NEW FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AND EXCLUSION:
GADJOFICATION OF ROMANI COMMUNITIES IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZHAN ÖNDER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Ast. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar Akgüner
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Suavi Aydın   (HÜ, ANT.)   _____

Ast. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar Akgüner (METU, SOC.)   _____

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör   (METU, SOC.)   _____

Prof. Dr. Tansu Açık   (AÜ, EDK.)   _____

Asc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen   (METU, SOC.)   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Özhan Önder

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

NEW FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AND EXCLUSION:
GADJOFICATION OF ROMANI COMMUNITIES IN TURKEY

Önder, Özhan

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Asc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar Akgüner

September 2013, 210 pages

Romani communities having concrete frontiers with the rest of the society are strongly being transformed to the forms which are acceptable for the trends of these surrounding societies by late 20th century. Therefore the needs the dissertation is intended to cover, in accordance to such problems in the existing literature defined, are to explore and deepen questions about Romani communities from a scholar point of view which is critical not only to the low facilities the communities have but also to the tendencies to *"normalize"* the communities mostly in the name of *empowering*. Moreover, to not to detach living agents from the reality they are in, the research is highly critical to widespread prejudices Romani communities face.

On the other hand to cover how the 'natives' experience such process and to make all these arguments comparable the research have carried out ethnographic observations and interviews with the ordinary Romani people and key figures of established grassroots Romani organizations on the sites where communities are settled all around Turkey.

Keywords: Gadjofication, Romani Studies, Urban Transformation, NGOization, Identity Politics

ÖZ

AYRIMCILIK VE DIŞLAMANIN YENİ BİÇİMLERİ
TÜRKİYE'DEKİ ROMAN TOPLULUKLARIN *GACOLAŞTIRILMA*SI:

Önder, Özhan

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar Akgüner

Eylül 2013, 210 sayfa

Toplumun geri kalanıyla somut sınırları olan Roman toplulukları 20. Yüzyılın sonları itibarıyla onları çevreleyen toplumun eğilimleri için Kabul edilebilir biçimlere dönüştürülmeye zorlanmıştır. Buna göre bu çalışma, var olan literatürde tespit edilmiş olan boşluklarla da ilgili olarak, sadece toplulukların yaşam koşullarının düşüklüğüne değil aynı zamanda genellikle "güçlendirme" adına toplulukları "normalize" etme eğilimlerine de eleştirel bir akademik bakış açısından, Roman topluluklar hakkındaki sorunları araştırmak ve derinleştirmek gibi ihtiyaçlara yanıt vermeye çalışmakta. Bunun yanı sıra, yaşayan öznelerin içinde bulundukları gerçeklikle ilişkilerini zayıflatmamak için, bu çalışma Roman toplulukların maruz kaldıkları yaygın önyargılara karşı hayli eleştireldir.

Diğer yandan, bu çalışma Türkiye'de toplulukların yerleştikleri pek çok yaşam alanında 'yerli' deneyimi kapsamak, bu süreçleri ve tartışmalarını karşılaştırılabilir kılmak üzere, sıradan Roman bireylerle ve kurulmuş olan Roman taban örgütlerinin anahtar kişileriyle sohbetlere ve etnografik gözlemler yürütmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gacolaştırma, Roman Çalışmaları, Kentsel Dönüşüm, STKlaşma, Kimlik Siyaseti

To whom it may concern

but Ulus Baker
in behalf of black children of cities

dance of the black child

oh! a myriad paths along
i have seen them faces in my life time long
while a glass is poured of wine
oh! when that bonfire's burning in some garden

look! those children there
look! they start to dance

black is their skin, long are their hands
the children from the edge of town
beyond the days and nites
oh! the garden of eden lies in our horizon

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Ast. Prof. Dr. Fatma Umut Beşpınar, co-supervisor Prof Dr. Tansu Açık, ex-supervisor Ast. Prof. Dr. Aykan Erdemir for their guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör, Prof. Dr. Suavi Aydın, Asc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen, Ast. Prof. Dr. Begüm Özden Fırat, Ast. Prof. Dr. Çağatay Topal for their suggestions and comments.

Remziye Umunç, Selçuk Karadeniz, Erdinç Çekic, İmdat Kaplan, Mehmet Demir, Badin Zeydan, Atalay Demirkesen, Halit Keser, Ali Demirci, Asım Hallaç, Şükrü Pündük, Gül Özateşler, Zeynep Ceren Eren, Melike Karlıdağ, Zeynep Kurt, Ipek Oskay, Adrian R. Marsh, Thomas Acton, Bertil Videt, Niştiman Amed, Selmet Güler, Saim Yavuz, Idaver Memedov, Gamze Toksoy, Meral Ozbek, Emine İncirlioğlu, Sema Kılıçer, Cengiz Çiftci, Erbay Yucak, Sedat Şeyhoglu, Selma Şahindokuyucu, Sündüs Aydın, Heinz Schmidt, Marcus Reinhardt, Emel Kurma, Ebru Uzpeder, Başak Erel, Gocagül Gümüş, Abdullah Karatay, Özlem Yeniay, Çağdas Önder, Seçkin Erdi, Özgür Gençer, Ahmet Murat Öğüt, Süha Ünsal, Kudret Emiroğlu, Erkan Bolotlu, Nurgül Turan, Haris T Rigas, Özgür Nizam, Gürsel Zonguldak, Zeynel Zonguldak, Erkan Sert, Rabia Harmanşah, Veli Metinoglu, Aykan Sever, Emre Eren, Murat Obenler, Hasan Belen, Demet Arısoy, Özlem Sağdıç, Julia Bar-Tal, Duygu Cantekin, Özcan Taşkın, Nobuyoshi Kitamura, Vildan Önder, Özer Önder, Ulus Baker, Tayfa Bandista and many others i cannot name here.. This work was only possible by your companionship.

This study was supported by no grant but my personal efforts accompanied with the solidarity of my beloved ones.   Ankara 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AC	After Christ (Anno Domini)
AKP	Justice and Development Party
BAMEP	The Project to Training for Building Bamboo Furniture Production
CFCU	Central Finance and Contracts Unit
CoE	Council of Europe
CoEDB	Council of Europe Development Bank
CIDA	The Canadian International Development Agency
DTO	Chamber of Marine
DYP	True Path Party
EC	European Commission
EDÇİNKAY	Edirne Association for Research on Gypsy Culture, Aid and Solidarity
EDROM	Edirne Association for Research on Romani Culture, Aid and Solidarity
EIDHR	European Commission's The European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights
ERRC	European Romani Rights Centre
EU	European Union
G8	The Group of Eight
GLS	Gypsy Lore Society

HcA	Helsinki Citizen's Assembly Turkey's Branch
İÇEV	Içel Foundation of Handcraft
IMF	International Monetary Foundation
İş-Kur	Job Recruitment Agency
LGBTQ	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trangender, Queer
MTSO	Chamber of Commerce of Mersin
NGO	Non Governmental Organizations
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
OSI	Open Society Institute
ROMDEF	Federation of Romani Associations
SkyGD	The Association to Develop Social Cultural Life
STGM	Civil Society Development Center
SYDV	Social Cooperation and Solidarity Foundations
TDK	Turkish Language Society
TL	Turkish Lira
TOKI	Social Housing Management
TR	Republic of Turkey
ToR	Terms of References
UKAID	Department for International Development of United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WB	World Bank

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION:
GADJOFICATION THROUGHOUT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Neoliberal globalization that has been announcing its dominance all around the globe by late 1980s has fundamentally influenced the previous forms of organization of societies. It is widely accepted that the recent changes especially on information technologies, accumulation of knowledge and capital and market regulation have direct impact on the former dominant form of political organization namely nation states, which have already emerged as a failure of Marxism as Anderson (2006) puts. The limits of national frontiers turned to be deficient for the *competition-driven market model* (Farmer, 2003) of whose global investors have already run to induce spaciously. Therefore, the regulation of the space, the economy, the politics and all grounds of power relations have started to transform in advance of the needs to maximize the profit and desires of the rulers, namely multinational investments.

It was easier for this new form of capitalism to vote its dominance ideologically and set up its hegemony especially after the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). On the other hand, the counter hegemonic movements have also shifted to new strategies to overcome these new forms of establishment. However, the establishment was quite strong enough to absorb the discourse of its oppositions for easily sustain of itself. The hegemony of the new establishment has also influenced most political economy based scholar endeavors and resistance politics

for leaving a large slice of their place for that of the identity oriented politics. There the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have taken a central position in order to melt down the possibilities of resistance by encouraging antipolitics (Fisher, 1997).

This roughly defined transformation of the world system for a global and flexible form has various indicators visible in almost every fragment of social organization. Accordingly, the coup d'etat of 1980 and the structural changes on its constitution were quite helpful for Turkey to meet the requirements of this neoliberal era. Such a shift in establishment of Turkey was fixing the economic and social conditions for the interests of multinationals by the last decade of the previous century. The former was realized by privatizing public economic enterprizes, changes in tax system, promoting cheap unsecure labor conditions, etc. where the latter was by subcontracting the social issues to non governmental ground, assuring the death of the welfare state that already was never there.

Following these globally popular tendencies the NGOs in Turkey have also taken the role to regulate civic ground throughout subcontracted governmental issues of those used to be accepted as "social" and to perform and diffuse the ideas of this new era. The objectives of these organizations were mainly defining and regulating the "problems" of society and set up a level of "justice" throughout the imported *know-hows* about the failing sects of the "society" which are popularly named as *disadventaged* groups. The cases of women, non-schooling, earthquake victims, etc. were segments of this unclear "disadventaged groups." The society was not a *whole* anymore but a multitude of various fragments.

This research intends to questionize the local affects of global policies by exploring the operations of neoliberal apparatus in two practical ground of globalization, namely urban transformation and NGO system. Therefore it is basically to investigate the large arguement of development idea to bring it down to ordinary humanly narrations to make a variety of affects visible.

Such complex set of social, political and economical relations have been put on the desk through the basic methodology of the multisited ethnographies in comparison to politically correct institutional texts and implementations. Therefore almost all arguments of the work have sprung out of the first hand experience of myself from a critical stand point also to be able to keep the reflexive position up. The research is intended to contribute the qualitative literature about the Romani studies, urban studies, identity politics and anthropology of development. By putting development onto the goal of anthropological analysis, it is aiming to build up a critical scholar position, which is revealing the hypocritical development idea.

As a case study, the research investigates if how the assumptions of neoliberal global policy trends, such as urban transformation implementations and NGO form of social organization, affect different *Romani* communities in Turkey. There, the objective of the study is to exploring on one hand how these means of neoliberal globalization operates over the local Romani communities and on the other how do the "natives" experience such processes and finally to make all these arguments comparable and reproachable. In doing so, the endeavor this dissertation is eager to spend, on defining the global influence on local sites, is to better understand the *globalization*.

As Özateşler put in her mind-opening work (2011) Romani communities have hardly invited to the social set of the surrounding communities. Having concrete frontiers with the rest of the society, the communities moreover implicitly forced to being transformed onto forms those are acceptable for the trends of these surrounding societies by late 20th century. This subduction is basically encouraged and legitimated by the discourse of *development* and *empowerment* so far defend as being beneficial for the communities which are on the spot. However this was a contemporary global tendency not only performed onto Romani communities but also to many others around the world who are claimed to be 'outcast, 'under developed, 'indigenious' etc. in order to *include* its objects into the economic cycle of the age. Still the differential features of the Romani communities, especially

3

being the poorest sect of the society, discriminated and excluded historically from the networking of rest of the surrounding communities and there from any basic rights to perform ordinary citizenship were the main motivations for me to have a focal interest on Romani communities in search of impacts of practices of globalization.

On the other hand, the selfing and othering conditions of Romani language from this historically opressed position of the communities provides useful tools to think about the case concerned. There it may be argued that the main effort the dissertation puts is to study the systematical subversive operations of the *Gadjo*[1] society for *'normalizing'* the Romani communities by early 2000s and to put them into a framework. This particular historical intervention will be named as *Gadjofication* within the dissertation. Gadjofication is not a term in use. That is a term which I try to define within this dissertation to name the practices of Gadjo society over the Romani communities to convert them onto Gadjo-friendly forms. The definition of Gadjofication mainly signifies a specific set of practices allowed by Gadjo gaze who considers Romani people not as living agents but as a unique body and a problem to be *managed*.

However, neither the Romani agents met have argued that they are being Gadjofied nor the agents of Gadjofication, namely designers and performers of neoliberal argument in this case by the NGO industry and urban transformation implementations, would call their activities as Gadjofication. Moreover the agents of Gadjofication do not even name themselves as Gadjo; since, the term Gadjo is a saying through the insider position of Romani language out to whatever external to the community life. The Gadjo is mainly not aware of what Gadjo is, such like being unaware of what Romani is. However, for getting aware of his/her Gadjo being, one needs to gain the *Romani sense* of the term and practice a mental break about one's self. Therefore such an awareness, which in my case have also established the methodological stand point, is only possible with gaining the gaze of

---

[1] Gadjo means *non-Roma* in Romani language. It signifies both the individuals and their set of relations excluding the Romani.

the other on looking at oneself.

One can observe Gadjofication as a global political tendency run in any level of social organization which tends to force the Romanies to be Gadjofied by getting transformed to the forms which are *definable* and there *acceptable* and *managable* for dominant neoliberal mind. The traces of Gadjofication may be visible in several different neoliberal practices Romani communities face. There, the way Romani communities indigenized and marginalized by implementations of Gadjofication are going to be focused throughout a comparative examination of different practices for bringing out palpable material to make the influences of global policies on the local sites visible.

It can even be argued that Gadjofication is almost a synonym of *neoliberalization*, which is *particularly* practiced over the Romani communities. The needs to define such practices the Romani communities face as Gadjofication separately from the experiences of other agents or interest groups who are also damaged out of neoliberal policies are rooted in the certain specific characteristics the Romani communities carry, at least from "the Gadjo" point of view, to meet such catastrophe. Firstly the Romani communities have international representation. Meaningly, before the practices in Turkey, the Romani issue is already an important agenda within the international politics, especially in Europe. Therefore it can be argued that the agenda of Romani politics in Turkey has strong connections with mainly European policies, which have constructed its forms by dealing with EU level debates and negotiations for years.

Accordingly, the governmental position of Republic of Turkey (TR) about Romani communities were stressed to shift to the opposite way round from where it was disregarding and excluding the Romani identity to *recognition* and *inclusion*, at least to meeting the criteria of EU harmonization process by 2003. That was out of the mediator position of TR between EU and the Romani communities of whom are accepted as political agents within the EU level political regulations. However it would not be that easy to argue that this mediator is fully an abler implementer, but

5

more a side which is lost within all obligatory paperworks of EU harmonization process. Therefore, being an imported agenda, it can also be argued that this is a half-hearted practice for TR, which is not based on a concrete political ground.

Secondly, again connected to the first reason, the communities are yet invited to the political ground where they were being excluded so far. Therefore, one can easily argue that the neoliberal transformation of the *citizen* to the *customer* by announced death of the social (Rose,1996) is not valid for the Romani case; since, regarding the legal configuration and social practices it would not be to exaggerate to claim that the Romani communities have not ever performed even ordinary conditions of citizenship historically. The dissertation is also intended to explore such conditions of citizenship for Romani communities to better examine such particular experience of neoliberalization.

As the conditions of Romani communities have been transformed from nomadic to settled society by migrant waves of 1950s from rural to urban area and the forced migration which eventuated mostly in 1992 and 1993 (Önen, 2011) this work would like to go further to explore how these forced settled populations have met with neoliberal regulations.

So, to undermine the conditions of such systematic operations in multiple situations, this study is going to focus on two interrelated fields where these global neoliberal trends operate and both of which are directly influencing the local social organization of Romani communities. First of them is the urban transformation implementations, which is working on one hand for confiscating the land the Romani communities performs their lives and on the other for forcing the community members to leave their neighborhood based communities, to settle down onto apartments of TOKI[2], to get oblieged for making monthly paybacks for this centrally designed houses as a middle class attitude and there to disconnect with the solidarity based Romani community life and get Gadjofied.

---

[2] TOKI is the governmental organization for housing in Turkey.

The second field to study the practices of neoliberal argument is the organizational experience of the communities, which is pushed to realize, in the standards of Non Governmental Organizations (NGO) ideology. In this instance, the organizational form and the agenda of the Romani organizational process is occupied by the centrally decided funding trends and professional gestures of neoliberal argument. Such process is practically working for converting the active political participants of Romani communities onto Gadjo form of acting and understanding the world as means of Gadjofication and there absorbing the resistance possibilities of the communities against Gadjofication implementations.

The former is examined with a focus on one hand on the constituent idea of urban transformation implementations and on the other some sample projects of which are influenced the Romani communities and met during the fieldwork carried. The latter is explored by reviewing the literature about function of the NGO industry on diffusion of development discourse but mainly by participantly observing the practices of NGOs in any level, most particularly on fund raising and professionalism as well as texts and gestures they produce and promote.

On the other hand, taking such brief Hegelian historical narrative partly serious, this thesis is intended to focus on more minor histories to bring out real stories from real lives of real people. To better covering how the Romani communities experience Gadjofication, the ethnographic observations and interviews carried with the ordinary Romani people and key figures of established grassroots Romani organizations on several sites all around Turkey where communities are settled was also to explore the conditions of *reality* the communities live in and to expose and criticize the "abler" gaze of Gadjo over the communities.

As well as being diffused in entire world, despite being one of the largest ethnic groups, Romani communities have always been subjected low political, social or scholar attention in Turkey. Even though increasing number of the studies, which have been made about the communities in recent years, is visible, there still is insufficient number of research carried on the experiences and practices of Romani

people. Furthermore an important slice of them are hardly quantitative to reduce the life-worlds of ordinary people to numbers or percentages to better serve for the scholar market under manipulation of international relations discipline and project based politics or some of the them are not distanced to stereotyping the Romani, whether xenophobic or xenophilic, for the dominance of consumption trends of popular culture or the most of the rest were carrying the righteous definition of correctness for a society comforting Romani question as a problem to be managed in favor of a hygienic fantasies over society.

Therefore the needs the dissertation is intended to cover, in accordance to such problems in the existing literature defined, are to explore and deepen questions about Romani communities from a qualitative scholar point of view which is critical not only to the "low facilities" the communities have but also to the developmentalist Gadjofication tendencies to "normalize" the communities mostly in the name of *"empowering."*

The dissertation intends to spend some multi-sited efforts to have a contribution to the current debates on questioning the world today throughout exploring the ways peoples get organized and come up with some critical comments against interpretive anthropology which is currently keeping the position to host the legitimation of the operations of neoliberal tendencies concerned. Hence, the narrative of the research is mainly rooted on the experience of real people including myself. Since, the way to compare and weave these ethnographies and to design such dissertation is encouraged by the debates on reflexivity in anthropology. Therefore it was basically an effort spent to questionize also the positioning of the ethnographer exploring if how the social inequalities are produced again and again. The methodology itself and the argumentation around it are also designed about the will of the dissertation to contribute such discussion on making of the ethnographies and there social sciences today.

The main arguments of the dissertation, to document and discuss invention and a historical transformation of *the* Romani identity and to come out with some material

to study the very conditions of this particular period throughout a critical gaze on the way the global neoliberal trends organized in its unequal relation with local dynamics, are going to be based on some basic ethnographies about the Romani communities in Turkey. The field research the dissertation based have been carried out both in the nongovernmental organizations environment by occupying professional positions in some critical projects and in the Romani neighborhoods in several cities of Turkey whether communities were officially organized or not. Moreover the follow-ups taken on the central gatherings of the Romani organizations have important inputs on the arguments about the early age of the organizational history of the Romani communities in Turkey. There the field notes of observations and in-depth interviews taken during the field research, which has been covered between the years 2006 and 2008 in different concerning circumstances, are central to establishing the narration of the dissertation.

Covering also the questions around identity agenda as a necessity, the dissertation is going to take a start by briefing the situation of the Romani communities in Turkey. Such a narration is going to be accompanied by a raw overview of the world surrounding the communities, of which the *Romanes* language names *Gadjo*, to dig down the ideological formation of the invention of the Romani identity and its systematical transformation throughout the needs of current global trends of Gadjo by the methods of the same tendencies.

As the term *Romani* is taken for granted in most NGOist perspective, (Simland, 2009) the dissertation is going to cover the basic question of naming the communities. Though there are several different words to identify the communities and I would personally find the word *Gypsy (Çingene)* more suitable to cover different tribes and cultures concerned, the communities will be called as *Romani* in this dissertation to respect the decisions of Federation of Romani Associations (ROMDEF) to be named and be "politically correct." Still, the dissertation will also be in critical charge about the affair to be politically correct as a Gadjo attitude. That is to say, the question of naming the communities is also a prior discussion the

dissertation tries to mention.

However that would be too loud to argue about a *unique* Romani identity which can cover any Romani individual. Therefore recognizing the distances and familiarities of different Romani beings, the Romani identity for this research is accepted not as stably generic but as dynamic social construction, just like any of those identities. In doing so the dissertation will make an effort to stand away from reducing the characteristics of "Romani culture" to a single narrative but partly try to figure out the diverse dynamics also of various Romani identities which may be interconnected in different occasions.

Peculiarities of different Romani organizations and settlements have a sober importance to underline the diversity of practices of Romani communities those are meant to unified and stereotyped in the setting of rational Gadjo mind. Therefore the core intention is to make an etude not only about the Romani "culture" which is accepted as a *lower* cast but mainly about the development discourse of Gadjo NGO system which is accepted as *higher* in the existing social mind sets without excluding the positioning of myself as an ethnographer in-between.

Moreover, to not to detach living agents from the reality they are in, the research is highly critical to widespread prejudices Romani communities face. Neither reproducing hates speech against the communities nor romanticizing an accepted Romani image, but to root its arguments on the ground where real people lives is basically a clash declared by the dissertation against racist stereotyping the communities. Finally, the dissertation would like to be a useful additive on the qualitative researches on the field and provide solid information.

To take a start as a queen of the obvious that would not be hardly to claim that besides being the poorest sect of the society, the Romani communities have always had limited access both to public services and the social networks of the surrounding communities. The widespread mind set of the rest of the society have always stereotyped and defined the communities in a distinct position in the social

scale they build and the dominant prejudices have never let the *Romanies* into the public space as *equal* individuals (Balibar, 2009). Such exclusion has pushed the most communities to make their lives out from the set of surrounding communities where they can perform the lives and values without Gadjo pressure.

Besides greater cities having several neighborhoods where Romani communities are settled, almost each particular town in Turkey has its own Romani quarter usually set by its outskirts. The distinct neighborhood identity such conditions bring (Mischek, 2003) is something even more than an ethnic formation of identity for the most community members. The neighborhoods where this large population is concentrated provide the space to perform community relations and poverty far from the gaze of outsiders and make the survival possible within the solidarity chains built inside. One can easily argue that a "divergent" Romani "culture" is only possible in a Romani quarter in multilateral relations of all Romani inhabitants.

Socially isolated conditions in the neighborhoods and there dominance of the local agenda are also bringing several difficulties for most community members in order to cover the dynamics of outer space, to take it serious and stand against to survive within the changing conditions of the everyday life which is today more competitive than ever. The rapid transformation of the globe by last decade of 20th century especially on organization of people and modes of consumption and production have disqualified and there weakened a big portion of the community members, who already were having minimum facilities to get in touch with that of the melts in the air. So the Romani is being pushed deeper to bottom every single day by the hands of invisible. The permanently hardening conditions of capitalism have disqualified the craft based occupations "traditionally" Romani communities carried (Eren, 2008).

Especially the trespassing transformation of urban space throughout the needs of neoliberal trends such like maximization of profit and consumption has severely diminished the neighborhoods where the Romani population is concentrated. This was basically disposing the communities and putting Romani individuals into a

11

weaker position against hardly conditions of this new era without solidarity chains those used to make at least livelihood possible. Such a destructive design of the social ground could even be called as annihilation of the settlement-based Romani way of life. There the Roma was provided two choices; being forced to move to new "fancy" social housings and paying for it per month which means to be middle-classification or to leave the ground and disappear.

Moreover, the social acceptance of Romani which already appeared very few was getting lost and leaving its place for those of the racist hate attitudes which was pushed to grow up within the surrounding communities by stereotyping the negative image of Romani on developing mass communication in the same decade.

Parallelly, having deep historical roots, such external conditions pushing Romani communities out of the surrounding society were also located in the Romani language. The distance between the *external* and the *internal* is quite powerful in the making of the *selfing* and *othering* encodings in different Romani language*s* built in different tribal conditions. The word *Gadjo,* meaningly *non-Romani* or *the other* in the widespread *Romanes* language is clearly defining the ones and the social set that are out of the community relations.

According these hardening conditions of the Gadjo world in the last decade of the previous century there few initiatives have been taken within the communities in Turkey to get organized for defending the basic rights particularly of the communities again throughout the needs of the age. However these few efforts were harshly obstructed in order to preserve the sake of the national security policies.

At least, on the year 2004 throughout the interest of Turkey's national policies to meet the European Union membership criteria, which was named as Copenhagen Criteria, some legislative changes have made the organization of not only Romani communities but also all ethnic groups possible. There the first official Romani organization, Edirne Association for Research on Gypsy Culture, Aid and Solidarity – EDÇİNKAY, is set the same year in Edirne city (Uzpeder, 112). Following this

milestone on official organizational history of the Romani communities in Turkey there organized several Romani associations all around the country one after the other.

From there after, the main agenda these local Romani NGOs were busy with getting organized in the *viable* forms and to act for social acceptance and basic rights of the communities. However, unfortunately, such a multitude of organizations could not be enough to defeat the external interferences over the communities. The most systematical operations faced were the urban transformation implementations to demolish the Romani settlements throughout the needs to satisfy the most primitive desires of the owners of economic capital, maximization of the profit and designing the land throughout the trendy forms of neoliberal fantasy of the age.

Those were also the years where several programs about Romani communities were conducted by European Union - EU in all around the land where the authority of this newly growing nation tending to unify a multiple ex-nations set and the *Decade of Romani inclusion 2005 - 2015* has taken a kick-off with the support of a collaboration between a variety of transnationally operating organizations, namely the Council of Europe (CoE), the Council of Europe Development Bank (CoEDB), Open Society Institute (OSI), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the World Bank (WB), the European Commission (EC), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). These conditions were encouraging the local Romani communities to get organized in the form of *associations*.

Moreover the agenda of these young associations were fully occupied with the NGO trends rather than the local dynamics to find out novel what-to-dos for building up trustful networks distant from benefit relations. Consequently, the early ages of Romani organization in Turkey were just parallel with the years when civil society in Turkey was meeting with the fruitful NGO industry and taking a new uniform under the requirements of *Terms of References*, professionalism, grants and campaigning through the means of public relations etc.

The close attention of highly professionalized NGOs on Romani issues were not only out of humanitarian necessities but also having something to do with the international funding trends, which are strongly connected to global policy trends. After corruption of the civil model, especially in Eastern European experiences (Maruák and Singer, 2009), the potential interest around the virginity of Romani environment in Turkey was surely providing a huge market for those internationally operating clumsy organizations to spend the funds they have access throughout collaborations sometimes even with some local briefcase organizations who had no grassroots relations at all but able to manage proper reporting.

On the other hand, these fashionably association-based organizational practices of Romani communities in Eastern Europe has not given an account for the failure which was caused by neoliberal form of development uniform that the communities are forced to wear in order to engage the post-Sovietic era. However, still these not properly evaluated NGO models are being promoted at least in Turkey as the only form of human organization to join the game and benefit from international fundings those may still be accepted as social rights of the communities gained by international grassroots struggle.

In such circumstances, some experiences were quite correct and the local implementers have learned out of negative or positive practices, some others were correct in the beginning but not lately have learned how to make do with the project management and some have had no change to meet these experiences and faced extinction however like this or that this dominant ideology of NGO environment has affected almost all Romani organizations very closely.

To sum up, the critique, dissertation intends to cover, of the Romani identity which is invented by NGO industry companion to interpretative anthropology for development is to come up with critical comments to our own society and to contribute the debates especially on globalization, identity and social regulation with narrow critical assumptions by looking into everyday experiences of living people. It will try to connect local to global by examining the definition and

representation of "the Roma" on the texts of non-governmental policy makers and dig out how the actors experienced change and create strategies concerning the past, present and the future.

To do it so, besides exploring the formation of Romani identities throughout the means of sociolinguistics and exploring selfing and othering definitions between surrounding *Gadjo* communities, the research will seek to criticize developmentalist ideology and put an overview about the situation of Romani communities in Turkey, focus on some project examples run by several NGOs targeting the communities and underlining urban gentrification implementations to integrating and redesigning Romani cultures for the elegant needs of global cultural imaginations of the investors. As the developmentalist practices made by receiving the real peoples' everyday lives as calculable subjects and rejecting the object positions of individuals and their communities, any social contact corresponds many affects on the local level which brings the basic arguments to oppose such developmentalist ideology.

The main effort the dissertation puts is to cover the systematical operations of the Gadjo society against the Romani communities and to put them into a framework that will be named as *Gadjofication*. The way Romani communities indigenized and marginalized by these Gadjofication implementations are going to be focused throughout a comparative examination on the global influences on the local sites. Still, I have to put before to start that even though I have determined Gadjofication as an experience the Romani communities face, within the research, dealing with the cases of urban transformation and NGOization, I have noticed that this process is having different features beyond affecting only the Romani communities but it may also be useful to focus on the experiences of other population groups who are also exposed to such practices. Therefore I propose that one might also use the term Gadjofication for more general scales and there transform the notion. Though having a sense of it during the fieldwork, it was a transformation which clearly appeared in course of writing Gadjofication. Therefore I try to handle the term as a

critique in a more extended sense. That is to say, being fundamentally an experience of Romani communities, I use Gadjofication as overarching different experiences implemented to unifying and similarizing differences of human formation.

Following this introductory chapter the dissertation will continue by a theoretical chapter in search of its theoretical framework within the development literature. Putting its critique against an anthropology that is in service of colonialist bias and management of the people. To do it so, the research tries to enframe its work practically for making of anthropology of development.

The third chapter to put the methodological tendencies and lessons learned on exploring Romani communities in Turkey. Targeting to demystifing its objective bases the methodology of the research on an experiment in search of reflexivity in anthropology work. The experience of building a field to realize the research embraces the multi-sited ethnographies. The chapter is also concerned with the collection process of empirical data and the field experience on positioning the ethnographer into its methodological framework.

The three body chapters, to bring out several layers to discuss the research question, follow the methodology chapter of the thesis. The first of them, namely the Chapter Four, is about the unequal encounters between Romani and Gadjo. The chapter starts with a brief history of Romani communities to name the main tribes concerned. Then it goes to different grounds where such encounters are getting realized with close analyses of cases on legal discrimination, health services, employment, education and social assistance. Such encounters provide the grounds where the affectus of ordinary people against neoliberal apparatus are visible.

The fifth chapter is concerned with the urban transformation implementations those mainly targets the Romani neighborhoods. The chapter firstly discusses the impacts of neoliberalism on urban space in general; then it goes more specificly onto the impacts on Romani communities. How insulting the operations are legitimized and the importance neighborhood life and loss of neighborhood based community life as

a means of gadjofication is also on the goal of the chapter.

The sixth chapter is about the NGOization of Romani communities. It takes a start with a short history of the Romani identity politics in Turkey and explores the early ages of positioning of Romani identity into political discourse as a case study. The minority question on making of identity and the impacts of NGO industry are analysed. Moreover the grants system and the trends of the donors are criticized as grounds of making of the anti-politics for Romani case. Finally impacts of NGO industry on Romani organizations, such like research projects, projects for cultural activities, to provide social services, raising awareness and building advocacy, are analysed throughout a focus on several projects where Romani communities encounter NGO environment. Then the terms "empowerment" and capacity building are analysed.

The seventh chapter of the thesis is to mapping Gadjofication. There it firstly assays the word *Gadjo* in Romanes language throughout the means of sociolinguistics as a base to the suggestion of the study, Gadjofication. There the different layers of Gadjofication experiences met are put out. The chapter proceeds by having a focus at the survival stories of several members of Romani communities dwelling inbetween exclusion and integration and defines Gadjofication as a new form of social discrimination. Finally the discussions chapter tries to bring out claim the emotions, which several Gadjofication examples put onto individuals; since, Gadjofication has several personal hidden injuries.

Finally having many deficiencies, this work intends to have a contribution on the qualitative works done about Romani communities. To have a close look at the selfing and othering processes of Romani individuals and communities, the study focuses especially onto urban transformation implementations and NGO industry as case studies, to find out how the distances with Gadjo world practically realize. Such attention on the encounters of Romani communities on Gadjofication processes is to bring out the affects produced in such encounters and to argue on the local impacts of global policies and make them visible.

CHAPTER 2
ANTHROPOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT
TO OVERCOME DEVELOPMENT ANTHROPOLOGY

This chapter is going to provide a theoretical framework and underline the main theoretical discussions the dissertation is based in search of the significance of its questions.

2.1 Questioning Development

One could easily claim that the interpretive anthropology, which is abstract, rhetoric and based on programmatic exaggeration, carrying irritating righousness and systematically avoiding historical and theoretical contextualization (Damatta, 1994), has a direct impact on transnational politics both in governmental and nongovernmental levels by hosting the legitimation of the ground they dwell. At least, the ways they operate are based on quite the same ground such as the orientalists and functional anthropologists did for the favor of colonialism (Asad, 1973). To deal with such mistaken theoretical and methodological path, Arjun Appadurai (1990) underlines the urgency of a "new" model of social theory to cover this context dependent organization of peoples, technologies, economies, images and ideologies of the world we live in today. As Thomas Acton (2006) proposes, new forms of historical scholarship, rooted in questions from the lived experience of Romani/Gypsy/Traveler people can help deconstruct the constrains of the

conventional wisdom.

The term *development* and the implementations carried on until today in order to realize this imagined idea of modernity, provides the necessary material to better understand the world today. Despite the field is harshly dominated by political science and economics, development provides enough space also for anthropology to explore its core questions. The policies concerning Romani communities both on settlement programmes and on the culturalist projects based transnationally operating organizations are legitimated mainly through the discourse of *integrating* the Romani communities to today's modern societies which are accepted as highly developed.

Such an idea, first of all, hosts an acceptance of *a* unique Romani culture as being essentially *under developed* or at least as a *culture* which is destitute of being developed. At this very moment that would also be useful to keep in mind James Ferguson (2005) putting the critical definition of anthropology as the science of 'less developed' peoples. Therefore, one could easily argue that the cultural deterministic theoretical line the urban transformation implementations and the NGO industry dwells today therefore provides even a racism which may not be based on biology but based on culture, culturalism (Benedict, 1934).

However, from a point of view which is critical to such argument, anthropology of the idea and the establishment of development, which is enforcing the peoples to be modernized, would surely be working for a better understanding of the Romani question. The objective of such a stand point, as this dissertation is willing to carry, is to contribute the current debates between the development anthropology and the anthropology of development in favor of the former. Therefore the main will of the dissertation is to not to make an anthropology *for* the development but to put development on the critical goal of anthropology and to make an anthropology *of* development.

Development is the main discursive ground where the legitimacy of modernist

policies dwells and there the neoliberal globalization is rooted. To exaggerate, development was the dream of rationalized, modernized "West" which is insisted on the rest of the world without a shame; in a sense, it was the apparatus to export "the fruits" of the enlightenment and diffuse the *western* idea of progress. Apart from its intention, if there is one self, however it is not easy to claim a success story. Though, even the best practices of this modernist project could not help its subjects to have "better" life conditions. One could remember Terry Eagleton (1990) shirking that the furthest point for this tendency to go could only be Iraq today, pure suffer.

The debates pointed out below are to explore the theoretical ground, throughout the discussions on "globalization," in search of the very dynamics for the need of this "new" model of social theory to cover the urgency cited from Appadurai above. To do it so, the focus is to the concept of development as globalization's principal, not only but mainly political apparatus for its conditions to be realized. Therefore the effort spent is intended to be an etude to examine the development and the notion's contribution to anthropology and vice versa to shelter the questions of the dissertation. A close reading on Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud's painstaking work (2005) has put the main footmarks of the endeavor.

Edelman and Haugerud put that the theories and practices of development are been motivated by an imagined shift from personal to rational, traditional to modern, poverty to wealth. They analyze the anthropological approaches to development by separating them into two. The difference between the practices of these anthropological approaches is in their relationship with the development theory. The first approach which could be called as "alternatives-to-development" or "alternative development" basically argues that the epistemological and political field of postwar development is been abandoned. Arturo Escobar (1992) defines this approach as a call for radical critique of, and distancing from, the development establishment. The second approach proposing reforms in the existing development policies could be called as "alternatives-in-development" rather than alternatives-to-

development. The term signifies the work of anthropologists who actually design, implement or evaluate the programs of directed change, especially those intended to alleviate poverty in poor nations. It is the use of anthropological knowledge to fit the development projects to the beneficiaries' cultures and situation throughout the needs of the poor. Similarly, Norman Long (2001) puts the distinction between these anthropological models as theoretical models aimed at understanding social change and policy models to promote development. However, as Cernea (1995) quoted from Bronislaw Malinowski (1961, *The Dynamics of Cultural Change,* Yale U.P.), the opinion of difference between practical and theoretical or academic anthropology is erroneous. Covering a strong position in the mainstream scholar works, such error provides the ground also for the practices carried out in the name of development.

Development doctrine presumes a linear understanding of history and estimates a similar path for all by rejecting the role of history and political processes. That is how the global development agencies such as International Monetary Foundation (IMF) and World Bank (WB) take the bases of their courage to intervene several different countries' policies and to propose a route to drive their history. The idea behind proposes the western modernist path as the only way for all peoples living around the globe (Escobar, 1991).

According to Cowen and Shenton (1996, *Doctrines of Development*, Routledge), as Edelman and Haugerud quotes, development in late 18th century was meant to construct order out of the social disorder of rapid human migration, poverty and unemployment. The second phase of the development could be defined in-between the end of the 2nd World War and the 1970s. The 1944 Bretton Woods Conference, where the IMF and WB are established, put the milestones of this new phase of development which is strongly influenced from the doctrines of John Manyard Keynes who defends the public expenditure as the only locomotive of the economic growth. This second phase was, besides, naively a will for the equal growth of the nations. Therefore the capital movements across the national frontiers are limitiated

and the currency exchange rates are fixed by common systems. The definitions of 'development' and 'underdevelopment,' of where the colonizing countries gained their justification from, showed up in this phase. The colonizers named their colonization implementations as 'support giving' to the "underdeveloped" countries throughout a discourse of equal economic growth and social change. To make it clear, Arturo Escobar (1991) defines the development as a Western colonial, or imperial cultural construct.

The third phase of development has taken its start by the 1970s when the IMF and WB's control over the capital movements have been lost. From thereafter, whatever possible issue has been left for the interest of the market and the state control over economy has started to be weakened as a requirement of economic neoliberalism. The collapse of the limitations on capital movement across national borders was announcing the rise of neoliberal globalization era. Parallel to the transformation on the discourses of these supranational institutions from economic growth to poverty management, the decade was calling a shift on the tendencies of anthropology's theoretical ground from grand narratives to the particular analysis.

The decade was also providing new career opportunities for the anthropologists within the above mentioned development agencies as project managers or policy makers. In this situation the main thing defining the path of most anthropological researches became to be the grants system which is also controlled by the preference of international development agencies. These institutions which support the researches of university based popular semi-academic interdisciplinary development studies institutes have taken the control of the researches interests; the critical theoretical mind is left alone where such policy models of anthropology are supported. There the grants system and the interests of the development institutions, which became dominant especially in the last decade of development and shaping not only the fields of thinking but also the actions of the anthropologist and his or her Third World clients, are standing still as subjects of anthropological gaze (Escobar, 1991).

The current mode of development, of where the capital moves across national borders as a renewed era of globalization, is a neoliberal decade. This era, where the movement of the labor is prevented but the capital is not, revealed new forms of organization of peoples and therefore new debates for the anthropology to explore these new conditions.

Even one could examine the connection between anthropology and development through several different issues, the gracefully briefing work of Edelman and Haugerud put it by an overview of NGOs, civil society, gender, population, culture, consumption, environment, and city and countryside issues. They underline that the anthropology has shifted from connecting culture and political economy which was a popular tendency until 1970s; however by 80s this tendency mainly took a distance to political economy to defeat the criticism of reductionism and cultural determinism. There the main anthropological tendencies have taken the neoliberalism as granted and focused on global flows, flux, fragmentation, the indigenous, grassroots organizations and cultural difference. This was on one hand distracting attention from "the largest and most totalizing framework of the world history-the market" (Graeber, 2002), but on the other, providing the opportunity to explore why the contemporary globalization is not natural or inevitable. Nevertheless historical and structural connections among social groups, institutions, states and ethnographic sites keep their urgency to be explored.

Anthropology provides the basic analytical tools to sober examine the development throughout integrating culture, power, history, and economy into one framework. There, on meeting the need for a "new" model of social theory to cover the world today, William Roseberry (1996) warns against the danger of rejecting the history by paying attention only to grand concepts such as capitalism, colonialism and the state without analyzing their forms, relations, structures, histories or effects and proposes to undertake to analyze and understand the relations and structures of power in, though, and against which people live to require histories of colonialism or capitalism, class analysis, processual analysis, ethnographic analysis and grand

narratives as the key elements of critical "new" theorizing.

At this very moment, Sivaramakrishan (2000) argues that, as Edelman and Haugerud quotes again, the field of anthropology of development is "already animated by the anthropological debates on nationalism, globalization, transnational flows, diasporic cultures, and most importantly the cultural analysis of modernity, postmodernity, and postcoloniality -there is, then, a doubly reinforced challenge to think beyond the study of discourse, representation, knowledge, narrative, and all other manners of cultural construction."

Throughout the need of anthropology of a reevaluation of comparison "by exploring new methodologies that are less rooted in the past" as Gingrich and Fox (2002) put the research puts forth a multi-sited effort to crystallize the forms of *the Romani* and its needs defined to legitimate both by urban planning and civil policy implementations as means of neoliberal development ideology and the contradiction between practices and self definitions of the community members about their identities and problems from different sites in Turkey where Romani communities intensely live.

On this ground, the research explores how the ideological base of transnational policies, which is depending on conservative legitimating of the current mode of anthropologies for development, as main constraining element to manipulating the possible Romani resistance onto NGO formation of organization. There it tries to find out the very dynamics of how those are received by the communities. Then how they impact to the grassroots Romani organizations becomes to be a crucial point of the dissertation.

Parallelly, the research exploring how the Romani identity and the problems the communities face which are defined by global actors, what sort of policy recommendations are put on the texts of the nongovernmental organizations and how did they operate in the practical ground in order to have an overview of the politics of globalization experimented on Romani, have been compared by

24

exploring the experience of local agents to verify the grand argument and to put them on a proper paradigm.

