP Politikai Bizottsága számára 1956 áprilisából" [Submission to the Politburo from April, 1956]. *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 257–272.
- Fleck, Gábor, and Vera Messing. "A roma foglalkoztatáspolitikai alakváltozásai" [Metamorphosis of the Roma employment policy]. In *Közelkép. Munkapiaci diszkrimináció*, edited by Anna Lovász, and Álmos Telegdy, 2009. Accessed April 8, 2015. <http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt09/hu/kozelkep.pdf>, 82–96.
- Fleck, Gábor, and Tünde Virág. *Egy beás közösség múltja és jelene* [Past and present of a Boyash community]. Budapest: MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete Etnoregionális Kutatóközpont, 1999.
- Fleck, Zoltán, Gábor Gadó, Gábor Halmai, Szabolcs Hegyi, Gábor Juhász, János Kis, Balázs Majtényi, and Gábor Attila Tóth. "Opinion on the Fundamental Law of Hungary." June, 2011. Accessed April 8, 2014. <http://lapa.princeton.edu/hosteddocs/amicus-to-vc-english-final.pdf>.
- Forray, R. Katalin, and András T. Hegedűs. *A cigány etnikum újjászületőben. Tanulmány a családról és az iskoláról* [The rebirth of Gypsy ethnicity. A study on the family, and on school]. Akadémiai: Budapest, 1990.
- . *Cigányok, iskola, oktatáspolitikai* [Gypsies, school, education policy]. Budapest: Oktatókutató Intézet – Új Mandátum, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2002.

- . *The Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin, 1998.
- . “Seminar: 28 January 1976.” In *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, translated by David Macey, 66–84. New York: Picador, 2003.
- . “The discourse on language.” In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- . *The Archaeology of knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- . *Les mots et les choses. Une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard, “Bibliothèque des sciences humaines,” 1966.
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.
- Frye, Northrop. “The Archetypes of Literature.” In *Criticism: the Major Statements*. 3rd ed. (1st ed. 1980), edited by Charles Kaplan, and William Anderson, 500–514. New York: St. Martin’s, 1991.
- Füzes, Miklós, Attila Márfi, András Rozs, and Huba Vörös. *Dokumentumok a baranyai cigány-ság történetéből* [Documents from the history of Gypsies of Baranya county]. Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2005.
- Gans, Herbert J. “Über die positiven Funktionen der unwürdigen Armen. Zur Bedeutung der ‘underclass’ in den USA.” in *Armut im modernen Wohlfahrtsstaat*, edited by Stephan Leibfried and Wolfgang Voges, 48–62. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- . *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- . “The Coming of Nationalism and its Interpretation: The Myths of Nation and Class.” In *Mapping the Nation*, edited by Gopal Balakrishnan, 98–132. London: Verso, 1996.
- Gesztelyi Nagy, László. “A cigányügy rendezése” [The solution of the Gypsy issue]. *Közszégi Közlöny* 25 (1929): 315–317.
- . *A magyarországi cigánykérdés rendezése* [The solution of Gypsy issue in Hungary]. Kecskemét: Első Kecskeméti Hírlapkiadó és Nyomda, 1940.
- Gunda, Béla. *Néprajzi gyűjtőúton* [On an ethnographic research trip]. Debrecen: Alföldi Magvető, 1956.
- Györfi, Tamás. *Jogok az új alkotmánykoncepcióban* [Rights in the new constitution concept]. *Szuverén* (2011). Accessed April 8, 2015. <http://szuveren.hu/vendeglap/gyorfi-tamas/jogok-az-uj-alkotmanykoncepcioiban>.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity, 1996.
- . *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1962.
- Hajnal, László Endre. “Nagyvárosi cigányok. Fotóesszé” [Gypsies of City. A photo essay]. *Tabula*, 1, no. 1–2 (1998): 167–178.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *La Mémoire Collective*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950.
- Halmi, Gábor. “An Illiberal Constitutional System in the Middle of Europe.” In *European Yearbook of Human Rights*, edited by Wolfgang Benedek, Florence Benoit-Rohmer, Wolfram Karl, Matthias C. Kettmann, and Manfred Nowak. Vienna: Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2014.

- . “The Rise and Fall of Hungarian Constitutionalism.” In *The Democratic Disconnect: Citizenship and Accountability in the Transatlantic Community*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, David Cameron, Anna Dolidze, Gábor Halmi, Gunther Hellmann, Kateryna Pishchikova, and Richard Youngs. Washington: Transatlantic Academy, 2013.
- Halmi, Gábor, and Kim Lane Scheppelle. “Opinion on Hungary’s New Constitutional Order: Amicus Brief to the Venice Commission on the Transitional Provisions of the Fundamental Law and the Key Cardinal Laws” (2012), accessed December 20, 2014. <https://sites.google.com/site/amicusbriefhungary>.
- Hancock, Ian F. “‘Uniqueness’ of the victims: Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust.” *Without Prejudice: International Review of Racial Discrimination* 1, no. 2 (1988): 45–67.
- . “Gypsies, Jews and the Holocaust.” *Shmate: A Journal of Progressive Jewish Thought* 17 (1987): 6–15.
- . “Uniqueness: Gypsies and Jews.” In *Remembering for the Future: Jews and Christians During and After the Holocaust*, edited by Yehuda Bauer, Yehuda Bauer, Alice Eckardt, Franklin H. Littell, Elisabeth Maxwell, Robert Maxwell and David Patterson. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988.
- . *The Indian Origin and Westward Migration of the Romani People*. Manchaca, TX: IRU, 1998.
- . “1938 and the Porrajmos: A Pivotal Year in Romani History.” *Global Dialogue* 15, no. 1 (2013): Winter/Spring – Genocide.
- . *Danger! Educated Gypsy. Selected Essays*, edited by Dileep Karanth. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2010.
- . “On Romani Origins and Romani Identity: A Reassessment of the Arguments,” 2004. Accessed April 8, 2015. http://www.radoc.net/radoc.php?doc=art_b_history_origins&lang=en&articles=true.
- . “Responses to the Porrajmos: The Romani Holocaust.” In *Is the Holocaust Unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide*, edited by Alan S. Rosenbaum, 39–64. Boulder, CO: The Westview Press, 1995.
- . *The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution*. 2nd rev. ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers, 1988.
- . *We are the Romani People. Ame sam e Rromane džene*. Hatfield: Centre de recherches tsiganes/University of Hertfordshire Press, 2002.
- Havas Diósi, Ágnes. “A cigányság ügye a demokratikus ellenzék történetében. Interjú Havas Gáborral” [The Gypsy issue in the story of democratic opposition. An interview with Gábor Havas]. *Esély* 11, no. 6 (1999): 83–99.
- Havas, Gábor, and István Kemény. “A magyarországi romákról” [On the Hungarian Roma]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 3 (1995): 3–20.
- Havas, Gábor, and Ilona Liskó. *Szegregáció a roma tanulók általános iskolai oktatásában* [Segregation of Roma students in primary schools]. Budapest: Felsőoktatási Kutatóintézet, 2005.
- Havas, Gábor, István Kemény, and Gábor Kertesi. “A relatív cigány a klasszifikációs küzdőtéren” [The relative Gypsy in the battle for classification]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 193–201. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000.
- Havas, Gábor, István Kemény, and Ilona Liskó. *Cigánygyerekek az általános iskolában* [Gypsy children in primary school]. Budapest: Oktatókutató Intézet – Új Mandátum, 2002.

- Havas, Gábor. "Korábbi cigányfoglalkozások" [Earlier Gypsy occupations]. In *Cigányvizsgálatok* [Gypsy research], edited by Mihály Andor, 181–202. Budapest: Művelődéskutató Intézet, 1982.
- . "Cigányok a szociológiai kutatások tükrében" [Gypsies in the mirror of sociological research]. In *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Gypsies in Hungary], edited by István Kemény, 21–44. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999.
- Havasi, Éva. "Megélhetési nehézségek, anyagi depriváció" [Subsistence difficulties, material deprivation]. In *Feketén, fehéren* [Black and white], edited by Péter Szivós, and István György Tóth, 59–82. Budapest: Tárki, 2006.
- Herrmann, Antal. *Magyarországon 1893. január 31-én végrehajtott Czigány összeírás eredményei* [Findings of the census of Gypsies carried out on 31 January, 1893 in Hungary]. Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények IX, 1895.
- Hidvégi, B. Attila. "Gárdaszellem" [Garda's Spirit]. In *Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2007* [A Roma's life in Hungary. Report 2007], edited by Erika Törzsök, Ildikó Paskó, and János Zolnay. Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2008.
- Hirst, William. "The Remembered Self in Amnesiacs." In *The Remembering Self: Construction and Accuracy in the Self Narrative*, edited by Ulric Neisser, and Robyn Fivush, 252–277. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Horváth, Aladár. "A leggyorsabban megtérülő befektetés a szegényekben van.' Horváth Aladárral a Roma Polgárjogi Alapítvány elnökével, miniszterelnöki tanácsadóval Révész Sándor és Zádori Zsolt beszélget" [An interview with Aladár Horvath President of the Roma Civil Rights Foundation, advisor of the Prime Minister, by Sándor Révész and Zsolt Zádori]. *Beszélő* 11 (2002): 36–42.
- . "A hűbéres cigánypolitika folyamatossága" [The continuity of vassal Gypsy policy]. *Amaro Drom*. Special issue based on "Humán Rajt" conference presentations (Székesfehérvár, May 14, 1995).
- Horváth, Ágota, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai. *Cigánynak születni: Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents]. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000.
- Horváth, Sándor. "A társadalmi gondoskodás gyakorlata: szociálpolitika Szombathelyen a szocialista korszakban (1950–1973)" [The practice of social care: Social policy of the socialist era in Szombathely (1950–1973)]. In *Tanulmányok Szombathely történetéből, 1945–1990* [Studies on history of Szombathely, 1945–1990], edited by Valuch Tibor, 233–248. Szombathely: Szombathely Megyei Jogú Város, 2010.
- Hoóz, István. "A magyarországi cigányösszeírásokról és a cigány népesség számának alakulásáról" [The surveys on Gypsies in Hungary and changes in the number of Gypsy population]. In *A cigányok számának és demográfiai helyzetének alakulása Baranya megyében* [Changes in the demographic situation of the Gypsies in Baranya County], edited by István Hoóz. Pécs: Janus Pannonius Tudományegyetem, 1989.
- Hunt, Lynn, ed. *The New Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Jameson, Fredric. *A Singular Modernity: Essay on the Ontology of the Present*. London: Verso, 2002.
- . *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

