



Antigypsyism in the German Public Sphere


Strategies and Mechanisms of Media Communication

Markus End

Short version
Approach, Examples and Findings of the Study
Translated by William Templer

Study prepared for the Documentation and
Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma





Antigypsyism in the German Public Sphere

Strategies and Mechanisms of Media Communication

Markus End

Short version
Approach, Examples and Findings of the Study
Translated by William Templer

ON THIS TEXT

This shorter volume summarizes the research approach and findings of the study *Antiziganismus in der deutschen Öffentlichkeit. Strategien und Mechanismen medialer Kommunikation (Antigypsyism in the German Public Sphere. Strategies and Mechanisms of Media Communication)* by Markus End, translated into English by William Templer. It is intended to provide journalists and those working in the political sphere with a quick overview of the findings of the study. The introductory sections and the conclusion of the study were slightly revised for this short version. Initially it provides a brief overview of previous debates on the representation of Sinti, Roma and others stigmatized as “Gypsies” in the German media. The following section explains the approach here to criticism of antigypsyism. The findings are then briefly presented organized in terms of the strategies and mechanisms that the author was able to find and analyze in the framework of the investigation.

The complete study (ISBN 978-3-929446-30-2) is available in bookshops or can be ordered as a book from the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma.

eMail: info@sintiundroma.de

Telephone: +49 (0) 6221 - 981102

It can also be downloaded in .pdf form as follows:

Full version in German:

<http://www.sintiundroma.de/fileadmin/dokumente/publikationen/extern/2014StudieMarkusEndAntiziganismus.pdf>

Short version in German:

<http://www.sintiundroma.de/fileadmin/dokumente/publikationen/extern/2014KurzfassungStudieMarkusEndAntiziganismus.pdf>

**© 2014 Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum
Deutscher Sinti und Roma**

English version

**© 2015 Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum
Deutscher Sinti und Roma**

Bremeneckgasse 2
D-69117 Heidelberg
www.sintiundroma.de

Author: Markus End

Editorial team: Frank Reuter, Herbert Heuß, Armin Ulm,
Thomas Baumann, Hans Scheid, Jacques Delfeld jr., Oliver von Mengersen

Copy editor: Birgit Lulay

Translation: William Templer

Layout: Stefanie Eifler, www.stefanieeifler.de

Printing: Neumann Druck, Heidelberg

Financed by the Representative of the Federal Government for Culture and the Media on the basis of a decision by the German Parliament, also supported by the Ministry for Labor and Social Affairs from funding generously supplied by the state of Baden-Württemberg.

FOREWORD BY ROMANI ROSE	9
INTRODUCTION: APPROACH OF THE STUDY	15
The State of Research	18
The Sources and their Evaluation	20
Antigypsyism – Attempt at a Definition	23
Prejudices, Imagery and the Structure of Meaning of Antigypsyism	30
THE FINDINGS	40
List of the Mechanisms	42
1. Stereotypical Selection of Images against the Backdrop of a Cultural Framework of Interpretation Shaped by Antigypsyism	42
<i>a) Selection of Persons to be Portrayed or Topics Worth Reporting on, Focus on the Unusual</i>	44
<i>b) Selection of What is Filmed</i>	45
<i>c) Recontextualization and Repetition</i>	46
2. The Word ‘Gypsy’ as a Metaphor	47
3. Image Identification	48
4. Thematising Persons Who are Not Thematised	49
5. Camera Techniques	51
6. Generalizations	53
7. Deviation from the ‘Normal’ Individual	55
8. Ethnicizing Presentation of Social Processes	58
9. Reduction to Being ‘Roma’	59
10. Explicit Attributions	61
<i>a) Attributions Through the Frame Narrative</i>	62
<i>b) Who is Talking?</i>	64

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11. Implicit Attributions	66
<i>a) Relevance as a Prerequisite: Implicit Attribution</i>	66
<i>b) Implicit Attributions Through Encoding</i>	68
<i>c) Implicit Attribution Through Presumption of a Cultural Framework of Interpretation Shaped by Antigypsyism</i>	70
<i>d) Attribution Through Classifying in Lexical Fields</i>	72
12. Examination of Prejudices	73
CONCLUSION.	76

FOREWORD

With this study by Markus End, the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma presents the public with an investigation in which, for the first time, there is a detailed probing examination and analysis of the modes of operation of antigypsyist bias and attitudes hostile to Sinti and Roma in the German media. Looking at a multitude of examples that specifically do not seek to point up extreme forms of prejudice, Markus End is able to show how the reportage about Sinti and Roma can be positioned in an antigypsyist framework of interpretation, in this way confirming and reproducing in part centuries-old clichés and prejudices.

The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) in Vienna arrived already in 2002 in its study on racism in the mass media at the finding that the representation of Sinti and Roma in the media is shaped and determined by negative images. This negative tenor has such disastrous effects because there are hardly any positive counter-images in public perception. The Central Council of German Sinti and Roma has for many years also criticized the production and dissemination of stereotypical conceptions in the media and official agencies. In this connection there is a special focus on the questionable practice of marking or profiling the minorities, employed by the police and justice authorities to the present day, and then adopted by the media. Criticism however is more comprehensive and relates to the entire representation of the minority in the media context.

A careful examination of reportage in the media in respect to Sinti and Roma reveals that the press and media are still reproducing derogatory “Gypsy” clichés. A prime recent example of that is the case of “Maria”: in the autumn of 2013, in the course of a police operation, a blond, light-skinned little girl in Greece was separated from her Roma family and placed in state custody. The suspicion was voiced that the child was very likely illegal in this family, since she appeared externally quite different from her parents. There was an immediate suspicion that the Roma family had abducted the child in order to misuse her for professional begging. The photo of the small blond Maria, sitting frightened between her dark-skinned parents, went viral, spreading rapidly in all the media.

Subsequently, there was a downright wave of media hysteria. Under its impression, light-skinned blond children in a Roma family were soon discovered likewise in Ireland. The authorities there likewise reacted promptly, taking the children away from the family. Across the globe, reports appeared about the abduction of children by gangs in the purported “Roma milieu,” about children sold in the illegal adoption market or misused for trafficking in human organs. Although at this point there were no certain and confirmed data, speculation in newspapers and Internet forums generated a torrent of ever more fanciful ideas. The impression was conveyed that child abduction was to a certain extent an integral part of Roma culture. In this way, all Roma were declared per blanket generalization to be “child abductors.” That is no accident: the caricature of the “Gypsy” who “steals children” has been part of European cultural history for centuries.

Critical and differentiated voices in the media were, by contrast, barely audible. A trend reversal emerged after the Irish authorities determined beyond any doubt by a genetic test that these children were indeed the natural offspring of the Roma family. In the case of little Maria as well, the real circumstances soon were clarified: the mother of the child, a Bulgarian Romni, had in distress placed her daughter in the care of the Greek Roma family.

However, until that point, Sinti and Roma had been named and shamed worldwide as “child abductors,” and even the later rectifications were no longer able to change anything. We can see clearly in this example how easy it is to animate longstanding traditional xenophobic images of the “Gypsy” in our society. Likewise in connection with so-called “poverty migration,” all the biases and negative attitudes against Roma are repeatedly invoked.

Just how dangerous such images can become is shown by the terrible crimes committed by the so-called “NSU,” the National Socialist Underground, first against citizens with a migration background in Germany, and then against a German policewoman. After the murder of the Heilbronn policewoman, Sinti and Roma as an entire group were placed under general suspicion, condemned wholesale, it was stated that the perpetrators were to be found in the “Gypsy milieu.” This is what the state prosecutor’s offices and police told the media, and the media in turn then disseminated this blanket suspicion across Germany and throughout the world. In con-

nection with this bloodshed, the worst such crime in German postwar history, the general suspicion targeting our minority then also continued to be maintained despite the fact that early on police inquiries established that this suspicion was untenable.

