Mobile subjects: Power relations and tactics for survival

Ada I. Engebrigtsen

In a parking lot outside the Botanical garden in the centre of Oslo, 20 vans are parked side by side. On the fences around the garden, clothes are spread out to dry and while some women are busy frying chicken on small portable barbecues, others are washing dishes and others again are sitting around the fire eating. In some vans, one can see family members sleeping with the doors wide open, while some men are repairing cars or chatting and laughing in small groups. This scene resembles scenes in most Gypsy settlements I have seen in Eastern Europe. In Norway, where domestic privacy is strongly valued, this public display of private life is highly disturbing, challenging conceptual boundaries between self and other, public and private.

Romanies (Roma and other Gypsy populations) are present in most parts of the world. In Europe they make up large minorities in most countries. All European countries have both sedentary populations of Romanies that have been citizens for centuries and more recently settled populations of Roma. In addition, Romanian Romanies[1] that migrate as EU-citizens and tourists and have since about mid-2000 travelled regularly between Romania and the rest of Europa as workers, beggars, and entertainers. Street begging and entertainment (music) are the most prominent forms of livelihood in Norway for migrating Romanies. Romanian Romany migrants to Norway and the semi-nomadic Norwegian Rom population are my cases for this discussion.

---

[1] Roma and other similar minorities

By looking at these two different Romany groups' struggle for survival historically and in the present, I will explore how the concepts of mobility and nomadism can illuminate the power ratios between mobile populations and state-formations. I will discuss how governments try to control 'mobile subjects' such as Romanies, and their responses hereto. I will discuss mobility in terms of the interrelatedness of physical movement and motivation for movement. I argue that in spite of their stigma as 'eternal strangers' Roma and Romanies are dependent on social connections both outside and inside their own group and thus have changing relationships both with Roma and non-Roma. The relationship between time and mobility and the relationship between sedentarism and nomadism is intrinsic for the discussion here (see also Hays and Ninkova's chapter in this volume).

Mobility, nomadism, mobile subjects

I employ the concepts of mobility and mobile subjects here as metaphors of the same order as the French political philosophers Deleuze and Guattari's implied in their work 'Nomadology' (1986). Nomadology is a metaphorical concept and perspective for the aspects of the social world (groups, subjects, processes) that avoid state power, most often by being more or less mobile in a physical and/or psychological and intellectual sense. In Nomadology the state represents the sedentary power with control over territory while the mobile subjects represent the deterritorialized subjects in opposition. In Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy (1987, 1986), state-power and nomadic power represent interdependent forces that are tied together through opposition. The nomad is metaphorically termed *a war machine against the state* because she defies classification and hence conservation and control. In this chapter, mobility and mobile subjects denote parallel social positions in a specific formation of power relations. While Deleuze and Guattari's nomads are foremost 'mentally mobile,' mobility in this chapter implies the interconnection of physical and mental mobility. Mobility

here is the position of a subject or group without a "proper locus (place)" (de Certeau 1984: 37) who resides on the territory of others, with all that denotes about the ability to plan ahead, control time and to take well calculated actions. Mobile subjects are people who avoid being governed and who try to evade what they see as control that threatens their way of life and their communities. To the subjects and groups I am discussing mobility is life shaping (Salazar and Smart 2012). The combination of physical mobility and a mobile or nomadic habitus (mental mobility) is at the core of my discussion; an interconnection also emphasized by Hays and Ninkova in this volume. Whether an individual or a group/people can be understood to be 'mobile' in this power-sense is thus an empirical question. In this chapter, I claim this to be the position of the two Roma/Romany groups I discuss; they are mobile subjects—mobile by intentionally evading state control, and they are dependent on physical mobility for upholding their communities and their evasion of state power. Other mobile subjects and groups in this sense could be illegal migrants, religious dissidents, street-children, or international corporations outside state control (Deleuze and Guattari 1986; Urry 2014).

Migrating Romanies and Norwegian Roma

From the government's point of view Romanian Romanies and Norwegian Roma in Norway resisting integration are culturally conservative groups, dominated by powerful males, and due to poverty or lack of education 'difficult to integrate.' The general idea is that they will change (or be salvaged) depending on the quality of the supportive projects developed for and bestowed onto them, expressions of what Foucault, (as cited in Golder 2007) has called pastoral power. In Norway, soft or pastoral power is combined with more cohesive measures towards such "nonconformists". In the case of Norwegian Roma cohesive measures are implemented in order to ensure children's school attendance and to secure

proper socialization practices in Rom families. For Romanian Romanies, cohesive measures such as banning begging and 'rough sleeping,[2]' and controlling mobility together with harsh police treatment (Nasjonal Institusjon for Menneskerettigheter 2015) are applied. In both cases, the government sees physical mobility and illiteracy as the source of their alleged problems, and sedentarization and education as the solution. The Norwegian Roma must stop moving to ensure their children's education and the adult's inclusion into the work force, and Romanian Romanies must go back to Romania and stay there in order to become integrated Roma/Romany citizens and to avoid poverty. However, this solution rests on a misinterpretation of the life-world, social position, and economy of most Roma and Romany populations.

Tactics and strategies

Inspired by de Certeau's (1984) discussion of strategies and tactics in power struggles, the analytical idea underlying this chapter is that mobile subjects and networks have instruments at their disposal for exerting power other than territorialized subjects and institutions. In de Certeau's analytical model tactics are 'weapons of the weak,' or, more precisely, weapons of the peoples without territory, while strategies are only available to subjects and groups with territorial rights. I further claim that the concept of resistance as an opposition to domination does not capture the subtle ongoing process of negotiation of dependency and autonomy. I do not see the Roma's acts of avoidance and ambiguity as resistance and opposition to domination in Scott's (1990) sense, but as outcomes of the relationship between two modes of existence and of power; the 'nomad mode' and the 'state mode' (Deleuze and Guattari 1986), and as expressions of their specific strategic position and of the Rom habitus. Consequently, I argue that the Roma's troubled relationship with

---

[2] Sleeping outdoors in the city.

authorities is an unforeseen outcome of their past experiences and of the way they form communities based on specific modes of subsistence, organization, power structure, and cosmology (Engebrigtsen 2007). To understand the particular situation of these highly diverse groups of Roma/Romanies, my main question is: *What is the strategic situation of most Roma groups, what weapons do they have to their disposal, and what are their options for securing relative cultural autonomy?* Before developing this perspective further, I will present the data for this study and the historical background of the cultural traits of the two Roma populations.