- Janky, Béla. "A cigány családok jövedelmi helyzete" [The income status of Gypsy families]. In *Társadalmi riport* [Social report], edited by Tamás Kolosi, István György Tóth, and György Vukovich, 400–413. Budapest: TÁRKI, 2004.
- Jenkins, Keith. *On 'What is History?': From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Joyce, Patrick. "The End of Social History." In *The Postmodern History Reader*, edited by Keith Jenkins, 380–384. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Kádár, András Kristóf, and András László Pap. "Police Ethnic Profiling in Hungary – An Empirical Research." *Acta Iuridica Hungarica* 50, no. 3 (2009): 253–267.
- Kádár, András Kristóf, Balázs M. Tóth, and András László Pap. "Diszkrimináció az igazoltatási gyakorlatban – egy empirikus kutatás eredményei" [Ethnic profiling in the stop and search practices of the Hungarian police – Results of an empirical study]. *Rendészeti Szemle* 57, no. 9 (2009): 50–67.
- Kádár, András Kristóf, Zsófia Moldova, Balázs M. Tóth, and András László Pap. "Igazolt igazoltatás" [On police stop and search]. *Rendészeti Szemle* 56, no. 5 (2008): 106–132.
- Kállai, Ernő. "A cigányzenészek helye és szerepe a magyar társadalomban és a magyar kultúrában" [The status and role of Gypsy musicians in Hungarian society and culture]. In *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből* [Space and Field. Studies on ethnicity and identity], edited by Nóra Kovács, and László Szarka, 327–345. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2002.
- . "Cigányzenészek" [Gypsy Musicians]. In *Roma migráció* [Romani migration], edited by András Kovács, 72–90. Budapest: MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Nemzetközi Migrációs és Menekültügyi Kutatóközpont, 2002.
- . "Válogatás a magyarországi romákat érintő legfontosabb eseményekből, 2002–2006" [A selection from the most important events concerning the Hungarian Roma]. In *Átszervezések kora. Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2002–2006* [A Period of Reorganizations: Being a Gypsy in Hungary – Report 2002–2006], edited by Ernő Kállai, and Erika Törzsök, 13–55. Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2006.
- . "Vannak-e cigányok, és ha nincsenek, akkor kik azok?" [Are there any Gypsies in Hungary, and if not, who are they?]. *Regio* 22, no. 2 (2014): 114–146.
- . *Helyi cigány kisebbségi önkormányzatok Magyarországon* [Local Gypsy self-governments in Hungary]. Budapest: MTA Etnikai-nemzetiségi Kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gondolat Kiadói Kör, 2005.
- Kálmán, András. "A magyar cigányok problémája" [The problem of Hungarian Gypsies]. *Társadalmi Szemle* 8–9 (1946): 656–658.
- Kalvoda, Josef. "The Gypsies of Czechoslovakia." In *The Gypsies of Eastern Europe*, edited by David Crowe, and John Kolsti, 93–115. London: M. E. Sharpe, 1991.
- Kaltenbach, Jenő, interview by György Kerényi. "'Fontos, hogy ne veszítsem el a jóérzésű közvélemény bizalmát' Kaltenbach Jenő kisebbségi ombudsmannal Kerényi György beszélget" [An interview with Jenő Kaltenbach, parliamentary commissioner for minority rights, by György Kerényi] *Fundamentum* 2 (2000): 35–42.
- Kántor, Zoltán. "Kisebbségi nemzetépítés – a romániai magyarság mint nemzetépítő kisebbség" [Minority Nation-Building: The Hungarians in Romania as a nationalizing minority]. *Regio* 3 (2000): 219–241.

- Kapralski, Slawomir. "The Aftermath of the Roma Genocide: From Implicit Memories to Commemoration." In *The Nazi Genocide of the Roma: Reassessment and Commemoration*, edited by Anton Weiss-Wendt, 229–251. New York: Berghahn Books, 2013.
- Kapur, Ratna, "Human Rights in the 21st Century: Taking a Walk on the Dark Side." *Sydney Law Review* 4 (2006): 665–687.
- Kardos, László. *Tiszaigár. Egy tiszántúli falu életrajza, 1744–1944* [Tiszaigár. Biography of a village of the Trans-Tisza region]. Budapest: Mentor–Szanator, 1997.
- Karsai, Ervin, and György Rostás-Farkas. *A cigányok története. Le romengi historija* [The history of Gypsies]. Budapest: Művelődési és Közoktatási Minisztérium – Cigány Tudományos és Művészeti Társaság, 1992.
- . *Amaro Krugalipe. Környezetünk Kenya Kiponca. Képes szótár* [Our Environment. Visual dictionary]. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984.
- . *Gilya, poemi, paramichi. Dalok, versek, mesék Kenya Kiponca. Képes szótár* [Songs, poems, tales. Visual dictionary]. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984.
- . *Ginav kathar o jekh zhikaj e desh! Számolj egytől tízig! Kenya Kiponca. Képes szótár* [Count from 1 to 10! Visual dictionary]. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984.
- . *Sityovas te ginavas. Olvasni tanulunk. Kenya Kiponca. Képes szótár* [We learn to read. Visual dictionary]. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984.
- . *Szószedet a cigány–magyar képes szótár négy füzetéhez* [A glossary to the four volumes of the Gypsy – Hungarian visual dictionary]. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Intézet Nevelési Osztálya, 1984.
- Karsai, Ervin, and Ilona Sztójkó. *Romano–ungriko alavari. Cigány–magyar kisszótár* [Concise Gypsy–Hungarian dictionary]. Medgyesegyháza: Anda Romani Kultúra Alapítvány, 1998.
- Karsai, Ervin. *A cigány nyelvjárások. Le romane dialekturi I–II* [Gypsy dialects]. Medgyesegyháza: Anda Romani Kultúra Alapítvány, 1999.
- Kársai, László. *A cigánykérdés Magyarországon, 1919–1945. Út a cigány Holocausthoz* [The Gypsy question in Hungary, 1919–1945. Road to the Gypsy Holocaust]. Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1992.
- Kemény, István, ed. "Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó, 1971-ben végzett kutatásról" [Report on research carried out in 1971 on the situation of Gypsies in Hungary]. Budapest: MTA Szociológiai Kutató Intézetének kiadványai, 1976.
- Kemény, István, and Béla Janky. "A 2003. évi cigány felmérésről" [On the 2003 Gypsy survey]. In *A magyarországi cigány népesség helyzete a 21. század elején* [The Hungarian Gypsy population in the beginning of 21st century], edited by Ernő Kállai. Budapest: MTA Etnikai-Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2003.
- Kemény, István, Béla Janky, and Gabriella Lengyel. *A magyarországi cigányság, 1971–2003* [The Gypsies of Hungary, 1971–2003]. Budapest: Gondolat, 2004.
- Kemény, István. "Nyelv és oktatás: asszimiláció és szegregáció" [Language and Education: assimilation and segregation]. In *A romakérdés az integráció csapdájában (A romák integrációs lehetőségei Magyarországon)* [Caught in the Trap of Integration: Roma Problems and Prospects in Hungary], edited by Jenő Böszörményi, and Márta Józsa. Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Programiroda, 2000.
- . "A magyarországi cigányok helyzete" [The status of Gypsies in Hungary]. In *Beszámoló a magyarországi cigányok helyzetével foglalkozó 1971-ben végzett kutatásról* [Report

- on research carried out in 1971 on the situation of Gypsies in Hungary], edited by István Kemény, 7–67. Budapest: MTA Szociológiai Kutató Intézete, 1976.
- . “Megfelezett élet. Csizmadia Ervin beszélgetése Kemény István szociológussal” [A split life. An interview with sociologist István Kemény by Ervin Csizmadia]. In *Közelről s távolból* [Close view from a distance], edited by István Kemény, 179–189. Budapest: Gondolat, 1991.
- . “A magyarországi cigány lakosság” [The Hungarian Gypsy population]. *Valóság* 1 (1974): 63–72.
- . “Előszó” [Preface]. In *A romák/cigányok és a láthatatlan gazdaság* [The Roma/Gypsies and the invisible economy], edited by István Kemény. Budapest: Osiris – MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely, 2000.
- . “Tennivalók a cigányok/romák ügyében” [Some proposals on the Gypsy/Roma question]. In *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Gypsies in Hungary], edited by István Kemény. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999.
- Kenrick, Donald, and Grattan Puxon. *The Destiny of Europe’s Gypsies*. London: Chatto Heinemann, Sussex University Press, 1972. (New edition: *Gypsies under the Swastika*. Hatfield, UK: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2009.)
- Kerékygártó, István. “A cigány képzőművészet – elindulás és kibontakozás” [Roma folk art – The beginning and the evolution]. In *Romológiai alapismeretek* [Basics of Romology], edited by Elemér Várnagy, 70–97. Zsámbék: Corvinus – Zsámbéki Katolikus Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1999.
- . “A cigány képzőművészet és a hagyomány” [Gypsy fine arts and tradition]. In *Romológia – Ciganológia* [Romology – Gypsy Studies], edited by Katalin Forray R., 235–242. Pécs: Dialog-Campus, 2000.
- . “A cigány képzőművészet és a hagyomány” [Gypsy Fine Arts and Tradition]. In *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép. A Néprajzi Múzeum “Romák Közép- és Kelet-Európában” című nemzetközi kiállításának képeskönyve* [Gypsy-Image – Roma-Image. Visual book of the international exhibition “Roma in Central and Eastern Europe” in the Museum of Ethnography], edited by Péter Szuhay, 96–97. Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1998.
- . “A cigány képzőművészet Magyarországon” [Gypsy fine arts in Hungary]. In *A Magyar Művelődési Intézet évkönyve, 1993–1994* [Yearbook of the Hungarian Institute for Culture], edited by Péter Halász 199–214. Budapest: Magyar Művelődési Intézet, 1994.
- Kerényi, György. “Tudás, hatalom” [Knowledge, power]. *Beszélő* 1 (2000): 32–28.
- Kertesi, Gábor, and Gábor Kézdy. *A cigány népesség Magyarországon. Dokumentáció és adattár* [The Gypsy population in Hungary: Documentation and statistics]. Budapest: Socio-typo, 1998.
- Kertesi, Gábor. *A társadalom peremén. Romák a munkaerőpiacon és az iskolában* [On the edge of society. The Roma in school and the labor market]. Budapest: Osiris, 2005.
- . Az empirikus cigánykutatások lehetőségéről [On the possibility of empirical research on Gypsies]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 211–238. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000.
- Kis, János. “Beyond the Nation State.” *Social Research* 63, no. 1 (1995): 224–237.
- Kóczé, Angéla, and Éva Kovács. “Ezt még igazából nem dolgoztuk föl.” Beszélgetés Kóczé Angélával és Kovács Évával, a Méltóságot Mindenkinék Mozgalom tagjaival. Készítette: Horváth Kata és Kovai Cecília [An interview with Angéla Kóczé and Éva Kovács, members of the movement *Dignity for everyone*, by Kata Horváth and Cecília Kovai]. *anBlok* 4 (2010): 24–27.