We are still waiting today in Germany for an apology by responsible politicians for this irresponsible criminalizing of our minority by the justice authorities and the police in Baden-Württemberg. But it would appear as though when it comes to Sinti and Roma here, there is no awareness of injustice. Instead, the old xenophobic images are still alive and well.

The series of murders committed by the so-called “NSU” has shown just how much the state authorities misjudged and downplayed the danger of rightwing extremists. The reports by the authorities on extreme rightwing violence show the same tendency to make light of this threat. While the German media have arrived at a figure of at least 152 persons who have lost their lives at the hands of extreme far-right perpetrators, the official agencies provide a number far less, of only 63 such murders. It is specifically the ways the police and justice authorities deal with the extreme far-right ideology of violence that is a touchstone for evaluating whether lessons had been learned here from war and genocide, and if so, what.

It may well be that our minority has developed a special awareness and sensitivity when it comes to the dangers of racism and extremism. Sinti and Roma are dependent on the functioning of our state, our democratic system of laws, and we know full well that when the state, our legal order is endangered, this can pose a threat to our existence as a minority. It is precisely here that the media have a task of decisive importance for the functioning of our democracy. It is the media which can critically interrogate the prejudices and xenophobic images, and which above all can and must speak out and act when minorities are singled out to be abused and misused as scapegoats.

Just as little as the antisemitic caricatures have nothing to do with the Jewish minority, the xenophobic images of the “Gypsy” have nothing to do with the reality of life of our people. Antigypsyism is interpreted by science as a phenomenon in the majority society: this is a melange of prefabricated notions, constructions and fanciful ideas about individuals

or groups that are projected onto Sinti and Roma and others completely independently of any semblance of truth. The consequences are exclusion and discrimination in all spheres of life.

The question arises: how is this at all possible in a seemingly enlightened society? Why is there no success in proscribing the deeply rooted antigypsyism in society, just as antisemitism has been outlawed and ostracized?

The present study aims to interrogate the role of the media in the crystallization and formation of prejudicial images of the “Gypsy.” In the process of opinion formation, press, radio, television and the Internet play a key role. It must provide cause for concern when the author concludes that professionals working in the media evidently still do not possess an adequate awareness of these operational mechanisms of antigypsyist thought patterns. Nonetheless, it is important for me to emphasize that this study should not be misunderstood as a reproach or even accusation. In his analysis of individual reportages and documentaries, the author’s concern is not to point a finger: rather it is to work out the often quite subtle forms and operating modes of antigypsyism. The paramount goal of this study is thus to galvanize a process of awareness and new sensibility among those in positions of responsibility in the editorial offices across the media landscape. As head of the Central Council of German Sinti and Roma, I hope for a continuation of the constructive dialogue we are already engaged in with many persons working in the media, because overcoming negative hostile attitudes is a common task for us all.

Romani Rose, Heidelberg 2014

INTRODUCTION: APPROACH OF THE STUDY

In keeping with other social institutions such as the police, justice system, the educational system, the municipalities, politics and science, the media in the Federal Republic of Germany did not break completely with anti-gypsyist ideology following the systematic mass destruction of Sinti and Roma during National Socialism. On the contrary: incitement continued against ‘Gypsies’ (*Zigeuner*)¹ in the mass media, stereotypes of ‘primitiveness’ and ‘criminality,’ of ‘filth’ and ‘nomadism’ continued to be reproduced and disseminated. Over the decades, the media in the German Federal Republic have thus played a role in the constant stigmatization of individuals, producing and reproducing a traditional image of the ‘Gypsies.’

These lines of continuity of antigypsyism in the early decades of the FRG were not countered until the emergence of protests by those affected and the work of the German Sinti and Roma civil rights movement. A critique of representations in the media likewise only began to assume shape through the civil rights movement.²

Since its founding, the struggle against antigypsyist reportage has been an important policy area of the Central Council of German Sinti and Roma (CCGSR, *Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma*),³ and the organization has conducted several conferences on this topic.⁴ Other national and international organizations have also joined in that struggle to bring to an end the continuing stereotypical and discriminatory representation of Sinti and Roma in the media.⁵ For the past two decades, the main focus of criticism

1 Single quotation marks (‘ ’) here, apart from a quotation, are used to mark a distancing employment of the terms so indicated; they are in a sense cited from dominant social discourse. The German term *Zigeuner* has been rendered here throughout in English as ‘Gypsy’ (trans. note).

2 See Irina Bohn, Franz Hamburger, & Kerstin Rock (n.d.). *Die Konstruktion der Differenz. Diskurse über Roma und Sinti in der Lokalpresse*. n.p., p. 5.

3 See Romani Rose (1987). *Bürgerrechte für Sinti und Roma. Das Buch zum Rassismus in Deutschland*. Heidelberg, pp. 157ff.

4 Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma (ed.) (1995) *Diskriminierungsverbot in Rundfunk- und Pressegesetzen. Dokumentation einer Medientagung des Zentralrats Deutscher Sinti und Roma*. Heidelberg; see also idem (ed.) (2010). *Diskriminierungsverbot und Freiheit der Medien. Das Beispiel Sinti und Roma*. Dokumentation einer Medientagung des Zentralrats Deutscher Sinti und Roma in Kooperation mit dem Deutschen Presserat und der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung am 05. November 2009 in Berlin. (Publications Series, Vol. 6). Heidelberg.

5 Thus, for example, on the initiative of the organization *ergonetwork*, a study was carried out on the representation of the Roma in the Bulgarian media; see ERGO Network (2011). Bulgarian media routinely paint a biased image of Roma. Accessible online: <http://www.roma-react.eu/bulgarian-media-routinely-paint-biased-image-roma>

by the CCGSR has been the constant and repeated labeling of crime suspects as belonging to the minority of the Sinti and Roma. Up to the present, the CCGSR has been campaigning at various levels with the demand that the minority origin of a suspect, be it ethnic, religious or on another basis, should only be permitted to be mentioned in press reportage on crime if there is a “compelling need for such information as regards its relevance to the facts reported.”⁶ However, along with discrimination in the area of reporting on crime, there are numerous other debates in the media in which stereotypical and discriminating content is communicated regarding Sinti and Roma.

Since 2011, we can observe an ongoing and intensified reportage in the German-language media using the catchwords ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma.’ Even if no extensive empirical data are available, it is evident that there has been increased recent media interest in certain events, and that these events are being associated with the minority of the Sinti and Roma. Paramount here is reporting on various social phenomena that are attributed in the media to increased immigration into Germany of Romanian and Bulgarian citizens. Second, there is a focus on events reported on in connection with asylum seekers from Serbia and Macedonia. The intensified reporting has to be viewed in the context of a long tradition of trends in the media. The migration or flight of people from Romania, Bosnia⁷ or Kosovo⁸ is repeatedly taken as an occasion for reporting on certain topics relating to ‘Gypsies’ or ‘Roma.’

The main topics and catchwords that the media pick up and disseminate are so similar that people would hardly notice if entire passages from reportage in the early 1990s, for example, were simply to be recycled in 2013, aside from the fact that the German capital is now Berlin and not Bonn:

(accessed 22 Feb. 2013). A similar study was presented at a roundtable discussion of the Czech initiative *Romea*; see František Kostlán (2013). NEWTON Media publishes analysis of the image of Roma in the Czech media 2013. Accessible online: <http://www.romea.cz/en/news/czech/newton-media-publishes-analysis-of-the-image-of-roma-in-the-czech-media-2013> (accessed 10 April 2013). The two studies are available only in Bulgarian or Czech respectively.

