

# **EUROPEAN REPRESENTATION OF ROMA INTERESTS**

By  
Suad Skenderi

Submitted to  
Central European University  
Department of Political Science

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisors:  
Professors Nenad Dimitrijevic and Robert Sata

Budapest, Hungary  
2015

## ABSTRACT

Representation of interests is one of the essential democratic needs of people to voice out their values, preferences, and interests. Minority representation is promoted due to pre-political inequalities that affect democracy. Roma are the most peculiar case of minority in Europe, they reside in almost all of the European countries and they have no territorial claim, being often perceived as a stateless nation. In order to represent their priorities and interests, Roma use international non-governmental organizations as a mechanism to define, aggregate and represent their interests in Europe.

This thesis will examine organizations that focus on the representation of Roma interests at the European level. The research question that this thesis answers is *how international organizations can advance Roma interests at the European level*. This thesis will track difficulties of Roma in attempts to organize, represent and articulate their interests. For the analysis, I focus on two specific organizations: the International Romani Union and Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma Issues of the Council of Europe. I examine the factors that I consider crucial for representativeness: the type of representation, accountability, recognition status and financial sources. I conduct my analysis relying on qualitative methods and secondary data collection, combined with content analysis of available literature on the subject. The conclusions identify my findings on different patterns and forms of representativeness in the European arena of Roma interest representation.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Professor Nenad Dimitrijevic and Robert Sata for their guidance through this academic process. I am sincerely grateful for their patience criticism and support, which helped me to improve my academic performance and ability to think critically.

I dedicate this thesis to my family. I would like to express my special gratitude to my father Samet Skenderi, my mother Minever Skenderi, my brother Amit Skenderi, my sister-in-law Isna Skenderi and my grandchildren. Their unconditional love and support made me overcome all the obstacles and become a better man.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Marina Vasic, my fellow Romalitico friends (Elvis Shakjiri, Albert Memeti, Deniz Selmani, Nadire Redjepi and Sebijan Fejzula), CEU Roma friends (including my closest friends Silhan Saitov, Fikrija Tair, Marija Sulejmanova), and Bedri Toci, Edin Mimidinovski, Vladimir Trpevski and Baskim Hajdari. Their trust and support was manifested in different forms, which made me believe that I can succeed

Lastly, I would like to salute the interviewees for their time and support for my thesis. Without their help my thesis would have had many gaps and issues.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Data collection .....	7
Limitations .....	11
<b>THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>IDENTIFICATION OF ROMA INTERESTS AND ACTORS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL</b> <b>.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>CASE SELECTION.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
International Romani Union .....	36
Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma issues .....	50
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>65</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1: Patterns of organizations based on the four factors (Type of representation, accountability, institutional recognition and financial sources)

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

**AI** - Amnesty International

**CoE** - Council of Europe

**CPRSI** - The Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

**ERI** - European Roma Institute

**ERRC** - European Roma Rights Centre

**ERTF** - European Roma and Travellers Forum

**EU** - European Union

**IRU** - The International Romani Union

**MG-S-ROM** - Roma Specialist Group

**MRGI** - Minority Rights Group International

**OSCE** - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

**OSI** - Open Society Institute

**OSF** - Open Society Foundations

**REF** - Roma Education Fund

**SRSG** - Special Representative of Secretary General for Roma Issues of the Council of Europe

**UN** - United Nations

**UN-ECOSOC** - United Nations Economic and Social Council

## INTRODUCTION

Representation of interests is one of the essential democratic tools that enable constituency to voice out its values, preferences, and interests. The idea of having representative governments is to open space for participation in the decision-making through elected/appointed delegates (Pitkin 1967: 2). These then speak, advocate, symbolize, and act on the behalf of others in the political arena (Pitkin 1967; Young 2000; Mansbridge 2003; Rehfeld 2006; Pickering 2000). Although, the definition of representation can be easily applied to majority groups in a society, minorities usually face hard times to establish a fruitful ground for representation of their interests. Minority representation is promoted due to pre-political inequalities that affect democracy. Simple majority rule effectively excludes minorities from the decision-making processes. Some states provide space for participation and representation of minority interests while others hinder or neglect their priorities or even their existence (Kymlicka 1995; Young 2000). Worst-case scenario applies for Roma, the biggest ethnic minority in Europe. According to Kymlicka (2000: 204), Roma are a particular case of minority when it comes to representation, due to the lack of interest in territorial autonomy or separate political institutions.

Defining interests is, in fact, an extremely difficult task due to the variety of meanings across several disciplines. The term “collective” or “group interests” in the broadest sense is defined with the existence of the group (Benn 1960: 125). Pound (1943: 2) explains interests as “claims, demands or desires that individuals or groups opt to satisfy through politically organized society”. The representation of interests is level dependent, meaning that sometimes same interests are differently treated at the local or national level. At the international level, organizations attempted to identify common interests of Roma within the frame of Europe. Many international organizations define interests through grassroots research, focus groups, or

existing data on issues identifying the baseline necessities of the group. The Decade of Roma Inclusion was one of the attempts to identify the benchmark of common Roma interests<sup>1</sup>.

According to many international organizations, including the European Union, there is an estimation of 10 to 12 million Roma people in most of the European countries<sup>2</sup>. Since Roma cannot refer to any of the countries as their kin state, they are often perceived as a stateless nation. This is due to the harsh history of migration, persecution and eviction after which the Roma were naturally forced to adjust to the new country setting. Moreover, the minority has had a long struggle to prove that they are equal citizens with the same set of rights as anyone else (Hancock 2002: 120). Until just a few decades ago, Roma have been living in Europe without any form of political organization and representation. However, the necessity for political organizing dramatically increased due to the hostile conditions that Roma had faced at the beginning of their migration to the European nation-states and the World Wars<sup>3</sup>.

The vast persecution and atrocity that had happened during the World War II had led to the first attempts to form social and political organizations. The pioneer political organization was the first world Roma Congress in 1971, which raised the political self-awareness and need for unity of the Roma (Hancock 2002). At the same time, the international organizations became aware that Roma are seriously lacking in political participation, representation and recognition. According to Liegeouis (2008: 213), the post-war period addressed the rise of Roma non-governmental organizations in some of the European countries. These organizations acted on behalf of Roma communities with minimal but existing influence

---

<sup>1</sup>The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 was an initiative where twelve European states joined efforts and concentrate on eradicating the causes of discrimination and exclusion of Roma. The stakeholders agreed to Focus on four pillars (Education, Employment, Health and Housing) of interests prioritized as the most important for betterment of the Roma situation in Europe (last access 10.05.2015, available at <http://www.romadecade.org/about-the-decade-decade-in-brief>)

<sup>2</sup> European Commission – DG Justice, (last access 10.05.2015, available at [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm))

<sup>3</sup>Suad Skenderi - Nation or an ethnic community - the challenges of Roma identity – Romalítico (last access 10.05.2015, available at <http://romalitico.org/index.php/content/item/47-roma-nation-or-an-ethnic-community>)



at the international level (Liegeouis 2008; McGarry 2010). Therefore, non-governmental organizations were considered as best mechanism to articulate and represent Roma interests on national and international level (Thelen 2005; Klimova-Alexander 2002; McGarry 2010).

In order to evaluate interest representation of Roma, this thesis puts in focus two organizations/entities: The International Romani Union (hereinafter IRU), and the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma Issues of the Council of Europe (hereinafter SRSG). Since 1960, Council of Europe (hereinafter CoE) is one of the most vocal and consistent stakeholders, initiating many programs and projects to improve the Roma situation within European borders. In addition, several bodies and ad-hoc organizations were created under the umbrella of the CoE with a specially focus on Roma issues. IRU is also an initiative-based organization, created by the members of the World Roma Congresses. In the beginning, the Congresses were highly recognized and IRU was one of the most influential organizations representing Roma at the European level. These two organizations, apart from many other organizations in Europe, are representing the same target group, using similar pattern to define Roma interests. Both of the organizations identify same priorities and thus advocate for the same set of interests. Their common agenda is set to act against discrimination, advocate for employment, education, health, political empowerment and etc. In addition, both IRU and SRSG monitor the situation of Roma and develop activities to tackle issues with the help of other high profile decision-making organizations (such as the UN and the EU). In this respect, both of the organizations seem to follow the same pattern of representation of interest. However, the outcomes of representation are noticeably different. The fact that potentially opens the space for debate is that they demonstrate substantial differences in accountability, recognition and finances. However, what draws the biggest attention is the nature of representation: IRU being described as descriptive and nationalist type of organization that

supports the idea of “Roma representing Roma”, while the SRSB is a more policy-oriented and bureaucratic entity, supporting the idea of delegated and educated person to represent Roma.

Following this debate, the thesis focuses on these two internationally recognized organizations/entities, the nature of their representation and accountability. The research question that triggers this discussion draws attention on *how international organizations/entities that advocate for Roma in fact advance Roma interests at the European level*. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, IRU and SRSB are the two units of analysis. This paper tackles this question by elaborating on existing theories of political representation and recognition, which will demonstrate how organizations act at European level. Theories of representation will provide a distinction between the Roma-led and non-Roma led organizations, their internal and external accountability and their recognition status by other international actors. In addition, financial sources and opportunities will also give space for interpretation of their sustainability. This phenomenon is relevant for political science because it deals with the issue of representation of a unique case of non-territorial nation, lacking political institutions and mechanisms to advance its status at the European level. In addition, Roma representation of interests is a challenge to the existing theories related to political actors and methods of representation, and aggregation of interests of a non-territorial nation. This work will also contribute to political anthropology and political sociology.

The present work is divided into six chapters: The first chapter explains the methodology of this research, which mainly consists of qualitative data analysis including interviews with the members of the two organizations and experts` interviews. I will also look at secondary (scholarly) literature and official documents of the organizations. This chapter also explains the method of gathering and analyzing data and the limitations of the research. The second chapter will tackle the main theoretical concepts delivered by the theories that define representation with the addition of accountability, recognition status, and financial

sources and opportunities of the NGOs. Since mainstream theories focus generally on the types of representation and accountability, I try to apply existing typologies and accountability mechanisms fitting in the situation of the Roma at the European level. Furthermore, the status of recognition also plays an important role in the representativeness of the actors. Following this, the thesis elaborates on their recognition from different international actors and the target group. Lastly, I will present arguments for NGO financial sources and their opportunities to represent interests of Roma in Europe. In the third chapter, I identify actors of Roma representation and interests of Roma at the European level in order to narrow down the focus of the thesis. This will ease the understanding of Roma priorities and NGOs that represent Roma in Europe. The fourth chapter will discuss the case selection and justification of the units of analysis. This chapter will include interviews and academic literature on both of the organizations, explaining their establishment and structure for the sake of more comprehensive analysis. The fifth chapter will be focusing on comparison and in-depth analysis of the organizations. More closely, this chapter will elaborate on the nature of representation, accountability, recognition and finances of the organizations, and will try to provide a comprehensive understanding of their representativeness. The sixth chapter will contain comprehensive summary of the analysis of the comparisons, evaluation the best fitting model of representation and final concluding remarks.

## METHODOLOGY

In order to present how organizations can advance Roma interests at the European level, this thesis mainly uses qualitative data collection and analysis, and secondary data analysis. Due to the lack of primary data for this topic, secondary data sources and interviews are the most reliable evidence. It should be noted that there is a poor number of available academic contributions dealing with Roma representation in Europe. Therefore, I tried to collect as many contributions as possible from the field of Roma representation, recognition, and accountability at European level. Here I particularly refer to McGarry 2010, Liegeouis 2008, Marushiakova and Popov 2005, Thelen 2005, Klimova-Alexander 2002, Kenrick 1971 etc.

The content of the interviews aims to provide valuable data for discussion and analysis based on the following criteria: a) type of representation; b) accountability; c) recognition; and d) finance. There are seven (7) interviews in total, from which two (2) are conducted with representatives of IRU, two (2) are carried out with representatives of SRSG and three (3) interviews with the experts from the field of representation of Roma interests in Europe. Furthermore, it should be noted that this thesis combines two types of interviews: unstructured exploratory and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The interviews with the representatives of the organizations (conducted in the period May 2014 – May 2015) follow the semi-structured type of interviews. The interviews with the experts (carried out in the period May 2014 – May 2015) follow an unstructured exploratory pattern. I use semi-structured in-depth interviews for the organizations due to the lack of background information in the literature, focusing on the phenomenon of representativity in details and covering the issues of accountability, recognition and finances. It should be noted that this paper uses “the snowball method” for approaching the interviewees. This more closely means that I have used available contacts who are personally or formally connected to the respondents. These interviews generate original and rich data for comparison and analysis. As for the experts, I used

unstructured exploratory interviews in order to have a control over the information gathered for the organizations, experts' point of view on representation of Roma interests at the European level, reducing the biases of the organizations and scholars who contributed for Roma in general. Responses from the organizations and the experts might not correlate to one another, thus the control of information from the interviews gives an opportunity to track incorrect information.