- Kóczé, Angéla, and Nidhi Trehan. "Postcolonial Racism and Social Justice: The Struggle for the Soul of the Romani Civil Rights Movement in the 'New Europe.'" In *Racism, Post-colonialism, Europe*, edited by Graham Huggan, 50–77. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.
- König, Ulrich. *Sinti und Roma unter dem Nationalsozialismus*. Bochum: Brockmeyer Verlag, 1989.
- Körtvélyesi, Zsolt. "From 'We the People' To 'We the Nation.'" In *Constitution for a Disunited Nation Hungary's New Fundamental Law*, edited by Gábor Attila Tóth, 111–142. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2012.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. "'Spaces of Experience' and 'Horizon of Expectation': Two Historical Categories." In *On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by Keith Tribe, 267–288. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985 (1st ed. Frankfurt, 1979).
- Kőszegi, Edit, and Péter Szuhay. *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép*. Dokumentumfilm [Gypsy picture – Roma picture. Documentary]. Néprajzi Múzeum, 2002.
- . *Kései születés*. Dokumentumfilm [Late birth. Documentary]. Fórum Film Alapítvány, 2003.
- Kovács, Éva. "Fekete testek, fehér testek – A 'cigány' képe az 1850-es évektől a XX. század első feléig" [Black bodies, white bodies: The 'Gypsy' image from the 1850s until the first half of the 20th century]. *Beszélő* 1 (2009): 74–90.
- Kovács, Kriszta. "Equality: The Missing Link." In *Constitution for a Disunited Nation. On Hungary's 2011 Fundamental Law*, edited by Gábor Attila Tóth. Budapest: CEU Press, 2012.
- Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Hungarian Central Statistical Office]. "1960. évi népszámlálás: Összefoglaló adatok" [Census of 1960: Summary]. Vol. 13, Budapest, 1964.
- . "1980. évi népszámlálás: Demográfiai adatok" [Census of 1980: Demographic Data]. Vol. 21, Budapest, 1981.
- . "2011. évi népszámlálás" [Census of 2011]. Vol. 11, Budapest.
- Kripke, Saul. "Naming and Necessity." In *Semantics of Natural Language*, edited by Donald Davidson, and Gilbert Harman Dordrecht. Boston, MA: Reidel, 1972.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Ladányi, János, and Iván Szelényi. "Az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról" [On the objectivity of ethnic classifications]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 203–209. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000. (First publication: *Kritika* 3 (1998): 33–35.)
- . "Még egyszer az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról" [Once more on the 'objectivity' of ethnic classifications]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 239–241. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000. (First publication: *Replika* 30 (June, 1998): 179–181.)
- . *A kirekesztettség változó formái* [The changing forms of exclusion]. Budapest: Napvilág, 2004.
- . "Cigányok és szegények Magyarországon, Romániában és Bulgáriában" [Gypsies and poor people in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 4 (2002): 72–94.

- . Ki a cigány? [Who is a Gypsy?]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 179–191. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000. (First publication: *Kritika* 12 (1997): 3–6.)
- Ladányi, János, and Tünde Virág. “A szociális és etnikai alapú lakóhelyi szegregáció változó formái Magyarországon a piacgazdaság átmeneti időszakában” [Changing forms of social and ethnic-based housing segregation in Hungary in the transitional period of the market economy]. *Kritika* 8–9 (2009): 2–8.
- Ladányi, János. “Romaügyek pedig nincsenek!” [There are no Roma affairs!]. *Egyenlítő* 1, no. 1 (April, 2003): 21–26.
- Lakatos, Menyhért. *Füstös képek* [The color of smoke]. Budapest: Magvető, 1975.
- Lázár, Guy. “A felnőtt lakosság nemzeti identitása a kisebbségekhez való viszony tükrében.” [The national identity of the adult population in the light of its relation to minorities] In *Többség – Kisebbség. Tanulmányok a nemzeti tudat témaköréből* [Majority – Minority: Studies on national identity], edited by Guy Lázár, Judit Lendvai, Antal Örkény, and Ildikó Szabó, 9–115. Budapest: Osiris – MTA – ELTE Kommunikációelméleti Kutatócsoport, 1996.
- Leduc, Jean. *Les historiens et le temps, conceptions, problématiques, écritures*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1999.
- Lemon, Alaina. *Between Two Fires: Performance and Romani Memory from Pushkin to Post-Socialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Lengyel, Gabriella. “Cigánytelepek egykor és ma” [Roma colonies in the past and today]. In *Átszervezések kora. Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2002–2006* [A Roma’s life in Hungary. Report 2002 to 2006: The age of reorganization], edited by Ernő Kállai, and Erika Törzsök, 56–91. Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 2006.
- Liégeois, Jean-Pierre. *Roma in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2007.
- . *Roma, Gypsies, Travellers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1994.
- Lindenberger, Thomas. “Alltagsgeschichte und ihr möglicher Beitrag zu einer Gesellschaftsgeschichte der DDR.” In *Die Grenzen der Diktatur. Staat und Gesellschaft in der DDR*, edited by Martin Bessel, and Ralph Jessen, 298–325. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Lüdtke, Alf, ed. *Alltagsgeschichte*. Frankfurt: Campus, 2002 [1989].
- Luhman, Niklas. *Legitimation durch Verfahren*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1983.
- M. Ladvenicza, Ilona. “A csobánkai cigányok szegkövácslása” [The nail-smith Gypsies in Csobánka], *Néprajzi Értésítő* 37 (1955): 227–241.
- M. László, Ferenc. “Önerőt merítettek – Roma foglalkoztatási programok I” [Roma employment programs I] *Oknyomozó*, 2009. Accessed April 8, 2015. <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/38>.
- . “Sziszüphosz a Csereháton – Roma foglalkoztatási programok II” [Roma employment programs II] *Oknyomozó*, 2009. Accessed April 8, 2015. <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/39>.
- M. Tóth, Balázs, and Pap András László. “Etnikai profilalkotás a magyar rendőrség igazoltatási gyakorlatában” [Ethnic profiling in ID checks by the Hungarian police]. In *Lejtős pálya. Antidiszkrimináció és esélyegyenlőség* [Slippery slope – Antidiscrimination and equality policies], edited by Balázs Majtényi, 111–134. Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2009.
- M. Tóth, Balázs. “Percepcióalapú etnikai adatok és az önrendelkezési jog” [Perception-based ethnic data and the right to self-determination]. *Föld-rész* 3–4 (2009): 147–157.