6 See Helmut Simon (1993). *Gutachten erstattet im Auftrag des Zentralrats Deutscher Sinti und Roma* (Expert Opinion Commissioned by the Central Council of the German Sinti and Roma). Heidelberg.

7 On this, see Brigitte Mihok (2001). *Zurück nach Nirgendwo: bosnische Roma-Flüchtlinge in Berlin*. Berlin.

8 See Dirk Auer (2009). *Zwischen den Fronten – Die Vertreibung der Roma aus dem Kosovo und die Verantwortung der Internationalen Gemeinschaft*. In: Markus End, Kathrin Herold, & Yvonne Robel, eds., *Antiziganistische Zustände. Zur Kritik eines allgegenwärtigen Ressentiments* (pp. 251-260). Münster.

“In the Ruhr area, which is a particularly popular destination for many Roma, city mayors demonstratively called for a crisis meeting. In a dramatic call for help (“The cities are at their wit’s end”), they demanded from Bonn an immediate halt to the influx of Roma. Nine city managers from North Rhine-Westphalia think the social peace in our cities is under threat.”⁹

‘Shouts for help’ from the cities, ‘invasions’ of ‘Roma’ and the ‘jeopardizing of the social peace’ also play a central role in current media reporting: “German cities bemoan the influx of migrants from Romania and Bulgaria: ‘The social balance and social peace’ are ‘under extreme threat,’ as stated in an internal document of the Council of German Cities, according to the weekly *Der Spiegel*. The document notes that many migrants are moving into neighborhoods suffering in any case from high levels of unemployment. This is affecting cities such as Berlin, Dortmund, Duisburg, Hamburg, Hanover, Munich and Offenbach. [...] According to the Council of German Cities, a particularly problematic aspect is the high percentage of Roma.”¹⁰

Trends in the media are thus not something unusual; rather, they are repeated at more or less regular intervals. Moreover, the choice of focal points, generally associated with ‘problems’ or ‘conflicts’ with ‘Roma,’ is not at all something new. ‘Crime,’ ‘begging,’ ‘filth,’ ‘prostitution,’ ‘abuse of social benefits,’ and ‘poverty’ are among the classic antigypsyist tropes. Our concern here cannot be centered on checking the purported truthfulness of individual reports. The question of “closeness to reality [must] recede into the background as attention concentrates on the criteria of the selective perception of reality.”¹¹ Thus, the following analysis, aside from a few rare cases, will not attempt to establish some comparison between what is reported and the actual events. Rather, the focus of analysis and critique here is to shed light on the necessary media construction process in every

9 “Asyl in Deutschland? ‘Alle hassen die Zigeuner’” (1990). *Der Spiegel*, 36, pp. 34-37, here p. 35. Accessible online: <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-13500312.html> (accessed 26 April 2015).

10 “Migration: Prekäre Verhältnisse” (2013). *Der Spiegel*, 6, p. 17. Accessible online: <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-90848676.html> (accessed 26 April 2015).

11 Bohn, Hamburger, & Rock (n.d.). Konstruktion der Differenz, p. 14. Cf. also Karmen Erjavec (2001). Media Representation of the Discrimination against the Roma in Eastern Europe: The Case of Slovenia. *Discourse & Society* 12, 699-727, here pp. 702f.

report examined, which consists in the selection of what is to be reported, the perspective chosen, the inclusion in various contexts, the description of causal factors and the evaluation of the phenomena being reported on.

The State of Research

Striking in debate to date on antigypsyism in the German media is the fact that such debate is almost exclusively centered on the question of *whether* a specific newspaper article, a certain formulation or a specific television report is antigypsyist, i.e. whether it reproduces or furthers prejudices and stereotypes toward persons stigmatized as ‘Zigeuner.’ The focus there has been especially on stereotyping and discrimination in reports on criminal offenses. Although these reports are among the most serious forms of discrimination and ethnic profiling, this mode of reportage is by no means the only one in which antigypsyist content is constructed and transmitted. On the contrary: reports in the media reproduce numerous diverse facets of antigypsyist stereotyping.

There are already a number of studies in the German-speaking area that have investigated various aspects of antigypsyism in the media. The earliest and to date most extensive such study was the research project of the German Research Foundation *Das Bild von Sinti und Roma in der deutschen Lokalpresse* (The Image of Sinti and Roma in the German Local Press), conducted from 1990 to 1992 at the Institute for Education, Mainz University by Franz Hamburger together with Irina Bohn and Kerstin Rock. It is based on data collection and preliminary studies carried out from the mid-1980s. The research team analyzed reportage in local papers in Dortmund, Cologne, Mainz and Wiesbaden. Unfortunately, almost only quantitative findings were published, such as the high percentage of reports on crime associated with Sinti and Roma, although the final report of the project, which was not published, also contains an innovative qualitative analysis.¹²

12 Ibid., *passim*. For a strong qualitative analysis, see also Irinia Bohn, Wolfgang Feuerhelm, & Franz Hamburger (2000). Die Erzeugung von Plausibilität als Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit. Eine Fallrekonstruktion zur Berichterstattung über Sinti und Roma. In: Klaus Kraimer, ed., *Die Fallrekonstruktion. Sinnverstehen in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung*. Frankfurt a.M., pp. 532-560.

It points there, for example, to strategies employed to identify the group such as marking by social structure, external features or aspects of how the crime was committed.

Since then there have been numerous individual isolated studies which deal with reportage in the German media on Sinti and Roma. There have also been various investigations on this topical focus in other countries and on a comparative European level.¹³ These studies as well are largely quantitative in orientation, examining the proportion of certain tropes and topoi, topics and emphases in media reporting. There have only been a small number of qualitative studies that explore the ‘how’ of such antigypsyist reporting, its method.¹⁴

The tenor of nearly all these studies is that a form of reporting marked by stereotypes and prejudice is widespread in Europe. Based on such findings, Herbert Uerlings and Ramona Mechthilde Treinen, looking in their case at descriptions in encyclopedic works, have argued for the need for a shift in perspective:

“In the light of this clear and unmistakable finding, our concern here cannot be to offer still another proof that the representation of ‘Gypsies’ in works on collective knowledge is stigmatizing, and then to list once again the stereotypes involved. Rather, our aim here is to show how the stigmatization comes about through lexical representation.”¹⁵

This demand should in analogy also be raised for reporting in the press. A more probing analysis should not only describe the existence of antigypsyism in the German media but should also and indeed principally

13 See the full version of this study for a bibliography of such studies.

14 Important among innovative and qualitative studies are Bohn, Feuerhelm, & Hamburger (2000). *Die Erzeugung von Plausibilität*; Erjavec (2001). *Media Representation*; Peter Widmann (2010). Die diskrete Macht des Vorurteils – Bedeutung und Grenzen des Diskriminierungsverbots im Pressekodex. In: Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma, ed., *Diskriminierungsverbot*, pp. 37-41; Brigitte Mihok (2011). Ein Film über „Zigeuner“ als Inszenierung zur Stigmatisierung einer Minderheit. In: *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, vol. 20, pp. 315-329; Bea Bodrogi (2012). “Gypsy” stereotyping in the media. Media portrayal of disadvantaged groups and practice of the Media Authority. Civil Media. Accessible online: <http://civilmedia.net/cm/Gypsy-stereotyping-in-the-media.pdf> (accessed 10 April 2014); Barbara Tiefenbacher and Stefan Benedik (2012). Auf der Suche nach den „wahren Merkmalen“. Beispiele für Ethnisierungen von RomNija in der österreichischen und slowakischen Presse. In: Andres Kriwak and Günther Pallaver, eds., *Medien und Minderheiten*. Innsbruck, pp. 215-237; Alexandra Graevskaia (2013). „Die machen unser schönes Viertel kaputt!“ Rassismus und Antiziganismus am Beispiel Duisburg. *DISS-Journal* 25. Accessible online: <http://www.diss-duisburg.de/2013/07/die-machen-unser-schoenes-viertel-kaputt/> (accessed 28 April 2015).