In addition to my personal research on this topic, I will also use official information available on the internet and secondary data sources. The official data will provide empirical and descriptive background information of the organizations, their establishment, structure, agenda, and outcomes. The IRU Charter(s) and Strasbourg Declaration are the key sources for these organizations followed by the academic articles from scholars who researched these two organizations. The IRU Charter from 2000 and the new draft charter are the founding documents of the organization, which provide extensive details of the focus of representation, interests, structure etc. The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma from 2010 is a declaration document, which initiated the Special Representative position in the CoE. This document also contains details on the priorities and interests of the CoE related to Roma. Apart from the official information, the secondary data also provide an advantage to the comparison of the arguments and criticism of the most influential researchers in the field of representation of Roma interests.

### ***Data collection***

My primary intention was to provide details on their (1) Nature of representation related to theory and classification; (2) Chain of accountability, defining the principal-agent relations of internal and external accountability; (3) Institutional recognition of international

organizations, implying the network of cooperation and inclusiveness with other stakeholders and (4) Finance and sources of funding of the organizations, hypothesizing whether finance has an impact on outcomes of both organizations.

There were two stages of interviewing the members of the organizations, following the same topic guide: The first round of interviews was conducted to gather information about SRSG. The first respondent was Mrs Aurora Ailincăi<sup>4</sup> has been working in the SRSG support team since the establishment of the office in 2010. She provided detailed information related to the Support Team and the Special Representative, as well as the roles and structure of the team, insights of international recognition from other stakeholders dealing with Roma issues, the chain of accountability and flow of processes, and the main financial sources and allocation of funds.

The second respondent was Mr. Ulrich Bunjes, the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma Issues of the Council of Europe. He was the key stakeholder for information regarding his mandate and role as a Special Representative. He also explained his views on the mechanisms of representation and the process of policy-negotiation for betterment of the situation of the Roma. The SRSG has the biggest disposal of information for the specificity of my thesis topic.

The second round of interviews was conducted in order to gather information about IRU. The first respondent was Mr. Zoran Dimov, the former Macedonian representative, and the current Prime Minister of IRU (according to the recent changes on the draft statute of the organization). The new draft statute of the organizations introduces an idea of Roma virtual government, in order to provide a more legitimate, democratic and transparent structure of governance in the organization. He is an essential source of all the information for IRU because

---

<sup>4</sup> Mrs Ailincăi is the Head of the Strategic Partnership Unit within the Support Team of the SRSG, which is based on the Joint programs between the Council of Europe and European Commission. The two on-going programs for Roma are ROMED and ROMACT Programs.

of his role in the organization. His input on the process of reshaping and transition of the organization complements my analysis for the typology, accountability, recognition and finance.

The second respondent was the Vice-president of the organization- Mr. Orhan Galjus, as one of the most influential figures in the IRU structure. He has been engaged in the strategic developments, which include the representation and advocacy plans of the organization. Mr. Galjus provided particular information about his mandate and the outcomes related to IRU's accountability flow within the internal structure, international recognition and cooperation with other stakeholders, and financial support and funds of the organization. All of the respondents provided information for the analysis chapter and conclusion of this work.

Apart from the interviews conducted with the members of the two organizations, I also included interviews with experts from the field of Roma representation. Since most of the literature covers minorities in general and their representation, I decided to keep the scope of the interviews exclusively on Roma, in order to understand and evaluate their issues of representation. All of the respondents have different points of view, roles and engagement in the topic. These interviews are fully transcribed and thematically analyzed in order to examine the models of representation that specifically focuses on the patterns of Roma representation in Europe. Due to the request for anonymity of some experts, I will not use their original names and surnames on the analysis part. I will refer to their input with other alias names.

I conducted (3) three interviews with experts who are involved in the issue of Roma. The first interviewee was John (alias). The choice to conduct this interview follows two reasons: First, he is one of the most prominent human rights activists from Romania, focusing especially on the political participation and representation of Roma in Europe; and secondly because of his profound knowledge of both units of analysis. Besides his extensive experience, he was also a coordinator of the international advocacy program at the European Roma Right

Center (ERRC) and former Open Society Institute (OSI) Roma program director. Currently he is a visiting professor at Corvinus University in Budapest, and a consultant at the Roma Education Fund (REF).

The second respondent was Nick (alias). He is also one of the most vocal activists from Macedonia, who advocated for equality and Roma participation in decision-making bodies. He is also internationally known since his famous lawsuit against the Macedonian government at the International Court of Justice for causing the murder of a Roma adult by the “Alfa” special forces in Macedonia<sup>5</sup>. In addition, as a leading activist in Macedonia, he also contributed to political representation of Roma at the national level and worked on several initiatives establishing better mechanisms for inclusion of Roma in Europe. I decided to conduct this interview in order to acquire empirical and descriptive arguments for Roma representation in Europe, with the main focus on the two unit of analysis.

My third interviewee was Mike (alias). He has contributed in the field of political participation, Roma social movement, and representation. In addition to his experience, he has been involved in several initiatives, currently working at the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat. I decided to conduct an interview with him for two reasons. The first reason is his experience and contribution on the same focus as of my thesis; secondly, I chose him to decrease the bias of my analysis due to the fact that the previous two respondents were of Romani descent. Thus, I have foreseen in advance the high probability of similar pattern in their answers.

---

<sup>5</sup>“Vistina – the hidden case of Trajan Bekirov” (last access 10.05.2015; available at <http://vistina.mk/2015/05/05/vladata-na-sdsm-pod-tepih-ja-stavi-smrtta-na-trajan-bek-irov>)



## ***Limitations***

I identify two limitations in the methodology applied in this thesis. The first limitation is the number of the units of analysis. One may argue that IRU and SRSG are not the only international organizations that contributed to the improvement of the Roma issues. Therefore, I will address my justification of the cases in one of the following chapters. The second limitation is the number of interviews. It can appear that seven interviews might not produce an objective analysis for the European context. I am aware that the higher number interviews would provide more in-depth analysis with a variety of conclusions. However, there was a lack of time to present different viewpoints and units of analysis.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter elaborates on the models of political representation, which also relate to chain of accountability. In addition, the discussion will cover the situation of Roma and their models of representation at the European level. After political representation, this chapter will also include theoretical arguments for recognition and the actors of Roma representation within Europe. Lastly, this chapter will tackle financial sources and opportunities of NGOs for the sake of representation.

When discussing political representation, there is a longstanding discussion among scholars who seek to find a proper definition and models of political representation. Many of them agree that the concept of political representation should be continually developing along the changes in democracy in order to fit needs of people (Eulau and Karps 1977; Philips 1995). Hana Pitkin (1967: 2) offers the most straightforward definition of political representation. with a thorough normative analysis of “who” and “what” we may consider to politically represent. According to Pitkin’s (1967: 41) basic definition, political representation is set of actions to make citizens’ voices, opinions and preferences present in the decision-making bodies. In addition, the actors are required to “speak, advocate and symbolize” the interests of the group, which elected the representatives in the decision-making bodies. Therefore, Pitkin (1967: 135) in the broadest sense defines political representation as a kind of “political assistance” where the traditional principal-agent relationship<sup>6</sup> is employed in order to represent a group in the political arena. Contrasting Pitkin’s limitations of the broad concept of representation, Michael Saward (2006:303) describes the political representation as a “two-way process”. He underscores the importance of the group choosing a person to represent them and the task of the representative to “portray” or “frame” their interests in a contestable manner. In his

---

<sup>6</sup> Used by many scholars in definition of political representation, Principal-Agent relation refers to one-way process where the representative (person) is the agent and the audience (electorate or target group) are the principal;

elaboration, audience and claim making play key role for representation. A representative creates a claim to represent an audience and the audience should accept his effort to voice out their interests. The representative approaches the audience suggesting that “(1) you are/are part of this audience, (2) you should accept this view, this construction — this representation — of yourself, and (3) you should accept me as speaking and acting for you.” (Saward 2006:303). Similarly to Saward, Andrew Rehfeld (2006: 2) provides a broader definition of political representation stressing the importance of identification of group that agrees for a person to be their representative in order to achieve a specific function. Having these concepts elaborated, one might still find difficulties to understand the essentials of representation. In short, almost all of the authors agree that political representation is a process where (A) there is a person or a body, (B) representing the narratives, preferences or interests, (C) of an electorate or group of people. Thus, this thesis mainly discusses two prominent scholars in the field of political representation. Hana Pitkin and Jane Mansbridge provide baseline concepts and models of political representation, which can be applied to the case of Roma. Considering the fact that my analysis is based on the two international organizations/entities, focusing on Roma in Europe, these two theorists are give a rich ground for analysis.

According to Pitkin (1967: 11), there are four specific types of representation: (1) Formalistic representation; (2) Descriptive representation; (3) Symbolic representation and; (4) Substantive representation. She also divides (1) Formalistic representation into two subtypes of representation, (a) Authorization and (b) Accountability. In her view, formalistic representation (authorization view) occurs when a person is authorized to act in the name of a group, meaning that she is entitled to represent a group. In addition, the represented in this case are in control of his actions as if the represented does something himself. She points out that this type of representation gives many privileges to the representative because his “rights have been increased and his responsibilities decreased” (Pitkin 1967: 39). According to this view,

representation is not defined by duties or activities but it rather puts the question whatever the representative does or says because he is entitled to do so. This also means that in the limits of his authority, one becomes aware of his status when authorized to represent. However, Pitkin was aware of the gaps of this view and contrasting to this, she developed the accountability view. In the view of formalistic representation (accountability view), a representative is someone who is held accountable and he has to be responsive to the people he represents (Pitkin 1967: 55). A person or group, accountable to either another person or group of people, is considered as a representative (Pitkin 1967: 55). Representation in this case focuses more on the relation between the representative and the group he represents. This view unlike the authorization view has definite sets of obligations with a strong emphasis on responsiveness, where representatives are required to be responsive to the group they represent. According to Pitkin (1967: 56), this view is not only to hold a representative accountable but also to make him/her aware of his/her constituents and consult with them. In short, the introduction of the accountability view generates more trust in the relationship between voters and representatives. She points out that authorization and accountability are concepts that are implemented in pair for more consistent link, impact and coordination between the constituency and representative. However, these two views of representation mean to “represent” simply because one is given authority, or because one is held accountable for his actions. Consequently, both of the views require further development in order to provide details on how would the model work and what should be taken as a mechanism to implement these two views of representation.

Apart from the formalistic views of representation, Pitkin continues with *descriptive* representation. She elaborates how the descriptive type of representation can be used in some contexts as a successful type of “stand for” political representation (Pitkin 1967: 61). This type of representation mainly focuses on the “mirroring” the constituents (Pitkin 1967: 61). Literally, Pitkin shows that the appearance characteristics of the representative are a significant

feature in political representation. If the representative has the same features like his constituency, then he is supposed to “mirror” the interests of the constituency (Pitkin 1967, Mansbridge 1999, Phillips 2002). Unlike the previous concept of representation, this type of representation is more focused on the idea that “being something” is better than “doing something”. Furthermore, this type of representation does not imply that the representative should “act for others” but directly implies that the representative should “stand for” his constituents as a “resemblance” or “reflection” (Pitkin 1967: 61). According to Pitkin (1967: 61), descriptive representation is not a type of representation that should be evaluated if it is good or bad but rather a more developed view of the formalistic type of representation. Since not everybody can represent himself, many theorists fond of descriptive representation provide arguments that this type of “mirroring” of electorate may not be perfect, but it is close enough to show that the electorate feels represented in decision-making.

*“Representing may be seen as an accurate correspondence between legislature and the nation, not for purposes of information, but to ensure that the legislature does what the people themselves would have done if they had acted directly.” (Pitkin 1967: 62).*

Advocates of representative democracy and minorities usually favor this view of representation due to the opportunities to elect or appoint someone who would “mirror” the society. Yet Pitkin using Mill’s arguments for proportional representation shows that this view should not be confused with governing. Mill’s argument favor accurate depiction of the society and only then the legislative body is representing every group of the society. In this view, minorities should also be represented and practice the values of active citizenship (Pitkin 1967, Mansbridge 1999, Phillips 2002). However, many of the theorists in favor of descriptive representation are aware that this type of political representation cannot provide arguments that would suit every country because in some countries with a majoritarian electoral system, the “mirroring” is less productive than the participation of every citizen in elections with the mainstream parties.

