edited by

Huub van Baar,

Ana Ivasiuc,

and

Regina Kreide

THE SECURITIZATION
OF THE ROMA
IN EUROPE

Human Rights Interventions

Series Editors
Chiseche Mibenge
Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA

Irene Hadiprayitno
Leiden University
Leiden, Zuid-Holland, The Netherlands

The traditional human rights frame creates a paradigm by which the duty bearer's (state) and rights holder's (civil society organizations) interests collide over the limits of enjoyment and enforcement. The series departs from the paradigm by centering peripheral yet powerful actors that agitate for intervention and influence in the (re)shaping of rights discourse in the midst of grave insecurities. The series privileges a call and response between theoretical inquiry and empirical investigation as contributors critically assess human rights interventions mediated by spatial, temporal, geopolitical and other dimensions. An interdisciplinary dialogue is key as the editors encourage multiple approaches such as law and society, political economy, historiography, legal ethnography, feminist security studies, and multi-media.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15595

Huub van Baar • Ana Ivasiuc
Regina Kreide
Editors

The Securitization of the Roma in Europe

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Huub van Baar
Justus Liebig University Giessen
Giessen, Germany

Ana Ivasiuc
Justus Liebig University Giessen
Giessen, Germany

Regina Kreide
Justus Liebig University Giessen
Giessen, Germany

Cover image: Image (detail) of the public art installation "Safe European Home?" by Damian John Le Bas and Delaine Le Bas. Photograph by Damian James Le Bas

Cover design by Fatima Jamadar

Printed on acid-free paper

Foreword: On Multiplicity, Interstices and the Politics of Insecurity

Exploring the securitization of the Roma in Europe today necessarily makes for a bleak reading of both contemporary minority politics and how discrimination and violence are currently inscribed into European societies. The Roma have been a key target of intensifying xenophobia, racism, economic marginalization, social destitution and the hollowing out of citizenship. They are not the only group of people who have become a battleground for the institutionalization and contestation of who can legitimately and effectively claim which human, civil, social, economic and political rights. However, together with refugees and particular groups of immigrants, they are certainly at the heart of struggles and disputes over the distribution of rights in a Europe that is experiencing a severe crisis of European integration, a continuing marketization of life, increasing precarity and inequality, an intense contestation over the viability of multiculturalism and a revival of geopolitical nationalism. As the chapters in this book show, the Roma have been and continue to be subjected to severe discrimination in this conjuncture. Their rights claims and campaigns for the right to have rights have become very precarious indeed.

Political, socioeconomic and cultural securitizations of Roma play a central role in instituting discrimination and exclusion and the grounds for legitimizing them. One of the major contributions of this volume is its detailed analyses of the multiple processes through which the Roma are enacted as a source of insecurities. However, in this preface, I want to focus on this volume's contribution to the study of securitization, not just of minorities, but more generally. Although it may seem more comfortable to reflect on the academic question of how to study security than to

engage the—in places—quite disturbing and violent realities that securitizations produce for the Roma, that is not the reason for drawing attention to the understanding of securitization. The approach to the question of security is important for a proper understanding of the predicament of the Roma in Europe, and also for understanding how to critically engage the processes of securitization.

The term 'securitization' was introduced into security studies in the 1990s to study insecurities as the product of discourses which articulate phenomena as existential threats to a society, state, community, individual or systemic entity. It refocused security analysis from the actions of those considered as posing a threat, to the actions of those who claim to defend against these threats. The latter are considered key for understanding how issues such as housing policies or border crossings become politicized as matters of security concern. The question is not whether the Roma are threatening or not, but rather what practices, and by whom, are framing the Roma as a matter of security, and what are the consequences of this? Such a take on insecurities creates reflective distance from the justification of security practices and their effects along the lines of, 'We know that security policies are not necessarily the ideal response and have possible negative side-effects, but we are not the ones posing a threat; we have a responsibility to defend the community, society, state against the threat'. By drawing attention to the active involvement of security practices in the production of insecurities, responsibility for its consequences shifts significantly to those claiming to defend and protect, whether vigilante, security agencies or politicians. As a result, the politics of security takes on a broader set of concerns as to how best to protect against a threat, including whether security methods and representations should be deployed at all.

