



**Mid-term review- UK Roma National Integration Strategy:  
Roma at the intersection of ethnic-inclusive, post-racial and  
hyper-ethnic policies.**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Contemporary European Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CJEA-2019-0001.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Article
Keywords:	Gypsy, Roma, ethnic inclusion policies, Brexit

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## **Mid-term review- UK Roma National Integration Strategy: Roma at the intersection of ethnic-inclusive, post-racial and hyper-ethnic policies.**

### **Abstract**

Rather than developing a specific strategy to promote Roma integration, the UK government decided to use mainstream legislation. However, the complex mechanisms of UK policy-making, means that responsibility for integration is defused. Because of the devolved governmental systems and the localisation agenda, Gypsy, Traveller and Roma (GTR) populations often find that they are subject to different forms of inclusion and exclusion depending on their specific geo-political location. In this paper, the authors suggest that in addition to experiencing the impact of devolution, 'mainstreaming' approaches to Roma integration are failing because GTR communities find themselves located at the intersection of three different policy ideologies in the UK: 'ethnic inclusive policies' (that seek to promote Roma inclusion), 'post racial policies' (that obscure specific forms of structural inequalities) and 'hyper-ethnic' policies, (targeted in a discriminatory manner towards certain communities). With the British about to exit from the European Union, concerns are also being raised about the future of Roma communities and the commitment to their inclusion.

**Key words,** Gypsy, Traveller, Roma, UK, ethnic inclusive policy, post-racial policy, hyper-racial policy, Brexit.

### **1. Introduction**

The high levels of social exclusion and discrimination experienced by the Roma across Europe have been well documented (European Union FRA, 2018, European Commission, 2012, World Bank 2016). In 2011, the European Commission called on all EU Member States to respond to these concerns, by adopting the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategy (NRIS). Member States could choose to either establish an integration strategy, or outline a set of objectives and measures to promote the integration of their Roma populations. The UK government lobbied for this second approach and have advocated for using existing policies and legislation to promote Roma inclusion (Ryder and Cemlyn, 2016).

In this paper, the authors examine some of the complexities of the United Kingdom (UK) policy-making mechanisms that are purported to promote Roma integration in the UK, developing a critical analysis of these mechanisms and the ways in which they impact Roma integration.

The paper is divided into two parts; in part one, the authors outline the complexity of UK policy-making mechanisms, where policy is made at both the central government level, as well as through the devolved administrations of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Consequently, different aspects of policy that relate to Roma integration are informed either by policies at the central/national level, or at the level of the devolved governments (National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups et al, 2018). In recent years the central government has also been promoting the localisation agenda, which means that decision-making and budgets are supposed to be transferred to local

1  
2  
3 governments, the local authorities and local people. Consequently, even within the same  
4 nation, Roma people have differing access to services and support depending on their  
5 geo-political location (Lane, Spencer and Jones, 2014).  
6

7  
8 However, in examining the finding of the EU mid-term review of the UK National  
9 Roma Integration Strategy, the authors argue that part of the reason that ‘mainstreaming’  
10 approaches are failing is because Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities find  
11 themselves located at the intersection of three policy ideologies.  
12

13 Therefore, in part two of this paper, the authors highlight the implications of ‘ethnic  
14 inclusive’, policies’ (that seek to promote Roma inclusion), ‘post racial’ policies’ (that  
15 obscure specific forms of structural inequalities) and ‘hyper-ethnic’ policies (that are  
16 targeted in a discriminatory manner, towards nomadic Gypsies, Travellers and the Roma  
17 migrants). Finally the paper ends with a brief reflection on the UK exit from the  
18 European Union (EU) community and concerns about the future of Roma inclusion.  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **2. Gypsies, Travellers and Roma in the UK**

24 The European Commission uses the term ‘Roma’ in policy and other documentation as  
25 an umbrella term to describe a range of heterogeneous communities, which includes  
26 Romany Gypsies and Travellers living in the UK. Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers  
27 have been part of British culture for hundreds of years. However, the National Census  
28 only collected data on Gypsies and Travellers for the first time in 2011, indicating there  
29 are 58,000 people who self-identified as Gypsy or Irish Traveller in England and Wales  
30 (Office for National Statistics, 2011). This is usually considered to be a considerable  
31 undercount and other reports have estimated that the Gypsy and Traveller population is  
32 nearer to 200,000 to 300,000 (Irish Traveller Movement in Britain, 2013, Wemyss et al.  
33 2015).  
34  
35

36 Under the Equality Act (2010) Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised as  
37 minority ethnic groups, with ‘protected characteristics’ and should be afforded  
38 protection from discrimination under equality legislation (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010).  
39 However, a number of reports have highlighted that many Gypsies and Travellers face  
40 multiple disadvantages as well as discrimination, hate speech and hate crime (Equality  
41 and Human Rights Commission, 2015, National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups al.,  
42 2018). In the UK the term ‘Roma’ generally refers to the Roma communities from East  
43 and Central Europe who have arrived as migrants largely by exercising their freedom of  
44 movement as EU citizens. The Roma are not a homogeneous group and are from various  
45 nations and different subgroups that can transcend national borders and consequently,  
46 they often have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds as well as different needs to  
47 indigenous Gypsies and Travellers (Institute for Public Policy Research, 2016). It is  
48 difficult to know how many Roma live in the UK and the 2011 national census failed to  
49 collect any ethnic data on Roma communities. However data generated from one  
50 national study based on questionnaires to UK local authorities, suggests that the migrant  
51 Roma population in the UK is approximately 200,000 and they tend to live in and  
52 around major cities (Brown, Scullion and Martin, 2013).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **3. Roma integration and policymaking mechanism in the UK**

1  
2  
3 The UK has a complex system of policy making and only some aspects are made by  
4 central government with the devolved governments of Wales, Scotland and Northern  
5 Ireland responsible for other aspects of policy. England does not have its own parliament  
6 and issues affecting England, are decided by UK central governmental policy. The UK  
7 policy-making process is further complicated by current (and preceding) governments'  
8 promotion of 'localism' through the Localism Act (2010) where resources and power are  
9 supposed to be devolved down to local communities via the local authorities. These  
10 structures are significant for Roma inclusion because it means that Roma may be subject  
11 to different forms of inclusion and exclusion, across the UK, depending on where they  
12 happen to reside.  
13  
14