Another argument is that some countries do not recognize or provide space for every community to create their own party or have their own representative to advocate for their interests (Philips 2002; Young 2000)

Another style of representation elaborated by Pitkin in her typology is the *symbolic* representation. This view focuses mainly on symbols like flag or anthem, which represent a nation or a distinct culture. Here, representing means portraying something that is currently not present, this is why representing symbols play a crucial role in politics. Along these lines, Pitkin (1967: 93) argues that symbols are not alternatives for representing neither “proxies” for objects but rather as mechanisms for a specific purpose. Many of the scholars who disputed this view provide arguments showing that symbols can be interpreted in a different way. Therefore, symbols for one group might represent something that for another group might be controversial. Depending on the context, symbolic representation creates a gap in the process of visibility. Some countries with plural composition of identities may have clashes between people from different ethnic, sexual, class, religious and other identities because of their public demonstration of symbols. To some extent, this model shows that symbols are essential in political representation, building a common principles, values and ideas but it lacks mechanism of implementation for long-term political representation.

The last category of representation evaluated by Pitkin is the *substantive* type of representation. According to this view, political representation is a process where representatives take actions on the “behalf of”, “in the interests of” or as “an agent of” a defined group of people represented (Pitkin 1967:113). According to Pitkin, this view is a sophisticated form of representation due to the incentives for a more developed method of representation by the behavioral scholars. This view described as the “acting for” implies that substantive political representation “is a certain characteristic activity, defined by certain behavioral norms or certain things a representative is expected to do” (Pitkin 1967, 212). The importance of this

model is to provide “truthfulness, accurate rendering of information about something absent” (Pitkin 1967, 113). She underscores the importance of the “connection”, “contact”, “correspondence” even a “chain of communication” of the representative and the constituencies (Pitkin 1967, 212). This type of representation must match the wishes, needs and interests of the constituencies, but at the same time use his skills, tools, and knowledge in order to make a balance of what “really” is a good representation. Generally, the positive arguments for substantive representation highlight the significance of taking decisions. If a descriptive representative takes a decision, emotions or other ties with the group may influence him and generate a bad decision. While the substantive representative would not be eager to risk and he might not be imposed to emotions so that he would generate a rational decision (Philips 2002; Young 2000). On the other hand, the negative arguments implicitly show that the substantive representative may not share opinion, preferences and most importantly values, which would lead to disruptive articulation of the group interests. This opens space for debating about the best fitting model (Philips 2002; Young 2000).

The next generation of theorists focuses on different aspects and analysis on the representation activity. Representation did not only mean to make somebody present in the legislative body but also deliberation, consultancy, advocacy, and rendering of information for decisions (Pitkin 1967; Mansbridge 1999; Rehfeld 2006). Jane Mansbridge (2003) following the arguments of Pitkin and Rehfeld, tries to narrow the gap between the concepts of political representation. She underlines that political representation cannot be a simple concept employing the “principal-agent” process, but a more complex idea creating different types of political representation that focus more on the deliberation rather than aggregation. In “Rethinking representation”, she normatively describes the plurality of representation introducing four different types of political representation. (1) Promissory; (2) Anticipatory; (3) Gyroscopic; and (4) Surrogate representation (Mansbridge 2003: 515). The theoretical input

by Mansbridge will provide details for analyzing the representation model with specific focus on accountability of the IRU and SRSG.

The idea of *promissory representation* follows the principal-agent relationship between the representative and the constituents. Mansbridge draws the attention to the simple relationship of power. The linear relation starts with the representative's promises prior to elections or delegation and ends with the voters' power to track if the promises made before elections are achieved. This model theoretically seems simple and accountability for the promises appears blurred. In reflection to Pitkin's accountability, Mansbridge shows that promissory representative should be "responsible to", "answerable to", "bound" and even "bound by" the constituents (Mansbridge 2003: 516). In this type of representation, the representative in his mandate follows the guide provided by the voters. Voters state their desires, instructions and the representative promises to fulfill voters' preferences (Mansbridge 2003: 516). Still, Mansbridge is aware that this model is not the ideal model but it can be the best method for citizens to affect or change politics.

The second model of the typology is the *anticipatory representation*. According to Mansbridge, this model is based on previous empirical data showing how the electorate evaluates actions of representative in order to decide whom to vote. This model shifts from "traditional" to "intention-based" power model, which includes anticipations for choice (Mansbridge 2003:517). In this model, the focus is set on the audience and their mechanism of rationality of choosing their representatives. The incumbent in this case is evaluated according to his actions and results from previous mandates, while the challenger is assessed according to the promises he makes. If the audience assumes that the incumbent did not meet his promises, then they would seek for an alternative option for their interests. As a sanction of the incumbent's mandate, voters anticipate the choice of the challenger if his promises seem more



pleasing than the actions of the incumbent. The challenger should provide a plan to meet voters' preferences and act in their interest (Mansbridge 2003: 519).

The third proposed model by Mansbridge is the *gyroscopic representation*. This model is the opposite of the anticipatory model because of the accountability method. Unlike traditional method in the anticipatory and promissory models, gyroscopic representation requires accountability only for "internal reasons" which are caused by the representative's understanding of interests (Mansbridge 2003: 520). This model focuses on the behavior of the representative and the voters' expectations of his performance. These representatives are like "gyroscopes" rotating in the scope of interests of the electorate (Mansbridge 2003: 520). This implies that the representative is driven by own set of principles that he would act upon if delegated or appointed as a representative. Having said this, voters have the chance to profile representatives and predict policy preferences of the representatives. This is how voters put a certain set of principles and values (through a representative) into the political system. The placement of the representative in the system makes the voters cautious and aware about the inclination of advocacy that the representative would perform. Unlike previous models, which concentrate on representatives "acting", gyroscopic representation concentrates on "performance" and his behavior (Mansbridge 2003: 522). If voters are dissatisfied, they consult the representative or vote for another representative.

The last proposed model is the *surrogate representation*. This model provides an alternative understanding of representation as a process for acting in the political arena. Surrogates are representatives who advocate for voters who failed to give a vote for him and thus cannot hold him accountable for his acts (Mansbridge 2003: 522). There is no electoral relationship. This model was firstly introduced in the United States as "collective representation" or "institutional representation" because interests of a group or identity are represented (Mansbridge 2003: 522). If a representative elected from constituency A and

promotes minority interests, then minorities from constituency B will be represented as well. Therefore, interests of minorities from A and B are represented in the legislative or other decision-making bodies. In addition, the surrogate often provides expertise and offers recommendations to solve issues of the target group (Mansbridge 2003:524). Although Mansbridge is aware of the model gaps, she asserts that still the model meets the “democratic standards”. Interests and preferences of groups are political reality and in her own words: “Surrogate representatives may consult with group members, particularly those who have some formal or informal claim to represent others of the group, so that information and insights flow both ways” (Mansbridge 2003:524). Summing up this model Mansbridge highlights the need for innovations in political representation aiming for further analysis of this model.

Considering these two prominent authors, it is clear that voters have a variety of strategies to use in pursuing their interests and preferences, while representatives have another set of strategies to attract voters and maximize utilities. Many of the theorists have developed alternative models to advance the basic notions of political representation as a principal-agent relationship. In continuation of the debate, Mansbridge among others promote alternative models, which contributes Pitkin’s concepts of political representation. Mansbridge also highlights the accountability as a complementing factor for a successful representation. Her typology also tackles questions regarding the accountability of a representative. The introduction of all the models challenges the question of Roma representation of interests at the European level. According to the classifications and the scholarly arguments, the debate on Roma representation remains a puzzle between the descriptive and substantive types of representation. Therefore, the main focus of the analysis will be based on these two models of representation.

Considering all of the Pitkin’s models, we can see that the most interesting debate is focused on descriptive “standing for” and substantive “acting on the behalf of” types of

representation (Pitkin 1969; Mansbridge 2003). One may find a combination of symbolic and formalistic models with descriptive or substantive representation to achieve better results. Descriptive representation focuses on resemblance of the voters, while the substantive is more about rendering information of the voters. Many authors including Pitkin (1969) criticize the descriptive model of representation, describing it as a passive model. The benefit of this model is the trust that the representative has the physical characteristics of the voters as the group voting for him. Still, this argument does not only refer to the physical characteristics but also includes experiences, preferences and particular perspective (Phillips, 1995: 40). The social aspect of this model of representation is especially essential because it involves a particular point of view about specific social processes that group members share. If a representative is a chosen member of a group, then this incentivizes trust among group that elected him, assuming that their interests will be adequately represented in the decision-making bodies. According to Mansbridge (1999:629), it is likely that these representatives will be more loyal to their electorate. This is mostly important for socially disadvantaged or oppressed groups (Phillips 1995: 629). The comfort that the descriptive representation model offers is often disputed with the fact that representatives do not necessarily act or have the ability of to act in the interest of the group that elected him. The most common criticism of descriptive representation explains the capability of descriptive representatives to accomplish a substantial representation of interests.

In addition, the substantive representation models (proposed by Pitkin), in some contexts is more preferred due to better flexibility for minorities. When it comes to substantive representation, minorities would favor rendering of their interests in the high instances of decision-making than descriptive resemblance of a community. However, rendering does not always show the best intentions for disadvantaged or oppressed groups (Young 2002; Phillips 1995). In addition, there is a strong criticism from the authors in favor of descriptive model

showing substantive model unfit for minorities due to lack of common sense of belonging. The lack of experience does not produce outcomes that would satisfy minority perspectives, interests and preferences. It is also argued that misinformation may lead to bigger conflict and unsatisfied constituencies (Young 1997; Philips 1995; Pitkin 1967). Substantive representation cannot generate truthfulness and real representation due to the group mistrust and loyalty on a non-descriptive representative. Some are arguing that models are sufficient and applicable to every context; others argue that political representation should have innovative alternatives in order to show that it is not only limited to these two types of relationship between the voters and representatives. Substantive and descriptive representation remain the most debated types due to the argumentation of scholars that one model should be more favored than the other because of the democratic settings in a country. They namely refer to electoral system, institutional design, relationship between the majority and minorities, political culture etc. All of these types show that political representation is a normatively indistinct concept, which requires analysis and more developed forms that would satisfy necessities of constituents.

The universality of the models provided by Pitkin and Mansbridge could be applicable to some minorities in certain circumstances. The case of Roma demonstrates that they are under-represented nation, which is need of voicing demands at the international level. If we analyze the situation of Roma in Europe, we can see that the debate on political representation of Roma is based on descriptive and substantive models. Roma face the biggest problems since there are many actors to represent different interests for the common target group. Important to highlight here is the unfortunate failure of institutionalization of Roma representation in Europe. The lack of territory is one of the reasons for this. On the other hand, interests vary due to their political, social, and economic situation in all of the European countries. Therefore, Roma lack unity of institutionalization, interests and actors for a common European agenda. For this reason, international organizations illustrate the best examples of descriptive and

substantive representation with addition of the surrogate, and gyroscopic accountability. None of these types of representation would impact if the organizations are not visible. In this case, visibility is linked to their status of recognition.

Recognition is an essential part of social life especially for minorities. Their demand of recognition from the majority initiates the “multiculturalism” (Taylor 1994: 1). As Taylor notes, recognition contributes to the understanding of the status of an individual or a group. If there is a lack of acknowledgement for what an individual or a group stands for, then misrecognition may cause obstacles and distortion of the image that is presented (Taylor 1994: 25). He also points out that lack of recognition might lead to misinterpretation, ignorance and oppression (Taylor 1994: 25). In addition, Laitinen (2002) provides different structures of recognition. In this case, the simple structure of recognition is when A is a recognizer and B is recognized, in which C is the features to be recognized and D is B’s background. This complex structure illustrated in example is when I recognize you as an individual having specific rights and responsibilities as an free and rational human being (Laitinen 2002: 465). Different forms of recognition affect the process when various actors are involved. Recognition has many different meanings in use of different contexts. When we elaborate political recognition of actors for representation, it is important to note that states are political units representing national interests. Therefore, recognition is a crucial factor for the representativeness of interests on European level. According to the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, recognition has three meanings. “(1) an act of intellectual apprehension, such as when we ‘recognize’ we have made a mistake or we ‘recognize’ the influence of religion on American politics; (2) a form of identification, such as when we ‘recognize’ a friend in the street; and (3) the act of acknowledging or respecting another being, such as when we ‘recognize’ someone’s status,

achievements or rights”<sup>7</sup>. This distinction is widely used for different contexts. Nevertheless, the most appropriate political definition of recognition is “the act of acknowledging or respecting another being, such as when we ‘recognize’ someone’s status, achievements or rights”<sup>8</sup>. This means that political recognition entails accepting and respecting others presence and status. Furthermore, recognition in this case is a process where mutual acknowledgement and credit is required for recognized and the recognizer in order to achieve cooperation and support of the same interests. The focus of this thesis specifically elaborates the recognition of actors at the European level and their cooperation with other actors to advocate for the interests of Roma. In order to evaluate both of the organizations, I will use the one-dimensional structure provided by Laitinen. Moreover, I will also stick to the third meaning of political recognition provided from the internet encyclopedia of philosophy.