The chapters in this book draw on this understanding of security, and share a critical disposition towards deploying security methods and representations of the Roma. The book is not, however, simply an application of securitization analysis to the Roma in Europe. It introduces a distinct take on the study of securitization. Between them, the chapters put forward the idea that, for understanding the securitization of the Roma, security studies need to move beyond focusing on security agencies and political speech. Nobody in this book argues that the latter are not important, but the securitization of the Roma involves significantly more than the application of coercive governmental methods by state security agencies and spectacular security statements by political leaders. The book

multiplies the sites and processes that are significant, including urban gentrification, regional policies, entertainment culture, local vigilante groups, social media, social policy, border practices and criminalization. In doing so, it makes a strong case for understanding securitization as a more diffuse process that is enacted throughout societies. That may sound obvious, but analytically it is not so easy to pull off because it requires recognition that the securitization of the Roma is really multiple in terms of the kind of actors involved, the processes through which it is enacted and the differences in experiences at different sites. It also demands that the analysis retain the heterogeneity of securitization while nevertheless articulating that these multiple practices are related, but not necessarily in an aggregative way that would bring the diverse processes together into a systemic securitization of the Roma. One of the strengths of the volume is that it is quite careful in seeking to retain the multiplicity of minor processes—minor not in the sense of small scale or micro but in the sense of resisting integration into aggregated/aggregating systemic processes—while nevertheless giving a real sense of resonance between them in terms of the discriminations, exclusions and violence directed at Roma people. Although the concept of multiplicity is not explicitly deployed and developed by the authors, the book makes a strong case for pursuing methods and conceptual takes that sustain and develop securitization analyses which take multiplicity seriously.

Analysing the multiplicity of securitizations in itself does not, however, address a particular issue with securitization studies: as a mode of security studies, it tends to isolate or home in on the security dimensions of phenomena and practices; as a mode of disciplinary knowing, it always risks reifying the centrality of security in the processes of governing and politicizing. By approaching security sideways, this volume addresses the need to avoid that risk. Most of the chapters take as their focal point practices which are not, strictly speaking, security practices. They look at the marketization of government and social relations, the development logic enacted in minority politics, visual cultures enacted in reality TV shows and social media, border practices and policies, the use of governmental methods reminiscent of colonialism, the enactment of racism, urban gentrification and so on. They then analyse how these practices take on securitizing characteristics, intersect with security practices and sustain renditions of the Roma as the source of insecurity. However, it is always clear that the discriminations, exclusions and violence addressed to the Roma cannot be reduced to securitization. Coming to security sideways

thus guards against explicit or implicit reductive readings. It allows for an interstitial approach to securitization in which the securitization analysis creates interstices between security and various other practices, issues and processes. It opens towards a more complex and heterogeneous understanding of how discrimination against and exclusion and subordination of the Roma are enacted, and the place of security discourses and techniques within that enactment. Taking such an approach leads to a better understanding of how situations are shaped for the Roma and the place of securitization in this process. It proposes a study of security that is not really a security study; indeed, in some places, it leads to analyses in which securitization seems more like a minor theme than a central force, and that is exactly what is valuable about deriving an understanding of the securitization of the Roma from the analysis of the multiple processes of governance and modes of representation and diffusion that are irreducible to security.

Combined with multiplying securitizations, this sideways approach to securitization contributes to a fracturing analysis of the securitization of the Roma and the discrimination, violence and stereotyping to which they are subjected. Rather than pulling all the chapters together into an aggregated statement at a macro-level on the process of securitization of the Roma, which does not really exist, the volume preserves a fractured landscape of securitizations, with the chapters, between them, allowing the reader to glimpse resonances across various sites and processes that do indeed imply a securitization of the Roma in Europe. In my understanding, this is a more accurate, but also more politically astute, approach to securitizations than tracing processes of securitization as such.