### 15 16 3.1 *National policymaking and Roma inclusion*

17 Despite being a signatory to the NRIS in 2011, the UK government's lack of policy or  
18 legislation to promote Roma inclusion across the country means there is no systematic  
19 mainstreaming for Roma inclusion within central Government policy. In the absence of  
20 any national policy initiatives specifically promoting Roma integration, mainstream laws  
21 and policies have had to act as a proxy for a NRIS. Ryder and Cemlyn have suggested  
22 that the divergent approaches of the devolved administrations could 'provide for  
23 interesting comparisons as to 'which method is most effective in advancing social  
24 justice' (2016, p. 153). However, the fifth monitoring report on the UK by the  
25 European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (2016) expressed their concern  
26 about the lack of a national Roma integration strategy across the UK and recommend  
27 that the authorities develop with GRT representatives a set of policies to address the  
28 inequalities across the domains of health, education, accommodation, employment and  
29 social integration experienced by all of the communities in all the countries of the UK.  
30 Not only do devolved governmental systems create differing levels of funding and  
31 integration policies that result in differing types of inclusion and exclusion but the  
32 location of Roma people within each country means that they will often have differing  
33 access to services and support and therefore different opportunities for integration.  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 3.2 *The role of devolved government and Roma inclusion*

39 The devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are responsible  
40 for monitoring the effectiveness of their own policies (with the UK central government  
41 being responsible for these matters in England). Funding for the devolved governments  
42 largely comes from a combination from central government, local government and EU  
43 funds. However, the funding of local services has proven highly contentious, raising  
44 questions about how funding is distributed and issues of inter-regional equity (British  
45 Academy, 2018). Policymaking is the responsibility of central and the devolved  
46 governments but the delivery of Roma integration at local levels, may be inhibited or  
47 facilitated by the availability of central funding, regardless of the intent of the devolved  
48 government (Poole and Adamson, 2008).  
49  
50

51 *Scotland:* The Scottish government has not developed a NRIS, although a report  
52 '*Mapping of the Roma Community in Scotland*' (Scottish Government, 2013)  
53 highlighted a range of inequalities that migrant Roma are facing across Scotland. The  
54 report failed to make any substantive recommendations and research suggests that three  
55 years later little had changed for Roma in Scotland (Scottish Churches Racial Justice  
56 Groups, 2016). Moreover, because the majority of Roma live in and around Glasgow,  
57 the Scottish policy response and service provision has been concentrated in this area,  
58 often leaving others across Scotland with limited support. The Scottish government has  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 introduced a 'Race Equality Action Plan' (Scottish Government, 2017), aiming to  
4 promote positive change for minority ethnic communities, which only makes limited  
5 reference to the needs of GTR communities.  
6  
7

8 *England:* England does not have a NRIS. Central government policy has established the  
9 legal parameters for equality though the Equalities Act (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010) and  
10 this applies across all of the devolved administrations (except Northern Ireland) but  
11 there is little evidence that this is advancing GTR integration. Indeed, the Leveson  
12 Inquiry 2012, highlighted how Gypsies and Travellers are often the targets of hostility  
13 and/or xenophobia in the UK media. Other reports have highlighted how GTR  
14 communities continue to face race-hate and discrimination (National Federation of  
15 Gypsy Liaison Groups 2018; Traveller Movement 2016; Equality and Human Rights  
16 Commission, 2016). In 2018, the government produced a consultation document for  
17 England outlining a strategy for integrated communities (HM Government, 2018), but at  
18 the time of writing, no progress has been made on these proposals and there was very  
19 little mention of GTR populations.  
20  
21  
22

23 *Wales:* The Welsh Government, are the only devolved government to establish a NRIS.  
24 The first strategy in 2011 (Welsh Government, 2011), achieved some of the objectives -  
25 although ironically it made little mention of Roma migrants. The new strategy (Welsh  
26 Government, 2018) embeds Roma concerns throughout the document. However, it is  
27 notable that the strategy only involves partial monitoring on progress on integration  
28 relating to nomadic Gypsies and Travellers caravan/ trailer sites and there is very limited  
29 monitoring relating to progress on the integration of Roma migrants.  
30  
31

32 *Northern Ireland* has not developed a NRIS, although the government has developed a  
33 Racial Equality Strategy for 2015-2025 (Office of the First Minister and Deputy First  
34 Minister, 2015). This highlights the needs of Traveller and Roma communities and  
35 recognises the lack of data monitoring racial equality. Overall, there is very little  
36 mention of Roma integration in Northern Ireland and the Northern Ireland Human  
37 Rights Commission (2018) published an investigation into Travellers' accommodation,  
38 noting that the community often face hostility and discrimination from public authorities  
39 and the settled community.  
40  
41

42 A number of EC monitoring reports on the UK NRIS have expressed concern about the  
43 lack of a national Roma integration strategy across the UK (European Commission,  
44 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016). Although Ryder and Cemlyn (2016, p. 53) have  
45 suggested that the divergent approaches of the devolved administrations has the potential  
46 to 'provide for interesting comparisons as to 'which method is most effective in  
47 advancing social justice' in practice the devolved governmental systems means that  
48 GTR communities often have differing access to services and support, and therefore  
49 different opportunities for integration. The lack of a NRIS in most of the devolved  
50 governments, combined with a lack of national monitoring on Roma inclusion, also  
51 makes it difficult to compare progress on Roma integration within and across the  
52 devolved governments. These issues have been further complicated by the 'localism'  
53 agenda.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60 *Localism and Roma inclusion*

1  
2  
3 Since 2010, central government has promoted ‘localism’, aiming to decentralise power  
4 to local councils and local people (Department for Communities and Local Government,  
5 (2011). However, most local authorities now find themselves as agents of austerity, with  
6 the task of delivering central government budget cuts, while trying to maintain services  
7 (Penny, 2017). Between 2010-2016 local government spending fell by 27% with poorer  
8 areas and regions impacted disproportionately (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2017;  
9 Hastings, Bailey, and Bramley, et al. 2015). There are examples of positive practice  
10 within some local authorities, which are usually piecemeal and locally based for  
11 example, Glasgow City Council and its partners in the Govanhill neighbourhood or the  
12 Local Engagement for Roma Inclusion (LERI) project in Chatham, Kent (European  
13 Commission, 2016; EU Fundamental Rights Agency 2017). Nonetheless, a report by the  
14 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups et al. (2018) suggests that in some areas  
15 the “localism” agenda has not only failed to promote Roma integration but has  
16 facilitated an active “anti-Gypsy” stance. The EC’s assessment of the UK’s NRIS  
17 summarised the shortfalls of localism as hindering Roma integration by highlighting  
18 poor cooperation between central and local government; the lack of Roma input into  
19 policy formulation, and the lack of data gathering for monitoring purposes (European  
20 Commission, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016).