CHAPTER 3
EXPLORING ROMANI COMMUNITIES IN TURKEY

3.1 For Reflexivity in Anthropology Work

The field research concerning the Romani communities for this dissertation has been realized in different neighborhoods in various cities all around Turkey where the Romani communities are concentrated; namely Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Diyarbakir, Adana, Zonguldak, Canakkale, Mersin, Mardin, Artvin, Erzurum, Erzincan, Bursa, Balikesir, Van, Bartin, Trabzon, Agri, Kars, Batman, Edirne, Tekirdag, Kirklareli, Igdir, Ardahan, Rize. There have been several stories listened, pages of ethnographic writings noted down. However, I should mention that I have not met one unique Romani identity. That would not be to exaggerate to claim that each Romani met has defined being a Romani in another way. Therefore to cover Romani identity in a framework and make invisible side of the narrations readable I have put the shared and non-discriminative ones on the spot depending on my personal scholar elaborations to also be able to give also a sense of the witness position.

However keeping in mind the warning Abu-Lughod (1991) underlines referring to Clifford (1988) that ethnography is a form of culture collecting (like art collecting) in which "diverse experiences and facts are selected, gathered, detached from their original temporal occasions, and given enduring value in a new arrangement" the cultural relativism with a reflexive critic as culture is not something essential but historically produced and there can be changed, my critic within this dissertation

goes through the *illusio* the *Gadjo* NGO industry and its supporting academic formation built also for making of *a* Romani culture. Therefore to keep up a witness position between hierarchically *higher* Gadjo environment and *lower* Romani *culture* with all possible shifts was to dig down the dynamics of such historical construction and to contribute the wills to make it de-constructible.

There to imply what I could learn from Edward Said (1978), as he argues for the elimination of "the Orient" and "the Occident", for eliminating "Romani" and the "Gadjo" altogether, is one of the objects the dissertation carries. As Abu-Lughod underlines (1991) by this Said means not the erasure of all differences but the recognition of more of them and of the complex ways in which they crosscut. More important, his analysis of one field seeks to show how and when certain differences, in this case of places and the people attached to them, become implicated in the domination of one by the other.

Therefore to *demystify* the *doxa* of these positionings in Bourdieuan sense (Wacquant, 2006) I will not be distant to accepting these existing hierarchies and excluding my personal position in this stratification as if they were not there. The main effort I try to put is not to speak in the name of oneself but to demute various Romani voices, at least met during this research and to take a critical position out of it against interpretive anthropology which is putting its highest effort to reproduce these hierarchies in service of development fantasies of liberal mind set.

Distancing from the *positivist* interest which depend on cold exactations and mechanical conceptualizations and *post-xist* positionings of which put their efforts to produce unclear definitions for building comfort grounds for themselves, the research is having a will to place everyday practices of real peoples into the global power relations exploring how the existing social stratification is there reproduced and to produce formulas to present its outcomes back to everyday life again. Being accepted as opposite tendencies, moreover grounding their chairs on criticisms of each other, these tendencies however are serving for the same path finally to blur and legitimate the neoliberal, neocolonialist hegemony which is in charge of selling

the goods of the developed, whether material or immaterial, to under developed or so-called developing societies.

Following the suggestion of Pierre Bourdieu (2007) for a reflexive sociology, to show if how the practical perceptions of the agents make reproduction of social inequalities possible again and again, the research has compartmentalized the systematical attacks the Romani communities faced onto *symbolically* by defeating the Romani neighborhoods and *culturally* by manipulating the practices of political organization. Therefore, comparing different personal experiences with each other, for surviving not only in the rapidly transforming world but, as a core question, also basically in the NGO industry, to explore the effect of current global politics on re-producing these ongoing social inequalities as a *critique of hegemony* both in Kantian and Marxist sense, the dissertation has put an effort to step on the footmarks of Pierre Bourdieu as Loic Wacquant (1998) briefed brilliantly.

Designing a research on a question spread onto such various fields as one should firstly consider the *misrecognition* over the practical process and to put an effort to *demystify* the *illusio* on very conditions (Bourdieu, 1980) trying to find out weak homologies themselves, in Durkheimian sense, and stabilize the questions, actors and structures would make no sound contribution for a reflexive framing of the question. Rather to enframe the research question as a dynamic on going reproductive process was a principal guide to keep reflexivity up. There I have also put my researcher position on the spot to keep up a reflexive position.

There to have a critical gaze on the policies of settled power and its *preforms*, the dissertation would like to cover a criticism of *inherited* technocratic and intellectual mind sets which are accepted widespread and functioning to provide basic means of management, also of the Romani communities, in the name of rationality and culture. With an exploration on some cases of *symbolic violence*, which is imposing a mind set to legitimating and therefore strengthening the unequal structures, such work is also to signify the social conditions to oppose, to transform and diminish these hierarchies (Bourdieu, 2007). There the dissertation intends to explore global

capitalist policies, as practices of symbolical violence over Romani communities, which are obvious but invisible on urban transformation implementations and on the way NGO industry operates to put them on the desk to not to reproduce but to study the possible symbolic means to struggle against.

The main methodological tool of the dissertation to examine the circulation of cultural meanings, objects and identities in diffuse time-space is to making *ethnographies*. Learning from Lila Abu-Lughod (2000) and making ethnography as not only as a research method of social anthropology but also a literary form to narrate the personal observations and opinions of the anthropologist depending on the everyday life experience of the field, however I will not be taking a concrete distance on textual rendering of the social worlds (2000) and joining her effort about theorizing from my *lived experiences*.

Marcus (1995) puts the heart of contemporary ethnographic analysis as not the reclamation of some previous cultural state or its subtle preservation despite changes, but rather in the new cultural forms to which changes in colonial subaltern situations have given a rise and he suggests tracing a cultural formation across and within multiple sites of activity that destabilize the distinction, for example of the lifeworld and system (Holub, 1991) by which much ethnography has been conceived. Just as this mode investigates and ethnographically constructs the lifeworlds of various situated subjects, it also ethnographically constructs aspects of the system itself through the associations and connections it suggests among sites. Following this suggestion to bring out these new forms on the making and comparing on one site ethnographies in different neighborhoods in search of the situation of the Romani communities, the affects of urban transformation implementations and *NGOization* (Trehan, 2009) experiences and on the other participant observation in the functioning of NGOs were working to have a better understanding of different life worlds and systems and to examining the possibilities for destabilizing their distinction raised out of these colonial subaltern situations. This is also to share the emergency of multi-sited ethnographies in response to

empirical changes in the world and therefore to transformed locations of cultural production as Marcus (1995) puts again.

The main considerations the research keeps in mind as a priority according to the requirements of postfoucauldian era, if how the knowledge and power interrelated in history, how the power works at different levels of society; how the power and its relations are produced by knowledge and policy makers (or scholars), are not to define a constant, greater power focus but to questionize the usual methodologies of interpretavists which do not carry any intention to deal with the power relations and accept the situations as if they all are given and do not depend on dynamic interrelations.

Keeping in mind the questions and principals of feminist standpoint theory as a point of stand for the research was well functioning for reflexive self-evaluations for a pro-feminist researcher. For example, knowing that interviewing is a hierarchical form of social relationship itself (Sprague and Kobrynowicz, 2006) I have tried various communicative ways to have *equal* relationship with the interviewees; even to not to oppress with solid questions and to not to overvalue the everyday practices of people were quite helpful. Following the suggestions of Rosaldo (2006) to make it a more democratic work, interviewees were never forced or suppressed to talk about a particular issue but were informed about what I was searching for and always given control over the topic to be discussed. Though some basic observations were depending on sudden occasions however an interviewing relationship was always built over time, and most interviewees were asked for feedback on my interpretation of interviews.

Whether about Romani communities, urban transformation or NGO instances, all cases which are taking place in this dissertation have came out of direct contacts the research made. So to keep up reflexivity with a critical mind also to the *defining feature* position of an anthropologist, as Dresch and James (2000) warns out, to leave it for listening for the unsaid, looking for the visually unmarked, sensing the unrepresented, and thus seeking for connections among parts of the obvious which

locally remain unstated was the main perspective carried.

Learning from Thomas Acton, as he mentioned personally in *Diyarbakır* before we start the collaborative fieldwork at 2006, and the field experience itself, the principle for the research was *to not to ask questions*. Though that was not always possible to follow such rule very correctly, it was still providing a useful ground to set up protection from such power relations at least on the making of the field work. There, in an in-depth interview I have firstly expressed my intention in detail and expected the interviewee to tell her or his own story in a sincere conversation. The *narrations* of the interviewed Romani agents about the past, present and expectations of future incorporation with the *gestures* observed, where the implicit side of the narrations would come out, have already provided a large material for the obvious situation to be analyzed.

3.2 Building a Field to Realize Itself

The entire Romani question in Turkey is quite a complicated issue to cover for a simple anthropology dissertation. Especially the effort to tide up a research which was diffused onto several years and fragments was quite more than a PhD candidate to do. Therefore the research field has first emancipated from the obsession of a holistic cover of its question and then straightened it to a field which was fairly to study about. There would of course be more work to sort out the imperfection of the study. The question of the research might be better undermined with additional chapters on governmental policies amongst Romani communities, movement on demographical data and more examples of project practices the NGO industry realized about the communities in the local level.

Still, governmental policies have their implicit positioning within the dissertation. The way to explore the possibility of Romani organizational process and discussions on identity formation has direct references on the issue. The statements some

governmental representatives issued have taken their places in the narration. The way the Romani question is dealt in the nongovernmental ground has strong connections with the governmental relations; since, that is hardly to claim a perfect civic environment which is well emancipated from the influence, intervention and funding of central policy makers. Moreover the settlement policies which are on the goal of the research are mainly sourcing out of central governmental policies. Thus, despite taking a distant position on focusing the governmental concern on the question, that was not possible to argue about the research question without having even a short touch on official ideology.

Though that was one of the most eagerly anticipated issues on the field, the demographical data did not take any place within the dissertation. On one hand that was quite impossible to reach a creditable data about issue but mainly on the other, yet principally I was regretting to deal with the numbers rather than dealing human beings; since, the grand game of "political" regulation is always been played at this level where I would not like to take a part.

Finally, despite the examples of project implementations providing most important information to process for the possible knowledge about how the Romani organizations deal with the NGO industry, the practical response of it would be to inform out some confidential data, which would cost loss of resources for some Romani organizations. Therefore to not to take a position of infidelity, such arguments has put out of research field. At this very moment I should strongly mention that this is never to claim about unreliability about the Romani organizations. Rather the Romani organizations which have been touched were the most trustable social grounds I have ever met. However that is a precaution I feel like taking against the aggressive relations set of Gadjo NGO environment who takes the control over the paths to access to operational funds. Therefore the frontiers of research field are drawn throughout inexplicable precisions. The rest is left for a will to be written soon.

3.3 Ethnographies for a Multi-sited Research

To have a grassroots gaze on the situation of Romani communities and the Romani politics, the Romani living places to be explored for the field research, of which sometimes were not settlements but camps, have been visited, the necessary relations have been set and besides the interviews with the local Romani agents, simple observations about the Romani life worlds have been made. The interviews made with people from the Romani communities has covered the neighborhood, those old days, present situation, demolishment or the forced transformation of life in general, livelihood, the Romani being and future forecasting. The aim was to explore the experiences of the population mainly about identity and discrimination instances of which they have been subjected to like the demolishment and forced evictions, and the experiences on getting organized. There I have tried to dig down how it works between groups; how groups behave differently, how the values are constructed within the group, the impacts of Gadjofication process, how do they function, what are the main debates on the run, what is the relation of the organizations with the people who are claimed to be represented by these organizations, what are the on different nongovernmental approaches. A cross reading of the outcomes of these research lately been processed to the narrative of the dissertation.

Coming back to the ethnographies of NGO industry, Sharing Akhil Gupta's concern on Indian experience (1995), the dissertation intends to look what is going on within the institutions, how does the globalization act locally and the political standards set, to bring them down to the earth and make accessible for anthropology (Lila Abu-Lughod, 1991). To take it an example, how secularism used to colonize the world (Asad, 74-75) and to refuse it from a postcolonialist perspective (Bhabha, 1994) was to enrich the possible discussion.

The opinions built about the NGO industry are grounded on the research which has been in touch with various *strats* of non governmental forms of human organizations from *weakest* very grassroots level Romani organizations who were

hardly standing still in the NGO environment to *most powerful,* donation giving or policy making level Gadjo organizations, who were owning and putting the rules of the game for such environment. Different professional and volunteer positions I was taking in this scale was providing an important opportunity to participantly observe the priorities, decision giving tendencies, intervals in between the lifeworlds of professionals and the world where the Romani was making life and there ideological background of projects based neoliberal social proposal from a point of view of an insider. So the basic observations, about how the industry works and what the basic trends of this environment are produced, are distilled to a narrative, which seeks the distances they have with the reality settled in grassroots ground.

On the other hand linguistic positionings of complex set of social relations on the language of the communities is also a part of the dissertation. As Paulston and Tucker (2003) cite the concern of anthropological linguists from Scherzer (1992); "to describe … the sociolinguistic resources of a community, that is, the grammar but also the complex of linguistic potentials for social use and social meaning; how these resources figured in discourse and social interaction; and how they fitted to the larger society." Such a sociolinguistic view was quite helpful especially on problematizing selfing and othering processes by exploring the definitive position of the word *Gadjo* in Romani language as a verbal resource.

Throughout Bourdieuan suggestion on Austinian speech-act theory (Bourdieu, 1999) claiming that the social conditions are priorly required for linguistic action to be successfully performed, however by taking a critical gaze as onto the argument as Judith Butler (1999) warns, this privileged social field as dominating objective reality that determines discursive *habitus* of agents might itself fail to recognize sufficiently how change of discursive practice might in turn modify that social field itself, the dissertation is intended to undermine the social conditions which produce the Romanes word *Gadjo* and give back the term to the field with a definition of *Gadjofication* carrying a will to have an active participation of transforming the current dominant mind set by *de-constructing* the word Gadjo and *re-coding* it onto

relations set of global capitalism surrounding the Romani communities.

3.4 Empirical Data and Collection Process

The main ground the dissertation dwells is lying on several visits taken to various cities in Turkey where Romani communities live. Being in the Romani neighborhoods as a researcher to cover such research I have also spent so much time occupying different positions in different Non-Governmental Organizations - NGOs concerned with the questions of the research and made it possible for me to be in touch with the Romani communities. That was practically a grant for me as a graduate student who was without a proper support, there also had to make his life. Besides making observations for my own work, I was in the field to run researches for different NGO projects I will mention below and being paid for this. That was a real advantage to be in touch with the communities but also to participantly observe how the NGOs are functioning to make these experiences comparable. Therefore, in other words, this dissertation have written down from the out comes of my personal professional life.

The arguments the dissertation intends to bring out stand on the researches of which I have involved professionally between 2006 and 2008 for running projects for different NGOs about Romani communities in Turkey. The things happened around within this time and the facts I was witness have transformed my scholar interest of research from superior theories of sociology down to earth between back streets of the urban space and super professional headquarters of NGOs where problems of these streets are meant to be pointed and managed by the *experts*. During this time, I have on one hand joined a plenty of professional projects in different levels of NGO scale and on the other visited several neighborhoods where Romani communities were concentrated, met and talked with innumerable individuals living in these neighborhoods.

The first touch I have made with the issue was in early 2006 with the research I have covered for *the Project for Initiating Local Social Policies of Reconciliation in Favor Of Roman People* which was implemented by *The Association to Develop Social Cultural Life (SkyGD)* donated by *European Commission's The European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), Turkey 2004 Micro Project Programme*. As a young sociology graduate, under the project coordinator title, I have prepared and run a widespread research for this project in Romani neighborhoods of four different cities of three different regions of Turkey. Especially the experiences in two cities of these four, I could have the chance to spend time more than a month per each neighborhood.

That was a very well designed research to cover not only the Romani communities but also the outer local dynamics who did carry a political and social influence in the concerning cities to perform social policies the research might develop. There the research was also aiming to organize a Romani friendly political view within the local political environment in these cities. To realize the research I was first getting in touch with the local authorities of the cities where I was to carry the research on. Therefore the first step put in these cities was to fix appointments with this ruling Gadjo environment. That was basically to start by visiting the governor of the city and then that was followed by concerning vice governor, heads of governmental social services foundations, local social centers and go on with visiting the major and concerning municipality workers, local headmen, health care centers, mosques and schools where the communities were in touch, bar associations and some other non governmental associations which could take a part building and organizing Romani friendly local social policies.

This endeavor itself was quite interesting experience for me. I should first get know the local dynamics of the city, how the power relations set in parallel to the locations of the Romani neighborhoods then later start to get in the neighborhoods and keep all these network built informed about how the research is going on and force them to think and move about what sort of policies could be developed and

36

realized. All these workload were quite more than a single researcher could realize at its best in a month or two. Still it made a very valuable experience to observe how the local Gadjo environments received the communities and the project itself.

The main aim of the research was to note down the situation of the Romani communities in these cities. The reports I have made from the field were elaborated in collaboration with the project advisory council in Istanbul of which was composed of scholars, social workers and NGO professionals and developed to social policies which could be implemented in local scale. These policy recommendations were discussed back with the relations set in the cities research carried. The final objective was to transform these built local networks onto local working groups to implement the Romani friendly social policies which are designed all together. That was almost an impossible goal for a six month experience to be realized in four different cities. However within all its difficulties that was partly a useful game to play to get also the Gadjo mind set.

Those were the days I have met the deep inside of the Romani neighborhoods. I have learned a lot out of roaming alone within different communities. However the reality I have met in the field was not that interesting for most of my colleagues who were responsible to assist me from the head quarter and to develop local social policies for the needs of the communities I was working with. Therefore the distance between the lifeworlds of the ordinary people and the professionals of whom are pretended to *save* them was something likely to think about. Besides my personal field experience drawn in the Romani neighborhoods, the cold face of project based NGO ideology and the gaze of the urban NGO elites was quite likely to demystify. There the core ideas dwelling under this dissertation have come out within this period.

This experience was lately followed by *the Project for Promoting Romani Rights in Turkey* which was a joint work of the *European Romani Rights Centre (ERRC)* in Budapest, the *Helsinki Citizen's Assembly Turkey's Branch (HcA)* in Istanbul and *the Federation of Romani Associations (ROMDEF)* in Edirne, funded by *European*

Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights Programme Combating Racism &
Xenophobia, & Promoting the Rights of Minorities Grant. That was a researcher
position which carried a research on condition of human rights in Romani
neighborhoods in 23 different cities of all around Turkey between 2006 and 2008.

This was the period I have met many Romani neighborhoods of which were
subjected to gentrification and local Romani associations of whom were trying to
establish a political ground to operate. Working in an international NGO
environment and there with foreign colleagues was an additional opportunity for me
to observe the concerns of the global NGO trends with the knowledge of the local
dynamics. This was also a period I have joined many organizational meetings of
grassroots Romani organizations.

Besides having an experience and knowledge of how do donations taking
organizations operate and report what they do, I was able to be in direct touch with
the Romani communities during these first two jobs. I was lately following up the
relations that are set on these researches with my personal effort. That period was
also the early days of my PhD studies. There I was having the advantage of living
the field with parallel readings of doctoral seminars of social anthropology.

On the other hand the following two positions I was hired were in Ankara, the
capital city of Republic of Turkey, were more office positions having nothing to do
with the field they were concerned, apart from the paper work. This was providing
me the opportunity to observe the central operations where the field works are
designed, assessed, evaluated and granted.

The first central position I was holding was in *the Project for Technical Assistance
to Implement a Grant Scheme for the Promotion of Cultural Rights in Turkey*,
funded by the *European Union Central Finance and Contracts Unit - EU-CFCU*
run by *ICON Institute Public Sector GmbH.* ICON Institute was a Germany based
private company which was operating for consultancy in public sector, private
sector, engineering, education and training and information systems. My position as

short term expert was fixing the local conditions on the early ages of the project in 2007. The grant was shared with two dozens of local projects and what we were doing was to assist these projects technically to be implemented and finalized throughout the given scheme of European Union. This position has provided me a great chance to observe how the projects are designed and what makes the donors to call them successful.

Finally the last position I have taken concerning this dissertation was again a short term expert position for assessing, evaluating and grading projects within *Supporting Civil Society Development and Dialogue in Turkey, Programme for Strengthening Civil Society in Turkey: Integrated Approach to the Civil Society and the Participatory Local Projects Grant Scheme of European Union Central Finance and Contracts Unit –EU-CFCU* and *Civil Society Development Center – STGM* by 2008. That was a job performed in an office on a tall skyscraper where there was nothing but the white walls covering around. I was meeting with tens of different project proposals and assessing them throughout the criteria which have taught me by standard assessing trainings of EU.

Unfortunately, I will not be writing about the professional contents of these jobs; since, I had to sign a statement of confidentiality and therefore I am not allowed to discuss unique examples. However out of professional requirements of such job, there is nothing to limit oneself to think about how the offices were designed, how the relations between the employees set, the gestures around and the distance between these offices and the streets. Indeed I keep such a confidentiality running for each particular field example I will refer and sidestep to mentioning real names of the people at all and even places. Some basic observations, still, even though speaking on the surface level, could already provide enough material to develop a comparative social research about the question of the dissertation.

Moreover, because I was biologically a male researcher, the research could meet a limited number of Romani women within all these years. Besides few examples of interviewing and general observations on the public ground, that was quite difficult

for me to build the links up with the life worlds of women within the communities. Which means a pity that these writings are not having enough empirical data to cover the Romani women's world. There the ground is left for the interest of the women researchers also to be politically correct in feminist perspective. Paralelly that would also be correct to say that the woman's official presence in the Romani organizations is as weak as the research could meet them. However, all these experiences have pushed up a whole set of ideas about the research question; what the dynamics of the distance between the lifeworlds of the ordinary people and the professionals were?

3.5 "Field" Experience: Positioning the Ethnographer

The early questions I was intending to deepen for my research as a PhD candidate on sociology was about focusing on the theory of videographic images to deal with the questions of representation in history writing. All my readings and production was around the *Deleuzean* world of images. However those were also the days I have started to work professionally with the Romani communities. The poor result of a short literature review about the communities has shocked me; since, there was almost nothing noted down about the communities in Turkey. This was a matter of consciousness that I strongly felt like the experience I was having should be scholarly written down. What I have been witness at the field was pure poverty and discrimination. Romani communities, at least the ones I was in touch, were having their own inner dynamics which were similar to each other. Such an insider ground was very much closed into itself and that was always a difficult task even to get in touch with the members of the local communities.

I was also quite lucky that my relation with the communities was well fit with the early days of official Romani organizational process. There, to follow up the meetings of Romani organizations I have found myself in the middle of a young and huge Romani network trying to establish the base for existence of a movement.

Having great friendships within the communities, meeting with local initiatives in local coffee houses or streets of Romani neighborhoods in several cities, witnessing how the process is getting organized, what kind of problems they face, what kind of strategies they develop to over come such problems and sharing the knowledge I have just because of being a well educated Gadjo have taught me a lot.

Moreover those were also the days a strong attention over the communities has yet started. My email inbox was receiving questions and demands from different agents who would like to get in touch with the Romani communities and having no direct connection at all. This was on one hand feeling quite unreal to me; since, the Romani communities were there, as they are today, and to build up a relation could not be that further than giving a warm greeting. Lately I could notice that this was basically a Gadjo position, even though having good intentions, to feel than to feed an imagined distance to get in touch with Roma. I was there surprised and the process of writing something also in my doctoral dissertation about the lifeworlds of the communities has started to make its position on my mind.

However, on the other hand, I was also having a sense that there were more to focus before to out put the inner dynamics of the communities. Moreover, I have realized that such dynamics are not to be written down. The distance between the widespread opinions about the communities and the communities themselves was a prior issue than gossiping about the lifeworlds of ordinary people.

The very output of these ethnographic endeavor was that the Romani "culture" is not something to be covered in a rational base and textualized by Gadjo. Otherwise that would be such a betrayal. So taken the researcher a non-Romani in advance, despite the will of this series of research, to not to take a side for an outsider remark, the research process became to be also a path to ask questions about the curiosity of the outer gaze over Romani. What would be the knowledge that any ethnography could dig out; especially from the point of view of a Gadjo researcher who is hardly involved into Romani life? Therefore the field experience has extended into a "field" which also covers a personal voyage of the researcher onto his experience.

Looking at such wide field in such long time long, I have also met various different incidents to be dealt. To have a social acceptance for such closed communities as a researcher was the most difficult task of the whole research. I had to find out different strategies each time for each community to be welcomed. To be able to get in touch with the people and speak about being Romani, world and whatever, I had to spend too much time and desperate effort to prove that I was not that of the Gadjos to decree and juridify people just because of their identities and trustable enough to start a deeper conversation. Even this difficulty itself was something to think about. Unintentionally, getting into a neighborhood with a backpack and an audio and visual recorder I have always started my touches as pretended to be a Gadjo. Even though I sometimes was there with strong references to soften the construction of the relation, this was always how I have been received in the beginning. So to take a trustful interview was rarely possible in the first touch. I was received sometimes as someone who is to get afraid of and sometimes a rich and powerful one to ask for merci, but always a Gadjo. Each case has its own story. I will try to write down three different experiences two of which was able to overcome such barrier but the one was not.

A strong example has happened at southeastern Turkey bordering Syria where historically different cultures dwell including Kurdish, Arabic and Assyrian. Arriving to this little town seeking the Romani neighborhood I have taken the first interviews in the town center with the vice major, the sub-governor and shopkeepers about the town and the Romani communities. However the common point within all these preparatory interviews was the main answer coming out claiming that there was no Romani population living in the town. That was not a convincing point to find out that there is no Romani living in the town. There I have tried some other ways to come to a point in the conversations, such like questioning the musician families in the town, who would be playing for weddings etc. Luckily that was a correct point to ask about the communities. The Romani communities were there however the notables of the town were having no idea about the identity of the musician communities. Finally, some interviewees were claiming about the

42

neighborhood where the musicians were concentrated with underlining that they were not Romani but Kurdish. That was such an interesting output to notice a similar path almost for each particular interview. Moreover that was also interesting to see the similarities of the tendency in the western cities when the people claim that the Romani is not a separate ethnic identity but they are Turkish.

Walking down the street described one could easily smell a deep poverty. A dozen of children were running around us with feet naked and greeting 'Hello!' in English language. In the gaze of these little children the one who is walking in their street could only be a foreigner. That was very hard to explain their father what the research was aiming; since, the previous interviews I have taken with the Gadjo of the town have made the charged prepossessions about the non-Romani being of the inhabitants. There I did not want to state this word, Romani, as if I was blaming them for something they were not to be. So at the beginning I explained the research task as being about the cultures and identities of the local musicians in the town. That was a musician family, playing basically *Rebab* and *Bağlama*. We were invited to the house inside. Hearing the visit of a Gadjo in the neighborhood some more neighboring relatives have appeared to visit. We all together were sitting in a room of approximately 15 m^2. The grandmother, the oldest of the family, was sitting on the center and most of the rest in the room were her sons, daughters-in-law and grandchildren.

A documentarist friend who was there to accompany me and give the research hands has put an eminent effort to translate the conversation; since, that was only possible in Kurdish language which I used to have no knowledge about. Only the little pupils and mature man were having a poor knowledge of Turkish language. Since, the former were taught in the primary schools, where it is officially compulsory for them to follow, and the latter were sometimes out to work and get in touch with Turkish speaking environment. However the women, whether young or old, were speaking in no Turkish but Kurdish language. During the conversations, between performances of music, they were claiming that they are Kurdish and they

speak Kurdish language in the community with each other.

We have taken about a half hour to speaking about music, conditions of life etc. They have openly stated that they are musicians but not *Mutribs*.[3] Speaking about the local languages within the musician groups there, they have often stated that the language they speak within their own community is Kurdish.

The face and the hands of grandmother, which were rolling often her tobacco, were covered with beautiful tattoos which are quite usual within the *Dom* communities. She sometimes was asking questions about us to her sons in Kurdish language. The young women, the daughter-in-law, were standing by the gate of kitchen and serving tea as soon as our glass gets empty. The whole family has put a big effort to host us pleasantly. At one point the grandmother has asked us if we were ok and if there was anything more we would like to have. There I have replied *"pani piye"* with my poor knowledge of Romani language, which means *"to drink water."* That was a tricky wish I have put. If they would bring a glass of water that would mean that they understand what I have asked. Otherwise that would be such a big shame to debar somebody from even water which is the basic human need. There a short silence appeared. Since they were hiding their knowledge of a Romani language for more than an hour and that was a very crucial moment in our sitting. Suddenly with an eye contact between the grandmother there came out an inhibited little smile onto her eyes and everybody in the room have started to laugh loudly. Finally became out that they were *Dom* having a good knowledge of *Domari*. It was very surprising for them seeing a *Perev*[4] saying something in their language.

Actually there normally are substantial differences and few analogies between Romanes and Domari (Hancock, 2006). However, that was an instantaneous luck

---

[3] *Mutrib* is an Arabic word used in Kurdish language to signify musician Gypsies which may have an insulting sense.

[4] *Gadjo* in Domari language

44

that these basic words to signify basic needs of human being were sounding similar in this two dialect of Romani language. There the interview has taken a new start within this new condition. Getting deeper in the conversation they have stated that there is a big Dom population in the town spread around a hundred houses. They usually make their lives out of playing music in the weddings and public parks where people go for picnics. The women were working more on agriculture in grape and wheat harvests. However these all were temporal jobs only taken in summer and autumn seasons. They also have put that they walk through Perev houses to demand tips. They call their tribe as *Saçi*, which means *Troubadours*, however the Perev communities are calling them as *Karaçi*. Underlining the difference they have with the Perev communities, of whom are mainly Kurdish, they have put a narrative about having roots in India.

As a young researcher concerned with anthropology, that was an unbelievable experience to be in touch with such tribe which was not known before at least by the surrounding community. The Dom community, according to the migration narratives, is one of the three main Gypsy tribes in the world. (Marsh, 2008) They were known to live in Egypt, Jordan, Palestine, Syria and Cyprus. Reporting such population, I have lately had the chance to make a visit to the region with a team of highly qualified scholars of Romani studies. My colleague Adrian Marsh was often saying that this was an enormous finding but I am still not sure if to be out was something good for the communities or not.

The second example has happened in a city on the Black Sea coast. I have met a young Romani man at my first week in the city. It was in the late afternoon. We met on the street while he was just coming back to neighborhood from the shop where he was working. He kindly asked me if I was the man who wanted to interview with his grandfather. He was the grandson of the oldest man of the community of whom I have met some days before and who was not really cheerful to talk to me. Lately the young man asked me to go to his house and have tea with him and his friends. That was a great invitation for me and I have accepted. On the way up to his house he has

45

spoken with a friend of him on the street and invited some other friends of him to join us to the house.

In the end we were six young men in a room sitting and talking. One of them has cooked the tea and brang six glasses. The tea glasses were having proper plates four of which were red and two were white. I have taken a glass in a red plate. Having our first teas they have asked me what I was doing in the neighborhood, what the research is for, the situation of Romani in the other cities etc. I was trying to give them my answers in details. One of them has stood up and collected the empty glasses and brang them to the kitchen, filled with tea, brang back again and served. He used to bring all the glasses together in a tray and distributes us randomly. In this second round of tea drinking the plate of my glass was a white one. I did not even care about it and the conversation was getting deeper.

After having our teas this young man has said *"Hey, sorry! I think this was not your glass."* I have replied him saying *"It is ok. That is a glass of tea in the end. It does not matter which glass it is in."* He has stand up and wanted to shake my hand saying: *"Thank you dear brother."* I was surprised listening to him and he kept on saying *"You did not get disgusted out of drinking your tea from the glass we have drunk. A Gadjo would never do that. You are not that of the Gadjos. Welcome here."* After that very moment I was able to go deeper for an understanding about how the Gadjo threats. Then they have told so long about discrimination stories they have faced. Most *crucially* they underlined that *"Gadjo would never eat from the plate we have eaten or even the food we cook."* That was a tricky tea party to test me if I was a Gadjo or not. There with this certain experience I have learned that Gadjo is not something racial but cultural. That made me very happy to not to be treated as a Gadjo. I might not be a Romani but that was happily that I was named a *non-Gadjo.* The following day I was able to have a long and great interview with the old grandfather and the rest of my time in the neighborhood was quite comfortable due to this acceptance I could meet.

Still in any case as an urban researcher, as an outsider that is something difficult to

be trustfully accepted into a Romani community. These two above-mentioned cases were totally different experiences depending on different dynamics. In the first case the community members were not even accepting their Romani being and run a conversation on the surface level. That was not to reject myself but to reject their identity in front of the Gadjo and represent themselves as Kurdish, of which was the accepted culture surrounding the community; though I was not Kurdish. Kurdish identity, which can also be a accepted as a "secondary" identity comparing to Turkish identity and be a reason to face discriminatory attitudes in Turkey, has became a cover for them to not to put their status lower and fix it at least in the Kurdish level. To take an acceptance as a researcher I had to prove my non-discriminative friendly position and familiarity with the culture they carry secretly. To that extent, most of the following stories they put were about being *treated* as a second class citizen.

In the second case from the beginning they did not hide their Romani identity but the problem I have faced was more about proving if I was having the right to access the networking of the neighborhood. At the former that has worked on lingual touch to community's secret language and at the latter that was more on cultural and about daily practices. However in any case, what these experience, have made me think of was the violent level of discrimination the Romani face. Therefore they were having their own methods to protect themselves against the Gadjo who usually exclude them symbolically but still violently. Such violence can also be replied again by violence.

However the third example was comparably not a success story whict taught me a lot about what to take out of the neighborhoods. One of the Romani interviewees I was in touch on a town by the Aegean coast was an old musician. He used to play dance tunes with his band which was composed of his son and nephews. They were quiet good musicians and famous within the local scene. After taking an interview with him in a tea house, he invited me for a wedding which they would be playing the same night in the neighborhood where he also used to live. I was very excited to

47

have such invitation and asked him if I could make video shootings of their stage or not. He accepted it but also strongly warned me that I could make videos as soon as I focus on the stage but not the people. I have been to the neighborhood by late afternoon and joined them to fixing the sound system. I have made very close-up footages of the sound check and their performance. Since I was warned about it, I have never directed my camcorder onto the invitees but only to the stage. That was a very crowded and upbeat party. But at one point, before the wedding comes to end, I wanted to take leave and sad goodbye to the musicians and the hosts of the ceremony.

I was very happy walking out the streets of the neighborhood by the late night. The musical performance I was able to witness and document was absolutely great. However at one corner I have heard a break squeak. That was from a fast going car, which has stopped just besides me. The driver has got out of the car and started to shout at me. He was very drunk and that was very difficult for me to understand what he was saying. He had fastly run onto me and blew me down the ground on the street. He was asking for the video tape I made in the night. I was telling him that he could get the tape but first he should set me free and stop yelling. He was extremely rageful and shouting like: *"You the Gadjo come to our neighborhood and shoot our life. What do you do then? You go back to your house and brodcast the images to degrade Romanies."* That was a very stressful position for me lying on the ground with a big Romani man sitting and yelling onto me. I was still trying to make explanations that I would not be using the images to insult the community and I was receiving invitation and permission from the musicians and the hosts of the wedding. There came a lot of people from the neighborhood trying to understand what the situation is and smooth the man down. However that was quite desperate; since, he was listening neither to me nor to his neighbors. Then he drew a gun and held it to my head. I was very scared and I have given him the tape. He stood up and kicked me on the gound. Some of the people around were helping me to stand up and some were speaking to him cool it down. He was unappeased, got his car keeping the tape and swearing and left the street alone. That was such a traumatic

48

experience for me where I was freezed with fear. That was the very first experience for me with a gun onto my head. I have given my apologies and thanks to the people around and left the neighborhood. The following day I have given a visit to the neighborhood again to get what the situation was. Everybody was informed about the incident and wishing me recovery. However it was not possible for me to see that man again.

From thereafter, walking on the streets of the neighborhood was quite stressful for me. Still what I could have against this angry man who was attacking to me was not a feeling of hate or revenge. Moreover his level of rage was explicitly stressing the violence he used to have since he was a Romani. That was a direct action against the material I used to have from the neighborhood as a Gadjo, in his point of view who was having a potential to harm the community of the neighborhood. There he was basically defending his community and identity against potential Gadjo attitudes.

On the other hand, telling about this story to my colleagues in the NGO I was working for I have asked few off days to synchronize my mind and get into a peaceful mood again. However they replied such a story like: *This is a very pity story. But you know we are in short of time for reporting and you should finish up with the research soon.* To be honest this answer was more wrecking for me than the attack I was subjected in the neighborhood. In the latter I could at least have an understanding about the conditions of attitude but I could give no explanation to myself about the former. Therefore I was convinced to questionize this distance with the reality on the streets and my personal experience and how it was seen from a snobbish industrial NGO gaze above; since, it was obvious to me that apart from the everyday experience happening on the field what NGO industry would care was only the proper reports to prove their donors that the money they have spent is not wasted.

To conclude, unlike the first two examples of where I was received friendly into the communities, this was a unique experience for me to learn out of that even though I was told to be a non-Gadjo by some of the community members, my everyday

attitudes and even posture could easily be making me out as a Gadjo. Therefore the field experience with the Romani communities as a Gadjo researcher, the most important was to keep the ordinary respect up and try to feel the moral boundaries of the community I was working with. Once I have spent enough time with dignity and respect the channels of communication with the community members were likely to open. Otherwise, roaming like a gogetter around to datafy lived experiences would never be helpful but impolite. Bringing such experiences out of neighborhoods as *souvenir*s to Gadjo world, where Romani have no control over, would just be to reproduce historical uneven relation by performing the Gadjo violence over the communities practicing the "power" of the "abilities" to datafy peoples lives.

CHAPTER 4

UNEQUAL ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN ROMANI AND GADJO

This chapter is going to start with an overview about the cultures and the situations of the Romani communities in Turkey. Writing in such a framework, keeping a critical mind but not to distancing an overview even though having the risk of making simple reductions, I have first briefed a composition of mainstream Romani histories accepted, then tried to map out different tribes located in different parts of the country roughly. Lately my observations, which have commonly made in all the communities I have visited, are put out.

4.1 Brief Romani History to Name the Main Tribes

According to the grand narratives of history in the Romani studies there are three main tribes basically depending on the migration waves, paths and accordingly the forms of the Romani language/s has taken until today. Different Romani families spread around entire world in these migration waves are categorized throughout their distances to these tribes namely *Dom*, *Lom* and *Rom*.

As Acton and Marsh (2007) puts, critically but depending on the grand narrative of Northern Indian roots, the first wave of the migration was by AC 900s because the *Gadznavid* Islamification attacks to Punjab. The path went out by today's Iraq, down to Sinai Peninsula until Palestine, Egypt and Cyprus. These traveler communities of which still dwell or roam in the same territories are called *Dom*. Their language is

Domari, which is transformed by getting in relation mainly with Arabic besides the other local languages on the migration path.

The second wave of migration has taken start by AC 11th Century. This path has followed more to the North West line. It went up to Caspian Sea, passing through Caucasians and Russia has reached Europe. Then some went until the Atlantic coast and some was down to the Aegean coast and Anatolia. The Romani tribes in this migration path are called *Rom*. The language they have is called *Romanes*. This tribe constitutes the roots European Romani identity and their language do the mainstream western Romani language.

Finally the third migration wave was by AC 11th Century which was following the path through Afghanistan, Iran, and Armenia until southern Caucasians and Northeastern Anatolia by the South East coast of Black Sea as a breakaway from the Rom migration (Marsh, 2008). This migration path was carrying the *Lom* communities whose language is *Lomawre* which is, besides other local languages they were in touch, highly influenced strongly by Armenian language.

There are also critical tendencies to this grand history of Romani roots. (See; Lee, 2000, Hancock, 2005). Keeping in mind that such narrations of grand history are construct of old fashioned mistake of nation building tendencies, these three main lines accepted are not enough to cover the diversity of Romani cultures today but provides at least a primitive base to be able to have a raw idea before to build up critical histories. The field in Turkey provides traces to read such categorization.

These three main tribes have large populations in Turkey. The Dom community in Turkey is settled from the South Eastern border by Syria up to Eastern Anatolia to city of Van and concentrated mainly in Diyarbakir city. They still keep on speaking Domari on the community relations. The Rom communities may be the most crowded Romani population in Turkey. They are more concentrated to Northern Aegean and Marmara regions however one might easily meet native Romanes speakers almost all around the country. The Lom communities in Turkey do spread

by the Eastern Black Sea coast down to Erzurum and Erzincan cities. They have knowledge of Lomavre; however the language use is getting weaker within the younger generations. Despite from linguistic and other differences depending on the geographical determinants, the three tribes have significant similarities on the basis of economic activities run, social acceptance, discrimination they face and culture of living together.

4.2 An Overview on the Situation of Romani Communities in Turkey

One can easily argue that the diversity of Romani communities in Turkey is quite rich. Even in one neighborhood three of four different dialects can be met. During the research carried I have been in touch with all these three main tribes of Dom, Lom and Rom and note down some pieces of the three existing languages. However what I have met was something more than these three tribes. Still within the dissertation I am going to obey the main accepted knowledge of the Romani Studies discipline, name the little differences I have met as extraordinary details and follow the taxonomy of three main tribes to deal with the communities.

Keeping in mind that such definitions might ground racist stereotyping, the writings would pay a high attention to be critical to monolizing the Romani culture. The effort put to crystallize the Gadjofication of Romani communities is never holding a conservative position to conserve *the Romani culture* and defend essentially the reproduction of conditions for poverty and discrimination from a snobbish scholar gaze.

Apart from lingual or other racial definitions but taking it more social, one could easily claim that the main significance of the Romani communities observed is *the culture of living together* whether it is in a neighborhood or in a traveler tent camp. This same tendency is observed at Dom, Lom and also for Rom communities. That would not be to exaggerate to claim that *the Romani culture*, if there is one, *is only*

possible in a Romani neighborhood. Neighborhoods are the basic habitats where Romani can perform community relations, use of language and social networking to *survive*. Romani is not a practice to be performed apart from the community. There, for a Romani individual living out of the neighborhoods, being a Romani turns only naming of the ethnic identity s/he belongs to. However the argument of this dissertation claims Romani culture as something more than an ethnic identity. On the other hand, *poverty* and *discrimination* faced can also be underlined as the common points Romani ways of lives deal. Therefore the fact building Romani identity can even be claimed as coping with such conditions imposed.

The concerned conditions of Romani communities have been observed as the grounds where the identity gets real. The difference between Gadjo society is most strongly felt on the encounters of Romani communities and Gadjo which have various dimentions. This section is going to put out some cases of Romani met in encountering legal codes, health services, labor conditions, education and social assistance to bring out such variety of dimentions. The conditions mentioned are indeed realized on the grounds where any citizen also encounters *the social*. However, the social encounters in these grounds, where cases of discrimination communities faced are easily visible, have something to do with the significance making of the Romani identity.

Such grounds, where governmental services do not equally work, have a sober importance also for the NGOs to operate; since, these organizations can easily claim to provide such missing social services. However, once the gadjo NGO industry also takes its proffessional distance between Romani experience, then that is not easy for one to argue that the blank contact points those occur from governmental advances can be filled by the nongevernmental operations.