Methods

Data for this chapter is based on my PhD work on Roma and peasant relations in a Romanian village in 1996/7 and on my two studies regarding migrating Roma and other similar groups as beggars and street-workers in Norway in 2009–2012 and 2013–2014. My data of Roma in Romania are based on a one-year participant observation—participation in daily life as well as in ritual manifestations such as weddings and funerals together with informal conversations with men, women and children. The focus of my PhD study was the relationship between the Rom population and the non-Rom community (Engebrigtsen 2007). My data of migrating Romanian Roma and other Romanian citizens begging in Oslo is mostly based on interviews, observations, and informal discussions concerning their situation in Romania, their opportunities there and their experiences as beggars in Norway (Engebrigtsen 2012, 2014). Data about the Norwegian Rom group are not based on research, but on seven years of participant observation as a kindergarten teacher in an open[3] Rom kindergarten in Oslo, and on reports and evaluations of the program that the kindergarten was part of. These data are obviously of different quality, as they were produced in different contexts and times. They also concern different Roma populations at different times and in different places.

---

[3] The kindergarten was open to parents and family members throughout the day.

Together they make up a comparative and multi-sited knowledge base. Interviews, conversations and observations with Roma in Romania and Norway were done in Romanian and Romanés, as my late husband spoke Romanés and we both spoke Romanian.

The Roma…who are they? Historical background

The Vlach Romanés speak Roma (Norwegian Roma and the majority of the Romanian street-working migrants in Norway) are the largest group of the highly diverse populations that today are generalized as 'Roma or Romanies' for political purposes. The term Vlach is a linguistic term for the Romanés dialect spoken by the populations of Roma who entered Wallachia (the western and southern parts of present day Romania) around the 13th century and Transylvania somewhat later. They were incorporated into the economy as slaves in Wallachia (Ţara Romaneasca) and serfs in Transylvania (then Hungary and the Austro-Hungarian Empire) (Achim, 1998:282)[4]. All Roma and other 'Romany' groups were slaves in Wallachia and only these populations were slaves. They performed most of the forced manual labour in agriculture, in housework, as miners, and as artisans for their owners, and their owners were the church, the monasteries, royalty, and the nobility. Although these slaves were not legal subjects—in contrast to the almost entirely Romanian-speaking serfs, some Roma slaves, mostly the clans of smiths, could achieve relative independence and could make fortunes as long as they served their masters as well. Smiths and most of the other artisan slave-groups were mobile in the physical sense and they travelled through their master's territory serving the serfs and masters with crafted tools (ibid). In Transylvania, Roma and other Romany groups where "royal serfs" mostly mobile craftsmen, directly dependent on the royalty (Achim 1998: 43). The status of the Roma and other Romanies was quite distinct from other groups in Wallachia and Transylvania, but they lived in close interrelation with the

---

[4] Probably originating from the Indian territories some hundred years earlier, Romanés being classified as an Indic language.

Romanian and Hungarian speaking feudal peasants (Achim 1998: 44). After the abolition of serfdom and slavery around 1860, out-migration was legal and large parts of these populations migrated first to Western Europe and then to the rest of the world, were the majority became more or less sedentary. However, many stayed in Romania and were subject to forced sedentarization and relative immobility in villages and towns, eventually under the Ceausescu regime. Not until Romania was included as full member of the EU in 2006 could Romanians again travel out of the country, and this was the starting point of a second large emigration of Roma and other Romanies to Western Europe.

The Roma's history is a one of physical mobility, but also of people being constructed as strangers (Bauman1991) residing on the territory of the Other. It also tells a story of shifting regimes of mobility/sedentarism in different times (Glick Shiller and Salazar 2012). During times with forced sedentarization, many Romany groups became permanently sedentary, but others only shifted their patterns of mobility to adapt to political restrictions and took up mobile livelihood strategies as soon as new regimes made it possible. These are indispensable factors for understanding the cultural norms and ways of life of present day Roma and other similar groups with background from Romania.

However, Romanies and Romanés speaking Roma are highly diverse when it comes to religion, way of life, and their inclusion in the majority society. Descendants of the Romanian, Romanés-speaking Roma who left Romania in the 19th century live in most countries of the world, often forming separate societies within the majority society, but always connected to majority society in different ways. But even other non-Rom populations of Romanies such as *Sinti, Manush, Gitanos, Romanichel, or Travellers* have long histories of persecution, exclusion, and discrimination in the countries where they have lived, histories that are crucial to their present political, economic, social, and cultural life.

Physical mobility is a viable way of life when resources are spread and marginal, and

a way to evade political control. The political unpredictability that these populations have experienced creates time and space as an aspect of life to be adapted to rather than to control; moving means passing over the territories of others by adapting to the conditions that are set by them. Thus, the time/space relationship is different among mobile groups than among sedentary groups; mobile groups must relate to the moment, and act in the spur of the moment (de Certeau 1984). In a different socio-cultural context, this is also a point made by Simonsen in his chapter in this volume. Most Roma groups in Romania are sedentary in the sense that they live in permanent villages, but the majority are still dependent on mobile strategies for their livelihood and for sustaining their communities. In contrast to farmers their economic resources are spread over a wide territory, and may expand and diminish according to shifting power regimes. Romanies are in the same way sedentary, but they have historically been dependent on different modes of internal and external mobility for their economic survival and cultural and political independence.