A related but distinct method of avoiding reifications of security is to move away from the understanding that securitization is depoliticizing, with depoliticizing understood as a technological or technocratic governing practice or an exceptionalist political practice. Several chapters do emphasize that insecurities and security practices always exist in contestations of rights, disputes over the right to have rights, claims of autonomy, protests, resistance and so on. However, in most of the chapters the bulk of the analysis remains focused on governing processes and modes of representation of the Roma. This is partly because security is primarily understood as securitization rather than as a politics of insecurity. Taking securitization as the driving analytical approach draws attention, in the first instance, to the social, cultural and political forces which structure

situations into security situations. The place of disputes, conflicts, contestations, and appropriations of rights, identities, conceptions of acceptable practices and autonomy that are equally defining of the situation, but in a continuously changing rather than an entrenching way, then tend to be ignored, become an afterthought or are given only secondary attention. Embedding the study of securitizations within an analysis of the politics of insecurity gives these elements a front-row seat in the analysis. It foregrounds categories and methodologies that approach politicizations as fractured and multiple becomings which simultaneously configure and challenge the enactment of insecurities and their consequences. The disruptive claims to rights of the Roma, countercultures, appropriations in everyday life, mobilizations of understandings that rupture reproduced imaginaries and so on then become crucial practices for understanding the renditions of insecurities in relation to the Roma in Europe today. It does not necessarily produce a less depressing picture of the way the Roma are governed and understood, or of the subjugations they experience; it does, however, open towards a world with more possibilities. It introduces an understanding that situations of securitization are not shaped by processes but by disputes, controversies, contestations, struggles and misappropriations, which continuously create new possibilities.

The distinct approach to securitization that this book expresses matters politically. It emphasizes the heterogeneity and multiplicity of securitizing practices, and how discriminations and subordinations are produced at interstices between securitizing practices and various processes that are not reducible to security. If the discriminating processes are inherently fractured, and connect more through resonances than systemic aggregations, then the fractured political acts and possible resonances between them are key to creating possibilities in specific sites for changing the precarious situation of many Roma in Europe today. Such an approach to the securitization of the Roma gives value to minor practices which, from the aggregated level of the state or the EU, appear as insignificant, as not having any bearing on the political process. In doing so, the book opens towards the valuing of a broad array of political actions for challenging securitization and the continuing marginalization, silence and subjugation to which the Roma are subjected in Europe. Combined with the book's distinct approach to the study of securitization, this makes for a great and timely contribution to both security studies and Roma politics. It sets an example

of how to assemble a study of securitization which captures its fractured but highly consequential reality by drawing together a group of researchers working, from multiple disciplinary angles, on how the lives of a particular group of people are rendered precarious today.

Queen Mary University of London   Jef Huysmans
London, UK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

Notes on Contributors

Marija Dalbello is an Associate Professor of Information Science in the School of Communication and Information at Rutgers University, New Jersey, in the USA. Her teaching and publications focus on the history of knowledge and history of the book applied to liminal phenomena and visuality. She has published on digital mediation, visual epistemology and immigrant literacies. She is the co-editor of *Visible Writings: Cultures, Forms, Readings* (2011) and *A History of Modern Librarianship: Constructing the Heritage of Western Cultures* (2015).

Nicholas De Genova has held academic appointments at King's College London, Goldsmiths, Columbia and Stanford, as well as visiting professorships and research positions at the Universities of Chicago, Amsterdam, Bern and Warwick. He is the author of *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago* (2005), co-author of *Latino Crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and the Politics of Race and Citizenship* (2003), editor of *Racial Transformations: Latinos and Asians Remaking the United States* (2006), co-editor of *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement* (2010) and editor of *The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering* (2017).

Markus End is an independent scholar from Berlin, Germany, and the Chairman of the *Gesellschaft für Antiziganismusforschung* (GfA). He was awarded his Ph.D. in Education from the University of Bielefeld in Germany in 2017 and has published widely in the field of antigypsyism. He is the author of *Antiziganismus in der deutschen Öffentlichkeit* (2014) and the co-editor of *Antiziganistische Zustände: Zur Kritik eines*

allgegenwärtigen Ressentiments (2009), *Antiziganistische Zustände 2: Kritische Positionen gegen gewaltvolle Verhältnisse* (2013) and *Antiziganism: What's in a Word?* (2015).

Jef Huysmans is a Professor of International Politics at Queen Mary University of London. After finishing his Ph.D. at the University of Leuven, Belgium, he was a Lecturer in International Relations and European studies at the University of Kent in Canterbury. Later, he moved to the Open University in Milton Keynes, where he taught politics and international relations and was Director of the Centre for Citizenship, Identities and Governance. He has published several books, including *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU* (2006), *Security Unbound: Enacting Democratic Limits* (2014) and, with Xavier Guillaume, *Citizenship and Security: The Constitution of Political Being* (2013).