- Majtényi, Balázs, and András László Pap. "Uniformizáltak-e az etnikai adatok? Eltérő helyzetek az etnikai adatok, információk kezelésénél" [Are ethnic data uniform? Legal options for ethnic data processing]. In *Lejtős pálya. Antidiszkrimináció és esélyegyenlőség* [Slippery slope – Antidiscrimination and equality policies], edited by Balázs Majtényi, 89–110. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009.
- Majtényi, Balázs, and Balázs Vizi. "A kisebbségi jogok nemzetközi okmányai. Dokumentumgyűjtemény" [Selected international documents on minority protection]. Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Jogtudományi Intézet – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2003.
- Majtényi, Balázs. "Mi lesz veled 'bezzeggyerek'? Változóban a kisebbségi jogi szabályozás" [What Will Happen to Our Model Child? Amendments of the Hungarian Minority Law]. *Fundamentum* 3 (2005): 109–120.
- . "Történelmünk hagyománya" [Historical approaches to the Fundamental Law]. *Fundamentum* 2 (2011): 56–61.
- . "What Has Happened to Our Model Child? The Creation and Evolution of the Hungarian Minority Act." *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 5 (2006): 397–419.
- . *A nemzetállam új ruhája. Multikulturalizmus Magyarországon* [The new cloth of nation state. Multiculturalism in Hungary]. Budapest: Gondolat, 2007.
- Majtényi, György. "Texts, Structures and Experiences." *Socio.hu. Online Journal of the Institute for Sociology, Centre for Social Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences*. Special issue in English 2 (2014): 96–117.
- Márfi, Attila. "Cigánysors, cigánykérdés; a vályogtelepek felszámolása Baranyában a tanácskorszak idején" [Gypsy fate, Gypsy Issue: the elimination of mud settlements in Baranya during the council period]. In *Távolodás és közelítések. Rendszerváltás és Kádár-korszak* [Regime change and the Kádár era], edited by György Majtényi, and Csaba Szabó, 339–353. Budapest: Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára – Kossuth, 2008.
- Máté, Mihály. "Abroszárusok – A colári cigányokról, Magyarország legkisebb cigány csoportjáról" [About the Colari Gypsies, the smallest subgroup among Gypsies living in Hungary] *Beszélő* 10 (2009): 50–61.
- . *Lovári nyelvkönyv. Lovareski shib* [Lovari textbook]. Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1994.
- Matras, Yaron. "A conflict of paradigms: Review article." *Romani Studies* 14, no. 2 (2004): 193–219.
- Mayer, Éva, ed. *Kisebbségek Magyarországon, 2004–2005* [Minorities in Hungary, 2004–2005]. Budapest: NEKH, 2005.
- Messing, Vera. "Egymásnak kiszolgáltva. Inter-etnikus konfliktusok és a média" [At the mercy of each other. Interethnic conflicts and the media]. In *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [Minority among the minorities: Human and political rights of Roma in Hungary], edited by Mária Neményi, and Júlia Szalai. Budapest: Új Mandátum Kiadó, 2005.
- . "Gondolatok Rogers Brubaker: Csoportok nélküli etnicitás c. könyve kapcsán" [Some thoughts on Rogers Brubaker's book *Ethnicity without Groups*]. *Regio* 1 (2006): 215–221.
- Mezey, Barna, László Pomogyi, and István Tauber. *A magyarországi cigánykérdés dokumentumokban, 1422–1985* [Documents of the Gypsy question in Hungary, 1422–1985]. Budapest: Kossuth, 1986.
- Mezey, Katalin, ed. *Roma kincses kalendárium 2001. Romano kalendari 2001* [Romani calendar 2001], selected by Gusztáv Nagy and József Choli Daróczi. Budapest: Széphalom Könyvműhely, 2001.

- Miklósi, Zoltán. "Demokrácia: liberális, alkotmányos és egyéb" [Democracy: Liberal, constitutional and other]. *Szuverén*, 2014. Accessed 13 November, 2014. <http://szuveren.hu/politika/demokracia-liberalis-alkotmanyos-es-egyeb>.
- Mikó, Zsuzsanna. "Cigánykaraván a jog szorításában az 1950-es évek Magyarországnán" [Gypsy Caravan in the 1950s Hungary]. In *Cigánysors. A cigányság történeti múltja és jelene 2* [Gypsy fate. The past and present of the Gypsy population 2], edited by Attila Márfi, 135–140. Pécs: Baranya Megyei Levéltár, 2009.
- Molnár, Emília, and Csaba Dupcsik. *Country Report on Education: Hungary, 2008*. Accessed April 8, 2015. http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/documents/edu-migrom_background_paper_hungary_educ.pdf.
- Molnár, Emília, and Kai A. Schafft. "A helyi roma/cigány kisebbségi önkormányzatok tevékenysége és céljai Magyarországon 2000–2001-ben" [The activities and goals of local Roma/Gypsy minority self-governments in Hungary in 2000 and 2001]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 1 (2003): 79–99.
- Molnár, Emília. "A beilleszkedéstől az önkormányzatisáig. A roma önszerveződés intézményesülésének története Békésen" [The history of Roma self-organization in Békés]. In *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [Minority among the minorities: Human and political rights of Roma in Hungary], edited by Mária Neményi, and Júlia Szalai, 458–489. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005.
- Molnár, István Gábor. *In memoriam Péli Tamás (1990–1994). Portréfilm* [In memoriam of Tamás Péli (1990–1994). Portrait]. Budapest: Eötvös József Cigány–Magyar Pedagógiai Társaság, 2004.
- Muir, Edward, and Guido Ruggiero, eds. *Microhistory and the Lost People of Europe*. Translated by Eren Branch. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Nagy, Gusztáv, ed. *Az idő szekerén. Cigány írók antológiája. Elbeszélések* [Anthology of Gypsy writers]. Budapest: UbiPressz Bt., 1998.
- Nagy, Pál, ed. "Ugyanolyanok, mint mindenki más ember." *Válogatás a Szabolcs-Szatmár megyei cigányság történeteinek forrásaiból (1951–1961)* [Selection from the resources of Roma history in Szabolcs-Szatmár County (1951–1961)]. Nyíregyháza: Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megyei Levéltár – Szent István Egyetem Gazdaság- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, 2010.
- . "Cigány csoportok és az együttélési modellek változásai a Kárpát-medencében a 15–20. században" [Gypsy groups and changes in the models of coexistence in the Carpathian Basin between the 15th and 20th century]. In *Romák a történelemtanításban* [The Roma in history teaching], 35–50. *Történelemtanárok 17. Országos Konferenciája*. Budapest: Történelemtanárok Egylete, 2008.
- . *A magyarországi cigányok története a rendi társadalom korában* [The history of roma in Hungary during the feudal era]. Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola Társadalomtudományi Tanszék, 1998.
- National Planning Authority Long-term Planning Department submission to the Economic Policy Committee, "The composition of strata that are multiply disadvantaged, the reasons for their reproduction and modes for improving their situation." Basic study. October, 1979.
- Neményi, Mária. "Kis roma demográfia" [Brief Roma demography]. In *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 277–282. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000.

- . “Méltányosság és méltóság” [Due and respectful treatment]. In *Nemzetfelfogások* [Concepts of Nationhood. Minority – majority], edited by Pál Tamás, Gábor Eröss, and Tímea Tibori, 196–203. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005.
- Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Jogok Országgyűlési Biztosja [Parliamentary Commissioner for the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities]. “Jelentés a szociális ellátásokat szigorító egyes helyi önkormányzati rendeletek kisebbségi jogi szempontú vizsgálatáról (a ‘monoki modell’)” [Inquiry of certain local governmental decrees tightening social supplies from the perspective of minority rights (the ‘Monok Model’)]. Accessed April 8, 2015. http://www.kisebbségiombudsman.hu/word/06-17-2008_14_15_47/monok_jelentes_szines.html.
- . “A nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségi jogok országgyűlési biztosának jelentése a 2011 márciusában történt gyöngyöspatai események és a hasonló jelenségek veszélyeiről” [The Report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the National and Ethnic Minority Rights on the incidents happened in Gyöngyöspata in March, 2011]. Budapest, 2011.
- Népművelési Intézet Művelődési Otthon és Klub Osztálya. *Dokumentumok a Magyarországi Cigányok Kulturális Szövetsége, 1957–1961 életéből* [Documents from the life of the Cultural Association of Hungarian Gypsies, 1957–1960]. Budapest, 1986.
- Nora, Pierre. “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire [1984].” *Representations* 26 (Spring, 1989): 7–25.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Ö. Kovács, József. “Ekkora gyűlölet még nem volt a falunkban, mint most.’ Szövegek és kommentárok az erőszakos kollektivizálás befejező hullámáról” [Texts and commentaries on the concluding wave of forced collectivization]. *Századvég* 13, no. 47 (2008): 37–69.
- O’Leary, Brendan. “Ernest Gellner’s diagnoses of nationalism: A critical overview.” In *The State of the Nation. Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism*, edited by John A. Hall, 40–90. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Okely, Judith. *The traveller Gypsies*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Oláh, József. “Romák társadalmi kirekesztése vagy társadalmi befogadása?” [Inclusion or exclusion of the Roma in society?]. *Regio* 1 (2006): 198–214.
- Orsós, Anna. *Beás nyelvkönyv kezdőknek. Pályimbá bájásilor* [Boyash textbook for beginners]. Kaposvár: Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1994.
- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). “Addressing Violence, Promoting Integration. Field Assessment of Violent Incidents against Roma in Hungary: Key Developments, Findings and Recommendations.” Report on a field assessment in Hungary in June–July 2009, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), Warsaw, 2010.
- Országgyűlési Biztosok Hivatala [Parliamentary Commissioners’ Office]. “Beszámoló a nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségi jogok országgyűlési biztosának tevékenységéről, 2000. január 1.– december 31” [Report on the activity of the parliamentary commissioner for the rights of national and ethnic minorities, 1 January – 31 December, 2000]. Budapest, 2001.
- Pataki, László T. “Haza a Hajnal-völgyben” [A home in the Hajnal valley]. *Nógrád* (April 6, 1978.): 5.
- Pogány, György, and Géza Bán. “A magyarországi cigánység helyzetéről” [On the situation of the Gypsy population in Hungary]. *Munkügyi Szemle* 5 (1958): 42–45.

