

This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Drivers of Roma migration: Understanding migration in politically uncertain times

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

Loughborough University and the Ruhama Foundation

VERSION

VoR (Version of Record)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Tileaga, Cristian, Jo Aldridge, and Salomea Popoviciu. 2019. "Drivers of Roma Migration: Understanding Migration in Politically Uncertain Times". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/37916>.

DRIVERS OF ROMA MIGRATION: UNDERSTANDING MIGRATION IN POLITICALLY UNCERTAIN TIMES



**Loughborough
University**



CONTENTS

Executive summary	3
Introduction	4
Roma community perspectives on migration to the UK	6
Drivers of Roma migration	8
Strategies that currently limit Roma migration	10
Roma migrants’ access to housing, healthcare and employment	12
Conclusion	15
Recommendations	17
About the authors	18
References	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report discusses some of the current drivers and challenges of Roma migration to the UK. Roma migration is a contested topic. The pages of the UK and European tabloids often portray Roma people as the shameful face of European freedom of movement.

Roma people are frequently described as “welfare tourists” and abusing free movement rights. In this context, Roma’s own aspirations to mobility and freedom of movement are construed as anomalous.

This report draws upon two sources of evidence:

- 1. qualitative research findings from a participatory and collaborative community action pilot project aimed at understanding motivations, fears and barriers to migration to the UK, conducted by Loughborough University with the support of Ruhamă Romania in 2018 (Tileagă et al., 2019).
- 2. a preliminary review of the literature on strategies that currently limit Roma migration and Roma access to housing, healthcare and employment.

Drivers or motivations for Roma migration have been historically described more as an issue of “last resort” (Cherkezova & Tomova, 2013). Actual accounts and experiences of migration show that it shares, to a much higher degree, characteristics associated with voluntary rather than non-voluntary migration. Although Roma migration is still being described by Roma communities as an opportunity to address a position of precariousness (unemployment, racism) in the country of origin, accounts and experiences of Roma migration also reveal an emerging self-emancipation repertoire mobilised around the idea of self-expression, more control over one’s own destiny and means of self-affirmation and self-definition.

Understanding the complexity of Roma migration in politically uncertain times needs greater recognition of the meaning that Roma themselves place on voluntary migration, and

especially on the notions of “integration” and “citizenship”. It also needs further recognition of the idea that Roma migrants are a distinct and diverse group with specific backgrounds, aspirations, and unique vulnerabilities. Future research and policymaking on Roma migration should consider specifically the acculturation strategies used by Roma communities in the migration process as these differ from the expected behaviors of other migrant groups and communities.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary European challenge of migration is how to treat others who are alike, but also, essentially, unlike “us”. Roma people, defined in the broadest sense possible by the Council of Europe (2012, p. 4) as “Roma, Sinti, Kale and related groups in Europe, including Travellers and the Eastern groups (Dom and Lom)” and also including “the wide diversity of the groups concerned, including persons who identify themselves as Gypsies”, present a paradigmatic example, and test, of this attitude.

The Roms present us with a paradigmatic dilemma. They have no fixed territory but are dispersed ... Rather than having a territorial base or allegiance towards the symbols and institutions of a particular state, what defines Romani identity is a distinct language, a set of values and beliefs, a form of family organization and a particular outlook on the relations between their own community and the outside world.

Matras, 2014, p. 22

European policy and responses to extra-EU and intra-EU migration have created new ways of talking and acting in order to manage the causes and consequences of cohesion and diversity, as national and global challenges of our time (Cantle, 2008; Vertovec, 2007). Roma migration has been, since the first wave of eastern European accession in 2004, and subsequently, the second wave in 2007, one of the key challenges of intra-EU migration. Debates on Roma migration have taken place alongside debates on the more general phenomenon of intra-EU migration (e.g. labour migration). However, debates on Roma migration have not always been at the forefront of, or have informed, policy discussions and initiatives. Whenever Roma migration is discussed, so is Roma inclusion. Roma inclusion is the issue that concerns both “home” and “host” countries.

The inclusion of Roma migrants creates marked ambivalence, moral uneasiness, and anxiety for politicians, local authorities, and governments. On the European agenda, the sympathetic

cosmopolitanism of social inclusion and managing diversity coexists with pragmatic, economic, visions. The first EU legal instrument for Roma inclusion outlines the objectives of Roma integration in Europe:

Roma integration is not only a moral duty, but in the interest of Member States, especially for those with a large Roma minority. Roma represent a significant and growing proportion of the school age population and the future workforce. Efficient labour activation policies and individualised and accessible support services for Roma job seekers are crucial to allow Roma people to realise their human capital and to actively and equally participate in the economy and society.

European Council, December 2013

As argued elsewhere (Tileagă, 2015), the contemporary struggle of European societies with “inclusion”, “cohesion”, and “integration”, is reflected by attempts to make Roma people a bit more “like us”. Framing the future of Roma inclusion and integration using emancipatory values is commendable – however, it is a position that hides more than it reveals, of the difficulties, barriers, that Roma people face when trying to become full and active participants to the European “dream” of an organic economic community, whether at home or abroad.

Generic, well-intentioned, avowals of “inclusive sympathy” (Nussbaum, 2013, p. 2) usually stand in stark contrast with negative public perceptions of Roma, Gypsy and Traveller groups (Abrams et al., 2018). Toughness and conservatism coexist with reasonableness and humanitarianism (Fassin, 2005). A cosmopolitan, more open, and more inclusive, Europe is the political desideratum (Council Directive, 2000). Yet, what is desired, is, sometimes, far removed from the reality on the ground. The same well-intentioned citizens and institutions that promote a discourse of inclusivity and tolerance, often produce and reproduce uncritically degrading repertoires that position Roma people as “out of place” and

thus transform or diminish their moral standing in society (Tileagă, 2005). The public, politicians and policy-makers seem to agree that the Roma are unlike any other European minority group. There is a strong, yet tacit consensus that Roma’s existence is in stark opposition to the traditions of majority groups across Europe. This consensus, shared commonly by the general public, politicians and policy-makers alike, places Roma’s way of life at odds with the values and customs of majority groups. The Roma, as “problem group” is a familiar, historical, trope in European private and public discourse (for illustrations, see Csepeli & Simon, 2004; Fraser, 1992; Okely, 1983; Richardson, 2014).