After the establishment of IRU, the representatives sought to find methods to gain recognition in the international arena of actors. According to Kenrick (1971: 105), the organization intended to establish cooperation with the CoE and UN. Their correspondence aimed to show that IRU is an international organization, which represents the interests of Roma. One of the ultimate goals of the organization was to acquire the recognition status from the UN assembly. Throughout the years, IRU successfully negotiated with many international actors and NGOs for cooperation. This substantially contributed to the visibility and acknowledgement of the organization. IRU successfully became part of the UN with a consultative status in the UN-ECOSOC. As previous examples of non-territorial nations in the world show, UN recognized IRU as an actor to advocate for Roma interests (McGarry 2010: 160; Hancock 2002: 121). The recognition status from the UN shows that IRU became a visible factor and acknowledged their existence. Furthermore, the cooperation continued with the

---

<sup>7</sup> Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (last access 25.05.2015, available at [http://www.iep.utm.edu/recog\\_sp/#H1](http://www.iep.utm.edu/recog_sp/#H1))

<sup>8</sup> Ibid

Czech Republic recognizing IRU as a genuine representative of Roma (PER 2001: 33). In 2000, the Czech Republic established cooperation with IRU and supported the idea of a non-territorial nation (2001: 33). However, their status remained only supported from the Czech Republic, which was later declined after the change of IRU leadership in 2004 (PER 2001: 34). In sum, the recognition status of IRU from all of the organizations showed that IRU was acknowledged actor for Roma interests. This also shows that European states, national NGOs, and other actors working for the same interests, recognized IRU.

The recognition status of the SRSG is closely linked to the status of the CoE. All the initiatives for Roma within the CoE are recognized by the member states in the CoE (Interview Ailincăi; Interview Bunjes). The Secretary General as well as the member states of the CoE recognizes the status of the SRSG. Furthermore, the EU also recognizes the SRSG since it financially supports the SRSG with programs and projects (Interview Ailincăi; Interview Bunjes). The status of the SRSG is also recognized by national NGOs, because of the implementation of SRSG's projects (Interview Ailincăi; Interview Bunjes). ROMED and ROMACT programs are operating in many CoE members states. These arguments show that national NGOs are the main stakeholders for implementation of the projects and they recognize the status of the SRSG representing Roma (Interview Ailincăi). In sum, the status of the SRSG is widely recognized because of the already established status of the CoE. The cooperation shows that SRSG is recognized by member states of the CoE, national NGOs, EU and other stakeholders who are directly cooperating with the organization.

Since both of the organizations have a visible status of recognition. Many states, international and national NGOs, show that both organizations have cooperated to advance the situation of Roma in Europe. Since cooperation is highly dependent on initiatives for programs and projects, both organizations have had different financial sources. In order to discuss the financial sources and funds of political representation, one should be careful of the distinction

of actors and their acquiring of funds. The sources for non-governmental organizations are different and they are not always depending on national budgets. In literature, there are different articles, which elaborate on the options and sources of non-governmental organizations. NGOs mainly depend on external resources, which imply their own financial support from membership fees or grants from foundations, individual donations, projects or other activities (Frumkin 2005; Cornforth 2003; Antrobus 1987). Since both of the units of analysis are non-governmental international organizations/entities, I will focus on their financial resources and budget allocations for representation of Roma interests at the European level. In both cases, there are different fundraising strategies and differ in sources for their activities. Therefore, the focus of this section is to demonstrate financial sources and opportunities of IRU and SRSG.

After 1991, there is a constant rise in the number of organizations and foundations set in many of the states in transition to ensure a sustainable establishment of democracy. Moreover, this was also an opportunity for Roma to take part in the civil society and to advocate for the Roma issues (Marushiakova and Popov 2005; Thelen 2005). According to the existing literature on IRU, as noted by Marushiakova and Popov (2005: 10), there is an assumption that Yugoslavia financed the fourth Congress in Poland in 1990. In addition, the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs, also funded the fifth congress, while the congress in 2003 in Smolensk was funded by Open Society Institute (hereinafter OSI). Currently, according to the interviews conducted with the members of IRU, the only source of the organization lays in the membership fees and individual donations. Both Galjus and Dimov confirmed that the organization has no external sources from foundations or other international organizations (Interviews Galjus and Dimov). They said that country representatives pay fees to the organization and there are individuals who support the organization and contribute with donations (Interviews Galjus and Dimov).



In elaboration of SRSG, there is a lack of secondary data which would provide information for their financial sources. In the case of SRSG, I will only rely on the interview data gathered for analysis. According to the interviews, both Bunjes and Ailincăi responded that there are three main sources in the office of SRSG. The first is the ordinary budget of the CoE, which covers most of the salaries of the SRSG and the Support Team. The second source is the EU, which covers the bulk of operational costs and the ROMED and ROMACT programs. Lastly, there are voluntary contributions from individual member states in the CoE that allow the office to organize activities and events related to Roma (Interviews Ailincăi and Bunjes).

## IDENTIFICATION OF ROMA INTERESTS AND ACTORS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

When defining actors of representation for a unique example of a stateless nation such as the Roma, we must take into account the historical background and struggles for institutionalization of political participation and representation. In this part, I mainly focus on the international actors, which have representational capacity to advocate for Roma interests in Europe. The most visible actors for representation are the NGOs, advocating for Roma interests in the decision-making bodies. On one hand, there are NGO networks that continually advocate for Roma interests such as IRU, European Roma and Travelers' Forum (hereinafter ERTF) etc. On the other hand, there are ad-hoc bodies/entities within international organizations that cover Roma in their agenda of interests such as the Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues - Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (hereafter CPRSI-OSCE), the SRSG in CoE (McGarry 2010; Liegeois 2007).

Every organization develops programs and implements activities related to the previously defined interests. Some of the international organizations included Roma members to their teams to coordinate or operate with a position, which would deal with the Roma interests such as the OSI, Amnesty International (hereafter AI), Minority Rights Group International (hereafter MRGI) etc. Other organizations base their claims on research and analysis from non-Roma professionals. In addition, some of these actors claimed to be exclusive representatives of Roma in Europe, while some are appointed offices to implement programs. IRU claimed that they are the exclusive representative of Roma while SRSG is an appointed office by the CoE. All of these actors contributed for the betterment of Roma in Europe with different methods providing different outcomes. According to some scholars (McGarry 2010; Liegeois 2007; Klimova-Alexander 2004; Hancock 2002) the interests of Roma are advocated by both Roma-led and non-Roma organizations. These two types of actors

are the stakeholders for the issue of representation of Roma at the European level. Both types of the organizations have initiated and implemented programs and actions for improving the overall situation of Roma in Europe. However, authors also point out to the fact that the non-Roma organizations that cover Roma issues are usually organizations that primarily have the aim to represent or advocate for minorities and their human rights, social groups, poverty, marginalization, etc. Roma organizations often face issues of recognition and participation in the decision-making processes. Syndrome

The notion of interests in political representation has different definitions and interpretations. As noted by Pitkin (1967) and Mansbridge (2003), the term “interests” is interchangeably used for policy preferences, opinions, values, needs, requirements, experiences, perspectives. As noted by Benn (1960) there is an interest when a group strives to achieve it. Furthermore, Pound (1943:2) points out interests being the “claims, demands or desires that individuals or groups opt to satisfy through politically organized society”. Group interests usually depend on the values, experiences, needs, policy preferences, views and opinions of the group. In contemporary Europe, many of the nations had the opportunity to define and prioritize their interests through an institutionalized method. The creation of the founding documents assumes that the nation would strive for the priorities set on the constitution and generic laws (Benn 1960; Pound 1943). In addition, these documents demonstrate the power to preserve and represent the common interest of the country. The guardians of these values are the institutions in the country, which are established with an aim to achieve and sustain the basic principles that the nations set.

As a political unit, but non-territorial nation, Roma minority lack institutional power to generate and unify their own interests. In many respects, as a heterogeneous group, it can be argued that Roma face difficulties to promote a stable identity and unified interests due to the fact that they do not have a kin state and they lack political power that would bring together

and articulate their interests. Many scholars (McGary 2010; Liegeois 2007; Hancock 2002) argue that Roma have a large but common scope of divergent interests, which can be classified and articulated through international organizations as actors of Roma interests. Furthermore, NGOs are the most important instruments for Roma to voice their needs, priorities, preferences, values in one common concept as a set of interests. These actors are the main proponents to identify the sum of Roma interests at the European level. They also provide a platform to observe and evaluate the nature of interests including the economic, social, cultural, and political aspects of their interests. Considering the fact that Roma are a heterogeneous group, there were many attempts to set a common agenda for Roma interests. One of the first attempts to define Roma interests as group interests in Europe was the first World Roma congress and the initiatives by the CoE from the establishment of the Roma Specialist Group (hereafter MG-S-ROM), ERTF, SRSG to the latest support for the European Roma Institute (hereafter ERI).

After the genocide in the World War II, which seemed to be the biggest motivation for organizing, the Congress was ready to establish an organization that would protect Roma, prevent another genocide, and at the same time identify and articulate Roma interests at the European level (Liegeois 2007; Marushiakova and Popov 2005; Klimova-Alexander 2004; IRU Charter 2000; Kenrick, 1971). According to the goals from their founding document (International Romani Union charter 2000), the organization focuses on the development and persistence of culture, tradition, customs and language as top priorities which should be visible and highly represented aspects of Roma identity. Furthermore, fundamental human rights, representation, equality, peace, and safety are also in the list of interests. Apart from the wide set of interests, the main focus of the organization included history, identity, language, war crimes, culture, social affairs, human rights, and education (Marushiakova and Popov 2005; IRU charter 2000; Kenrick 1971). In total, there were eight World Roma congresses, in which priorities were set among the interests for IRU. The biggest attention throughout the years was

pointed to the status of recognition as ethnic minority and later as a non-territorial nation in Europe, human rights, Romani language encyclopedia, promoting Roma unified history, language and culture as essential values of Roma as priorities for Roma in Europe (Liegeois 2007; Klimova-Alexander 2004; Kenrick, 1971). In addition to these values, IRU especially focused on Roma women, family values and children, the Romani transnational passports and the latest priority, the migration and discrimination against Roma (Marushiakova and Popov 2005; Klimova-Alexander 2004). The definition of interests for IRU was a huge challenge due to the constant rotation in presidency and members of the organization. Changes in the structure made the organization to shift priorities among the broad scope of interests. After all the initiatives and attempts, IRU successfully brought attention to many of the Roma issues and advocated for the political claim of a non-territorial nation. Their representative effort on international level incentivized European states to negotiate and implement some of the key interests defined by IRU on their congresses.

Another organization that focused on the Roma interests was the Council of Europe. Since 1969, the CoE established several bodies to advocate Roma interests. The most recent one is the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma issues (SRSG), as a complementary body to the previously established initiatives. The CoE established the SRSG and his team in 2010 after the high-level meeting on Roma (Council of Europe High Level Meeting on Roma, Strasbourg, October 20, 2010 - The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma). This provided space for the Special Representative to monitor the situation of Roma and advocate for their interests according to the Declaration. SRSG represents an ad-hoc body in the CoE umbrella of bodies that would accumulate different projects for Roma, negotiate policies for Roma in the CoE member states, monitor and represent Roma to the Secretary General and the CoE in general. The team of the SRSG has adopted several programs in order to improve the situation of Roma in Europe. SRSG tackles some of the interests with high priority set by the

Strasbourg Declaration on Roma. The role of the Declaration is to provide support and assistance for efforts at national, regional and local level for full inclusion of Roma as European citizens (The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma). According to the Declaration, there are several key spheres as priorities of overall interests of Roma. The Declaration covers the social and economic inclusion, which specifically tackles the education, employment, health, and housing components. In addition, the declaration requires the member states to pledge for protection of human rights, combating discrimination focusing on racism, stigmatization, and hate speech against Roma. This also covers the right to citizenship, women's rights and gender equality, children's rights and access to justice. Finally, the Declaration also focuses on the international cooperation urging member states to respect the European Social Charter and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma). Having said this, the establishment of the SRSG is a mechanism for the Secretary General to have an overview of the situation of the Roma in the member states, and to safeguard the implementation of this declaration.