Moreover, such encounters provide the basic experiences of learning about Romani desperation against the powerful Gadjo. There one may easily argue that such encounters between Romani and Gadjo also the ground where the urban question is getting realized. As the violence apparatus of gadjo world performs onto Romani in

any level, especially of the social, then the reproducing the violence again or the hesitation becomes to be the main defining subjects of Romani identity to survive. So that the level of resistance against demolishment of any Romani neighborhood most probably decreases because of such learned desperation.

The emotional distinction between being a Romani and a Gadjo is only visible from the side of the Romani. Therefore, for any Romani individual, besides the Romani identity, the Romani perception of Gadjo identity is also set within these encounters. This section is trying to put practical examples out for building a stand to feeling the Gadjo identity which is built from a Romani point of perception.

4.2.1   Discrimination Legal

The Roma in Turkey, just like elsewhere in the world, is living under solid discrimination conditions. Besides the everyday level, the discrimination of Romani is happening on the lingual level by negative stereotyping of the communities. Though each citizen is defined equal in the constitution, some governmental texts where Romani / Gypsy was mentioned, including official glossaries and legal codes are clearly excluding Romani identity by undervalueing the Romani definition and existence. One can easily find out obvious examples of dismissive definitions looking at some dictionaries prepared by Turkish Language Society (TDK) which is the governmental institution in Turkey to make official studies on Turkish language. For example *the Dictionary of Performance Arts*, which was again published by this official institution in 1983 defines the word *gypsy* as;

> *"A sporadic person, who usually speaks in slang, reads the rune, trades herbs and sometimes plays music."*[5]

---

[5] *"Genellikle argo konuşan, falcılık yapan, yaban otları satan, kimi kez de çalgıcılık yapan, seyrek görülen bir tip."*
See: BSTS, 1983, Gösterim Sanatları Terimleri Sözlüğü, TDK, Ankara.

It might be received as an innocent mistake; however such a glossary entry is not exceptional example. One can also meet with another instance of pejorative definition of Gypsy in *the Glossary of Theater Terms* again published by the same institution;

"*Gypsy: Frumpish, darkskinned woman type.*"[6]

Looking at these two examples, which are defining the word *Gypsy* in officially published texts, one can easily claim that the official position of Republic of Turkey has no direct idea about what a Gypsy is. Moreover such a definition on an official text indicates that the Gypsy / Romani people has even no definition there no recognition as a community but the name and the members of the communities are defined with pejorative accounts. Such example can also be followed by official codes like *the Instructıons about the Role of Police within the Ceremony and Communities and Organization of Police Stations* which is still on the force. The Article 134 on the 1st Chapter, 5th Section under the *Public Mission of Chief of the Station* heading it clearly instructs that;

> "*9) The chief of the station will struggle operatively with principles in his zone that shows tendency for violation of security and criminalization. That is fundamental to take measures and discharge over these above mentioned parties and affairs for procurement of the goals in this struggle.*
>
> *A) Parties:*
> *1) Suspected and previously convicted;*
> *2) Ramblers and beggers;*
> *3) Lunatics who has tendency to be a mere instrument of any agency, semi- or uncritical insanes;*
> *4) The ones settled under prospect of security and refugees;*

---

[6] "*Çingene: Kötü kılıklı, esmer kadın tipi.*"
See: BSTS, 1966, Tiyatro Terimleri Sözlüğü, TDK, Ankara.

5) Gypsies who has no vital jobs; ..."[7]

The instruction clearly defines the Romani people as essentially potential criminals; especially the emphasis on employment situation evokes that the unemployed Gypsies are clearly seen to be criminal threats. These former examples of official approach on Gypsy/ Roma are still standing.

On the other hand, some of the pejorative descriptios of Gypsy/ Roma in central official texts have been removed or changed to more "acceptable" forms by previous decade. For example in *the Contemporary Turkish Dictionary*, again published by TDK, the previous definition of Gypsy was correspond to the words of *"miser, penurious, acquisitive, impudent, shameless, indecent, barker, scoundrel"*[8] (Aksu, 2003) which would be accepted as the worst adjectives possible in the language. However throughout many pressures made by Romani activists the entry has been changed to some sort of the identification of the Romani as people in its latest edition;

> *"1. proper noun, A community which is told to be rooted in India, living in various places of the world, Gypsy, Copt, Romani.*
>
> *2. proper noun, Somebody who isa member of this community.*

---

[7] *"9) Karakol amiri mıntıkasında emniyeti ihlal ve suç çıkarma istidadını gösteren amirlerle müessir surette mücadele edecektir. Bu mücadele de maksadın istihsali içinde aşağıda sıralanmış şahıs ve şeyler üzerinde gereken tedbirleri almak ve vazifeleri yapmak esastır.*
A) Şahıslarda:
1)Şüpheli ve sabıkalılar;
2)Serseri ve mazannaisu eşhasla dilenciler;
3)Her vasıtaya alet olmak istidadında bulunan mezcuplar,yarı veya tehlikesiz deliler;
4)Emniyet nezareti altında bulunanlarla ikamete memur olanlar ve mülteceler;
5)Esaslı bir mesleki olmayan çingeneler; ..."
See:
http://www.egm.gov.tr/hukuk/EMNIYET%20TESKILATINDA%20GORULEN%20IDARI%20DAVA%20KONULARI%20ILE%20BUNLARA%20ILISKIN%20MEVZUAT/MEMUR%20ISLEMLERI/POLISIN%20DISIPLINE%20MERASIM%20VE%20TOPLULUKTA%20VAZIFE.%20DAIR%20TALIMATNAME.htm

[8] *"çingene; cimri hasis,açgözlü ,arsız yüzsüz, hayasız, çığırtkan"*

Gypsy, Copt, Romani."[9]

Though there might be more descriptive ways for a glossary to define Romani, this change may still be accepted as the first step of acquisitions of the Romani organizational process in Turkey to reclaim the correct ways to represent the Gypsy.

On the other hand, some changes may also be seen on the legal codes by the same era. For example the Article 4 of the Act of Settlement which was on the run by 1934 and strongly discriminative could give us a sense to get official approach to Romani communities. According to the code, Romani communities were refrained to migrate to Turkey and accepted as citizens of Republic of Turkey;

> *"Article 4 - A: Those that are bound to the Turkish culture,*
> *B: The Anarchists*
> *C: Spies*
> *Ç: Traveler gypsies,*
> *D: Those have been deported out of the country, are not*
> *accepted in Turkey as migrants."*[10]

However this code has been part of the law which has rescinded by 2006. Such changes, apart from the above mentioned ones which are still standing there, might be received favorably. However it still makes us get officially that the Romani existence has been denied by the republican laws until early 21st century.

---

[9] *"1. özel, isim Hindistan'dan çıktıkları söylenen, dünyanın çeşitli yerlerinde yaşayan bir topluluk, Çingen, Kıpti, Roman ...*

2. özel Bu topluluktan olan kimse, Çingen, Kıpti, Roman"

[10] *"**Madde 4 -** A: Türk kültürüne bağlı olmıyanlar,*
B: Anarşistler,
C: Casuslar,
Ç: Göçebe çingeneler,
D: Memleket dışına çıkarılmış olanlar, Türkiye'ye muhacir olarak alınmazlar."
See: http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/554.html

The new regulations were not to accept the Romani existence but only to give up the discourse of insultation without giving an excuse for how it was until the change. There it would not be incorrect to argue that such changes are made according to the non-discrimination strategies of EU level policies. So that changes were quiet reluctant where it was not easy to observe social practices of such discourse.

However any legal regulation does not help Romani to emancipate from facing discriminatory attitudes in everyday life. Romani communities in Turkey face discrimination as a constant harassment like it is in anywhere else they live around the world.

4.2.2 Health Services

One can easily notice the social climate that these social and economical conditions produce in terms of the deprivation of Romani communities from access on health, social services which are besic right of all citizens. Most of the interviewees have underlined that the health services is the main ground where Romani experience discrimination because of their identity. The exclusion was mentioned by some Romani interviewees as a reason even to not to go to hospital any more. A young Romani man speaking about their access to health services has stated that;

> *"I don't go to a hospital without taken sick. Most of us would*
> *also not. Just in case of definite sickness, for example getting*
> *wounded or injured."[11]*

Some of the interviewees have indicated that they usually are obliged to force officials to have any proper service. Such force may often rise to perform even violence in order to receive a treatment;

---

[11] *"Hastalanmadan hastaneye gitmiyom. Bizden çoğu kişi gitmez. 4-4lük bi hastalık olduğunda da, ya birinin bi yeri kesilir ya da kanlı bıçaklı olunur, ancak o zaman."*

"They compulsorily consult when we go berserk and smash things out. This is what I know, nothing more."[12]

"They certainly find wanting. It is about loss of life for this side. … Since it is a matter of life, you become absolutely nervous and make a lot of noise. That's the way they take care. Otherwise they do not."[13]

Most of the population met was able to reach the health services throughout the *Green Card.*[14] Local health services in the neighborhoods were given by local clinics. For most of the interviewees, the obstetricians from the local clinics were the only officers they have met in their inhabitants; since, out of a population control policy, they are obliged to tour all houses to note down and follow up the childbirths.

Some of the interviewees have noticed that they often were alienated with an excuse of smelling badly and in some hospitals there noticed unofficially separate rooms for Romani patients. The mentioned insults are made not only by the health service providers but also by the Gadjo patients. An old woman was narrating her experience in the city hospital during the birth giving of her daughter-in-law. Her story was about how the Turkish patients, they used to share a room, have treated them and how she have dealt with the issue;

"Look I swear, I went to hospital for the birth of one of my

---

[12] *"Hastaneye gittiğinde camı çerveveyi kırdığında mecburen bakıyolar. Onu biliyom, başka bişey bilmiyom yani."*

[13] *Mutlaka bi eksik çıkarıyolar. Şimdi bu tarafta da can kaybı olduğu için. Elinden dökülecek olan bi bardak su değil. Olan bi can olduğu için insan mutlaka sinirli oluyo bağırıp çağırıyo. O zaman bakıyolar. Öbür türlü bakmıyolar yani.*

[14] *Yeşil Kart;* is a lisence given by Ministry of Health of Turkey for the citizens who is having no Social security and property for assistance to accessing health services by asking the patience to pay the 20 % of the service cost.

daughter-in-law was giving. Two peasant women were there.
I was taking care of my daughter. She suddenly said 'Oh! A
Gypsy woman! There are gypsies here.' And she is a peasant
woman. That's how she is called. I was in quiet frantic so I
did not care. Some other Turkish patients also say similar
things. But I did not care. She was giving her first birth. But
they have become 4-5 women in two days. I finally put;
"Look! You give a birth and I give it so. You take out a child
and I do so. What difference do we have? Don't remark me lie
that." She said me to not to take it personal. "I am a Gypsy" I
replied, "Why do you say such thing so? You come to hospital
and I do so. What difference do we have? We wear long and
put headscarf, we don't use lipsticks. What is the difference
between us? Look we have same hands and we have same
eyes. You give a birth and I do so."[15]

Romani communities deal with serious conditions of discrimination those may also provide lack of access to public services and social resources. Still it was observed that the communities have access to social aid by governmental Social Cooperation and Solidarity Foundations (SYDV)[16] even though it is limited. *The internal networks of the communities are building an organic public space,* in the

---

[15] *"Bak ben hastanede kuran çarpsın doğuma gittim. Benim gelinin birini, iyi dinle bak,. köylü karısı iki karı gelmişler bak. Ben gelinimi bakliyomm. 'Ay çingen karısı, çingenler var burda' deyoo. O da köylü karısı. Onun adı köylü karısı. Şimdi ben telaşeden pek umursamıyom. başka hastalar söyleyo bunu; türklerden. Şimdi ben de önemsemeyom tamam. Gelir mesela ilk doğum ediyo. Ama bi iki günde oldular dört beş karı. Aaha bak bööle dedim "sende uşak çıkarıyon ben de uşak çıkarıyom, ne farkımız vaa? Ne farkım vaa" dedim. "Bana ööle deme" dedim. "Sen üstüne alınma" dedi. "Ben çingenim" dedim. "Madem niye söylüyosun? Sen de hastaneye geldin ben de, ne farkımız var? Biz uzun geyiyoruz, başörtü gullanıyoruz, boya dudak boyası kullanmıyoruz" dedim. "Bi o farkımız var gızım senlen" dedim. "Senin bizden ne farkın var" dedim. Bak aynı ellerimiz vaa. Aynı gözlerimiz vaa. Aynı uşak çıkarıyon aynı uşak çıkarıyom."*

[16] Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Vakfı, is a governmental bureaucratic aid organization which is set in each province under the local governorships. The SYDV's are providing aid material in forms of nourishment, habiliment, fuelcoal or liquidity depending to the needs of the families determined by local neighborhood headmans.

sense Jürgen Habermas suggests, (Habermas, 1991) *which makes them aware of means of social support.* The communities can easily be informed about the pecuniary, victual and fuel aids throughout their internal networks. However the aid the foundations can provide is already very limited.

Still regarding the level of poverty, even some packets of nourishment can be received as an important input for the Romani families. However the irregularity of existing social supports is preventing them to put a structural contribution on resolving the problems. *Such irregularity of the accessed resources makes the communities to experiencing the indefiniteness more definitely.* Though being irregularly, Romani communities have partial access to the official social aids. An old woman speaking about the annually distributed social aids was briefing the conditions;

> *"Thanks god, we have received both 50 lira and 750 kgs of coal. ... Sometimes they refuse* [our demand application]. *Sometimes we receive assistance but sometimes they refuse it and we cannot receive anything. Last year we got nothing but this year we did."*[17]

There also are several discrimination cases against the communities on their access to social aids. A Romani man was complaining that the local SYDV officiers who were following the surname of the demanding people to find out if they are Romani or not and insult them because of it by blacklisting the names of Romani families.

> *"Sometimes they give aid material from the foundation* [SYDV]. *You should see what they say us. 'What is these* [mentioning his own surname]*, everywhere is full of them'*

---

[17] *"Şükür Allahıma hem 50 milyon aldık, 750 kilo kömür aldık. Kömürü o alıyo, erzakları alıyo. Bazı ret geliyo. Bazı alıyo; bazı da red geliyo alamıyoz. Geçen sene red gelmişti, alamadıydı. Ama bu sene aldık."*

they say."[18]

4.2.3 Labor Conditions

One of the main tactile outputs of the research, proving Yoors (2005)*,* was that the Romani communities, covering the lowest position at the social stratification, are mainly occupied by the works nobody would ever like to do. It was quite obvious that the most members of the Romani communities are making their livings out of informal economy or in economic relations which are not to be formalized by the states system. An old Romani woman who was making her life by waste parsing was defining how she spent her lifetime as follows;

> *"How have we arrived to this age? That's all about suffering.*
> *Sometimes we have begged, sometimes scrap dealt, sometimes*
> *we have ported, have worked on households. This is how we*
> *have spent our life times."*[19]

A huge portion of the Romani population is working in irregular working hours without social security and even without a proper definition of the work they do. A peddler interviewee was claiming that he used to work hard in selling whatever goods come along;

> *"We were peddling. We used to do seasonal works. I just do*
> *whatever it comes. For example I sell umbrellas when it is*
> *rainy. Such kind of seasonal works… Usually toys I do sell."*[20]

---

[18] *"Onlar yardım filan veriyolar bize vakıflardan. Git bi gör adam diyo yani 'ne bu* [kendi soyadını zikrederek] *yani. Her yer onlarla doldu' diyo."*

[19] *Bu yaşa nasıl geldik? İşte çeke çeke; yeri geldi dilendik,yeri geldi demir sattık, yeri geldi hamallık yaptık, ev işinde çalıştık. İşte böle; hayatımız bööle geçti.*

[20] *"işportacılık yapıyoduk. Mevsime göre iş yapıyoruz. Ööle elime ne gelirse yapıyorum. Örneği*

Acton and Marsh (2007) put the key element of Romani peoples as their abilities to use certain economical positions within the settled societies. However, as Eren (2008) states, transformation of the dominant economic organization of the society and the means of production within last two decades have invalidated traditional professions of Romani communities which were mainly noted down as forging, informal dentistry, basketry, and sievery. The knowledge of such crafts occupations traditionally made by Romani communities is mainly lost or turned out to be memories. The memories of an elderly woman interviewee from a blacksmith family was extracting the days when their artisanship was still fitting the economic organization of society;

> *"I of course do remember. We satisfy a need here then. … We*
> *namely were Blacksmiths. That's what we do. Where is the*
> *work to do? They already used to tell my father: "We have*
> *iron work to be done." Then we used to load the whole house*
> *onto donkeys and move there. We sometimes were sleeping in*
> *a room but sometimes were pitching a tent. Lay down on the*
> *grass like this. That was to work. The village mood is*
> *different. Our family was crowded. My sister was striking the*
> *iron. My father was working already. He was a competent.*
> *We used to carry coal. That was how we used to get by."*[21]

Therefore it might be argued that the general urban poverty which is on the rise within neoliberal economic regulation (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001) affects the

---

yağmurlu havalarda şemşiye satıyorum. O şekilde mevsime göre işler yapıyorum. Genelde çocuk oyuncağı üzerine düşüyorum."

[21] *"Hatırlıyom tabi.. Şimdi buranın işi bitiyo lazım olanı yapıyoz ediyoz..demirciyiz yani. Yapıyoz..hangi köyde iş var .. Filan köyde zaten söylüyolar işte babama ..demirimiz filan falan duruyo diye.. Yani her köyden haber geliyodu..bi gidiyodu babam gari.. Eşşeklere yükle söylemesi ayıp.. Evi doğru oaraya.. Ama odada yatıyoz bazı çadır koyuyosun.. Çimene böyle yatıyosun.. Çalışıyosun yani..köy hali daha başka oluyo ... şimdi bizim şey kalabalıktı..benim kızkardeşim cavıra tokmak vuruyodu.. Babam zati rahmetli çalışıyodu.. Ustaydı.. Biz kömür çekiyoduk..öyle idare ediyoduk."*

members of the Romani communities, who became to be disqualified, quite harshly. A young man briefing the most popular current occupations of the community in his neighborhood was complaining about the disqualification;

> *"Since they are not qualified, skilled labor they usually are self-employed. What may it be? It may be driver, if he has a driving license, they work in textile sector. Apart from these, portage and peddling they do. Well there is not job qualification generally self-employed and most of them are unemployed most youth are porters. Uncommonly they study. Only the brother in-law of a friend did. And he is working for a flower shop. Only he is."[22]*

The recent popular occupations within the Romani communities under such competitive circumstances today can only be the ones on the low scale such like garbage collection and partition, shoe shining, porterage, scrap dealing, begging, peddling, cleaning and musicianship. Besides wide-ranging temporal agricultural jobs there are also some local jobs noticed like fishing and rockhounding. Briefly, the members of Romani communities were taking any job that comes along.

Indefinitiveness of the job and the income can again be accepted as a constitutive feature of Romani identity. An old Romani woman, whose family works with their horses, was complaining about to none to be wiser about the income of her family and how they make do with their economic circle.

> *"Now my animals are gone for lugging pebbles for 30 liras. Look they are going to carry that much, is that fair to do carry 2 m² of pebble for 30. [My sons] will bagain and get it.*

---

[22] *"yetişmiş kalifiye eleman olmadıkları için genelde serbest meslek..ha ne olabilir bu? Ehliyeti varsa şöförlük, tekstil sektöründe çok fazla çalışıyolar, onun haricinde hamallık, seyyar satıcılık şey meslek olmadığı için genelde serbest çoğu da işsiz. Çoğu gençler mesela hamallık yapıyolar.. çok nadir okuyolar o da bir arkadasin kayıçosu var..o da çiçekçide çalışıyo bak.. o vardır.."*

One of them is smoking. He takes, and the other so, 10 liras.
Money must come, otherwise there is not. We don't know how
much is the mothly income? One would have it in a proper
job. If we could work regularly I would tell you how much it
is. But I can't tell it. There is no regular job. They have closed
the sandpit; there they have stopped hiring. They have started
it again recently. It had been months that the horses lie at
anchor. There is no greensward land to depasture them.
There we must buy litters to feed them but we buy it on credit.
We can pay it when we can work. So we are lieing them; we
convince. God bless them, we cannot go and pay. So, we
cannot work, there we cannot pay. They give it once but not
the second time.''²³

Though it may be argued that the life time of a Romani is being spent by all-time working, it can literally be argued that most members of the communities are unemployed or employed in unsecured occupations without any perceptions of future, where Wacquant (2008) would call *precariat* or *outcasts* whose economic activities accepted to be outlawed. The father of a peddler Romani family was briefing the un/employment conditions with his children and the problems they face in performing economic activities;

"I entreat to give me a job, I want to work. No. Now, I don't
want to lie, my children are begging. Sometimes they are
busted. The municipality or police arrest them. 'Why do you
beg?' they ask 'Isn't it forbidden?' 'But my brother we have

²³ *Şimdi benim hayvanlarım 30 milyona çakıl çekmeye gittiler. O kadar çakıl çekcekler ordan 30 milyon mu alınır. Bak iki metreden çakıl çekcekler. [Oğullarım] pazarlık edicek alıcaklar. Çocuğun biri sigara içiyo. O alır, öbürü alır 10 milyon. Gelicek, gelmezse yok. Aylık ne bilemeyoz yavrum. Çalışsak aylık o zaman oluyo. Devamlı çalışsak şu gelir oluyo deyosun onu da deyemeyom. Devamlı iş yok çalışameyoz. Kumluk yerleri kapattılar iş alımını durdurdula. Yeni yeni başladı. ...... Kaç aydan beri bizim atlar yatıyo orda. Çimene kosan çimen yok. Mecbur saman alıyoz veresiye. İş yapınca veriyoz ambara. Onlarda yalan sööleyoz kandırıyoz.Allah onlara bakmasın, gidemeyoz veremeyoz. Ee biz de gidemediğimize göre. Bi yol veriyo adam ikinciye vermeyo."*

no jobs, what should we do?' They of course call me when they arrest the kids. They don't set them free. 'And I say that I am looking for a job. Should we be starved? Should we pull a rob? What should we do? These kids should sell pens or tissues for a livelihood. I do also compulsorily sell beads and pens in summer. They [the city police] even come against it; 'you can't sell, you can't do! You must be having a shop' they say. This is theonly way to sell something. So what shall we do? We cannot do anything else. I have sought a lot. And I am still looking for it; something like a watchman service which can be suitable for my age. But there is no such thing. That's no possible. As I told you begging is illicite, you need a shop to retail. Here comes the summer how can I peddle? I go to Merzifon, Tokat district… one week here and another there. They do not let even it. Police come and say 'get off you stranger!' They don't let anymore. There we stay getaways. Is not there a fight for bread?"[24]

Then the father has kept on telling with accountancy of their income and expenditure. What such a *fight*, in his words, could make was not more than a poor livelihood.

> *"We stay one week there. If each of us brings 10 liras, we are*

---

[24] *"yalvarıyorum yaa..alın yani beni. Ben de çalışayım..yok..şu anda gene yalan konuşmamıza gerek yok çocuklar dileniyor..onu da yakalıyolar bazen. belediye yakalıyo, karakol yakalıyo..niye dileniyosun dilenme yasak diilmi ..ama kardeşim iş yok güç yok naapalım. yakaladıklarında tabiki beni çağırıyolar. Çocuğu yakaladıkları zaman bırakmıyolar. Ee bende diyorum kardeşim iş arıyorum. Aç mı kalalım hırsızlık mı yapalım soygun mu yapalım..ne yapalım.eee bu çocuk kalem satıcak selpak satıcak ta ev geçinicek..ben de tesbih kalem satıyorum yani yaz döneminde..: mecbur yapıyorum yani..ona bile karşı çıkılıyo yani. Satamazsın yapamazsın ille bi dükkanın olcakamış dükkanında satıcakmışsın. Ee nolcak napıcaz? başka bi iş yok yapamıyoruz artık yani çok aradım halen de aramaktayım..yani mesela yaşımıza uygun bi iş bekçilik gibi, ama yok yani. Mümkün diil az önce dediğim gibi dilenirsem yasak, satarsan kapalı yer olcak… çünkü havalar ısındı yanii.nasıl satışa çıkıcam mesela ..açılıyorum ben merzifon tokat taraflarına..yani bi hafta bi yerde, bi hafta bi yerde..onu da koymuyolar da polis geliyo kalk sen yabancısın..yani koymuyolar..artık kaçamak maçamak kalıyoruz yani. Ekmek kavgası mı yok?"*

4, there it makes 40 lira per diem. We share 20 of it and 20 we
set aside. If we stay one week we would buy gas for20 lira. So
we get 100 there and 100 here and try a livelihood."[25]

One observing a Romani neighborhood shortly can easily notice the high affection on music and dance. Music and dances are also has an important place in Romani cultural space. Romani musicians in different parts of the country perform different musical instruments. For example the Rom communities mostly play clarinet, violin and darbuka where the Dom plays rebab, baldric drums and shrill pipes. The streets of the settlements are mainly functioning like conservatories, which are not conservative. Most children get in touch with musicianship at early ages. There, musicianship is also a common way to make a living. Moreover, one can also argue that any musical form marking the Gadjo community is performed by the Romani musicians of their region. There that is likely to say that Romani is the musician of the surrounding communities.

However, musicianship provides no widespread economic opportunity as a profession. Few Roma can meet regular job opportunities out of musicianship. Besides some restaurants and clubs with alcohol, of which are not that common especially in provincial Turkey, they perform as musicians and dancers in the weddings which are mostly happening temporarily in the summertime, between May and October. A traveler musician telling about him and his musician friends was emphasizing that being a musician gives them a chance to travel and vary the range of jobs they could do.

"The ones I know usually work on seasonal jobs. For example
they may work in the plantations in Nevşehir *in summetime.*
When they are done with it they may move to Kayseri *to play*

---

[25] *"Bir hafta kalıyoz işte. Onar milyondan gelse, 10 bin liradan gelse yani, 4 kişi napar 40 bin lira, ya bunun 20 size 20si kenara kalır yani. Bir hafta kalsak orda, 20 milyonluk tüp alsan..yani 100 bi yerde alsan 100 bi yerde alsan geçimimizi sağlamaya çalışıyoruz yani."*

drums in the Ramadan."[26]

Moreover, most of the jobs taken by Romani communities are high risk ones. For example, in Zonguldak, a mining city on the Black sea region, most of the workers in the illegal mines are composed of members of Romani communities. Such coalmines are far from holding healthy working conditions and there several members of Romani communities get injured or even lose their lives out of mine failures.

Despite covering high-risk jobs, the rate of having a social security within the Romani populations is also quite low. In most neighborhoods, noone from the community is working in a regular job with social security. Though, there might be some workplaces for employment around, it was often argued that none of the employers wants to employ a Romani as a worker. Moreover, there underlined some obvious cases of discrimination such like one of the interviewees who had been fired from his job in a big shopping mall just besides the neighborhood, whenever his chief learns the neighborhood he lives.

On the other hand, one can easily claim that the living conditions of the communities are making the poverty, social exclusion and indefiniteness of life, which may be accepted as a result of the former two, visible. Moreover the common connivance about such conditions has defined Romani as taboo, the wild ones, and the people of execration and of whom one should avoid and there put the communities out of social networks including economic ones. A Romani man complaining about the officers who were kicking him out from the governor house in his city where he usually stops to demand income support has claimed that;

> *"They* [governorship officiers] *advice me to go and sell meatballs. I already am excluded here. Your citizens consider me as second-class or even third class of human throughout*

---

[26] "*Benim bildiklerim genelde mevsimlik iş yapıyolar. Mesela diyelim Nevşehir'de tarlada şey yapıyolar işte yazın. O tarla bitti ordan Kayseri'ye ramazanda davul çalıyolar.*"

these eyes. Who is going to buy meatballs from me; since, I
am a Gypsy. So I should hire a 'clean human being' and
gonna say him 'here my friend, this is my stand, you put your
capital and you make yoru lifeout of it and I will so.' ... He
would not even come near to me, how comes to my stand.
How can he work with my stand and I make a lifeout of it.
Such a human being would never come next to me."[27]

4.2.4 Education; a Place of Distrust

That would not be unusual to claiming the low rates of schooling within the Romani communities. It may be argued that education does not cover an important agenda within communities met. Most of the Romanies met who used to be called as "educated" were the ones who could meet with primary school for few years and learnt how to read and write. Arguing about his knowledge on literacy, a Romani man without a proper job was underlining his low expectations about reading and writing;

"Nobody took care of us. We were working then of course. It
was not confronted. It was left over. I learned [literacy] by
myself. That's enough for me."[28]

The neoliberal argument puts that the low qualified labor conditions the

---

[27] *"git köfte sat diyor bana ... burda zaten ben dışlanıyorum yaa. Vatandaşların tarafında..ikinci sınıf üçüncü sınıf insan olarak görülüyorum ben gözlerden..çingen diye benden roman diye kim köfte alır benden..ha ben şimdi tutucam dicem ki yav temiz bi insan bulcam ,aha arkadaş araba benden.. sermayede senden..sen de ekmek ye ben de ekmek yiyim dicem..deyil arabama zaten bana yanaşmıyo ki arabama yanaşsın..arabamla dolaşsın onun sayesinde ben ekmek yiyim..bööle insan zaten bana yanaşmaz ki yaa."*

[28] *"Bakan yok. O zaman da çalışıyoz tabi. Üstüne gidilmedi. Öyle kaldı. Kendim öğrendim ben. Bana yetiyo."*

communities have is out of low educational facilities the communities have (WB, 200). However the contrary was a stronger observation the research made. One might argue the main reason of non-schooling as poverty. A woman who was making the livelihood her family by collecting paper from the garbage with her children was putting the fundamentals of impossiblity to schooling her children as economic incapabilities;

> "I push Hüseyin to study. He goes to the school across. But I cannot afford the others. If I buy a pair of shoe, I cannot afford socks. But if I buy a pair of socks there I cannot afford shoes. I must also buy a bag. Therefore I cannot make the others study. I just can afford one of them. Hard situation! But it is also possible by the support of my neighbors. They have supplied his school bag and clothes. Otherwise that wouldn't also be possible. ... Why wouldn't I make them study if I was having money? I would school them all. I don't want them to be ignorant. The boys will go to military soon. My 10 years old daughter is crying. She cries 'mom let me go to school! Mom let me go to school!' But missing. She needs uniform, panty-hoses. How can I afford it? I just could collect [papers] till evening."[29]

Moreover, the few Romani who has a regular job and there access to economic and social opportunities may shift to middle class life style especially on giving importance to schooling their children as a practice of the belief on the idea of progress. However even though believeing such phantasm, parents who had no

---

[29] *"Hüseyin'i okutuyorum. Şeyde karşıda bizim karşımızda okulda okutuyom onu. Ötekileri okutturamıyom, para yok. Ayakkabısını alsam çorabını alamıyom, çorabını alsam ayakkabısını alamıyom. Çantası öyle. Diğerlerini okutturamıyom işte. Bi tanesini okutuyom. Zor durum. Onu da komşular yardım ediyo valla. Çantasını komşular vedi, önlüğünü komşular vedi. Öyle olmasa yok. ... Param olsa niye okutmayım? Hepsini okuturum. Cahil kalmasınlar yarın askere gitcekler, oğlan çocukları. Kız çocukları, benim bi kızım var 10 yaşında, okul diye ağlayo. 'okula gideyim anne, okula gideyim anne!' Yok ki. Önlük lazım, kilotlu çorabı lazım. Neylen alıyım ona? Akşama kadar toplayom."*

chance to meet the benefits of definite working conditions have usually no chance also to schooling their children. An unemployed Romani man was complaining about his distance with proper working conditions as a reason for his children to not to have an educational life;

> "I wish I was working for a governmental agency. In that
> case my children would be going to school. But unfortunately
> the doors of the state were always closed for me. If I were
> working they would be studying. Unfortunately they have
> never sat on a school desk. It keeps on going like this."[30]

I have met only few Romani university students during the research. Most of whose parents were occupying regular jobs pushed and supported them to study. One of the interviewees of whom was a university student was putting that the educational facilities and there the ability to deal with the state apparatus is quite weak within the communities and vice versa. He was therefore exposing a middle class belief to move up the social ladder by education;

> "If a child living in a beautiful housing can go to private
> teaching institutions and have a good formation, this is
> neither a shame of our neighborhood nor of the Romani kids
> in our neighborhood nor the non-Roma kids and their
> families. This is only possible by education. There is big
> difference on education."[31]

The low economic conditions mostly end up with working children. All family

---

[30] *"Keşke ben devlet müessesesinde çalışır olsaydım. Şimdiye kadar benim çoluk çocuğum okulun sırasına otururdu okumuş olurlardı..ama maalesef bi devlet kapısı bana açılmadı.. ben çalışır olsaydım çocuklarım okumuş olcaktı..çocuklarımda maalesef sıraya oturmuşlukları dahi yok...bu şekilde de halen devam ediyor.."*

[31] *"Bugün bir sitede bir çocuk tutup da güzel dershaneye gidip de bir şekil alabiliyorsa bu bizim mahallemizin, mahallemizdeki roman çocuklarının, diğer roman olmayan insanlar onların ailelerinin ayıbı değildir. Bu eğitimle olan bir şeydir. Eğitim olarak çok fark var."*

members, including the children, pair up the load of gaining domestic income. Providing livelihood becomes practically more important than, there prior to, dreaming a future to have an income. A mother who works for waste parsing was explaining why her children were not studying by their necessities to work in order to cover a living as a common charge of Romani kids. She was able to school one of the five children she had;

> *"They work how they can study? Just this one, when he comes*
> *back from school he just leaves his bag and takes the barrow*
> *and goes fortwith to garbage [to work]."[32]*

On the other hand, excluding few examples, most of the teachers interviewed were quite hopeless about educating the Romani pupils. Such argument could go as racist as accusing the communities by being essentially ignorant. One of the teachers interviewed was complaining about the economic situation and the lifestyles of the Romani parents by accusing them by not to paying any importance for schooling their children depending on the widespread stereotypes of Romani;

> *"The kids come to school without proper clothing. We provide*
> *them uniforms and new shoes but you can see the pupil*
> *coming to school again without putting those shoes. They [the*
> *Romani families] sell the new shoes and buy drinks with that*
> *money. They are like this. We don't know what to do."[33]*

However I have not met many Romani parents who did not want to school her/his kid. On the contrary most of the parents were also complaining about their loss of education. One of the interviewees, who was a shoeshiner on the street, was putting a good example of such complaint;

---

[32] *"Çalışıyolar da nerde okuyolar? O da okuldan çıktı mı atıyo çantayı, alıyo el arabasını doğru çöplere."*

[33] *"Cocuklar okula geliyorlar, ustlerinde baslarinda bir sey yok. Onluklerini, ayakkabilarini veriyoruz ama ertesi gun bir bakiyorsun cocuk yine ayakkabisiz gelmis. Aileler ayakkabiyi satip parasiyla icki aliyorlar. Bunlar boyleler. Ne yapacagimizi bilmiyoruz."*

"[I am] mainly analphabetic; just like a child. You read
newspapers and learn everything. But I cannot do it. I know
nothing. The most I could learn is out of tv."[34]

Moreover, the main reason of low schoolin rates was mostly put as the racial
discriminations that can be faced in the schools. Explaining why he did not
have an educational life, a young Romani man has complaint about
discriminative conditions of schools as he was refused by cheap excuses.

"I have never been [to school]. My mother took me there. She
was in the city center. But there were no seats available.
There were another school in this district; she then wanted to
register me here."[35]

Therefore the main reason met about the issue was the social barriers to access to
formal education. The abasement the Romani people face at the schools is also
stated as a strong reason to be distant to educational system. Momentarily instances
might easily be ending up with serious results as well as interruption on education.
Another young Romani man telling his story with his teacher was still carrying the
rage against being denigrated;

"The teacher has spent me a single word. I felt it beneath to
hear. I quit the school. He told me Gypsy, my brother. That
was offending; that word. Then I was openly reviling against
the teacher each time I see him. For example I had to go to
school again to getting driving license. I told him just like
that: 'you will give my diploma.' He said 'ok, I will give your

---

[34] *"Cahilsin kafadan. Cahillik bu, çocuk gibisin. Sen gaste okuyosun, gaste okuyosun, sen herşeyi öğreniyosun. E ben öğrenemiyorum, bişey bilmiyom. Anca şunu bunu televizyondan alabiliyorum yani."*

[35] *"Ben hiç gitmedim. Benim annem çocukken götürüyo ki beni… Annem çarşıdaydı, çarşıdaki okula müracaat ettik, yer kalmamış. Bu tarafta bi okul daha vardı, oraya vericekti."*

diploma.' We have raken over the coals. He said 'I haven't

spent such word to you." I told him 'you were beating me

each day." We have cross sword with him. I told him that he

defraud me. .. I saw him last day lately. I was driving a car.

There happened a conflict. I drove the car onto him. He had

run away. Otherwise I would cruch him. I am still irritated of

the teacher wherever I see him."[36]

Though such exclusion practices are not always out of personal sensibilities but can also be in a systematical order. Such systematical discrimination, which may occur especially in the schools where Romani children studies with Gadjo pupils, is often stated as the main reason to not to study. A father who is a flower seller has put the reason for his kids to not to study as protecting them from the insulting behaviors they used to meet in the school;

"They separate. They parade them into align and the Gadjo

into another."[37]

As discrimination can come out of school administrations it can also be faced through Gadjo parents. It was usually mentioned that most Gadjo parents do not want their children to be friends with Romani kids. Many Romani parents receive education as a privilege for Gadjo communities. There, some of the interviewees have refered schooling as impossibility for Romani children. Another interviewee was explaining the schools as spaces stigmatized by Gadjo for the Gadjo children

---

[36] *"öğretmen bana bi kelime dedi. O kelimeyi gururuma yitiremedim. Okulu bıraktım. çingene dedi abi bana..o gücüme gitti..o kelime ..her gördüğümde de öğretmene resmen küfrederdim. Mesela ehliyet için mecburen okula gitmek zorunda kaldım. Dedim bana diplomamı verceksin , aynen bööle, tamamdedi veririm senin diplomanı , bi daha da eski defterleri açtık tabi..ben sana dedi ööle bişi demedim. Dedim yaa sen beni hergün dövüyodun, ediyodun bilmemne..orda biraz ağız davuluna girdik. Benim hakkımı sen yedin dedim..geçen gün gördüm. Arabayla gördüm ben de araba kullanıyodum. Bi şey oldu anlaşmazlık oldu. Üstüne doğru yürüdüm arabayla kaçtı, kaçmasaydı ezecektim. Öğretmene hala gıcığım nerde görürsem göriim."*

[37] *"Ayırıyolar. Şimdi onları bi sıraya koyuyolar. Gebenleri bi sıraya koyuyolar."*

and impossibility of such derogatory system to include Romani pupils;

> *"Our people are the half of 72½ peoples. This Turkish people send their kids to kindergartens, educate, and send the courses.not only private teaching institutions but also additional studies they have. We also have asked for additional studies. They don't want to send their chidren there. It is better spent your minutes by collecting papers rather than having studies. They manipulate the psychology of the students. They already are student. No student wants to study. I will already not let my child study."[38]*

On the other hand, being forced to work and marry at early ages, as economical survival strategies, have became to be the only choice for most teenaged Romani who already are excluded from educational system. Especially a strong tendency on not to school female children has often observed. The reason for this was usually explained again with the distrust over the educational system. The families think that there is no chance for especially a Romani girl to have a proper position within the society. Besides facing any kind of racial discrimination, sexual harassment is also stated as a serious problem the Roman girls do face in the schools. A Romani man speaking about schooling the Romani girls has put that;

> *"They [the Romani] don't let the girls to study. Why not? Since we are keen on the purity of our girls; that's why. Therefore we don't want them to get harmed."[39]*

---

[38] *"Bizim millet işte iki buçuk millet. Yav! bunlar türk milleti anaokuluna verirler işte, yetiştirirler, kursa göndeririler. Dershaneler gitmeseler dahi örtmenleri bazen etüt verirler. İşte biz istedik etütü. Oraya göndermek istemezler. Orada geçireceğin bir dakika etüdü, karton topla daha iyi. Öğrencilerin psikolojisine giriyorlar bunlar. Ya öğrencileri zaten kim olsa istemez zaten. Nasılsa okutmayacak ben."*

[39] *"Okutmuyolar. Niye okutmuyorlar? E kardeşim bakıyolar ee benim kızın namusa çok düşkünüz. O yüzden yani zarar gelmesin şu olmasın bu olmasın."*

Moreover even though some of the Romani kids do study, it can easily be observed that most of the pupils have no private space at their home to study. Speaking proudly about her son who is successful in his studies, a Romani woman was explaining the domestic conditions for her son to study;

> *"No! He has not a private room. We all already live in one room and the children as well. Eating and drinking are all in one room. We are not that separated."[40]*

4.3 Affects on Meeting *Gadjo*

There it may be argued that the Romani communities are out of the civic social, economic and cultural life and there besides they cannot even utilize the basic democratic and legal rights arising out of citizenship, it is also hardly to take an equal communication between a Gadjo and a Romani.

Such widespread behavioral patterns push the Romani to not to take social norms seriously as a social existence strategy. Standing out of regular jobs can also be a justified as a strategy not to face any assult.

> *"I don't also have social security but when you work for Gadjo they pay you 300-400 liras of fee. Moreover you have to put up with them I would rather shoeshine on the streets. It would make 300 if I polish 10 shoes a day. Then I play my own game and keep on going."[41]*

---

[40] *Yok. Kendi odası yok. Hep bi arada oturuyoz zaten. Çoluk çocuk, hep bi odada duruluyo. Hep yani yeme içme bi odada oluyo. Ööle ayrı ayrı komayız.*

[41] *"benim de sigortam yok da şimdi adamlarla çalışıyosun orda da 300-400 milyon maaş veriyolar adamların sabahtan akşama kadar kahrını çekiyosun. Yapacama alırım boya sandığımı elime günde 10 çift ayakkabı boyarım yapar ayda 300 milyon. Kendi işimi kendim paslarım. Devam anam devam."*

The members of the communities who are subjected to harsh poverty and intolerant discrimination are obviously excluded virtually from most sectors of public ground. Such exclusion is not only working by Gadjo hand pushing Roma out of the social networks but also by Roma self-effacing from the Gadjo environment which is brutal against Roma.

Members of the Romani communities who even have the chance to access higher educational studies and to "integrate" with the greater community are also continuously facing serious problems to express their identity freely in their social environment. Aksu (2003) and Dinler (2011) have stated various examples of such occasions.