Roma people continue to be represented as the “new face of marginality and poverty” (Tileagă, 2015, p. 133). This representation, we argue, influences how researchers and policymakers conceive of Roma migration. In this report we focus on contemporary drivers of Roma migration. We also recognise that migration and the free movement of people makes an important contribution to community cohesion, social inclusion and the European economy. Roma migration, as a subset of the broader phenomenon of intra-EU migration, is routinely misunderstood and affected by public misconceptions and prejudices related to migration. Actual accounts and experiences of migration show that Roma migration shares, to a much higher degree, characteristics associated with voluntary rather than non-voluntary migration.

Accounts of Roma migration are, increasingly, accounts that encompass a motivation or drive for self-expression, and affirmation, values that are not usually associated with Roma experiences in their countries of origin. Self-expression values are the values that “motivate people to seek the civil and political rights that define liberal democracy” (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005, p. 152). These are values that underpin an emerging self-emancipation repertoire that Roma migrants rehearse in their accounts of intra-EU mobility.

ROMA COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES ON MIGRATION TO THE UK

Loughborough University-led study on Roma community perspectives on migration to the UK. The full study report can be found here: www.ruhama.ro/downloads/Rapoarte/RomaCommunityPerspectivesonMigrationtotheUK.pdf

Participants: 45 people from seven Roma communities in the North-West of Romania: 39 adults (aged 19-65) and six young people (aged 13-18); 28 men and 17 women. Participants had either migrated to the UK and returned to Romania after a period of residence in the UK or were currently residing in the UK and visiting family and relatives at the time of the project.

Methods: Participatory reflection groups and arts-based activities.

Main research findings:

- Roma participants reported overwhelmingly positive experiences of migration to the UK. However, positively valued dimensions highlighted by participants (employment, benefits system) are also ones that usually fuel negative public perceptions in the UK related to migration and migrants. Employment, although often precarious and sometimes even dangerous, was perceived as an essential dimension of self-emancipation, a means to economic independence, future planning, and self-reliance.

- Roma migrants tended to value more “social bonds” (connections within the Roma community) rather than building “social bridges” (interactions with members of other communities) and “social links” (interactions and communications with local authority services) (cf. Ager & Strang, 2008). The Roma “diaspora” in the UK was perceived as key enabling factor of migration and early settlement.

- Prejudices and discrimination were portrayed as problems in the country of origin, but less so in the UK. At an early stage of settlement negative experiences in the country of origin are very much the yardstick against which everything is being measured. However, what Roma migrants seemed to fail to appreciate was the negative public current of opinion in the UK and the more general policy context aimed at limiting migration in general and Roma migration in particular. Downplaying prejudice and discrimination in the UK may mean Roma migrants fail to recognise and report discrimination, exploitation, or complain and challenge unfair practices.

Messages from the research:

(Overly) optimistic accounts of the benefits of migration, may actually leave migrants at an early stage of settlement vulnerable to subsequent “acculturative stress” (Berry, 2006) that might arise from individual, group, and state pressures to adjust to the host culture. Positively-valued dimensions highlighted by our participants, especially related to employment and the benefits system, may actually have the adverse consequence of reinforcing existing stereotypes against Roma migrants.

Migration “success” was associated by participants with positive perceptions of access to employment, housing, education and health, features that are usually associated with successful integration (Ager & Strang, 2008). Yet, interestingly, “integration” did not feature as a focus for Roma migrants. Participation alongside other groups, usually seen as the litmus test of integration, to a range of practices and activities in the host culture, seemed to be missing in the accounts we heard.

As we argued in our “Roma community perspectives on migration to the UK” report, this does not necessarily mean that Roma migrants do not value participation – it may just mean that a “participation repertoire” is not yet a sedimented part of a more general repertoire of talking about oneself and one’s community. This is perhaps not surprising for Roma communities who, in their countries of origin, are subject to discrimination and are not perceived as full participants in the life of majority communities. It also does not mean that Roma migrants do not value “integration,” rather it is more likely the case that they do not describe integration using the same terms and assumptions that academics and policymakers use and take for granted. Again, this is perhaps not surprising for Roma communities, especially those communities who continue to live on the margins of society, and are denied access to basic employment, housing, education and health provision in their countries of origin.

DRIVERS OF ROMA MIGRATION

Since 2004, European freedom of movement (granted by the Free Movement of Citizens Directive (2004/38/EC)) has opened the economic, political and cultural benefits of market-driven progress (Favell, 2014) to EU nationals belonging to both majority and minority groups across Europe. European freedom of movement paved the way for voluntary migration, a situation where the individual has a choice whether or not to migrate. Among the reasons behind voluntary migration are better living conditions, access to better health care and education, as well as the prospect of higher wages and better employment. It has been argued that intra-communitarian Roma migration could be explained by a complex range of factors that shared characteristics of both forced and voluntary migration (Craig, 2011). Although some Roma people migrate in search of a better life and better employment prospects, life-threatening events such as hate crimes and racially-motivated violence, as well as displacement, everyday discrimination, and marginalization, have forced many Roma to migrate to other European countries.

The legacy of Soviet-style economic systems in eastern Europe has left many Roma people excluded both socially as well as economically from mainstream society. The new found prosperity enjoyed by newly-democratic states, has not trickled down to Roma communities. Many Roma people chose (and continue to choose) to migrate in order to improve their overall quality of life (Acton, 2010; Sigona, 2010; Vlase & Voicu, 2014)¹. It is an established fact that Roma migrants from eastern European countries are more likely to experience higher levels of income in Western destination countries in comparison to Roma who remain in their country of birth (Benedik, 2010; Gabor & Rughinis, 2008; Slavoka, 2010; Vlase & Preoteasa, 2012).