Ana Ivasiuc is an anthropologist and a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Political Science of the Justus Liebig University in Giessen, Germany, where she is carrying out research on the securitization of the Roma in Italy within the project *Dynamics of Security: Forms of Securitization in Historical Perspective*, funded by the German Research Foundation (2014–17). She was awarded her Ph.D. in Sociology from the National School for Political and Administrative Studies in Bucharest, Romania. She is the co-editor of *Roma Activism: Reimagining Power and Knowledge* (forthcoming in 2018).

Angéla Kóczé is an Assistant Professor of Romani Studies and Academic Director of the Roma Graduate Preparation Programme at Central European University (CEU) in Budapest, Hungary. Previously she was a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program at Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem (North Carolina), the USA (2013–17). She was the principal investigator of the research project 'Institutionalization of Romani Politics After 1989 in Hungary', funded by the Hungarian Social Research Fund (2013–16). She is the co-editor of *The Romani Women's Movement: Struggles and Debates in Central and Eastern Europe* (forthcoming in 2018).

Regina Kreide is a Professor of Political and Social Theory and the History of Ideas at the Justus Liebig University in Giessen, Germany. She is the co-director of the Collaborative Research Centre *Dynamics of Security* and, together with Huub van Baar, leads the research project

'Between Minority Protection and Securitization: Roma Minority Formation in Modern European History', financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG). She is the author of *Die verdrängte Demokratie: Essays zur Politische Theorie* (2016) and *Globale Gerechtigkeit* (forthcoming in 2018), and the co-author of *Transformations of Democracy: Crisis, Protest, and Legitimation* (2015).

Olivier Legros is a geographer and senior lecturer at the University of Tours in France. Since working on the articulation between urban policies and social dynamics in the informal neighbourhoods of southern cities (e.g. Tunis, Dakar), he has focused his research on the policies towards Roma migrants in precarious situations in France. Legros is a founding member of URBA-ROM, the observatory of policies towards groups referred to as Roma/Gypsies. He oversees the Marginalization/Inclusion (MARG/IN) research programme devoted to policies aimed at Roma migrants and their effects on target populations in France, Italy and Spain. The French National Research Agency (ANR) finances this programme.

Marion Lièvre is a researcher at the Paul-Valéry University, Montpellier 3 in Montpellier, France. Previously, she was a postdoctoral researcher (2015–17) at the University of Tours, France, where she participated in the framework of the MARG-IN research programme, financed by the French National Research Agency (ANR). In 2013, she completed her Ph.D. thesis, entitled 'Ethno-Cultural Nationalism and its Relation to the Culture of Roma in Post-Communist and Multicultural Romania', at the Paul-Valéry University, Montpellier 3. Her research is dedicated to the analysis of the relationship between Roma migrant practices and public policies, with a specific focus on the role of the 'new social worker'.

Manuel Mireanu was awarded his Ph.D. in International Relations from Central European University (CEU), Budapest, Hungary, in 2015. He has conducted research on the security practices of vigilante groups in Europe. He is conducting research autonomously in Romania.

Ryan Powell is a Reader in Urban Studies in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at the University of Sheffield in the UK, where he is also the Department's Director of Research. He previously worked at the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University. He has diverse research interests spanning urban marginalization, urban governance, citizenship and the stigmatization of 'outsider' groups.

Annabel Tremlett is a Senior Lecturer in Social Inclusion at the University of Portsmouth in the UK. Since gaining her Ph.D. in Cultural Studies from King's College London (2008), she has been awarded two external grants to continue her research into visual representations. Her research interests include investigating the differences between public and self-representations of minority or marginalized groups. She is particularly interested in how to challenge misleading representations to bring about social change and has extensive expertise in ethnographic and photo elicitation research.

Huub van Baar is an Assistant Professor of Political Theory at the Justus Liebig University in Giessen in Germany and a senior research fellow at the Amsterdam Centre for Globalisation Studies (ACGS) and at the Department of European Studies of the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. Together with Regina Kreide, he leads the DFG-funded research project 'Between Minority Protection and Securitization: Roma Minority Formation in Modern European History'. He is the author of *The European Roma: Minority Representation, Memory, and the Limits of Transnational Governmentality* (2011) and the editor of *Museutopia: A Photographic Research Project by Ilya Rabinovich* (2012).