This have to do mainly about basic stereotyping of the Gadjo for the negative Romani image which also strongly define the gaze of Roma accordingly. A young Romani man of whom we were speaking about being a Roma was complaining about how Gadjo see Roma. That was quite surprising for me when I have noticed that the Romani identity was usually placed against an imagined gaze of Gadjo; just like Fanon used to warn (2008) in case of women of color against white man, rooting such affect at the black man's being a former slave;

> *"Do you know how they know us; gypsy, mess. Namely you*
> *can find it wherever a trouble is wherever thievery is; that's*
> *the gypsies who do it. This is the way* [they believe].
> *Therefore, they don't like us, since they don't like mess.*
> *Trustworthy there is no such thing. ... The Gypsies, for lack of*
> *a better word, are people who are extraordinarily… Well! I*
> *swear, just human to wit."*[42]

---

[42] *"Bizi nasıl bilir biliyo musun onlar; çingen, pislik. Yani nerde olay varsa orda bulunur, nerde hırsızlık varsa çingenler yapar. Yani bu şekilde. O yüzden sevmezler pisliği sevmezler yani. Harbi hiç alakası bile yok. ... Çingenler, nasıl diyim sana yaa! Türkiye'de, yemin ederim, bulunmayacak kadar şey bir insan… Yemin ederim bir insan yani."*

Most community members who face discrimination and grown up with discrimination stories were not feel like to express their Romani identity in the Gadjo environments. Moreover, to be exposed such a recessive social conditions brings tactical role plays for most Romani interviewees where they perform their everyday life as if they were Gadjo. What such a performance can produce is only to sharpen the intenseness of discrimination. That is to say the social relations within the surrounding community were set in front of an imagined Gadjo gaze which is proper and on a higher status. A Romani man working in a grocery stand was quite displeased about such condition;

> "That is such an understanding which sizes you up
> throughout your money. That's the character they have; such
> a fallacy... They take a look at the neighborhood and see the
> children naked or they consider us trafficking women. That's
> why I shelter my gypsy being. I do not directly say that I am a
> gypsy. I say it indirectly, softly my brother. But I do not hide it
> as might be required. For example everybody in the market
> place knows that I am a Gypsy."[43]

> "For example when I go to city center with my family, one in
> a thusand, one can see the meat kebap cooked there. So sorry
> but I am a man, If I really desire it, [I can notice that] the
> woman has desires too. My daughter can be with us or my
> son. They also desire the meat of course."[44]

A strong domestic law runs within the communities, which is mainly based on

---

[43] *"öyle de bi kafa ki seni paranla tartar..o karatere sahip; yanlış… bakıyo ki mahallede çocuklar çıplak gezerken görüyo. Veya karı satıyo bilmem ne yapıyo gözüyle bakıyolar. O yüzden ben çingen olduğumu saklarım. Yani ben çingenim demem. Dolaylı yollardan yumuşatarak anlatarak damardan girerek söylerim kardeşim. ha gerektği yerde sakınmam. Halde mesela herkes çingene olduğumu bilir."*

[44] *"Mesela binde bir ailemle çarşıya gittiğimde orda afedersin döner yapılıyo..ben erkekim , şöyle af buyur..benim canım çekmişse..kadının hayde hayde çeker..kızım olur yanımda çocuğumun olur..ee benim canım çakiyosa ailemin kızımın oğlumun torunumu elbette çeker."*

respect. For example, in case of death of a member of the *Orom* communities in Zonguldak, the community brings the body of the dead one to the house where s/he used to live. They make the body spend her/his last night in the house. The rest of the community burns big fires in front of the house of the dead Romani, gathers around these fires telling each other their memories about the one who left the community and waits until the day appears. The ceremony and burying happens the next day the incident appears.

However these ceremonials coming out of respect to their neighbors they lost is quite distorted by the surrounding communities again. There is a strong belief within the surrounding Gadjo communities about the cannibalism of the *Orom*s claiming that the Romani eats the bodies of dead community members. This is a Gadjo belief and the way the Romani communities are disturbed out of such gossip is underlined many times by number of interviewees and they strongly claimed that such disinformation is coming out of ignorance of the Gadjo about cultural practices of the Romani communities. There listened several mythical stories about it.

> *"And I want to mention another important issue. I met it several times in the military. They said that the one who sleeps with a Gypsy should have a bath with the water which is boiled on a firebrick. The only way to purify one's body is to boil the bath water until the fire brick melts. ... Moreover they also asked me if we do eat our dead bodies. Some backward people say that the Romanies bury the dead human bodies on the ground floor of our houses and eat them. Please illuminate this issue, there is no such thing within our communities."*[45]

---

[45] *"ha bi de en önemli konuyu ben sana söyliyim bak. Asker ocağında benim başıma çok geldi bak.. dediler ki çingenle yatan adam dışardaki teneke varya bak mantığa bak tenekedeki suyu ateş tuğlası derlermiş o tuğla yanıncaya eriyinceye kadar o su kaynicakmış. Yoksa o çingenle yatan adamın cenabetliği çıkmazmış. ... Hatta bana dediler ki siz ya ölünüzü mü yiyosunuz falan gömüyolarmış*

This short example was a strong one about the myths about the communities I have met. That was also making the distance taken against the communities clear.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the loss of provided services on the social concerns of the communities is out of misrecognition of the distinctive features of the communities by these policies. Existing moral barriers in front of the communities to reach existing social opportunities and loss of comprehensive social policies, for example in education or poverty, causes with pushing the children to work for their families and to have no relation with official institutions. Such circles reproduce discrimination and poverty again and once again.

The existing circumstances are deepening these social and economical conditions, where poverty and intolerance harden for Romani communities. There, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that the Romani have the weakest facilities to deal with the global cultural environment which is also covering the communities. Subsequently, the only chance for Romani people to break the very dynamics of this unfair relationship and defend their basic rights was to get organized and to be visible to remove the prejudices about being Romani by carrying rights based advocacy.

---

evinin altına bak bu da var. öyle diyolar yani bazı geri kalmış insanlar evin altına gömüp etini yiyolarmış diyolar çingenler için ya da romanlar için. Yani onu iyi aydınlat bizde kesinlikle öyle bişi yok."

CHAPTER 5

FORCED "BENEFICIARIES" OF URBAN TRANSFORMATION

As David Harvey (1988) put that the symbolical regulations of space and time provides an important frame for experience, for us to learn who or what in the society we are, an exploration of the dynamics of changing spatial positioning of the Romani settlements and the how inhabitants have experienced such regulation of their life spaces would provide an important opportunity to examine the effects of globalization over the local communities in such a frame.

Therefore this section intends to examine the conditions of spatial transformation in relation to its neoliberal impact on urban space. The main arguement to put is that the urban transformation implementations are practices of force of the rulers onto the weaker populations starting from the weakest. Therefore the Romani neighborhoods are often the first quartiers to be demolished. The only choice the Romani populations given are to settle in a Gadjo housing or to leave the urban space out and get lost.

5.1 City and Impact of Neoliberalism

As Ibn Khaldun (1989) put in his quite early work by 15th century, cities are simply the place where human crowd live together. Therefore as being the most important field for making of *the social*, the forms the cities take by make cultural tendencies of the lives going inside readable. Such an argument can be grounded by following

the path which Harvey puts again (2009) for an explanation of spatial forms which are not to be accepted as apathetical objects where social processes taking place inside but they are to be seen as the things which include social processes in the same manner how these processes are spatial. So one can easily claim that the construction of the city (urban space) is also the construction of citizen (urbanite) there the *place* itself provides a frame to make the ideological clashes visible.

Indeed keeping in mind that since Le Corbusier the cities are products of geographical imagination of *modern* regional planning, defining the urban transformation activities taking place on the third phase of development, one can argue about the neoliberal global capitalism conducting the world today by its ideological hegemony throughout reading its traces on the urban space. Idealizing and monolizing the values of *good*, *right* and *beautiful,* of which are expectedly to be multiple for each human being, capitalism provides no external right for critical alternate experiences and force the individual agents for an integration throughout taking the imposed forms. The rest who is out of these acceptable forms and practices either tamed and integrated or dismissed but surely suppressed.

Explaining the rapid transformation within last 10 years, which Istanbul was subjected to, Keyder (2000) put the change of the rulers of the production relations from national capital to multinationals as the main reason of this transformation in the city. As a principle of global economy, the ruling multinational companies of the world had always been operated on a flexible ground, as they always are ready to move their investments from one country to another. The governments who want to keep these investments operating inside their national borders are obliged to providing more suitable conditions to hook this new form of production up. Therefore, the cities, where the productive forces settle, are being reshaped through the demands of postindustrial global capitalism. Consequently, to better serve the rules of this new era, Istanbul, where the research of this disertation has largely run, also had to be packed as a *global city* where the transnational investments could comfortably stand.

83

The accumulated capital and the high professionals of the neoliberal economy, which have settled onto their thrones comfortably by the '80s, are today in need of a different design of the cities which are to be structured throughout similarizing the constituting elements of life. Accordingly what we meet today, as urban transformation projects are basically operations of the rulers to reportioning the urban space out. This class, which is controlling the economic and political power, does not hesitate to perform on the land ignoring the life spaces of the rest who are out of this circle on reforming the city. There, for the sake of "beautiful" cities, the house of the weaker is being demolished and the people are forced to migration and housing within conditions of these new forms dictated.

Just like Smith (2002) defining urban transformation implementations as basically the re-division of the land by the ruling class and made without covering the people who are subjected to them, the major plans of the cities are being changed in order to cover the needs and desires of the hegemonic ideology. There the urban poor is pushed to participate even difficultly to the cheap in-law labor mass to join the city by taking lives in the newly defined ghettos but of course kicked out of the decision making process about this redesign of the urban space. There, urban transformation implementations are enclosing the valuable parts of the cities to the use of the urban poor, including the Romani communities.

The society of *surveillance,* as Michel Foucault (1975) put its definition to cover the dynamics of the social organization of highly developed late capitalism, is in need of proper iconography of street settling and house numbering to keep up the control over populations. Even though the people do not really need such encoding, the main motivation of such urban design is basically working to getting rid of *slums* where the urban poor are concentrated and control over the population is getting almost lost. There it was basically to regulate the urban poor by the social housing, which is to keep the control over the population as sub par labor forces.

As Mike Davis (2006) defines clearly, the only way for new urban poor to locate in the city was the slums. *Gecekondu* was how the slums were called in slang of

Turkish language. The word is signifying a particular architectural form emerged by late 1960s to cover the housing needs of rapid population movement into the cities, which has appeared out of rural poverty and promising industrialization in the western cities. *Gecekondu* settlements were on one hand at least offering a resistance focus for this newly urbanized crowd against the hegemonic economical perception of the cities and providing a space out of the control apparatus of capitalism for those being off the books. On the other hand they were architecturally representing a symbolic uprise against the planning ideology. The former was about being illicit both out of the accounting system as a tax-free economic product and of the population administration system by providing the ones living inside the space to do it out of census registrations where the latter was more about the imagination of life which is more an epistemological question.

What mainstream modern architecture can offer as a discipline is first to imagine *the life* to spend in the dwelling as a whole and than later to build the house throughout its function that is designed to perform such imagination inside. By offering a bedroom, a kitchen, a bathroom and a living room it pedantically dictates how a human life should be by telling the inhabitants where to sleep, where to cook, where to wash hands and therefore what the standards of a life are. So the house built in such approach is *deductively* designs the whole life set.

However in the slums, in *Gecekondu* system, the people have started to build their houses by themselves without a systematical knowledge of what a modern life is but with an organic approach rooted on their needs and conditions. To make it clear, on the way a gecekondu was built, first only one room was built just to dwell. The toilets were mainly external houses for the common use of multiple households without proper sanitary sewerages. But then according to the growth on the economic accumulation and domestic population the next rooms were attached one by one until the house was reaching the borders of the next one. This way of building a house was valid for almost all gecekondu form of houses. They were usually formed as 'much' as the topography and the aesthetic and material means

controlled by the household let. The final forms of the houses were totally *inductive*.

Such an architectural form was quite popular from 1960s and '80s for broad settlements. It still is partly visible also in most of the Romani neighborhoods where the wall of a house might be reinforced by a tinplate and the roofing so by a used tyre. In such form, the materials used and their execution were always as much as the life as it is. There the traces of the history of the neighborhood are dressed onto the architectural form. A diversity of colors and shapes does enrich the presence of the neighborhood and provides a personal space to perform one's aesthetic likings onto her/his house. One could even propose from a multiculturalist perspective of global trend of urban planning to preserve such neighborhoods as a popular organic architectural form if its particular age.

However this architectural form was not fit for the requirements of neoliberal era where any human need including water and health services are left for the initiative of free market conditions. As a trend of this third phase of development the state apparatus is grown weaker and public rights and services are defined as economical sectors. Therefore the *right to cities* (Harvey, 2008) is been commodified too not only in the discourse level but also on the market conditions where the gecekondus would cost higher parcels of land and labor expenses unless they were not kept under control.

The popular forms of this new era were surely depending on the main principle of the free market, maximization of the profit. So the building trends have started to go through constructing massive buildings where highest number of population can be settled on the lowest portion of the land was working as the formula of making highest profit in the sector. Such implementations are being run both by individual entrepreneurs who are operating on the commercial bases and there may represent this ruling ideology in-itself as well as run by the governmental organization of social housing (TOKI).

TOKI is the governmental organization for housing in Turkey. It is not only but

86

mainly working for building social housing projects. In its system of social housing, which is likely to be seen also in many countries today, tall monotype buildings are built besides the cities and the citizens who would like to have a house in the system are taken into long-term mortgage credit payment. Being the institutional performer of housing policies of the political power apparatus, TOKI also is operating under hegemony of finance capital and of course depending on commercial trends of uniformed imagination of contemporary life. Though being a governmental institution, the physical works are subcontracted to private companies to run construction works or to promote the imagination of lives in these new trendy houses for the *public* market.

On the other hand such a tendency would give an opportunity for the rulers to get rid of irregular settlements which are providing spaces to perform lives out of institutional social control and also pretended to be old fashioned and *ugly* by the aesthetic trends of neoliberal argument. Paralelly the poor gecekondu neighborhoods of the cities have started to be demolished one after the other to force the population to get settled in this new system and provide an opportunity for the estate speculators to occupy the lands remaining from the old neighborhoods. As Harvey (2007) put again, this trend also has something to do with serving the rulers who desire to reclaim the city centers where they have left to be collapsed by 1980s.

Today, with the lateral spreading of the cities, the land of neighborhoods including even the ones built by the outskirts of the city have transformed to become very strategic. So the land of a neighborhood may easily be a preferable area for the multinational companies to set their quarters or for their proffessionals to settle. This interest has been caused a rapid decline of the land value and made the poor neighborhoods, which are having no means to preserve their appearence, one of the target areas of urban transformation implementations especially in the city of Istanbul. Having a short tour in for example Kucukbakkalkoy, a recently demolished Romani neighborhood in Istanbul, today one easily can observe the tall skyscrapers mounting between the remains of demolished dwellings around.

That is to say, the impacts of neoliberal policies on the run are visible throughout its traces on the urban space. The certain outcome of such policies has been the changing dynamics of the land value in favor of the ruling class. Within this rapid spreading of the urban land, most of the Romani neighborhoods which were settled besides city centers became to having more central locations there prior targets for gentrification operations.

5.2 Impact of Urban Transformation on Romani Communities

The urban transformation implementations are there to regulate the cities through the needs of global capitalism. Being the weakest sect of the society Romani communities have been the first victims of the process. The interest of the ruling class does not cover the sensitivity on the lives of weaker communities who never had the chance to access to the fruits of the neoliberal imagination and defend their rights to be housed. Evaluating today, all the interviewees who are subjected to these implementations were agreed on the argument about their lives to being relapse.

Regarding cases of urban transformation in Romani neighborhoods I have focused on history of these neighborhoods, basic locational characteristics, variety of inhabitant communities, the changes in the city in general, how the Romani communities informed about the process, how they receive this, was there a common opinion within the communities about the transformation process, how the demolishment have performed, what was offered as compensation, who were the main actors of the transformation and the situation of the day as the main issues to explore in order to underline and provide material to analyze the effects of urban transformation implementations that the inhabitants of the area are been faced.

Having a close up on the primarily gentrified quarters, one can easily observe that most of these locations are close to the city centers or where the finance capital

concentrates and there the land can be more easily converted to high amounts of rents. There the change on the ownership of these lands in favor of *developed* classes as a priority was also about the rules of the neoliberal game where the power is performed over the weaker.

5.3.1 "Cleaning" the City

Urban transformation in Turkey is a centrally imposed process. The Municipality Law, which was accepted at 2005, was asking the municipalities to renew and restore urban parts of those are getting older and in need of conservation. However such definition of age and health was not clear enough to operate when the research was carried. A Gadjo member of a municipal council in a little town who has been interviewed was confused about the implementation of new law and he was targeting the Romani neighborhood while complaining about the unclearness of the new law;

> *"They (the central government) now say that we have to make*
> *an urban transformation. We do not really know what it is*
> *about and what is for us to do. ... We will probably start*
> *renewing the Romani quarter."[46]*

There the local implementers of governmental policies were not always having the knowledge of what and why they are transforming but only following the changes on the laws technically. However imagining the execution of such law, the Romani neighborhoods becomes to be the first places to come to mind for performing transformation practices. This was mainly because, as the most local executer put, it is easily to legitimate the operations run against the Romani settlements out of the slummed conditions the neighborhoods have. Still at this point one should mention

---

[46] *"Simdi diyorlar ki (hukumet) kentsel donusum yapacakmisiz. Nedir, ne yapacakmisiz bilmiyoruz. ... Heralde Roman mahallesini yenileyerek baslayacagiz."*

that this tendency to brand slummed neighborhoods as being *dirty* and *ugly* is only about the class habitudes of the Gadjo officials and their Gadjo voters who have basic reconcilements with development argument.

There have been met with several inapplicable arguments put by the municipalities to legitimate cases of demolishments. It was often argued to the inhabitants that the land of the demolished houses has officially planned to be green areas. On the basis of this, the municipality might be claiming to construct a sport complex and parks on the demolished land to take the consent socially. In a case, that was also stated by interwievees that the mayor of the concerning town, who has given a visit to a Romani neighborhood before the demolishment and advanced these arguments personally. Therefore an imagined beauty of development was often used as an argument to legitimation of gentrification. At this point, the Romani neighborhoods, which are famous as dirty and smelly for the Gadjo values, were easier to be demolished.

Meaningly, a reason for the Romani quarters to be prior choices for the urban transformation implementations can be put as the negative stereotyping of the communities. Depending on the widespread believes put on the imagined Romani by degreeing it as being dirty and having low ethical norms, the local implementers of urban transformation can be arguing their implementations as *cleaning* the city. Such argument can work not only for legitimating the defeat of the communities but also for the implementations being approved by the Gadjo citizens. A Gadjo interviewee neighboring an ex-Romani neighborhood, which has been demolished a short while ago, was clearly stating that;

> *"This (demolishment of the Romani quarter) became good*
> *dear teacher. We were afraid of walking to our own street*
> *passing by this quarter. Our children were learning to swear.*
> *It was quite noisy here; drugs, thievery, prostitution,*
> *everything was present here. ... However now we give thanks*

that all is cleaned."[47]

As this man was putting concrete borders between them, the *white Turk* citizens*,* and the Romanies he did not hesitate putting all the dirty clothes of his stereotypical belief on the Romani communities. He was strongly supporting that such problems are over by defeating his neighboring Romani community; since, nothing *wrong* was happening in front of his eyes anymore. Such a social acceptance of Gadjo citizens on getting rid of the neighborhoods where Romani communities live would surely be encouraging for the implementers of urban transformation to perform the demolishment over the Romani neighborhoods.

5.3.2 Resistance Opportunities

Moreover, the low facilities the communities have, to asking for their rights legally to protect themselves, was another reason for the quarters to be prior choices for the urban transformation implementations. Most of the communities the research has met were not officially organized. Though being attempted to launch a legal case against the municipality in order to invalidate the decision of demolition of the neighborhood, however they could make no proper advocacy of their will. Some families in a demolished neighborhood were writing a letter to local public prosecutor to lodge a complaint about the situation. However they received no reply and had no chance to follow the process up, since they were neither having money to pay a lawyer nor legal knowledge to do it alone.

Therefore it would weakly probable for the demolishment in a Romani neighborhood to be a legal trouble for the implementers. Though the strong community formation within the Romani neighborhoods can be interpreted, as

---

[47] *"Bu (Roman mahallesinin yikimi) iyi oldu sevgili hocam. Mahalleden gecip sokagimiza yurumeye korkuyorduk. Cocuklarimizin ogrendigi hep kufur. Bir suru de tantana; uyusturucu, hirsizlik, afedersin orospuluk, hersey buradaydi. ... simdi cok sukur hepsi temizlendi."*

91

resistance against the demolishment is more easily to get organized. However, that is not likely to work in case of Romani communities at least on the legal basis; since, the level of poverty and destitution are quite high unlike the social courage. Having low access to the educational services, the Romani communities mainly devoid use of the formal means of resistance. Since the mainly observed Romani way of perception of the policy ground lets one to consider him/herself as being the one who is already out of the juridical circle. It was quite difficult for a Romani individual to running a juridical process against the illegal demolishment.

So once a state institution asks the Romani to move out of the house, a Romani individual mainly have no way to perceive it an invasion against him/herself and push up a resistance possibility. In such case what the most Romani was not to say *"No! You have no right to demolish my house!"* but to leave the ground and move to any other place where they think that can make a life again to face less problem to trying to excuse about their existence. A young boy claiming after the land his grandfather left a half century ago has stated that;

> *"We are the people who live on daily bases, eating daily what we earn. We are not kind of people who thinks of what to eat next day. My grandfather has sold his house and field in Giresun for a bottle of wine. But why? That is never about drinking wine as our mothers told. In reality our Romani people culturally do not want to deal with state [legal] works. They always receive it badly. They are distrustful against the State that comes out of a fear of being embarrassed in front of this apparatus. 'To go there [to an official office], I will try for the deeds of the field and the house. I cannot manage such governmental work. I can not manage with juridical process' they say and that is how they sold it."[48]*

---

[48] *Günü birlik yaşayan insanlar, ne kazandıysa onu yiyen insanlar. Yarın ne yiyeceğiz diye düşünen insanlar değil. Benim dedem Giresun'da bir şarap için evi satmış. Arazileri satmış. Şimdi niye*

Therefore, thinking on the low resistance Romani communities show against demolishment of the neighborhoods, it can also be argued that the practical way of everyday life which has not much to do with the bureaucracy of institutional issues is also something to be taken into account.

Almost all evicted inhabitants met were been promised for compensation. But only few of them could get it. Because of this promises some of the inhabitants have demolished their houses on their own. However, a Romani interviewee in a neighborhood in Istanbul has told that he has demolished his house by his own months ago but could still not received any compensation. He moreover asserted that the mayor of the town lately given a visit to the neighborhood and claimed that compensation has been fully paid by accusing him with calumniation.

The demolitions were decided by municipalities and carried out with assistance of police forces. In most cases the families have received no legal notification about the evictions before they face it. One of the most crucial narrations about the neighborhoods was about regular police operations using pepper gas and dogs to force them to leave the neighborhood. During the operations the police break into people's houses, beat and handcuff the inhabitants. It was quite usual especially for the male Romani inhabitants to be taken into custody. Moreover some neighborhoods were subjected to 24 hours of surveillance by police throughout cameras.

Some of the narrations about demolishment operations claimed that the bulldozers, assisted by hundreds of police officers have arrived the neighborhood by the dusk. There, the inhabitants have woken up by the attacks of the police forces. The police have announced the inhabitants that *they are there to make cleaning* and asked

---

satmış? Hani şarabında. Bir şarap içmek değil amaç. Aslında amaç o değil. Onu bizim annelerimiz diyor. Aslında gerçeğe bakıldığında bizim romanların kültüründe devlet işiyle uğraşmak istemiyorlar. Her zaman bunu kötü algılıyorlar. Mesela devlete bir güvensizlik var. Ben buraya gideceğim zaman mahçup düşeceğim korkusu olduğu için. 'Ya ben şimdi oraya gideceğim diyor tarlayı üstüme yapacağım, evi üstüme yapacağım. Bir dünya şey işte. Ben bunlarla uğraşamam. Devlet işleri işte. Mahkemesiyle uğraşamam' diyerekten. Öyle bir cahillik, satmışlar.

inhabitants to come out of the houses and wait in the street. While they came out to the street the bulldozers started demolishing the houses with all the properties and the domestic animals inside. Some of the inhabitants climbed up to the roof in order to protect the houses as human shields. However the police launched pepper gas and dragged people out of the houses brutally. It was stated that many of the children were waking up at nights with nightmares about attacking police as a consequence of the demolition.

Because of insecure feeling some of the habitants have sold the houses on the private market before the demolitions. The police have used this fact as a pretext to running the operations. Even the houses belonging to owners who even have legal deeds have been demolished. Most of the families are not provided alternative accommodation. No matter on whatever issues we have been speaking about, the all interviewees was focused on the same thing; demolitions and the loss of those old good days.

5.3.3 Loss of Neighborhood Based Life

As I have often mentioned one can easily claim that the main significative feature of the Romani communities is to living together and building the Romani identity throughout a culture of solidarity. Just like the gecekondus, it was closely observed that the culture of unity and solidarity built in the Romani neighborhoods could also constitute a resistance focus against what capitalism exacts.

> *"We don't have a chief here. But the all neighborhood is sticked well. They give support in case of any threat from outside. There is solidarity. He* [an anonymous Romani neighbor] *would come in case* [to support you in conditions of

threat] *even if he is your enemy.*"[49]

However that was not easy for a Gadjo, who is running the neoliberal life set, to get a sense of what sort of commons can be built within the neighborhoods unless giving a close touch and respect on whatever life is built inside. The competition based Gadjo ideology would have not much to do with the solidarity based ones. Even though such solidarity may even be received, again on the basis of competition, as an enemy of oneself to undermine the ideological ground where the hegemonic Gadjo life forms do stand.

During the field research there no strict borders between the members of Romani communities in a neighborhood has noticed. The same was also visible with the Traveler Romanies who do share their tents as well. Visiting the tents camp of a Romani community who were temporal agriculture workers in South Eastern Turkey there have been observed that plenty of children have taken care by two old men and two young women one of whom was physically handicapped. It was stated that each tent was holding a population from eight to fifteen there the total population of the camp was going up to approximately fifty people. There was a cooker fire between the tents and the meal was being cooked for four families living there. The old man's saying was a good example of the solidarity relations amongst the community members;

> *"This is my grandchild and the kid playing there belongs to*
> *our neighbor. What can be the difference between them? We*
> *are living together. These children belong to all of us. ... Now*
> *my bride is cooking for everybody, as much as God gives us.*
> *... Our tent is narrow, so we host our visitors in our*
> *neighboring tents."*[50]

---

[49] *"Burda yok ööle yaa, çeribaşılık yok. Ama hep mahalle birbirini tutar. Dışardan bişi olduğu zaman, yani o şeyde destek çıkarlar. dayanışma var. Düşmanım da olsa gelir adam."*

[50] *"Bu benim torun iste orada oynayan da komsunun. Ne farklari olacak? Beraber yasiyoruz. Bu*

The same solidarity is also visible in settled neighborhoods. One can easily name it a survival strategy; since, the existence of the Romani communities in such poverty and discrimination conditions would only be possible by a culture of living together. This strategy to survive is about the heavy current conditions of not only poverty but also of exclusion and discrimination the communities face. A community member can eat in almost every house of the community without having any drawbacks and noone in the neighborhood offend them just because they are Romani. There the demolishment or deportation of a Romani neighborhood is functioning not only to gentrify the land but also extinguish the conditions of living together and of the solidarity chains, meaningly the condition of existence for the communities.

The ones whoever leave the neighborhood split away and go to some different cities or some other parts of the same city where it is possible for them to dwell. Romani who is forced to leave the community and settle with Gadjo communities is no more connected to Romani living but fall into the Gadjo world. So keeping in mind that the demolishment systematically focused onto the Romani neighborhoods and forced them to leave or settle on neoliberally acceptable housing conditions, one can easily claim that these implementations, which end up with assimilation of Romani culture in favor of integrating to the surrounding community, are working for the Gadjofication of the communities.

This is how the TOKI form of housing, which is pretended to be hosting the evicted families, is also working for. The Gadjofied design of the living spaces and buildings built around by governmental social housing tendencies and also by private enterprises are there with a mind that can only cover an ideal, a single definition of life excluding the forms lively in the Romani neighborhoods. There they do not regard about the different forms of life choices. There an imposed definition of what a citizen should be is running the urban planning process that is following the requirements of atomizing, alienating rules of everyday life of global

---

cocuklar hepimizin. ... bak simdi bizim gelin herkese yemek yapiyor; Allah ne verdiyse iste. ... Cadirlar kucuk, misafir falan olunca komsu cadirlarda kalir."

culture. Therefore the room to eat, the room to sleep and the building to go for shopping are strictly given in this utopic design for each individual taking its part inside the system.

However *a life* does not necessarily to follow such centrally given orders. The people can surely construct their lives within more complex dynamics and diverse forms. Especially in case of Romani communities, some examples of forced evictions and housing have proved such argument. Especially the inhabitants of Romani communities of who are to establish their environment throughout the dynamics of their own lifeworlds have no comfortable conditions to perform Romani way of neighborhood relations in such designed residents. Therefore to force Romani communities to get out of community relations and integrate the surrounding culture, which is systematically performed, is, to put it mildly, ending up with the assimilation of the Romani communities in favor of *Gadjofication*.

The non-assimilation of the Romani, the dissertation would suggest, is not to defend the conservation of the poor social conditions the Romani communities have in Romani neighborhoods but to argue in favor of existence of a culture to living together and to underline that the city is not a place where only white, middle and upper class people live. There a planning over the city should also be covering diverse cultural forms and provide space for any practice of human being. However such policies, in order to recognize the rights and differences of Romani communities, can only be realized throughout the needs and desires of the inhabitants. Otherwise, the implementations turn to be discriminatory practices against the rights to housing of people.

The main problem in renewing the Romani neighborhoods appear to be not only to deport the communities to occupy the land they use but also to force them to settle into monotype social housings where a Romani culture has not the conditions to exist any more. Arguing about the effects of urban transformation implementations on the Romani communities, the Romani is subjected to discrimination also on the field of urban planning.

Its effects on Romani communities are only a little portion of the damages of current urban transformation practices where the damages of urban transformation are only a little portion of the current discriminatory practices of which the Romani face. Still one is likely to put that the urban transformation implementations are the most serious violation the communities face. The Romani culture, if one can mention that there is one, is only possible within a set of neighborly community relations. However in the opposite case it would not be difficult to argue that these implementations to defeating the neighborhoods and integrating the communities to the surrounding ones are resulting with Gadjofication, namely systematic erosion of cultures of Romani communities.

The increasing land value of the Romani neighborhoods in accordance to the changing financial dynamics and there urban planning trends, poor resistance opportunities the communities have depending both low educational facilities and there legal knowledge the communities own and the ability of Romani way of life to make up a life in any conditions appear, therefore not insisting on defending the living space but leaving more it to not to have any legal trouble became to be the main reasons to make the Romani neighborhoods being an priorly preferable target for the transformation implementations to operate. Moreover, rather having contradictions, any single human being still does have the right to exist. There the most tragic fact with planning and designing ideology, which is crystallized in urban transformation practices, might be to rule out the affects of implementations onto the lives of unique individuals.

For example, the Romani communities that have been forced to leave the Kucukbakkalkoy neighborhood by 2006 are now spread all over the city, such like *Ümraniye*, *İçerenköy* and *Çayırova*, or left out of Istanbul to the outer cities like *Kocaeli*, *Sakarya* and *Bursa* for tent-camping. One could easily observe many inhabitants living in the streets, on the ruins of their former houses or in hand made nylon tents. However, apparently, one single building settled on the land of the neighborhood can today be exchanged for current 10 millions in Euros.

There are several cases where Gadjofication operations carried over Romani neighborhoods; *Sulukule* neighborhood in *Istanbul* has first been bought by local speculators, then the municipality condemned and demolished the neighborhood, later the TOKI get the place to build high value privies for the ruling class; the half of the neighborhood Romani houses in *Kocavezir* neighborhood in *Mersin* are been bought one by one by a private hospital and demolished; the demolishment in *Küçükbakkalköy* in *Istanbul* was conducted by the municipality and the land is rebuilt with the upper class private housing estates and multinational business premises just like *Çarşı* neighborhood in *Erzincan* demolished to leave their ground for the TOKI sites. *Fevzipaşa* neighborhood in *Çanakkale* or *Kamberler* neighborhood in *Bursa* can be other examples to pluralize Gadjofication implementations on urban transformation level. However to make it handy the dissertation is arguing about only few of these multiple cases. Most of these neighborhoods are symbolically important neighborhoods in the history of their cities where the Romani communities live for such long time. So one may also argue that the loss of Romani neighborhoods by the demolishments is not only Gadjofying the Romani communities but also ensuring the Gadjo form of the cities in an incommunicative set of Gadjo mind by erasing the memories of the cities.

The story of Romani communities in Çarşı neighborhood of Erzincan city, where I have been at 2006, was a clear example of illegal confiscation of Romani neighborhoods. The neighborhood was built after the grand eartquake happened in 1936. Its location is just sideby the new center of the city. Almost the whole population was Romani before it was demolished by 2004 with a mentioned number of 600 houses. The inhabitatns were having the legal deeds of the houses have been offered 10,000 Turkish Liras (TL) of compensation for one m^2 of land they own. The inhabitants have first rejected to sell their houses. There the officiers told them that they were going to demolish it any way and the houses of the ones who refuse the offer will still be demolished and they would be loosing even the compensation. However that was such a Gadjo trick to intimidate the Romani residents and it has worked out and the owners have left out the neighborhood. What an interviewee

woman has asked desperately was a good example of the fear of the state apparatus:

> *"What can you do when the state tells you to go? Can oneself object the government?"[51]*

There, the highest amount of compensation paid was TL 2,500. However that amount of money was not enough to set up a new life. Then the municipality was usher informally in a new land for the landless community to settle on the outskirts of the city. However the amount of compensation was only enough for short stock of material to building small gecekondus again onto this new land. Moreover the ones moving to this new land were having no deeds. There the official authorities have let the Romani communities of Çarşı neighborhood to settle illegally. They settlers were having no guarantee about how long they would be able to live there. Hence they were restless.

On the other hand, TOKI has built social houses on the land of ex-Çarşı neighborhood. Each building was consisting of 8 apartments. Asking the price of a single house in this newly built TOKI settlement, the answers I have received were going from TL 80,000 upto 120,000. Therefore, with an approximate calculation, the land the bought for 25 hundred was changed almost to a billion liras by TOKI. In such financial conditions it was neither possible for Romani communities to defend their land nor buying one of this newly built houses. Such a high amount of profit was only possible by forcing someone to renounce.

Neslişah and *Haticesultan* neighborhoods, better known as *Sulukule*, in Istanbul was another example of forced evictions. The neighborhood was located within the walls of the ancient city, which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It was historically known as a Romani neighborhood. Moreover it is often stated that the neighborhood is the eariest Romani settlement ever known (Marsh & Strand, 2005). Moreover Sulukule is also quite a famous neighborhood by being the set for some classicals of

---

[51] *"Devlet sana git demişse ne yapacaksın? Hükümete karşı çıkabili misin hic?"*

cinema in Turkey.

Being in the center of the city, the neighborhood has met gentrification quite early. The interviewed residents from *Romani Culture and Solidarity Association of Sulukule* were claiming that the most important part of the settlement have been demolished by 1950s and '80s in favor of two largest main axes of the city, Vatan and Millet avenues. On the other hand, Sulukule was one of the most important entertainment zones of Istanbul with numerous local nightclubs where local musicians and dancers have been performing pieces of Romani tunes and dances. However, claimed to being a center for drugs and prostitution, such clubs were also abandoned by the police of the age on early 1990s, where the economical decline for the inhabitants has taken a start. There some inhabitants have left the neighborhood at that age. The remainers were mainly busy with again musicianship and dancing in different parts of the city, porterage, horse drawn cartering and peddling, which was basically mean to be back to usual poverty conditions of Romani communities.

The times I have spent in Sulukule were exactly when the local Romani association was established after local municipality has declared to renovating the neighborhood by early 2006. From there after the inhabitants and association has made a strong effort to negotiate and resist against the eviction of the neighborhood. Because of specific historical and cultural character Sulukule have received enormous support from local and international campaigns and agents varying between Council of Europe to famous rock bands. However that have not work out enough and the neighborhood was in the end demolished.

On the other hand, what the inhabitants were provided as compensation was buying houses in TOKI settlements built in *Taşoluk* where it was about 30 kilometres far from Sulukule. The new offered land was a typical TOKI settlement with multiflat, ugly buildings where it was impossible for the Romani to perform their previous living which they have brang from hundreds of years ago. This new form was letting the ones no outdoor space, no public ground to communicate or even no

market to supply basic human needs.

The residents who have moved to Tasoluk were asked to pay about TL 300 for 180 months. Besides being unfair with demolishing the deeded houses and selling flats as a compensation, that was also quite hardly conditions to make livelihoods. To be oblieged to making monthly payments was not something usual for the Romanies who are out of regular occupations. On the other hand it also costs a high amount of transportation expense and time to reach the city center from Tasoluk; unlike Sulukule, where it was possible also by foot. A street peddler, who moved to these new TOKI site and making his worklife in *Eminonu*, was complaining about being oblieged to take four hours of trip with public transportation in this new condition to reach his job and be back to home. Moreover one should note down that a single newly built detached house over the remains of ex-Sulukule might cost between TL 200,000 and 800,000 today.

The main argument of the demolishment and the compensation of multiflat modern housing sites was to overcome the *miserable living conditions of Romani* and to *better integrate* the communities. Though this claim has no relation with what the real people lives, pushing the populations out of their organic living spaces is to not to serve for defeating the poverty but again for Gadjofication of the communities throughout breaking the neighborhood based relations, forcing people to get TOKI flats and earning in monthly bases in order to be able to make paybacks there to get, even hardly, middle classified.

That would not be to exaggerate to argue that the Romani communities were hardly getting share of them in this new form of Gadjo world; since, on one hand, one can easily argue that Romani already almost never have any potentiality to meet such set of life and on the other having the weakest facilities to access the formal resistance tools like running juridical process against such cultural raids. Meaningly, the Romani neighborhoods and there the neighborhood based Romani life is getting Gadjofied.

The past references of the inhabitants about the neighborhoods were generally related to the nature and solidarity. It has just told about and the environment's natural and peaceful character, the horses they ride and good neighborhood relations. Taking from the past and bringing to today, the interviewees were having no belief on the future. It was usually and strongly underlined that the Gadjo does *not* like Romani even they used to live in peaceful conditions.

That is to say, the prior loss of community-based life in Romani neighborhoods by neoliberal regulations was not only to erasing certain examples of human solidarity but also tracing the limits the rational mindset of control; accountability and maximization of profit would go. Michael De Certeau (1993) was to brief the very condition such situations concerned on his experimental masterpiece, Walking in the City;

> *"Ultimately, since proper names are already 'local*
> *authorities' or superstitions', they are replaced by numbers:*
> *on the phone, one no longer deals* Opera*, but 073. The same is*
> *true of the stories and legends that haunt urban space like*
> *superfluous or additional inhabitants. They are the objects of*
> *a witch-hunt by the very logic of the techno-structure. But*
> *their extermination (like the extermination of trees, forests,*
> *and hidden places in which such legends live) makes the city a*
> *'suspended symbolic order'. The habitable city is thereby*
> *annuled."*

5.3 Neighborhood; a House for Romani

A Romani neighborhood is mainly established organically throughout the needs of the people and the conditions of the topographical reservation. Once again the losses of economic conditions give rise to low living standards. The complex structures of

the neighborhoods may not be easily received by the means of modern urban design.

The existing housing is mostly made by inferior or collected waste materials, sometimes even by nylon wraps or tin plates. The same room can function as a living room, kitchen, dining room, bedroom and even bathroom. There the living rooms observed do not necessarily comfort widespread standards of "modern living." However this is just to argue about the variety of the use of living space but not to claim a general rule for a Romani house. That is to say, Romani lifeworlds are not to be understood by the means of middle-class habitudes.

However, still it may easily be noticed that the communal use of the houses between the neighbors, of who are mostly relatives is quite usual. Describing their neighborhood and the relations A young Romani man was to put a sense of a Romani habitat partly;

> "The all houses are nested. It is very difficult in that sense.
> But that's all about material situation. That's because of
> poverty. Nobody would complain about hygiene. Nobody
> would mind about it. That's enough to have house to roof over
> your head. For example we have neighboring houses which is
> a single room. He is the father of the guy living there. So he is
> my uncle. How comes that he is my uncle? I don't know he is
> my uncle from somewhere. He used to live in X
> neighborhood. Then he came and asked permission to build
> the house and my father let him built it."[52]

The unwellness of housing conditions in most Romani settlements, where poverty

---

[52] *"hep içiçe bu tek göz oda evler falan o bakımdan çok zor ama o da maddiyata dayanıyo..yetersizliklerden dolayı kaynaklanan bişey.. ve kimse şey demiyo..aman bu hijyendi..o tarz bi düşünce yok..kafamı sokacağım bi evim olsun yeterli..mesela bizim evin yanında da var.. tek oda bi yer .. orda orutan çocuğun babası. Yani benimde dayım. Nerden dayım oluyo? Bi yerden oluyodur dayım..o da X'ta oturuyodu, sonra oraya geldi bizden izin aldı, ev yapabilirmiyim diye yap dedi babam."*

and deprivation is experienced at its highest form, is quiet obvious. To generalize, most of the houses where the communities make their life have not much than two rooms. Moreover the populations of such household are observed usually between five and fifteen. Meaningly, in most of the Romani settlements one can observe several houses where the space is shared with numbers of people. In such case the codes of an imagined nuclear family do not "properly" work. There most houses might be shared with any of the relatives. One staying at this house today can easily be staying in another one the next day.