Numerous other factors related to structural and historical conditions that led to or helped

maintain historical inequalities, discrimination, as well as continuous, unsanctioned, violations of human rights and restrictive access to basic rights such as health care or education, have led, over the years following the demise of communism in eastern Europe, to an intensification of the Roma migration phenomenon. Such conditions have led to a steady trend of Roma migration to Western countries (Vlase & Voicu, 2014). Research shows that there is a link between the decision to migrate and the expectation that the destination country will better protect people from prejudice and discrimination (Benedik, 2010; Vlase & Voicu, 2013).

Roma migration remains a highly contested topic, and Roma people are often portrayed as no more than “economic migrants” (Sardelič, 2019). At times, politicians have argued that free movement should not apply unconditionally to all EU citizens, because some people will become an “unreasonable burden” on the receiving countries (Faure, 2013). This negative portrayal of Roma people as economic migrants who are “exploiting” the well-intentioned welfare state has legitimated an anti-Roma/ Gypsy public discourse. It has also masked the unwillingness of government and local authorities to design and implement efficient migration strategies (Kostka, 2019) that involve Roma people themselves.

During negotiations for EU membership, the protection of Roma rights was one of the accession criteria. Some authors argue that this was not only due to a preoccupation with human rights, but also because of concerns that Roma people would migrate to the West in too large numbers (Kymlicka, 2007; Sardelič, 2017). Nonetheless, according to available data, Roma people from eastern European countries did not migrate in large numbers (Pantea, 2013). In fact, according to the available data, the percentage of Roma arriving in France and Italy from CEE receiving countries was lower than that of non-Roma migrants. For example, in 2010, 1.2% of

non-Roma people from Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, FYR Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovakia have moved and stayed in the receiving countries for at least 12 months. In comparison, 0.9% of Roma people from the same countries moved to CEE countries in 2010 for at least 12 months (Cherkezova & Tomova, 2013). Also, in many cases, the Roma who did decide to migrate were not the ones that were living in absolute poverty in their birth countries. In fact, Roma people living in very poor conditions most likely did not have the necessary economic resources to migrate (Pantea, 2013).

¹For historical dimensions of Romani migrations see Crowe (2003)

STRATEGIES THAT CURRENTLY LIMIT ROMA MIGRATION

Roma migrants are often perceived as undesirable, although nominally legitimate. Borderline legal measures have been adopted throughout Europe in order to limit Roma migration (Bigo, Carrera, & Guild, 2013; Tervonen & Enache, 2017). Destination countries often regulate Roma migration in order to both control mobility and limit Roma migration (Sardelič, 2017). European Roma are frequently subject to deportation (van Baar, 2015), despite EU citizens being granted free movement rights.

In Nordic countries there is a tradition of strict and also exclusionary regulations concerning entry and residence rights, that disproportionately affect Roma people (Tesseri & Allik-Schunemann, 2018). Freedom of movement means that street workers, poor people and the homeless can legally migrate to Nordic countries. However, public discourses about Roma migrants often build on the fear that Nordic inclusive welfare policies are unrealistic, both politically and institutionally (Tervonen & Enache, 2017; Tesseri & Allik-Schunemann, 2018; Yuval-Davis, Wemyss, & Cassidy, 2017). One example of a Nordic country that aimed to limit Roma migration by emphasising the risks associated with migration is Finland. Some (failed) political initiatives to control Roma migration included: criminalizing street work, introducing a register for people who begged, banning illicit camping, and criminalizing “low quality” street music performances. However, none of these initiatives led to changes in the national legislation. The issue of EU migrants who were not meeting the basic social rights of the Finnish welfare state was left to the rulings of street-level police and municipal workers, rather than policymakers (Tervonen & Enache, 2017). Consequently, municipality officials became gatekeepers in the task of preventing and reducing Roma migration.

The goal of limiting Roma migration in Finland was pursued by three means. Firstly, cities carried out demolitions of Roma campsites and forced evictions, and included parks, woods, cars and abandoned buildings on the list of illegal camping sites. Secondly, legal places to sleep remained either too expensive for Roma migrants, or were only available to residents. Thirdly, child protection services would take into custody minors found living in improper conditions or who were not enrolled in school. A further barrier for Roma families with young children was that in some places schools did not enrol children if their parents or legal guardians did not have a permanent address (Tervonen & Enache, 2017).

Other countries also implemented policies that contributed to the discrimination and social exclusion of Roma migrants. In Italy hundreds of Roma people are enclosed in shanty towns or “Gypsy encampments” (Fekete, 2014). Many are deported on grounds that they posed “unreasonable burden on the state”, even though Roma were less likely to claim welfare. Other reasons cited for mass Roma deportation were vaguely referred to as “security concerns” (Fekete, 2014). Roma migrants are often portrayed in political discourse as a danger to national “civilised” order (Ivasiuc, 2018). In 2008 the political response to Roma in Italy was to declare a state of emergency which focused on dismantling Roma settlements and evicting people. Many Roma settled informally in other unauthorized places: under bridges or in abandoned industrial buildings, risking further evictions, and entering what van Baar (2017) calls the condition of “evictability”.

In France, the destruction of Roma settlements was approved by the government based on the claim that these sites negatively affected the non-Roma neighbouring communities (Davies, 2010). In the UK, many Roma people who have lived in the country for more than

10 or 15 years are at a high risk of deportation post-Brexit because of a lack of documentation required to achieve settled status (Perraudin, 2018). In Germany, measures were taken in order to prevent “poverty immigration”. For example, Roma migrants who were suspected of defrauding social services were expelled from Germany, despite having the right to travel and work in countries from the European Union. After expulsion, people were banned from returning to the country for an unspecified length of time (Spiegel, 2013). In Sweden, thousands of Roma migrants, the majority from Romania, do not have access to health services, shelter or sanitation and are frequently the target of police harassment and discrimination (Amnesty International, 2018).