- . *A magyarországi cigányság helyzetéről* [On the situation of the Gypsies in Hungary]. Published manuscript. Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár – MD 11 488, 1958.
- Pogonyi, Szabolcs. “Non-Resident Hungarians Get Voting Rights” (2012). Accessed 13 November, 2014. <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/search-results/591-non-resident-hungarians-get-voting-rights>.
- Pomogyi, László. *A magyarországi cigányság történetének válogatott bibliográfiája* [A selected bibliography of the history of the Gypsies in Hungary]. Budapest: ELTE Állam és Jogtörténeti TDK (Állam- és jogtörténeti bibliográfiák 5), 1983.
- . *Cigánykérdés és a cigányügyi igazgatás a polgári Magyarországon* [The Gypsy question and the administration of Gypsy affairs in Hungary before 1945]. Budapest: Osiris-Századvég, 1995.
- Pozsgay, Imre. “A szociológiai és történeti tények szava. Beszélgetés Pozsgay Imrével” [On sociological and historical facts. An Interview with Imre Pozsgay]. In *Egyszer karolt át egy fát. Cigányalmanach* [Gypsy Almanac], edited by Gábor Murányi, 5–11. Budapest: Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat, 1986.
- Prónai, Csaba. *Cigánykutatás és kulturális antropológia* [Romology research and cultural anthropology]. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem – Csokonai Vitéz Mihály Tanítóképző Főiskola, 1995.
- Pulay, Gyula, and János Benkő. *A magyarországi cigányság helyzetének javítására és felemelkedésére a rendszerváltás óta fordított támogatások mértékéről és hatékonyságáról*. [Rate and efficiency of expenditures spent for the improvement of living conditions of Roma in Hungary since the regime change]. Budapest: Állami Számvevőszék Fejlesztési és Módszertani Intézet, 2008.
- Purcsi, Barna Gyula. “Fekete személyi igazolvány és munkatábor. Kísérlet a cigánykérdés megoldására az ötvenes évek Magyarországon?” [Black identity cards and labor camps: Attempts to find a solution to the ‘Gypsy question’ in the 1950s Hungary]. *Beszélő* 6 (2001): 26–37.
- Putnam, Hilary. *Reason, Truth and History*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Raz, Joseph. “Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective.” *Dissent* 41 (1994): 67–79.
- . “Multiculturalism.” *Ratio Juris* 11, no. 3 (September, 1998): 193–205.
- Reading, Anna Marie. “The European Roma: An Unsettled Right to Memory.” In *Public Memory, Public Media, and the Politics of Justice*, edited by Philip Lee, and Pradip N. Thomas, 121–140. Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012.
- Révész, Sándor. “Hosszú útról visszatérni” [Returning from a long way]. *Beszélő* 13 (April, 1995): 6–7.
- Roma Sajtóközpont [Roma Press Center]. “Köznapi események krónikája, 1997” [Chronical of Everyday Events, 1997]. Budapest: Magyar Helsinki Bizottság, 1998.
- Romano Rác, Sándor. *Cigány sor* [Gypsy quarter]. Budapest: Osiris, 2008.
- Romsics, Ignác. *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században* [Nation, nationality and state in Central and South-East Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries]. Budapest: Napvilág, 1988.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *Hidden from History*. London: Pluto Press, 1992.
- Sághy, Erna. “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon az 1950-es, 1960-as években” [The policy towards Gypsies in Hungary in the 1950s and 1960s]. *Múltunk* 1 (2008): 273–308.

- . “Cigánypolitika Magyarországon” 1945–1961 [The policy towards Gypsies in Hungary in 1945–1961]. *Regio* 1 (1999): 16–34.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
- Sára, Balázs, dir. *Lakatos Menyhért* (portréfilm) [Portrait of the writer Menyhért Lakatos], 2002.
- , dir. *Cigányok* (dokumentumfilm) [Gypsies (documentary)], 1962.
- Schiffer, Pál, dir. *A pártfogolt* (dokumentum-játékfilm) [On Probation (documentary)], 1981.
- , dir. *Cséplő Gyuri* (dokumentum-játékfilm) [Cséplő Gyuri (documentary)], 1978.
- , dir. *Faluszéli házak* (dokumentumfilm) [Houses at the village end (documentary)], 1972.
- , dir. *Fekete vonat* (dokumentumfilm) [Black train (documentary)], 1970.
- , dir. *Mit csinálnak a cigánygyerekek?* (dokumentumfilm) [What do the Gypsy kids do? (documentary)], 1973.
- Sen, Amartya. *Social Exclusion: Concept, Application and Scrutiny*. Office of Environment and Social Development, Asian Development Bank, Social Development Papers no. 1, June, 2000.
- Stewart, Michael. “A roma/cigány ‘eticitás’ az antropológiai vizsgálódás homlokterében” [Roma/Gypsy ‘ethnicity’ in the foreground of anthropological research]. In *Etnicitás. Különbségteremtő társadalom* [Ethnicity. Distinction and difference in the society], edited by Margit Feischmidt, 33–47. Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010.
- . “Remembering without commemoration: The mnemonics and politics of Holocaust memories among European Roma.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* n.s. 10 (2004): 561–582.
- . *Daltestvérek. Az oláh cigány identitás és közösség továbbélése a szocialista Magyarországon* [Brothers in song: Survival of the Vlach Gypsy identity and community in socialist Hungary]. Translated by Tamás Sajó, Zsuzsa Szarvas, and Gábor Vargyas. Budapest: T-Twins, MTA Szociológiai Intézet and Max Weber Alapítvány, 1994.
- . *The Time of the Gypsies*. Oxford: Westview, 1997.
- Synnott, Anthony, and David Howes. “Canada’s Visible Minorities: Identity and Representation.” In *Re-situating Identities: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Culture*, edited by Vered Amit-Talai and Caroline Knowles, 137–160. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1996.
- Szalai, Andrea. “A mi és az ők határai, avagy a beások belülről” [The characteristics of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ opposition in the language use of Boyash Gypsies]. *Regio* 1 (1997): 104–126.
- Szalai, Júlia. “A társadalmi kirekesztődés egyes kérdései az ezredforduló Magyarországon” [Social outcasts in twenty-first century Hungary]. *Szociológiai Szemle* 4 (2002): 34–50.
- . “Az elismerés politikája és a cigánykérdés” [The politics of recognition and the ‘Gypsy question’: On some contemporary problems of the majority-minority relations]. In *Cigánynak születni: Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [Born as Gypsy: Studies, documents], edited by Ágota Horváth, Edit Landau, and Júlia Szalai, 531–571. Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum, 2000.
- . *Nincs két ország? Társadalmi küzdelmek az állami (túl)elosztásért a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon* [There is but one country? Social struggles for (excessive) state redistribution in Hungary during the transition]. Budapest: Osiris, 2007.
- . *Uram! A jogaimért jöttem! Esszék, tanulmányok* [Sir! I am claiming my rights! Essays and studies]. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 1998.

- Szelényi, Iván, and Donald J. Treiman. "Social Stratification in Eastern Europe after 1989." Last revised 8 December, 1994. <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/issr/da/datapickup/For-Libbie/SSSEE%20Quex/SSEE.CDBK.PDF>.
- Szikra, Dorottya. "Produktív szociálpolitika" [Productive social policy]. *Szuverén*. Accessed April 8, 2015. <http://szuveren.hu/tarsadalom/produktiv-szocialpolitika>.
- . "Democracy and Welfare in Hard Times: The Social Policy of the Orbán Government in Hungary between 2010 and 2014." *Journal of European Social Policy* 24 (December, 2014): 486–500.
- Szociális és Munkaügyi Minisztérium [Ministry of Social and Labor Affairs]. "Roma telepeken élők lakhatási és szociális integrációs modellprogramja 2005–2006" [Roma social and housing programs, 2005–2006]. Budapest: Szerif Kiadó, 2006.
- Szőke, Zsuzsa. "A roma (nem)foglalkoztatási program" [The Roma (non)employment program]. *Beszélő* 1 (2010): 34–43.
- Szűgyi, Jerne. "Labirintuspróba. A fogyatékos nyilvántartás útvesztői" [The labyrinth test. The road to declaring disability]. *Beszélő* 3 (2009): 48–60.
- . "Numerus nullus. Szegregáció és deszegregáció a magyar közoktatásban" [Numerus nullus: Segregation and desegregation in the Hungarian public education system]. *Beszélő* 9 (2008): 84–95.
- Szuhay, Péter, and Antónia Barati. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. – "A világ létra, melyen az egyik fel, a másik le megy"* [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the twentieth Century: "The world is a ladder upon which some go up, some go down"]. Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1993.
- Szuhay, Péter, ed. *Cigány-kép – Roma-kép. A Néprajzi Múzeum "Romák Közép- és Kelet-Európában" című nemzetközi kiállításának képeskönyve* [Illustrated book of the international exhibition "Roma in Central and Eastern Europe" organized by the Museum of Ethnography]. Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum, 1998.
- . "Foglalkozási és megélhetési stratégiák a magyarországi cigányok körében" [Strategies for employment and living among Gypsies in Hungary]. In *A cigányok Magyarországon* [Roma in Hungary], edited by Ferenc Glatz, 139–161. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1999.
- . "A cigány irodalom" [Gypsy Literature]. In *A magyarországi romák* [The Hungarian Roma], edited by István Kemény, 37–41. Budapest: Press Publica, 2000.
- . "A néprajzi kutatás forrásai" [The sources of ethnographical research]. *Amaro Drom* 4, no. 9 (1994): 16–19.
- . "Akiket cigányoknak neveznek – akik magukat romának, muzsikusnak vagy beásnak mondják" [Who are called Gypsies – who think of themselves as Romani, Musician or Boyash]. *Magyar Tudomány* 6 (1997): 656–674.
- . "Az egzotikus vadembertől a hatalom önnön legitimálásáig – a magyarországi cigányokról készített fotók típusai" [From the exotic wild man to legitimizing power – Types of photos taken of Hungarian Gypsies]. In *A Roma Kultúra Virtuális Háza. Multimédiális DVD-ROM* [Virtual House of Roma Culture DVD ROM], edited by Gábor Fleck, and Péter Suhay. Budapest, 2006.
- . "Cigány kultúra. A magyarországi cigány etnikai csoportok integrációjáról és a nemzeti kultúra megalkotásáról" [Gypsy culture. Integraton of Gypsy ethnic groups and constructing a Gypsy national culture]. *BUKSZ* 3 (1995): 329–341.
- . "Ki beszél? Cigány/roma reprezentáció a képző és fotóművészetben" [Gypsy/Roma representation in fine arts and photography]. In *Etnicitás. Különbőségteremtő tár-*