Ioana Vrăbiescu is a postdoctoral researcher in the ERC project *SOLIDERE: The Social Life of State Deportation Regimes,* at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. She was previously a Roma Initiative Office Fellow at the Open Society Institute (OSI) and a visiting scholar at the University Autonoma of Barcelona in Spain. She holds a Ph.D. in Political Science and has an academic background in gender studies and international relations.

LIST OF FIGURES

The European Roma and Their Securitization: Contexts, Junctures, Challenges

Huub van Baar, Ana Ivasiuc, and Regina Kreide

Events and transformations in and of the world—terrorist attacks, the movements of migrants and refugees, violent conflicts in Ukraine, Syria, and elsewhere, climate change, and a changing world order beyond the bipolarity of the Cold War—are all, in one way or another, framed in terms of security and insecurity these days. We live in a world where threats to security are constant—at least, this is what the prevalent public and political discourses on security seem to want us to believe. But, as the diversity of the examples indicates, the question of *whose* security needs to be defended and guaranteed is not unambiguous. For some groups—minorities and migrants in particular—security discourses and practices have themselves turned into a kind of threat, as they have often become the targets and the objects of measures which—allegedly—are designed to bring about 'more security'. Security and its impact on minorities and migrants, and on the Roma in Europe in particular, are the central focus of this volume.

H. van Baar (✉) • A. Ivasiuc • R. Kreide
Justus Liebig University Giessen, Giessen, Germany
e-mail: Huub.van-Baar@sowi.uni-giessen.de; Regina.Kreide@sowi.uni-giessen.de

During the Cold War and in traditional security studies, the term 'security' referred mostly to national security and the guaranteeing of the borders of territorialized nation states; hence, minorities were not a specific concern of these analyses. With the emergence of critical security studies in the 1990s, the alleged neutrality and objectivity of security and its conditions of possibility, as well as the methodological nationalism of traditional security analyses, have explicitly been questioned. Over the last two decades, a series of studies inspired by the linguistic and post-structuralist turns in modern philosophy has sought to understand why and how security discourses and mechanisms are created, and what the effects of the subsequent policy measures are on human lives. Among these studies are those pertaining to the 'Copenhagen School' (Buzan et al. 1998) and the 'Paris School' (Bigo et al. 2010; Bigo and Guild 2005; Huysmans 2006; Huysmans et al. 2006) of securitization.

For the Copenhagen School, speech acts uttered by political elites perform security with 'words' in a process called securitization. Speech acts invoke a semantic repertoire, a 'grammar of security' (Buzan et al. 1998: 33) through which a societal affair can be performed as a security 'problem'. Here, securitization involves defining something as a security problem, and thus triggering exceptional political measures to deal with it.

This approach has been criticized, most notably for its one-sided focus on the discursive dimension of securitization. The representatives of the Paris School, in particular, consider the speech-act approach to be too narrow, as it neglects both non-discursive practices of securitization and the ways in which a process of normalizing securitization is always already underway, for instance, through the practices and technologies used by security professionals which go beyond publicly uttered speech acts (profiling, satellite techniques, risk assessments, or the activities of Frontex). By asking who *accepts* the discourses on security, their approach focuses on the relationship between security measures, the actors discursively and non-discursively articulating security threats, and audiences who are, or are not, responsive to these threat renditions (Balzacq 2011). Understood in this way, securitization encompasses discursive and non-discursive ways of creating knowledge about the security techniques which change the governance of social, political, economic, cultural, and military affairs. Moreover, in this approach, practices of securitization come to the fore in a *dialectical* relationship in which the formation of security does not bring about a *more secure* world but only produces more insecurity (Ivasiuc, Chap. 11, this volume; Kreide, Chap. 3, this volume) through practices of normalization which

distinguish, for example, between 'regular' citizens and migrants, and those who are rendered 'irregular' such as minorities and illegalized migrants. This dialectical, Foucault-based approach includes not only a reflection on the processes of discursive representation and construction but also a critical interrogation of the techniques and forms of expertise and knowledge formation involved in enacting, maintaining, reinforcing, or challenging aspects such as migration-related processes of securitization (Bigo et al. 2013; Huysmans 2006; van Baar 2011a, 2015).