A significant number of Roma migrants are undocumented and as a result continue to be legally invisible (Sardelič, 2017). The rights that are guaranteed to a citizen or a resident of an EU country cannot be enjoyed by an undocumented migrant. Due to a number of other reasons, including prejudice, discrimination, and language barriers, thus many Roma people have limited access to housing, healthcare and employment (European Commission, 2018).

ROMA MIGRANTS' ACCESS TO HOUSING, HEALTHCARE AND EMPLOYMENT

A significant number of Roma migrants are undocumented and as a result continue to be legally invisible (Sardelič, 2017). The rights that are guaranteed to a citizen or a resident of an EU country cannot be enjoyed by an undocumented migrant. Due to a number of other reasons, including prejudice, discrimination, and language barriers, many Roma people have limited access to housing, healthcare and employment (European Commission, 2018).

Housing

Access to housing differs in various European countries as a result of national public policies targeting Roma migrants. For example, in Italy a significant number of Roma migrants live in nomad camps (Sigona, 2005). Marinaro (2010) notes that this arrangement is a direct result of the way in which Italian public policies portray Roma people as a threat to the security of the mainstream population. In turn, this leads to tighter police control and increased surveillance within the camps. Italy is not the only receiving Western European country in which the political debate frames Roma migration as a threat to public safety and welfare. Similar responses are also found in France (Nacu, 2011), Germany (Lucassen, 1997), Finland (Tervonen & Enache, 2017), Sweden (Lindström, 2015), and the UK (Grill, 2012).

In 2018, in France, there were approximately 570 slums, home to over 16,000 people mostly of Roma ethnicity (United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, 2018). In January 2018, France issued an "instruction" to municipalities complementing a 2012 policy of informal slum eradication by 2023. People living in slums face obstacles in accessing jobs and education and these are magnified when there is the additional threat of forced eviction. Although France does not collect official data

on evictions, the European Roma Rights Centre reported that from 2014 to 2018, over 10,000 people, mostly Roma, had been evicted from France, violating the European Convention of Human Rights (European Roma Rights Centre, 2018). For example, in cases when police force was used families not only lost their homes in the process but also their belongings and even important documents, which were destroyed by the police (United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, 2018). Moreover, for the majority of migrants no alternative accommodation was offered (Ligue des Droits de l'Homme & European Roma Rights Centre, 2017).

In Germany, the asylum law was amended in October 2015. One of the effects of this change was that it became very difficult for people from Central and Eastern European countries to be granted asylum, many of whom were Roma (Brenner, 2016). Another consequence was that the policy fuelled the idea that Roma people do not really belong in Germany, and it fostered further discrimination. For example, Roma access to housing, employment and education was restricted, and Roma migrants were more likely to be deported (Sardelič & McGarry, 2017).

Finland adopted the National Action Plan on Fundamental and Human Rights in 2017. This plan proposed to study Roma homelessness and (lack of) access to housing in order to reduce homelessness and address the gaps in housing between Roma and non-Roma people living in Finland (Ministry of Justice Finland, 2017). An earlier report found that in 2015, there were almost 500 discrimination cases processed by the Non-Discrimination Ombudsman, many of which related to housing access (Parliamentary Ombudsman of Finland, 2015).

In Sweden, according to Amnesty International

(2018), thousands of Roma are sleeping in tents, cars or temporary settlements, and in winter, this becomes a struggle for survival. Due to inadequate legal and policy frameworks, many Roma migrants do not have their basic needs met. For example, a lack of access to shelters has an effect on other problems such as a limited ability to find employment. The Swedish government's approach to homelessness in the case of migrants is deportation after three months, even if migrants had experienced human rights violations in their country of birth. However, according to the same Amnesty International report, simple policy changes at the local level have made a difference in the protection of Roma migrants. For example, in Lund and Gotland long term shelters are available for migrants, enabling them to plan ahead and find employment.

In the UK, a significant number of Roma migrants live in unauthorized and precarious living conditions and are at risk of evictions (Burchardt, Obolenskaya, Vizard, & Bottaglini, 2018). According to Burchardt and colleagues, nearly half of Roma children living in the UK (47.7%) experience housing deprivation, defined as living in overcrowded conditions, in a household with no central heating or in a non-self-contained dwelling. This rate is three times as high as for other ethnic groups. Housing initiatives in the UK have tended to overlook the needs of Roma migrants. One reason is that data collection and monitoring by ethnicity is patchy. Also, Roma, Gypsies and Travellers are a numerically small population and often remain statistically hidden. Consequently, they do not benefit from a clear policy focus (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017). For migrants living in marginalized communities in the UK, access to better housing is particularly difficult. For example, the risk of being stopped by police officers is higher in the case of ethnic minorities

living in nomad camps, public transportation to city centres is often lacking or takes very long, and the chances of permanent residence and good education are far less than for majority citizens (Mezzandra & Neilson, 2013). This situation is likely to worsen after Brexit, as many Roma have reported a rise in verbal attacks and discrimination in the aftermath of the EU referendum vote (Roma Support Group, 2016).

Healthcare

According to a report by the European Commission (2016), in Roma communities, there is a higher incidence of major chronic diseases. Roma women are generally in worse health compared to Roma men and non-Roma people. There are various barriers that limit Roma people's access to the healthcare system, such as a lack of health insurance, affordability of the costs of services, lack of identity papers, or a lack of knowledge about how to access health insurance (de Graaf et al., 2016).