Romanian Roma: Looking for greener pastures

My first case concerns Romanian Romany migrants in Norway, mainly village-Roma and similar groups, and their relations with Norwegian authorities. Street-working Romanian migrants are almost entirely from the segments of the population called by the derogatory term *ţigani* in Romania, which is parallel to, but not synonymous with, the English word Gypsy. They represent a range of different groups with similar histories and positions in Romania, with different self-ascription and different mother tongues. In World War II, the Roma and other Romanies who stayed in Romania risked forced deportation[5] and persecution. After World War II and under the socialist government, outmigration was again prohibited, until Romania's inclusion in the EU in 2006. The largest group of the people termed *ţigani* in

---

[5] Thousands of Romanian Romanies were deported to Transnistria where thousands died of hunger and disease.

Romania today are self-defined Vlach Romanés speaking Roma and descendants of those who stayed in Romania after the abolishment of serfdom and slavery. Others are self-defined Romanian speaking *Roma Romanisat* or *ţigani* (Romanized Roma), define themselves by other group names, and some say they are just Romanian. The ethnic boundaries of Romanies in Romania are not fixed, but may vary according to time, place, and context. The Romanies that migrate today originate from different regions of Romania with a concentration around the central and eastern parts (Engebrigtsen, 2012, 2014). In Romania, they often live on the fringes of villages or in a separate part of a village or town, but also in mixed villages with Romanians or Hungarians.[6] They engage in different activities from wage-labour, crafts, trade, farm work, gathering, and begging. Until the 1950s several of these groups travelled in Romania with horse-pulled wagons in spring, summer, and autumn, gathering, exchanging, and performing simple services for the peasants. In winter they dug caves (*colibi*) outside the village where they now live, and stayed there until spring when they took up travelling again. Under Ceauşescu nomadism was banned, primary school was made mandatory for all Romanian children, and all men and most women were employed in state enterprises. After the revolution, Romany children were no longer expected to go to school, and families that wished to send their children were advised to send them to schools for children with special needs. Most Romanies lost their jobs and took up their old way of life, settled but mobile. As the resources they exploit are scarce, and found over large areas, mobility is a requirement in order to make ends meet. In some villages the women go by train scavenging in a nearby town several days a week. The waste is fed to pigs that eventually are sold at the village market. Many work as farmhands for the peasants and several of the older women perform magic services such as palmistry and exorcism. The men may seek work or sell simple handmade products in nearby villages, or go on business ventures to other areas. Many are

---

[6] That is how they generally refer to themselves.

employed as day labourer in construction and road work. Families with horses may cut firewood for sale in the villages in the area (Engebrigtsen 2007).

It is the poor and unemployed segments of the Romany populations that go abroad "looking for greener pastures" as it is termed in Romanés (ibid).[7] To most Romanian Romanies, going abroad simply means expanding one's mobile activities across national borders. They stay in Norway for a period before going back to Romania for some months and then leave for Norway again. They travel in family/kin groups from the same village or community, mostly leaving their dependent children at home with relatives. This is a kind of seasonal migration that follows the weather, and the opportunities; few endure street-activities in mid-winter, but to those who do it is very profitable. The majority migrate in family and kin groups from the same village and town. They travel by rented minibuses, or by buss directly. As with all travel, several actors are eager to make money of the Romany migration from Romania, to the rest of Europe[8].

As few young people have education or references from employment, they are almost entirely dependent on street-activities in Norway (Andriaenssens 2011). They sit on pavements expecting alms, play music, sell magazines, or party-stash to night-owls in the city centre, gather empty bottles for recycling, some are employed in illegal economic activities, other in petty crime, and some engage in all these activities at different times.. Romanian beggars in Norway practice 'rough sleeping'—some rent a mattress in overcrowded apartments, some in overcrowded cars, others in illegally occupied, run-down houses and under bridges, many sleep in tents in the woods surrounding the towns. The last years several shelters have been provided for by NGO's, were the homeless may sleep at a low cost, and in

---

[7] Romania also has a growing population of educated professional Romanies often working as lawyers in NGOs etc. often for the benefit of Romanies, and a population of traditional, but wealthy Roma, they also migrate, but not to beg.
[8] Romanies emigrate from all countries in Europe with large Romany populations, but in Norway almost all are from Romania

Norway most homeless people are now Romanian. They do their laundry in the rivers and dry their clothes wherever possible, often on bridges or fences, use dark corners, bushes, and back yards as bathrooms, in short; they display their daily life for all to see and thus challenge the boundary between the private and the public. Migrant Roma thus live their private life in public spaces, they occupy that space and make it theirs.

The authorities relate to what they see as 'trespassing' in different and often contradictory ways. The police and private security guards impose control and eviction. As it is illegal to sleep in public places in the city, the police and private security companies chase sleeping families, often several times in one night, and confiscate their belongings. Beggars who try to warm up in public buildings, like railway stations and shopping malls, are regularly chased and fined. A recently implemented regulation banns sleeping in cars in the city, a rule that primarily targets Romanian migrant beggars. However, this political and governmental aggression is paired with several other initiatives that soften their daily life: A street- magazine is published for them, which enables them to make money without begging, even if security guards control where it can be sold. The shelters and outreach services, run by NGO' in the large towns, also represents "softening" of their harsh conditions .

There is an ongoing discussion among politicians about banning foreign beggars altogether, but there is strong opposition to this strategy by some politicians and parts of the public. Romanian beggars have supporters all over the country. Members of the public are concerned for their well-being and involve themselves through friendship, in housing projects, general economic support, wage-labour and other projects. The situation is rather ambiguous, the authorities try to control, Roma evade this control and challenge various classification such as between private and public and between work and charity.