- sadalom* [Ethnicity. Distinction and difference in the society], edited by Margit Feischmidt, 367–391. Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010.
- . *A magyarországi cigányok kultúrája: etnikus kultúra vagy a szegénység kultúrája* [The culture of the Gypsies in Hungary: An ethnic culture or the culture of poverty]. Budapest: Panoráma, 1999.
- . *A társadalom peremén. Képek a magyarországi cigányok életéből* [At the margin of society]. Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum – Fővárosi Tanács VB, Cigány Szociális Módszertani és Művelődési Központ, 1989.
- TASZ [Hungarian Civil Liberties Union]. “Governmental attacks against Hungarian NGO sphere.” Accessed November 13, 2014. http://tasz.hu/files/tasz/imce/timeline_of_gov_attacks_against_hungarian_ngos_20140921.pdf.
- Tauber, István. “A cigányok által elkövetett bűncselekmények kriminológiai kutatása” [Criminological research of crimes committed by Gypsies]. *Belügyi Szemle* 5 (1979): 49–57.
- . *A hátrányos társadalmi helyzet és a bűnözés összefüggései, különös tekintettel egyes kisebbségi csoportokra* [The relationship between underprivileged social status and criminality in regard to the case of certain minority groups]. Budapest: ELTE Jogi Továbbképző Intézet, Tankönyvkiadó, 1986.
- Tauszik, Nagyzezsda, and György Tóth. “A hazai cigányság és a nem cigány lakosság dermatoglyphiai tulajdonságai közötti különbségek” [Dermatoglyphic distinctions between the Gypsy and the non-Gypsy population in Hungary]. *Belügyi Szemle* (June, 1987): 111–115.
- Taylor, Charles. “The Politics of Recognition” In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, edited by Amy Gutmann, 25–74. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Tebbutt, Susan. *Sinti and Roma: Gypsies in German-Speaking Society and Literature* (Culture & Society in Germany, 2). New York: Berghahn Books, 1998.
- Tenigl Takács, László. “Korunk mantrái” [The mantra of the era]. *Mozgó Világ* 2 (2010): 70–78.
- Tidrick, Heather. “Gadzology as Activism: What I Would Have Ethnography Do for East European Roma.” *Collaborative Anthropologies* 3 (2010): 121–131.
- Timmer, Alexandra. “Report state-of-the-art literature review human rights, democracy and the rule of law,” Work Package No. 3 – Deliverable No. 1. FRAME: Fostering Human Rights among European Policies, 2013, accessed 11 November, 2014. www.fp7-frame.eu/wp-content/materiale/reports/01-Deliverable-3.1.pdf.
- Tóth, Gábor Attila, ed. *Constitution for a Disunited Nation: on Hungary’s 2011 Fundamental Law*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2012.
- . “Justitia bekötött szeme” [Iustitia with blindfold]. *Szuverén*, 2011, accessed April 8, 2015. <http://www.szuveren.hu/jog/justitia-bekotott-szeme>.
- UCLA, Department of Sociology. “General Population Survey.” Los Angeles, 1993.
- Valuch, Tibor. “Szegény ember vízzel főz... Adalékok a magyarországi szegénység történetéhez a XX. század második felében” [Contributions to the history of poverty in Hungary in the second half of the 20th century]. In *Megtalálható-e a múlt? Tanulmányok Gyáni Gábor 60. születésnapjára* [Is the past findable? Studies dedicated to Gábor Gyáni to commemorate his 60th birthday], edited by Zsombor Bódy, Sándor Horváth, and Tibor Valuch. 269–281. Budapest: Argumentum, 2010.
- Váradi, János. “A magyarországi cigány népesség számának alakulása 1850–1910” [The development of the Hungarian Gypsy population 1850–1910]. *Regio* 4 (2009): 60–81.

- Váradi, Monika Mária. "Szegénység, kirekesztettség" [Poverty, exclusion]. In *Közösségtanulmány. Módszertani jegyzet* [Community studies. A methodological handbook], edited by Éva Kovács. Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum – Pécsi Tudományegyetem BTK Kommunikáció- és Médiatudományi Tanszék, 2007.
- Varró, Szilvia. *Céltalanul – Az MSZP–SZDSZ kormányok romapolitikája 2002 óta* [Without any aim. Roma policy of the MSZP–SZDSZ governments since 2002], 2009, accessed April 8, 2015. <http://oknyomozo.hu/node/22>.
- Vekerdí, József. *A magyarországi cigánykutatások története* [History of Gypsy research in Hungary]. Debrecen: KLTE, 1982.
- Vermeersch, Peter. *The Romani Movement: Minority Politics and Ethnic Mobilization in Contemporary Central Europe*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.
- Vidra, Zsuzsa. "Cigányság a magyar sajtóban, 1945–2000" [Roma in the Hungarian press, 1945–2000]. In *Bevándorlás Magyarországra* [Immigration to Hungary], edited by Pál Péter Tóth, 249–287. Budapest: Kisebbségkutatás Könyvek, 2006.
- . "De l'invisibilité à la visibilité. Politiques d'intégration et stratégies identitaires des Tsiganes de Hongrie dans une ville (post)-industrielle." PhD Diss. 2008.
- Vidra, Zsuzsa, and Jon Fox. "Mainstreaming of Racist Anti-Roma Discourses in the Media in Hungary." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 12, no. 4 (2014): 437–455
- Vigh, József, István Tauber, and Imre Madácsi. *A hátrányos társadalmi helyzet és a bűnözés kapcsolata* [The relationship between underprivileged social status and criminality]. Budapest: BM Könyvkiadó, 1988.
- Virág, Tünde. "Az átengedett munka. Megélhetés és munkavállalás két cigányok lakta faluban" [Ceded work. Subsistence and work in two gypsy villages]. In *Etnicitás. Különbségteremtő társadalom* [Ethnicity. Distinction and difference in society], edited by Margit Feischmidt, 254–266. Budapest: Gondolat – MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézet, 2010.
- . "Hátrányos helyzetű cigány fiatalok középfokú oktatási intézményei és lehetőségei" [Secondary schools and the possibilities of underprivileged youth]. *Iskolakultúra* 12 (2009): 102–115.
- . *Kirekesztve: Falusi gettók az ország peremén* [Excluded: Rural ghettos at the edges of the country]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 2010.
- Walter, Mignolo. "Delinking: the rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality, and the grammar of de-coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2 (2007): 449–514.
- White, Hayden. "The Burden of History." *History and Theory* 5, no. 2 (1966): 109–134.
- . *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- . "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *Clio* 3, no. 3 (1974): 277–303.
- Williams, Patrick. "Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities: Theorizing Modernism and Empire." In *Modernism and Empire*, edited by Howard Booth, and Nigel Rigby, 13–38. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Wingfield, Nancy M. "The Problem with *Backwardness*. Ivan T. Berend's Central and Eastern Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." *European History Quarterly* 34 (2004): 535–551.
- de Witte, Bruno. "Politics versus Law in the EU's Approach to Ethnic Minorities." European University Institute Working Paper, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, no. 4. Florence: European University Institute, 2000.
- Wizner, Balázs. "Osztok, keverek. Cigány programok és roma szervezetek finanszírozása a rendszerváltás után" [Financing Roma programs and organizations after regime change].

- In *Kisebbségek kisebbsége. A magyarországi cigányok emberi és politikai jogai* [The minority of minorities: The human and political rights of the Roma in Hungary], edited by Mária Neményi, and Júlia Szalai, 430–457. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005.
- Zolnay, János. “Vákuumfalvak, vákuumiskolák. Kistelepülések, kisiskolák, közoktatási kirekesztés” [Vacuum-villages and vacuum-schools. Small villages, small schools, and exclusion in public education]. *Beszélő* 6 (2008): 70–88.
- Zsigó, Jenő. “Feltárni és megnevezni az elnyomások direkt rendszerét” [To disclose and name the direct system of subordinations]. In *Kisebbségek kisebbsége* [The minority of minorities: The human and political rights of the Roma in Hungary], edited by Mária Neményi, and Júlia Szalai, 7–41. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2005.
- . Diplomácia a Roma Parlamentben [Diplomacy in the Roma parliament]. *Amaro Drom* (October, 2005).

List of Photographs

Péter Szuhay assisted in selecting the photographs.

Abbreviations

- EKCM Erdős Kamill Cigánymúzeum [Erdős Kamill Gypsy Museum]
Fortepan Fortepan on-line Privátfotó Gyűjtemény [Fortepan on-line Photo Collection]
OSA MRF Open Society Archives, Magyar Rendőr Fotóarchivum [Hungarian Police Photo Archives]
OSA 356 Open Society Archives, fond 356, Schiffer Pál gyűjtemény [Pál Schiffer collection]

Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] = Szuhay Péter – Barati Antónia ed. 1993: „A világ létra, melyen az egyik fel, a másik le megy”. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th Century: “The world is a ladder upon which some go up, some go down”]. Néprajzi Múzeum, Budapest.

A roma kultúra virtuális háza [The Virtual House of Roma Culture] = Fleck Gábor – Szuhay Péter ed. 2006: *A roma kultúra virtuális háza*. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture] Interaktív DVD-ROM.

On the cover

Wrecking a house in the Corvin Quarter. Budapest, 2005. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.

- Page 7: Gizella Faragó, family photo montage. Kétegyháza, 1990s. A roma kultúra virtuális háza [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 15: Pál Schiffer in the field. Circa 1970, HU-OSA 356.
- Page 16: Scene from filming of *Faluszéli házak* [Houses on the edge of town]. 1972. Photo by Tamás Féner. HU-OSA 356.
- Page 33: Holocaust survivors with family portrait. Circa 2000. Private photograph.
- Page 35: Rudolf Bukovits during construction of the Sió canal. 1947. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 37: Family photograph. Ozora. Circa 1960. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 38: Gypsy settlement. Circa 1950. Mária László's bequest. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 40: Gypsy woman making a net. Rozsály, 1957. Photo by András Béres. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 94/198.
- Page 41: Gypsy settlement. Late 1950s. Mária László's bequest. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 43: Building of the Mecsek Mining Industry Trust. Circa 1955. Fortepan
- Page 44: Pál Vajda Sr., Gypsy voivod. Zalaegerszeg, 1961. Private photograph.
- Page 47: Police viewing Lenin's photograph. 1957. OSA MRF
- Page 48: Gypsy caravan. 1950. OSA MRF
- Page 49: Mounted police. Balatonlelle, 1957. Photo by István Németh. OSA MRF
- Page 54: Police at construction site in Salgótarján. 1952. Photo by Miklós Pál. OSA MRF
- Page 65: Forest settlement in the film *Houses at the Edge of a Village*. Northeast Hungary, 1972. Photo by Tamás Féner. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 182/396.; HU OSA-356.
- Page 66: Worker at the Kaposvár Metalworks. Kaposvár, 1986. Photo by Béla Csonka. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 145/316.
- Page 67: Power plant in Tatabánya. Circa 1975. Fortepan.
- Page 68: The Pfeifer family's shooting range. Ozora, circa 1970. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 69: Spare baskets arriving. Buzsák, 1978. Photo by Gábor Ruzsonyi. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 133/288.
- Page 70: István Vilovits, retired mason, helps build the Rontó family's house. Felsőszolca, 1963. Photo by Árpád Birgés. A roma kultúra virtuális háza.