## CASE SELECTION

This thesis is based on the comparison of the two units of analysis: the SRSG and the IRU. I selected these two organizations because they were the first to identify and consolidate interests of Roma from local and national level to the international level. Both of the organizations have the same target group and similar scope of interests. They are explicitly tackling discrimination, advocating for employment, education, health, political empowerment etc. These two organizations are also the most persistent actors of Roma interest representation in Europe. Both of the organizations preserved their credibility and reliability through different initiative including negotiations and policy changes to remain visible actors. Another similarity is the monitoring role by both of the organizations. They both monitor the situation of Roma in European countries and react if possible through different democratic methods.

The IRU was the first political organization as an international representative for Roma. IRU was a visible actor in the beginning having the role of a guardian for Roma interests at the European and international level. According to Klimova-Alexander (2004: 600), Roma were in necessity to create organizations for their own interest due to the historic mistrust and the misbehavior after the World Wars by non-Roma. She points out that Roma used the opportunity of organizations to voice their needs as a nation without a kin state that survived a genocide. This organization, as an actor of representation, is one of the oldest initiatives to represent Roma at the European and international level. Their historical background and consistency showed that the organization is putting efforts to cover many interests as priorities of Roma in Europe. In addition, the CoE's engagement on Roma dates from 1969 and since then have been establishing several ad-hoc bodies to defend Roma interests in the CoE member states. Second, as stated above, the SRSG is the latest existing initiative after the Strasbourg Declaration for Roma in 2010. This body was a result from the declaration appointed by the Secretary General

of the CoE. This position within the CoE makes it a visible mechanism to represent and monitor Roma interests in the member states of the CoE.

However, these two organizations have major differences in their organizational structure, type of representation and views. As I already mentioned above, IRU is an organization advocating for a more descriptive type of representation. Some authors, (Marushiakova and Popov 2005; Klimova-Alexander 2004) who contributed in literature with a focus on the organizational achievements, present the organization as a nationalist body set in 1971. This is argued due to its type of advocacy for Roma interests. The SRSG as an initiative by the CoE is a policy oriented technocratic body as a part of the umbrella ad-hoc organizations created for improvement of the situation of Roma in Europe. Similar to almost all of the initiatives by the CoE, SRSG has a substantive nature of representation employing a more diplomatic role to achieve interests in European states.

The structure of both of the organizations varies due to their nature of representation. IRU contains four bodies apart from the president, vice president, general secretary and treasurer, which are the founding positions of the organization. The four main bodies are the Congress, Parliament, Presidium and a Court of Justice (IRU Charter 2000: 2). The SRSG is composed of the Special Representative who has a special advisor, personal assistant and the Head of the Support Team. The Support Team is composed of two units. Both of the units have their head of units (coordinating the programs), and program managers (dealing with the projects and activities). The first unit is in charge of the strategic partnerships, responsible for ROMED and ROMACT programs. The second unit is called I-Care Unit (Interview Aurora Ailincăi).

This leads to the highly noticeable differences in accountability, their recognition and finance, which affect their outcome in representation of the same group. In addition, all of the other organizations in Europe, representing Roma interests, follow a similar pattern of



representation. The EU also represents Roma interests through different structures, which are part of the numerous Directorate Generals. Therefore, EU goes out of the focus of comparison because it does not have a long-term body for Roma interests. The same applies for the OSCE and the CPRSI. OSCE follows the same pattern of representation as the CoE, but the argument of consistency is in favor of the CoE and its initiatives. Historically, CoE initiated support for Roma in the early 70ies, while OSCE created the CPRSI the mid 90ies (Vermeersch 2006; Thelen 2005). ERTF is also an organization initiated by the CoE, currently expected to close its office in Strasbourg. The CoE seems to be more eager to support the SRSG office and the initiative of the ERI. The last organizations is the UN, which urged organizations to cooperate for improving the situation of Roma. UN's role of representation focus on territorial nations and their participation in world politics. Encouraging the cooperation, UN granted consultative status for the IRU at the UN-ECOSOC in 2001 in order to represent Roma as a non-territorial nation (McGarry 2010; Marushiakova and Popov 2005).

Considering all of the similarities and differences of the IRU and SRSG, I believe that they are the only consistent and comparable organizations for Roma interests in Europe. I strongly believe that studying these two organizations would provide new insight on how Roma can advance their interests at the European level.

## ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the analysis of the two units, based on the four factors (type of representation, accountability, recognition, and finance) for evaluation of the organizational representativeness. There are two sub-chapters of the analysis, which are based on the units' elaboration. I use here arguments from the theoretical framework, data from secondary sources, and the interviews. In the end of every sub-chapter, I offer a summary of the arguments of the data for the factors and provide concluding remarks.

### ***International Romani Union***

Driven by the simple definition of terms of Pitkin (1967: 41), representation is a kind of “political assistance” where representatives are obliged to “speak, advocate and symbolize” the interests of the constituencies in the decision-making bodies. Therefore, citizens' voices, opinions and policy preferences are represented in the decision-making bodies. In explanation of Roma representation of interests in Europe, these types will explain whether the model of representation influences the representativeness of the organizations or not.

According to the interviews, both of the organizations have a different type of representation of Roma interests. IRU's input show that the leadership and all representatives are Roma. Both of the interviewees from IRU stated confidently that the organization is Roma-led and they are about to implement the idea of Roma virtual government. As Dimov enthusiastically pointed out “...*These changes are proposed in order to close the gaps in accountability, show more transparency and practice democratic rule...*” (Interview Dimov). Still, this does not say much about the type of representation of the organization. When I asked Dimov about the identity of their membership, Dimov said “...*We are all Roma... we speak Romanes and it should stay like this... we are recognized as a Roma organization, then we*

*should be Roma of course*” (Interview Dimov). On the other hand, Galjus confirmed his response but he also added:

*“... the organization is something that we started long time ago, it has been a movement, it started by us, Roma(...) this does not mean that we don't want non-Roma, of course we should cooperate but... you know... Europe today is the same Europe from 1930ies, full of hate-speech, nationalism and extreme right-wing organizations... and this is not good, everybody is protecting their own interests, right?”* (Interview Galjus).

These responses clearly stated that this organization started in 1971 in order to protect Roma interests because they are Roma themselves. In addition, the respondents highlighted the importance of Roma representing Roma interests and the common sense as the most important value for someone who represents Roma. Both of the respondents confirm Klimova-Alexander's (2004: 600) argument that Roma after World War II were in a necessity to create a political organization to represent their interests due to the historic mistrust and misbehavior of non-Roma during the World Wars. Dimov in his own words,

*“...not only Jews, but also Roma were victims in the Second World War(...) if you want to prevent this you have to come up strong and protect your values, tradition, language, customs... [adds an old proverb in Romanes] ... how can you believe in someone that killed your ancestors, discriminates you, segregates you, calls you 'cigan' ... no wonder we created this organization”* (Interview Dimov).

Furthermore, Galjus seemed to provide an answer, which would relate to the types of representation explaining the role of IRU in representation of Roma interests. He noted:

*“...would you find it wrong if a Czech or Hungarian political organization is only composed of Czechs or Hungarians? Of course not, but you would think that Roma organization composed of Roma is a problem(...) we are an organization who protects*

*Roma, just like every other organization or government protects its people... you know... it's hard for some people to understand that" (Interview Galjus).*

In evaluation of these answers, most of the patterns indicated a descriptive type of representation. According to Pitkin (1967), the descriptive type of representation “mirrors” the constituents. Descriptive representation stands for accurate resemblance of the represented community. Moreover, she adds that appearance characteristics of the representative are a significant feature in political representation and “being someone” is more important than “doing something” (Pitkin 1967:61). As noted from the interview with Galjus, “...*we are an organization who protects Roma, just like every other organization or government protects its people...*” (Interview Galjus). In this organization, “being someone” is more important than “doing something”. Dimov also affirmed the position of the organization fitting in the descriptive pattern of representation when he added “...*We are all Roma... we speak Romanes and it should stay like this... we are recognized as a Roma organization, then we should be Roma of course*” (Interview Dimov). This shows that the accurate resemblance of the representative is a very important feature for the organization. Additionally, both of the responses show that the organization “mirrors” the constituents because of their physical appearance. These arguments were supported by the expert interviews. Nick and John were vocal in addressing the patterns and models saying that IRU is a descriptive organization that lost its importance throughout the years. Nick said,

*“...IRU is the start of the nation-building process, they set the flag, the anthem, the term ‘Rom’ and demanded recognition for equal citizenship in the countries where they lived(...) If an organization sets these things and it is Roma only all these years... then yes, it is a descriptive type of organization... for Roma from Roma type of organization” (Interview Nick).*

John provided a similar answer when he compared the typology of the organizations. He said that IRU started ambitious and every change in the structure made the organization less representative because everybody lost hopes. He said:

*“...IRU was very ambitious and Roma loved the idea, the idea that Roma can represent themselves was very attractive(...) they had a lot of hopes and efforts... but their changes in the structure made the organization very weak(...) after the 90ties a lot of NGOs appeared and ‘represented’ Roma interests... that slowly killed their idea...”*  
(Interview John).

Mike in his response said that these two organizations are established from different initiatives. These initiatives including the structure of the organization give an insight of the typology of representation. He said,

*“... We cannot forget the importance of IRU, in theory the structure of the organization may be descriptive but they welcomed cooperation with non-Roma as well...”*  
(Interview Mike).

These responses provided more evidence confirming that IRU is a descriptive organization. According to the experts, they clearly claim that the patterns of the organization are theoretically linked with the descriptive type of representation. According to Pitkin (1967), the actor is “stands for” the constituents and this was provided in Nick’s response. He said “*from Roma to Roma*” (Interview Nick), which explains why the organization is “stands for” the constituents. This response shows that Roma had the chance to represent themselves, which indicates the “mirroring” and the “standing for” of the organization. In addition, of the analysis the organization also fits in Mansbridge’s models of representation and accountability. According to the interviews with IRU, both of the interviewees encouraged the new idea of restructuring the organization. The changes of the structure as Dimov puts it

*“... requires a lot of time and effort, but most importantly belief that we are a nation (...) These changes are proposed in order to close the gaps in accountability, show more transparency and practice democratic rule” (Interview Dimov).*

However, the changes require time for realization and the contemporary situation shows that few people in the organization control the accountability. As Dimov stated,

*“In the past, there was no clear accountability. The organization fixed the interests and everybody was accountable to the president, vice-president and general secretary. This made the parliament only to discuss issues in order to create plans of advocacy. The advocacy was done by the congress and the Congress was accountable again to the president, vice-president and general secretary...” (Interview Dimov).*

This answer shows that the organization was only an instrument of some people with higher recognition. I assumed that accountability was not a priority for IRU and they are full of hope for a change. In line with Dimov’s statement, Galjus provided a similar response when he answered the question about his engagement with the organization.

*“When I joined the organization I asked them to write me what are my responsibilities duties and so on. They were looking around and you know [laughs] ... But afterwards we defined the roles of the high-commissioners with the presidium...” (Interview Galjus).*

In addition, Galjus enthusiastically stated that we should use the existing information technology to ensure a perfect link of accountability. He claimed that everyone who uses the social networks could see the activities of the organization and react to their agenda. He stated,

*“First of all, we call each other, for example in the case of Ukraine, I got a call from many organizations as a current IRU vice president. We had to say what do we do, whom should we talk and how to help (...) you know, we use phones and especially the*

*internet, the social networks as a tool gives us the chance to be accountable to our people...” (Interview Galjus).*

This response confirmed my initial assumption for the accountability links in IRU. They lack a formal mechanism of accountability or according to Mansbridge (2003: 516), they lack a principle-agent relationship with their target group. Analyzing Galjus’s response, we can see that the organization had not set the obligations and the duties of the representatives. This confirms Pitkin’s argument that accountability cannot be successful if a representative does not know his obligations and there are not any demands. If the only organizational source for accountability were the reports from the country representatives and those representatives were not responsive then clearly there is a missing link in the organization.