Norwegian Roma: A national minority, surviving as Roma

The ancestors of the Norwegian Roma were most probably serfs or slaves in Romania/Hungary and started to travel in Norway (and to the rest of the world), after the abolishment of serfdom and slavery in the late 1800. Like in Romania, they were dependent on spatial mobility for their livelihood. Many travelled all over Europe, but some stayed for long periods in Norway, and as church records show, married, had children, and were buried there. Their livelihoods were probably similar to present-days Romanian Roma migrants'— they were mobile crafts-men, peddlers and beggars. In the 19th century, Norway already had a relatively large population of travellers, non-Roma Romanies (tater, reisende, romani) who had settled in the 1600 century as itinerant craftsmen, seasonal labourers and beggars (Hvinden 2000). In the late 1800s a religious organization was commissioned by the state to settle and assimilate this population. The organization used harsh means to enforce settlement, wage-labour, and education (Pettersen 2005; Hvinden 2000; Halvorsen 2000). In the 1920s, when the organization started to show interest in the migrating Roma, they left the country (Lidén and Engebrigtsen 2010). When a group of Roma, with Norwegian passports, tried to re-enter Norway in 1934, as a response to the tightening persecution in Germany, they were rejected and sent back to Germany/Belgium from where they were deported to concentration camps where many of them perished (Johansen 1989; Rosvoll 2013). This was done with reference to 'Gypsy law' (sigøynerparagrafen), already launched in 1907, which prohibited Gypsies (sigøynere) from entering the country. After the war, around 50 survivors from this group with their families claimed asylum and were eventually, after several law-suits, granted Norwegian citizenship (Hanisch 1976). In the fifties and sixties, they were living in caravans in a parking lot in the centre of Oslo surrounded by high fences. Human-rights activists contacted the group and, together with one family leader who titled himself as 'a Gypsy king,' they wrote a letter to the Norwegian king asking for help with integration into Norwegian society. Backed by government authorities, the municipality of Oslo planned a program: The

'Rehabilitation of Norwegian Gypsies'—that aimed at settling the Roma in permanent houses, offering appropriate education for children and adults, vocational training for men, and a kindergarten for the children to enable the women to go to school. These activities were supported by social security funds; all families received allowances, adults received small wages for school-attendance, and the kindergarten was free of charge (see also Hays and Ninkova's chapter this volume). The program was developed in cooperation with the 'Gypsy king', the influential but self-appointed Rom leader, and several other leaders of extended families. The program represented a classical pastoral project in the Foucaultian sense, (Foucault in Goulder 2007) aimed at changing self-understanding and mentality of Gypsies by voluntary sedentarization and education. After about 10 years most families were settled in houses that had been constructed for extended families in different townships in Oslo. The state still offered literacy education to all adults, paid by the hour. Some work-training projects were established and the municipality even started a carpet shop run by one family. Certain schools set up classes for Rom children and developed school material in *Romanés,* and some Roma were appointed as mother-tongue teachers. The municipality started a kindergarten for Rom children and a separate social security office for Rom people. Roma representatives were involved in the development of all these projects, and they consented to them (Lidén, 2010). After 15 years, the program had expanded and included several activities such as free karate-instruction for girls and a youth club for Rom children and youth. The authorities and the public questioned the program. After 20 years and a major swindle committed by the self-appointed Gypsy king's family, the program was shut down and evaluated as a failure; two Roma had completed secondary school. No adults were wage earners, and all families received social benefits. Most families still travelled for economic and social reasons. Thus, the Roma were left on their own that is to the general social security system, to majority classes in schools, and to majority kindergartens. The failure of the

rehabilitation project was attributed to a lack of cultural awareness by municipal authorities and the strong resistance to change among leading Roma. The outcome of this programme will be discussed in a later section.

Thanks to the welfare system, and their own businesses, the economic situation among most Roma families in Norway today is rather good. Most are still illiterate, most are semi-nomadic as they always were in Norway, travelling extensively in and outside Scandinavia during spring, summer and autumn. Several families are quite wealthy, but there are also signs of increased abuse of drugs and alcohol, conflicts between families, and other social problems. Alarming numbers of Roma children are taken into custody by the Child Welfare Services and placed in Norwegian foster-homes because of alleged abuse and neglect. Families are worried about the increasing demands from the authorities that they send their children to school. Many families do send their children to primary school now and then, but only two Norwegian Rom completed an education after the 1990s, no one has a regular position, and all receive social benefits. In 2011, the state launched a new program to better the situation for Norwegian Roma and to include them in mainstream society. They established special classes for young Rom adults with work training as part of the basic education. Some young people followed this programme for a while, but in 2013 the tension between the authorities and the Roma, and between Roma families, intensified, and school attendance stopped.

In 1999, Norwegian Roma were given status as national minority (as were the Travelers, the Kvens, the Jews, and the Forest Finns) and with this status, the pressure to integrate into mainstream society increased. The position offers protection from discrimination and instructs public agencies to facilitate the development of culture and identity, but it also raises the government's expectations of cultural and economic change among the Norwegian Roma. The active negotiations with public agencies demand a new

form of organisation. Traditionally leadership has not exceeded the extended families and 'representation' has been in the shape of 'kings' (Kaminski 1987; Engebrigtsen 2007)—more a show for the government than anything resembling democratic representation.

Before discussing the battles between authorities and different Roma populations, I would like to discuss the social and political organisation of these Roma populations, as that is crucial for understanding their relations with governments.

Social organisation and cultural traits

As already stated these two groups; Romanian Romanies migrating to Norway, and the Norwegian Roma, live under different socio-economic conditions, but they do share some social and cultural traits that makes it possible to see them as different cases in the same power struggle. Roma groups are generally kin-based, they practice endogamy, and they are without institutionalised leadership above the level of the extended family. This a-cephalous political organisation is supported by a strong sense of personal autonomy and equality between Roma, gender and age being the only dividing criteria. A traditional Rom community consists of a group of related Roma, by marriage and descent. They practice endogamy and viri-locality, and every individual has a network of relatives, most important on their father's side, but also on the side of their mother. In a family, these networks ideally make up their alliances outside the domestic group. The group that make up a settlement is not necessarily fixed, but may shift as individuals and families move in and out. The extended network is thus just as important for one's community as the local group is (Engebrigtsen 2007). Most Vlach Roma populations have an internal judicial system called *kris romani,* which is based on external objective judges and consensual decision-making (Engebrigtsen 2007; Stewart 1997; Gropper 1975; Sutherland 1975). This network formation, virilocality, and the mobile *kris* institution, imply that people must travel to keep their networks together, as also discussed by

Hays and Ninkova among the Juǀ'hoansi of Namibia in this volume. They must travel to visit alliances such as paternal uncles and aunts, in-laws, and influential relatives. All winter, men and some women travel extensively to funerals to show respect, they may travel to attend *kris* sessions, for work, and for business, and in summer they travel to attend marriages.