- [The Virtual House of Roma Culture] Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 171/377.
- Page 71: Shanty in winter. Pest county, circa 1980. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 180/392.
- Page 74: Gypsy settlement. 1969. Private photograph.
- Page 74: The Gypsies of Rozsály had an independent music and dance group. Rozsály, 1977. László Petrovits' photograph. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 75: Young bride serving lunch. Bogyiszló, 1968. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 158/343.
- Page 76: Portrait of a married couple. Ozora, circa 1970. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 77: Boy playing guitar at the edge of a settlement. Circa 1970. Photo by Albert Kresz. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 79: Girl in school. Circa 1970. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 79: Gypsy school in Sükösd. 1960. Photo by Sándor Bojár. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 162/353.
- Page 82: Girl in her home. 1974. Photo by Tamás Féner. From the filming of *Mit csinálnak a cigánygyerekek?* [What are the Gypsy children doing?]. HU-OSA 356.
- Page: 83: Edit Lettrich, social geographer in the field. 1983. Photo by László Bassa. Property of the photographer.
- Page 84: Forest settlement. Northeast Hungary, circa 1970. Photo by Tamás Féner. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 401/183.; HU-OSA 356.
- Page 85: Poster for the film *Mit csinálnak a cigánygyerekek?* [What are the Gypsy children doing?]. 1973.
- Page 86: Images from the film *Cséplő Gyuri*. 1978. (Advertisement) Property of the authors.
- Page 88: Premier of *Fekete vonat* [Black train]. Budapest, 1970. HU-OSA 356
- Page 89: Costume contest in a Young Pioneers camp: young girl dressed as a Gypsy. Csillebérc, 1959, Private photograph.

- Page 90: Credit union slide show using a Gypsy as a negative example. Circa 1970.
- Page 93: Police check at the entrance to a market. 1959. Photo by Kamill Erdős. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 97: Farewell in Csatka. 1975. Photo by Gábor Ruzsonyi. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 285/635.
- Page 101: Poster for the First Exhibit of Self-Taught Gypsy Fine Artists. 1979.
- Page 102: Sándor Pintér: *Facial Gallery of Roma Artists*, 2000. Tamás Péli, Menyhért Lakatos, József Choli Daróczi. A roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 104: Tamás Péli: *Birth*. Tiszadob, Childrens' Village, 1983.
- Page 107: Motorcycle owners. Boldog, 1985. Photo by Sándor Szabó. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 252/560.
- Page 108: Child labor. Becksed, 1992. Photo by Péter Szuhay. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 195/431.
- Page 109: House with lion fence. Sárkeresztúr, 2009. Photo by Péter Szuhay. Property of the photographer.
- Page 121: Bricklayers. Karcsa-Becksed, 1992. Photo by Péter Szuhay. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 80/164.
- Page 122: Construction. Eperjeske, 1992. Photo by Gózon Francisco. Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 177/389.
- Page 124: Horse cart. Settlement of Péró, Bicske (Fejér county), 2014. Photo by Flóra Pöcze. Property of the photographer.
- Page 127: Electors voting. Budapest, 1995. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.
- Page 130: Multiculturalism in Hungary. Three banners. Circa 2000. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.
- Page 131: Voter in front of the ballot box. Budapest, 2007. Photo by Gergely Szuhay.
- Page 132: Election poster for Lungo Drom
- Page 132: Orbán Kolompár, Roma politician, Kinga Göncz, minister without portfolio for equal opportunities, László Teleki, Roma politician. Budapest, 2004. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 135: László Gargya, Roma police staff sergeant. Budapest, 2003. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer

- Page 139: Flórián Farkas, Roma politician and Viktor Orbán, prime minister. Budapest, 1998. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 140: Orbán Kolompár gives a speech on a stage on Margaret Island. Budapest, 2007. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 142: Jenő Zsigó, Roma politician and reformer, leader of the Roma Parliament. Budapest, 2007. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 142: Aladár Horváth, Roma politician and reformer. Budapest, 2009. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 144: Poster for the 3rd National Exhibit of Roma Fine Artists. 2000.
- Page 145: Concert of the *100 Tagú Cigányzenekar* musical ensemble. Budapest, 2010. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer
- Page 146: Mara Oláh: *Cigányország*. [Gypsy country] Roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 147: Mara Oláh: *Kifehéredve*. [Whitened out] Roma kultúra virtuális háza. [The Virtual House of Roma Culture]
- Page 148: József Fenyvesi: *Drótos család*. [Tinker family] EKCM
- Page 150: Ágnes Daróczy, minority researcher, activist, a stereotype embodied: “the old pipe-smoking Gypsy woman”. From the exhibit *Politics of the Roma Body: There Are No Innocent Pictures*. Photo by Miklós Déri. Copyright: Gallery8, Gallery8 Roma -Contemporary Arts Space.
- Page 151: Mária Bogdán, media researcher, a stereotype embodied: “Gypsy palm reader”. From the exhibit *Politics of the Roma Body: There Are No Innocent Pictures*. Photo by Miklós Déri. Copyright: Gallery8, Gallery8 Roma -Contemporary Arts Space.
- Page 154: Tibor Derdák teaches French to Hungarian and Roma students. Magyar-mecske, 1989. Photo by Gyula Bartos. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the History of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th Century] 167/361.
- Page 158: Goat in a village doorway. Besence, 1996. Photo by Tünde Virág. Property of the photographer
- Page 160: Closed mine in Bódvarákó. 2004. Photo by Tünde Virág. Property of the photographer
- Page 162: Bulrush weaving. Köröm, 1992. Photo by Péter Szuhay. *Képek a magyarországi cigányság 20. századi történetéből*. [Pictures of the history of Gypsies in Hungary in the 20th century] 103/225.
- Page 164: Children in the courtyard of a District VIII tenement. Budapest, 1995. Photo by Tünde Virág. Property of the photographer.
- Page 165: Street scene. Settlement of Péro, Bicske (Fejér county), 2014. Photo by Flóra Pócze. Property of the photographer.

- Page 173: Poster for the 1993 photo exhibit titled “The world is a ladder upon which some go up and some go down.” Berlin touring exhibit stop, 1995.
- Page 190: On the way to Munich. Lawyer Henrietta Dinók reads the first comments on the Fundamental Law. Budapest – München international train, 2012. Photo by Dezső Tamás Ziegler. Property of the photographer.
- Page 192: Time of the Voivods? Csaba Kállai is declared the national Voivod of Hungarian Gypsies at the Ferencváros Sports Club’s handball arena. Budapest, 2006. Photo by Gergely Szuhay. Property of the photographer.
- Page 193: Roma children in Parliament. Budapest, 2005. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.
- Page 194: Ernő Kállai. “Last notes and we close the door” from the Ombudsman’s website archive. Budapest, 2011. source: <http://www.kisebbszegiombudsman.hu/>
- Page 198: Police check, Baross street. Budapest, 2000. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.
- Page 206: View. Settlement of Péró. Bicske (Fejér county), 2014. Photo by Flóra Pócze. Property of the photographer.
- Page 207: Gathering elderberries. Hungary, 2014. Photo by Flóra Pócze. Property of the photographer.
- Page 208: Family in the courtyard of a District VIII tenement. Budapest, 2015. Photo by Gyula Nyári. Property of the photographer.

Index

A

anthropological 2, 10, 13, 21, 87, 95
anti-egalitarian 8, 11, 31, 189, 199
assimilation 11, 17, 19, 34, 39, 46, 55,
62–66, 68, 70–71, 96, 97, 99, 106, 119–
120, 123, 125–126, 129, 145, 162
association 18, 36, 51, 96, 98–99, 133, 137,
153–156, 167–168

B

Barany, Zoltan 4, 23, 24, 25
Bari, Károly 20, 99–100, 103, 181
Bársony, János 56–57, 100
Barth, Fredrik 2
Bentham, Jeremy 187
Bergstein, Béla 45
Bibó, István 11, 209
Boyash 18–20, 68, 99, 126, 143, 145,
153–154

C

catch up 145
Choli Daróczy, József 102–103, 181
citizenship 127, 129, 159, 189
Colari Gypsy 67–68, 102
colonial 199–200, 209

colonization 179, 200, 209
communist party 31
constitution 31, 126, 129, 133, 138, 144,
188–189, 191–192, 196–197
constructivist approach 13
counter history, counter histories 4, 25,
205
cultural 1, 2, 4, 19–21, 50, 64–65, 96,
98–100, 123, 129, 133, 136, 143, 170–
171, 181, 200
Csalog, Zsolt 11, 12, 15, 80, 87–88, 94
Csepeli, György 11

D

Daróczy, Ágnes 56, 100, 102–103, 150
democracy 133, 188–189, 200, 207
democratic 119–120, 123, 125, 128, 133,
138–139, 167, 191, 199–200, 208
Dupcsik, Csaba 5, 170–171