Uniquely, this volume links critical security studies with minority studies and focuses on the Roma as a much discriminated-against, 'irregularized' transnational minority in Europe from the perspective of various intersections of security. The chapters in this book shed light on the question of what is implied by securitization, both conceptually and in practice, combining the approaches of both the 'schools' discussed. The authors illustrate—from a variety of perspectives—the process of securitization as a mechanism of exclusion: from territories, residence, citizenship, public services, humanity, and the egalitarian promise of citizenship.

The contributors discuss the position of the European Roma from the angle of how they and their practices have been considered to be a threat to public, social, or even national security or to themselves—the latter mostly in the context of human security—in various national and European contexts. While research regarding the securitization of the Roma has so far primarily focused on the nexus of security and mobility in the context of Roma migration from Central and Eastern to Western Europe, and in that of 'free movement' in an enlarging European Union (EU), this volume offers a notably more comprehensive approach: it situates Roma-related concepts, discourses, and practices of securitization in the broader context of their mutual interactions and intersections with mobility, development, marketization, and visuality. In so doing, we show not only how the processes and mechanisms of securitization significantly impact the everyday lives of the Roma throughout Europe but also how several programmes presented as solutions to 'their problems' are ambiguously related to the ways in which the Roma have been problematized as security threats. We do not understand securitization as a kind of master narrative or frame through which we can comprehensively understand the situation of the Roma in Europe; rather, we adopt it as an analytical tool which can illuminate the processes to which the European Roma are subjected, but always at the intersection with regimes of mobility, marketization, development, and visuality. Thus, we take a 'fractured' look at securitization (Huysmans, Foreword, this volume).

The book also sheds new light on how the securitization of the Roma and their practices can be questioned and challenged. Normatively, conceptually and empirically, this is not simply a matter of reframing or approaching them in the 'non-security' terms of human and minority rights, empowerment, inclusion, participation, or development more generally. In fact, our volume shows that this reframing and the correlated political interventions are often also problematic in different respects. The contributions to *The Securitization of the Roma in Europe* imply that any serious attempt at 'de-securitization' should thoroughly reflect on how the prevalent securitization of the Roma and their practices largely overlaps with regimes of mobility, marketization, development, and visuality. De-securitization is always linked to securitization and vice versa. Thus, there is no de-securitization without pre-existing securitization, and any process of securitization explicitly or implicitly has the potential to be unmasked, offset, and overcome.

In critical security studies, de-securitization has generally been conceptualized in binary opposition to securitization and as its normatively 'good' and 'desirable' counterpart (Aradau 2004; Hansen 2011a). Indeed, overly dramatized and exceptionalized issues can be brought back into the realm of 'politics as usual' through de-securitization. Following critiques of this view (e.g. Austin and Beaulieu-Brossard 2018), in this volume, we question both this binary opposition and the qualification of de-securitization as inherently normatively 'good'. In the case of the Roma, also given the historical continuity of their problematization as a threat, de-securitization is possible but not always easy to pinpoint empirically. While it often remains ambiguously interwoven with practices of securitization (Dalbello, Chap. 13, this volume), it can sometimes involve openings and alternative narratives. The power of de-securitization does not merely stem from an objective or normative strategy to reveal securitizing measures but, rather, from creative political counter-narratives to securitizing practices on an everyday basis requiring a micro-lens on tactics and the ordinary (Legros and Lièvre, Chap. 4, this volume). These creative 'counter-narratives' can become part of the orchestrated ways of political movements and resistance (Kreide, Chap. 3, this volume).

This book is structured in four parts, which discuss the securitization of Roma minorities in terms of mobility, development, marketization, and visuality. Discussing these intersections separately does not imply that they are *separated* from one another: these intersections form a *continuum* and mutually constitute one another.