> *"The house where my father lives, my father, one aunt-in-law,*
> *the wife of my father, not my birth-mother, she is different,*
> *they have two children. I live besides my uncle. How many*
> *children my uncle has? Many, 1-2-3-4-5 children he has. His*
> *wife and my uncle, my uncle works, and I live there. ... We*
> *live in a house of two rooms, a saloon and a kitchen."[53]*

Although the hard policies of forced settlement, especially in the last two decades in the regions where Kurdish speaking population lives as a majority, where I could meet with numerous traveler Romani communities during the research. Besides, a serious slice of the Romani population is recently settled. Especially mature Romanies have often put out memories from those traveler days despite being settled today. The settlement narrations I met were not going to earlier than 50 years ago and most of them are concentrated more on last two decades. An old woman interviewee was briefing the nomadic days and their distant relation with even the idea of a settled life;

> *"That was good, rural. Ours was not a house. We used to*
> *pitch tent. We were travelers. We used to not build a house.*

---

[53] *Babamgilin olduğu evde, babam, bi yengem var, babamın hanımı, benim öz annem diil, öz annem ayrı, onların iki tane çocukları var. Ben amcamgilin yanında yaşıyom. Amcamın kaç tane çocuğu var? Baya kalabalık çocuğu var. 1-2-3-4-5 tane amcamın çocuğu var, yengem var, amcam var. Amcam çalışıyo, ben varım yani. ...* İki odalı, bi salon, bi mutfak, öyle bi evde yaşıyoz.*"*

There was no house. Why should we build it? We used to stay

here one month and then move to another place."[54]

One would ask for more to name the interrelations of the communities as solidarity. However, it is often observed that even a small amount of humanly touch is quite important for the survival of the individuals. A young Romani interviewee telling about the troubles they have in the neighborhood was describing solidarity, especially they show during clashes, as the grace of community relations;

"If I get into trouble, god forbids! All neighborhood runs

here. If someone else has a trouble we would go to help;

since, we are friends. We protect human. If someone is

graceless and if I notice my friend fails to deal with it, I would

not ask [and go into it]. If any friend of mine fights, that

would be a shame against me. He would also avoid. It is not

possible. We are cohesive."[55]

The "*essence*" of Romani way of life has usually defined as a culture of living together. The main objective of life has usually put as being happy together with the bellowed ones. A Romani porter who was standing on a job market, claiming in general about why all the porters working there are Romani, was putting the fundamentals of such togetherness as a physical act of desire to not to be regarded as strangers;

"Do you know why the Gypsies are porters? That's because

they all coexist. Now, 5 of them remain together. They can't

[54] *"Eyidi işte, köylük yerdi. Ev deyildi bizim, çadır kurardık biz. Biz çadır kurardık. Göçebeydik. Yani ööle ev filan kurmazdık. Yoktu ki hani. Ne gurucan. Bi ay burda duruduk, bi ay başka bi yere giderdik."*

[55] *"Şimdi benim burda başıma bi hadise gelmiş olsun allah korusun.. Bütün mahalle koşarlar buraya. O yana da bişi olsun biz koşarız buraya..yani..biz arkadaşız çünkü benim.. Biz insanda koruruz yani . Bi öyle terbiyesiz biri olsa.. Arkadaşın baktın beceremiyo.. Anlamam ..arkadaşlarımda oyledir ..zati bi yerde tutkunluk olmadıktan sonra yaramaz yani olmaz o.. Şimdi arkadaşım dövüş ediyo..bana karşı ayıp olur.. O da kaçar..olmaz..tutkunluğumuz var yani bizim."*

deal. But if they all are together, they may easily go porterage. Otherwise, even if you give them trillions, they would stay 3 months there but come back on the 4th month to be a porter. That's why they are porters. They like to be together. They understand each other. Look that's why they all are here. Most of them are here for that reason. Most of them have studies, this and that. But he may be regarded as a stranger in the school. That's why they all are here."[56]

Besides to not to facing discrimination, the life together has also economical fundaments. The relations based on confidence and sharing makes one's life easier. In a Romani neighborhood an inhabitant can do basic shopping from the little grocery shops which are running over the trust relations where one can make the payment whenever possible. Moreover that is also possible for a community member to buy a single napkin or a single cigarette from a shop in the neighborhood. Even one can buy 100 grams of sunflower oil poured from the bottle to a little nylon pack. Therefore it can be argued that living together has also something to do for the basic economical and socal survival of the Romani communities. Such social values are not easily to be found in the outerspace. A young Romani interviewee was putting the feeling of attachment to the neighborhood, which can strongly be observed almost in each community;

"Our ancestors have settled here. They did not want to go out of here. None of the Roma, even if they have a trillion can go out of here. There have been some people who have gone but with difficulties. Some families have left because of conflicts. But most of them are planning to come back. That's for sure

---

[56] *"Çingenler niye hamallık yapar biliyo musun? Hepsi bi yerde olduğu için. Şimdi 5 kişi bi yerdedir, şimdi bi yerdeler yapamıyolar. Ama hepimiz birlikte oldukları zaman gidiyolar hepsi hamalığın peşine. Yoksa ki trilyon versen 3 ay durur, 4.cü ay gelir yine hamallık yapar. O yüzden yani. Hamallık yapıyolar, bi arada durmayı seviyolar. Birbirlerini anlıyolar. Aha! Hepsi burda onun için. Çoğunun okulu var, şunu var, bunu var ama okulda da yadırganıyodur belki, o yüzden hepsi burda."*

that if a Roma has a trillion of money s/he would build a
house here and stay in the neighborhood."[57]

One cannot easily argue that the Romani people have conservative position on preserving their lifestyle. That is to say the Romani communities are content with the places they live but restless with the conditions and underlined that they would like to live the same life in better conditions and opportunities. On the contrary, some of the interviewees were open for new suggestions and transformation of which they are often subjected to. A Romani woman interviewee was briefing the phantasm of making a come back to the nature, which can be observed quite strongly within the communities;

"If they give another house I would take it. It should be
pastoral, in a garden, in a meadow, forest everywhere. ...
They are going to demolish here."[58]

Romani identity is strongly attached with the neighborhoods life inside. There it may take different forms in different allocations. The neighborhoods provide the communities the conditions to perform their lives and professions free from the Gadjo gaze, which has a trend to consider one other's life, and build up the Romani way of lives.

In some cases, where the Romani identity is received as the *reason* of the poor living conditions, to leaving the neighborhood may symbolically mean getting rid of Romani identity and there conditions of poverty. However the neighborhoods are full of stories of community members who were not able to make a better life out of the community and settled back to the same or another Romani neighborhood. A

---

[57] *"O büyüklerimiz işte buraya yerleştiler. Buradan da çıkmak istemediler. Hiç bir roman da burada trilyonu olsa, trilyonlara sahip olsa da bu mahalleden çıkamaz, gidemez. Öbür gidenler de işte çok zorluklar çekip de gittiler. Bazı aile anlaşmazlıkları üzerine gittiler. Onların da çoğu dönmeyi düşünüyorlar. Ama hiç bir roman da trilyonu olsa evini bu mahallede yaptırır. Bu mahallede kalır."*

[58] *"Şööle başka bi yerden bi ev vesinler, çıkarım. Şööle bağlık bahçelik olcak, çimenlik olcak, her tarafı orman. Yıkıcaklarmış burayı."*

young garbage collector was briefing such conditions;

> *"We cannot make [a life] somewhere else. Nobody would put up with us. They cannot. They would not accept us anywhere else because of our mess. We also cannot make it there; they would not let us collect garbage materials. Nobody would accept us like that."*[59]

---

[59] *"Biz başka bi yerde yapamayız ki ya! Kimse kahrımızı çekemez ki.. Çekmez. Pisliğimiz yüzünden bizi hiç bi yerde kabul etmezler çünkü. Biz başka yerde de yapamayız. Çünkü her yerde bize karton, ööle çöp maddesi toplatmazlar. O şekilde kimse bizi kabul etmez."*

CHAPTER 6
NGOIZATION of ROMANI COMMUNITIES

Revealing its industrial organizational relations, this chapter is going to study the fundamentals of Non-governmental organizations environment in third phase of development. The granting system to make such industry up and the trends of the NGO professionals are going to be mentioned to examine the functioning of NGO industry. Briefing the organizational process of Romani communities in Turkey and the principal debates of establishment, the chapter intends to put arguements about the influences of NGO industry on organizational practices of Romani communities.

6.1 A Short History of the Romani Identity Politics in Turkey

During the research I was having the chance to witness various organizational practices of communities. Some ethnographic notes from a witness position about the early ages of Romani organizational process in Turkey to have more clear valuation on the way to cover the very dynamics of this official organization of Romani communities to better understand the way the communities deal with the Romani identity and the problems they face. In doing so, the main discussions in the process and the defining contact points with the surrounding world will be pointed out. The main agendas on the run were defining the identity and naming the common interests. Positioning a political discourse from the common problems they were having, was seriously hard job for the associatios who were striving to fit their

realities to a ground which was before hand being designed and always under manipulation of Gadjo mind set.

6.1.1 Early Ages of a Positioning of Identity into Political Discourse

Apart from internal social networkings, the official organization process for the Romani communities in Turkey to deal with the outside dynamics has been started by the early 1990's in Edirne. However, the first Gypsy Cultural Association in Turkey has been banned by the government of the age throughout a justification to preserve the unity of the nation state based on the Association Law, the Article 33 of 1982 constitution which was set in the constrictive militarist conditions of post *coup d'état* period accusing all ethnic identity based organizations as separatist threats for the national security. Therefore the founder members of this first wave of organization have been fined and faced with social and political pressure by being claimed to be separatists.

The organization of the Romani in Turkey was only possible by the agreements of the statements which are assigned on the European Union integration process, especially the *Copenhagen Criteria*. There, the current official history of organization of Romani communities in Turkey has taken a start in 2004 by the establishment of Edirne Association for Research on Gypsy Culture, Aid and Solidarity (EDÇİNKAY).[60] From there after, there have been approximately more than sixty different local Romani associations and three different federations of Romani associations established all around Turkey in first four years of this organizational history.

The EU policies, which are based on subcontracting the relations between the state and agents to civil sector, were not only encouraging this new era but also

---

[60] Edirne Çingene Kültürünü Araştırma ve Yardımlaşma Derneği

dominating the social climate and the political forms of the Romani oganizations in Turkey. There many grassroots Romani organizations have been established with a motivation of dealing and overcoming the problems of communities and implementing projects with donations of EU or whatever donor.

On February 16th, 2006, 7 of these Romani associations have come together in Malkara and found the Federation of Romani Organizations (ROMDEF)[61] officially. The first general assembly of the Federation has been realized at April 8th of the same year in Edirne with a participation of representatives of founder Romani associations from Adana, Edirne, Kırklareli, Lüleburgaz, Malkara, Mersin and, Muratlı cities. Moreover some more Romani associations from Balıkesir-Ivrindi, Bartın, Izmir, Keşan and Lalapasa, of which were represented there, have applied for ROMDEF membership the same day.

Platform of the founder assembly was not occupied only by the representatives of Romani associations but also by other invitees from different official institutions. Deputies of Edirne city, the representatives from Governorship of Edirne city, high level army commanders from Edirne city, Security Director of Edirne city and political parties were present in the hall.

The gathering was an elementary experience for the participants to meet each other and to face with similarities of the problems of Romani communities especially living in the different parts of the country and focus on common policies to overcome these problems in the country scale. The environment the ROMDEF established has made the share of knowledge and experience between Romani associations from different parts of Turkey possible. What has happened and talked in this day was providing an important experience to sort out the very dynamics of early ages of the organizational Romani history. There I have taken the debates of the day as a base to discuss main questions the Romani associations deal.

---

[61] Roman Dernekleri Federasyonu

Starting from the founding assembly, besides the works handled for setting the structure of ROMDEF, the main axis of the all day long *informal* discussions of the participants made during the coffee and lunch breaks can be summarized around weak situation of Romani communities in relation to the greater communities, lack of access to public services, social exclusion, the ways to deal with the stereotyping of the Romani and finally the identity definition which can be briefed around two questions of "how to name the communities?" and "are we a minority or not?"

Almost every participant was feeling obliged to spend sentences stating commitment to *Turkish* and *Muslim* identity, then appointing issues above with generalizations exporting some local examples and concluding that it was the time to come together and develop joint projects also in harmony with the other Gadjo NGOs besides local and governmental officers and deal the problems set.

The main agenda of the debates taken by the participants of ROMDEF Assembly in the first gathering was social exclusion and the way to deal with the stereotyping. The debates on stereotyping the Romani was mainly about the media presentation of Romani and focused more on a popular soap television series of the day, *Cennet Mahallesi*. The main location of the story in this weekly series was an anonymous Romani neighborhood in Istanbul and it was supposed to be a comedy film making 'fun' out of the everyday life of stagy characters who were supposed to be Romani. Some jokes and insulting attitudes about Romani were quiet widespread within the greater community and the most of the representatives have underlined their will to target such media reflection to transform the image of Romani in the public. One of the young representatives joining the gathering was briefing the main position of the assembly about the issue by stating that;

> *"I want [Roma] to improve herself; to reach to a good*
> *position in the society. I want her [therefore] to announce our*
> *problems once reaching to media one day. I want an uprise*
> *once one claims "dirty gypsy" in a movie. I do not want Roma*

to be mentioned with prostitution or thievery anymore."[62]

On the other hand, besides how the Gadjo approach Romani communities, the self definition of the communities was also another main agenda. There were two sides discussing on the former question for the debates of identity. The mainstream wing was defending the name *Roman*, meaning *Romani* and the other side was in favor of using the word *Çingene*, meaning *Gypsy*. Because of the preventions, which were on force until that day, about the right to get organized under the name of any ethnic identity, such a debate was quite lately appeared within the agenda of the organized Romani in Turkey.

EDÇİNKAY was the only association in this young federation using the word Çingene in its name and defending the definition as being the correct name to cover all communities and different tribes. However the rest of the associations were refusing to use the name and even one of the spokesmen was claiming that he was getting ashamed out of even the name of EDÇİNKAY because of the pejorative sense of the word Çingene. After all day of assembly there founded the board and the name Roman was accepted to represent all communities in Turkey. The debates were briefed by the president of one of the member associations and a founder board member of the new Federation into a face to face discussion we have taken during the lunch time:

> *"We are of course Gypsy. However nobody knows the real*
> *meaning of Gypsy. They use it use to insult us. It is now*
> *something like a curse. Everybody knows Çingene as a thief*
> *and alcoholic. Even though that is not true, they call it like*
> *that. Now we call ourselves as Romani. That is also correct.*
> *Today we gather here for the problems of our people and set*

---

[62] *Kendini geliştirsin istiyorum. Güzel bir istediği bir mevkiye gelsin. Yarın bir gün, medyaya çıktığında, bizim olan rahatsızlıklarımızı duyurmaya çalışsın. Yarın bir gün bir filmde biri "pis çingene" dediği zaman birisi kalksın desin, bir ayaklanma olsun istiyorum. Artık romanların bir af edersin orospulukla, hırsızlıkla anılmasını istemiyorum.*

a beautiful unity. I hope we can take Romani onto better
positions in the society and tell everybody what real Gypsy
is. "[63]

So the main problem was the humiliating use of the word especially by Gadjo. Therefore, throughout the first decision taken by the ROMDEF, EDÇİNKAY has also decided to change its name in favor of the word Romani and transformed to be Edirne Association for Research on Romani Culture, Aid and Solidarity[64] (EDROM). Therefore, one of the main reasons this dissertation is also calling the communities as Romani but not Gypsy is to following the accepted sensitivity of the Founder Assembly of ROMDEF up.

However the discussions are still current. Especially by the "discovery" of *Dom* and *Lom* communities some positions argue that the name Romani is signifying a particular sect of societies, Rom, but not enough to cover all Gypsy. On the other hand there is another position which Mustafa Aksu might represent argues that the definition of Romani is Eurocentric and is not enough to name the diversity of the communities in Turkey. Moreover as Ceyhan (2003) has largely discussed on identity formation of Romani communities in Edirne, popular films, tv and new job opportunities with industrilization affected the need for an identity drawing boundaries for Roma from Gypsy.

---

[63] *"Tabi ki Çingeneyiz. Ama kimse Çingene'nin gerçek anlamını bilmiyor. Aşağılamak için kullanmışlar, bozulmuş. Neredeyse bir küfür gibi bir şey. Herkes Çingeneyi hırsız ve alkolik olarak biliyor. Öyle değilse de öyle diyor. Şimdi neden kendimize küfrettirelim ki? Şimdi Romanız diyoruz. O da doğru. Bugün artık insanımızın sorunları için yanyana geldik güzel bir birlik oluşturduk. İnşallah Romanların toplumda iyi yerlere gelmesini sağlayarız da bir gün Çingene'nin ne demek olduğunu herkese anlatırız."*

[64] Edirne Roman Kültürünü Araştırma Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Derneği

6.1.2 The Minority Question

The minority question was the second main question of the same agenda. The main position was to refuse such a definition for Romanies in Turkey. This was the first time when the associations have met the term minority used for defining Romani in Turkey. Even the probability of the minority definition to fit on Romani communities was rejected without a detailed examination on the term today.

The official definition of minorities in Turkey was formed in the Treaty of Peace with Turkey Signed at Lausanne, July 24th, 1923 text some months before the foundation of the Republic of Turkey. According to the Article 45 of the treaty only the non-Muslim population in Turkey was treated as minorities. On the other hand, besides religious minorities, namely the Greek, Armenian and Jewish communities, minority rights as a demand was an agenda discussed around the Kurdish question which was having a negative implication for the official ideology as being separatist.

The representatives of official institutions in the Assembly were strongly representing the central power and were able to influence the tendency of the community representatives. After the opening ceremony there were some greeting speeches made before the elections of executive committee. The speeches were made by one of the deputies of Edirne city, the military brass hat of the Brigade of Edirne, Security Director of Edirne, the provincial head of neoislamist ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP)[65] and the provincial head of conservative secular True Path Party (DYP)[66]. There have been no Romani speakers except the council committee who were there to execute the Assembly.

The deputy who was invited to make a greeting speech was occupying the ground for almost half an hour. He was mainly speaking about the foreign threats especially

---

[65] Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi

[66] Doğru Yol Partisi

116

of EU, and complaining about the criteria which EU put on minority issue without understanding that there is no ethnic question in Turkey. Referring to *Mustafa Kemal Atatürk*, the founder president of Republic of Turkey, he claimed that every single person living in the country is *Turkish*. Giving thanks to Romani citizens for their loyalty on the republican values, he was warning the hall on being aware of the games the enemies of the nation play to disturb the peace environment in Turkey by trying to name Romani as a minority. And he asked the Assembly to not to give any compromise in their international relations.

From there after the Federation of Romani Associations, like this or that, has rejected to put the minority rights issue on the agenda. All the speakers whoever takes the platform, without an exception, has started to their speech by underlining the priority of the Turkish identity and loyalty to the values of the republic. Some notes from a speech made by a spokesman was putting not only the main accepted axis about the issue but also implicitly the early sense of restlessness about EU policies which were not clear for nobody and there distanced as a first reaction with a nationalist aspect;

> *"We are Romani; that's true. But we are first Muslims and Turks. The Romani people in Europe have other conditions. They are under pressure of European Union as minorities. Now they want us to be a minority. However we refuse to be minority. We say we are an element of the majority."* [67]

This was such a happily disposition for especially one of the observer participants of the Assembly. That was the brass hat officer from the Brigade of Edirne who was invited there and announced as the representative of the Army of Republic of Turkey. He was underlining the same argument when got the floor;

---

[67] *"Elbette Romanız; bu doğru. Ama önce elhamdrillah Müslümanız, Türküz. Avrupa'da Romanlar'ın şartları başka. Orada Avrupa Birliği'nin baskısı var, azınlığız diyorlar. Şimdi de bizim azınlık olmamızı istiyorlar. Ama biz azınlık olmayı reddediyoruz. çoğunluğun parçasıyız diyoruz."*

"We are very happy about your unity under such Federation. However it is our mission to warn our citizens, of whom we always have good relations, against internal and external threats. Romani has always been loyal to the homeland and nation. I follow your sensitivity against separatist elements also in such association with pleasure."[68]

Manifesting his pleasure on the character of the Assembly to defend a national position in favor of Turkish identity, the commander was implicitly drawing the acceptable frontiers where the Romani politics could go from the point of view of his position. Moreover the internal threat he was assuming, as he has not abstained naming it obviously, was Kurdish policies and the external threat was the European Union policies of which were grounding the cultural rights including language. Whether true or not, any level of demand on cultural rights would easily be marked as separatist from his point of view again. That would not be a speculation to interpret his speech as he was putting a precaution on the Romani associations to allude to almost a threat assuming the solid conflict between the Kurdish policies and Turkey's official national ideology.

The associations who have established ROMDEF can be accepted as the first generation of Romani associations in Turkey. However those were not holding the whole story of Romani organizations in Turkey. Even more important might be the everyday practices of the community members to relate and survive with formations of Romani identity.

---

[68] *"Sizlerin böyle bir federasyon altında bir araya gelmesinden çok memnunuz. Ancak bu güne kadar hep iyi ilişkiler içinde olduğumuz vatandaşlarımızı iç ve dış tehditlere karşı uyarmak vazifemizdir. Romanlar daima vatanına milletine sadık olmuştur. Bu birlikteliğinizde de bölücü unsurlara karşı hassasiyetlerinizi memnuniyetle takip ediyorum."*

6.1.3 Making of Identity

Spending few times within the Romani communities, one could easily notice the overwhelming nationalist and religious discourses even aggressively defend. However different field observations were providing other dimensions on thinking about the identity formation of the Romani communities.

In a town where the communities were surrounded with the Kurdish speaking population, the interviewed young boy who was performing his everyday life mainly in Kurdish language has tentatively underlined that most of his Kurdish speaking friends do not know about his Dom Romani being. Despite being a Romani he was engaged in pro-Kurdish policies. He was defending a position against the Turkish nationalist perspective claiming about the similarities of Kurdish and Romani people on being exploited from the same official ideology. Moreover his brother was died on the mountains as a guerilla in a clash with the Army of Republic of Turkey. This was, with half an eye, an opposite example of what have been observed in the Romani communities living in Turkish speaking towns. However the paralellity was the affect that makes them all taking precautions on the risk to expressing their Romani identity into their non-Romani environment.

Another example for the same framework was noted down in a Romani neighborhood in a town on the Blacksea coast. Arguing about the religious identity, an old Romani man interviewed, who was sitting under the poster of Prophet Ali of whom is the main key figure of the Alevism and showing his grandson who was just coming home from the local mosque after practicing his prayer as a Sunni rituel, put:

> *"In the old days, we used to live in the tents. ... There were* dede*s coming, we also used to whirl. Now there is nobody*

around. There we compulsorily say god is great." [69]

He was very excited narrating on his experiences of traveler life with his family in the tents, also as childhood memories, referring how free they were. The *dede*-s (wise-papa-s) he was mentioning are the main socio-religious key figures of Alevi communities. They also lead the whirling ceremonies of which are the main performances of faith, practiced with a collective ceremony in Alevism. However he was complaining, also appointing the new generation by exampling his grandson, from the transforming religious identity of the community in favor of Sunni Islam of which is the mainstream religious line of the majority of the population in Turkey. He was not really pleased out of this fact even mentioning one of the principle saying of Sunniism 'Allah is Great' as a compulsion.

In another example again on the formation of religious identities, noted down in a coastal town on Aegean region. The lodge of *Naksibendi* sect of Sunni Islam was one of the main public places in the neighborhood. A Romani man in his age of thirties talking about social acceptance has claimed that;

> *"What to do my brother? Look they threat you as a human being and listen what you are talking about. You can also eat everyday. What else would you ask for?"[70]*

He was roundly claiming about the bad treatment of the non-Romani against Romani individuals by giving examples from his life in the streets, working life and his short experience of primary education. He has explained how distanced he was to the religious issues such like most of the Romani inhabitants of the neighborhood, how this sect became popular in the community and how he has converted to be a devoted member of this religious sect.

---

[69] *"Eskiden çadırlarda yaşardık ... dedeler gelirdi, semah da dönerdik. Şimdi kimse kalmadı mecburen 'Allah-ü Ekber' diyoruz"*

[70] *"Ne yapacaksın kardeşim? Bak adamlar seni insan yerine koyuyor, sözünü dinliyorlar. Hem her gün yemek de çıkıyor. Daha ne isteyeceksin?"*

Besides the widespread myth built on Romani identity on being loyal to mainstream nationalist and religious identities, the research have also met different practices during the field work. Legitimations of selfidentities by their agents were always about gaining social acceptance in case of this research. It is noticed that such tendency is an out put of harsh conditions of exclusion. There the identity expressions were functioning as a survival strategy and the accepted values of the greater community are defend sometimes even more than an ordinary member of the surrounding community. That was tacitly to say *I am one of you and please do not exclude me anymore.'*

To conclude about the selfing expressions of Romani communities, one cannot easily argue about a unique and constant Romani identity bases on religious and ethnic formations. Those are again and again socially constructed depending on several dynamics surrounding the communities, as well as it may be argued for any human being. However the significance of Romani identity can be noted down as being an identity which is constructed against a whole set cultural pressures of Gadjo which is in a constant tendency to rationalize, there to Gadjofy, whatever around.

6.2 NGO Industry: Making of the Anti-politics

Boli and Thomas analyze these International Non-Government Organizations – INGOs, as "the primary organizational field in which world culture takes structural form, showing how INGOS help shape and define world culture as a distinct level of social reality. We also explore the substance and structure of world culture by a close analysis of the cultural principles by which INGOs are constructed and an examination of the distribution of INGOs across social sectors and over time." (Boli & Thomas, 1999)

As Gill (2000) puts the neoliberalism has changed the NGO climate from political

opposition to accommodation. There the NGO industry is basically functioning to make the global policies implementable on the local level. It provides a softening role in order to regulate the relations between the state and the society. Transnational nongovernmental organizations donate numerous programmes concerning also the question of Romani and there various projects are being implemented locally in accordance to them. The projects donated and manipulated by the transnational organizations and implemented by local organizations are legitimated with a discourse of *development, social responsibility*, *reduction of poverty*, *integration, cultural rights,* etc. but actually functioning to make the poverty and the identity, which usually are mutually related especially on the Romani case, manageable.

The transnational NGOs are managed by high skilled professionals who are making high amounts of incomes. Even though claiming to be nonprofit, these organizations are managed with the management models of which multinational capitalist investments invent and use. Therefore in the competitive ground of funds, the main motivation to running projects may easily become to be making proper reporting to ensuring the next grant. Depending on such grants system one can easily claim that these NGOs and their professionals do only have indirect opinions on the field they work about; since, most of the time they do not even have contact touch with their concerns. The climate these organizations create by assumptions is obviously disposing the very dynamics of society. Moreover the discourses they produce in order to define their subjects and operations are stating the language of globalization. That is to say, the Romani communities of who are in organization process are experiencing the impact of NGO policies harshly.

Looking at the influences of global policies on the local dynamics of people's organization the dissertation is eager to argue on the NGO industry and the organizational dynamics of the Romani communities. The relations between the civil implementers of global policy makers, international non-governmental or quasi-non-governmental organizations and the grassroots organizations are going to

be examined by focusing on the trends of this environment Romani communities and their organizational process are concerned officially since 2004 in Turkey's national scale.

6.2.1 Grants System

The basic decisions of the global policies are given by the G8 meetings and World Economic Forum (WEF) where economically and politically most developed countries gather and supposed to make evaluation and future forecasting in framework of what on earth does the humanity need. Looking at how the priorities of the central policies and how they operate, that would not be too much to argue that the decision giving process of this global apparatus are dominated by the neoliberal argument which is set throughout the needs of global capitalist interrelations.

In this new form, which is already mentioned as a reason and an outcome of the third phase of development, national borders are not enough to limit the movement of capital accumulation, which is basically in need of new markets. The functioning norm of such bodies have turned to be dependent to lobbying of multinationally operating companies of which are aiming eternally to maximize their profit and there in need of legal regulations for the new scale to operate. Over passing such borders for the investments to reach new markets and cheaper labor resources (Escobar, 1994) but also to strengthening these same borders for the ordinary people in order to keep the control over the movement of labor going became to be the significance of the phase.

The previous scale of human organization on national level was not enough anymore to cover the needs of such phase there even the nation states have started to transform their bodies to enlarge the market and labor resources as it gets crystallized in European Union (EU) example. The practical regulations of such

123

policies are realized by internationally organized civil organizations to be operated by the local parties. These bodies are supported mainly by the public expenses of the governments, meaningly the taxes of the world population.

The policies and the budget to cover local operations to realize the centrally decided politics are distributed to the local organizations, which are supposed to implement these policies on the local level, throughout funding programmes. UN, WB, EU or whatever donor origined programmes announce their grants and ask the local organizations to propose their projects in the local scale in a proper application scheme they put. The applications received are evaluated and graded by a set of independent assessors in the direction where these donors ask for. Each programme receive numerous applications and the ones who fit best on the *eligibility* criteria receive the funding and start to operate locally throughout the way they have proposed. One could easily argue that to take a position in this system is the only way to exist and operate for a serious slice of local associations. Lately, independent bodies monitor the local implementations by again to make sure that the money granted is used as it was promised on the proposals accepted.

Since it is not a practical system but technical, mainly standing on paper work, the most important for this system is to have proper reporting of what is happening with this money. Therefore the job of anyone who takes a position in this system is to make sure that the one working below her/himself has reported enough for her/him to report the one above her/himself. The rest is just nonsense details once such condition is fixed on the textual level. However, most of the time the reality, where the politics is performed, is this rest of the details. That is to clearly announce that almost no professional in a higher state of this *social sector* has a concrete idea of what is happening on the grassroots level.

The local organizations who are operating by the international grants always have to follow the policies put by the Terms of References (ToR) of the donor institution and make a clear reporting of what they did with this money and how it was parallel with the aims and objectives of the programme and the proposal subjected to a

contract. However these centrally selected projects to solve the questions, again centrally decided incorporation with development anthropologies, do rarely fit the problems the local communities face.

There local organizations dealing with the grants become to be busy with fitting their problems to the ones dictated from the headquarters of the donors. Even carrying good wills to deal with the local agenda to follow, more than answering local needs, they are implicitly forced to transform their bodies and policies for the requirements of these references of which they once are under contract; since, the ideal form of operation is already been declared by the funds supplier and the organizational scheme is already been accepted by the local implementers to have an access to such grant. That is where to report something becomes more important than realizing it and where therefore the antipolitics is produced by dominating the agenda and the practices of the local organizations who would organically have chance to contribute direct politics. Observing such process, one might easily agree with the sentence Arundhati Roy puts, just like a Romani idiom; "to grant someone is smarter than killing himself." (Roy, 2009)

Unfortunately, this is a great dilemma at all. The local associations who are dealing with poverty, sometimes even hunger, especially in case of Romani communities, are in need of such funds to get organized and operate. At least that is how they are told to on the advisory boards or capacity building trainings they participate, which are given by greater stage NGOs. However access to the funds is only possible by covering certain conditions, which are put by the donors. There the donor organizations become to be the ones who control the ground where the local policies are realized practically. It may sometimes be even without seeing the physical conditions but depending just on soft paper reports.

Grants assessing process of the proposals could itself be a question for another full set of anthropology dissertation. Applications prepared in excellence can have good marks in the assessing process and some organizations that are good at preparing applications but not having a practical ground may easily gain the grant. Parallelly

and on the contrary some organizations which are standing on some real grassroots relations but incapable to write shiny texts to present themselves and the things they could do practically may loose the opportunity to support their potential works. Most of the Romani organizations of whose members mostly have limited facilities to deal with such system fit more to the latter case. Such a funding system has also provided to ground for establishment of several *briefcase organizations* who pretend to be a Romani but having no local connection there fit more to the former group.

Fund getting is even a competitive ground. Each announced grant could have various project applications. I can honestly put as a personal experience of the assessing job I have been hired, that it is seriously a hard task to assess the best applications that fit the requirements of the donation. Similarly that is also a hard task for a proposal to fulfill the requirements of a grant and receive acceptance. Such mechanism even has established a market ground about grants applications. There are many professional consultancy agencies those prepare application forms for the local associations as a business. In such conditions various organizations who are not capable to prepare a proper application form are buying professional service from these consultancy companies which are working privately to prepare grant applications for high amounts of payments, mostly depending on the amounts of the grant they get. In such case, most examples loose on the next step to practicing the technical requirements of which these companies exaggeratedly promised on the project proposals in the name of local organizations in order to win the funding but most of the local organizations in reality are not capable enough to realize such detailed technical work as they were presented on the excellent paper proposals prepared by the consulting agencies.

A local organization formally should be as proper as the donors ask for to get the grant. Some of the better-organized organizations having enough sources even hire fundraiser positions to benefit more from the given grants and they do. Moreover some greater organizations such like municipalities or chambers can even have a separate departments functioning only to raise funds. Therefore to run a local social

project, which is pretended to depend on funding it, turns to be a more technical task than a political one. This process is working also for the Romani associations. There the problems the Romani people face on their everyday lives are also received as technical questions as soon as they become the subject of project management.

Besides, the very decisions about the social field for the definition of the problems and implementation of the local projects are given by the donor organizations by following the central policies of global capitalist tendencies. The hegemony of global capitalism is reproduced by keeping the experiences, desires and opinions of people out of advance and recognizing only the neoliberal interest to design and operate policies. What the blindness against local strategies and opinions and there the agent positions of real people would produce could only be the antipolitics.

6.2.2 Trends of the Donors

The importance of the trends of the donors is on their economic and ideological power to influence and form the grassroots organizations who have dependency relations with the donations provided and there exporting their organizational structures to the local ones in order to make them benefit from the fruits of the grants environment. As it was explained above, the relation between the donations giving organization is never stand on equal bases. There Romani organizations who are founded in a climate which is manipulated by such NGO ideology have imported most gestures from the trends of more powerful organizations which are pretended to be successful and asking the Romani organizations to be successful in this environment again.

However actually, not only the structural bodies and also the formal and discursive trends of the decision and grant making organizations are grounded on the neoliberal argumentation that is quite abstract for the grassroots level. Indirect definition of the social questions blurring the reality mostly depending on

confusingly crowded statistical data and snobbish commentaries made over them are quite likely to meet in such discourse.

The donor organizations have popular definitions on their texts to represent their position to amaze its subjects and to fix and empower the ground they dwell. One getting it serious would easily think that these organizations and the policies they carry which are represented in such texts are intending and able to solve the problems they appoint. However, unfortunately, even the definitions of the problems to overcome usually have weak connections with the reality of the people they are pretended to *save*. Besides in definition of its questions such discourse has fatal errors also on the operation of the solutions they propose depending on the class ownership of the white-collar NGO professionals and the dominant ideology manipulating the practices of NGO environment.

As the worst of its kind for such NGO discourse, a strong tendency to appoint the real people who face social problems as the reasons of such problems is quite popular within such discourse. This tendency, for example, can legitimate a neighborhood demolishment in the name of saving a Romani community from its *inhumanly, dirty* living conditions. Moreover priorily decided *better* life conditions on the ugly social housings, which has nothing to do with the Romani ways of living, can easily be proposed for the *development* of the communities. One could remember a great slice of the TOKI housing projects for the Romani communities to leave their neighborhoods are built with resources credited by WB who is also in claim of protecting the fundamental rights of the *disadvantaged* groups including Romanies. Or such tendency depending on reasoning the human attitudes can easily be searching the conditions of low access of Romani populations to education on the *laziness* of the community members distracing the demotivating discriminatory educational system or hard labor conditions of Romani children workers those have nothing to do with being lazy.

Another fatal incorrect trend on the NGO discourse is again a strong tendency to victimize the subjects of the questions defined in the name of being protective.

Especially in the case of Romani question such mistake is often repeated. Such a tendency has also included a romanticization of its object, which is also the ground where implicit racist stereotyping works on xenophilic romanticization of the Romani people by disconnecting the individual agents or communities with the reality they deal.

Besides protection of the fundamental rights, development, disaster recovery, environment, sustainability, social inclusion of disadvantaged communities or the Romani communities themselves can be a key word on the argumentation of these texts. Such trends are dependent both on the popularity of the issues on the public space and on the interest of the lobbies. For example social housing, which had been a forgotten topic for decades, can suddenly become to be a decreasing trend when the construction sector gets in a crisis. In such case the lobbies of the companies in the sector can influence the central policies that have the control over the policies for the donation giving bodies to follow. Disaster recovery discourse can provide the best opportunity for such sector to enlarge its market. These circumstances usually have nothing to do with the needs and desires of the real living people who are the concerns of the decisions given.

The competitive climate of the NGO environment is only accessible to those ones who are pretended to be successful. This is problematical itself; since, usually the success criteria are also quite blurred. The evaluations are usually made in surface level and the way to present a success story is mostly based on the means of *marketing*. Preferable outcomes of the projects are become to be the media presentation of the issues covered, well designed reports books, shiny slideshows of statistical graphics and romantic iconography of the field which the project is realized, video works mainly brightened by after effects and dramatic audio lines, press releases supported with these material and preferably made in five star hotel lobbies as well as consultancy meetings where thousands of dollars are spent just to host sophisticated professionals to make grand arguments. However all these outputs mostly have nothing to do with the field which is pretended to be covered

and likely to be produced with means of strong public relations and of media production in office work.

Moreover the NGO projects, which are short term by definition, provide only temporal working opportunities for its employees. The most workload usually been carried by students or semi scholar professionals who has no opportunities to oppose unfair, insecure and flexible working hours and conditions. I also have some experiences and many witness on many projects that the social workers to be fired because of a personal power relations or by reaching the enough data to cover final reports. There one can easily argue that the decisions to finalize most projects realized are not depending on the grassroots effect produced but on accessing to the quantitative final targets those are promised in the beginning by the aims and objectives of the project proposals.

Moreover none of the NGO operated projects are subjected to a proper follow-up research unless the concerning NGO do not prepare another project to sustain the both the work itself and the financial sources. One could easily argue that, though that never is stated under contracts, the project based NGO workers are asked to cover additional fundraising activities and write project proposals besides the workload they carry. This condition implicitly works as a hidden contract between the employer and the employee for the continuity of the job opportunities. The job of the employee can go on with a new contract if s/he can succeed to win a follow up grant; otherwise closing the project would easily end up with unemployment of the NGO professional apart from the intentions.

There are many different trends routing the path NGO industry works mainly on the discourse level, which can be as strong as defining the practical ground the NGOs operate. These trends some of which are subjected here can also easily be observed in a professional body of a private company. However even such business ground can be more merciful just out of market interests but one can not guarantee the NGO environment to not to be ruthless against both its human objects and the financial resources to be spent.

130

Romani organizations of whom are quite new and low qualified to scoping NGO industry are strongly influenced from the ideology that is dominating such industry. There the trends to make do with the requirements sometimes are learned and implemented for a "success" story but they mainly are quite complicated and disturbing for a Romani organization to deal with.

6.3 Romani Communities Encountering the NGO Environment

The works the research met, where the NGO environment getting in touch with the Romani communities, can be briefed in five types of projects depending on their aims and objectives. Most of these projects are realized by collaborating with grassroots Romani organizations. Research projects about the communities, which are very common within the environment. The rest of the projects observed can be briefed as the projects to raise awareness on identity and advocacy, capacity building projects, the ones to providing social service.

6.3.1 Research Projects

Since the knowledge of the Gadjo about the Romani communities is quite poor most research projects are arising out of the need of basic information to ground any operation about the communities. Therefore research projects, which this dissertation is willing to scramble are the most important ones; since main Gadjo knowledge about the Romani and therefore the latter type of projects are basically rooted on the ground these research projects produce.

Though the research projects on one hand can be polished with a good intention to monitor the inequalities faced and to overcome the disadvantages the communities have both in practical and discursive grounds, however, taking a path walk from the trends of NGO industry, it can easily be argued that such data is basically to serve

better managing the poverty and criminalization which is adherent onto the communities from a Gadjo point of view. Therefore, though inintentionally, the problems the communities face are usually undervalued and blurred but the main question is often assumed and discribed as the imagined *irreconcilable* character of *essential* Romani culture, which is also produced by Gadjo prejudices.

Depending on the anti-political characteristics of non governmental organizations having no will to take a radical critique of the very conditions the communities have but to push the communities to better *integrate* with such conditions and *develop*, one can also argue about the dominance of anthropology-for-development on the background of these research trends. *Sociographic Mapping of Roma Communities in Slovakia*, which is supported, by the World Bank Social Development Fund, The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Office of the Plenipotentiary of the Government of the Slovak Republic for Roma Communities can be a good example of such developmentalist projects. The objective of the project is briefed as;

> *"The project's aim is to perform a complex mapping of all*
> *Roma communities in Slovakia; to review the existing data*
> *and to collect and fill in the information that is necessary for*
> *proposing effective development strategies in individual Roma*
> *communities in Slovakia."*

For such research, the reportability of the communities is the main tool especially for these donation giving bureaucratic organizations in order to produce central management policies for this *social problem* defined. Therefore, for a wholistic understanding of its subject, quantitative data becomes to be important for the most research projects that reduce the experiences of real human beings to numbers as an essential disease of modernist development fantasies.

> *"The research is not focused on individuals within the Roma*
> *minority or individual households, but the Roma*

community/settlement as a whole. The aim of the project is to collect data, such as the size and the demographic structure of the Roma community, their location in a given territory and availability of basic infrastructure. Furthermore, the project maps the accessibility of education and employment to members of Roma community and to what extent they have a say in public affairs."

The most important function of such developmentalist research tendency is to providing information for governmental or semi-governmental organizations about the distance the communities have between the grand targets of the governments, like ansuring education and employment conditions, to fill such blanks and increase and ensure the success of social policies at least on statistical level.

"Database of information about Roma communities in Slovakia, to be administered by the Office of Plenipotentiary of the Government of the Slovak Republic for Roma Communities. The database is to serve as a source of information for state institutions, donors and organizations involved in carrying out or supporting projects in Roma communities."

This particular and quite popular understanding of social research which pay no attention for the experience, life worlds, values and even the existence of individual human beings living in Romani ways of life and reduce them to weak bodies, acting the social roles attached to them, as a tendency is basically reproducing the racist stereotyping of the Romanies. The main objective of such anthropologies for development is to esure the measurability of its subjects in order to make grand arguments. However, one aiming to get in touch with the Romani communities in a democratic way and understand the very dynamics of the experience of real people should have first kept in mind what an individual life is and what Romani neighborhood is in making of the communities. On the contrary, most research

projects taken over the communities and the professionals carrying them on are regreting even to get in a correct relation with the current lifeworlds built in these neighborhoods.

> *"The aim of the study is to propose concrete measures to put an end to the increase in the disparities between the majority population and members of the Roma ethnic group, predominantly inhabitants of the so-called Roma settlements."*

Such a discourse can only mishit the reality and feed up the racist distances the Gadjo environment take against the communities. The understanding and definition of socially "normal" versus the "marginal" can only serve the continuity of current conditions if it is not having a critical point of view of this centralization in the definition of a society. Moreover such a fatal mistake is taken in the name of integration and democratic participation of the communities to the greater Gadjo ones.

> *"Parallel aim of the project is to identify successful models of integration of marginalized groups of Roma population with the majority population."*

On the other hand, the criteria of *success*, such understanding defines, is quite well known by the Romani communities. This was basically to erasing the existence conditions of the Romani identity by marginalizing the current being and integrating the communities to the greater communities by an insolent knowledge assuming the Gadjo culture as a developed one, which one should buy into it. Therefore as taking its kick off by such text, whatever information and knowledge this kind of developmentalist research could produce was again to Gadjofying the Romani communities.

Indeed what the Gadjo needs, in order to get a sense of Romani life, is to step onto

the ground of the reality where ordinary people lives, rather than shining the quantities which the rational mind of Gadjo is in need of to protect and maintain its set of relations, to produce out qualitative information about the communities to overcome the prejudices and to be able to build up a more equal relation than ever. However, the contrary tendency, which is busy with in making of the managable Romani identity, is dominant today. Therefore the latter type of projects those are based on the basic knowledge onto such developmentalist research projects produce become to be desperate ones by grounding their operations which has no direct connections with their subjects.

6.3.2 The Projects for Cultural Activities

The cultural projects concerning the Romani communities are mainly aiming to promote Romani culture or to promote any interest throughout Romani culture by organizing local activities and festivals or taking part in some events to reproduce Romani culture. Depending on the strong musical and dance environment living in various Romani neighborhoods, most of the Romani organizations have a dance and music performance groups.

The main example of such projects i have met was the 40 Days and Nights in Sulukule project run by the Sulukule platform. That was a series of cultural events those including concerts, dance shows, film screenings, exhibitions and workshops realized by the Gadjo arts performers in order to give hands for the visibility of destruction of Sulukule, which is accepted to be the oldest Romani settlement known in the world.