E

East-Central Europe 9–10, 31, 38, 108
education 17, 61, 78, 91–92, 97, 106, 111,
115, 124, 129, 131, 133, 141, 145, 150,
152–155, 158, 162–163, 175, 177, 187,
195–197, 198

egalitarian 8, 10–11, 18, 31, 189, 191, 199
employment 17, 34, 42, 60, 72, 78–89,
91, 106, 108, 114, 123–124, 152–153,
156–158, 197, 175, 196–197
epistemological approach 12
equality 4, 6, 31, 53–55, 91, 126, 141, 149,
152, 155, 189, 191–192, 197, 200, 209
equal treatment 148–152
Erdős, Kamill 20, 32, 35
ethnic 2, 4–5, 9, 12, 17, 19–20, 23, 34, 53,
55, 57, 60, 73, 92, 94–95, 98–99, 106,
108–110, 120, 122, 125–126, 128–131,
141, 150, 152, 160–161, 163, 166–167,
170–172, 174, 188, 189, 191–192,
199–200, 206, 208
ethnic groups 2, 99, 166
exclusion 3, 11, 34, 70, 73, 88, 91–92, 106,
108–110, 157, 159–161, 191–192, 196,
199–209

F

Faludy, György 32, 143
Farkas, Flórián 137–139
Feischmidt, Margit 11, 18
Foucault, Michel 1, 4, 6, 22, 25, 26, 187
Fundamental Law 188–191, 195, 200

G

Gadzology 5
group 1, 2, 6, 8–9, 11, 13, 15–23, 32–34,
36, 38–39, 43, 50, 64, 68, 74, 78, 80–
82, 92–94, 96, 98–100, 102, 106, 110,
123, 126–127, 129, 137–138, 150,
152–153, 159, 161, 166, 169–172,
174, 200, 208
grouping 9, 20, 137
Gypsy 1–48, 50–68, 70–74, 77–85,
87–103, 106, 108–117, 120, 123–125,
133, 136–140, 143–146, 150–151,
155–156, 161, 163, 166–172, 188, 193,
197–199, 205–206, 208
Gypsy communities 2, 7, 16, 20, 31–32,
36–37, 39–41, 43, 46, 51–52, 64, 68,
80–81, 109
Gypsy crime 34, 93–94, 166–168, 197

Gypsy issue 11–12, 34, 36, 46, 48, 53, 61,
63, 73, 85, 89, 91, 94–95, 97, 98, 106,
110, 123, 175, 205

H

Habermas, Jürgen 103
Hancock, Ian F. 2, 3, 23, 174
Havas, Gábor 17, 81, 137, 177
history 1–13, 21–25, 32, 37, 50, 52, 62–63,
87, 93, 99–100, 102, 106, 110, 143, 167,
172, 187, 189, 191, 199–206, 209
history of everyday life 4
Holocaust 3, 32–33, 56, 100, 181
Horváth, Aladár 103, 137, 140–142
housing 17, 65, 70–72, 75, 89, 103, 124,
142, 188
human rights 4–5, 129, 142, 199, 200, 209
Hungarian Guard 167–168, 198, 203
Hungarian Gypsies 20, 33, 36, 50, 53, 63,
87, 96, 99–100, 113, 116, 137, 156, 193
Hungarian history 5–6, 10, 110, 172, 191,
199, 205

I

identity 1–3, 5, 8–14, 17–21, 32, 35, 67, 70,
97, 100, 110, 119–120, 126, 128, 133–
134, 153, 166, 172, 174, 205, 207, 209
illiberal 188, 199, 209
immigration 16
individuals 1, 6, 8, 22, 37, 40, 42, 55, 64,
68, 81, 84, 87–88, 93, 94, 120, 126, 129,
152–154, 161, 170, 188
integration 11, 13, 18, 25, 38–39, 80–81,
83, 96, 99, 120, 123–125, 130, 156, 163,
171, 174, 191, 199–200

J

Janky, Béla 126

K

Kádár era 55, 68, 73, 89, 93, 96, 106, 123, 169
Kádár, János 51, 52, 63–64, 66, 110

Kállai, Ernő 21, 194
Kálmán, András 33
Kemény, István 14–15, 17, 28, 80–83, 85,
100, 108, 126, 143
Kis, János 129, 143, 189
Kovács, Kriszta 191

L

Ladányi, János 161
Lakatos, Menyhért 100, 102–103
László, Mária 35–36, 51–53, 60
liberal 119–120, 124, 128–129, 188–189,
196, 199, 208
Liégeois, Jean-Pierre 2

M

majoritarian democracy 199
majority 2, 5–23, 31–32, 38, 40, 42, 46, 48,
50–51, 68, 73, 80, 83, 87, 91–92, 94–97,
99, 108–110, 123, 126, 128–131,
133–134, 139, 142–143, 148–149, 152,
156–157, 159–163, 166, 169, 171–174,
181, 187–188, 193, 196–199, 205–209
marginalization 8, 11
memories, memory 2–4, 6, 110
Minister's Council 46
ministry, ministries 34–36, 53, 123, 156, 174
Ministry of Labor 34, 42, 53
Ministry of the Interior 13, 36, 46, 48,
93–95
Minority Act 120, 122, 125–126, 128–129,
134, 144, 192
minority culture 52, 120, 143
minority, minorities 1, 3–6, 8–9, 11–14,
16–24, 31–36, 38, 40, 52, 55, 63–64,
83, 92–93, 96–100, 103, 106, 108, 110,
119–120, 122–123, 125–131, 133–134,
136–138, 140–145, 150, 152–153, 155,
161, 163, 166–172, 187, 189, 191–195,
196, 199, 200, 205–209
modernity 22, 39, 43, 65, 85, 128, 163, 165,
170
multiculturalism 128–130, 136, 171
Musician Gypsies 20, 60
Muzsikus Gypsies 20

N

national and ethnic minorities 120, 125,
128–129, 131, 141, 150, 192
national culture 99, 100, 103, 143
nationalism 8, 10, 12, 31, 37, 50, 100, 106,
128
nationalities 192, 194
nationality 193–194
national minority 33–36, 52, 63–64,
92–93, 96–98, 103, 125, 128, 137–138,
145, 150, 155, 187, 192
national movement 99–100, 102–103
nation (ethnic, political) 2–4, 8, 10, 13–14,
36–37, 45, 50–51, 103, 110, 129, 143,
165, 171–172, 187, 189, 191–192, 197,
200, 205–209
Neményi, Mária 17, 59
Nora, Pierre 110

O

ombudsperson 120, 141, 150, 192
Orbán, Viktor 139, 156, 174, 189, 202
Örkény, Antal 11

P

past 1–2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 21, 32, 45, 110, 125,
159, 161, 166, 189, 191, 208–209
Pirezians 169
Politburo 34, 46, 63, 70, 81, 106, 110–115
Political Committee 14
political nation 10, 189
Pomogyi, László 5
post-colonial 209, 203
poverty 11, 17, 73, 77, 81–83, 85, 91–92,
106, 120, 123, 129, 159–161, 163, 172,
195, 196–197, 207–208
program 82, 103, 124, 153–155, 157, 161,
168, 188, 195, 196–197

R

Raz, Joseph 129
regime change 8, 14, 32, 67, 75, 80, 83, 96,
99, 106, 119–120, 122–125, 129, 136–

141, 143, 145, 153, 156, 159, 162–163,
166, 169–170, 195, 199, 200, 208
researcher activism 4
Roma history 2–5, 9, 13, 23, 56, 174, 205,
209

S

Schiffer, Pál 15, 85, 87
self-government 35, 126, 130–131, 133–
134, 136–138, 140–141, 192, 193
self-organization 50, 103, 106, 136, 141,
208, 209
series of murders of Roma 167
shift 106, 165, 187, 199
Socialist Workers Party 14
social policy 63, 65, 70, 75, 78, 81, 89, 98,
106, 125, 158, 161, 195, 196, 207
society 2, 5, 7–14, 16, 17, 18, 20–23,
31–34, 36–38, 40, 43, 45–46, 50–52, 65,
68, 73, 80–81, 83–85, 87–89, 92, 96–97,
106, 110, 120, 123, 129, 152, 160–161,
163, 165–166, 169, 172, 188–189,
196–198, 200, 206–209

Stewart, Michael 18, 23, 65, 68
Szalai, Júlia 119, 159
Szelényi, Iván 118, 161
Szuhay, Péter 99, 109

T

Taylor, Charles 119

V

Virág, Tünde 20
visible minority 12
Vlach 18–20, 68, 103, 126, 143
Voivods / Gypsy judges 44, 46, 48, 68, 192

W

wage work 65

Z

Zsigó, Jenő 99, 101–103, 137, 141–142,
154, 159, 180

This book discusses the history of the Gypsy/Roma issue in the context of Hungarian history, relying on state policy documents. The authors track events and narratives from the historical turning point of 1945 to the present. The volume argues that despite various political changes, official policies towards the Roma have been characterized by continuous exclusion. Written from an equality and human rights perspective, the volume breaks with the dominant discourse that has constructed the Roma from the viewpoint of the state and which, further, has long determined scholarly discourse.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Balázs Majtényi is a lawyer and associate professor at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, and senior research fellow at the Institute for Legal Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. His research interests include nation building, constitutional law, and human rights.

György Majtényi is a historian and professor at Eszterházy Károly University of Applied Sciences, Eger. His research interests include history of the dominant elite in Hungary during state socialism and Roma social history.

This is their first co-authored book which was first published in Hungarian.

This important book examines the history of the Roma in Hungary after WWII. Theoretically engaged and historically sensitive, this account of the Roma's position in Hungary through multiple regime changes shows how and why efforts to deal with the "Roma question" repeatedly reinforced inequality despite official pronouncements to the contrary. The authors add their own broader theoretical engagement to set Roma history against a broader landscape of revolution and intolerance. This is crucial scholarship for all those who are engaged in the study of Central Europe or in the examination of minority cultures around the world.

Kim Lane Scheppele, Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Sociology and International Affairs, Princeton University

Central European University Press

Budapest – New York

Sales and information: ceupress@press.ceu.edu

Website: <http://www.ceupress.com>

ISBN 978 963 386 123 3



9 789633 861233