In most European countries, access to healthcare services is tied to requirements that the person is a legal resident, employed or self-employed and a contributor to healthcare insurance (Cherkezova & Tomova, 2013). Many Roma migrants do not have access to healthcare due to their undocumented status. For example, Cherkezova and Tomova (2013) reported that in France, over 70% of Roma people did not have medical insurance. In such cases, a legally invisible person can find alternative ways of gaining access to health care such as the practice of borrowing health insurance cards from other people (Sardelič, 2017; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2011). This practice is often used by pregnant women when they are about to give birth. As Sardelič (2017) argues, the practice insures that vulnerable and undocumented

CONCLUSION

people can gain access to a basic human right by subverting the health care system. However, this creates problems for birth registrations and the identity of the child's parents. Also, due to the uncertainty and stress of accessing health care, some Roma experience mental health problems, creating further barriers in accessing broader public services and engaging with the wider community (Feischmidt, 2018; Sigona, 2010).

In some countries, however, access to healthcare is somewhat easier. For example, in Italy, an irregular migrant can complete an official form to declare insufficient economic resources, which would give them access to the same medical services as a native citizen for a period of six months. According to available data, up to 83% of Romanian migrants, including Romanian Roma, have received medical help in Italy, when they needed it (Cherkezova & Tomova, 2013).

A different example discussed in the academic literature about Roma migrants' difficulties in accessing healthcare pertains to cases of physical injuries acquired by victims of anti-Roma violence. For example, between 2012 and 2013, in Italy and Greece, there were numerous documented instances of violence against Roma migrants (Gökçen, 2013; Human Rights Watch, 2013). Undocumented migrants who were victims of violence had difficulties in accessing medical care after those attacks (Fekete, 2014).

Employment

According to the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2018) approximately 80% of Roma people living in European countries are at risk of poverty, with a proportion of 63% of young Roma people not in education, employment or training. In 2017 there were only 25% of Roma people in paid work, and the average proportion of employed Roma women was half of that of men.

Roma migrants face many barriers to the labour market, often more so than local Roma or non-Roma immigrants. For example, compared to local Roma, Roma migrants are more likely to live in precarious housing and in neighbourhoods

with predominantly Roma populations (Cherkezova & Tomova, 2013). Without formal access to employment or social benefits, Roma migrants need to find alternative ways to reduce the economic, social and psychological risks associated with migration. Some of the risk reducing strategies include: sharing of resources with families and kin or ethnic based informal networks and finding alternative economic niches, in activities such as collecting and selling scrap metal (Sardelič, 2017). In Finland the majority of Roma migrants work outside of the regular labour market, which means that they have little chance of acquiring permanent residence (Tervonen & Enache, 2017).

Roma people who are in precarious positions in their home country are more likely to migrate to Finland or Sweden because in these countries begging is not against the law. However, due to strict child protection legislation, underage migrant Roma children are, very often, left behind in the countries of origin. In contrast, Denmark has a begging ban, leading to a predominance of mostly male Roma migrants working on the streets (Djuve, Britt, Friberg, Tyldum, & Zhang, 2015). Street work generally includes selling newspapers or magazines, and collecting bottles (Tervonen & Enache, 2017). Roma migrants are likely to tap into multiple sources of income, meaning that earnings gained from selling newspapers, for instance, can be supplemented by seasonal work such as selling flowers or berries (Djuve, Britt, Friberg, Tyldum, & Zhang, 2015; Tervonen & Enache, 2017).

There are some local level actions designed to improve Roma inclusion into the labour market. For example, in Sweden, The National Employment Office initiated informational job seeking campaigns for Roma people, leading to an increase number of employed people. Also, in France, job training is available for Roma people, which has led to an increase in the number of Roma entrepreneurs (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2018). Nonetheless, the employment gap between Roma and non-Roma people continues to be significant throughout Europe.

Roma community perspectives show that Roma migration shares, to a higher degree, characteristics associated with voluntary rather than non-voluntary migration. Although Roma migration is often described as an opportunity to address a position of precarity (unemployment, racism, etc.) in the country of origin, and although Roma people encounter a myriad of challenges and barriers in the destination country, Roma are now more mobile, more active, and more involved in the lives of their communities, both at home and abroad, as they have ever been.

Perhaps what distinguishes Roma migrants from other categories of migrants and refugees is a renewed drive for self-emancipation, self-expression and self-affirmation. Roma are now not just passive recipients of European policies that address structural disadvantage but are also active in shaping the agenda of governments and European institutions. As George Soros argued recently, the Roma should be encouraged and supported to be "their own chief advocates" (Soros, 2017).

Roma self-emancipation is perhaps a feature of what Inglehart and Welzel (2005) have called "self-expression values". These are values that motivate people to become "citizens", to seek and secure civil rights that were perhaps were not available to previous generations. Young Roma people are more mobile than ever before, more political, and more committed to campaigning for causes beyond those that affect the members of their own group - see, for example, the various youth exchange initiatives led by Nevo Parudimos (<https://nevoparudimos.ro>) with young Romanian Roma. Roma advocacy related to self-determination and self-emancipation has reached unprecedented levels and is starting to make a difference. Roma themselves talk and write about the value of "self-respect" and "self-esteem", of Roma that is being changed and boosted by the actions of Roma communities across Europe (Jovanovic, 2018).

The often-voiced complaint of the general public and politicians is that the Roma do not seem to share the basic motivational drives that characterize life in advanced democratic societies. But evidence shows that they do. A 2016 Migration Yorkshire report argued that "trust" and "safety" were two key repertoire values identified by a Roma community panel answering questions about their lives and experiences from people in South Yorkshire. "Security" and "dignified" treatment by others were also mentioned (Migration Yorkshire, 2016). These are, presumably, the same values that the South Yorkshire majority group members also take for granted.

As our research has shown, Roma migrants tend to value more connections and relationships within the Roma community. This does not mean, however, that they are not attuned to the values of hosting communities. The Roma "diaspora", a key enabling factor of migration and early settlement, can help new arrivals understand their rights, entitlements, and way of life in the host country. Long-term engagement with the Roma "diaspora", and entrusting Roma people to manage resources for projects that affect their communities, can lead to viable and organic, group-led, developments.