Mobility

Since the fall of communism, the mobility of the Roma has primarily been approached in academic contexts and circles—but also and most extensively in political, public, and policy debates—in terms of their migration from Eastern to Western Europe rather than as socioeconomic mobility (but see Ivasiuc 2018; van Baar 2012). In most European countries, the migration of the Roma has been framed in terms of a problem of—or even a threat to—public order, public health, or the social security systems of the host countries. This problematization has led to the introduction of radical measures, such as stop-and-search practices, surveillance, police raids, eviction, and deportation. The reasons for this prevailing focus on the migration of the Roma as a threat are highly ambiguous. They relate, firstly, to the racializing subtext of the distinction between mobility and migration, secondly to the legacies of excluding the Roma through the irregularization of their mobility, and thirdly, to the often neglected role of the Roma's agency in debates about their mobility.

First, the shift of the debate from broader issues of mobility to a narrow focus on migration is problematic because of the way in which migration since the 1980s has increasingly become securitized (Huysmans 2006). According to one of the key principles of the EU, all EU citizens have the right of free movement within the Union, usually qualified as the *mobility* of EU citizens; indeed, its encouragement could even be considered to be one of the main driving forces behind the EU political project. But when it comes to those forms of intra-EU mobility that are considered problematic—such as the mobility of the Roma or that of Central and Eastern European citizens more generally—the EU citizens involved are considered to be *migrants* or even 'poverty migrants' or 'social tourists'. These discursive frames suggest that, in such cases, these 'migrant' EU citizens should be governed differently to their fellow EU citizens. This can be seen in the all too familiar cases of non-EU migrants deemed unwelcome in Europe, but who, in many cases, are nonetheless differentially included on the basis of ambiguous and often precarious and exploitative arrangements in the labour and housing markets, or even in detention centres across Europe (Jansen et al. 2015).

Meanwhile, unorthodox technologies of citizenship (Walters 2010; van Baar 2017a) such as those of surveillance, profiling, detention, eviction, and deportation are deemed to be prerequisites for dealing with the tensions in public opinion regarding migrants. Consequently, these technolo-

gies have rendered technical and normal the policy responses to non-EU migrants, as well as to European citizens such as the Roma. The fact that Romanian and Bulgarian Roma citizens who have 'migrated' to France continue to be deported back to their countries of origin is telling, not only of the limitations of EU citizenship but also of the *normalization* of illegitimate practices through populist politicization, administrative regularization, and public consent. The law plays an ambivalent role in this context: through an inscription of these practices into national legislation, the law *usually* functions *against* the Roma (Kreide, Chap. 3, this volume).

At the same time, the 'migrantization' (New Keywords Collective 2016: 29) and 'irregularization of migration' (Jansen et al. 2015) in contemporary Europe, in which the mobility of particular citizens is rendered 'naturally' irregular or illegal, reveal the neoliberal conditions under which mobility regimes in and at the borders of Europe have begun to function. This has become prominent in the recent contexts of the financial-economic crisis, the 'migrant'/'refugee' crisis, and, more generally, crisis-driven neoliberalization (Brenner et al. 2010; New Keywords Collective 2016; Walby 2015).

The securitization of mobility has thus gone hand in hand with new forms of racialization that qualify some forms of mobility in Europe as less desirable than others. Moreover, as the example of the ongoing deportations of Roma from France makes clear, we are dealing not only with a disqualification regarding the supposedly general EU right to mobility but also with regard to social, civil, human, and minority rights (Kreide, Chap. 3, this volume) and to those rights which Sandro Mezzadra (2004) brought together in his idea of 'the right to escape'. He uses this concept 'to highlight the elements of subjectivity which permeate the migratory movements and which must be kept in mind if one wants to produce an image of these movements as *social* movements in the full sense' (2004: 270). This is not meant to disregard the objective background to why people migrate but rather to 'underline the fact that for these migrations to exist, there must be an individual motion… of desertion from the field where those "objective causes" operate, a reclaiming precisely of a "right to escape"' (ibid.). The fact that many Roma who—for various objective *and* subjective reasons—have used their EU right to mobility have been faced with practices ranging from denial to removal implies that their right to escape has been seriously violated.