Ritual separation

Many Roma groups maintain several practices of separation from the majority populations. Romanés is the mother-tongue of most Roma groups all over the world and this language functions almost exclusively orally.[9] Although Roma also speak the majority language, they often have limited command of it and use Romanés, which separates them from the majority population. As few children attend school they are separated from majority children most parts of their childhood. The Norwegian Roma as well as many Roma populations in general do not see education as relevant for their way of life and very few children attend school regularly over a long period of time (Engebrigtsen 2007). In Romania the school-system does not serve Roma students due to stigmatisation, and in many Roma groups, most adults are unemployed and generally avoid military service, which reinforces their separation from the majority populations. Thus, traditional Roma perceive there to be a constitutive difference between themselves and non-Roma or *gaze*, a derogatory term for non-Roma. This may be seen as an adaptation to a historical and contemporary stigmatization and segregation from the majority society. These practices are supported by a cosmology of ritual purity where separation between the pure and the impure aspects of the body, of groups, of actions, and of the physical and spiritual world is basic. Historical and present experiences of exclusion together with a strong sense of difference and independence from majority society concerning, language, practices and morality, confirms a strong sense of identity segregation

---

[9] A standardised version of Romanés is set in writing by linguists, but the majority language is mostly used when written, this may be changing these days.

(Mirga 1992) in many Roma populations. Political, cosmological, and social independence from majority society is, however, paired with economic dependency (Engebrigtsen 2007; Stewart 1997; Gropper 1975; Sutherland 1975).These perceptions of difference are widely held majority by populations as well (Engebrigtsen 2007; Achim 1998).

Ethnic groups or network

The Roma are often referred to as an ethnic group, a people, or a nation in public discourse, although this reference is disputed among scholars (Stewart 1997; Gay y Blasco 1999; Engebrigtsen 2007). Brubaker (2004) questions the idea and use of the term 'group' in anthropology and particularly in combination with ethnicity. His main objection is that ethnicity is often used as a claim for power and influence by organisations and persons without support from the people they allegedly represent. His other objection is that 'groupness', the level of incorporation in a population, is not constant, but may vary with external and internal factors, where conflict is an important one. The term ethnic group exaggerates and overemphasises a groupness that at best is ephemeral or imagined. This point can be exemplified by the heated disputes all over Europe about the definition of Romany populations. In Norway a debate has been going on in the media about the 'sigøyner' beggars from Romania. A Norwegian Rom (head of family) was interviewed and he announced that they (the Norwegian Roma) were not *sigøyner*, but Roma, and he distanced himself from any association to 'those people' from Romania. The next day an evening paper invented a new word that embraced them all: 'romfolket', 'the Rom-people', and this is now the official public name for Romanian beggars, Norwegian Roma, and traveller people, regardless of how they identify themselves. The term 'the Rom people' suggests a tightly knit ethnic group with all the popular connotations of common history, territory, interests, and organisation and language. When this denomination had established itself, several Norwegian Roma realised

that this new 'name' lumped them together with Romanies and Romanian Roma beggars and several Roma announced publically that they actually are 'sigøyner': Gypsies.

The idea of 'the Rom people' is a fiction of sedentary imagination (Mallki 1997). The very loosely knit network organisation without leadership, or at least permanent leadership outside the family, without territorial rights and with populations spread all over the world, without a written language and historiography to consolidate groupness, presents itself as a different mode of social organisation than what is generally termed ethnic groups, and with different means to pursue their interests

Strategies and tactics: Nomadic and sedentary power modes

As the history of the Roma has exemplified nomadism and sedentarism, mobility and immobility are not necessarily oppositions, but are, as also discussed by the other chapters in this volume, combined in different ways, in different times, dependent on political and economic contexts (Sørbø 1985; Barth 1980). Thus a 'mobile habitus,' which does not necessarily depend on physical mobility, (Scott (2009; Deleuze and Guattari 1986; Clastres 1977), is still a drive for movement and change. Groups that are dependent on physical mobility for their livelihood are often without territorial rights vis a vis a state formation and are often subject to state control and governance, which they try to avoid. This is the situation of the Romany populations in this chapter. To analyse this relationship one needs concepts that can capture the relations between a state and a mobile population and between the powers available to mobile groups and those available to sedentary groups. The French sociologist de Certeau (1984) discusses these modes of power in terms of *tactics* and *strategies*. de Certeau writes about power and resistance and is interested in how 'the weak' make use of 'the strong' to create a locus of relatively autonomous action. Strategies, as manipulation of power relations are possible "as soon as a subject with will and power can be isolated" (Certeau

1984:36) and this subject (a business, an army, a city, a scientific institution) can create his/her own place, and from there manage his/her interests. The ability to manipulate power relations rests on the possibility to create one's own territory that serves as a basis from where to define and relate to others. Residing in one's own place also implies control over time and offers opportunity to plan ahead, to prepare for the future, and to write history. The Romany groups I am dealing with here do not have this option—as eternal strangers in Romania and intruders in Norway they are subject to the will, regulations, and laws of the land. Without their own place they cannot protect any specific territory and call it theirs, and thus they have no basis for legitimate knowledge; without territory they develop no legitimate history (de Certeau 1984) and without a written language it is not possible to create a legitimate common past and hence 'a people.' Of course they do this locally by oral means, but de Certeau writes that orality builds on imagination and fabulation and is thus protected from the power of established order (de Certeau, 1984).