Sulukule was such a perfect location for the project implementers to perform their talents and jobs by the means of public relation. Regarding the historical background, famous name of the neighborhood rooted on the cinema in Turkey, the local conditions of Istanbul 2010 European Cultural Capital interests, hygienically

135

accepted forms of Romani identity, Sulukule was a perfect ground to perform both for media campaigning and for unburdening ones upper-middleclass remorses about the demolishments and loss of an urban grain. Therefore the project was easily realized with participation of several sponsorship and media attention.

So, the aim to draw attention on the neighborhood was quite successful, however there were not many few political mistakes taken. Firstly the discriminative stereotyping of th imagined Romani was centrally present there. The xenoplilic claim over the Romani community in the neighborhood was blurring the reality on the legal bases but highlighting how Sulukule and its people are cultural values for the Istanbul city. Moreover the set of funding relations are out of the practices of this research.

In a meeting that we have organized with Erbay Yucak, a lawyer from the platform of neighborhood movements, just some months before the concerning project has taken its kick-off, we clearly have noticed that the Romani residents of the neighborhood were having no proper information and knowledge about the urban transformation and the demolishments in general.

Finally the Gadjo were there to perform their good wills and then be back to their safe Gadjofied ghettos with a belief on how nice and merciful they are but misleading the main problems about Sulukule by reducing the questions and probable solutions to cultural performances.

6.3.3 The Projects to Provide Social Services

During the research there met with some projects to provide social services for the Romani communities. Such projects are mainly run by relief organizations and have a little slice on the space where Romani communities meets Gadjo NGO environment. The practices of those I could observe were also projects acting on basis of development. Such type of projects to provide social services are grounded

on a culturalist motivation depending on romanticizing the image of Romani communities.

The projects to providing social service, at least those I have met during the research, were more carried by youth organizations who were hanging around the Romani neighborhoods to hook up children for realizing their activities. Their activities can vary between giving assistance to the pupils for the studies for being helpful on their educations and playing games with them on the street or in a social center which may be established around the neighborhood.

6.3.4 "Raising Awareness" and Advocacy

NGO projects aiming to raise awareness on identity and advocacy are also mainly based on promoting an *imagined* definition of ideal, acceptable Romani identity. The non-Gadjo way of contested and contextual identity definitions and lifeworlds are easily to be marginalized. Hence, the main tendency to define *the* Romani identity is to reduce it only to an ethnic belonging. This tendency, for example, is asking the Romani organizations to *unify* the language and their presence to becoming accepted agent on the political ground. However the Romani identities, as far as I have observed during this research, are clearly outcomes of multiple crosscuts of various living conditions.

The Romani identity, which the Gadjo organizations invented and trying to teach the Romani people and organizations by the information diffused throughout NGO trainings and texts, is basically about what the Gadjo understands out of identity. There the promoted ways to perform it are also the Gadjo ways of performing any belonging. But the Romani people are already aware of 'who they are' in the society by being taught each day throughout experiencing the excluding practices of Gadjo.

On the other hand the proposed ways to advocate about basic rights and identity are also that Gadjo. The EU way of political organization, where the Romani

communities are packed as an ethnic minority, is a good example for this. The way to politically act in EU level is basically working throughout political organs defined those may work incorporation with NGOs. However, according to the unwritten trends of this world, even though being a Romani, one needs to be well educated, well organized and good looking enough to take a part in those organs. Meaningly a large slice of Romani population is already put out of decision giving processes just because their clothing, posture and knowledge to deal world is not fit on the requirements and the trends of this environment. There what the Gadjo NGO industry could propose for Romanies to politically advocate their rights is to build up their capacities to deal with all this complex set of relations. This is what the awareness raising projects work for.

6.3.5 "Empowerment" Through Capacity Building

To make it clear, on the *Guidance on Capacity Building* published by Department for International Development of United Kingdom UKAID (2009), the goal of capacity building was defined as;

> *"[f]acilitate individual and organisational learning which builds social capital and trust, develops knowledge, skills and attitudes and when successful creates an organisational culture which enables organisations to set objectives, achieve results, solve problems, and create adaptive procedures which enable them to survive in the long run."*

Therefore we may define capacity building as a systematical process to bringing knowledge of an accepted set of ideals to build *social capital* for dealing with it. The research has met two different types of capacity building projects depending on their objects. The capacity building trainings do target on one hand the members and managers of Romani organizations and on the other hand they may be dealing with

ordinary Romani individuals to develop mainly craft knowledges.

The capacity building projects, targeting the Romani organizations I have observed during the research have met their objects on the trainings organized in the meeting rooms of mainly luxurious hotels. The representatives of local Romani organizations invited to these trainings have mostly been taught about how to define the problems faced, how to deal with these problems, how to report about these problems, how to advocate etc. In the case of Romani, capacity building is basically to injecting the basic knowledge that is produced by Gadjo to the Romani organizations, depending on the outcomes of anthropologies for development, in order to include the Romani into this NGO environment to better benefit from the opportunities and get developed not only by training but also by modeling the trends to put on in a meeting or performing again concerning trendy manners. Most Romani organizations met are consequently linked to the Gadjo world of NGO indutry throughout capacity building projects.

On the other hand, some of the capacity building projects aim to improve the qualities of craft knowledge of the Romani individuals to engage its subjects well into the labor *market*. Such projects were quite popular within last few years; since, the Romani communities can easily fit onto the *disadventageous* definition of the target groups the development grants ask and mekes it easier for the Gadjo NGOs to grant their applications and keep their existence up. It was quite easy to benefit from the funds of local development agencies once a well-organized organization collaborates with a local Romani association. There many trade chambers, municipalities, foundations etc. have covered such kind of occupational capacity building implementations with local Romani communities. However the local Romani organizations were mostly having little initiative on the decision-making processes depending on the Gadjo means they have control over. Therefore in most cases the greater associations have produced the project proposals and the Romani existence was backing them up to legitimate the development goals of the projects; since, as a result of a NGO granding trends, even the name Romani was

strenghtening the funding chance of project proposals within the developmentalist NGO environment.

The main tendency to starting from the inspiration on making of such a project was again to go on the surface level of quantitative knowledge about the communities. There the weaker Romani coorganizations namely have no agent position on the work done but providing only Romani human material as of the objects and legitimation. Depending on weak knowledge about the communities but also in order to take Romani friendly action most of these projects were willing to develop the imagined *essential* traditional Romani crafts.

An example for such projects can be put as *the Project to Training for Building Bamboo Furniture Production (*BAMEP*)* realized in Mersin city between the years 2005 and 2006 funded by European Union.[71] The project was applied by Chamber of Commerce of Mersin (MTSO) in partnership of Chamber of Marine (DTO), Içel Foundation of Handcraft (İÇEV) and realized in collaboration of Job Recruitment Agency (İş-Kur), Mersin Çamlıbel Lions Club, Akdeniz Municipality and Mersin Roma Culture and Solidarity Association with € 93,000 total budget most of that supported by EU. The objective of the project was defined as *to train the Romani citizens on bamboo furniture production rather than basketry and to built the capacities in order to get employed*. There 40 Romani trainee, 6 of whom were women, have spent 9 months to have the training to built furnitures by bamboo material. The project of 10 months have started and closed with a great media attention promoting if how the Romani communities are getting out of unemployment and how the implementers were successful. BAMEP was also an important example often mentioned on the conferrences held about Romani participation.

Considering the practice of the project one can point out many issues. First of all, the design of such project can be read as *hands giving* the Romani people in order to

---

[71] **http://www.icev.org.tr/icerik/11/44/projenin-yazilma-gerekcesi.html**

get them employed. However such understanding of *helping* or *relief* is already quite Gadjo oriented manner by setting up a benefit giving relation from up to down, stronger to weaker, where the Romani communities are more to build *solidarity*, which is a relation between equals.

On the other hand, once a Gadjo organization, who known few about the Romani communities, mentions about improving the employment skills of the imagined communities they are not to go further than the stereotyped information about the myth of traditional Romani occupations, as if the jobs for any Romani to cover could only be around these accepted crafts of imagined Romani. There one can easily mention that such understanding of trainining Romani communities on the jobs ascribed *them* by Gadjo is arising from a stereotypical understanding of *the* Romani and serving again to reproducing of such stereotypes.

Moreover, considering the application assessment process, applying such a grant by a project intended to developing the Romani communities is an asset for the local Gadjo organizations. It is on one hand, about the branding of the Romani communities itself. Meaningly, that is an important asset for central assessing of the applications to be additive on the disadventageous groups. This is also another issue, about not to recognizing the Romani communities as equal citizens but as diasadvetageous objects to be developed by the highly developed ones. Still, that is how the trends work out and to take the Romani communities as objects of development works, fulfilling a granting trend, makes the project more acceptable. On the other hand, that is also a great means of public relations for the Gadjo organizations to show off the public how merciful they are by helping the disadventaged Romani communities to get developed.

Anyone degreeing the project by the ordinary text based methods would easily claim that it was a successful project reaching its aims and objectives by training 40 Romani about bamboo furniture production and meeting them with skills, those culturally belongs to them, to be more easily employed on the field. But today none of the Romani trainees participated on the project are working on bamboo furniture

production. Though being culturally racist, no institutional agent involved on the project was having a follow up to the process, which also have something to do with the granding trends.

Therefore, at the end of the day, at least these 40 people who were trained and given hope are left onto the race based discriminative conditions of employment of the Gadjo world and one Romani association is on the cynical desperacy of meeting the Gadjo NGO environment.

6.4 Impact of NGO Industry on Romani Organizations

The main problematic of the Gadjo NGO industry to perform over the Romani communities is that to approach the communities as objects of research and project implementations. There the everyday reality of the living agents easily transforms to be a matter of interest. Once degradation becomes to be the main motivation of popular NGO attention, such attention can also easily end up in parallel with the loss of grants dependant to the funding trends of the NGO industry.

To that extend, the NGO approach observed have never received Romani communities as subjects to be learnt out of their experiences and view to figure out the world. Therefore the belief to carry development ideals to the communities was always on the run. One can easily name such NGO practices as operations to set down consciousness from above. Besides, providing equipment and funding for the less developed ones and exporting popular gestures by the meetings carried in upper class hotel saloons.

The NGO industry instrumentalizes the Romani communities and organizations in order to get closer to the grants opportunities. On the other hand I have met many collaborative project practices of Gadjo NGOs and Romani organizations. However none of them were giving the control to the Romani agents especially during the very moments of decision giving.

Moreover, even mandatorily, the NGO industry acts in orientation of money. I have witness many problems within the communities spewed from an imagined funding which the organizations have never touched. Besides harming the solidarity bases of community organizational process, such an understanding is also a problem for the Gadjo organizations on making them believe that they can act as much as the money they control. However that sounds such a propoganda to me where there are several things to do without dependency onto money for the Romani organizations and the Gadjo NGOs working on the Romani issues.

Most of the the project implementations met were culturally reductionist against the Romani identity and people. Stereotyping the Romani identity onto a form which is in need of Gadjo interpositioning is quite dangerous. Such a powerful understanding strongly feeds the popular racist stereotyping of the Romani communities whether xenophobic or xenophilic. Finally the Romani organizations are expected to act the roles they are given by the Gadjo NGOs. At this very moment noone would expect the Romani organizations to be active on for example ecology policies but they only are allowed on the issues concerning defined Romani identity.

On the other hand, besides NGO formation of organization has particular advantages for the communities to get organized. In case, organization may become to be a tool for financial support, social mobility and social acceptance by proving the belonging to the greater group, it may also be argued that such dominant gestures are not really well received by the Romani organizations. Meeting an old Romani friend in a workshop organized in Istanbul by European Commission was a good example for this argument.

That was a central gathering to confirm the problems the communities have. The gathering was opened by the speech of a minister of TR. He was basically arguing that the Romani communities are very important for TR in EU harmonization process and giving the thanks of the government to the Romani organizations that those have never let the government alone unlike the other identities. There after several sessions in different meeting rooms have happened. Just after the morning

143

sessions, during the coffee break, I saw an old friend from a Thracian city. Standing by the tables having coffee and cookies snack we immediately started to talk.

> *"They* [the members of his neighborhood association] *woke me up early in the morning to come here. I could not sleep well. That was also not possible to rest on the bus. It was so sudden that I could not also have a breakfast too. When do you guess the lunch is?"*[72]

I then have noticed that he was not busy with whatever was spoken there but with his hunger. I adviced him kindly that he could make do with the cookies and there is not much for the lunch time. He was of course knowing what to do, better than me. He was wearing a two piece suit and I have spoken in praise of his suit dressing. Then he replied;

> *"Oh! Forget it! That's from my son. I have woke him up late in the night and taken the suit. How is it? You like it ha?"*[73]

That is so hard for me to argue about that conversation. In a meeting in a very luxuory hotel in Istanbul about questioning the problems Romani communities have with an international participation one of the very grassroots man I knew was telling me that he has borrowed his suit to well fit the situation but in reality he was busy with his hunger. This conversation was kind of a summary of relations between the Gadjo NGOs and Romani organizations. The Gadjo organizers were expecting grassroots information from the Romani participants but nobody was aware of the pure poverty around.

The success criterion of the Gadjo NGO industry was erroneous for Romani case; since, the success of any project is defined to prooving that the money granted is

---

[72] *"Kaldirdilar erkenden, buraya gelegegiz diye. Dogru duzgun uyuyamadim zaten. Otobuste de uyku tutmuyor. Apar topar ciktik geldik, bir sey de yemedim. Ne zaman yemek verirler?"*
[73] *"Bos versene yaa! Benim oglandan iste. Bir de gece gece kaldirdim da aldim. Nasil ama? Olmus de mi?"*

spent to correct purposes throughout the text reports. However, as it was notable in BAMEP example, such projects depending on putting the development idea on the imagined under developed and objectifying the communities was incorrect from the beginning until the end.

By the early terms of the popularity of the Romani issue on the NGO grants, which are decided on the central policies of donation giving bodies, the Romani communities were encouraged to get organized on the forms of associations. Some of the Romani associations could have the chance to work with some Gadjo organizations and learn how to make corporate relations within the Gadjo world and sustain themselves, where many others, for whom that was not possible to raise funds, are still are hardly alive or they already left the profession back.

The funding trend about development and inclusion of the Romani communities have made a peak between 2007 and 2010. However those shiny days seem to be eased off within past two years. Even though the most professionalized Romani organizations are today complaining about not finding any suitable grants to apply for their actions. Therefore most of the Romani organizations which are encouraged by the Gadjo NGO environment are currently left alone in the competitive world of fundraising. Moreover, since the granding was strongly taught as the only way to act for an association, most of the Romani organizations who could not built the ways of self-sustainability have no financial means to survive but depts which are causing to various internal conflicts.

CHAPTER 7
MAPPING GADJOFICATION

Recent chapters have tried to overview the situation of the Romani communities in Turkey, examine the discrimination the Romani communities face in encountering the Gadjo social set, explore the dynamics of the regulations over the urban space focused onto Romani neighborhoods and brief the Romani organizational process to overcome such problems, as the main dimentions where Gadjofication is realized.

To have a short look at selfing and othering process of different Romani communities by the means of sociolinguistics is also concern of the chapter. That is basically to dig down into identity formations for bringing out some determinations about how the *world* also the Romani organizations, as the *most* Romani individual, cope is posed into the language. The definition of the word *Gadjo* and its social use will have a sober importance for the main question of the dissertation to underline the on going invention and social transformation of the Romani identity. In doing so I am going to cite some fragments from the interviews realized and to try to put them in to a palpable framework.

There it is mainly to figure out the verbal distances between the Romani communities and surrounding communities by undermining the word *Gadjo* in Romani language by the means of sociolinguistics as a footstep to define examples of identity formation in relation to the situations the communities faced today and to ground such arguments as *Gadjofication*. The idea behind the term is about forcing a group of people, who are distanced and weakly accepted to the widespread

community relations in the society in general, to be transformed onto the forms those are acceptable for this widespread neoliberal Gadjo surrounding who puts the social norms. Therefore, one would argue that the main means of Gadjofication is the social pressure built over the Romani identity. It was first a will to pack an imagined Romani knowledge in rational manners. Then what proposed for a Romani to be "normalized" is to get rid of the way of life, which is not acceptable from a Gadjo gaze, to get Gadjofied.

The focal subjects of Gadjofication for our case are particularly Romani communities but as I would like to propose, it might not necessarily be. Keeping in mind that such transformation on the political economic ground is persecuting any human being, the term might cover the experiences of different "disadvantageous" groups against developmentalist pressure. The weakening of the *social* understanding of state apparatus, as Rose (1996) warns out, and parallel transformation of the *citizen* to *customer* by the third phase of development has promoted a radical competence over all personal and colective forms of human presence. However, what makes the Gadjofication significant to mention in our case is its specific characteristic to being priorily performed over the Romani communities.

Being never invited to the *imagined* grounds of citizenship, which perfectly belongs to Gadjo, but always excluded into their Romani ghettos, which are out of Gadjo world, the Romani communities constitutes the weakest sect of the society in general who are rarely capable to use the legal means of resistance to become a trouble for uneven implementations of Gadjo. Therefore the communities easily become an earlier target for Gadjofication attacks of neoliberal regulations. Today, mostly because of the changes over the global political dynamics, the communities are forced to leaving their current existence conditions, of those are already hardly constructed by the communities within the second half of the previous century, and take a new form just to keep on living. That is to say, common particularities of different Romani communities provide a field to define Gadjofication which may

147

also be performed over any poor.

The conditions to have an acceptable status in competitive set of relations of current social structure, which is pretended to exist naturally, is quite hardly to get by a member of Romani communities who are pushed out of average ground of social interactions. The qualities of any individual in defined circumstances are continuously kept under degreeings and there forced to getting developed each day. However, even such effort *to get developed* is parallel to the Gadjo distance taken with existing Romani identity. Therefore a new Romani identity that may fit to these *new* Gadjo-friendly conditions is likely to be constructed. That is to say Gadjofication is not only about erasing the current Romani identities but also about defining it from the beginning into the trendy forms of neoliberal era.

One might observe Gadjofication of the communities within several cases and conditions. However the dissertation is mainly focused on two interrelated practices of Gadjofication those were perfectly met during the fieldwork; keeping namely the urban transformation implementations and NGOization of the Romani organizatonal process in two hands. There I try to undermine systematic practices to enforcing the Romani communities to integrate the surrounding communities throughout a focus on some declaratory examples of urban transformation project implementations met during the fieldwork carried. Systematical demolishment of the Romani neighborhoods, where *the* Romani culture is only possible, is basically working as a Gadjofication practice. Therefore I explore the very dynamics of redivision of land ownership in the cities and replaning of the urban space in favor of neoliberal ideology of these new owners to understand the conditions of such form of Gadjofication.

That is shortly to say, throughout the urban transformation practices, the Romani communities who are making their lives within solidarity chains built in the ghettofied Romani neighborhoods are either forced to settle the governmental social housings where these networking and there practices of Romani ways of life are already quite impossible or simply kicked out of the borders of the accepted urban

148

space which are recently being drawn for the interest of neoliberal argument and again forced to lose their connection within the everyday experiences of community life build in a neighborhood where members can construct and practice *their* Romani identity. So, the urban transformation implementations are direct attacks not only onto the land but also to the memories of neighborhoods and there to neighborhood based Romani ways of life built in ages. So the only choice the communities are given to exist is to get Gadjofied.

On the other hand, a short examination of current Romani organizational practices, which became to be possible on the first decade of 2000s in Turkey by the encouragement of European Union harmonization process. Shortly, the Romani communities who are intended to get organized with a motivation of gaining and advocating basic rights, struggling agaist the racist stereotyping of Gadjo and the discriminative practices they are subjected to, and building a ground of political representation for voicing these demands were radically manipulated by the trends of the NGO industry.

That is to say, the NGO industry that keeps the control over the finance and knowledge of civil society's organizational process particularly in Turkey was basically limiting the existence and there resistance opportunities of self-organization of the communities throughout ideological dominance of neoliberal progressive development practice over the forms and discourses. Therefore the communities who were intended to be organized were implicitly motivated to taking form of *associations* rather than any probable forms of human organization and the members to being good looking and intelligent enough to be able to run, or even to step in, the whole set of complicated, competitive relations set of Gadjo NGO environment. So the basic motivation of the organizations became to be not to name and dwell on the significances of the communities, find out the practical organizational possibilities and act politically but to try to learn and manage the complex formal terms of this NGO world of Gadjo and reach the resources to get "developed enough" to do it "better" once again in a vicious circle.

On the other hand, this new era has presented the NGO industry as the only means of social and political inclusion of the Romani communities who are being suffered constantly against the racist hate attitudes and prejudices and holding desperate desires of social inclusion. The newly established Romani organizations were basically organized this potential as a strategic tool also to holding the loyalty of the communities to the hegemonic ideology and to get rid of discriminatory exclusion, to get *developed* to better climb the ladders of social strata and take the imagined form of an acceptable citizen, which used to belong the Gadjo as well. Therefore the Gadjofication defined is not only about the *force* the Romani individuals faced to get Gadjofied but also includes the basic *consent* of the organized communities in Gramscian sense of the term to produce and re-produce the hegemony of the dominant class to balance such force. (Gramsci, 2010:156)

However, it may be argued that the Gadjo gaze, at least over the Romani, is by definition a failure. Apart from the practices of Romani communities and individuals taking a part within these communities, there is no such Romani identity as stable as the Gadjo desires to see. It may easily be argued that "the Roma" is only an image that is produced by the Gadjo to keep it computable and there reasonable and manageable. That would not be to exaggerate to argue that Gadjofication is a primitive enframing of such sophisticate building to "tame" human beings.

The Gadjofication here is studied as a practice performed over the Romani communities. However one can also imply such a term onto any performances of neoliberal argument over the opressed communities to dislocate the previous forms of these communities and to "normalize" them. Therefore, from a Romani point of sense, I use the term Gadjo in order to signify the "abler" oppressor, or the not-that-oppressed, against a total set of "disadvantaged" that is hardly in touch with the exacting conditions of our age.

Finally, for whoever is minding about it, like this or that the organic local knowledge the Romani communities carry is about to get lost by the Gadjofication process.

7.1 *Gadjo*; the World in a Word

This section intends to be an introductory study to examine the identity formation of Romani populations in Turkey throughout the interest of sociolinguistics. It is going to focus on a single word in Romani language, *Gadjo,* which defines implicitly the world and the position of Romani in it, in a symbolic interactionist manner, and to start to undermine the lingual processes of construction of Romani identity. Various possible definitions of identity and contributions of language and language use for these definitions are going to be underlined through fundamental sentiments of sociolinguistics. There seeking principles of sociolinguistics, I am going to put some experiences and observations about languages of Romani communities which are currently in use in Turkey and relate them with some events those could be significant to cover the use of the word Gadjo, its definitions and to argue on possible background determinations depending on the outcomes of the field work carried.

Accepting the word Gadjo as a sociolinguistic resource, the work tries to examine the social use and social meaning of the word, how it is figured out in discourse and social interaction, and how it fitted to the larger society throughout ethnographies of speaking (Hymes, 1989) to dig out the selfing and othering practices of the Romani groups in Turkey.

The main out put of the research has confirmed that there is not such a unique Romani language. One could easily argue that the diversity of range of dialects is as diverse as Romani identities practiced in local scales. Besides the accepted main streams of Romani tribes in Turkey, *Rom*, *Dom* and *Lom*, of which are having exactly different dialects, one can also meet different usages of the same dialect between different neighborhoods. Even in just one neighborhood in Bursa city at August 2006 there noticed four different dialects of Romanes language.

The word *Perev* in the *Domari* language used in Diyarbakir by the Dom community, *Geben* in the dialect of *Orom* communities in Zonguldak, *Manuş* in the dialect used in *Sepetçi* settlement in Kartal Street in Bursa, *Muur* in the dialect of *Cono* tribes settled in Adana and Mersin, *Dağa* in *Lom/Posha* communities' who spread down to eastern Blacksea coast through Erzurum, Artvin, Erzincan and finally *Gadjo* in *Roman/Rom* communities who are more concentrated in western Turkey; all these set of words are synonyms used in different Romani tribes. Gadjo is a word to define the one who is not a member of the community, non-Gypsies, namely the stranger, (Lee, 2005) for these various languages of various Romani communities.

It is not a word assigning a certain ethnic or cultural group but basically the social structure surrounding the Romani community. There, Geben mainly signifies the Turks where Perev are Kurds. That is to say the signified of the Gadjo is mostly a composition of diverse ethnic identities who are not Romani. However the implicit sense of the word is more socioeconomic and politically based. It signifies not only racial but mainly the class difference between the Romani and non-Romani by putting the concrete boundaries; Gadjo is the dominant group of which the Romani communities live besides, with a dependency relation. The Romani identity is mainly construct by othering the position of Gadjo which is stronger to put the norms of the society also the Romani communities are living in.

The disparity of Romani and Gadjo needs to be searched in power relations between each other. The word basically is a delineation of social exclusion. A case I have noted down was providing a clear example for the difference of Romani and Gadjo. I used to visit the vice-Governor of the city of where the research with Romani communities was realized in 2006 before to start the fieldwork in the neighborhood. Talking to him about the research, the necessity of raising awareness about the communities and the importance of cultural rights friendly social policies etc, he has suddenly intervened and said;

> *"The work you handle is very well. However, please visit and*
> *inform the Central Police Station each time before you go into*

152

the settlements. Inevitably, we never want you to be
harmed.”[74]

This was the very moment where I felt my Gadjo being. In the gaze of Mr. Governor, I was a well-trained, white citizen, who is a member of the community of citizens where he also was to belonging. While he was advising me the ways to get in touch with the Romani communities he was defining me in a position where I should not be harmed and there in his definition the Romani was the one who could harm me but never an equal citizen as my-Gadjo-self. What a governor could propose about collaborating with the research project I was involved was to protect his citizen from the Romani communities. This was an obvious instance of stereotyping, criminalization, there discrimination that the Romani communities faced even in the level of discourse at the top of the local representative of central government.

Just few weeks later, during the fieldwork I have carried out in same city an old Romani man complaining from the controversial version of the same story where I could have a sense of how the Gadjo was received from a Romani point of view;

> *“You know how we live, what sort of people we are. Since,*
> *you saw our inside. Gadjo never even pass by our*
> *neighborhood. He looks only from outside. He might be*
> *smiling to our face but one never knows what he really thinks*
> *of you. ... Do you know why Gadjo takes a visit to this*
> *neighborhood? He might be having load to be ported, s/he*
> *might be having scrap metal or might be searching for*
> *narcotics. Even in case, he would never be spending more*
> *than five minutes here. You are the only Gadjo who comes*

---

[74] *“Peki, çalışmanız çok güzel. Ancak mahallelere girmeden önce mutlaka Emniyet'e uğrayın ve mahallede olduğunuzu bildirin. Malûm, başınıza bir şey gelsin istemeyiz.”*

here, spend time with us talking and asking our problems."[75]

The old man's use of the word Gadjo was a good example for social action of the word itself. He was defining the one whoever lives out of his neighborhood as Gadjo; like the governor did, representing the government, with an attention he paid for me, himself and "our kind". The Gadjo was not helpful for the Romani to have its own representation in even as a citizen. Moreover, one could easily argue that the definition of politics is designed for the needs and abilities of the Gadjo. In case, government was unarguably the space of Gadjo. That was an inhibitory manner against Romani to claim or even imagine a decision making position for politics. Gadjo was the outer space; the world we know.

The world academia and the academic knowledge are not also away from such position. Ken Lee (2000) was defining the *gypsylorism* as "… that field of study that discursively constitutes as its subjects 'The Gypsies." He criticizes the Gypsy Lore Society's (GLS) positivist linguistics project to 'preserve' Romani dialect, pointing out the orientalist point of view of gypsylorism. "Orientalism, translating ancient Oriental texts 'for amusement' found expression in many of the early Gypsylorist projects (for example, collecting and capturing Romani dialect for preservation, of developing (allegedly) greater linguistic competence than native speakers, of their creation of a pseudo-orality in their language-games) which had a subtler impact of discursively controlling and textualising 'The Gypsies' as subjects." There, interposing Lee's argument, the understanding and interpretation of the modern world is calligraphic. For it, any culture needs to be subjected to taxonomy; even though the very 'nature' of the oral cultures is reverse. "To do this, the oral forms of Romani, vocabularies, folk-tales and folksongs, had first to be captured, thereby converting the Romani spoken word into the *gaje* [*Gadjo*] written word."

---

[75] *"Nasıl yaşadığımızı, nasıl insanlar olduğumuzu sen biliyorsun; içimizi gördün. Gaco bizim mahallemizin yanından geçmez. Uzaktan bakar, yüzümüze belki güler ama içinden ne düşünür, bilemeyiz. ... Gaco bu mahalleye niye gelir biliyor musun? Ya eşyası vardır taşınacak, ya hurdası vardır alınacak, ya da narkotik alacaktır onu sormak ister. O da beş dakika ya durur ya durmaz. ... Mahallemize böyle gelen ilk Gaco sensin; oturan, bizimle sohbet edip, derdimizi soran."*

The obvious exclusion and discrimination of Romani by the Gadjo provides the *de jure* ground for a *de facto* use of the term. The existence of the term Gadjo has its roots on the social exclusion of Romani. As a survival strategy for selfing, Romani is to build a safe ground for her/himself by othering the 'native inhabitants' who are in a harmonious collaboration with each other for the making and managing of the world and not recognizing access of the Romani to a social floor having an equal right to do it so.

Hence, the Romani identity, which is in lack of access to social means of the greater society and became out of this world, is built upon existence strategies against the one who trusts out. It can be argued that the communities are concealed to neighborhoods, where can be related to the term ghetto in Wirthian sense (Wirth, 1997), providing the conditions to Gadjo to perform for social control over the communities. Besides, a ghettofied Romani neighborhood is also a safe ground for Romani communities to not to face at least the symbolic violence of Gadjo and provide the minimum conditions to make a life through local solidarity chains. Meaningly, not only Gadjo is whatever out of Romani but also Romani is whatever out of Gadjo.

Just like impossibility of a unique Romani identity I can also easily argue that the definition of the identity is also not so clear within the Romani individuals. Different namings can substitute each other depending on the different regions, communities or even situations about to whom and in which condition the Romani individual is speaking. Therefore, sometimes it was not an easy task also for me to come to a ground to talking about what I was doing in these neighborhoods.

There, the nondescript use of the word Gadjo in Romani language is clearly to define the entire outer world which is not only excluding Romani but also is incomprehensible for Romani; which is out of Roma's world. There, today, the Gadjo may be received as the modernity itself; the set of capitalist interrelations of existing power relations.

7.2 Layers of Gadjofication

Gadjofication is not a unilateral process. Moreover, the Romani communities rarely reject the "abler" position where Gadjo dwells. The forcible performance of such adventages might be an object of desire decorating the dreams to getting rid of conditions of poverty and discrimination. According to several dynamics, but mainly to the harsh conditions of being a Romani against Gadjo, establishment of the development idea, namely Gadjofication may also gain acceptance by the Romani communities.

Therefore it may be argued that the Gadjofication is a bilateral and multilayered process. It basically is about a tension within the power relations. As long as the competition based stratified presence of the social structure is there, the Gadjo values are promoted strongly via media and any of those representative relations settings of the ruling society Gadjofication can easily find supporters also from the members of the Romani communities.

From such point of view one might also argue about self-Gadjofication. Self-Gadjofication is the belief of Romani about the hardly living conditions are there because of their Romani being and one's salvation is only possible by getting rid of this "evil destiny." Remembering the radical tendencies within the Romani communities to appropriating the values of surrounding communities even more than an average member of them, it may be argued that Romani also has an image of Gadjo which is built on the power relations performed. There to get Gadjofied can take its place as a survival strategy to not to be insulted anymore.

That is to say that being a Romani does not mean to be free from the will to power. Even though a Romani agent might easily feel guilty just because s/he is faced violence of Gadjo in each interaction. Because of the widespread insulting approaches of the Gadjo against Romani, one's declaration of his or her Romani

156

being out of the community is quite hardly to get realized. Most members of the Romani communities interviewed have argued that they prefer to not to mention about their Romani identity in a Gadjo environment and act as if they are Gadjo as well.

On the other hand, such insulting attitude is also visible within the inner relations of the community members and different communities. As Romani identity is not an unpaired body there are also discriminative stratifications within different Romani tribes. Being a member of a tribe can be more prestigious than being a member of another. However this relations are also multilayered and the hierarchy between the families can easily change in different circumstances.

The members of Romani community may also feel different than Gadjo. This feeling mainly appears as deficiency. However, the opposite is also valid. Meaningly any Romani may also feel superior than the Gadjo in different circumstances. It is a matter of negotiation. Therefore there are many fields of those the Romani agents would not compensate and resist Gadjofication; but also others where a feeling of deficiency works out.

Being a Romani is by definition a dependency relation with Gadjo. Whatever the Romani does, it is not possible to avoid from the gaze of Gadjo. The coppersmiths are pretended to be the coppersmiths of the Gadjo as well as the musicians are named as the musicians of the Gadjo. The position the Romani communities take in their relation with the surrounding communities are mainly out of the position they take in the economic life. There, some of the qualifications those the imagined Gadjo might appreciate are also the main ones also appropriated by the Romani communities. Musicianship, which is a very common vocation for the Romani communities, is a good example for such argument. That usually is mentioned as an artizanship that the Gadjo can hardly cover as a Romani does talentedly. Therefore it provides a space where the Romani can perform the abilities, amaze Gadjo and show off superiorities.

Meaningly, the relations based on interactions of the Romani communities and the external communities provide shifting hierarchies. Therefore being a musician usually is put out of negotiations on leaving the Romani identity in favor of Gadjofication; since, it is accepted to be a higher value for the Romani communities where the Romani musicians would not like to lose. But leaving a neighborhood may be a matter of negotiation; since, the neighborhood stigmatize, in Wacquantian sense (Wacquant, 2007) the Romani as a Romani for the imagined gaze of Gadjo and may bring barriers in any public space to be accepted as an equal citizen. There, as a fantasmic flowchart, as long as living in the Romani neighborhood most Romani individual feels no possiblity to get rid of his/her Romani identity which is pretended to put him/her onto a lower strata in the current dominant social stratification.

Therefore from the position of the Romani, being a musician is not a position that is open to negotiation; since, it may provide a higher-level position for the Romani in the social hierarchy. So it is something to not to lose but to be defent and got proud of; since the Gadjo is not capable to do it as the Romani does. There it is one of the few grounds where Romani may perform abilities. However, such degreeing rooted on an imagined virtue might not match on the values set of *the* Gadjo. However, the saying of *musician*, as it may be observed on the use of the term *Mutrib*, may signify an insulting meaning for *Dom* communities when the *Perev* use it to name the communities. As it may be visible on the degrading use of the name *Mutrib*, what Romani degrees musicianship, as ability, may also be a lower definition for Gadjo.

Therefore, such positionings of Romani may also be dependent upon the imagined stereotype of Gadjo. Since, the Romani do not have access on the field of Gadjo, there the knowledge about it may only ground on the points of interaction where is fully occupied by insulting practices. Musicianship, at least on the popular way of how Romani musicians live it, is not always appreciated by Gadjo; since, it is widespreadly accepted as an unsecured, nomadic way of life. That is to say, a

Romani musician may be accepted into a Gadjo wedding to entertain; however such acceptance never guarantee for the same musician to be invited to join the prayer ceremony in the mosque of the same Gadjo neighborhood.

Such hierarchy mentioned is based on very fragile dynamics those may easily change in any practical situation. These dynamics provides me the ground to argue that the Romani identity and its relation with the Gadjo are multilayered. Depending on certain situations such layers may host for both legitimating argument of Gadjofication implementations and the points of resistance against Gadjofication.

On the other hand, this set of relations with Gadjo to establish the idea of self-Gadjofication may end up with insulting practices also between the communities. Once a resistance is broken, it can keeps on breaking the others. I remember a clear example in a workshop where young members of Romani associations met. A young Romani woman who is a member of a Rom tribe from a Thracian city was accusing another participant who was a young Dom man from a Kurdish city during a hard discussion taken between the participants. Referring on the widespread Turkish nationalist belief that "the Kurdish people are terrorists" she has claimed;

"You are the Gypsies of the Kurdish!"[76]

The young Dom man seemed to be very accustomed such abasement and he rapidly asked back that;

"So whose Gypsy are you? You are a Gypsy and I am. You put Turkish superior than Kurdish and judging me. What do you know about what Dom lives? We are lower than the lowest."[77]

A similar degreeing can also be observed for different tribes living in the same city.

---

[76] "Siz Kürdü'n Çingenesi'siniz."
[77] "Ya sen kimin Çingenesisen? Sen de çingensin, ben de. Türk'ü Kürd'ün üstüne koyup beni aşşahlayacan ha? Dom ne yaşarmış ne bilirsin? En aşşahtan daha aşşahtayız."

The object of such degreeing is again mainly determined by a discourse that grades the communities with an imagined distance to the Gadjo values. In such cases being closer to Gadjo forms is accepted as an asset.

However Gadjofication, including self-Gadjofication, is only valid up to certain points. Such certainty is not visible but each member of Romani communities perfectly knows that it is there.

There are also certain points where Gadjofication of Romani does not work. Such points are not to be observed openly but working more by gestures embedded onto everyday practices. For example most of the interviewees have mentioned referring to their experiences that the Gadjo would never touch them or eat from the food they prepare. I have also observed some examples of it. Such gestures can usually be a matter of some inspections for the Romani to find out if the one is a Gadjo or not. Even though to be accepted as a Romani is impossible for a Gadjo origined individual who is out of community relations, being a non-Gadjo is immesurably possible.

Non-Gadjo is a specific category in-between being a Romani and a Gadjo. That is a degree which the Romani may give for a Gadjo in case where the concerning Gadjo individual is not taking any insulting discriminative attitude against the Romani. A non-Gadjo has an access to carry some certain practices with Romani communities. They may be allowed to eat with Romani or built trustable friendships. I would not call most of my experiences as *Romanization* but I would comfortably call such experience as *non-Gadjofication*, which is a matter of accepted to be "good" to get closer or "evil" to stand away and make provisions against. A Gadjo may be accepted as a non-Gadjo, once s/he gets in the space of interaction where the Gadjo do usually keep out.

That is to say the relation of Romani and Gadjo is not stably defined but based on various dynamics. There are certain unnamed levels working within the community relations and between the Gadjo based on the probable interactions those may be

established by Gadjo and received and recognized by Romani.

On the other hand, one should also mention that the sense of Gadjo is not to define racial differences but it is more about if its subject having a discriminatory position or a non-discriminatory one against Romani. Walking together down to a Romani neighborhood in Izmir, a Romani man has told in a conversation about being a Gadjo and Roma;

> *"Never fear. You can't be Gadjo; since, you step down here, drinking our tea, eating what we cooked. You will never be harmed here but protected."*[78]

As a personal experience that was so nice to hear such an acceptance from a Romani of whom in his neighborhood. Moreover that was a tip for me to get that the one who is not having a discriminatory position against Romani could have the chance to access on the lifeworld of the communities. A Romani man was rooting such tension to differences of class habitudes;

> *"When you look from the outside, the Gypsies seem to be open out. Nobody likes them. For example when a woman gets into a society, a Gadjo would prefer to stand up. But our kids would not be that sensitive; since they are more easygoing. That's why they regard us strange. Next time when this Gadjo comes to a Romani society, the Romanies regard him odd; since he regards the Gypsy odd. So they mutualy dislike each other. Whereas, this is the thing. … However, it is a far cry. They odd us first. That's all why."*[79]

---

[78] *"Merak etme senden Gaco olmaz. Buraya geldin bir kere, çayımızı içtin, yemeğimizi yedin. Burdasana zarar gelmez, kollnırsın hatta"*

[79] *"Dıştan baktığın zaman çingeneler böyle rahat görünür. Kimse onları sevmez. Mesela bi adam toplum içinde bi bayan geldiğinde ayağa kalkmayı tercih eder. Ama bizim çocuklarımız daha rahat*

On the other hand, despite such a Gadjo belief on the superiority of Gadjo values and attitudes, a young Romani man who was speaking about the table manners was to turning the middle-class Gadjo rituals upside down;

> *"We all eat together. Once upon a time, I was in Ankara for a medical operation. But the operation date was delayed. May god bless them; we were staying in the house of one of my brother's army friend. We were there from ten to fifteen days. They eat from independent plates. We have no such thing. We eat ten to fifteen persons from the same plate. We don't have that much contamination. I personally see it as a mess. Everybody eats from his/her own plate. I am telling this not because I am jealous."[80]*

The Gadjo position may on one hand be the object of desire for the Romani comunities in a sense to move up the social ladder. However, the rational values of Gadjo were having no direct reflection in the world of Romani. There on the other hand the Gadjo identity may strongly be refused since the one who goes up on the social stratification is paralelly losing the social conditions of Romani being.

Still, one might also claim that Gadjofication, as a sign of advance, is also a widespreadly received positively also within the communities. An old Romani woman who was speaking about a Romani man from her neighborhood who got wealth was putting that;

---

olduğu için onu fazla düşünmez. Ayağa kalkmak istemez. O yüzden bunlarda yadırgarlar daha sonra aynı vatandaş çingenlerin içine geldiğinde, çingenleri yadırgadığı için bu seferde çingenler onu yadırgar, birbirlerini hiç böyle sevmezler. Halbuki olay budur yani. Halbuki alakası yok yani. İlk başta onlar yadırgar. Hep o yüzden"

[80] *"hepimiz bi arada yeriz. Ankarada bi tane ben ameliyat olacaktım. Almeliyat ertelendi. Abim asker arkadaşının evinde kalırdı o geben bize çok yardımcı olurdu allah razı olsun. Onlarda kaldık on gün onbeş gün hergün sabah ayrı, bizde o şey yok..bi taban içinden on kişi onbeş kişi yiyo..bu derece kirlilik yok yani bizde , biz şahsen ben şahsım olarak..kirlilik olarak görüyorum yani. Herkes bi tabakta yiyo. Yemek kıskandığımdan diil yani."*

162

"Look at that guy. He has rid himself to his salvation. He blessedly is walking with his cavaliers."[81]

Climbing the social ladder, as a developmentalist fantasia, is also a widespreadly shared dream for most Romani agent. Therewithal, for Romani case, such lower class dream is strongly connected with getting rid of Romani being; since, being a Roma is supposed almost equal to being poor. Otherwise it is widely presupposed that it may need a great deal of time for a Romani individual just to synchronize the identities and establish an equal relationship with a Gadjo even in personal level.