15 Ramona Mechthilde Treinen and Herbert Uerlings (2008). Vom ‚unzivilisierten Wandervolk‘ zur ‚diskriminierten Minderheit‘: ‚Zigeuner‘ im *Brockhaus*. In: Herbert Uerlings and Iulia-Karin Patrut, eds., *„Zigeuner“ und Nation. Repräsentation – Inklusion – Exklusion*. Frankfurt a.M., pp. 631-696, here p. 633.

look at *how* this is communicated. Irina Bohn, Franz Hamburger and Kerstin Rock thus emphasize that there is a particular need to “investigate the questions regarding the sources, strategies of presentation and the functions of press reportage on the Sinti and Roma.”¹⁶ In the framework of such an amplified perspective on antigypsyism in the German media, the present study advances the following theses for discussion:

1. Antigypsyism in the media is not necessarily linked with employment of the designation ‘*Zigeuner*’ (‘Gypsy’).
2. Antigypsyism in the media extends far beyond the attribution of criminal behavior.
3. Antigypsyism in the media does not necessarily contain a description that is clearly negative at first glance; even presumably ‘positive’ descriptions as “philogypsyism” can also reproduce antigypsyist patterns.
4. Journalists who reproduce antigypsyism do not necessarily do this consciously or with evil intention.
5. Antigypsyism in the media in the more recent period is generally not manifested openly but rather is encoded in various ways. In addition, authorship is frequently disclaimed.
6. Antigypsyism in the media is produced and communicated by a range of media-based mechanisms and strategies.

The Sources and their Evaluation

Proceeding from these theses, I attempt in the following analysis to elucidate some of the media mechanisms and strategies that shape the antigypsyist descriptions and representations in the German media. Various media formats such as documentaries, reports, magazine articles, TV news reports, talk shows, newspaper articles and police press reports are analyzed, primarily from a qualitative perspective. This reflects a conscious decision on my part, since a qualitative analysis is better suited for exploring in depth the questions noted above regarding the “sources, strategies of presentation and functions of press reportage.”¹⁷

16 Cf. Bohn, Hamburger, & Rock (n.d.). *Konstruktion der Differenz*, p. 4.

17 Ibid.

As I analyze a broad range of media sources here, my study proceeds, based on the research findings from previous studies cited above, on the assumption that media discourse in the topical area investigated displays a high level of homogeneity and “there are no basic changes in the quality of the stereotypical attributions,”¹⁸ or in other words “that there were no significant differences among different newspapers,” as the media analyst Karmen Erjavec puts it.¹⁹ My study thus seeks to present a cross-sectional analysis of contemporary antigypsyism in the German media, even if the corpus of sources cannot claim to be quantitatively representative. Rather, the aim here, by means of exemplary case analyses, is to gain new insight for better understanding and critiquing antigypsyism as conveyed by the media.

Since the prime focus is on the forms in which antigypsyism in the German media is transmitted, in the course of the analysis it is important to investigate more than just blatant open insults and the employment of crude antigypsyist stereotypes. Rather I see my task as also endeavoring to illuminate and criticize subtle attributions and ascriptions, positive stereotypy, implicit generalizations and the tendentious omission of information.

Accordingly, the selection of sources analyzed is not geared to an attempt to find the most spectacular, racist and discriminating articles or reports. On the contrary: in several chapters source materials are examined that upon a superficial first reading or inspection, in the absence of corresponding previous knowledge, do not appear to be especially worthy of criticism, although as a result they package and convey all the more subtle stereotypes. There is also a conscious attempt to analyze sources whose focus is not specifically reportage on ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti.’ Such examples are often particularly well-suited for pointing up most clearly the operating modes of reportage in the media that lead to the communication of antigypsyism. At the same time, no claim is made here to having presented a full analysis of every individual source examined in regard to its antigypsyist contents. For one, that is virtually impossible, in particular when it comes to TV documentary sources; second, an attempt was made to establish in the main those mechanisms that frequently reoccur and thus play a special role in the

18 Ibid.

19 Erjavec (2001). *Media Representation*, p. 721.

production of antigypsyist content in the media. In this connection, let me underscore the orientation of the present study: it does not seek to brand individual reports as antigypsyist; rather it aims to point out the subliminal and in part less-questioned orientations, reflexes, strategies and tendencies that promote or determine antigypsyist media reportage. This investigation thus intends to make readers aware of antigypsyist mechanisms operating in the media and to serve as a basis for further work and argumentation.

In the present study, presentation of the findings is in keeping with the media mechanisms analyzed and is ordered only approximately in accordance with the type of source. The associated aim is to foreground the mode of operating and manner of employment of the mechanisms, thus making them more understandable. The identification and naming of such mechanisms, in particular in connection with audio-visual sources, should be viewed as an attempt to reduce the complex intertwining of various corresponding and mutually supplementing logics, narratives, arguments and criteria for decision-making to readily understandable processes, designated here as mechanisms. For that reason, it is necessary to see these as interconnected and dependent one on the other.

The guiding central research question in the analysis of all sources is: what is the sense of employing the term ‘Roma’ (or ‘*Zigeuner*,’ ‘Sinti and Roma,’ ‘Sinti,’ ‘members of a minority,’ etc.) in the respective context?

In order to answer this question, the investigation explored both the tacit assumptions left unmentioned that underlie the employment of the respective designation and analyzed the way in which the terms are employed within the logics and narrative structures of the respective sources. Phrased differently, the above central research question, following the guideline for implementation of Section 12 of the German Press Code, is simply the question of the “relevance to the facts reported,”²⁰ the connection between specific mention of minority affiliation and the topic of the

20 “Press Code Section 12 – Discrimination There must be no discrimination against a person because of his/her sex, a disability or his membership of an ethnic, religious, social or national group. Guideline 12.1 – REPORTS ON CRIMES When reporting crimes, it is not permissible to refer to the suspect’s religious, ethnic or other minority membership unless this information can be justified as being relevant to the readers’ understanding of the incident. In particular, it must be borne in mind that such references could stir up prejudices against minorities.” See German Press Code (2013), p. 9. Accessible online in English: http://ethicnet.uta.fi/germany/german_press_code (accessed 12 Aug. 2015).

given article, report, etc. Proceeding from the manner of employment of terms such as ‘Roma’ or ‘Zigeuner,’ conclusions can be drawn about the often implicit meanings and associations of these words in their respective contexts, which—as in any form of communication—are more or less consciously suggested by the ‘sender’ and are picked up or meaningfully reinterpreted in his/her context by the ‘recipient.’

Antigypsyism – Attempt at a Definition²¹

Initially I present a short overview of what I understand in the present study as antigypsyism. Antigypsyism is a historically emerging and self-stabilizing social phenomenon consisting of

1. a homogenizing and essentializing perception and description of certain groups under the stigma of “Gypsy” or other related terms
2. an attribution of specific deviant characteristics to the stigmatized
3. along with discriminating social structures and violent practices that emerge against that background.

This very abstract definition requires a more precise explanation.