Thus strategies are possible for exactly the kinds of groups that are generally called ethnic or national, which can refer to a place or a territory that they belong to and create as their own, and control it by controlling its boundaries. Moreover, the control of time is essential for conserving and defending ones 'proper place,' and by fixing a common past and future to that defined place one can be 'a people' and 'a nation.'

A tactic is, contrary to a strategy, a calculated action or a manipulation of power relations "by the absence of a proper locus" (de Certeau 1984:37) and by the absence of the control over time. The space of tactics, says de Certeau, is the space of the other. Thus tactics must play on and with a terrain (read rules and conditions) imposed on it and organized by the law of the 'other.' "Tactics are thus to manoeuvre within the enemy's field of vision and within enemy territory", de Certeau (1984:37) wrote, and continued:

It does not, therefore, have the option of planning general strategy and viewing the adversary as a whole within a district, visible, and objectifiable space. It operates in isolated action, blow by blow. It takes advantage of 'opportunities' and depends on them, being without any base where it could stockpile its winnings, build up its position, and plan raids. What it wins it cannot keep. This nowhere gives a tactic mobility, to be sure, but a mobility that must accept the chance of offerings of the moment. It must vigilantly make use of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers. It poaches in them. It creates surprises in them. It can be where it is last expected. It is guileful ruse.

Migrants, tourists, and EU citizens: Controlling mobility

Controlling borders is one of the state's main tasks. The new EU-internal mobility of poor, unemployed, and to a certain degree unemployable people from countries hit by economic recession and from the new member states in the former Eastern-Europe appears to have struck governments quite unexpectedly. Classification is crucial for the exercise of government control (Deleuze and Guattari 1986) and for the individual's rights and duties, but the new street-working Romanian beggars challenge conventional categorization. They are categorized as tourist in the migrations regime, but as they travel for economic reasons, they do not fit into this category. They are not regular labour migrants as they have no formal qualifications and they do not seek asylum or work. As EU-citizens they have the right to travel anywhere in the EU as tourists. As long as they are not employed, they are technically tourists and have no national citizens' rights in Norway except for emergency health care and social assistance. Their appalling poverty in Romania and their destitution in Norway does however challenge the social-democratic government's rhetoric of poverty eradication; it

raises religious leaders' and left-wing politicians' indignation, and ordinary citizens' social conscience. For the last seven to eight years, spontaneous camps have popped up both in the centre of Oslo and in the woods surrounding the city. The authorities clear these camps regularly, but they always pop up somewhere else. The perpetrators are fined, but as they are not registered, they change their names or leave the country. If they break the law several times they may be expelled, but come right back. Beggars with cars are prohibited from parking overnight anywhere, but they play hide and seek with police; gathering in the evenings and driving around Oslo and spreading out for the night. The prohibition of sleeping in cars and the practice of fining people sleeping outside in the city force people to move around often several times a night. In 2012, a group erected a camp outside a church in a central part of Oslo. This developed into a demonstration, backed by Norwegian activists, for a permanent campsite. Only a small portion of the migrant Roma participated in this demonstration. Being EU-citizens and tourists, their claims had no legal grounds, but it stirred a heated debate about morality and humanism. After a while, a private entrepreneur offered them a parking lot at the outskirts of the city, but the neighbours complained so much over trash and filth that the police cleared the camp, which then popped up in the woods outside Oslo. This camp was guarded by activists and was kept clean and neat, but after several months the owner demanded the property cleared, and so it continues. The Romanies have no other option than to exploit the possibilities they have, most of them illegal: "It must vigilantly make use of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers" (de Certeau 1986: 37). Similar incidents are happening all over the country and in the city centre. 'Clean the city brigades' and local authorities have even hired Romanian police officers to trace beggars who gather, sleep and eat in parks, parking lots, and corners. The camp that introduces this chapter was closed soon after my observations, just to pop up somewhere else. The Roma leave when they are asked to and return when the guards

have left. The authorities have continuous discussions about banning street begging, but for a social-democratic government this has been problematic. The solution of the new right wing government is that every local council shall decide whether or not to ban begging in their community. This is a compromise, as even in the right wing coalition there are conflicting opinions about the "Rom-people" (romfolket).[10] Without legitimate claims other than staying and begging as long as begging is legal and tolerated, Romanian beggars cannot plan and develop strategies to counteract the control and harassment they are subject to. They must keep their heads low and make themselves visible as beggars, but invisible as troublemakers; they operate on the space of others and must manoeuvre within that field. Thus, they make use of the moment and develop tactics that exploit the possibilities that present themselves, constantly looking out for new opportunities.

The Norwegian Roma, on their side, are struggling to keep their autonomy by being invisible and by evading public institutions such as schools, military service, and taxation. Such tactics are not new, but an inherent consequence of their historical position as stigmatized others and their response of segregation and mutual avoidance (Mirga 1992). They find their way by "'clever tricks' within the order established by 'the strong'" (de Certeau 1984:40). The Norwegian Rom have evaded control by eagerly grasping all pastoral projects (Foucault 2007) intended to change and improve them and their way of life and, invisibly at first, by transforming them to their own purpose. The act that initiated the program: Rehabilitation of the Norwegian Gypsies, in the 1960s was a letter from the 'Gypsy king` to the Norwegian king in 1965, demanding assistance to be integrated into Norwegian society. The programme had the full support from the beneficiaries, but it turned out only to be by appearance. By *manoeuvring within the enemy's field*, the Roma managed to keep the recourses bestowed on them from the state without giving up their values and interests. For

---

[10] A majority of homeless EU-migrants in Oslo are East-Europeans, but the share of Spaniard and Portuguese is increasing. In Bergen, Norway's second largest city, South-Europeans constitute by far the largest group.

instance by admitting that their children need schooling, but never sending them long enough to learn, they consent and avoid at the same time. Norwegian Roma sometimes explain school avoidance by their cultural traditions of mobility and their fear of their daughters being abducted or violated. They have gladly accepted the houses build for them by the state and not, or only partly, paid rent or maintenance, and kept their caravans and travels. By avoiding wage labour in any form, not accessible to illiterates anyway, by attending adult-education in Norwegian, but never actually learning to read, they *avoid by consenting*. By claiming social benefits and presenting themselves as clients, they escape taxation on their real income. Exactly because the Roma have few legitimate claims, their tactic is to consent in principle and reject in practice. When pressures and demands from the authorities become too much, families move abroad and continue their activities there.