In theory, IRU shows patterns of a gyroscopic representation provided by Mansbridge. According to Mansbridge (2003), the gyroscopic model has a specific mechanism of accountability. Gyroscopic accountability focuses on the values and principles of the representatives. As presented in the literature, IRU appoints representatives according to their moral merits and authority. Moreover, the constituency looks at the profile of the representatives and foresees the preferences of the representatives. In the case of IRU, the structure, namely the president, vice-president and secretary general, predicts the performance of the trustees joining the organization, while the represented target group is not consulted. Not only does this model show that constituencies would predict the performance of the representative, but also consult him for if he is not performing as expected. A representative in the gyroscopic model has his own values, principles, and methods of how to perform representation. Considering his behavior, constituency knows if a representative is capable of holding such position. In IRU, the constituency seems to be in the internal structure. This is how the president, vice-president, and secretary general decide if a person should be joining the organization. Still, the target group, which is supposed to be consulted, does not have any

role in electing or suggesting their representatives. This evidently creates an issue of external accountability and trust among people. Therefore, the organization faces serious criticism regarding the lack of accountability. If an organization claims to represent interests of a certain group, then the organization has to consult the group. This is why Dimov introduced the new idea of virtual Roma government to IRU. The idea would close the existing gaps provided by the people as the real constituencies of this type of representation. When I discussed accountability with the experts, Nick said that IRU provided a fundamental awakening of the Roma. On one hand, Europe became more sensitive for the struggle and issues of the Roma, while on the other hand, accountability was an issue because the nation is dispersed in throughout the continent. Mike also added that IRU is to some extent accountable to the people but in different forms. As he said,

*“...IRU was almost a European Roma Parliament, although it’s very tricky (...) how will you account a representative from Albania if you are a Roma from other country... [laughs] of course there are some forms of accountability ...” (Interview Mike).*

John also said that Roma successfully set the organization but they have not had plans for accountability and building relationship with the target group. He said,

*“...IRU in the beginning was an organization of dedicated Roma from Europe who wanted to show that we need political participation and representation, but I guess they struggled to find a method for accountability...” (Interview John).*

Nick also added that the organization has a weak structure for a big project. He said that the organization slowly risked their success because of the dramatic changes in the structure. According to Nick,

*“... currently IRU does not have a strong structure and that makes them less accountable for their actions (...) Their structural changes made accountability even*



*more difficult (...) it's hard to maintain such a big project with such changes"*  
(Interview Nick).

Expert interviews confirmed my assumption that the organization does not follow a simple principal-agent relationship. They provided answers that supported my argument implying that accountability for a non-territorial nation is a big challenge. Institutional accountability and strong structure are required in order to assert their claim as a genuine Roma representative on European level. In theory, Mansbridge's (2003) innovation shows that accountability adapts to the model of representation. The patterns of IRU are closely similar to the patterns of the gyroscopic model. Although they are not directly tied to the grassroots, they maintain the internal accountability link. In this organization, clearly the pattern of the values and principles of the representatives play a big role. The prominence of the representatives, their values and principles also played a crucial role for the recognition of the organization.

As noted in the theoretical framework, the focus of the recognition status will cover the political definition provided by the encyclopedia. The patterns of the interviews will tackle the definition for acknowledging and respecting the presence of the organization from other actors and organizations. This definition also covers the status, achievements or rights of the organization. The focus of the recognition patterns corresponds the one-dimensional structure of recognition, presented by Laitinen. According to the interviews on IRU, the recognition status of the organization was a very important point in the beginning. Their efforts for the status were recorded in secondary sources with a criticism for the dramatic decline after the 90-ties. According to the interviews, both of the IRU members tackled this point. Dimov stated that the organization was a widely recognized and now it is the time to regain the trust of people and international actors as well. As he said,

*"IRU was a Roma trademark, it was a brand... from 1971 the organization fought for its own place cooperating with different supranational actors (...) IRU was successfully*

*recognized until the 90ties, when many NGOs emerged who spoke on behalf of the Roma (...) we lost our status because we had many problems with finance and structural changes...” (Interview Dimov).*

Galjus also provided answers referring to the past status of the organization. He also added that the organization has been acknowledged by the UN and closely worked with CoE. One of the notable results of recognition was also the recognition from the Czech Republic for their status as Roma representatives for Czech Republic and the world. This pattern also shows that the organization was a visible advocate for Roma issues. He said,

*“IRU was an actor negotiating for a recognition status in the UN... We also worked with CoE especially with the ERTF (...) the peak of the organization was when the Czech Republic recognized IRU as the representative of Roma in Czech Republic and in the world as well. This initiative was lost because of fractions in the organization...” (Interview Galjus).*

This response provided arguments showing that IRU was a highly respected and acknowledged organization. The organization cooperated with the most prominent international organizations and their presence was respected. Still, during the interviews, both of the interviewees said that the organization lost its status in the UN, barely cooperates with CoE and other international organizations. Their point of view on this was the same, the fractions and changes in the structure made serious damage to the image of the organization. According to Dimov,

*“... The organization has had its ups and downs, we had the status in the UN but we lost it because of the fractions in the organization, we lost that battle last year because of PAKIV<sup>9</sup> and our leadership creating another organization...” (Interview Dimov).*

---

<sup>9</sup> PAKIV is another Roma organization created by former members of IRU. The organization was created due to internal fraction in IRU (last access 25.05.2015, available at <http://www.pakiv.ro>);

Galjus also added that he rejoined the organization because of the fractions. He decided to work as a High Commissioner and Vice-president in order to unite Roma in the structure of the organization. He said,

*“When I heard that the organization is dealing with serious internal problems I decided to join and unite Roma inside (...) it was a pity that the organization had many fights and divisions, it hurts to see that Roma cannot save something that should be a government...” (Interview Galjus).*

These answers show that the organization was one of the most recognized actors until the emergence of the NGOs. The NGOs provided more doubts that IRU will survive the loss in the international arena. This is why many of the former members decided to join other organizations or create new organizations. The divisions in IRU and the structural changes caused the biggest damage to the organization after the 90-ties. Other organizations recorded bigger success representing Roma because they became more recognized and acknowledged. IRU remained with the structural issues and lost its status. Still, both of the interviewees enthusiastically said that the organization has to claim its recognition status back and cooperate with other organizations. The experts also supported these arguments implying that IRU was successful until the 2000. According to their responses, they showed the same patterns and reasons why IRU lost its status. According to Nick, the organization lost its status because it could not handle the increase of actors representing Roma interests. In addition, he said that the organization lost its recognition status due to the inability to attract financial sources. In his words:

*“... People still look at IRU as an important actor but they lost their image because of the emergence of other organizations representing Roma interests (...) their fragmentations and their inability to attract funds destroyed their vision...” (Interview Nick).*

This response was supported by John when he said that the organization needs to claim their recognition status if they really want to serve as the Roma representatives. Along that point, the organization needs to cooperate with other organizations and use the power of the young Roma to attract finance. According to John,

*“... They are invisible, the focus changed, people are more fond of joining other organizations than IRU (...) they have to regain their status if they want to represent Roma. That can only happen if the organization opens for young educated Roma to attract finance...” (Interview John).*

The last interviewee again confirms the arguments that the organization needs to find a way to attract financial sources. He also added that financial sources could help the organization to regain their recognition status. Mike said,

*“... IRU lost their status because of their approach to funds. That inflicted their recognition status in Europe (...) If IRU finds a way to attract finance, then they can recover their status...” (Interview Mike).*

All of the responses from the experts include patterns for the lack of recognition. In this case, IRU lost their recognition status due to their structural fragmentations, emergence of other Roma representatives, and financial sources. These patterns seem to have the biggest impact on the recognition status of the organization. The structural fragmentations in IRU are closely related to the emergence of other organizations. The last pattern shows that the organization also lost its abilities to attract financial sources and find opportunities to cooperate with other stakeholders. According to the experts, financial opportunities play a big role in the recognition status of an organization. If the organization does not cooperate with other actors with the same interests then they are likely to face criticism and failure. Finances as a factor for this analysis also show that the organization lost its hopes due to the inability to use the opportunities for financial support. In discussion of financial sources and opportunities, one should focus on the

sources and opportunities for NGOs (Frumkin 2005; Cornforth 2003; Antrobus 1987). Since IRU is an international organization, the sources of an international organization are national budgets, membership fees, grants, individual donations, projects or other activities, which advocate for Roma interests. In this case, IRU both Galjus and Dimov were vocal about their struggle for financial support. According to Galjus, the organization is mainly dependent on the membership fees and individual donations for strengthening the capacities of the organization. He said:

*“... IRU depends only on membership donations from the representatives and people who support the organization (...) it’s hard to make the organization visible when you don’t have any source of money... (Interview Galjus)”*

Dimov confirmed this statement and says that the organization should focus on cooperation and financial support from international foundations and donors. He boldly stated:

*“... throughout the years IRU might have had different donors (...) what I remember is in 2000 Scuka started the partnership with the Czech government, but that was it, that slowly disappeared (...) we really need to open up and try to attract funds, we need to make international organizations believe in IRU the representative of Roma...” (Interview Dimov).*

Both of the interviewees agree that the organization should focus on fundraising activities as priority of their organization if they seek representational impact. Evidently, the organization throughout the years of existence had many sources while now, the organization depends only on the membership donations. According to their responses, they both agree that the organization should demonstrate openness and become more collaborative with other international organizations. Their current budget cannot cover the basic costs, which makes a small impact. In discussion with the experts, Mike made some points about the importance of

finance. He said that the most important incentive for the representativeness of an organization is financial sustainability.

*“... IRU had good finance but they lost the track after 2000. Their lack of human resources shows that the organization is a symbol for Roma now (...) the best motivation for IRU would be financial sustainability” (Interview Mike).*

In addition, John also confirmed the same position on finance as a factor on representativeness. He added that the internal fraction of IRU made the organization unable to acquire new financial sources.

*“... IRU had financial sources but they did not want money from other non-Roma sources, I remember they asked OSI for one of the congresses and even the Czech government supported them but there was a fraction in the structure that made the organization independent from other sources (...) this is why IRU now has no finance and it is less representative...” (Interview John)*

The last response from Nick showed again that IRU lacks capacity to attain new sources. Their collaboration with the international organizations was visible until the fractions made the organization weak and incapable for further representation. He also said that finance is one of the biggest factors for representation of organizations especially on the international level. In his words:

*“... Elites made different fractions and that slowed the organization (...) because of some people in the organization that refused money from gadje<sup>10</sup>, the organization fell short of finance (...) I mean logically, finance is the biggest factor for representation...” (Interview Nick)*

---

<sup>10</sup>Gadje is a word used to address non-Roma by Roma

All of the expert responses as independent from the organizations demonstrate that finance plays a big role in representativeness of organizations. The organization became incapable of acquiring funds and the only hope were the individual donations, which were not enough to sustain the visibility and credibility of the organization. Their explanation was that they do not want to depend from donors` support due to the fear of directing the activities, and re-shaping the mission of the organization. Although donations in the beginning seemed revolutionary about the idea for Roma, IRU slowly moved to the bottom of its existence. All of the experts note that international organizations including foundations and other stakeholders changed their partners for cooperation leaving IRU dependent on membership fees and individual donations. Still, both Galjus and Dimov agree that IRU has to open for cooperation with other organizations and foundations. Again, the organization is in hope for better structure, which would make the organization again visible and attractive for cooperation.