"First I told them that I am not Romani. Then I said 'even if I am Romani, I do have the same qualifications with you. We share the same human rights. We share the same nation, breath the same climate. You and I have no difference. That is about what you see different, what you want to call forth of Romani."[82]

Furthermore, the use of the words Gypsy and Romani would also provide other layers. Whether being a member of *Sepetçi*, *Orom* or *Mangosar* families, still the words Romani and Gypsy have umbrella coverage also in the insider discourses of communitiy members. The words might easily take each other's place in different conditions. Generally the former is a word used for more "gadjofied" sense of the identity while on the contrary the latter word is used in more direct quotations to signify more "primitive" or even "vulgar" sense than Romani. One might reject the term Gypsy because of its pejorative sense while the other might do it for the term Romani because of its "elite", "whitish" sense. Some of the interviewees have rejected both names strictly while some accepts both of them and claimed how to

---

[81] *"Ha bak adam gendini kurtarmış. Adam süvarilenen geziyo mübarek."*

[82] *"Zaten ben onlara ilk dedim 'ben roman değilim'. Romansam da seninle aynı özellikleri taşıyorum. Aynı insan haklarını paylaşıyorum. Aynı milleti aynı çevreyi paylaşıyorum. Aynı havayı soluyorum. Seninle benim farkım yok. Sizin farklı farklı gördüğünüz romanlardan çıkarmak istediğiniz şu."*

name it does not make difference once you are a Romani. Still it may be argued that the use of both words is quite relevant inside the communities.

Besides, one might also argue that the communities were having more immediate relations with the non-Romani communities who are also oppressed from the Gadjo gaze and in closer circles with Romani communities. Speaking about the Romani participation onto *Haci Bektaş*[83] ceremonies of Alavi communities in Turkey, a young Romani man was briefing conditions to building an equal relation as non-discrimination;

> *"They [Romani] often go to* Haci Bektaş*. For example they go 20 days before the opening ceremony and they stay 20 days more after the gathering. They are really fantastic there. Even the real* Alavis *are not that commited. That's why there is no racial discrimination there."*[84]

7.3 Survival Stories Between Exclusion and Integration

Claiming that the world system is composed by and for the Gadjo, Romani communities have always been faced by lack of access to central positions and fruits of this order of the nations but more to be seen as a tumor. As being one of the most disadvantageous social groups, deal with greater competition both in economic and social ground, within these hard conditions of social acceptance, the Romani communities have their own strategies for social mobility in the sense De Certeau (1984) puts. However these strategies are never strong enough to stand directly

---

[83] *Haci Bektaş* is a popular religious figure of Alavism in Anatolia. Each year by August there organized gatherings in memoriam of his way, where crowds of people living in Alavi way of life meet.

[84] "*Onlar genelde Hacı Bektaş'a çok , mesela açılışına 20 gün kala oraya giderler. Açılıştan sonra 20 gün de orda kalırlar. Onlar çok accayipler mesela onların yaptığını hakiki Aleviler yapmaz. O şekil derece çok tapıyolar oraya. .. (orada) ırk ayrımcılığı yapmıyolar ya o sebepten.*"

against the discrimination but working more implicitly by the codes made up from poverty conditions and to be known only by the community members to make do with the Gadjo world.

It may be argued that any member of Romani communities living such discriminative conditions built around this discourse of exclusion is constantly positioning him or herself against such injurious Gadjo gaze. Therefore, to defend Romani being as a positive feature turns to be a social struggle of existance which may easily take a lifetime long. It may be why a young Romani interviewee, speaking about the undergrading Gadjo attitudes against the communities, was overgrading his identity;

> *"They find us odd in the school. They call gypsy. We sit on the*
> *same desk and when his family comes to pta meeting they say*
> *'hey why are you sitting with a gypsy? He is a gypsy, he can*
> *harm you.' But actually it is a far cry. He may contrarily*
> *harm us. Is there any human being like our people? Love and*
> *respect is never lost. They always try to cover even if a*
> *mistake is taken; they try the best to recover it."*[85]

For most of the Romani interviewees met during the research carried in different states, Gadjo is mainly received as something which is there to exclude and insult the Romani communities and can harm Roma easily. Therefore it is something to protect one's self from. I have clearly noticed it with a phrase I have heard in a case where some Romani men use it while speaking about a member of their community who had carried an illegal trace, which literally means *"neither to the Gadjo, nor to the police."*[86] Asking the meaning of the signified of this saying, I have received the

---

[85] *"Okullar da yadırganıyo yani. Çingen diyo. Şimdi bi sırada oturuyoruz. Ailesi geliyo… Toplantıya geliyo, bakıyo şimdi, 'ee! Sen' diyo, 'niye çingenle oturuyosun' diyo, 'o' diyo, 'çingen' diyo, 'sana bişeler yapar' diyo. Halbuki alakası bile yok. Asıl o yapar. Bizim insanımız gibisi var mı yaa! … saygı asla yitirilmez..o saygı sevgi asla yitirilmez..her ne kadar yanlış da yapılsa hata da yapılsa onu örtmeye çalışırlar.. düzeltilmeye çalışılıyor."*

[86] *"Ne Gadjoya, ne Baroya"*

answer that any problem appeared within the community is not possibly been understood by an outsider. Therefore they were operating a kind of inner legal system to resolve the problems without giving any tips to any Gadjo. Some daily problems based upon such as *cockfights* between community members or marriages without recognition of the parents are all to be solved within the community. Therefore, at least in this neighborhood level, one may argue that even the official Gadjo institutions may be excluded to set up a peaceful community environment.

Accordingly, the Gadjo environment is unaware about the social dynamics of Romani communities. Most practices which are widespread inside the communities are not being known by the Gadjo. Moreover it would not be to exaggerate to claim that all those practices are there to not to be known by Gadjo. It may be quite difficult for most Gadjo to be welcomed into community lives. Even though one is accepted to get in, most of the inner codes of communication are also quite difficult to be understood from a Gadjo point of view. This is also why the even awareness about the existance of Romani languages is poor within the Gadjo society.

One might argue that the significance of *the* Romani culture would also be founded on the different strategies to overcome such various practices of discrimination. It can even be argued that exlusion and discrimination faced and the strategies to deal with them have established the determining factors of the Romani identities. There ignoring the Gadjo hegemony may easily become to be the first strategy to defend the Romani identity. Another phrase I have heard in a Romani neighborhood in Izmir briefly putting, as a speech act, the blankness of Gadjo world for Romani; *"Get them as serious as they get you."* Besides practical examples of racial exclusion, to be a Romani, for a member of Romani community might be figured as to not to be taken seriously from the imagined gaze of Gadjo. There, as a counter action, the Gadjo values might be not taken serious from a Romani point of view. A young Romani boy who was working as a shoe shiner was expressing such position as follows;

"Just do not care what Gadjo says ... Look my brother, let me

166

brief you; Romani is the one who lives the life as it is; who loves life, nature and human beings. How can Gadjo know about these?"[87]

In such case the Gadjo is taken as the ones who have no means to get an understanding of what the world is. Another example for the use of the term Gadjo in Romani language is *"Gadjo si dilo"* which literally means, *"The non-Gypsy is fool"*. The phrase is also used in such situations where everything has gone crazy and when one's life got out of his\her control. It, on the one hand, refers to the foolishness of the world, which does not understand what a Romani does on earth, and on the other it understates the Gadjo who thinks that the world consists of his\her understanding. There, the reasons the Gadjo have to dealing with the world do not seem to be taken reasonable from Romani point of view. Indeed, the reasoning was for the rational world of the Gadjo.

On the contrary, to make the identity out is not an easy task for a Romani individual. In any case that must be stated that one of the main common points of being a Romani is the difficulty of expressing the identity in any circumstances openly. Such a declaration has different strategies to make do with such an experience, especially in a Gadjo environment, where being a Romani is covered as if it is a *culpa*. There the Romani identity turns to be something to be excused of and something the one who carries it always needs to make an explanation about.

One of the interviewees of whom was a mature male have put different examples of it in a deeply going conversation. The interview has realized in his house in a Romani neighborhood and he actually knew what I was researching for. He has declared his Romani being in the beginning and accepted to talk to me. However within the conversation he has put most used tactics to deal with the widespread prejudices he faced in the everyday life as substituting the Romani identity with

---

[87] *Gaconun ne dediğine kulak asmayacaksın … Bak kardeşim ben sana özetleyim; Roman hayatı olduğu gibi yaşayandır; doğayı, yaşamayı, insanı sevendir. Gadjo bunu ne bilir?*

167

more valuable identities of the Gadjo environment.

> *"I do not express that I am a Romani in every environment.*
> *We are all* correct*; we are Muslims. What does it mean being*
> *a Turkish in Turkey? This is what I am. There is no such thing*
> *called Romani, [but] citizen. We all are creatures of god. We*
> *all do our prayers. We practice our religion. There is no such*
> *thing [as Romani] here."[88]*

Within the same conversation, the same tendency was occasionally going as far as rejection of the identity would go;

> *"What am I telling you is that we are not Romanies. There is*
> *no Romani within our community. We are not Romanies. We*
> *were Turkish travelers when we have moved here from*
> *Erzurum. We were* Yörüks.*[89] Do you know what; the local*
> *people called them just because they live in the tents? They*
> *have called the people living in the tents as Gypsy. There is no*
> *such thing. We are not Gypsies. No, not at all!"[90]*

Moreover, another usual tendency on rejecting Romani identity is to convert the discourse onto the myth of *lately coming outsiders* to show one's closeness to Gadjo community off. According to this narrative, being a Romani is an adhered name for the communities since they have settled the city later than the Gadjos. Another

---

[88] *"Romani olduğumu her ortamda rahatlıkla ifade etmem. Biz tamız, müslümanız. Türkiye'de Türküm demek ne demek. Ben, öyle Romani diye bişey yok. Vatandaş. Allah'ın kuluyuz hep. Allah'ın kuluyuz. Namaz kılarız. Namaz niyaz, orucumuzu tutarız. Burda öyle bişey yok."*

[89] *Yörük* clans are accepted to be the roots Turkish speaker travelers. Because of similarities of dissettled culture the often being referred as a shelter identity for Romani communities.

[90] *"Yok be biz onlara karışmayız ya. Sana diyom biz Romani değiliz. Bizde Roman yok, biz Roman değiliz biz. Biz Erzurum'dan buraya geldiğimizde biz Türk göçerdik. Yörüklerden. Bu memleket ne demiş oldu biliyo musun? Çadırcılar ya! Çingen demiş çadırlara.. Öyle bişey yok, biz Çingen değiliz. Değiliz biz."*

young Romani man of whom was a waste paper collector speaking about the residents of another Romani neighborhood in the same city was putting an example of this tendency;

> *"They call us as Gypsies. Look that neighborhood is not Gypsy. That is not Romani. Neither there nor here is. These all have come from outside. [The inhabitants of] this neighborhood have come from outside. They came from outside and settled in." [91]*

Such myth can also be working in an opposite condition. Even though some members of communities were strongly refusing Romani identity some others, which may be relatives with the formers, defend the Romani identity proudly for their family and charge the other Romani families with being non-Romani but acting as if they are.

> *"For example there is this saying of fake Romanies, so-called Romanies. We are from absolute and absolutely 100 % real Romanies. Because, there are real Romanies in our family. I do not believe the others are real Romanies."[92]*

On the other hand, some of the interviewees who were aware of the Gadjo pressure over the Romani identity might be defending it as a struggle of existence. A young Romani man in a western town was claiming that being a Romani is denigrated by the Gadjo gaze while he was mentioninig his proud of being a Romani.

> *"I am not ashamed of being a Romani and I don't believe that*

---

[91] *"Çingen derler diyom. Bak o mahalle Çingen değil. Ha Roman değil orası. Orası da değil, burası da değil. Hep bunlar dışardan gelme. Bizim burası, orası dışardan gelme. Hani yerleşme o, gelip de dışardan yerleşme."*

[92] *"Mesela koftiden roman diyor, sahte romanlar diyor ya. Biz kesin ve kesinlikle %100 gerçek romanlardanız. Bizim sülalemizde çünkü gerçek romanlar var. Ben onların gerçek roman olduğuna inanmıyorum."*

I will. I was having a few distant friends who were ashamed of it. But they could challenge themselves. Romanies do love themselves. As everybody knows it they are the people who likes cheerful affections; who likes to help each other. We never get ashamed of being a Romani. We are proud of it. We can mention it everywhere without a shame."[93]

As I have tried to brief above, there have been several positionings of theRomani identity met during the field research. However, whether the interviewees appropriate the Romani identity or refuse or define themselves in-between refusal and acceptance, it may be argued that the Romani identity is construct against an imagined Gadjo, which is signified as anything excluding the Romani. Therefore besides any individual who is out of the Romani community relations, it may also be the mindset where the external social order, which is not to get what Romani, is produced.

Though it is not known and recognized by Gadjo environment, the Romani language exists and working as a secret language. Such argument was valid for Romanes, Domari or Lomawren and their various dialects, which are kept a secret within the all language speakers I have met. They were told to be mainly functioning in cases where the Romani is in a Gadjo environment and do not want to be understood by the Gadjo.

"For example we are Romani. Sometimes our neighbors come to visit us. My father cannot order us to cook tea; he would take it a shame. Or for example, to ask us setting a table, they would say 'Maru haşin.' *Of course they would not understand it. That's how it is for us. That would be a shame to ask for*

---

[93] *"Roman olmaktan utanmıyorum, utanacağını da sanmıyorum. Benim çok bir iki uzaktan arkadaşlarım oldu. Utanan arkadaşlarım oldu. Onlar da kendilerini aştılar. Romanlar kendini seven herkesin bildiği, neşeli muhabbetleri seven insanlar. Birbirine yardımcı olmasını seven insanlar. Roman olmaktan hiç bir zaman utanmıyoruz. Gurur duyuyoruz. Her yerde de utanmadan söyleyebiliriz yani."*

preparing food nearby someone else."[94]

Hereunder, it may be argued that the language is used strategically as a shelter in cases where Romani do not want Gadjo to understand what s/he is talking. I have also observed an analogy between use of language and Romani identity. That is to say, within the neighborhoods I have been, the communities who used to have strongest attachment with Romani identity were the ones who were using the Romani language actively. Such exclusion and marginalization makes the building of community formation spirit and solidarity easier. Such an extraordinary situation results with a special experience of human organization.

However, by the manipulation on the Gadjo sense, coaching the eye of the Gadjo even into Romani-self, Gadjofication might also be a working as a self organized process run by community members. However, though its a voluntary transformation, there are certain points where such Gadjofication would not work for Romani as the harshest point of discrimination. This was basically about the Gadjo distance taken on the basis of cleanness and mess where the Gadjo position received by participating Gadjofication practices would not work out. There the Gadjofication has various levels based on situational incidences.

Gadjofication actually imposes an experience to the Romani communities which is out of the experience they have until today, where the only way to exist for Romani is shown as to leave their life choices behind and to fit on the forms imposed, that finally means the fade away of Romani way of social organization which is not based on the rational codes accepted as a gospel by the Gadjo mind set. At least as being an expression of internationally diffused communities, unlike any nations-based Gadjo identities, Romani identities have never had a territorial reference, except neighborhood scale. Therefore a street graffiti in Istanbul, which I have seen during the fieldwork, even though romanticising the Gypsy identity, was having

---

[94] "Mesela biz Romanız. Ee! Komşularımız geliyor. Babam söyleyemez de 'çay yapın'; ayıp olduğunu düşünürler. Mesela yemek hazırlayacaksın. *Maru haşin* derler mesela. Bunlar anlayamaz tabi. Biz de öyle yani; yemek yapın demek misafirin yanında ayıp olduğu için yani."

something to say about the distinguishing features from those of the Gadjo identities;

"If nation was something good, Gypsies would have a country."[95]

7.4   A New Form of Social Discrimination; *Get Gadjofied or Out!*

By the 1990s, the neoliberal ideas of control and maximization of profit have declared their victory and started to regulate anything possible to promoting their ideals from city designs to social services. Thereforward the main tendency against any problem was not to solve but to manage it applicably. As a matter of fact, some problems have left to not to be solved in cases where management of crisis would cost more profitable than a probable solution. The appearance of such "professional" form of *social work* was having something to do with the values of competition-driven model by weakening of the social state and strenghtening of finance capital, land speculation, service sector and rapid circulation of information.

That common perspective of the defined era was to approaching "social problems" with campaigning methods of NGO projects and urban development implementations to regulate them. The discourse of "disadvantageous" was a popular definition for defining the subjects of "advantageous" sectors. There to interfere the social issues in this era were never about basic *rights* of human or citizen, but about the *mercy of advantageous*; since the advantageous ones, namely the Gadjo in our context, were legitimating their approaches by a discourse of giving the resources they control to the disadvantageous rather than enjoying them. From this Gadjo point of view to demolish the poor neighborhoods would save the under class from unhygienic conditions of living.

The practices to *cope up* with poverty have morphed into the a charity work. The

---

[95] *"Ulus iyi bir şey olsaydı, Çingenelerin vatanı olurdu."*

problems are intended to be solved by providing money after they appear. In this perspective, one can study anything comes out of the blue, such like the TOKI system, as a struggle against disadvantageousness. These fields are left onto "solutions" developed in the frameworks of urban development and NGO projects. Such solutions are functioning to to "including" the concerning communities by "taming;" there annihilating the subject positions of living agents.

Besides Romani communities, there are many disadvantageous grous defined in this period in Turkey such like women, differentiated, etc. Still, having similarities on the grounds of poverty and "disadvantage", Romani communities are facing also significantly different discrimination mechanisms than any of those disadvantageous groups face. However, I should underline here that the similar problems many Romani communities practice is not to argue about a unique Romani culture which is also comforting the grounds of powerty, as Oscar Lewis' Culture of Poverty (1961) tends to induce, but to mention about such understanding is rooted on a Gadjo point of view and to not to let such point to blurring several existing structural barriers and systematical practices against Romani communities such like discrimination.

Such barriers are not recently built. They are there historically and it is not valid only in Turkey, one can observe such structural barriers almost all around the world. These structural barriers may take different forms from an age to another, however this dissertation intends to document and questionize the forms of such barriers which are current in the field research concerned.

On the other hand another Gadjo tendency is to stereotype Romani. So meeting with a Romani which do not perfectly fit with these accepted images can be disappointing for a Gadjo. A Romani man who was working in a grocery was complaining about one of his friends who used to not believe that he is a Romani just because he does not seem like the Romani stereotype in his Gadjo friend's imagination;

173

*"I have talked to a friend one night. 'Look' I said 'I am a
Romani'. He told me that 'No brother! You are not a Romani.
You have no similarity with the Romanies.'"*[96]

The main will of the imagined Gadjo society in accordance to the grounding
opinions briefed behind are rooted on rationalization there the manageability of any
acceptable constituent of society where one can only be welcomed in case of
providing enough replies for the cultural acceptance requirements. The only way for
Romani to be accepted as a *constituent grata* was to shorten the imagined distance
and to form community relations throughout the necessities of the outer world. Such
adaptation might be on one hand by obeying the dictated conditions desperately and
trying to form an atomized middle-class life to do the monthly paybacks of a social
house which is supplied outskirts of the city by the state institutions and get lost in
making the effort to better integrate the hard conditions of Gadjo world or defending
the solidarity based community relations which provide basic resistance
opportunities to exist.

As Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand (2005) puts, the very negative stereotypes about
Romani, being dirty, immoral, isolated from the society, thief, not taking the life
serious, joyful, spending the days income, living for today etc, are building barriers
for the social inclusion of Romani communities. It may easily be argued that the
Gadjo is the one producing these stereotypes; Gadjo is the common sense, who
decides and sets the social norms.

Paralelly the use of Gadjo in Romanes is quite holistic. From the perspective of
Romani, it signifies the ones who exclude the Romani by placing them to a different
position than that of the other compounds of the society settled. The myth of
hierarchy on cultural differences is basically feed by perception of everyday
practices. Such differences may end up with sharp opinions about the cultures of

---

[96] *"Ben bi akşam konuştum onla. 'Bak ben romanım' dedim. 'Abi sen roman değilsin' dedi.
'Romanlara benzer bi halin yok senin' dedi."*

174

Romani. However to decreeing everyday attitudes would end up with culturalist racism. There the tendency to define an imagined Romani culture apart from "*normal"* social being can easily resolve to be constant stigmatization.

Even literally it sounds so, the Gadjo would not perfectly fit the term *the stranger* in Simmelian sense; since, Georg Simmel (1971) defined the stranger from the point of view of the settled, hosting position. There, stranger was the one who is an outsider, who is not owner of the land; it is dislocated, such as idle or itinerant trader. However, today the Romani, whether settled or traveler, is mostly the one who is defined as dislocated by the Gadjo. Contrarily the stranger has always been the Romani; since s\he was the one who is undesirable.

Apparently, Gadjo from the point of view of Romani fits more to the term *the other*. Remembering Edward Said (1978), on the concept of the other, one necessarily needs the definition of them, who are not us, to determine the borders and to differentiate him\herself as a part of the identity construction. Constructing his or her counter image, thought, idea and experience, the other is a supplementary fragment of the material civilization and culture of the gaze owner.

A distinctive briefing work of Emine İncirlioğlu (2007) states that, the word *gypsy* (çingene), written in small letters, has a pejorative use in the idioms of the Turkish speaking greater society. She gives several examples of it and argues that this scornful sense has transformed the word *Gypsy*, written in capital letters which is the name of a real human community, to gypsy.

One of the idioms used in Turkish, the main surrounding language for the Romani in Turkey, provides a notable example for the fact: "Seventy two and a half (72 ½) nations" defines the world with a calculation of consisting nations. In this metaphor each nation is counted as one unique nation, but the "half" is signifying the Romani which is only a remainder not even a unit. On the other hand the remaining 72 nations are a sum of Gadjo from the signifier position of Romanes.

However the main problem, where any Romani individual might be more hygienic then Gadjo individual, was that the definition of and the need to "hygienic life" were also made from such Gadjo perspective.

7.5   Hidden Injuries of Gadjofication

Besides being a systematical structural process, Gadjofication has also serious personal impacts. These impacts are mainly observed in emotional level. Each dimention of gadjofication, namely social encounters with the Gadjo environment, urban transformation implementations or operations of NGO industry have certain roles for the Romani individuals to get umbraged.

It can easily be argued that any Romani individual is quite used to being betlittled by the Gadjo environment. Such injuries are arises only being a member of Romani communities. This is where one starts to self-questioning about his/her Romani individuality. As Fanon (2008) has also underlined a similar questioning in case of man of color and the white woman, this is such a learned abasement from the lifetime long experience of being a Romani self against insolent approach of Gadjo surrounding.

Besides such injuries can be rooted on being a Romani individual, they can also appear on Gadjofication processes; since, Gadjofication that intends to transform Romani individuals is not always successful. Moreover Gadjofication is on one hand by definition an unsuccessful process on transforming the community members onto imagined Gadjo friendly living forms; since such forms are imagined and do not appear in reality.

However on the other hand it can also be received as quite successful as the previous form of neighborhood based Romani lives are getting lost, there erasement is getting realized and the individual is left alone within the Gadjo environment as trying to be Gadjoes to make do with the conditions of life and develop strategies to

survive.

Still, either doing well integration with the Gadjo environment or not, in any case mentioned the personal experiences of process are emotionally quite harmful for the Romani individuals. In former case has to do for example with the feeling of Romani individual putting as suppressing her/his identity especially in the Gadjo environments. In the latter case, the Romani identity also does follow oneself as it is not letting her/him to be Gadjofied.

That's to say Gadjofiation experiences have a lot to do with emotions and reactions and resentments as this chapter have put in several cases. As a global process the gadjofication creates many local emotions those are mainly unsafe, uncanny and bringing out many injuries. Those emotions are on one hand can be quite individual experiences but on the other they may also fit into collective positionings of the communities.

CHAPTER 8

TO CONCLUDE

The very output of the dissertation is just like the impossibility of a unique Romani identity there also is no unique Gadjo body. These namings are basically socially constructed and dependent on the contextual occasions. However the effort the dissertation put to generalize Gadjo as the set of opinions and practices of the neoliberal mind set, which is context dependent and providing the ideological background for global capitalism to comfortably dwell, is also a contextual proposal for an irony of an endeavor to *objectify* the desperate anthropologies or mind sets of whom are carrying the point of view to *objectify* Romani throughout defining their subject as a unique body to be rationally understood and there to make it manageable for keeping the hegemony of such ideology going. This work explores and defines three certain layers where such mind set is visible. First layer consist of of legal regulations, educational and health services and social services, namely the *social* ground where Romani communities encounter Gadjo environment. Secondly urban transformation operations which demolish not only physical ground but also the public space of the neighborhoods and thirdly NGO formation of organization of the communities help the rational mind to operate itself.

Moreover such proposal is of course not an obeisance to the hegemony of Gadjo and to preserve a so-called unique Romani culture. Mainly understanding and contributing on going discussions this dissertation put its efforts to discursively act in the terminology which is criticized, constructed and accepted by the scholar and

political environment of international Romani Studies. However as it could be followed during the study such literature mainly have a European and Northern American centric perspective to *explain* the Romani communities and the world around paralelly with the density of the scholar endeavors spent on the issues. Again just to underline an awareness, the terminology of this current dominant tendency is practically not enough to cover the Romani and the surrounding world at least for the scene in Turkey. To have a deeper look at the question the research have tried to investigate if what sort of communal and individual emotions the global forces put while operating at local. In case of accordance with the diversity and the scale of the Romani populations, the on going and probable scholar efforts put on the issue have been carrying a sound potential to terminologically and methodogically contribute existing debates in Romani Studies "discipline".

Similarly the Romani movement in Turkey, which is currently on its early age of self construction and organization, might have important contributions also on the international Romani politics in case of building and politicizing Romani experiences against the systematical Gadjofication practices.

A Romani movement building its own demands against the dictated terminology of Gadjo, there depending on the direct relations and networking within the Romani communities, resisting the Gadjofication attacks to unique definition and presentation of the communities on lingual, religious, sexual and various cultural level by *claiming* the free equal existence of *present* diversity as it is in the grassroots base, grounding on the everyday solidarity of Romani against the developmentalist competitive mind set of Gadjo, keeping in side-by-side touch with the other political communities who are under a similar Gadjofication attacks, shortly feeding from the real practice of the Romani life worlds would have the great potential to not only resist and also to emancipate the Gadjo policies which are on an on going stereotyping tendency.

One should also mention that Gadjofication is not necessarily a term only to signify the systematical attacks the Romanies face but it can also be useful to name the

whole operations of the neoliberal ideology taken for the sterilization of whole set of human practices. Though, Gadjo have a lot to "learn" from these communities about the virtue of living together in harmony with *other* communities besides performing their differences.

The economic and cultural limits of the Gadjo world has either damned, stand clear of this culture which was difficult to make a sense of and ignored or romanticized and converted to an acceptable object of desire which was impossible to be reached but inclined to define it something different anyway.

Romani population who has already low access to educational rights and disordered could only articulated the industrial and financial processes which mainly rules the dynamics of the city as being the ones at the lowest strata that does the jobs nobody would ever do for such few amount of fees. Moreover, claiming about either such encounters or urban transformation implementations or NGOization processes, Romani communities are not the only communities who are subjected to external decision-making and the ones those have been forced for meeting the "best" about them. However it is worthy to claim that the Romani communities are most exposed communities for such pressure; since, they have limited designation power on such processual layers. Moreover, reserving also many other "disadvantaged" groups inside the communities, such like women, handicapped or LGBTQ individuals, one can easily claim that the discrimination and exclusion the Romani communities faced have multiple layers.

Meanwhile, here I intent to questioning the impact of global policies, which are mainly envisaged, donated and sometimes also implemented by transnationally operating quasi-non-governmental organizations on the grassroots community relations with a focus on the case of Romani question particularly in Turkey.

Besides its contribution on qualitative literature of Romani studies, by examining the external, Gadjo, impacts on the communities and the individuals living within, the research intends to contribute the anthropology of development literature by

taking the practical operations of neoliberal apparatus of current development and the affects they produce regardlessly in the everyday lives of Romani individuals and communities into its goal.

However it would not be just to claim a perfect study. That is to say, most crucial corners of the study have arisen from during the practical field study. One should also claim that there would be less limitations if the research path was better thought before getting on the field. Most outcomes, such like many emotions met, were not the concerns in the beginning but risen the gathering of the data. However that was again an impossible cup of tea; since as a *gadjo* researcher, such design was not possible to make before meeting the everyday lives of the community members. Moreover, the research claims such a presupposition would only be from quite a gadjo position. Therefore, though not being perfectly tidy, the dissertation would like to ground probable further studies.

Still that was not much than writing my experience on the field defined. As a non-Romani researcher I would be accepted into Romani world. However that was something disturbing once it was known that I was to bring something out from where I was involved. That was acceptable once I also was melting into Romani lives, joining and living together. But to bring anything from the Romani lives as a souvenir out to Gadjo world was not ok.

Once carrying the representations of "our world" and "their world" one would be the example of production of the mutuality of double Gadjofication. Therefore the main intention of the dissertation was to write down such Gadjo moods against this mood again. Moreover, approaching the real people as if they were a bunch of datas, as may easily be observed on the development anthropologies, is a stereotypical Gadjo attitude.

Therefore, as a given ground by constructed norms of Gadjo dominated society, regarding the transformation of Romani communities onto data, the position of the ethnographer in this mutual relation was very much powerful than that of the

Romani individuals have. That is to say this is a unilateral relation where Gadjo have the means to control the power to datafy the "world Romani have." There, Romani of course have a "world" but that is where it is not to process the Gadjo as data. Gadjo collects data, Gadjo datafies, Gadjo archieves. This is also what members of Romani communities know and where to build the limits to say "no!" as it could be observed in my experience about the video tape of wedding. That is also where the position of non-Gadjo reaches to an end; to collect "document".

Therefore as an existance and there resistance strategy Romani may perform the power s/he has onto Gadjo by not to giving the data or a greeting, or to put a gun against one's head or whatever it is. That was basically to say; "hey! This is my life and you cannot datafy it."

REFERENCES

Adrian Marsh, 2008 A Brief History of Gypsies in Turkey, *We Are Here! Discriminatory Exclusion and Struggle for Rights of Roma in Turkey* Eds. Uzpeder, Roussinova, Özçelik, Gökçen, hYd, 5-20.

Adrian Marsh, 2008 Ethnicity and Identity: Who are the Gypsies? *We Are Here! Discriminatory Exclusion and Struggle for Rights of Roma in Turkey* Eds. Uzpeder, Roussinova, Özçelik, Gökçen, hYd, 21-30.

Adrian Marsh and Elin Strand, 2005 *'Reaching the Romanlar': A Report on the Feasibility Studies 'Mapping' a Number of Roman (Gypsy) Communities in İstanbul*, International Romani Studies Network.

Adrian Marsh and Thomas Acton, 2007 Erken Donem Roman Tarihi Uzerine Kisa Bir Arastirma, *"Roman" Olmak* ed. Remziye Umunc, EdRom, 2-12.

Akhil Gupta, 1995 "Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State", *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 22, No. 2: 375-402.

Andre Gingrich and Richard G. Fox, 2002 *Anthropology, by Comparison*, London-New York: Routledge.

Antonio Gramsci, 2010 *Prison Notebook Volume 1*, Columbia University Press.

Arjun Appadurai (1990) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 27-47.

Arturo Escobar, 1991 "Anthropology and the Development Encounter: The Making and Marketing of Development Anthropology", *American Ethnologist,* Vol. 18, No. 4: 658 682.

Arturo Escobar, 1992 "Imagining a Post Developent Era? Critical hought, Development and Social Movements", *Social Text*, 31/32: 20-56.s

Arundhati Roy, 2007 STK Yapmacıklığı Değil, Gerçek Mevzi Mücadeleler, *Çekirgeleri Dinlemek,* Agora Kitaplığı.

Benedict Anderson, 2006 *Imagined Communities,* Verso.

Christina Bratt Paulston & G.Richard Tucker, 2003, Ethnography of Speaking, *Sociolinguistics: the Essential Readings,* Malden: Blackwell.

Çağlar Keyder, 2000 *Küresel ile yerel arasında İstanbul*, Metis Yayınları.

David Graber, 2002 Anthropology of Globalization (with Notes on Neomedivalism, and the End of the Chinese Model of State) American Anthropologist 104(4): 1222-1227.

David Harvey, 1988 *Social Justice and the City*, Blackwell.

David Harvey, 2007 Neoliberalism and the City, *Studies in Social Justice*, Volume 1-1, 2-12.

David Harvey, 2008 Right to the City, *New Left Review* 53, 23-40.

David Harvey, 2010 Urban Process Under Capitalism: A Framework for Analysis, *The Blackwell City Reader,* Eds. Bridge & Watson, 32-39, Blackwell.

Dell H. Hymes, 1989 Studying the Interactions of Language and Social Life, *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach,* 29-66, the University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ebru Uzpeder, 2008 Development of the Roma Rights Movement in Turkey, *We Are Here! Discriminatory Exclusion and Struggle for Rights of Roma in Turkey* Eds. Uzpeder, Roussinova, Özçelik, Gökçen, hYd, 115-128.

Edward Said, 1978 *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon.

Emine İncirlioğlu, 2007, Küçük Harfle Yazılan "çingene", in *Roman Olmak*, Edirne: edRom, 34-41.

Etienne Balibar 2009, *Foreword*, Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order, Eds. Sigona and Trehan, Palgrave Macmillan.

Francis Fanon, 2008 Black Skin White Mask, C. L. Markman (Trans.) London: Pluto Press.

Georg Simmel, 1950 The Stranger, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel,* Kurt Wolff (Trans.) New York: Free Press, pp. 402 - 408.

George E. Marcus, 1995 Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 24. pp. 95-117.

Homi Bhabha, 1994 *The Location of Culture,* Routledge.

Ian Hancock, 2006 On Romani Origins and Identity- Questions for Discussion, *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities Contextual, Constructed and Contested,* 69-92.

Ibn Khaldun, 1989 *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, Tr. F. Rosenthal, Ed. N. J. Dawood, Princeton University Press.

James Clifford and George E. Marcus, 1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* Berkeley University of California Press.

James Ferguson 2005 Anthropology and Its Evil Twin: "Development" in the Constitution of a Discipline, in Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerad (eds), *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism* 140-155, Blackwell.

Jan Yoors, 2005 *Opré Roma*, (Tr. H. Alpman), Çiviyazıları.

Joey Sprague & Diane Kobrynowicz, 2006 A feminist epistemology. In J.S. Chafetz (Ed.). *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender.* New York: Springer. 25-44.

John Boli and George M. Thomas, 1997 "World Culture in the World Polity: A Century of International Non-governmental Organization.". *American Sociological Review* 62 (2): 171-90.

Jonathan X. Inda and Renato Rosaldo, 2008 'Introduction: A world in motion', The Anthropology of Globalization a reader, Eds. Inda and Rosaldo, 3-46, Blackwell Publisers.

Judith Butler, 1999 Performativity's Social Magic, *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, ed Richard Shusterman, Blackwell, 113-129.

Jürgen Habermas, 1991, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, MIT Press.

Katrin Simhandl, *2009 Beyond Boundaries? Comparing the Construction of the Political Categories 'Gypsies' and 'Roma' Before and After EU Enlargement*, Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order, Eds. Sigona and Trehan, Palgrave Macmillan.

Ken Lee, 2000 "Orientalism and Gypsylorism", *Social Analysis* 44 (2), pp 129-156.

Le Corbusier, 2010 The City of Tomorrow and Its Planning, *The Blackwell City Reader,* Eds. Bridge & Watson, 345-364, Blackwell.

Lesley.Gill, 2000. *Teetering on the Rim: Global Restructuring, Daily Life and the Armed Retreat of the Bolivian State*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lila Abu-Lugod, 1991 Writing Against Culture, in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present eds.* Richard G. Fox, School of American Research Press 137-54, 161-2.

Lila Abu-Lughod, 2000 Locating Ethnography, Vol 1(2): 261–267, Sage Publications.

Loïc Wacquant, 2004 Critical Thought as Solvent of *Doxa*, *Constellations* 11.1: 97–101.

Loïc Wacquant, 2006 Pierre Bourdieu, *Key Contemporary Thinkers,* Rob Stones (ed.), Macmillan.

Loïc Wacquant, 2007, Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality, *Thesis Eleven,* Number 91: 66–77
SAGE Publications.

Loïc Wacquant, 2008 *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*, Polity Press.

Louis Wirth, 1997 *The Ghetto (Studies in Ethnicity)*, Transaction Publishers.

Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 2005 *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization,* padstow, Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing.

Martin Maruák and Leo Singer, 2009 *Social Unrest in Slovakia 2004: Romani Reaction to Neoliberal 'Reforms,'* Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order, Eds. Sigona and Trehan, Palgrave Macmillan.

Michael Cernea, 1995 Malinowski Award Lecture: Social Organization and

Development in Anthropology, Human Organization 54 (3): 340-352.

Michael Foucault, 1995 *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Tr. Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books.

Michel De Certeau, 1984 "Making Do": Uses and Tactics, *The Practice of Everydaylife*, 47-59, University of California Berkeley.

Michel De Certeau, 1993 Walking in the City, *The Cultural Studies Reader*, 126-133, Routledge.

Mike Davis, 2006 *Planet of slums, Verso.*

Mustafa Aksu, 2003 *Turkiye'de Cingene Olmak,* Ozan Yayincilik.

Neil Smith, 2002, New Globalism, New Urbanism:Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy, *Spaces of Neoliberalism:Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*, Eds. N.Brenner ve N.Theodore, 80-103, Blackwell.

Nicolas Rose 1996 The Death of the Social? Refiguring the Territory of Government, Economy and Society 25, 327-356.

Nidhi Trehan, The Romani Subaltern within Neoliberal European Civil Society: NGOization of Human Rights and Silent Voices, *Romani Politics in Contemporary Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Mobilization, and the Neoliberal Order*, Eds. Sigona and Trehan, Palgrave Macmillan, 51-71.

Norman Long 2001, Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives, Routledge.

Oscar Lewis*, 1968 "The Culture of Poverty" On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences,* ed. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, 187–200, Basic Books.

Oğuz Işık and M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu, 2001 *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk, Sultanbeyli Örneği*,

İletişim.

Paul Dresch and Wendy James, 2000 Introduction: Fieldwork and the Passage of Time, *Anthropologists in a Wider World*: Essays on Field Research, Dresch, James and Parkin eds. Berghahan Books, pp 1-26.

Paul Farmer, 2003 *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on Poor*, Berkeley: university of California Press.

Pierre Bourdieu, 1999 The Authorized Language, *Language and Symbolic Power* Polity Press, 107-116.

Pierre Bourdieu, 2007 Vive La Crise!: Sosyal Bilimlerde Heterodoksi Icin, Ocak ve Zanaat: Pierre Bourdieu Derlemesi, eds Cegin, Goker, Arli, Tatlican, Iletisim, 33-52.

Robert C. Holub, 1991 *Jurgen Habermas: Critic in the Public Sphere*, Routledge.

Roberto Damatta, 1994 "Some Biased Remark on Interpretivism: A View from Brasil", in *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, ed. Robert Borofsky, 119-131.

Ronald Lee, 2005 *Learn Romani : Das-dúma Rromanes,* Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Ruth Benedict, 1934 *The Patterns of Culture,* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company.

Talal Asad, 1973 *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, New York: Humanities Press.

Thomas Acton, 1974 *Gypsy politics and Social Change*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Thomas Acton 2006, Romani Politics, Scholarship, and the Discourse of Nation Building: Romani Studies in 2003, *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities*

Contextual, Constructed and Contested, 157-163, Svenska Forskningsinstitutet I Istanbul.

Udo Mischek, 2006 *Mahalle Identity – Roman Gypsy Identity under Urban Conditions*, *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, 157-163, Svenska Forskningsinstitutet I Istanbul.

William Fisher, 1997 "Doing Good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices", *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 439-464.

William Roseberry, 1996 The Unbearable Lightness of Anthropology, Radical History Review 65: 73-93.

Theses;

Gül Özateşler, 2011 The Forced Dislocation of Gypsy People from the Town of Bayramic, Canakkale in 1970, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sociology, Boğaziçi & Leiden Universities, Istanbul & Leiden.

Melike Diler, 2008 *The Survivors: Roma University Students in Turkey,* Unpublished MA Thesis, Sociology, METU, Ankara.

Selin Ceyhan, 2003 *A Case Study of Gypsy/Roma Identity Construction in Edirne,* Unpublished MA Thesis, Sociology, METU, Ankara.

Selin Önen, 2011 *Citizenship Rights of Gypsies in Turkey: Cases of Roma and Dom Communities*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Sociology, METU, Ankara.

Zeynep Ceren Eren, 2008 *Imagining and Positioning Gypsiness: A Case Study of Gypsy/Roma from Izmir, Tepecik*, Unpublished MA Thesis, Sociology, METU, Ankara.

Glossaries;

BSTS, 1983 Gösterim Sanatları Terimleri Sözlüğü, TDK.

BSTS, 1966 Tiyatro Terimleri Sozlugu, TDK.

Legal Acts;

TR Act Madde 134, Kısım 1, Fasıl:5, Karakol Amirlerinin Umumi Vazifeleri, *Polisin Merasim ve Topluluklardaki Rolune ve Polis Karakollari Teskilatlanmasina Dair Talimatname. See:* *http://www.egm.gov.tr/hukuk/EMNIYET%20TESKILATINDA%20GORULEN%20IDARI%20DAVA%20KONULARI%20ILE%20BUNLARA%20ILISKIN%20MEVZUAT/MEMUR%20ISLEMLERI/POLISIN%20DISIPLINE%20MERASIM%20VE%20TOPLULUKTA%20VAZIFE.%20DAIR%20TALIMATNAME.htm*

TR Act 2510, 1934 Madde 4, Fasıl:1 Muhacirlerin ve Multecilerin Kabulu, *Iskan Kanunu*. See: http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/554.html

1923, Article 45 *Treaty of Peace with Turkey Signed at Lausanne.* See: http://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty.en.mfa

Reports;

Sociographic Mapping of Roma Communities in Slovakia, World Bank Social Development Fund, The Canadian International Development Agency and Office of the Plenipotentiary of the Government of the Slovak Republic for Roma Communiti

2009, *Guidance on Capacity Building,* Department for International Development of UKAID.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Önder, Özhan

Nationality: Republic of Turkey (TR)

Date and Place of Birth: 23 October 1978 , Izmit

Marital Status: Single

Phone: +9 0 212 235 30 41

email: e136366@metu.edu.tr

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
PhD	METU Sociology	2013
MA	METU Media and Cultural Studies	2006
BA	MSU Sociology	2000
High School	Kocaeli Anadolu High School	1996

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
03/2009 - ...	Kadikoy Music Production	Producer, Performer
05/2008 - 06/2008 07/2008 - 08/2008	European Union Central Finance and Contracts Unit – EU-CFCU	Short term expert – Consultant

08/2007 - 04/2008	United Nations Development Programme – UNDP	Short term expert – Cinematographer
08/2006 - 05/2008	Helsinki Citizens Assembly, Turkey's Branch – hYd	Researcher
09/2007 - 02/2008	Turkish Pharmacists Association – TEB	Design and development expert
01/2007 - 05/2007	Chamber of Electrical Engineers - TMMOB – CEE	Media and publication chair
03/2007 - 04/2007	ICON Institute Public Sector GmbH	Short term expert
02/2006 - 07/2006	Association For Development of Social and Cultural Life – SkyGD	Project coordinator
09/2001 - 09/2002	World Academy for Local Governments and Democracy - WALD	Project field coordinator

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, Intermediate German, Intermediate Ottoman Turkish

AYRIMCILIK VE DIŞLANMANIN YENİ BİÇİMLERİ:
TÜRKİYE'DEKİ ROMAN TOPLULUKLARIN *GACOLAŞTIRILMASI*

1980'lerin sonunda bütün dünyada hakimiyetini ilan etmiş olan neoliberal küreselleşme toplumların önceki örgütlenme biçimlerini temelden etkilemiştir. Özellikle bilgi teknolojileri, bilgi ve sermaye birikimi ve piyasa düzenlemeleriyle ilgili son dönem değişikliklerin, zaten Anderson'un belirttiği gibi Marksizmin bir başarısızlığı olarak ortaya çıkmış olan (2006), eski hakim siyasal örgütlenme biçimine, yani ulus devletlere doğrudan etkiye sahip oldukları yaygın olarak kabul edilmektedir. Küresel yatırımcılarının hareket alanlarını genişletmek derdinde olduğu *rekabet odaklı piyasa modeli* (Farmer, 2003) için, ulusal sınırların limitleri eksik ve ikna edemez olmuştur. Böylece, mekanlar, ekonomi, siyaset ve iktidar ilişkilerinin tüm zeminlerinin yeni düzenlenmeleri yönetenlerin, yani çok uluslu yatırımcıların, kar ve arzuları en üst düzeye çıkarma ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak üzere dönüşmeye başlamıştır.