#### 24 25 26 **4. Progress on the National Roma Integration Strategy in the UK and the Mid-** 27 **term review**

28 The EU Commissions midterm review compared the situation of the Roma in 2011 and  
29 2016 across EU Member States and noted some limited advancement in the four areas of  
30 housing, education, health and employment but concludes that progress has been  
31 ‘unequal and modest’ with much more required (European Commission, 2017). By  
32 2018, a Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the  
33 Council (European Commission COM (2018) 785 final), highlighted that at a general  
34 EU level, there was progress in the area of education, with positive changes in relation to  
35 early school-leaving and early childhood education, where the participation of Roma  
36 children grew in most Member States. However, the same Communication also  
37 suggested that while the self-perceived health status of Roma had improved, access to  
38 medical care continued to be of concern. Overall, the Communication suggested that  
39 progress towards Roma integration goals were limited, and ‘no improvement has been  
40 observed in access to employment, and the share of young Roma not in employment,  
41 education or training has even increased. The housing situation remains difficult’  
42 (European Commission 2018, 3.5). In common with past EU documents, the EC 2017  
43 and 2018 reports both recommend greater coordination and use of structural funds;  
44 greater stakeholder involvement and calls on member states to develop a set of measures  
45 to monitor progress and for greater alignment between mainstream inclusion policies  
46 and the key areas for Roma integration. It was notable that these 2017 and 2018  
47 documents did not specifically mention the UK, indeed that last comment on the UK’s  
48 NRIS was in the EC’s (2016) assessment of the implementation of the NRIS that noted  
49 that in the UK:-  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 “The mainstream approaches have not demonstrated sufficient impact on  
56 improving the situation of Roma. Targeted measures could be further exploited by  
57 also using the existing possibilities under the ESIF funds. Scaling up the existing  
58 initiatives implemented throughout the UK should also be explored” (2016, p. 89).  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 An explanatory memorandum from the Department of Communities and Local  
4 Government (2017) shows no significant change in policy orientation and recalcitrance  
5 towards the Commission's recommendations for speeding up the integration process. It  
6 reiterates the UK government's commitment to advancing Roma integration within  
7 broader social inclusion and integration policies and its retreat from the targeted  
8 measures and measurable outcomes recommended by the Commission. Instead the  
9 memorandum highlights the role of local areas in determining the most effective  
10 integration measures for its local GTR communities. Similarly with regards to planning  
11 for Gypsy and Traveller sites the government argue that it is the responsibility of local  
12 authorities to assess the need for sites and to identify a suitable five year supply of sites  
13 to meet those needs.  
14  
15

16  
17 In response to Commission concerns over the lack of data the memorandum argues that  
18 the UK has some of the most comprehensive ethnic data sets in the EU and that the  
19 collection of additional data will be considered on a case by case basis. It notes that  
20 enforcement of anti-discrimination and hate crime offences is a matter for the courts and  
21 regarding strengthening Roma capacity and involvement the memorandum notes that a  
22 quarterly Liaison group meeting with representatives from the GTR community is held  
23 but failed to include any changes or outcomes that the group has engendered. Much of  
24 the memorandum provides examples of mainstream policy measures to which GTR  
25 people can avail themselves, for example noting that the proportion of GTR pupils who  
26 qualify for the Pupil Premium (additional funding to enable schools to address  
27 educational inequalities between pupils from low income household and their peers) is  
28 much higher than average. However the memorandum contains no concrete proposals  
29 for addressing the poverty that many of these families face and remains wedded to an  
30 ethnically inclusive approach that focuses on increasing human capital. The UK  
31 government's approach also combines elements of a 'post-racial' approach that denies  
32 the distinctively ethnic dimension of Roma exclusion with 'hyper-ethnic' policies which,  
33 in opposition to equalities legislation, identify and isolate discrete populations and  
34 subject them to discriminatory and repressive policy measures. The implications of these  
35 three interrelated policy approaches are discussed below.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 **5. Ethnic inclusive policies and Roma integration**

42 The authors have drawn attention the UK policymaking mechanisms that are supposed  
43 to promote Roma integration, which raises the question of whether current policy  
44 approaches are sufficient to actually promote integration. The Equality Act (2010) is  
45 the dominant policy promoting integration in the UK although in Northern Ireland, the  
46 equality legislation is not harmonised and consequently, there is a lack of consistency in  
47 protection and rights (Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 2011).  
48  
49

50 The UK Equality Act prohibits unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation  
51 and protects individuals from unfair treatment. It protects GTR and all other 'race  
52 groups' from discrimination and others with 'protected characteristics' (Equality and  
53 Human Rights Commission, 2016). In addition, the Equality Duty (2010) places a duty  
54 on all public authorities to promote equality of opportunity and good community  
55 relations. Combined, the Equality Act (2010) and Equality Duty (2010) should promote  
56 equality for all, and by default, it should also promote Roma integration. Despite this  
57 legislation, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (2016) five-yearly found that  
58 Gypsies and Travellers continue to face multiple disadvantages and discrimination in  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 education, health, the workplace and the justice system.  
4