## ***Special Representative of the Secretary General for Roma issues***

The analysis of the SRSG will follow the same theoretical patterns presented in the theoretical chapter. The responses on the SRSG differ from IRU on all of the four factors. The interviewees provided answers that also correspond to the theoretical framework, and classify the organization in typologies. During the interview with both of the respondents, they said that the organization is representing Roma interests in a more institutional and bureaucratic way. Ailincal provided answers for the initiative to establish the SRSG. In response to the question regarding the type of representation, Ailincal said:

*“Yes it’s true, we may represent and advocate for Roma interests but our team has more non-Roma than Roma. In my opinion, there should be more Roma in the team in order to provide a more legitimate profile of the organization (...) but CoE is a different type of organization... its more bureaucratic way of representation” (Interview Ailincal)*

In addition, when she answered the question on accountability she also provided an answer regarding the type of representation. She clearly provided an insight that the Special Representative would fit in one of the types of representation from the theories. She said,

*“... he is a diplomat, an experienced diplomat who negotiates with states for better policies... he uses ROMED, ROMACT, CAHROM<sup>11</sup> and other programs to make impact on the existing policies” (Interview Ailincal)*

The interview with the Special Representative has also shown that the type and the role of the representative fit in the theory. While interviewing the Special Representative, the responses on his representativeness seemed diplomatic, aiming to show that that place like everybody else representing Roma interests is well deserved. He said:

---

<sup>11</sup> CAHROM stands for the Ad hoc Committee of Experts on Roma (Last access 30.5.2015, available at <http://www.coe.int/de/web/portal/cahrom>)



*“...We are working on the basis of a very clear political mandate, which is the Strasbourg Declaration... that sets the general orientation and whether you are Roma or a French or a German you know what you do...” (Interview Bunjes)*

In addition, the answers of the experts also provided more evidence to show that the Special Representative fits into the theoretical framework. John was one of the most vocal experts saying that the SRSR does not represent Roma. He also said that SRSR is a job given by the Secretary General and that is only a mechanism for the Secretary General to be informed about the situation of Roma. John in his response said:

*“... SRSR is just a job... it is a position to inform the Secretary General about Roma, all he can do is to inform and recommend (...) that’s just a mechanism that informs the Secretary General about the situation of Roma... that to me does not mean representation...” (Interview John)*

Mike aware of the CoE impact on the Roma situation in Europe was more structured. He said that the CoE helped Roma to initiate many opportunities, which helped to improve the situation of the Roma. He said that the Special Representative is a substantive type of representation, which is acceptable in the European arena of interests. According to Mike:

*“... All of the initiatives were helpful, they brought attention to the situation of Roma on European level (...) Europe is a challenging battlefield where substantive type of representation is needed...” (Interview Mike)*

Nick was the last expert who challenged the name of the title given to the person representing the Roma interests within the CoE. He argued that the name does not correspond to his role and activities. In addition, he said that the common sense of belonging plays a crucial role in representing the Roma interests. Nick said,

*“... I can understand the need for informing the CoE about the situation of Roma in Europe. They have always had some initiative to follow the situation of Roma, but here we have a person called a special representative... what is so special about it? The name of that initiative totally missed the point of representation (...) If we did not have capacities in the past, now we can deal with our own issues and there is nothing wrong about it...” (Interview Nick)*

These responses provided evidence to support the theoretical arguments for the organization. The analysis of the interviews shows that the organization fits into the substantive type of representation. According to the presented excerpts from the interviews, there are patterns from the SRSR that meet the substantive type of representation. According to Pitkin (1967: 113), the substantive representation focuses on the “acting for” pattern of representation. She underlines the importance of the “acting for including the actions on the “behalf of”, “in the interests of” or as “an agent of” a defined group of people represented (Pitkin 1967: 113). According to the interviews, Ailincăi is aware of the representation typologies and advocates for a more descriptive type of representation. She says that “CoE is a different type of organization... its more bureaucratic way of representation” (Interview Ailincăi), which implies that CoE has a different approach for representation of Roma interests. Furthermore, she confirms the substantive pattern when she says “he is a diplomat, an experienced diplomat who negotiates with states for better policies...” (Interview Ailincăi). This response shows that there is a pattern of “acting for” and the pattern of “in the interests of” or as “an agent of”. The pattern is also evident in his response when mentioning “political mandate” based on the Strasbourg Declaration. Experts also support the theoretical arguments of substantive representation. Mike explicitly said that the Special Representative is a substantive representative of Roma interests. While John and Nick showed doubt that the Special Representative is eligible position to serve as a representative. Moreover, their doubt also

challenge the “truthfulness, accurate rendering of information about something absent” (Pitkin 1967: 113). Both John and Nick advocate for a more descriptive type of representation and added that the Special Representative has a title, which makes him a representative of Roma interests. Both of the experts in their response doubt the truthfulness and the accurate rendering of information because of the lack of common sense of belonging. This shows that in the case of Roma interests “an agent of” is less recognized but still exists. The recognition status of the SRSG is institutionally set according to the rules of the CoE. The Special Representative as a body was introduced with the aim to join efforts for official representation of Roma issues. In the case of the SRSG, the CoE has already established mechanism for accountability. The CoE applies the same accountability methods in all of the ad-hoc bodies and offices within the organization. Alike every standard bureaucratic international organization, SRSG pays attention to the obligations and duties of every employee. A part of every contract in an international bureaucratic organization is the section for duties and responsibilities. Therefore, the accountability link has a mechanism, which is based on the contracts. However, the interviewees from the SRSG provided responses that do not meet the traditional principal-agent relationship of accountability. When Ailincăi answered a question on accountability, she stated:

*“... there is a two way accountability everything starts from the Secretary General... first the Special Representative is accountable to the Secretary General... then the Support Team is accountable to the Special Representatives... then national organizations that implement projects from our programs are accountable to us... and they are accountable to Roma... and the whole process starts with the people to the organizations all the way to the Secretary General” (Interview Ailincăi)*

After her explanation, she said that the internal accountability is highly respected. In her explanation, she explained that the SRSG office has a hierarchy like every other international non-governmental organization with an executive, program managers and project coordinators.

The interview with the Special Representative confirmed the same statement by Ailincăi. In addition, he said:

*“... I am not directly accountable to Roma but my actions are aimed to improve the situation of Roma... we negotiate with states to enable better policies for the Roma”*  
(Interview Bunjes)

Their answers clearly show that this organization focuses on a more bureaucratic representation for interests of the Roma. Evidently, there is an accountability mechanism where target group do not appoint the representative nor do they hold him directly accountable for his actions. These patterns of accountability are very similar to the surrogate representation model. Mansbridge (2003) explains how surrogate representatives can act for the interests of people who failed to vote for the representative nor can they hold him accountable. This is evident from the response of the Special Representative, he is representing Roma in Europe without being elected or appointed by them. This is also applicable with the accountability. According to the title, he is a representative but the target group does not keep him accountable. Furthermore, as Mansbridge (2003: 524) points out, in this model the representative often provides expertise and recommendations for solving the issues of the target group. As Mansbridge (2003: 524) noted, the surrogate consults through formal and informal ways with the group, so that there is an exchange of information both ways. This pattern can be observed from Ailincăi's response that the Special Representative uses different programs and information from the programs implemented by the national NGOs. They then provide information about the situation of Roma in their countries, while he proposes possible solutions that SRSR or CoE can provide in order to deal with those issues that Roma face at the national level. From these excerpts, we can see that the organization follows a certain type of institutional surrogate accountability, which is generally adopted by the CoE. Furthermore, this type of accountability suits these kinds of international non-governmental organizations

because they tend to gather information from the field and generate solutions. Likewise every international organization, CoE (or specifically the SRSG) negotiates with the states for policies and solutions given that they have information from the national NGOs. Experts also confirmed the pattern of surrogate type of accountability. John in his response was very specific when he said:

*“... the bureaucracy of the CoE cannot let the SRSG be unaccountable, they are a big organization with serious reputation... this is not only for Roma but to other issues as well...” (Interview John)*

Nick had a vocal arguments implying that accountability is claimed from the representative, which should include responsiveness. He said that the institutional accountability makes the representation more effective and sticks to the rules of the game. Nick said:

*“It looks easy for the SRSG, you have an institution and you cannot avoid the accountability, this is why international organizations are effective...” (Interview Nick)*

Mike was the last expert who supported the argument that SRSG follows a pattern of institutional accountability. In addition, he said the international bureaucratic organizations should not have a classical principal-agent relationship but they have to consult the people. He said:

*“... CoE cannot let the SRSG ruin their worldwide image (...) we should not expect that international organizations will have a classic accountability and deliberation, but if they do not consult the people than I think that they will lose trust from people...” (Interview Mike)*

After the arguments from the expert interviews, we can see that the pattern for institutionalization of representation plays a crucial role in accountability. SRSG with the supervision of the CoE follows the surrogate pattern of accountability. The Special

Representative is not accountable to the target group but he is accountable to the higher instances, in this case the Secretary General. Although Roma do not appoint or elect the Special Representative, he is representing Roma interests. In order to represent Roma interests, the representative must be institutionally recognized as an actor who advocates for group interests. Recognition in this case is a factor that shows the representativeness of the SRSG.

Alike the analysis for IRU, the recognition patterns remain the same for SRSG. The focus of the analysis will be the one-dimensional structure of recognition. In addition, the analysis focuses on the definition for acknowledging and respecting the presence of the organization from other actors and organizations. This tackles the status, achievements or rights of the organization. According to the interviews, SRSG is widely recognized actor among other institutions and organizations working on issues of Roma. His role as a representative is also acknowledged by the member states of CoE. Since SRSG is a position set in 2010, the organization used the CoE's status to ease their approach to many of the organizations and institutions. According to Ailincăi, the Special Representative and the Support Team is widely recognized with the partners working on projects and programs. She said that the status of the organization is still developing and it should take time for asserting their position in the arena of interests. She said:

*"... we are recognized actor from the EU, we work on projects and programs together... we are also working with the member states of the CoE, so basically they recognize the existence of such a position in the CoE (...) we are a young organization and when we introduce as CoE" (Interview Ailincăi)*

The Special Representative had a similar answer showing that the organization is recognized by many organizations but not acknowledged by Roma. He said that the grassroots know neither who the Special Representative is, nor that such position within the CoE exists. According to his response, the recognition of the people is nearly impossible since the CoE

does not interfere with people but rather international institutions. The Special Representative in his words:

*“... International organizations such as the EU, ERTF, OSCE or OSF address me when there are strategic orientations or projects created (...) I cannot say that the Special Representative is recognized by Roma because it is a new position in the CoE, and the grassroots would not know that there is someone representing their interests at the European level...” (Interview Bunjes)*

These answers show that the organization is well-known among the international actors dealing with Roma issues. Their status is acknowledged from the EU, ERTF, OSCE and OSF which are important organizations working on Roma issues. The cooperation on joint projects or strategies makes the organization acknowledged by other members that are established earlier. The answers also show that the organization strictly focuses on institutional recognition. According to the responses, their status of institutional recognition is enhanced with the acknowledgement of the CoE. These patterns were also recorded on the interviews with the experts. According to their opinion, the organization is an attempt to be visible in most of the developments in representation of Roma interests. Mike provided an answer, which shows SRSG has a high status of the institutional recognition due to their cooperation with many actors. He also added that the organization in many occasions introduces as the CoE and not as SRSG. Mike said:

*“...SRSG is the CoE of course, but they have to make sure that organizations know their name and recognize them as SRSG, not as the CoE... they are in a strategic position where they can use the benefits of being part of the CoE, and CoE is a trademark for international organizations...” (Interview Mike)*

According to John, the SRSG is not as visible as the CoE. He points out that the recognition status of SRSG cannot be the same as the CoE. As John noted:

*“... international organizations recognize CoE, but who knows about the Special Representative? The recognition status of CoE should not be mixed with the SRSG (...) SRSG has to do a lot more than it does now...” (Interview John)*

The last response from the experts also underlined the importance of recognition among international organizations and grassroots as well. Nick argued that the organization as every other organization has to consult and deliberate to the target group. He said:

*“... SRSG is not a visible actor, they have to put more effort on their recognition status from international organizations and the grassroots as well (...) I think that every organization that works for the Roma interests have to consult Roma and deliberate...” (Interview Nick)*

Considering all of the input, it can be noted that the organization is acknowledged by many international organizations and member states of the CoE. Furthermore, SRSG is more focused on the institutional recognition rather than the grassroots recognition. Still, as highlighted from the experts` interviews, the organization should put more effort on their visibility and acknowledgement. The experts also criticized the advantage to use the status of CoE instead of their own status. This makes confusion since stakeholders might recognize CoE but they might have never heard of SRSG or any position in the CoE that deals with Roma issues. The only pattern that seems to be common from all of the respondents is the cooperation with other organizations for projects and other activities for Roma. In order to succeed in cooperation, organizations have to implement projects that require financial means to achieve results. Financial sources and opportunities are also a factor that makes the organization sustain in representing Roma interests on European level. In the case of SRSG, there are three main sources of finance. These sources enable the organization to cover costs and even recruit new employees in the Support Team. As described by both of the respondents from the SRSG, the organization is supported by the EU and the CoE for their operational costs and programs.