The first step in the genesis of antigypsyism describes the construction of an alien group. It unifies all those affected, i.e. there is a homogenizing perception and description that excludes any differences and reduces the members of the alien group solely to their being “Gypsies.” In this process, however, not only is the alien group constructed; at the same time, by describing those who are “Gypsy,” it is implicitly established who does not belong to this group—and thus within the antigypsyist thought pattern is part of the we-group. The we-group and the alien group, ‘us’ vs. ‘them,’ are represented as opposed one to the other, there are no overlaps within this thought pattern. In the case of modern antigypsyism, the we-group is customarily designated by one’s nationality, for example, the discourse

21 This chapter is based on my attempt at a definition in Markus End (2013). Antiziganismus. Zur Verteidigung eines wissenschaftlichen Begriffs in kritischer Absicht. In: Alexandra Bartels, Tobias von Borcke, Markus End, & Anna Friedrich, eds., *Antiziganistische Zustände 2. Kritische Positionen gegen gewaltvolle Verhältnisse*. Münster, pp. 39-72. Some sections have been reproduced verbatim or paraphrased.

speaks of ‘Germans,’ ‘Romanians’ or the ‘French.’ This description has nothing to do with actual citizenship, since it does not encompass Roma with a German passport, for example. Rather it designates an existential state of ‘being German’ that supposedly goes deeper than mere citizenship.

This conception of nationality arises from the assumption that belonging to the stigmatized group and to the we-group or in-group is essential, and thus immutable or only temporarily subject to change, and is passed on from generation to generation. The function of explaining this essentialization was taken over by the late 19th century if not earlier via the conception of human races. Since the end of World War Two, this notion has been largely proscribed in public discourse in Germany. Nonetheless, the essentializing has continued; it is implemented utilizing other supposedly fixed and unaltering substantiations such as ‘culture,’ ‘ethnicity,’ ‘people,’ ‘mentality,’ or ‘tradition.’ However, decisive in connection with such terms is not the concept itself but the meaning it is supposed to convey. If the concept is employed in such a way that it implies both homogenizing and essentializing without explicitly proceeding from ‘races,’ racism research talks about a “racism without races” or a “cultural racism.”²²

In modern antigypsyist descriptions, it is not absolutely necessary to use the term ‘Gypsy’ in order to convey its meaning. For a long time now, various designations have been in currency that function as euphemisms or verbal evasions for ‘Gypsies,’ such as ‘traveller’ or ‘mobile ethnic minority.’ In part such substitute designations are actually first coined in media discourses, such as the German term “*Klaukids*” (“pickpocket kids”) or “poverty migrants,” two designations that are closely intertwined with antigypsyist prejudices and stereotypes. More and more frequently, terms are also used that are actually self-designations of individual groups affected by anti-

22 On the discussion of a racism arguing by means of ‘culture’ as well as the associated problems in analysis and with the concepts themselves, see Stuart Hall (1989): Rassismus als ideologischer Diskurs. In: *Das Argument* 178, pp. 913-921; Etienne Balibar (1991): Is There a ‚Neo-Racism‘? In: Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, eds., *Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities*. London, New York, pp. 17-28 and Paul Mecheril and Karin Scherchel (2011). Rassismus und „Rasse“. In: Claus Melter and Paul Mecheril, eds., *Rassismuskritik*. Vol. 1: *Rassismustheorie und -forschung*. Schwabach/Ts., pp. 39-58. Very early on, Adorno got to the crux of the matter in regard to this shift: “The noble word ‘culture’ replaces the proscribed term ‘race,’ though it remains a mere disguise for the brutal claim to domination.” Theodor W. Adorno (1998). Guilt and defense: In: idem, *Guilt and Defense: On the Legacies of National Socialism in Postwar Germany*, eds. J. K. Olick and A. J. Perrin, Cambridge/MA, pp. 51-185, here p. 149.

gypsyism, such as “Roma” or “Sinti und Roma,” to which however likewise the stereotypes are transposed. Thus, these self-designations can also be used to convey the old image of the “Gypsy.” When for example in contemporary debates in the media there is discussion about ‘Roma,’ this signifier generally implies antigypsyist meanings. In the present study, designations such as ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma,’ and the word ‘Gypsy,’ are placed in single quotation marks, if they are employed as an external ascription in order to distinguish them from self-designations such as Roma or Sinti and Roma, but without quotation marks.

In stereotypical perception and description, Roma are primarily ‘Roma,’ and nothing else. In such a description, the fact is simply ignored that there are young and old Roma, Roma oriented to a career and others oriented to family, poor and rich, traditional and modern, conservative and liberal, American Roma, Asian, African, European and Australian. It is distinguished by a belief that by using the word ‘Roma,’ supposedly all that is necessary has been said, and there is no attention paid to the diversity of the groups involved or the individuals. This imaginary has nothing to with reality: that is also reflected in the fact that in this perception, ‘Roma’ and ‘Germans’ are viewed as antipodes, mutually exclusive, while in reality there are of course German Sinti and German Roma who also (or even primarily) define themselves as Germans.

Thus, an analysis of racism says nothing at all about how those affected by these events actually position themselves. Roma, Sinti, Lovara and other groups traditionally speaking the language Romanes were historically regularly designated and stamped by the stigma ‘Gypsy’ and are still subjected to that today. In addition, groups or individuals not speaking Romanes, such as Yenish, Pavee or others living in a supposedly ‘maladjusted’ manner are stigmatized as ‘Gypsies.’

The second key aspect of antigypsyism consists in the ascription of social characteristics or traits. This ascription is based on the previous construction of the groups. It encompasses conceptions of the attributes of the alien group that are not in keeping with the norm of the majority societies and are thus viewed as ‘deviant.’ Such attributes are generally rejected socially and thus given a negative valorization. Yet even when these ascrip-

tions are communicated in a positive or admiring manner, they still contain a core element of deviance. At the same time, the constructed we-group is ascribed the opposite qualities in keeping with the norm and confirming the customary conceptions of morality. Here, too, there is the notion that the constructed we-group and alien group are antipodal and incompatible. The stereotypes in this connection adapt to their historical and spatial contexts; however, they are not arbitrary. Their structure of meaning, i.e. their deeper semantic level, is generally very constant.²³ The central elements of the structure of meaning of antigypsyism will be presented in detail in the following section.

While the first two aspects of antigypsyism as described tend to pinpoint its ideological core, the third central aspect consists of the structures of discrimination and acts of persecution building upon this. For Roma, Sinti, Yenish and others potentially affected by antigypsyism, these constitute the central problem, because they restrict their opportunities and future perspectives for life, cause serious disadvantages and in the worst-case scenario, can endanger life and limb. These social practices of antigypsyism arise in the interplay with the earlier described assumption of a homogeneous group and the ascription of deviant attributes. Nonetheless, a strict separation should be made between the two levels. There is a huge difference between the existence of antigypsyist prejudices and imagery and concrete actions of discrimination and persecution. Both phenomena represent different levels of a social phenomenon. Violent acts or discriminatory behavior should not be trivialized by being placed on the same level with stereotypical representations in the media, literature or art. Yet even if ideological structures and social practice initially represent very different levels sociologically and in politological terms, the approach adopted here proceeds nonetheless from the assumption that they must be viewed as elements of

23 “The structure of meaning of a prejudice designates a more abstract semantic level underlying the prejudices. It designates what is common to the numerous individual antigypsyist utterances verbally, written, and in images and film when abstracted from the respective historical context.” Markus End (2011). *Bilder und Sinnstruktur des Antiziganismus. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, nos. 22-23, pp. 15-21, here p. 17. I use the concept “structure of meaning” (*Sinnstruktur*) drawing on the work of Klaus Holz. On this concept, see Holz on methodology, idem (2001). *Nationaler Antisemitismus. Wissenssoziologie einer Weltanschauung*. Hamburg, esp. pp. 26-49 and 153-157.

one and the same social phenomenon. This approach is based on the thesis that the prejudices based on the ideological structures are a necessary prerequisite of discrimination, exclusion and persecution.