But there is fundamental dilemma that needs to be addressed. Roma people are the only group of Europeans whose (political and cultural) emancipation has not led to a change of their living and working conditions that have, arguably, actually deteriorated since many of them became EU citizens. Public perception is still hostile almost everywhere in Europe. In host countries, Roma people are still perceived as the unwanted and shameful side of European freedom of movement. In their countries of origin, the Fundamental Rights Agency suggest that significant levels of exclusion persist in Central and Eastern European Member States (FRA, 2016), despite EU legal frameworks that set out the policy and practice objectives and priorities of Roma inclusion and integration (European Commission, 2011).

Evidence shows that racism against Roma people is the last acceptable form of racism in European societies – it is a feature of both home as well as host societies (Tileagă, 2015). Many Roma people experience highly insecure environments in the destination countries. Some traditional Roma subgroups, such as the Romanian Căldărari Roma and Cortorari Roma², are especially at a high risk of becoming the target of racism and violence in destination countries. Specifically, (women’s) clothing style can indicate a specific, local, Romani identity – and also illustrate gender and age relations within the Roma community – in a European context where a Roma identity is often negatively perceived by the non-Roma population (Simhandl, 2006). Research found that, after migrating to a new country, women belonging to traditional Roma subgroups sometimes change their clothing and hair styles in order to appear “Western” and to avoid being identified as Roma (Vlase & Voicu, 2013).

²On Roma groups and Roma group names, see “Romani group names” compiled by Zuzana Bodnárová (http://romafacts.unigraz.at/get_pdf.php?file=pdf_docs/ROMANI_CULTURE/English/C_1_7_group_names.pdf)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) European municipalities should tap more directly into the diverse Roma “diaspora” as a resource for influencing policy-making and ensure that there is long-term Roma leadership on key issues. Greater recognition is needed of the positive contributions Roma migrants are already making to host countries.

2) European municipalities should take an active role in ensuring that (new) Roma migrants are made aware of, and familiarise themselves with, anti-discrimination law, and understand how to recognise and report discrimination, and how to complain or challenge unfair practices.

3) European municipalities should encourage the development and running of Roma-led community groups to understand the meaning of “integration” and “citizenship” for Roma migrants, as well as the meanings placed by individuals and communities on rights, responsibilities, and entitlements.

4) European municipalities should design special programmes for Roma migrants and consider specifically the acculturation strategies used by diverse Roma communities in the migration process, as these differ from the strategies used by other migrant groups and communities.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Cristian Tileagă is a member of the Discourse and Rhetoric Group in the School of Social Sciences at Loughborough University. He is an expert in the social psychology of prejudice and moral exclusion of ethnic minority groups. His monograph, *The Nature of Prejudice: Society, Discrimination and Moral Exclusion* (Routledge, 2015), is the first detailed, empirical study of the history, modern genesis and impact of discrimination against Roma people in the context of European freedom of movement. You can read more about his research here: www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/socialsciences/staff/cristian-tileaga/

Jo Aldridge is Professor of Social Policy and Criminology in the School of Social Sciences at Loughborough University UK. She has experience and expertise in evidence-based approaches to policy-making participatory research methods with vulnerable or marginalised groups. Her research on children and families has led to the design of evidence-based responses to policy challenges. She has contributed research evidence to government committees (including Parliamentary Select Committees), think tanks and policy makers. She has also conducted service evaluations and provided training for health and social care service providers, including GPs, social workers, and mental health professionals. You can read more about her research here: www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/socialsciences/staff/jo-aldrige/

Salomea Popoviciu is director of Ruhama-UK Community Interest Company, London. She has experience in working with disadvantaged and segregated Roma communities in Romania. She has published extensively on issues related to prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, and migration. You can follow her @mea_popoviciu and read more about her research here: www.researchgate.net/profile/Salomea_Popoviciu2/research

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., Swift, H. & Houston, D. (2018) *Developing a national barometer of prejudice and discrimination in Britain. Equality and Human Rights Commission* (Research report 119).

Acton, T. (2010). Theorising mobility: Migration, nomadism, and the social reconstruction of ethnicity. In Romani mobilities in Europe: Multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 5-10). Oxford: University of Oxford.

Amnesty International. (2018). *Sweden: Homeless Roma and other EU migrants face widespread discrimination and dangerous conditions*. Retrieved December 19, 2018, from Amnesty International: Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/11/homeless-roma-and-other-eu-migrants-face-widespread-discrimination-and-dangerous-conditions-in-sweden/>

Benedik, S. (2010). On the streets and in the bed: Gendered and sexualized narratives in popular perceptions of Romani migrations within Central and Eastern Europe. In N. Sigona (Ed.), *Romani mobilities in Europe: Multidisciplinary perspectives. International Conference* (pp. 11-19). Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre.

Berry, J. W. (2006). Acculturative stress. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 287-298). Dallas, TX, US: Spring Publications.

Bigo, D., Carrera, S., & Guild, E. (2013). *Foreigners, Refugees or Minorities? Rethinking People in the Context of Border Controls and Visas*. Ashgate: Wey Court East.

Brenner, Y. (2016). *Germany: Roma march against asylum-seeker crackdown. Demonstrators protested against increasing deportations of West Balkan asylum applicants, many of whom are Roma*. Retrieved March 15, 2019, from Aljazeera News: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/06/germany-roma-march-asylum-seeker-crackdown-160605092954463.html>

Burchardt, T., Obolenskaya, P., Vizard, P., & Bottaglini, M. (2018). *Experience of multiple disadvantage among Roma, Gypsy and Traveller Children in England and Wales*. London: Centre of Analysis of Social Exclusion.

Cherkezova, S., & Tomova, I. (2013). *An option of last resort? Migration of Roma and non-Roma from CEE countries*. Bratislava: UNDP.