The second problem that we want to address with regard to the securitization of the mobility of the Roma relates to the long history of problematizing the mobility of the Roma along the lines of a threat. The

various groups of Roma who live throughout Europe have often been portrayed as a people with a shared background of travelling through and beyond Europe (Mayall 2004; Willems 1997). They are characterized as being mobile by culture, a stereotype that has been so influential that some have suggested that 'the Gypsy is a nomad even when not travelling' (Liégeois 1986: 54). Yet the majority of people in Europe who are called or call themselves Roma[1]—particularly those who live in Central and Eastern Europe—have already lived sedentarily for a long time for various political and socioeconomic reasons, ranging from taxation policies in the Ottoman Empire and assimilation policies under Habsburg rule to renewed assimilation and labour-market policies in the former socialist states (see also Dalbello, Chap. 13, in this volume). Nevertheless, through a process of 'nomadization', they have often been stereotyped and differentially governed as a nomadic people who have no strong 'roots' in, but only loose 'routes' through, European cultures and societies (van Baar 2011b). For example, during the 1970s and 1980s, Western European states and European institutions frequently problematized their Roma citizens in terms of nomadism (Simhandl 2006).

Whereas post-war Western and Eastern European practices of governing through nomadization were initially used to regulate Roma minorities domestically, since 1989, they have increasingly been mobilized to manage newly emerged forms of mobility among the Roma within Europe's contested borders. Throughout Europe, this development has led to the emergence of a heterogeneous, ramified 'perpetual mobile machine of forced mobility' (van Baar 2015) in which many migrating Roma are confronted with their 'unwantedness', and with policy measures intended to govern, and thus 'nomadize' them through practices of repeated expulsion (De Genova, Chap. 2, this volume; Legros and Lièvre, Chap. 4, this volume; van Baar, 2011b, 2017a, Chap. 8, this volume; Vrăbiescu, Chap. 10, this volume).

A third aspect regarding the securitization of mobility addressed in this volume relates to the criminalization, victimization, or commodification of the Roma. If we suggest that all the mechanisms which have emerged to control and regulate their mobility have been successful in turning their subjects into 'docile (im-)mobile bodies', we overlook those practices that articulate the agency and subjectivity of the 'right to escape' and which—in the debates about the autonomy of migration, for example—have been qualified as the migrants' 'practices of appropriation' (Scheel 2015). The established regimes of migration and border control 'aim at de-politicizing

migration', something which is achieved 'through reducing the migrants to their labour power, to needy victims, or to cunning criminals' (ibid.: 4).

A consideration of the 'subjective face' (Bojadžijev and Karakayalı 2007: 212) of mobilities, which is taken away through these reductions, helps to show both the limits of practices of securitization and the wider politics of security involved in the idea of the 'efficient' control and management of borders and migration. But this consideration also gives us an insight into how we could conceptualize practices of de-securitization, and thereby also those practices which question, disrupt, circumvent, or challenge the powerful dynamics of security involved in the securitization of the Roma. Practices of de-securitization relate to a variety of practices of appropriation and re-appropriation and politicization and re-politicization, and we should avoid understanding them too easily as binaries of power *versus* resistance. Indeed, we have seen an entire spectrum of practices of resistance situated between, at one end of this spectrum, open activist and artistic acts of protest (Aradau et al. 2013; Çağlar and Mehling 2013; van Baar 2013) and, at the other end, much more mundane, less visible, or even consciously invisibilized acts of appropriation which, *because of* the asymmetric power relations involved in managing mobilities, have to operate mostly by stealth (Legros and Lièvre, Chap. 4, this volume). All of the practices in this complex spectrum articulate that migration has to be acknowledged as an *autonomous* practice of resistance in the sense of a 'right to escape' or 'egress' (De Genova 2017; van Baar, Chap. 8, this volume). In the first part of this volume, we address the question of the 'politicality' of these practices of resistance: to what extent do these varied practices articulate important political moments, not only in addressing the limits of securitization but also in directing our societies and cultures towards alternative paths?

The three chapters in the first part of the book speak in various ways to the three discussed arguments that problematize the nexus of mobility and security. In Chap. 2, *Nicholas De Genova* takes up the debate about the Roma's nomadization to make the original argument that the situation of the 'stateless' and 'refugees' discussed so prominently by Hannah Arendt in the 1940s and 1950s can be compared to that of the Roma, particularly when it comes to the new forms of nomadization imposed on them which characterize their position in Europe today. De Genova suggests a relational history in which he mobilizes Arendt's work to examine the position of the Roma. Inspired by her analysis of the deprivation of rights suffered by the refugees, De Genova examines to what extent the