Even if discrimination and persecution are far more serious problems, the focus of an analysis of press reporting must be on the ideological structure, i.e. on the first two criteria, namely homogenizing and essentializing and the ascription of deviant attributes. That is because it is this ideological structure that is disseminated widely through media reportage in many different forms and differing intensities.

At this juncture, it is important to point out that the term ‘anti-gypsyism’ itself is controversial.²⁴ Alongside various other objections, a central point of critique is that the term itself contains the stigmatizing designation of the Other, qua ‘Gypsy,’ and thus reproduces it. This gives rise to various dangers and problems. Initially there is a danger that the concept is interpreted as if it were meant to denote an enmity vis-à-vis real existing ‘Gypsies’ or even a real existing ‘Gypsyism,’ and thus pleads for the designation “Gypsy.”²⁵ Such an interpretation cannot be ruled out.²⁶ However, the manner of employment formulated here differs. The term is intended to cite the lexeme “Gypsy” to a certain extent seen from the racist perspective of the majority society. Its proponents argue that precisely for this reason, the term is more precise than a paraphrasing such as “racism against Sinti and Roma.” That is because on the one hand, through such a designation, the focus on the projective character, i.e. the differentiation between the ‘Gypsy imagery’ and the real existing Sinti and Roma, is lost.²⁷ On the other, not only persons who designate themselves as Sinti and Roma are affected by antigypsyism. Other sociocultural groups, like the Yenish, who

24 On this discussion, see in detail End (2013). Antiziganismus as well as numerous papers from the anthology Jan Selling, Markus End, Hristo Kyuchukov, Pia Laskar & Bill Templar, eds. *Antiziganismus – What’s in a Word? Proceedings from the Uppsala International Conference on the Discrimination, Marginalization and Persecution of Roma, 23-25 October 2013*, Newcastle upon Tyne, among others by Markus End, Anna Friedrich/Benedikt Wolf, Hristo Kyuchukov, Pia Laskar, Alexandra Oprea and Charles Westin.

25 Cf. Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma (2012). Cfp Antiziganismus. Accessible online: <http://www.sintiundroma.de/uploads/media/Cfp.pdf> (accessed 22 Dec. 2013).

26 At almost every lecture on the topic antisemitism, some people in the audience will say that the “Palestinians” cannot be “Antisemites” because they themselves are “Semites.” Here too there is an erroneous understanding of the concept “antisemitism.”

27 End (2013). Antiziganismus, pp. 53-57.

live in southern Germany and Switzerland and elsewhere, and the Pavee in Great Britain, Ireland and the U.S., are also stigmatized, discriminated and in part persecuted as ‘Gypsies.’²⁸ For that reason, designations such as “racism against Sinti and Roma” are inadequate and misleading. Yet the central problem of the term “antigypsyism” remains unresolved. Its employment engenders a spoken or written reproduction of the racist term. This harbors the danger that those affected may feel insulted or demeaned by the word itself.²⁹

The debate on how to deal with these problems continues. The author of this study and those who commissioned it are in constant discussion regarding these issues.³⁰ At the current point in this discussion, the sponsors recommend using the expression “hostility toward Sinti and Roma” for the phenomena they perceive as persons directly affected. According to the present state of the debate, that would not rule out designating the racist phenomenon of the majority society as “antigypsyism.”³¹ Since only media reports are investigated in the present study, whose production should be attributed to the majority society, and since in addition the analysis has shown that the majority of representations are marked by traditional ‘Gypsy’ images long in circulation—imagery whose genesis has nothing to do with the minorities of the Sinti and Roma—in agreement with the sponsors of this study, the term “antigypsyism” (in German “*Antiziganismus*”) is used.

28 Ibid.

29 Such an experience was formulated, for example, by Alexandra Oprea. See Alexandra Oprea (2015). Comment on Pia Laskar, “The Construction of ‚Swedish Gender’ through the G-other as a Counter-Image and Threat.” In: Jan Sselling et al. (2015). *Antiziganism – What’s in a Word?*, pp. 154-159.

30 For example, the Documentation and Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma contributed to the debate with a conference, inter alia with the aim of highlighting the “strengths and weaknesses of the concept.” See Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma (2012). Flyer zur Interdisziplinären Tagung Antiziganismus. Accessible online: http://www.sintiundroma.de/fileadmin/dokumente/medien/Flyer_Tag_Antiziganismus_web.pdf (accessed 22 Dec. 2013). At this conference, I presented and discussed various arguments and strands of discussion in regard to a “critical defense” of the concept “antigypsyism.”

31 On this, vide the ‘call for papers’ for the same conference: “The current scientific discourse often falls too short in its attempts at a definition when it sees antigypsyism solely as racism directed against Sinti and Roma. In a bit more differentiated way, one could say what is involved is a hostile attitude toward Sinti and Roma on the basis of an ‘image of the gypsy’ comprised of stereotypes [...].” Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma (2012). CfP Antiziganismus.

Thus, in the following, I speak of an antigypsyist communication or reportage if at least two conditions are fulfilled:

1. The positing of a homogeneous group based on an essentialist feature such as ‘race,’ ‘ethnicity,’ ‘culture’ or ‘tradition,’ which is marked by the stigma ‘Gypsy’ or another related designation.
2. The ascription to those so stigmatized of specific deviant attributes of the structure of meaning of antigypsyism.

An ideal-typical statement that meets these two criteria is: “Sinti and Roma have a proclivity for crime.” In a representative survey in 2014, 55.9% of the Germans surveyed agreed with this statement.³² The criterion of homogeneity is discernable in the fact that no internal differentiation is made between various different Sinti or Roma. They are understood and presented as a homogeneous whole. The essentializing is carried by the phrasing “have a proclivity.” Even if initially this constitutes a weakening, for example, when compared with the assertion “Sinti and Roma are criminals,” the statement “Sinti and Roma have a proclivity for crime” has no temporal or spatial restriction. At the same time, “proclivity” points to a deep-seated and formative character trait that very probably will not change. The ascription of “criminality” in this statement is patent.

A surprisingly large number of the media reports investigated manifest a similarly simple structure like the above statement. But in the majority of sources, it is necessary to analyze the media mechanisms employed in order to work out the antigypsyist content. The analysis of these mechanisms, which provide the complex and multi-layered possibilities for communication of antigypsyism, are central to the present study. But initially at this point it is useful to explain the structure of meaning and central prejudices springing from it in greater detail.

32 Oliver Decker, Johannes Kiess & Elmar Brähler (2014). *Die stabilisierte Mitte. Rechtsextreme Einstellung in Deutschland 2014*. Leipzig, p. 50.