Clark, C. (2002). Not just lucky white heather and clothespegs: Putting European Gypsy and Traveller Niches in context. In S. Fenton, & H. Bradley (Eds.), *Ethnicity and Economy: Race and class revisited* (pp. 183-198). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Council Directive (29 June 2000) Implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin (2000/43/EC). Official Journal L 180, 19/07/2000 P. 0022 – 0026.

Council of Europe (2012) Council of Europe descriptive Glossary of terms relating to Roma issues. Retrieved 10 February 2019 from <http://a.cs.coe.int/team20/cahrom/documents/Glossary%20Roma%20EN%20version%2018%20May%202012.pdf>

Craig, C. (2011) *The Roma: a study of national policies, European Commission DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities*. www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/pdf/EURoma.pdf

Crowe, D. (2003). The international and historical dimensions of Romani migrations in Central and Eastern Europe. *Nationalities Papers. The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 31(1), 81-94.

Csepeli, G., & Simon, D. (2004). Construction of Roma identity in Eastern and Central Europe: perception and self-identification. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(1), 129-150.

Davies, L. (2010). *France's Roma crackdown could spark xenophobia*, says Romanian minister. Retrieved December 18, 2018, from The Guardian: Roma, Gypsies and Travellers: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/aug/18/france-xenophobia-roma-flights>

De Genova, N. (2010). The deportation regime: Sovereignty, space and the freedom of movement. In N. De Genova, & N. Peutz (Eds.), *The Deportation Regime* (pp. 33-65). Durham: Duke University Press.

De Graaf, P., Pavlic, D. R., Zelko, E., Vintges, M., Willems, S., Hanssens, L. (2016). Primary care for the Roma in Europe: Position paper of the European forum for primary care. *Slovenian Journal of Public Health*, 55(3), 218-224.

Djuve, A., Britt, J. H., Friberg, G., Tyldum, G., & Zhang, H. (2015). *When poverty meets affluence. Migrants from Romania on the streets of the Scandinavian capitals*. Oslo: Fafo.

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2017). *Measurement Framework for Equality and Human Rights*.

European Commission (2011). *An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020*. Retrieved March 12, 2019 from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52011DC0173>

European Commission. (2016). *Roma health report: Health status of the Roma population: data collection in the Member States of the European Union*. Retrieved April 3, from http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/

docs/2014_roma_health_report_en.pdf.

European Commission. (2018). Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion: Your rights country by country. Retrieved March 12, 2019, from Policies, Information and Services: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=858&langId=en>

European Roma Rights Centre. (2018). *Written comments concerning France for consideration by the Human Rights Council, within its Universal Periodic Review, at its 29th session*. ERRC.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2018). *Fundamental Rights Report*. Retrieved April 4, 2019 from https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2018-fundamental-rights-report-2018_en.pdf.

Faure, A. A. (2013). European citizenship revealed: Sites, actors and Roma access to justice in the EU. In E. Isin, & M. (Eds.), *Enacting European Citizenship* (pp. 178-193). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Favell, A. (2014). The fourth freedom: Theories of migration and mobilities in 'Neo-Liberal' Europe. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 17, 275-289.

Feischmidt, M. (2018). *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics: Transnational Roma Mobilities*. Budapest: Centre for Social Sciences. Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Fekete, L. (2014). Europe against the Roma. *Race & Class*, 55(3), 60-70.

FRA (2016) EU-MIDIS II: *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey Roma – Selected findings*. Luxembourg: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. Retrieved from: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/eumidis-ii-roma-selected-findings>.

Gabor, F., & Rughinis, C. (2008). *Come closer: Inclusion and exclusion of Roma in present-day Romanian society*. Bucharest: Human Dynamics.

Gökçen, S. (2013). *Far right groups target Roma with violent protests in Italy*. Retrieved December 18, 2018, from ERRC: Challenging Discrimination and Promoting Equality: <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=4132>

Grill, J. (2012). Going up to England: Exploring mobilities among Roma from Eastern Slovakia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(8), 1269-1287.

Hayes, M., & Acton, T. (2007). *Travellers, Gypsies, Roma: The Demonisation of Difference*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Human Rights Watch. (2013). *Greece: Abusive Crackdown on Migrants. Police Sweeps, Invasive Searches, Arbitrary Detention*. Retrieved December 18, 2018, from Human Rights Watch : <https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/06/12/greece-abusive-crackdown-migrants>

Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2005) *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ivasiuc, A. (2018). Social mobility and the ambiguous autonomy of Roma migration. *Intersections*, 4(2), 109-125.

Jovanovic, Z. (2018). *What Europe's Roma Know About Defeating the Politics of Supremacy*. Retrieved from: <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/what-europe-s-roma-know-about-defeating-politics-supremacy>

Kostka, J. (2019). The migrating poor: Romanian Roma under social authoritarianism in Poland. In T. Magazzini, & S. Piemontese (Eds.), *Constructing Roma Migrants* (pp. 155-172). Cham: IMISCOE Research Series. Springer.

Kuiper, K. (2019). *Roma people*. Retrieved March 9, 2019, from Encyclopaedia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Rom>

Kymlicka, W. (2007). *Multicultural Odysseys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ligue des Droits de l'Homme & European Roma Rights Centre. (2017). *Census of forced evictions in living areas occupied by Roma (or people designated as such in France)*. ERRC.

Lindström, T. (2015). *They don't fit in: Homeless EU migrants, new social risks and the mixed economy of welfare in Sweden*. Lund: Lund University.

Lucassen, L. (1997). 'Harmful tramps': Police professionalization and Gypsies in Germany. In W. Lucassen, W. Willems, & A. Cottaar (Eds.), *Gypsies and other itinerant groups: A socio-historical approach* (pp. 74-93). Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Marinaro, I. C. (2010). Life on the run: Biopolitics and the Roma in Italy. In Romani Mobilities in Europe: Multidisciplinary Perspectives (pp. 36-40). Oxford: University of Oxford, Refugee Studies Centre.