Then, in 1999, the Norwegian Roma were offered a position as national minority, that was an acknowledgement of their belonging in Norway since the late 1800s, and an acknowledgement of their community as an ethnic minority with certain rights, but not of rights to a specific territory. The responses to this position is not clear, but one result seems to be an increasing conflict over representation and most families evading state control by leaving Norway to live abroad for periods.

Mobility: Creating and recreating the social

Mobility in terms of physical and mental movement is at the basis of culture, society, and habitus among the Romanies, it is what determines their strategic position and their instruments for control avoidance. However, it is exactly by this mobility that they try to secure their core relations and what they perceive as unchangeable—their families and networks, their language, and their way of living. Thus, mobility is basic for the creation and recreation the Rom life. Through moving, people in network societies keep and develop their

23

social relations. This illustrates the interconnectedness of mobility and immobility, of change and stasis. Throughout history both the Norwegian and the Romanian Roma I am discussing here have been sedentary and nomadic, but mobility in some sense has always been a basic trait of their economic adaptation, their social world, and their habitus. The combination of forming social alliances with the majority society and still securing cultural and political independence is a defining trait of many Roma populations (and of several others, see e.g. Fuglerud's chapter in this volume).

As migrants in Norway, the Romanian Roma engage in social relations with non-Roma, mostly as beggars. The ambiguous relationship between giver and receiver seems to spur sympathy and care in many Norwegians and to the Roma such relationships are crucial for their economic success. To establish relationships with store-owners and receive left-overs at the end of the day, to have allies in restaurants who let you use the toilets, to receive alms regularly and to be able to establish a friendship with a Norwegian is part of the Roma's adaptation tactics in a strange society. While these relationships are crucial to all newcomers to a country, what makes this situation concerning the Roma interesting is that it contrasts with their general perception of being 'eternal strangers' and secluded from mainstream society.

Tactics of dichotomization and complementarization

de Certeau's (1984) conceptual universe of tactics and strategies is based on metaphors of war and violence; it is guerrilla-war against the national army, parallel to Deleuze and Guattari's (1986) concepts of state and war-machine. As there is no aspect of the Rom worlds that is not marked by the non-Roma, adaptation to the non-Roma norms is their only path to survival. As much as the concepts of tactics, strategies, and war-machines still capture important aspects of the Roma/government relationship, they only seem to focus on

acts of dichotomisation and miss out the negotiations and the complementarization (Eidheim 1971) that form a crucial part of the relationship. The Norwegian anthropologist Eidheim introduced these concepts in his analysis of the Saami struggle for ethnic legitimacy with the Norwegian State. This struggle was about territorial and cultural rights and was different from the one I am discussing here. The Saami struggled for ethnic recognition based on historical rights to land and resources and they claimed the right to self- governance based on these territorial roots. The Saami successfully argued for rights to territory, common history, and language. The Roma groups I have discussed here cannot claim rights to any territory— they are strangers everywhere. This does not imply that they feel like strangers, only that they cannot exert the same type of strategic power that comes with a proper place and control of time. Groups that reside on enemy territory and want to continue to reside there must be tolerated and they must present themselves as tolerable. Complying in order to reject without breaking the relationship is vital in the struggle for tolerance to people without territory (Mirga 1992). The combination of the guerrilla-metaphor and that of negotiation may shed new light over these relations. Even the 'battles' between Norwegian Roma and authorities, imply both dichotomisation and complementarization.

The Norwegian Rom 'king' approaching the Norwegian king with a request for support was an act of complementarizsation; the acknowledgement of structural similarity and the will to cooperate. This act of complementarizsation set the stage for the program the king requested. The rampage and abandonment of the houses were acts of dichotomisation—not planned, but tactical expressions of sedentary frustration. When parents consented to send their children to school they complementarizsed, when they kept them at home they dichotomized. These seemingly inconsistent and ambiguous responses were utterly confusing to government institutions and supported their general understanding of Roma as immature and insecure. While the 'complementarism' of such acts was taken by the majority at face

value—as genuine acts of cooperation and of having common interests— the withdrawal was interpreted as the outcome of some family heads' domination. By interpreting the acts of complementarization as a tactic that is interdependent with dichotomization, the dynamics of this power struggle is obvious.

Thus the Norwegian Roma complementarize by complying verbally to pastoral projects offered to them, and dichotomize by avoiding them in practice. This apparent ambiguous behaviour infuses ambivalence in the majority—they are both fascinated and repelled.

Romanian beggars are not subject to the same pastoral power from government bodies, but they are subject to control, surveillance and all kinds of regulations concerning their whereabouts and movements. Their mobility renders them vulnerable as 'strangers,' but it also protects them from control. They consent to the control they are subject to verbally, but break the regulations when necessary. According to police records, petty crime is widespread among these groups, acts that lead to rejection and mistrust among Norwegians. Many Romanian Roma and Romanies, however, especially women, actively try to establish relationships with majority persons and many succeed. These are acts of complementarization, which to some degree counteract the crime committed by others. They generally also praise the Norwegian kindness, and down-play the harassment they are subject to.

Conclusion

My objective with this chapter has been to discuss how a perspective of mobility and nomadism may open up interesting interpretations of power relations between minorities, the majority public, and the state. Here with an empirical focus on two different mobile Roma/Romany populations and state authorities in Norway. Both the Norwegian Roma and

the Romanian Romanies in Norway are in a position where their true interests as mobile subjects are more or less illegitimate, or seen as a threat to authorities, and cannot be presented as claims in open negotiations with them. To follow their interests they have no other choice than to play along and exploit cracks in the state's armour (de Certeau 1984). By tactics of complementarization in order to be tolerated, and of dichotomization in order to affirm their separateness, they are able to retain their livelihood and community without losing what they see as their independence.