Prejudices, Imagery and the Structure of Meaning of Antigypsyism³³

The concept structure of meaning constitutes an attempt to grasp the continuities and logic of racist stereotypes and prejudices even if these themselves are subject to processes of change. The most simple example is the transformation of the visual stereotype of a ‘Gypsy horse cart’ into a ‘caravan.’ The visual stereotype has undergone modernization but the core of the statement has remained the same. Numerous images and stereotypes have arisen in this form, they were disseminated, popularized and then disappeared once again. The meaning of these images is often very similar and far less flexible than the images themselves, because these images always arise against the backdrop of norms and values of the majority society. Antigypsyist images and prejudices serve to strengthen the identity and sense of solidarity and belonging of the we-group and to sound out the boundaries of what is socially desirable. That is why all antigypsyist biases and prejudices can also be understood as an implicit statement about the we-group. Because what ‘Gypsies’ or ‘Roma’ are in the antigypsyist conceptual world, ‘Germans’ are not. So when people agree with the above-cited statement “Sinti and Roma have a proclivity for crime,” there is an implicit assertion that ‘Germans’ do not have such a tendency toward crime. This is not a logical conclusion, but this contrast permeates all structures of bias and can be considered the inner core of such prejudice. The concept of “prejudice” is not viewed here as a hasty judgment or one formed in connection with an actual experience with some individual, which was then only unjustifiably transposed to an entire group. Rather, in the tradition of the *Studies in Prejudice*³⁴ published in the 1950s, it is employed as part of a structure of perception that has little or nothing to do with those so judged but instead has a great deal to do with those expressing the prejudice.³⁵ Prejudices understood in this way always correspond with social norms and

33 For the following section, cf. End (2011). *Bilder und Sinnstruktur*, pp. 17-21.

34 Max Horkheimer and Samuel H. Flowerman, eds. (1949f.). *Studies in Prejudice*. New York.

35 Still fundamental is Theodor W. Adorno et al. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. Studies in Prejudice Series (ed. Max Horkheimer and Samuel H. Flowerman), Vol. 1. New York, esp. pp. 612f. See also Brigitte Mihok and Peter Widmann (2005). Sinti und Roma als Feindbilder. Vorurteile. *Informationen zur politischen Bildung*, 271, 56-61, here p. 56.

values of the respective we-group; they serve to prop up or implement and carry through with these norms and values.³⁶ Thus, generally these images of the 'Other' involve projecting socially undesirable attributes onto others. At the same time, one's own self-image or, on a social level, the image of the we-group is furnished with desirable qualities and elevated and consolidated as exemplary.³⁷

The abundance of the antigypsyist images and stereotypes that arise in this connection cannot be described here in its entirety. The structure of meaning of antigypsyism has likewise to date never been comprehensively described. For that reason, here I attempt solely to present several central semantic components of antigypsyism more precisely and to describe in greater detail those prejudices and stereotypes in particular that serve to shape current media discourse.³⁸

A very central semantic component of antigypsyism involves denying those considered to be 'Gypsies' or 'Roma' a solid and stable identity. The idea of a missing identity, or more precisely, an identity determined by ambivalence is generally manifested in denying those stigmatized by antigypsyism a well-grounded national or religious identity such as is central for the we-group, in this case 'the Germans.'³⁹ This is how the antipodal binary of 'nomadic Gypsies' over against the 'solidly rooted Germans' emerges. 'Gypsyist' is thus declared an opposite of 'German.' This logic is expressed primarily in stereotypes and prejudices such as 'nomadism,' 'non-sedentary lifestyle,' 'footloose and fancy-free,' 'itinerant people.' More modern

36 Cf. End (2011). *Bilder und Sinnstruktur*, p. 17.

37 These assumptions were originally formulated in antisemitism research and since have become established in research on prejudice. They were significantly shaped by authors working in early Critical Theory: "The psychoanalytic theory of pathic projection has identified the transference of socially tabooed impulses from the subject to the object as the substance of that projection." Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Palo Alto/CA, p. 158. Accessible online: <http://goo.gl/kDnJdi> (accessed 24 April 2014).

38 For an overview, see End (2011). *Bilder und Sinnstruktur*, pp. 19f. Building on her analysis of the media, Änneke Winckel undertakes to classify antigypsyist stereotypes using the categories "crime," "begging," "children," "hygiene," "superstition," "primitiveness," "clans," "Gypsy camps," "nomads" and "self-guilt." See Änneke Winckel (2002). *Antiziganismus. Rassismus gegen Sinti und Roma im vereinigten Deutschland*. Münster, pp. 148-174. For another categorization with "seven building blocks," cf. Wilhelm Solms (2006). „Kulturloses Volk“? *Berichte über „Zigeuner“ und Selbstzeugnisse von Sinti und Roma*. Seeheim, pp. 97-107.

39 Klaus Holz has also demonstrated this logic for the structure of meaning of antisemitism. See in particular Klaus Holz (2004). Die antisemitische Konstruktion des Dritten und die nationale Ordnung der Welt. In: Christina von Braun and Eva-Maria Ziege, eds. *Das bewegliche Vorurteil. Aspekte des internationalen Antisemitismus*. Würzburg, pp. 43-61.

designations such as ‘mobile ethnic minority,’ ‘European migrant workers,’ and roving ‘rotating Europeans’ can scarcely disguise their origin springing from these traditional prejudices. The logic of this contrast between ‘rooted and solid identity’ on the one hand and ‘erratic ambivalent identity’ on the other shapes countless descriptions and visual representations of ‘Gypsies’ and ‘Roma.’ They are shown or described situated out in the open or on the street, their residential areas are rarely presented as ‘home.’ It is rare for the word “Roma” to be combined with national attributes such as “German” or “Romanian.” Numerous visual representations such as caravans, tents, horses, campfires and images of individuals primarily located somewhere out in the open or on roads and streets have been shaped by this semantics. Through such representations, those stigmatized by antigypsyism are ascribed as lacking a solid identity and regular fixed residential location; instead they are constructed as being constantly on the move, wandering and having no place they call home.

An additional central semantic content of antigypsyism consists in the ascription of ‘parasitical’ behavior. This encapsulates the notion that ‘Gypsies’ do not maintain their own lives and survival by hard work, as is ascribed to members of the we-group, but instead live at the expense of the ‘Germans,’ their diligence and the fruits of their labor. In connection with this semantic element as well, the importance for the maintenance of the norms of the majority society is more than obvious. From the time of Luther’s Reformation if not before, a conception of work established itself in the German-speaking area that Max Weber termed the “Protestant ethic.” That ethic was not to serve principally to alleviate material hardship but rather, as a “profession” or “calling,” to be an “absolute end in itself.”⁴⁰ Labor as an end in itself consists supposedly in pleasing God or more generally in a moral superiority. The opposite position is also clearly stated: “that if any would not work, neither should he eat.”⁴¹ So not wanting to work is thus considered a deviation from the social norm. In the antigypsyist mindset, this deviation

40 Max Weber (2001 [1930]). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London, p. 25.

41 2 Thessalonians 3: 10, King James Version. Accessible online: <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Thessalonians+3&version=KJV> (accessed 24 April 2015). In greater detail on this meaning, see Markus End (2012). „Wer nicht arbeiten will, der soll auch nicht essen“ – Zur historischen und soziologischen Dimension des Bettelns im Antiziganismus. *Juridikum. Zeitschrift für Kritik, Recht, Gesellschaft*, no. 2, pp. 157-167.

is attributed to the ‘Gypsies’ in the form of stereotypical activities such as ‘begging,’ ‘theft’ and ‘deception.’ Which is to say: ‘Gypsies’ or ‘Roma’ are alleged to live from the labor of others. In addition, it is insinuated that those so stigmatized have no knowledge of or respect for the fundamental conventions of modern societies, such as the principle of private property, the work ethic, the concept of money and the principle of legal businesses.⁴²

This semantic element sheds light on an aspect relevant for a fundamental understanding of antigypsyism. The question as to whether a statement is antigypsyist or not must be dealt with independently from whether it has a negative or demeaning intention. Specifically in regard to this semantic element which points up the contrast with the dominant norm of the work ethic, in literature, art and also in everyday communication, one can find numerous stereotypes and statements that are supposedly positive and meant to express a favorable attitude or admiration. Thus, one can repeatedly hear that ‘Gypsies’ live ‘joyfully, for the moment, taking each day as it comes,’ and have especially a ‘lust for life.’ However, the core of a prejudice consists not in the associated evaluation but in the ascription itself. The ascription in this semantic element is that ‘Gypsies,’ and in many cases ‘Roma’ as well, do not live by their own work but rather from the labor of others. This ascription is also maintained in the positive descriptions. The social wellspring of “fascination and contempt”⁴³ is the same. In their analysis of antisemitism, Horkheimer and Adorno describe the “disowned wishful image” of the intellectual: who “appears to enjoy in thought what the others deny themselves and is spared the sweat of toil and bodily strength.”⁴⁴ Fascination and contempt are not only identical at their core; fascination often transmutes directly into contempt. The difference consists solely in whether the wishful image is totally repressed or whether it is desired as an “emblem of happiness.”⁴⁵

42 In antisemitism, there are also notions of a ‘parasitic’ behavior attributed to ‘Jews.’ On the differences in the respective ascriptions, see End (2012): Bilder und Sinnstrukturen des Antiziganismus. *Überblick – Zeitschrift des Informations- und Dokumentationszentrums für Antirassismusbearbeitung in Nordrhein-Westfalen*, no. 1: Antiziganismus: Funktionsweisen – individuelle Gegenstrategien & Empowerment, pp. 3-8, here p. 6.