5  
6 This is not surprising because while this legislation gives individuals ‘rights’, it does not  
7 require systemic changes, or address the role of neo-liberal economies in perpetuating  
8 social exclusion (Goldberg, 2009). Indeed, despite providing the conditions for the legal  
9 protection of ethnic minorities, evidence indicates that a legal ‘right’ to equality does not  
10 necessarily result in equality or inclusion (see for example, the governments’ own ‘Race  
11 Disparity’ report) (Cabinet Office, 2017). Imbalances of power and inequality are core  
12 to neo-liberal economies that are inherently unequal and which therefore prevents  
13 equalities legislation (such as the Equalities Act), from having a genuinely  
14 transformative effect. In the following section, the authors examine how these  
15 contradictions (between equality policy located within a system that promotes  
16 inequality), negates (or makes ‘invisible’), the specific ethnic experiences of inequality  
17 and discrimination, through ‘post-racial’ discourses.  
18  
19

## 20 21 **6. Post-racial society: rendering Roma inequality invisible.**

22 Despite the fact that race has been used to promote exclusionary practices (Umut, Karim  
23 and Nahaboo, 2016), within ‘post-racial’ discourses ethnic and racial differences are  
24 considered inconsequential because it is the individuals ‘choice’ to maximise  
25 opportunities available to them within neo-liberal economies (Goldberg, 2009). Theories  
26 of post-racial societies have been informed by the earlier work of Beck (1992), who  
27 argued that in ‘risk societies’ social inequalities lose their rootedness in the social realm  
28 and are articulated as personal inadequacies. Goldberg suggests that far from the post-  
29 racial discourse signalling an end to a racialised society, it presents us with a new  
30 modality of racism, in which racist practices operate, under the illusion that ‘the dream  
31 of the non-racial has already been realized’ (2015, p. 108). Indeed as Solf suggests, the  
32 fact that the UK government failed to recognise the specific ethnic needs and  
33 experiences of GTR communities, it ‘neglects the social existence and abject situation  
34 of most Roma, and enables authorities to make the issue non-existent’ (Solf, 2018, p.  
35 142). It might also be suggested, that by deploying the policy tools of mainstreaming to  
36 further GTR integration, the UK government aimed to make invisible (depoliticise) the  
37 specific ethnic inequalities that are perpetuated through its economic and social  
38 structure.  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **7. Hyper-ethnic policies in the UK**

43 Paradoxically, while post-racial discourses negate the structures that create ethnic (and  
44 other dimensions) of inequality, some ethnic communities find they are made ‘hyper-  
45 visible’ (Powell and Van Baar 2018). For Gypsies and Travellers, there has been a long  
46 history of hyper-ethnic policies linked to nomadism. Due to the lack of legal stopping  
47 places, many find themselves confined on permanent sites that are usually  
48 geographically and socially isolated from settled communities (Powell, 2013). These  
49 sites also create ethnic boundaries where Gypsy and Traveller communities often find  
50 that they are subject to extreme surveillance and control (Richardson, 2007). This is  
51 despite the fact that they have protected characteristics under the Equality Act (2010)  
52 and local authorities have a public sector equality duty.  
53

54 A recent Civil Society Monitoring Report on Implementation of the NRIS in the United  
55 Kingdom also argued that the ‘mainstream’ approach used by the UK government (i.e.  
56 using existing equality legislation to promote Roma integration) had failed to facilitate  
57 equal opportunities for Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities (National Federation of  
58 Gypsy Liaison Groups et al., 2018).  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Indeed, not only has the UK government failed to introduce the Roma integration  
5 strategy but it has also introduced hyper-ethnic policies. For example, recently the  
6 Conservative government introduced a significant change in the definition of 'Gypsy'  
7 and 'Traveller' under planning law (Department of Communities and Local  
8 Government, 2015). This means that if a Gypsy or Traveller stops travelling  
9 permanently (e.g. for health reasons or old age), they will lose their 'Gypsy status' for  
10 planning purposes. These hyper-ethnic policies also have implications for public sector  
11 professionals who often become hyper-vigilant of Gypsies and Travellers. For example,  
12 in the domain of social work, researchers have identified a significant and  
13 disproportionate rise in social work interventions involving GTR children due to  
14 systematic prejudice (Allen and Riding, 2018).  
15  
16  
17

18 Roma migrants also experience the impact of hyper-ethnic policies linked to their status  
19 as both Roma and migrants. With the expansion of the European Union, the arrival of  
20 A8 and A2 migrants from Eastern Europe into the UK, was greeted by a hostile response  
21 from much of the British media (Clark, 2015). The Roma became constructed as a  
22 distinctive type of migrant, portrayed as linked to criminality, antisocial behaviour and  
23 'welfare tourism' (Clark and Rice, 2012). In response to these public concerns, the UK  
24 sought to restrict both access to employment opportunities and welfare benefits for  
25 Roma migrants right up until 2014. Consequently, Roma became subject to a complex  
26 web of hyper-ethnic policies, where they experience different rights and entitlements  
27 from other European citizens (Palidda, 2011; Solf, 2018).  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **8. Conclusion**

33 In light of the EU mid-term review of Roma Integration, there are two main reasons that  
34 'mainstreaming' approaches are failing in the UK. Firstly, because of the devolved  
35 governmental system in the UK and the ideology of localism, GTR communities are  
36 subject to different forms of inclusion and exclusion depending on the specificity of their  
37 geo-political location. Secondly, the authors have suggested that GTR communities  
38 often find themselves located at the intersection of three conflicting policy ideologies.