Mobility is the core aspect of the uneasy relationship between these Roma/Romany populations and the state. Physical mobility is paired with a nomadic identity in Deleuze and Guattari's (1986) sense, which render these populations in opposition to state dominance and control. They are residing if not on enemy territory, then not on their proper territory. They are under a continuous regime of pastoral power and surveillance, and subject to programmes for cultural change or politics of rejection. Without legitimate interests, they have no legitimate claims and cannot, as ethnic groups with territorial roots, develop strategies to negotiate with the majority. The aspect of time is also important in this relationship—as mobile subjects without control over a territory, the Roma must always adapt to majority mobility regimes and strategies of placement and displacement. However, their physical mobility and unpredictability also render them difficult to control. Now they are here, then they are there and suddenly they are gone.

I am not claiming that the Roma's use of tactics such as the combination of dichotomization and complementarization are always conscious acts—on the contrary, I assume that it is foremost an effect of their strategic situation and mobile habitus. Trust and mistrust, ambiguity and uncertainty concerning individuals' feelings and interests in relation to the majority are also aspects of the Rom/Romany/majority relationship that create

emotional bonds of attraction and repulsion. This ambiguity plays on and enables mobile

tactics to parry majority power, but never to conquer it.

References

Achim, V., 1998. *The Roma in Romanian history*. Budapest, NY: CEUPress,

Andriaenssens, S. et al., 2011. "Street-level informal activities: Estimating the yield of

begging in Brussels." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 23-40.

Barth, F., 1965. *Nomads of South Persia: The Basseri tribe of Khamseh confederacy.* Oslo:

Universitetsforlaget.

-Barth, F. (Ed)1969. *Ethnic groups and Boundaries*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bauman, Z., 1991. *Modernity and ambivalence.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brubaker, R., 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge Mas.: Harward University Press.

Clastres, P., 1977. *Society against the Stat*e. NY: Urizen.

de Certeau, M., 1984. *The practice of everyday lif*e. Berkely, California: University of

California Press.

Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari, 1986. *Nomadology: The war machine*. NY: University of

Minnesota Press.

---------1987. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gay y Blasco, P., 1999. *Gypsies in Madrid. Sex, gender and the performance of identity.*

Eidheim, H., 1971. *Aspects of the Lappish minority situation*. Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.

Engebrigtsen, A. I. et al. (2014). Gateliv. Kartlegging av sittuasjonen til utenlandske personer som tigger. NOVA Rapport nr. 7/14,

Ada I. Engebrigtsen (2012). Tiggerbander og kriminelle bakmenn eller fattige EU-borgere? Myter og realiteter om utenlandske tiggere i Oslo. NOVA NOTAT nr.2/12

Engebrigtsen, A. I., 2007. *Exploring Gypsiness. Power exchange and interdependnece in a Transylvanian Village*. London NY: Berghahn Books.

Engebrigtsen, A. and H. Lidén, 2010. "Å overleve som Rom i Norge" in A. O. Bolme and M. Bonnevie Lund (eds.), *Nasjonale minoriteter i Norge*. Trondheim: Tapir akademiske Forlag.

Goulder, B., 2007. "Foucault and the genealogy of pastoral power. " *Radical Philosophy Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 157-176.

Gropper, R. C., 1975. *Gypsies in the city*. Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press.

Halvorsen, R., 2000. "Etnisk mobilisering i en brytningstid" in B. Hvinden (ed.), *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet. Følgende av hundre års politikk for en nasjonal minoritet.* Fagbokfolralet, Vigmostad og Bjørke AS.

Hvinden, B., 2000. "Innledning" in B. Hvinden (ed.)*, Romaniafolket og det norske samfunnet. Følgende av hundre års politikk for en nasjonal minoritet.* Fagbokfolralet, Vigmostad og Bjørke AS.

Kamiski, R., 1987. "The dilemma of power: internal and external leadership. The Gypsy Roma of Poland" in A. Rao (ed.), *The other nomads. Peripatetic minorities in cross-cultural perspective*. Köln, Wien: Bölaug Verlag.

Lidén, H. and A. I. Engebrigtsen, 2010. "De norske rom - og deres historie" in A. Bonnevie Lund and B. Bolme Moen (eds.), *Nasjonale minoriteter i Norge*. Trondheim: Tapir Akademiske Forlag.

Mallki, L. H., 1997. "National geographic: The rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees" in A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (eds.), *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology*. Duke University Press.

Mirga, A., 1992. "Roma territorial behaviour and state policy: The case of the socialist countries of East Europe" in M. J. Casimir and A. Rao (eds.), *Mobility and territoriality. social and spatial boundaries among foragers, fishers, pastoralists and peripatetics*. Oxford, NY: Berg.

Nasjonal Institusjon for Menneskerettigheter, 2015. UIO Institutt for menneskerettigheter, Juridisk Fakultet.

Pettersen, 2005. *Tatere og misjonen: Mangfold, makt og mostand*. Norsk institutt for forskning om oppvekst, velferd og aldring.

Rosvoll, M., 2013. "Antisiganisme." *Materialisten,* Vol. 1/2, pp. 7-39.

Salazar, N. B. and A. Smart, 2012. "Anthropological takes on (im)mobility." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp. i-x. doi: 10.1080/1070289x.2012.683674.

Scott, J. C., 1990. *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

---------2009. *The art of not being governed: an anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Stewart, M., 1997. *The Time of the Gypsies.* Colorado: Westview Press.

Sutherland, A., 1975. *The hidden Americans*. New York: The Free Press.

Sørbø, G., 1985. *Tenants and nomads in Eastern Sudan: A study of economic adaptation in the New Halfa scheme*. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala.Motala: Motala Grafiska AB.

Urry, J., 2014. *Offshoring*. Polity Press.