Kapitalizmin bu yeni biçiminin ideolojik hakimiyetini onaylamak ve hegemonyasını kurması, özellikle Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyetler Birliği'nin (SSCB) çöküşünden sonra daha kolay olmuştur. Öte yandan, karşı hegemonik hareketler de, tahakkümün bu yeni biçimleriyle baş etmek ve onları aşmak için yeni stratejilere doğru yön değiştirmiştir. Ancak, söz konusu yeni tahakküm, kendisini kolayca sürdürmek üzere muhalefet söylemini dahi soğuracak kadar güçlüdür. Yeni tahakkümün

hegemonyası aynı zamanda politik ekonomi temelli akademik çabaları ve direniş siyasetini de yerlerinin büyük bir dilimini kimlik odaklı siyaset lehine terk etmek üzere etkilemiştir. Bu yeni toplumsal örgütlenme içinde sivil toplum kuruluşları (STK), olası direniş ihtimallerini eritmek üzere antisiyaseti teşvik eden merkezi bir konum almıştır (Fisher, 1997).

Dünya sisteminin burada kabaca tanımlanan küresel ve esnek biçim lehine dönüşümünün, toplumsal örgütlenmenin hemen hemen her parçasında görünür olan, çeşitli izlekleri mevcut. Buna göre, 1980 askeri darbesi ve anayasasının getirdiği yapısal değişiklikler Türkiye'nin bu neoliberal çağın gereksinimleriyle karşılaşmasının zeminini kurmuştur. Müesses Türkiye'deki böylesi bir kayma, özellikle geçen yüzyılın son onyılı boyunca, ekonomik ve sosyal koşulları çok uluslu şirketlerin çıkarları için uygun hale getirmiştir. Bunların ilki kamu iktisadi şirketlerinin özelleştirilmesi, vergi sistemindeki değişiklikler ve ucuz güvenli olmayan çalışma koşullarının teşviki tarafından, ikincisiyse sosyal konuların sivil toplum örgütlerinin zemininde taşeronlaştırmasıyla gerçekleştirilmiş; böylece zaten olmayan refah devletinin ölümünü teyit edilmiştir.

Bu küresel popüler eğilimlerle uyumlu bir şekilde, Türkiye'deki STK'lar da sivil zemini düzenleyerek, o güne dek "sosyal" olarak kabul edilen ve hükümetleri ilgilendiren meselelerin taşeronlaşması ve bu yeni dönemin fikirlerini gerçekleşmesi ve yaygın olarak kabul görmesi rolünü almıştır. Toplumun "sorunlarını" tanımlamak ve düzenlemenin yanı sıra bu kuruluşların esas amaçları özellikle toplumun "dezavantajlı" olarak tanımladıkları kesimi üzerinden ithal edilmiş teknik bilgiler aracılığıyla bir "adalet" düzeyi kurmak olmuştur. Kadınlar, eğitim dışı olanlar, depremzedeler gibi toplamlar, STKlar tarafından tanımı aslında belirsiz olan "dezavantajlı" gruplara örnek verilebilen kesimlerdi. Buna göre, *toplumsal* artık bir *bütün* değil, çeşitli parçaların çokluğuydu.

Bu araştırma, neoliberal aygıtın operasyonlarını, kentsel dönüşüm ve STK sistemi gibi küreselleşemenin iki pratik zemininde inceleyerek, küresel politikaların yerel etkilerini sorunsallaştırmak niyetindedir. Bu nedenle, çalışmanın, sıradan insanların

195

gündelik anlatılarını ve pek çok duyguyu görünür hale getirerek, kalkınma fikrinin büyük cümlelerini incelemekte olduğu söylenebilir.

Söz konusu karmaşık sosyal, siyasi ve ekonomik ilişkiler dizisi, siyaseten doğru kurumsal metinlerin ve bunların uygulamalarının, gündelik etnografilerin çok yönlü metodolojisiyle karşılaştırılmasıyla masaya konulmuştur. Böylece, işin hemen hemen tüm argümanları, düşünümsel pozisyonu elden bırakmamak için, kendime dahi eleştirel bir pozisyondan kurduğum ilk elden tecrübelerimden türemiştir. Bu araştırmada Roman çalışmaları, kentsel çalışmalar, kimlik politikaları ve kalkınma antropolojisi hakkında nitel literatüre katkı sağlamayı amaçlanmıştır. *Kalkınma*yı antropolojik analizin hedefine koyan çalışma, bu iki yüzlü geliştirme fikrini çıplaklaştıracak eleştirel akademik konumun inşasına katkıda bulunmayı hedefliyor.

Araştırma, bir vaka çalışması olarak kentsel dönüşüm uygulamaları ve toplumun STK biçiminde örgütlenmesine bakarak, neoliberal küresel siyasal eğilimlerin varsayımlarının Türkiye'deki farklı *Roman* toplulukları nasıl etkilediğini inceler. Yani, çalışmanın amacı bir yandan neoliberal küreselleşmenin bu araçlarının yerel Roman topluluklar üzerinde nasıl işlediğini, diğer yandan "yerlilerin" bu süreçleri nasıl deneyimlediğini incelemek ve son olarak edindiği tüm bu argümanları karşılaştırılabilir ve üzerinde çalışılır hale getirmektir. Tezin, yerel yerleşimler üzerindeki küresel etkiyi tanımlarken ortaya koyduğu çaba, küreselleşmeyi daha iyi anlamak içindir.

Özateşler'in de zihni açıcı çalışmasında (2011) belirttiği gibi Roman topluluklar onları çevreleyen toplulukların sosyal ilişki ağlarına pek dahil edilmezler. Dahası, topluluklar toplumun geri kalanıyla somut sınırlara sahip olmanın yanı sıra, 20. yüzyılın sonlarından itibaren dolaylı olarak da olsa kendilerini çevreleyen bu diğer toplumların eğilimleri için kabul edilebilir olan biçimlere doğru dönüşmeye zorlanmıştırlar. Bu yok oluş, temelde şimdiye kadar söz konusu topluluklar için yararlı olduğu savunulan *kalkınma* ve *güçlendirme* söylemiyle yüreklendirilir ve meşrulaştırılır. Aslında bu güncel küresel eğilim, sadece Roman toplulukları değil, aynı zamanda 'kalkınmamış', 'ilkel', 'serseri' gibi tanımladığı ve ana akım ekonomik

döngü içine olmadıklarını iddia ettiği diğer 'nesneleri' de çağın bu dönügülerine dahil etmek iddiasıyla kendisini gerçekleştirir. Yine de Roman toplulukların, özellikle toplumun en fakir kesimi olmak, tarihsel olarak kendilerini çevreleyen toplumun diğer kesimlerinin ilişki ağlarından ayrıştırılmış ve dışlanmış olmak ve böylece sıradan vatandaşlıktan kaynaklanan en temel haklarını dahi gerçekleştirememiş olmak gibi ayırdedici özellikleri, küreselleşmenin pratiklerinin etkilerini ararken bu topluluklara odaklanmamın temel motivasyonunu oluşturmuştur.

Öte yandan, toplulukların bu tarihsel olarak ezilen konumları içinden kurdukları *Roman dili*nin kendileme ve ötekileştirme koşulları da söz konusu husus hakkında düşünmek için yararlı araçlar sağlamaktadır. Böylece, bu tezin ortaya koyduğu esas çabanın, Gaco[97] toplumun, erken 2000'lerden başlayarak, Roman toplulukları *'normalize etmek'* için gerçekleştirdiği sistematik yıkıcı faaliyetlerini incelemek ve bunları bir çerçeve içine koymak olduğu iddia edilebilir. Bu özel tarihsel müdahale, tez içinde *Gacolaştırma* (Gadjofication) olarak adlandırılacaktır. Gacolaştırma kullanımda olan bir terim değildir. Gaco toplumun, onları *Gaco-dostu* biçimlere dönüştürmek için Roman topluluklar üzerinde gerçekleştirdikleri uygulamaları adlandırmak üzere bu tez içinde benim tanımlamaya çalıştığım bir terimdir. Gacolaştırma tanımı esas olarak, Romanları çeşitli yaşamlar yaşayan herhangi özneler olarak değil de tek vücut ve *yönetimi yapılması gereken* bir sorun olarak gören Gaco bakışlarının yol verdiği belirli türde uygulamalara karşılık gelmektedir.

Ancak, ne çalışma süresince bir araya gelinen Roman özneler Gacolaştırıldıklarını savunmuş, ne de Gacolaştırmanın, bu çalışmanın sınırları içinde STK endüstrisi ve kentsel dönüşüm uygulayıcıları olarak yer alan, neoliberal argümanın tasarımcı ve uygulayıcıları olan, özneleri etkinliklerini Gacolaştırma olarak tanımlamıştır. Hatta Gacolaştırma sürecinin özneleri kendilerini Gaco olarak dahi isimlendirmezler. Çünkü, Gaco terimi Roman dilinin içendeki bir konumdan söz konusu topluluğun yaşamının dışarısında kalanlar için söylenebilecek bir terimdir. Gaco esas olarak,

---

[97] Gaco; Roman dilinde *"Roman olmayan"* anlamına gelen kelimedir. Kelime hem bireyleri hem de oların sosyal ilişkiler bütününü işaret eder.

tıpkı Roman olanın ne olduğunun farkında olmadığı gibi, Gaconun da ne olduğunun farkında değildir. Bir kişinin, kendisinin Gaco olduğunun farkında olması, kendi hakkında bir zihinsel kırılmayı deneyimlemesiyle ve terimin *Romani duygusunu* edinmesiyle mümkündür. Dolayısıyla, benim durumumda metodolojik duruş noktasını da kuran, böylesi bir farkındalık ancak kendine bakarken diğerinin bakışlarını takınmakla mümkündür.

Gacolaştırma, Roman toplulukları, egemen neoliberal zihnin *tanımlanabilir*, dolayısıyla *kabul edilebilir* ve *yönetilebilir* biçimlerine dönüştürmeye zorlama eğiliminde olan ve toplumsal örgütlenmenin herhangi düzeyinde işleyen küresel bir siyasi eğilim olarak gözlemlenebilir. Gacolaştırmanın izleri Roman toplulukların maruz kaldıkları çeşitli neo-liberal uygulamalarda görülebilir. Böylece, küresel politikaların yerel etkilerini görünür kılmak için elle tutulur malzeme ortaya çıkarmak üzere Roman toplulukların Gacolaştırma uygulamalarıyla yerlileştirilme (indigenized) ve yalnızlaştırılmalarına farklı pratiklerin karşılaştırmalı incelemeleri yöntemiyle odaklanılmaktadır.

Hatta Gacolaştırmanın neredeyse neo-liberalleşmenin, özel olarak Roman topluluklar üzerinde uygulanan, bir eşanlamlısı olduğu söylenebilir. Roman topluluklar yaşadıkları pratikleri, neoliberal politikalardan zarar gören diğer özne ve ilgi gruplarından ayrıştırarak tanımlama ihtiyacı toplulukların, en azından Gaco bakış açısınca, hatta bu felaketle baş etmek üzere, taşıdıkları spesifik özelliklerde kök bulur. Öncelikle Roman toplulukların uluslararası temsili vardır. Yani, Türkiye'deki pratiklerden evvel, Roman sorunsalı, uluslararası siyaset içinde, özellikle Avrupa'da, zaten önemli bir gündemdir. Bu nedenle Türkiye'deki Roman siyasetinin gündeminin, özellikle Avrupa politikalarıyla, kendi biçimlerini yıllardır AB düzeyinde tartışmalar ve müzakereler yürütülerek inşa eden, güçlü bağlantıları olduğu söylenebilir.

Buna göre, Roman topluluklar hakkında Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin (TC) merkezi konumu, en azından 2003 yılı AB uyum sürecinin kriterlerini karşılamak üzere, Roman kimliğini *göz ardı etmek* ve toplulukları *dışlama* siyasetinden ters yönde

geçerek *tanıma* ve *içerme* doğrultusunda baskılanmıştır. Bu duruma TC'nin AB ve AB düzeyindeki siyasi düzenlemeler içinde siyasi özneler olarak kabul edilen Roman toplulukları arasındaki aracı pozisyonu sebep olmuştur. Ancak bu aracı pozisyonunun tam bir muktedir uygulayıcı olduğunu söylemek kolay değildir. Bu daha çok AB uyum sürecinin tüm zorunlu kağıt işleri içinde kaybolan bir yandır. Bu nedenle, TC için ithal bir gündem olduğundan, somut bir siyasi zemine dayalı değil de, daha çok gönülsüz bir uygulama olduğu söylenebilir.

İkinci olarak, yine ilk nedeni bağlı bir şekilde, topluluklar şimdiye kadar dışlandıkları siyasi zemine henüz davet edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, *toplumsal*ın ölümünün ilanıyla *vatandaş*ın *müşteri*ye neoliberal dönüşmesi (Rose, 1996) Roman durumu için geçerli olmadığını kolaylıkla iddia edilebilir. Yasal yapılandırma ve sosyal uygulamalarla bakıldığında, Roman toplulukların tarihsel olarak vatandaşlığın sıradan koşullarını dahi gerçekleştiremediklerini iddia etmek abartı olmazdı. Bu tez, neoliberalleşmenin bu tür özel deneyimini daha iyi incelemek için, Roman toplulukların vatandaşlık koşullarını araştırmak niyetindedir.

Bu çalışma, Roman toplulukların 1950li yıllardaki kırdan kente göç sırasında göçerlikten yerleşik koşullara geçişi ve çoğunlukla 1992 ve 1993 yıllarında gerçekleşmiş zorunlu göç (Önen, 2011) deneyimlerinin ardından, daha ileri giderek bu zorunlu yerleştirilmiş kentli nüfusun neoliberal düzenlemeleri nasıl karşıladıklarına bakmak istemektedir.

Yani, bu çalışma bu sistematik operasyonların birden fazla durumlardaki koşullarının altını eşelemek için, söz konusu küresel neoliberal eğilimlerin faaliyetlerini yürüttüğü ve doğrudan Roman toplulukların yerel toplumsal örgütlenmelerini etkileyen her ikisi de birbiriyle ilişkili iki alana odaklanmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki bir yandan Roman toplulukların hayatlarını gerçekleştirdikleri arazilere el koymak ve diğer yandan topluluk üyelerini mahalle tabanlı yaşamlarından kopararak TOKİ[98] dairelerine yerleştirmek ve bu merkezi olarak

---

[98] TOKI Türkiye hükümetinin toplu konut kurumudur.

tasarlanmış evler için bir orta sınıf tutumu olarak aylık geri ödemeler yapmak zorunda bırakılması ve böylece dayanışma tabanlı Roman toplum hayatı ile bağlantısının kesilmesiyle Gacolaştırılmasıdır.

Neo-liberal argümanın uygulamalarını incelemek için odaklanılan ikinci alan toplulukların, Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları (STK) ideolojisinin standartlarında gerçekleştirilmeye itildiği, örgütlenme deneyimleridir. Bu durumda, Roman toplulukların örgütsel biçimleri ve örgütlenme süreçlerinin gündemleri merkezi olarak kararlaştırılan fonlama eğilimleri ve neoliberal argümanın profesyonel jestleri tarafından işgal edilmiş durumdadır. Bu tür bir süreç Roman toplulukların aktif siyasi katılımcılarınını dünyayı Gaco biçimler üzerinden anlamlandırmaya ve Gaco eylem biçimleriyle hareket etmeye dönüştürerek pratik olarak Gacolaştırma aracı olarak işler ve böylece Gacolaştırma uygulamalarına karşı toplulukların direniş olanaklarını da soğurur.

Bu alanların ilki bir yandan kentsel dönüşüm uygulamalarının kurucu fikri ve diğer yandan araştırma süresince karşılaşılan ve Roman toplulukları ilgilendiren bazı örnek projeleri odağa alınarak incelenmektedir. İkinci alansa kalkınma söyleminin yayılmasında STK endüstrisinin işleviyle ilgili literatür gözden geçirilmiş bunun yanı sıra ve esas olarak herhangi düzeydeki STK'ların uygulamalarına katılımcı olunmuş, özellikle de kaynak yaratma ve profesyonellik pratikleriyle ürettikleri ve teşvik ettikleri metinler ve jestleri gözlemlenmiştir.

Öte yandan, kısa bir Hegelci tarihsel anlatıyı kısmen ciddiye alsa dahi, bu tez gerçek insanların günlük yaşamlarıdan gerçek tarihleri ortaya çıkarmak üzere daha küçük hikayeler odaklanmak niyetindedir. Roman toplulukların Gacolaştırılma deneyimlerini daha iyi kavramak üzere, toplulukların tüm Türkiye çapında yaşadıkları çeşitli yerleşimlerde sıradan Romanlar insanlar ve kurulmuş olan Roman taban örgütlerinin anahtar figürleriyle yapılan etnografik gözlemler ve görüşmeler aynı zamanda toplulukların içinde yaşadıkları gerçekliklerin koşullarını araştırmak ve topluluklar üzerindeki "muktedir" Gaco bakışları ortaya çıkarmak ve eleştirmek içindir.

Tüm dünyaya yayılmış olmalarının yanı sıra en büyük etnik gruplarından biri olmasına rağmen, Roman topluluklar Türkiye'de her zaman cılız bir politik, sosyal ya da bilimsel dikkate tabi tutulmuştur. Son yıllarda topluluklar hakkında yapılmış çalışmaların sayısındaki artış görünür olsa da, Roman halkının deneyimleri ve pratikleri hakkında hala yetersiz çoklukta araştırma vardır. Ayrıca bunların önemli bir dilimi uluslararası ilişkiler disiplini ve proje bazlı siyasetin güdümünde olan akademik pazar için daha iyi hizmet etmek üzere sıradan insanların yaşam dünyalarını rakamlar veya yüzdelere indirgemekten çekinmeyen niceliksel çalışmalardır yahut bir kısmıysa ister yabancı düşmanı ister yabancı sevici olsun *Romanlar*ı steryotipleştirmeye mesafe almayarak, popüler kültürün tüketim eğilimleri ya da toplumda yerleşik olan hijyenik fanteziler lehine Roman sorunsalını yönetilmesi gereken bir sorun kabul eden doğrucu tanımlar taşıyorlardı.

Bu nedenle bu tezin arşılamaya niyetlendiği ihtiyaç, tanımlanan mevcut literatürdeki bu tür sorunlara uygun olarak, sadece Roman toplulukları hakkında niceliksel çalışmaların sorularını çoğaltmak ve derinleştirmektir. Bu durumda bu çalışma sadece toplulukların sahip oldukları "düşük imkanlara" değil aynı zamanda toplulukları "güçlendirme" söyleminin adına "normalize" etme derdindeki kalkınmacı Gacolaştırma eğilimlerine de eleştirel bir bakış açısında durmaktadır.

Tez, insanların örgütlenme yollarını incelemek için çok yönlü çabalar harcamak, bugünkü dünyayı sorgulayan güncel tartışmalara katkıda bulunmak ve söz konusu edilen neoliberal eğilimlerin pratiklerini meşrulaştırmak üzere pozisyon alan yorumlayıcı antropolojiye karşı bazı eleştirel yorumlar ileri sürmek niyetindedir. Bu nedenle, araştırmanın anlatısı ağırlıklı olarak, ben dahil olmak üzere, gerçek kişilerin gerçek deneyimlerinde yatmaktadır. Bu etnografilerin karşılaştırıldığı ve örüldüğü yollar ve bu tür bir araştırmanın tasarım yolu antropoloji içindeki düşünümsellik tartışmaları tarafından teşvik edilmiştir. Böylece, toplumsal eşitsizliklerin nasıl da yeniden ve hep yeniden üretildiğini araştırmak üzere aynı zamanda etnografın da pozisyonunun sorgulandığı bir çaba sarfedilmiştir. Metodolojinin kendisi ve etrafında yürüyen tartışma, tezin etnografi yapımına

dolayısıyla bugün sosyal bilim yapma tartışmalarına katkıda bulunma derdi etrafında tasarlanmıştır.

Tezin temel argümanları, *Roman kimliğinin* keşfini ve bir tarihsel dönüşümünü belgelemek ve tartışmak ve bu özel dönemin koşullarını küresel neoliberal eğilimlerin yerel dinamiklerle eşitsiz ilişkileri doğrultusunda eleştirel bir bakışla incelemek için ortaya malzemeyle çıkarmak, Türkiye'deki Roman topluluklar hakkında yürütülmüş kimi basit etnografilere dayanmaktadır. Araştırmanın dayandığı saha araştırması hem sivil toplum kuruluşları ortamında, topluluklar için kritik olan bazı projelerde profesyonel pozisyonlarda çalışılarak hem de Türkiye'nin toplulukların resmi olarak örgütlü olduğu ya da olmadığı çeşitli şehirlerindeki Roman mahallelerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ayrıca Roman örgütlerinin merkezi toplantılarında yürütülen takip çalışmaları Türkiye'deki Roman toplulukların örgütsel tarihinin erken yaşlarıyla ilgili tartışmalar hakkında önemli veriler sağlamıştır. Böylece 2006 ve 2008 yılları arasında topluluklara ilişkin farklı koşullarda yürütülmüş saha araştırması sırasındaki gözlemler ve derinlemesine mülakatların notları tezin anlatısının kurulumu için oldukça merkezidir.

Bir gereklilik olarak aynı zamanda kimlik gündemi etrafındaki soruları da kapsayan tez Türkiye'deki Roman toplulukların durumunnu özetleyerek başlıyor. Böylesi bir anlatıma, toplulukları çevreleyen, *Romanca* dilinde Gaco denilen, dünyanın genel bir açıklaması, mevcut küresel Gaco eğilimlerinin ihtiyaçları tarafından yine aynı eğilimin yöntemleriyle şekillendirilmiş Roman kimliğini icadı ve sistematik dönüşümünün ideolojik formasyonunun altını kazmak üzere, eşlik ediyor.

Roman teriminin NGOcu bakış açısı tarafından kabul gördüğü üzere (Simland, 2009) çalışma, toplulukları adlandırma meselesini de kapsayacak şekilde ilerliyor. Ortada toplulukları tanımlamak için çeşitli farklı kelime olmasına, ve ben şahsen farklı kabileler ve kültürleri kapsayacak bir kelime olarak *Çingene*'yi (*Gypsy*) daha uygun bulsam da, bu tezde Roman Dernekleri Federasyonu'nun (ROMDEF) kararlarına saygılı olmak ve "siyaseten doğru" olmak için topluluklar bu tezde Roman olarak anılacaktır. Yine de, bu tez bir Gaco tutumu olarak siyaseten doğru

olmak hakkında da eleştirel bir sorumluğa sahip çıkmaktadır. Demem o ki, toplumları adlandırma sorunu da tezin çalıştığı öncelikli bir tartışmadır.

Ancak bütün Roman bireyleri kapsayacak *tek bir* Roman kimliğinden bahsetmek bu tezin haddini aşacaktır. Bu nedenle, farklı Roman oluşlarının benzerlikleri ve mesafelerini tanımak üzere, bu araştırmada Roman kimliği sabit ve soysal olarak değil canlı ve sosyal bir yapı olarak kabul edilmektedir. Tez, bunu yaparken, "Roman kültürü"nün özellikleri tek bir anlatıya indirgemekten uzak durmak için bir çaba sarfetmesine rarğmen, aynı zamanda çeşitli Roman kimliklerinin muhtelif durumlarda birbiriyle ilişkili olabilecek envai dinamiklerini anlamaya çalışmaktadır.

Farklı Roman örgütleri ve yerleşimlerinin öznellikleri, rasyonel Gaco aklında tek ve kalıplaşmış olan Roman pratiklerinin çeşitliliğinin altını çizmek üzere tez için temkinli bir önem taşımaktadır. Bu nedenle çalışmanın esas niyeti hem mevcut genel toplumsal akılda daha *düşük* olarak kabul edilen Roman "kültürü" hakkında hem ve aslında esas olarak daha *yüksek* olarak kabul edilen Gaco STK sisteminin kalkınma söylemi hakkında hem de bunlar arasındaki bir etnograf olarak kendimi konumlanışımı dışlamayan bir muayene yapmaktır.

Ayrıca araştırma, yaşayan öznelerin içinde bulundukları gerçekliklerle ilişkilerini koparmamak için, Roman toplulukların yaygınca maruz kaldığı ayrımcı önyargılara karşı oldukça eleştireldir. Ne topluluklara karşı nefret söylemini yeniden üreterek ne de kabul görmüş bir Roman imajını romantize ederek ama argümanlarını gerçek insanların yaşadıkları zeminde köklendirerek, araştırma topluluklara karşı geliştirilen ırkçı steryotiplemelere karşı savaş ilan etmektedir. Çalışma esas olarak, alanındaki nitel araştırmalara kullanışlı bir katkı olmak ve sağlam bilgi sağlamak istemektedir.

Malumu ilan ederek başlamak için, toplumun en yoksul kesimi olmalarının yanı sıra, Roman toplulukların hem kamu hizmetlerine hem de kendilerini çevreleyen toplulukların sosyal ağlarına sınırlı erişimi olduğunu iddia etmek pek yanlış olmazdı. Toplumun geri kalanının zihninde topluluklar her zaman kalıplaştırmış,

203

toplumsal yelpazede ayrı bir konumda tanımlamış ve egemen önyargılar nedeniyle Romanlar kamusal alana *eşit* bireyler olarak asla dahil edilmemiştir (Balibar , 2009). Bu dışlama, Roman toplulukların yaşamlarını onları çevreleyen toplulukların yaşam kümesinden dışarıda ve Gaconun değerleri ve baskısından uzakta inşa etmeye itti.

Roman toplulukların yerleşik olduğu çeşitli mahallelere sahip olan büyük kentlerin yanı sıra, Türkiye'nin hemen hemen her şehrinin genellikle dış çepere kurulmuş kendi Roman mahallesi vardır. Bu koşulların getirdiği ayrı mahalle kimliği (Mischek, 2003) pek çok topluluk üyesi için etnik bir aidiyetten dahi önemli bir aidiyet sağlayabilmektedir. Bu büyük nüfusların yoğunlaşabildiği mahalleler, toplumsal ilişkileri ve yoksulluğu yabancıların bakışlarından uzakta yaşamayı ve içinde dayanışma zincirleri inşa etmeyi ve dolayısıyla ayakta kalmayı mümkün kılan alanlar sağlarlar. "Ayrışmış" bir Roman "kültürünün" ancak bir Roman mahallesinde yaşayan Roman sakinlerin çok taraflı ilişkilerde mümkün olduğu kolayca söylenebilir.

Mahallelerdeki toplumsal olarak yalıtılmış koşullar ve yerel gündemin baskınlığı pek çok topluluk üyesi için bugün her zamankinden daha rekabetçi dış dünyanın dinamiklerini ciddiye almak ve karşı durmak üzere günlük yaşamın değişen koşullarında hayatta kalmaya dair çeşitli zorlukları da beraberinde getirmekte. Yer kürenin 20. yüzyılın son on yılı itibarıyla özellikle insanların örgütleniş, tüketim ve üretim biçimlerine dair hızlı dönüşümü, katı olanın buharlaşmasıyla ilişki kumak için zaten oldukça düşük vasıflara sahip pek çok topluluk üyesini iyice vasıfsızlaştırmış ve zayıflatmıştır. Geç kapitalizmin sürekli sertleşen koşulları Roman toplulukların zanaate dayalı "geleneksel" mesleklerini işlevsizleştirmiştir (Eren, 2008).

Bu dönemin kar ve tüketim maksimizasyonu gibi neoliberal eğilimlerinin ihtiyaçlarını doğrultusunda özellikle kentsel alanın mütecaviz dönüşümü, Roman nüfusunun yoğun olduğu mahallelerde siddetli yıkımlara yol açmıştır. Esas olarak en azından geçimi mümkün kılan dayanışma zincirlerinin dağıtılması anlamına gelen bu yıkımlar toplulukları yeni dönemin koşullarına karşı daha zayıf bir konuma

koymuştur. Toplumsal zeminin böyle yıkıcı bir tasarımı yerleşim tabanlı Roman yaşamının şekilde imhası olarak dahi adlandırılabilir. Burada Roman topluluklara iki seçenek verilmiştir; yeni "süslü" toplu konutlara taşınmaya dolayısıyla en azından aylık ödemeler aracılığıyla orta sınıflaşmaya zorlanmak yahut ortamdan ayrılmak ve yok olmak.

Ayrıca, zaten oldukça az olan Roman toplulukların sosyal kabulünün kaybolması ve yerini kitle iletişiminin kalıplaşmış olumsuz Roman imajını beslemesiyle çevreleyen topluluklar arasında büyüyen ırkçı nefret tutumlarına bırakması da aynı zamanda gerçekleşmektedir.

Paralel olarak, Roman toplulukları onları çevreleyen toplumun dışına iten ve derin tarihsel köklere de sahip olan bu tür dışsal koşullar Roman diline de yerleşmişti. Farklı koşullarında inşa olmuş farklı Roman dillerinde *kendileme* ve *ötekileme* kodlamalarının yapımında *dışsal* ve *içsel* arasındaki mesafenin etkisi oldukça güçlüdür. Yaygın Romanca dilinde *Roman olmayan* yahut *öteki* anlamına gelen *Gaco* kelimesi açıkça toplum ilişkileri dışında olanları ve onların sosyal ilişkiler bütününü tanımlar.

Gaco dünyanın bu sertleşen koşulları karşısında Türkiye'de topluluklar içinde çağın dayatılan ihtiyaçları karşısında toplulukların temel haklarını savunmak için bir önceki yüzyılın son on yılında bir kaç örgütlenme girişimi de olmuştur. Ancak bu çabalar ulusal güvenlik politikalarının uğruna korumak sertçe bastırılmıştır.

Ancak, 2004 yılında Türkiye'nin ulusal politikalarının ilgisi doğrultusunda Kopenhag Kriterleri olarak adlandırılan Avrupa Birliği üyelik kriterlerini karşılamak için yapılan bazı yasal değişiklikler sadece Roman toplulukların değil aynı zamanda olası tüm etnik grupların örgütlenmesini mümkün kılmıştır. Böylece ilk resmi Roman örgütü, Edirne Çingene Kültürünü Araştırma, Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Derneği - EDÇİNKAY, aynı yıl Edirne'de kuruldu. (Uzpeder, 112) Türkiye'deki Roman toplulukların resmi örgütlenme tarihinin bu kilometre taşının ardından tüm ülke etrafında bir biri ardına pek çok Roman derneği kuruldu.

Buradan itibaren yerel Roman STK'larının ana gündemi *uygun* biçimlerde örgütlenme ve toplulukların sosyal kabulü ve temel hakları için harekete geçmekle meşgul oldu. Ancak, ne yazık ki, bu kuruluşların çok sayıda olması topluluklar üzerindeki dışsal müdahalelerin üstesinden gelmek için yeterli olamadı. Bu dönemde karşılaşılan en sistematik operasyonlar kentsel dönüşüm uygulamaları olmuştu.

O yıllar aynı zamanda bir dizi eski ulusu birleştirerme niyetindeki yeni bir ulus projesi olan Avrupa Birliği - AB tarafından Romanlar topluluklar hakkında çeşitli programların yürütüldüğü yıllardı. *Romanları İçerme On Yılı 2005 - 2015* Avrupa Konseyi (CoE), Avrupa Konseyi Kalkınma Bankası (CoEDB), Açık Toplum Enstitüsü (OSI), Güvenlik Teşkilatı ve Konseyi Avrupa İşbirliği Teşkilatı (OSCE), Dünya Bankası (WB), Avrupa Komisyonu (EC), Birleşmiş Milletler Kalkınma Programı (UNDP) gibi pek çok ulusaşırı çalışan örgütün işbirliğiyle başlamıştı. Bu koşullar yerel Roman toplulukları dernekler şeklinde organize olmaları için teşvik etmekteydi.

Dahası, bu genç derneklerin gündemleri kendilerine ait yapabileceklerini keşfetmek, çıkar ilişkilerinden uzak güvenilir ağlar inşa etmek gibi yerel dinamikler yerine profesyonel STK eğilimleriyle işgal edildi. Türkiye'de Roman örgütlenmesinin erken yılları aynı zamanda Türkiye'deki sivil toplumun tüzükler, profesyonellik ve hibe şartları altında yeni üniformalar giyerek siyaset yerine halkla ilişkiler, kampanyacılık gibi metodlar işleten, sorunları çözmek yerine yönetmeye aday bereketli STK endüstrisiyle tanıştığı yıllardı.

Hayli profesyonelleşmiş STK'ların Roman konularına yakın ilgisi salt insani gerekçelerle değil küresel siyasal eğilimleriyle güçlü bağlar içindeki uluslararası fonlama eğilimleriyle de alıp verdiği vardı. Sivil modelin özellikle Doğu Avrupa deneyimlerinin çürümesinden sonra (Maruák ve Singer, 2009), Türkiye'deki Roman çevrenin bekareti etrafındaki potansiyel çıkarlar uluslararası faaliyet gösteren bu beceriksiz kuruluşlara, kimi zaman hiç bir taban temsiliyeti olmayan ancak

raporlama iş lerini becerebilen yerel *evrak çantası örgütleri*yle bile yaptıkları işbirlikleri sayesinde ulaştıkları paralarını harcamak için büyük bir pazar sunuyordu.

Öte yandan, Doğu Avrupa'daki, modaya uygun dernek tabanlı kurumsallaşma pratikleri, Roman toplulukların sovyet sonrası döneme dahil olmak için giymek zorunda bırakıldığı kalkınma üniformasının neoliberal biçiminin neden olduğu başarısızlık dönemi için bir hesap vermemişti. Ancak, yine de bu doğru değerlendirilmelere tabi tutulmamış STK modelleri aslında toplumsal mücadelelerle elde edilmiş olan sosyal haklardan kabul edilebilecek uluslararası fonlardan faydalanmak ve oyuna dahil olmak için insan organizasyonunun tek mümkün biçimi olarak teşvik edilmiştir.

Bu koşullarda, bazı deneyimler oldukça doğru ve yerel uygulayıcılar negatif veya pozitif uygulamalardan öğrenerek çıkmış, bazıları başlangıçta doğru işlemiş ama sonraki dönemlerde proje yönetimi işini nasıl 'idare edebileceklerini' öğrenmiş ve bazılarınınsa bu gereklilikleri karşılayamamış ve lagvolmuştu ancak STK çevresinin bu egemen ideolojisi öyle ya da böyle hemen hemen tüm Roman örgütlerini etkiledi.

Özetlemek gerekirse, kendisini kalkınma fikrinin hizmetinde gerçekleştiren yorumlayıcı antropoloji ve STK endüstrisinin elbirliğiyle icad olan Roman kimliğine bir eleştiri getirmek niyeti, özellikle dar kritik varsayımlarla yürüyen küreselleşme, kimlik ve toplumsal düzenleme hakkında süregelen tartışmalara bugün yaşayan insanların gündelik deneyimlerine bakarak toplumumuz hakkında eleştirel yorumlarla katkıda bulunmaktır. Sivil toplum politika yapıcılarının metinlerindeki ve pratiklerindeki "Roman" tanımı ve temsilini inceleyerek bunu yereldeki öznelerin bu süreçleri nasıl deneyimledikleri ve geçmiş, bugün ve gelecek hakkında ne tür stratejiler ürettikleriyle karşılaştırabilir kılarak yerel ve küresel arasındaki ilişkiyi görmeye çalışacağım.

Araştırma bunu yapmak için, Roman kimliklerin oluşumunu sosyolinguistiğin araçlarıyla çalışarak, kendileme ve ötekileme tanımlarını ve Gaco topluluklarla

aralarındaki mesafeleri dilde aramanın yanı sıra, toplulukları hedef alan ve "Romanlığı" küresel yatırımcıların kültürel kurgularının ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda yeniden tasarlamak ve bu söyleme entegre etmek üzere işleyen kentsel soylulaştırma uygulamalarının işleyişine ve birkaç sivil toplum kuruluşu tarafından yürütülen bazı proje örnekleri üzerinde odaklanarak STK endüstrisine bakacak ve ortaya Türkiye'deki kimi Roman toplulukların durumu hakkında gözlemler koyacaktır. Küresel olarak işleyen kalkınma pratikleri gerçek insanların güdelik hayatlarını hesaplanabilir nesneler olarak kavrayarak ve bireylerin ve oluşturdukları toplulukların özne pozisyonlarını reddederek kurduğu temasların yereldeki öznelerde önemli duygulanımlara tekabül ettiği gerçeği kalkınmacı ideolojiye temelden eleştirel bir bakış ortaya koymaktadır.

Bu tür bir genel girişin ardından tez özellikle kalkınma literatür içinde kuramsal çerçeve arayışı doğrultusunda teorik bir bölümle devam etmektedir. İnsanları yönetmeye aday sömürgeci önyargıyla yapılan bir antropolojiye karşı eleştiri koymak için bu araştırma kendi çerçevesini pratik olarak kalkınmanın antropolojisini yapmak üzere kurar.

Tezin üçüncü bölümü, çalışmanın yöntemsel eğilimlerini ve Türkiye'de Roman topluluklar üzerine yapılan saha araştırmasından çıkartılan dersleri ortaya koyar. Antropoloji zanaatinde düşünümselliğin peşinde bir deney olma derdindeki bu çalışmanın yöntemi araştırma nesnesini ve kendisini gizemlerden arındırmak, konuşulabilir kılmak üzere tartışılır. Araştırmanın kendisini gerçekleştirmek için bir alan inşa etme deneyimi uygun yöntem olarak çok yönlü etnografileri kucaklar. Bu bölüm aynı zamanda ampirik veri toplama süreci ve metodolojik çerçeve için saha deneyiminde etnografin konumlanışıyla da ilgilenir.

Tezin araştırma sorusunu tartışmak üzere ortaya birkaç farklı katman çıkarmak için metodoloji bölümünü üç gövde bölüm takip etmektedir. Bunlardan ilki, yani tezin dördüncü bölümü, Roman ve Gaco arasındaki eşitsiz karşılaşmalarla ilgili. Bu bölüm, ilgili ana kabileleri isimlendirmek üzere Roman toplulukların kısa bir tarihçesiyle başlamaktadır. Daha sonra bu tür karşılaşmaların yaşandığı yasal

düzlem, sağlık hizmetleri, istihdam, eğitim ve sosyal yardım durumlarına dair analizleri barındırır. Söz konusu karşılaşmalar sıradan insanların neoliberal aygıtın karşısındaki duygulanımlarının da görünür olduğu zeminleri sağlamaktadır.

Beşinci bölümde bu ağırlıklı olarak Roman mahallelerini hedef alan kentsel dönüşüm uygulamalarıyla ilgilidir. Bu bölüm öncelikle neoliberalizmin kentsel alan üzerine etkilerini genel olarak tartışır, daha sonra özel olarak Roman topluluklar üzerindeki etkileri üzerine gider. Bu pratiklerin nasıl da hakaretamiz dil ve tavırlarla meşrulaştırıldıkları, mahalle yaşamının topluluklar ve kimlik için önemi ve dayanışma temelli topluluk yaşamının yok edilmesinin Gacolaştırmaya nasıl hizmet ettiği bu bölümün konularındandır.

Çalışmanın altıncı bölümü Roman toplulukların STK'laşmasıyla ilgilidir . Türkiye'deki Roman kimlik siyasetinin kısa tarihiyle başlar ve Roman kimliğinin siyasi söylem içine konumlandırmasının erken erken dönemlerini bir vaka çalışması olarak ele alır. Kimlik inşasında azınlık sorunu ve STK endüstrisinin etkileri bu bölümde çalışılır. Ayrıca hibe sistemi ve donörlerin anti-siyaset üretme eğilimleri Roman örneği içinden eleştirilmektedir. Son olarak STK endüstrisinin etkileri Roman toplulukların bu çevrelerle karşılaştıkları çeşitli proje zeminleri araştırma projeleri, kültürel etkinlik projeleri, sosyal hizmetleri sağlama projeleri, farkındalık artırma ve savunuculuk gibi tasnif edilip kimi örnek projelere odaklanılarak analiz edilir. Bunun ardından toplulukların "güçlendirilmesi" ve "kapasite geliştirme" söylemi araştırmanın kapsamına dahil olacaktır.

Tezin yedinci bölümü Gacolaştırmayı haritalamak içindir. Burada öncelikle Romanca dilindeki Gaco kelimesi sosyolinguistiğin araçlarıyla sökülerek çalışmaya bir zemin sağlaması için Gacolaştırma kelimesindeki yerine takılmıştır. Bunu Gacolaştırma deneyimlerinin farklı katmanlarının ortaya konulması takip eder. Bu bölüm dışlanma ve entegrasyon arasına yerleştirilmiş Roman toplulukların çeşitli üyelerinin hayatta kalma öykülerine odaklanarak Gacolaştırmayı toplumsal ayrımcılık ve dışlanmanın yeni bir biçimi olarak tanımlar. Bu bölüm son olarak Gacolaştırmanın birçok gizli kişisel ve kolektif yaralanmalara sebep olduğunu

tartışarak Gacolaştırmanın çeşitli örneklerinin bireyler üzerine yüklediği duyguları ortaya çıkarmak için çalışır.

Nihayetinde bu çalışma pek çok pratik eksiklik taşıyor olsa da Roman topluluklar hakkında yapılmış niteliksel araştırmalara bir katkıda bulunmayı amaçlıyor. Roman birey ve toplulukların kendileme ve ötekileme süreçlerine bakmak için Gaco olanla mesafelerine özellikle kentsel dönüşüm ve STK endüstrisi içindeki karşılaşmalara odaklanıyor. Pratik olarak Roman olanın nasıl Gacolaştırıldığıyla ilgilenerek söz konusu karşılaşmaların ne tür duygulanımlar ürettiğini esas mesele edinen araştırma küresel politikaların yerel etkilerini görünebilir kılmayı amaçlamaktadır.