39 *Ethnic-inclusive* policies (as exemplified in the Equality Act, 2010), views inequalities  
40 through an individualistic and neo-liberal lens, which perceives GTR inequalities from a  
41 'cultural deficit' perspective. This stresses the need to equip individuals with the right  
42 skills and competencies to thrive in a free-market system (e.g. through education and  
43 training) and to facilitate them to 'take up their rights' to education, health, employment  
44 and housing (Silva, 2014). However, the lack of a NRIS may also be considered as part  
45 of a wider discourse about *post-racial* policies, where racist discourses are obfuscated by  
46 a new modality of racism, where racial differences are no longer considered to be of any  
47 consequence. This effectively depoliticises the specific ethnic experiences of poverty,  
48 discrimination, marginalisation, vilification and social exclusion in GTR communities.  
49  
50  
51

52 The authors of this paper have suggested that what is problematic about *ethnic-inclusive*  
53 and *post-racial* policies is that they both fail to recognise the context of GTR  
54 communities and their specificity of experiences. Neo-liberal economies create and  
55 perpetuate social exclusion and the systemic nature of racism and anti-gypsyism is  
56 enacted through pre-existing social structures (James and Smith, 2017). In essence, this  
57 can be seen as part of the wider systemic violence created by neo-liberal economies  
58 (Žižek, 2008). Paradoxically, GTR communities also find themselves subject to *hyper-*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *ethnic polices*. While a number of reports have highlighted that GTR communities have  
4 the worst outcomes in health, education, employment and housing than any other ethnic  
5 group in the UK (United Nations, 2017; Home Office, 2016) GTR communities have  
6 become subject to a specific 'ethnic gaze' via their status as nomads or migrants and  
7 central government has designed specific ethnically-targeted polices to address these  
8 (i.e. specific planning laws related to nomadic Gypsies and Travellers and migration  
9 regulations for Roma migrants). Simultaneously, issues concerning inequality and  
10 discrimination have become subject to discourses of general inclusion (exemplified in  
11 the Equality Act, 2010)- thus vilifying some aspects of identity (relating to nomadism  
12 and migration) while at the same time obfuscating systemic racism and inequality.  
13  
14

15  
16 In conclusion, while the authors argue that GTR people often find themselves at the  
17 intersection of the complex governmental systems, and subject to ethnic-inclusive, post-  
18 racial and hyper-racial policies, it is important to recognise that all of these factors  
19 operate within a neo-liberal framework that shapes and perpetuates inequality.  
20  
21

### 22 **Footnote: thinking about Brexit**

23  
24 Following the UK referendum result in 2016 concerns have been expressed about UK  
25 based migrant Roma's 'Settled Status' and the process for securing their right to reside  
26 in the UK as well as the general rise in anti-migrant hate crime (Institute for Public  
27 Policy Research, 2016). At a wider level, there are also concerns that Roma integration  
28 will no longer be on the political agenda, especially as they already face discrimination  
29 in employment, housing, education and health (Burchardt, Obolenskaya, Vizard et al,  
30 2018) and social inclusion objectives generally have fallen off the political radar under  
31 the impact of austerity cuts and political preoccupation with Brexit. In this regard, it has  
32 been suggested that Brexit will only have a limited impact on policy formulation and  
33 objectives towards Roma migrants in the UK firstly because of the desultory response by  
34 the government to Roma integration and lack of commitment to improving the position  
35 of GTR communities to date. Secondly because economic injustice, inequality and  
36 exclusion is inherent within the current socioeconomic system regardless, meaning  
37 Brexit is unlikely to create much change for the Roma living in the UK (James and  
38 Smith, 2017). Much depends on the outcome of internal divisions within both of the  
39 major political parties about Brexit and the future direction of the UK, the post-Brexit  
40 migration system and the outcome of ongoing negotiations with the EU concerning  
41 Brexit and the UK's future relationship with the EU.  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Declaration of interests: None**

### 46 **References**

47  
48 Allen D., and Riding S. 2018. *The Fragility of Professional Competence: A Preliminary*  
49 *Account of Child Protection Practice with Romani and Traveller Children in England.*  
50 Budapest: ERRC.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

1  
2  
3  
4 Beck, U. 1992. *The Risk Society: Towards a new Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.

5  
6  
7 British Academy. 2018. *Governing England: devolution and funding*, London: The  
8 British Academy.

9 Accessed 24 September 2018

10 <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Governing%20England%20Devolution%20and%20Funding.pdf>

11  
12  
13 Brown, P., Scullion, L, and Martin, P. 2013. *Migrant Roma in the United Kingdom. Population size and experiences of local authorities and partners*. Manchester:  
14 University of Salford.

15  
16  
17 Accessed 30 August 2018

18  
19 [https://www.salford.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/1155666/Migrant\\_Roma\\_in\\_the\\_UK\\_final\\_report\\_October\\_2013.pdf](https://www.salford.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1155666/Migrant_Roma_in_the_UK_final_report_October_2013.pdf)

20  
21  
22 Brown, P. Shallice, A., Brown, G., and Ivatts, A. 2018. *Roma and Brexit: Report on a  
23 Joint Parliamentary All Party Group*.

24  
25 Accessed 24 September 2018

26 <https://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/APPG-Brexit-and-Roma-Report-1.pdf>

27  
28  
29 Burchardt, T., Obolenskaya, P., Vizard, P. and Battaglin, M. 2018 *Experience of  
30 multiple disadvantage among Roma, Gypsy and Traveller children in England and  
31 Wales Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion*. London School of Economics  
32 Publication

33  
34 Accessed 16 July 2018

35 <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/casepaper208.pdf>

36  
37  
38 Cabinet Office. 2017. *Race Disparity Audit : Summary Findings from the Ethnicity  
39 Facts and Figures website*.

40  
41 Accessed 1 October 2018

42 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/686071/Revised\\_RDA\\_report\\_March\\_2018.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/686071/Revised_RDA_report_March_2018.pdf)

43  
44  
45 Clark, C. 2015. "Integration, exclusion and the moral 'othering' of Roma migrants in  
46 Britain". In *Moral Panic in Theory and Practice* edited by Smith, M, 43-55. Bristol.  
47 Policy press

48  
49  
50 Clark, C. and Rice, G. 2012. "Spaces of hate, places of hope: the Romanian Roma in  
51 Belfast". In *The Gypsy 'Menace': Populism and the New Anti Gypsy Politics* edited by  
52 Stewart, M, 167-190. London: Hurst and Company.

53  
54  
55 Commission for Racial Equality. 2006. *Common Ground: Equality, good relations and  
56 sites for Gypsies and Irish Travellers*. London: CRE.

57  
58 Accessed 15 August 2018.

59 [https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/ER-2005-Gypsies\\_Irish\\_Travellers\\_Equality\\_CRE.pdf](https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/ER-2005-Gypsies_Irish_Travellers_Equality_CRE.pdf)

1  
2  
3 Department for Communities and Local Government. 2011. *A plain English guide to the*  
4 *Localism Act*.