Mezzandra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method or the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Migration Yorkshire (2016) *Roma integration in South Yorkshire*. Available at: <https://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk/userfiles/file/projects/roma-syorks/Roma-integration-South-Yorks-MYupdateJuly2016.pdf>

Ministry of Justice Finland. (2017). *National Action Plan on Fundamental and Human Rights 2017-2019*. Helsinki: Ministry of Justice.

Nacu, A. (2011). The politics of Roma migration: Framing identity struggles among Romanian and Bulgarian Roma in the Paris region. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(1), 135-150.

Nussbaum, M. (2013). *Political Emotions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pantea, M. (2013). Social ties at work: Roma migrants and the community dynamics. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(11), 1726-1744.

Parliamentary Ombudsman of Finland. (2015). *Summary of the Annual Report*. Juvenes Print.

Perraudin, F. (2018). *Roma communities fear deportation in post-Brexit Britain*. Retrieved December 18, 2018, from The Guardian: Roma Gypsies and Travellers: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jul/02/roma-communities-fear-deportation-in-post-brexit-britain>

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217-237.

Reyniers, A. (2008). La mobilité des Tsiganes en Europe: entre fantasmes et réalité. *Hermès*, 51, 107-111.

Richardson, J. (2014). *Roma in the News: an examination of media and political discourse and what needs to change*. People, Place & Policy, 8(1), 51-64.

Roma Support Group. (2016). Brexit Statements. Retrieved March 17, 2019, from *Empowering the Roma community since 1998*: <http://rsg2016.weebly.com/brexit-statements.html>

Sardelič, J. (2017). The position and agency of the 'irregularized': Romani migrants as European semi-citizens. *Politics*, 37(3), 332-346.

Sardelič J. (2019) Differing Romani Mobilities? The Case of Cross-Border Migration of Roma Between Slovenia and Austria. In T. Magazzini & S. Piemontese (Eds.) *Constructing Roma Migrants* (pp. 227-242). IMISCOE Research Series. Springer.

Sarde, J., & McGarry, A. (2017). *How the refugee crisis is dealing another blow to Europe's Roma*. Retrieved March 15, 2019, from The Conversation: <https://theconversation.com/how-the-refugee-crisis-is-dealing-another-blow-to-europes-roma-74000>

Sigona, N. (2005). Locating the 'Gypsy Problem'. The Roma in Italy: Stereotyping, labelling and 'nomad camps'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(4), 741-756.

Sigona, N. (2010). *Romani mobilities in Europe: multidisciplinary perspectives. International Conference of the Refugee Studies Centre*. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Simhandl, K. (2006). Western Gypsies and Travellers - Easter Roma: The creation of political objects by the institutions of the European Union. *Nations and Nationalism*, 12(1), 97-115.

Soros, G. (2017) *The Roma Are Their Own Best Advocates*. Retrieved 2 April, 2019 from <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/roma-are-their-own-best-advocates>.

Slavoka, M. (2010). Romani migrations from Bulgaria to Spain: challenges and perspectives. In N. Sigona (Ed.), *Romani mobilities in Europe: Multidisciplinary perspectives. International Conference* (pp. 210-214). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spiegel. (2013). *Germany to deport 'poverty immigrants'*. Retrieved December 19, 2018, from Spiegel Online. International: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/german-interior-minister-expell-eastern-european-poverty-immigrants-a-904415.html>

Tervonen, M., & Enache, A. (2017). Coping with everyday bordering: Roma migrants and gatekeepers in Helsinki. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(7), 1114-1131.

Tesseri, E., & Allik-Schunemann, E. (2018). *Some are more equal than others in Finland*. Retrieved March 12, 2019, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/feb/18/some-are-more-equal-than-others-in-finland>

Tileagă, C. (2005). Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about the Romanies. *Discourse & Society*, 16(5), 603-624.

Tileagă, C. (2015). *The Nature of Prejudice: Society, Discrimination and Moral Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

Tileagă, C., Aldridge, J., Popoviciu, S., Daragiu, M., Daragiu, L., Lumsden, K. (2019) *Roma community perspectives on migration to the UK. Loughborough University and Ruhama Foundation*. Retrieved 2 April, 2019 from <http://www.ruhama.ro/downs/Rapoarte/RomaCommunityPerspectivesonMigrationtotheUK.pdf>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2011). *Report on statelessness in South Eastern Europe*. Bureau for Europe: UNHCR.

United Nations, Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner. (2018). *No one left behind: Mission report on the right to housing and related human rights of Roma in France*. Brussels: OHCHR.

Van Baar, H. (2015). The perpetual mobile machine of forced mobility: Europe's Roma and the institutionalization of rootlessness. In Y. Jansen, R. Celikates, & J. De Blois, *The Irregularization of Migration: Detention, Deportation, Drowning* (pp. 71-86). London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

van Baar, H. (2017). *Evictability and the Biopolitical Bordering of Europe*. *Antipode*, 49(1), 212-230.

Vlase, I., & Preoteasa, A. (2012). Roma migrants from Bulgaria and Romania. Migration patterns and integration in Italy and Spain 2011. In D. Tarnovsky, *Roma from Romania, Bulgaria, Italy and Spain between social inclusion and migration*. Bucharest: Open Society Foundations.

Vlase, I., & Voicu, M. (2014). *Romanian Roma migration: The interplay between structures and agency*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(13), 2418-2437.

Yuval-Davis, N., Wemyss, G., & Cassidy, K. (2017). Racialized bordering discourses on European Roma. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(7), 1047-1057.



.....
LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY

Cristian Tileagă
c.tileaga@lboro.ac.uk

Jo Aldridge
j.aldridge@lboro.ac.uk

.....
RUHAMA FOUNDATION

Salomea Popoviciu
office@ruhama.ro



ISBN 978-1-911217-27-5