Apart from these sources, they also have individual contributions, which is mainly support from the member states. She also said that their finance provided by the EU is in CoE's interest as well as in the interest of EU. Along that point, she laughingly said that the finance allocation by the EU is small and their finance cannot be adequately allocated. She said:

*"... We are given money from the EU to implement their idea... I mean it is their interest but also ours... this is why the Support Team implements both ROMED and ROMACT programs... [laughs] and what can you do with one million euros (...) everything has to be endorsed by the Committee of Ministers..." (Interview Ailincal)*

This response shows that the SRSG uses all of the possible financial sources to sustain the organization and improve the situation of Roma in Europe. Their aims are met with the use of the opportunity to cooperate with the EU and the governmental representatives in Strasbourg. This implies that their office is strategically organized in order to have better negotiations with the Council of Ministers and the EU. The Parliamentary Assembly of CoE is a constant body in Strasbourg, while EU conducts plenary in Strasbourg as well. This makes the process of negotiations easier since many of the financial opportunities are in Strasbourg. In discussion with Mike, he made some points that indicated that finance is one of the most important incentives for the representativeness of an organization. His response showed that SRSG is using optimally the opportunities for financial sources. He elaborated:

*"SRSG is the CoE, so you don't have to question their finance and impact. They are skillful and they use all of the opportunities for finance..." (Interview Mike).*

John also said that CoE supports SRSG and this is why they are successful. His last comment included a bold statement saying that financial sources of IRU and SRSG are incomparable. John in his own words:

*"... for SRSG is easy, that's a job with a fancy name that is supported by the CoE... their finance is incomparable with IRU now..." (Interview John)*

Nick shortly talked about the financial sources of the SRSG. He said that the financial opportunities are optimally used. He added that SRSG has constant funding which makes the organization sustainable. Nick in his words:

*“Out of many financial opportunities, SRSG uses all of the possibilities for financing programs and projects (...) they have a constant source which is the CoE... that makes the organization sustainable” (Interview Nick)*

The explanation seems easier when finances of SRSG are discussed. As demonstrated from the interviews, the organization optimally uses the possibilities provided for NGOs. The interviews with the experts also show that SRSG is successful due to their constant sources of finance for their programs, projects and activities aimed to improve the situation of Roma and represent their interests. This is why the SRSG remains active on the Roma issues. However, for the experts this is less of a worry because the organization has already ensured financial sources for their programs. Moreover, Ailincăi laughingly added that The Council of Ministers and the EU have a big influence on the organization because of their role as the main donors. Along the same line, she said that they require many efforts for a small amount of money. If SRSG did not use the opportunities from the EU, and if the Council of Ministers in CoE decide to stop financing the SRSG, then the organization will only be supported from governmental contributions. SRSG would face the same destiny like IRU if the organization is not accountable to the donors. After all the arguments, it seems that the SRSG is a financially stable organization, which established a good cooperation with donors to achieve their goals.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the analysis shows that the organizations follow different theoretical patterns. Both of the organizations remained to represent Roma interests with different methods. The aim of this thesis was to show how Roma interests can be advanced on European level. This thesis shows that there are international organizations focused on Roma issues that follow different patterns of representation on the European level. According to the patterns, one cannot draw conclusions inferring that one organization is better than the other one. Analyzing these units, we can see that both of the organizations have good and bad patterns of representativeness. The following table shows the patterns and the organizations.

Factor/Organization	IRU	SMSG
Type of Representation	Descriptive type of representation	Substantive type of representation
Type of Accountability	Internal Gyroscopic accountability	Surrogate accountability
Recognition status	One-dimensional recognition, low institutional recognition	One-dimensional recognition, high institutional recognition
Financial sources	Membership fees and individual donations	National budgets from CoE member states, grants for programs and projects, individual donations,

**Table 1: Patterns of organizations based on the four factors**

This table summarizes the findings obtained from the analysis. These illustrate that the organizations have different approach for representing Roma interests at the European level. Throughout this research, I found that both of these types could exist and show results of their efforts.

In my opinion, there should be multiple actors representing Roma interests because of the hardships that Roma face in Europe. Multiple actors should only exist if the set of interests is the same. Roma themselves should institutionally define their common set of interests. The

establishment of the common agenda at the European level should be created including grassroots organizations, watchdog organizations, think tanks, researchers, advocates and experts of Roma origin. In order not to overlap with activities and efforts, these actors must use their own resources and define the roles with an aim to advance the situation of Roma in Europe. The setting should also define institutional mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation of the activities and actors. The mechanisms will provide directions and assess their performance for according to the initial setting of the roles and activities.

Furthermore, the resources of the new wave of educated young Roma should be used in order to embrace the common sense of belonging. Among all of the interviewees, the pattern of descriptive representation was more favorable due to the resemblance of the nation. I also favor the descriptive type of representation because Roma should deal with own issues. This should not be understood as an approach where non-Roma are excluded, but an approach where non-Roma help the Roma, who stand for their nation. Observing the situation of actors at the European level, I see more Roma engaged in different forms of representation. This should provide more space for institutional representation of Roma interests. Their values, experiences, and common sense of belonging should be the driving force to enable institutional representation of Roma interests.

Since Roma are a unique example of nation without any territorial claims, I think that the accountability is the biggest challenge in representation. The accountability of the actors should avoid the existing patterns of leadership and create an alternative method of accountability. In this case, Roma should be accountable to both the people and the donors. In my opinion, local and national actors should use IT innovations to deliberate for the international actors. If the international actors set a network of national and local actors, then the grassroots will be informed and consulted about the future activities of the international actors. If the actors use the social media or other sophisticated forms of responsiveness and

deliberation, then the international actors would be more accountable to the people. When the grassroots community is being informed, then the principal-agent accountability can be employed to the donors and other stakeholders. According to the interviews, the pattern of institutional accountability seems favorable and sustainable.

The status of recognition should also include institutions and grassroots as well. Organizations should acknowledge that the recognition status is dependent from two stakeholders. An actor will be successful if they put efforts for their visibility in the Roma communities and international actors. If the actors employ the descriptive type of representation, then the representatives will be more encouraged from the nation. Furthermore, the actors should also focus on institutional recognition. Actors should focus on cooperation, joint initiatives, and activities, which would serve for the common agenda of Roma interests. When the actors provide evidence that they are recognized by the nation and have capacities to join in cooperation with international actors, then the recognition status of the actors will be acknowledged by both of the stakeholders. Moreover, international actors should be aware that experts are not the only Roma stakeholders that can define and represent Roma interests on European level.

Financial sustainability is the most crucial factor that can ensure persistent representation of Roma interests in Europe. According to the interviews, the pattern of the SRSG is favorable due to the optimal use of all the opportunities. If an actor has constant funds for his activities then he is more likely to focus on implementation and strengthening his recognition status with the donors. Representatives of Roma interests should be aware that fundraising capacities are important section of an organization. Financial security and support for projects show that the direction and method of representation is accepted and endorsed. Financial support also indicates that actors have trust from the donors to implement activities for advancing Roma interests on European level. Moreover, actors should be aware that the use

of finances must be transparent and presented to the target group in order to gain trust and recognition of the people they represent.

Altogether, I think that these factors are the most important for successful representativeness. In addition, these factors are interrelated and efforts for every factor are required. If international actors, which represent Roma interests, address these issues of representativeness, then they will improve the situation of Roma in Europe. Finally, I think that Roma should also show that they have the will to change the current situation and engage in a more consistent way to represent local, national, and even European interests of Roma. Descriptive representation should prove that a Roma is ready for challenges of recognition from donors and the target group. Roma representative should also acknowledge the consultation and responsiveness to the people in need. Their view of the situation may provide future guidelines for a more successive representation. Lastly, Roma representatives should use all of the methods to gather financial support as well as to come up with innovative ideas, which will boost the financial stability of the representative.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Concept papers/Strategic documents

Concept paper on High-Level Meeting on Roma and Travellers Strasbourg, 20 October 2010

Council of Europe High Level Meeting on Roma, Strasbourg, 20 October 2010 - “The Strasbourg Declaration on Roma”

International Romani Union Charter 2000

Draft Charter of International Romani Union 2015

## Academic sources

Antrobus, Peggy (1987). *Funding NGOs: Issues and Options*. Pergamon Journals Ltd. World Development, Vol. 15:95-102

Benn, Stanley, Isaac (1960). *Interests in Politics*. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series. Vol. 60: 123-140

Courthiade, Marcel (2003). *The Gangetic city of Kannauj : original cradle-town of the Rromani people*. Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań: 273-286

Cornforth, Chris (2003). *The Governance of Public and Non-Profit Organizations: What do Boards Do?*. Routledge

Eulau, H. and Kars, P.D. (1977). *The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness*. Legislative Studies Quarterly. Vol. 2. No. 3: 233-254

Frumkin Peter (2002). *On Being Nonprofit: A Conceptual and Policy Primer*. Harvard University Press

Hancock, Ian (2002). *We are the Romani People. Ame sam e Rromane džene* Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press: 1-179

Jean-Pierre Liegeouis (2008) *Roma in Europe*: Stationary Office Books

Kenrick, Donald (1971). *The World Romani Congress - April 1971*: Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society. parts 3-4: 101–108

Klímová-Alexander, Ilona (2004). *Development and institutionalisation of Romani representation and administration*. Part I. Nationalities Papers, 32 (3): 599–630.

Klímová-Alexander, Ilona. (2002). *Romani political representation in Central Europe. An historical survey*: Romani Studies 12 (5).

Kymlicka, Will (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship*: Oxford University Press

Kymlicka, Will (2000). *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. Oxford University Press

Laitinen, Arto (2002). *Interpersonal Recognition: A Response to Value or a Precondition of Personhood?*. Inquiry: 463-78

Mansbridge, Jane (2003). *Rethinking Representation*. American Political Science Review. 515-528

Mansbridge, Jane (1999). *Should Blacks represent Blacks and Women represent Women? A contingent 'Yes'*. Journal of Politics 61(3): 628-657

Marushiakova, Elena and Popov, Veselin (2005). *The Roma - a Nation without a State? Historical Background and Contemporary Tendencies*: Ed. Nationalismus Across the Globe: An overview of the nationalism of state-endowed and stateless nations, Poznan: School of Humanities and Journalism, 433-455.

McGarry, Aidan (2010). *Who speaks for Roma: Political representation of a transnational minority community*: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc: 1:217

Phillips, Anne (1995). *The Politics of Presence*: Oxford University Press;

Pitkin, Hanna (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkley: University of California Press;

Pickering, William (2000). *Durkheim and representations*. British Center for Durkheimian Studies

Pound, Roscoe. (1943). *A Survey of Social Interests*: 57 Harvard Law Review. 1-39

Project on Ethnic Relations (2001). *Leadership, Representation and the Status of Roma*. Project on Ethnic Relations. 1-50



Rehfeld, Andrew (2009). *Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy*. American Political Science Journal. Vol. 103, no.2 214-230

Rehfeld, Andrew (2006). *Towards a General Theory of Political Representation*. Journal of Politics. Volume 68. Issue 1. 1–21,

Saward, Michael (2006). *The Representative Claim*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd: Contemporary Political Theory. 297–318

Taylor, Charles (1994). *The Politics of Recognition*. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 25-73

Thelen, Peter (2005). *Roma policy: the long walk towards political participation*. In *Roma in Europe: From Social Exclusion to Active Participation*. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. 7–73. Skopje

Vermeersch Peter (2006). *The Romani Movement: Minority Politics and ethnic mobilization in contemporary Central Europe*: Berghahn Books

Young, Iris Marion (1997). *Feminism and the public sphere*: Constellations 3 (3):340-363.

Young, Iris Marion (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press ch.4 (120-153)

## Online sources/web links

### Committee of Experts on Roma (CAHROM)

<http://www.coe.int/de/web/portal/cahrom> (Last access 30.5.2015)

### Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015

<http://www.romadecade.org/about-the-decade-decade-in-brief> (Last access 30.05.2015)

### European Commission – DG Justice

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm) (Last access 10.05.2015)

### Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

[http://www.iep.utm.edu/recog\\_sp/#H1](http://www.iep.utm.edu/recog_sp/#H1) (Last access 25.05.2015)

### Non-Governmental Organization Pakiv

<http://www.pakiv.ro> (Last access 25.05.2015)

**Portal Vistina – the hidden case of Trajan Bekirov**

<http://vistina.mk/2015/05/05/vladata-na-sdsm-pod-tepih-ja-stavi-smrtta-na-trajan-bek-irov>

(Last access 10.05.2015)

**Romalitico - Nation or an ethnic community - the challenges of Roma identity**

<http://romalitico.org/index.php/content/item/47-roma-nation-or-an-ethnic-community> (Last

access 10.05.2015)