5 Accessed 13 October 2018

6 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/5959/189](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/5959/1896534.pdf)  
7 [6534.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/5959/1896534.pdf)

9  
10 Department of Communities and Local Government. 2015. *Planning for Traveller Sites*.  
11 Department for Communities and Local Government Publication.

12 Accessed 26 September 2018

13 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/457420/Final_planning_and_travellers_policy.pdf)  
14 [\\_data/file/457420/Final\\_planning\\_and\\_travellers\\_policy.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/457420/Final_planning_and_travellers_policy.pdf)

15  
16  
17 Department of Communities and Local Government. 2017. *Explanatory Memorandum*  
18 *on EU Document 11801/117 'Reviewing the implementation of the EU Framework for*  
19 *National Roma Integration Strategies – Mid Term Review 2017*, 18 September.

20 Accessed 26<sup>th</sup> September 2018

21 [http://europeanmemoranda.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/files/2017/10/EM](http://europeanmemoranda.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/files/2017/10/EM_September_2017.pdf)  
22 [\\_September\\_2017.pdf](http://europeanmemoranda.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/files/2017/10/EM_September_2017.pdf)

23  
24  
25 Equality and Human Rights Commission. 2016. *Is England Fairer? England's most*  
26 *disadvantaged groups: Gypsies, Travellers and Roma.? Review spotlight report*.

27 Accessed 12 September 2018

28 [https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/is-england-fairer-2016-most-](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/is-england-fairer-2016-most-disadvantaged-groups-gypsies-travellers-roma.pdf)  
29 [disadvantaged-groups-gypsies-travellers-roma.pdf](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/is-england-fairer-2016-most-disadvantaged-groups-gypsies-travellers-roma.pdf)

30  
31  
32 European Commission. 2012. *Communication from the commission to the European*  
33 *Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social committee and the*  
34 *committee of the regions . National Roma Integration Strategies: a first step in the*  
35 *implementation of the EU Framework*.

36 Accessed 12 September 2018

37 [https://ec.europa.eu/anti](https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/national_roma_integration_strategies_a_first_step_in_the_implementation_of_the_eu_framework.pdf)  
38 [trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/national\\_roma\\_integration\\_strategies\\_a\\_first\\_step\\_i](https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/national_roma_integration_strategies_a_first_step_in_the_implementation_of_the_eu_framework.pdf)  
39 [n\\_the\\_implementation\\_of\\_the\\_eu\\_framework.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/sites/antitrafficking/files/national_roma_integration_strategies_a_first_step_in_the_implementation_of_the_eu_framework.pdf)

40  
41  
42 European Commission. 2013. *Steps forward in implementing national Roma integration*  
43 *strategies*.

44 Accessed 17 September 2018

45 [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0454&rid=1)  
46 [content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0454&rid=1](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0454&rid=1)

47  
48  
49  
50 European Commission. 2014. *Roma integration in the United Kingdom: Funding,*  
51 *strategy, facts and figures and contact details for national Roma contact points in the*  
52 *United Kingdom*.

53 Accessed 17 September 2018

54 [https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/roma-and-eu/roma-integration-eu-country/roma-integration-united-kingdom_en)  
55 [discrimination/roma-and-eu/roma-integration-eu-country/roma-integration-united-](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/roma-and-eu/roma-integration-eu-country/roma-integration-united-kingdom_en)  
56 [kingdom\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combating-discrimination/roma-and-eu/roma-integration-eu-country/roma-integration-united-kingdom_en)

57  
58  
59 European Commission. 2015. *Communication from the Commission to the eEuropean*  
60

1  
2  
3 *Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the*  
4 *Committee of the Regions Report on the Implementation of the EU Framework for*  
5 *National Roma Integration Strategies 2015.*

6 Accessed 17 September 2018

7 [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1481107022507&uri=CELEX:52015DC0299)  
8 [content/EN/TXT/?qid=1481107022507&uri=CELEX:52015DC0299](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1481107022507&uri=CELEX:52015DC0299)

9  
10  
11 European Commission. 2016. *Assessing the implementation of the EU Framework for*  
12 *National Roma Integration Strategies and the Council Recommendation on Effective*  
13 *Roma integration measures in the Member States.* Brussels, 27.6.2016 .

14 Accessed 12 September 2018

15 <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2016/EN/1-2016-424-EN-F1-1.PDF>

16  
17  
18 European Commission. 2017. *Roma inclusion: More effort needed to improve access to*  
19 *schooling and employment: press release 30<sup>th</sup> August.* Brussels.

20 Accessed 30 October 2018

21 [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-17-2961\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-2961_en.htm)

22  
23  
24 European Commission. 2018. *Communication from the Commission to the European*  
25 *Parliament and the Council Report on the Evaluation of the EU Framework for National*  
26 *Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020.*

27 Accessed 4 April 2019

28 [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1554376301733&uri=CELEX:52018DC0785)  
29 [content/EN/TXT/?qid=1554376301733&uri=CELEX:52018DC0785](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1554376301733&uri=CELEX:52018DC0785)

30  
31  
32 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. 2017. *Local Engagement for Roma*  
33 *Inclusion.*

34 Accessed 6 April 2019

35 [https://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2015/local-engagement-roma-inclusion-leri-multi-](https://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2015/local-engagement-roma-inclusion-leri-multi-annual-roma-programme)  
36 [annual-roma-programme](https://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2015/local-engagement-roma-inclusion-leri-multi-annual-roma-programme)

37  
38  
39 European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. 2018. *A persisting concern: anti-*  
40 *Gypsyism as a barrier to Roma inclusion.*

41 Accessed 23 October 2018

42 <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/roma-inclusion>

43  
44  
45 Goldberg, D. T. 2015. *Are We All Postracial Yet?* London: Polity press.

46  
47  
48 Hastings, A., Bailey, N., Bramley, G., Gannon, M. and Watkins, D. 2015. *The cost of the*  
49 *cuts: the impact on local government and poorer communities.* Joseph Rowntree  
50 Foundation.

51 Accessed 2 September 2018

52 <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/Summary-Final.pdf>

53  
54  
55 Home Office. 2016. *Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2015/16.* Statistical Bulletin  
56 11/16.

57 Accessed 3 August 2018

58 <http://report-it.org.uk/files/hate-crime-1516-hosb1116.pdf>

1  
2  
3 Her Majesty's Government. 2018. *Integrated Communities Strategy: Green Paper*  
4 Accessed 20 September 2018  
5 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/696993/Integrated_Communities_Strategy.pdf)  
6 [\\_data/file/696993/Integrated\\_Communities\\_Strategy.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/696993/Integrated_Communities_Strategy.pdf)  
7

8  
9 Institute for Public Policy Research. 2016. *Roma Communities and Brexit: integrating*  
10 *and empowering Roma in the UK*. IPPR  
11 Accessed 28 August 2018  
12 [https://www.ippr.org/files/publications/pdf/Roma-communities-and-Brexit\\_Oct2016.pdf](https://www.ippr.org/files/publications/pdf/Roma-communities-and-Brexit_Oct2016.pdf)  
13

14  
15 Irish Traveller Movement. 2013. *The Gypsy and Traveller population in England and*  
16 *the 2011 Census*. London: The Traveller Movement.  
17

18  
19 James, Z. and Smith, D. 2017. "Roma inclusion post Brexit: A challenge to existing  
20 rhetoric?" *Safer Communities*. September, Vol. 16, Issue 4, 186-195. DOI: 10.1108/  
21 SC-06-2017-0022  
22

23  
24 Joseph Rowntree Foundation. 2017. *The Cost of the Cuts: The Impact on Local*  
25 *Government and Poorer Communities*. London: JRF.  
26 Accessed 2 October 2018  
27 <https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/Summary-Final.pdf>  
28

29  
30 Lane P., Spencer, S., and Jones, A. 2014. *Experts by Experience: Gypsy, Traveller and*  
31 *Roma: reviewing UK progress on the European Union Framework for National Roma*  
32 *Integration Strategies*.  
33 Accessed 22 August 2018  
34 [https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-](https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/iris/2014/Experts-by-Experience--JRTF-Report-Oct-2014.pdf)  
35 [policy/iris/2014/Experts-by-Experience--JRTF-Report-Oct-2014.pdf](https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/iris/2014/Experts-by-Experience--JRTF-Report-Oct-2014.pdf)  
36

37  
38 Legislation.gov.uk. 2010. *Equality Act 2010*.  
39 Accessed 11 August 2018  
40 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>  
41

42  
43 Leveson Inquiry. 2012. *Report into the culture, practices and ethics of the press.*  
44 *Volumes one to four*.  
45 Accessed 12 October 2018  
46 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-inquiry-report-into-the-culture-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-inquiry-report-into-the-culture-practices-and-ethics-of-the-press)  
47 [practices-and-ethics-of-the-press](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-inquiry-report-into-the-culture-practices-and-ethics-of-the-press)  
48

49  
50 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison, Friends Families and Travellers, Roma Support  
51 Group, Roma Community Care (2018) *Civil society monitoring report on*  
52 *implementation of the national Roma integration strategies in the United Kingdom.*  
53 *Focusing on structural and horizontal preconditions for successful implementation of*  
54 *the strategy*. Published by the European Commission. B-1049 Brussels. March 2018.  
55 Accessed 13 October 2018  
56 [https://cps.ceu.edu/sites/cps.ceu.edu/files/attachment/basicpage/3034/rcm-civil-society-](https://cps.ceu.edu/sites/cps.ceu.edu/files/attachment/basicpage/3034/rcm-civil-society-monitoring-report-1-uk-2017-eprint-fin.pdf)  
57 [monitoring-report-1-uk-2017-eprint-fin.pdf](https://cps.ceu.edu/sites/cps.ceu.edu/files/attachment/basicpage/3034/rcm-civil-society-monitoring-report-1-uk-2017-eprint-fin.pdf)  
58

59  
60 National Inclusion Health Board. 2016. *Impact of insecure accommodation and the*  
*living environment on Gypsies' and Travellers' health*.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Accessed 2 August 2018

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/490846/NIHB - Gypsy and Traveller health accs.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/490846/NIHB_-_Gypsy_and_Traveller_health_accs.pdf)

NHS England. 2017. *England Analysis: NHS Outcome Framework Health Inequalities Indicators 2016/17*.

Accessed 12 August 2018

<https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/nhs-outcome-framework-health-inequalities-indicators-2016-17.pdf>

Northern Ireland Assembly. 2016. *International Migration in Northern Ireland: An update*.

Accessed 10 September 2018

<http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/raise/publications/2016-2021/2016/general/3916.pdf>

Office of National Statistics. 2011. *2011 Census analysis: What does the 2011 Census tell us about the characteristics of Gypsy or Irish travellers in England and Wales*

Accessed 13 September 2018

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/ethnicity/articles/whatdoesthe2011censustellusaboutthecharacteristicsofgypsyoririshtravellersinenglandandwales/2014-01-21>

The Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission. 2018. *Out of Sight out of Mind: Travellers Accommodation in Northern Ireland*.

Accessed 10 October 2018

[http://www.nihrc.org/uploads/publications/Out\\_of\\_Sight%2C\\_Out\\_of\\_Mind'%3A\\_Travellers'\\_Accommodation\\_in\\_NI\\_-\\_Full\\_Report.pdf](http://www.nihrc.org/uploads/publications/Out_of_Sight%2C_Out_of_Mind'%3A_Travellers'_Accommodation_in_NI_-_Full_Report.pdf)

Okolosie, L. 2015. "Is it time to ditch the term 'Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic' (BAME)?" *The Guardian newspaper*, May 22.

Palidda, S. 2011. 'A Review of the Principal European Countries, In *Racial Criminalization of Migrants in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, edited by Palidda, S, 23-31. Farnham, Ashgate. UK.

Penny, J. 2017. 'Between Coercion and Consent: the Politics of "Cooperative Governance at a time of Austerity Localism in London', *Urban Geography*, 38: 9, 1352-1373.

Powell, R. 2013. 'Loïc Wacquant's "ghetto" and ethnic minority segregation in the UK: the neglected case of Gypsy-Travellers'. *International Journal of Urban And Regional Research*, 37 (1), 115-134.

Powell, R. and van Barr, H. 2018. 'The invisibilization of Anti-Roma Racisms'. In *The Securitization of the Roma in Europe*, edited by Van Baar, H., Ivasiuc, A., and Kreide, R, 134-148. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Poole, L. and Adamson, K. 2008. *Report on the Situation of the Roma Community in Govanhill*. Glasgow: Oxfam.

1  
2  
3 Accessed 20 September 2018

4 <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/situation-of-the-roma-community-in-govanhill-glasgow-112456>

5  
6 Accessed 20 September 2018

7  
8  
9 Richardson, J. 2017. 'Precarious living in liminal spaces: neglect of the Gypsy–Traveller site'. *Global Discourse*, 7:4, 496-515 doi:<http://wp.lancs.ac.uk/good-culture/files/2018/01/06-Richardson.pdf>

10  
11  
12  
13 Richardson, J. 2017. *The Gypsy Debate: Can Discourse Control? 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Exeter: Imprint Academic

14  
15  
16  
17 Ryder, A. and Cemlyn, S. 2016. 'Monoculturalism, austerity and moral panics: assessing government progress on addressing Gypsy, Traveller and Roma exclusion'. *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*. 24 (2), 143–55.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Scottish Government. 2013. *Mapping the Roma Community in Scotland: Final Report*: 26th September 2013.

23  
24 Accessed 4 September 2018

25 <http://www.migrationscotland.org.uk/uploads/files/documents/mappingtheromacommunityinscotlandreport-2.pdf>

26  
27  
28  
29 Scottish Government. 2017. *A fairer Scotland for all: race equality action plan and highlight report 2017-2021*.

30  
31 Accessed 27 September 2018

32 <https://beta.gov.scot/publications/fairer-scotland-race-equality-action-plan-2017-2021-highlight-report/>

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Scottish Churches Racial Justice Groups (2016) *The Roma Community in Scotland 2016: Community Infor Source*.

38  
39 <https://www.renfrewshire2023.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/The-Roma-Community-in-Scotand-2016.pdf>

40  
41 Website accessed 4th September 2018

42  
43  
44  
45 Scullion, L. and Brown, P. 2016. 'Understanding the social exclusion of Roma'. In *Working with Marginalised Groups: From Policy to Practice*, edited by Ahmed, A. and Rogers, M., 77-85. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

46  
47  
48  
49 Solf, J. 2018. *Citizen Outsiders: How the Struggles of Romanian Roma in London Challenge the Conception of Citizenship*. PhD thesis: The Open University.

50  
51 Accessed 26 September 2018

52 [http://oro.open.ac.uk/53752/1/PhD\\_260118.pdf](http://oro.open.ac.uk/53752/1/PhD_260118.pdf)

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59 The Traveller Movement. 2018. *The preliminary report: 'Policing by consent: Understanding and improving relations between Gypsies, Roma, Irish Travellers and the police*.

60 Accessed 18 September 2018



1  
2  
3 [http://travellermovement.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TTM-Policing-by-](http://travellermovement.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TTM-Policing-by-consent_web-2.pdf)  
4 [consent\\_web-2.pdf](http://travellermovement.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/TTM-Policing-by-consent_web-2.pdf)  
5

6 The Traveller Movement. 2016. *Hate Crime, discrimination and the Gypsy, Traveller*  
7 *and Roma communities*.

8  
9 Accessed 13 September 2018

10 <https://travellermovement.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/HateCrime-final.pdf>  
11

12 Umut, E., Murji , K. and Nahaboo, K. 2016. ‘Understanding the contemporary race-  
13 migration nexus’. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 39:8, 1339-1360. DOI:  
14 10.1080/01419870.2016.1161808  
15

16  
17 United Nations. 2017. *Universal Periodic Review of Human Rights in the United*  
18 *Kingdom*.

19 Accessed 11 September 2018

20 [https://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/annex-uk-response-to-the-](https://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/annex-uk-response-to-the-recommendations.pdf)  
21 [recommendations.pdf](https://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/annex-uk-response-to-the-recommendations.pdf)  
22

23  
24 Welsh Government. 2012. *Travelling to a Better Future: Gypsy and Traveller*  
25 *Framework for Action and Delivery Plan*.

26 Accessed 16 September 2018

27 <http://www.romaniarts.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/110928gypsytravelleren.pdf>  
28

29  
30 Welsh GovernmenT. 2018. *Enabling Gypsies Roma and Travellers*.

31 Accessed 2 October 2018

32 [https://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/equality/180625-enabling-gypsies-roma-](https://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/equality/180625-enabling-gypsies-roma-travellers-plan-en.pdf)  
33 [travellers-plan-en.pdf](https://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/equality/180625-enabling-gypsies-roma-travellers-plan-en.pdf)  
34

35 Wemyss, R. and Friends Families and Travellers. 2015. *Inclusion of Gypsy Traveller*  
36 *health needs in Joint Strategic Needs Assessments: A review*. Published by Friends  
37 Families and Travellers

38 Accessed 20 June 2018

39 [http://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/FFT\\_Inclusion-of-Gypsy-](http://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/FFT_Inclusion-of-Gypsy-Traveller-health-needs-in-JSNA_FINAL.pdf)  
40 [Traveller-health-needs-in-JSNA\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/FFT_Inclusion-of-Gypsy-Traveller-health-needs-in-JSNA_FINAL.pdf)  
41

42  
43 World Bank. 2016. *Being fair, faring better: promoting equality of opportunity for*  
44 *marginalized Roma Washington, International Bank for Reconstruction and*  
45 *Development*. New York: The World Bank.

46 Accessed 2 September 2018

47 [http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/292771468196732276/Being-fair-faring-](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/292771468196732276/Being-fair-faring-better-promoting-equality-of-opportunity-for-marginalized-Roma)  
48 [better-promoting-equality-of-opportunity-for-marginalized-Roma](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/292771468196732276/Being-fair-faring-better-promoting-equality-of-opportunity-for-marginalized-Roma)  
49

50  
51 Žižek, S. 2008. *On Violence*. London: Profile Books;  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60