43 As Klaus-Michael Bogdal puts it in the title of his much-discussed study, see Klaus-Michael Bogdal (2011). *Europa erfindet die Zigeuner. Eine Geschichte von Faszination und Verachtung*. Berlin.

44 Horkheimer & Adorno (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, p. 141.

45 Ibid.

At times the concept of “philogypsyism” is employed for such stereotypes, analogous to the notion of philosemitism:

“The principal problem of most well-meaning descriptions of ‘Gypsies’ and of philogypsyism, however, is that of positive stigmatization. [...] In all these cases, the fundamental principle of stigmatization is repeated and a fundamental ‘otherness’ of the ‘Gypsies’ is posited. Consequently, positive stigmatizations are no solution but rather constitute a repetition of the problem in reverse. As a rule, what is decisive remains the same: the image of the ‘Gypsies’ is a projection, i.e. the expression of one’s own desires and fears.”⁴⁶

To that extent, precisely these positive images of the ‘Gypsies making music’ convey this semantic element. That is because the ‘devilish fiddlers’ admired in this way are likewise not working as the norm commands; rather, they live supposedly devoid of ‘real work’ and without being ‘productive.’

These centuries-old antigypsyist ascriptions are today still in circulation. Modern variants of the negative stereotypes are ascriptions of ‘abuse of the right of asylum,’ ‘gangs of beggars,’ ‘confidence tricks’ and ‘abuse of social welfare.’ These stereotypes only represent variations of the same semantic element in contemporary guise. The question here is not whether these phenomena actually exist in individual instances. Antigypsyism consists in describing these phenomena as attributes specific to ‘Roma.’ Very frequently we can also find recourse to this semantic element in visual representations. ‘Roma’ and ‘Gypsies’ are regularly presented by images of individuals begging, cleaning car windshields or stealing; images of street musicians or other musical imagery also frequently function as stereotypical references to this constructed group.⁴⁷

Closely linked to this semantic element of ‘parasitic behavior’ is the ascription of a far-reaching carefree lack of concern and discipline. Those stigmatized as ‘Gypsies’ are ascribed with an attitude of unconcern for the future, and for that reason, indifference to any kind of self-discipline. This

46 Herbert Uerlings (2007). Stigma Zigeuner. Formen der Stigmatisierung der ‚Zigeuner‘ im deutschsprachigen Raum. *Germanistische Beiträge*, 22, pp. 84–117, here p. 114.

47 On the entire semantic element, see esp. Wulf D. Hund (1996). Das Zigeuner-Gen. Rassistische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus. In: idem, ed., *Zigeuner: Geschichte und Struktur einer rassistischen Konstruktion*. Duisburg, pp. 11–35; see also Roswitha Scholz (2007). Homo Sacer und “Die Zigeuner”. Antiziganismus – Überlegungen zu einer wesentlichen und deshalb “vergessenen” Variante des modernen Rassismus. *EXIT!*, no. 4, pp. 177–227; End (2012). “Wer nicht arbeiten will, der soll auch nicht essen”.

is part of a binary in the counter-image of a disciplined, rational and well-organized majority society. The interiorization of self-discipline has to be seen as a supplement of the “Protestant ethic.”

In the sphere of economic action, ‘Gypsies’ are consequently ascribed a counter-image to that of the we-group: they do not make provisions for the future, planning and saving as a rational lifestyle would require. Self-discipline is a central element of modern subjectivity likewise over and beyond the realm of the economy. Control over one’s own instincts and desires, aptly termed by the colloquial German metaphor “overcoming one’s weaker self” (*Überwindung des inneren Schweinehunds*), is a central prerequisite of modern subjectivity and society. ‘Gypsies’ are ascribed as not having achieved and implemented this self-discipline and self-control in any way.

This semantic element is differentiated in countless spheres of life and encompasses perhaps the most extensive reservoir of prejudices and stereotypes: lack of interest in education and training is contrasted with a strong desire for education, chaos and filth function as antipodes to order and cleanliness. Common assertions are that ‘Roma’ live solely in the here & now and are oblivious of concepts such as the past and the need for future planning, which are central in the majority society. While ‘good Germans’ supposedly economize with their resources and finances, are thrifty and look to the future, ‘Gypsies’ are ascribed a self-inflicted ‘poverty’⁴⁸ and irrational patterns of consumption, throwing money out the window for senseless things, short-lived pleasures and extravagant celebrations. Likewise in connection with this semantic feature, it is important to note that determining the antigypsyist content of these prejudices does not intend to mean that individual instances of these phenomena do not exist in reality or that in individual cases, these characteristics do not apply to some Roma or Sinti just as they apply to some non-Roma and non-Sinti as well. Antigypsyism consists in the homogenizing and essentializing ‘wholesale’ ascription of these attributes to an imaginary group of the ‘Roma’ or ‘Gypsies.’

48 Wolfgang Aschauer (2010). Wer ist Roma? Aspekte gesellschaftlicher Beziehungen. In: Moritz Fischer, Christine Hämmerling, & Jan Hinrichsen, eds., *Romänien. – Zugänge zu den Roma in Siebenbürgen* (= Tübinger Korrespondenzblatt 60). Tübingen, pp. 53-71, here p. 66.

It is virtually impossible to enumerate all the stereotypical images that reproduce this semantic element. The most common antigypsyist stereotypes from this sphere are representations of filthy clothing and decrepit residential living circumstances or disheveled individuals, references to all sorts of excesses such as wild dancing, uncontrolled sexuality, consumption of various drugs and allusions to ‘primitiveness,’ in particular to a lack of formal education and illiteracy. Likewise in this sphere, one can find numerous positive stereotypes, which nonetheless encapsulate the same meaning and same reference to a purported otherness. Positive descriptions meant to convey such an ‘otherness’ are, for example, ‘facile ease of manner,’ ‘child-like air’ and ‘huge hospitality.’ Here there is positive valorization of what otherwise is criticized: namely that those so stereotyped are unconcerned about their own livelihood and future, living happily for the moment⁴⁹ and pleased to share even scarce food resources at their disposal.

Likewise in the media we can find countless images and stereotypes conveying this semantic. In the report on ‘Roma housing,’ there are numerous references to ‘litter and rubbish,’ ‘rats,’ ‘urinating’ and leaving ‘excrement scattered about.’ ‘Noisiness’ and the ‘destruction of housing’ are also ascriptions of this semantic element in the realm of circumstances of residence. They all suggest that ‘Roma’ supposedly do not have the self-discipline and love for order that the ‘Germans’ have: “Such filth and rubbish always lying about here, why that’s something we, I mean we Germans, just are not familiar with.”⁵⁰ The frequent reportage about ‘distance from school,’ ‘lack of education’ and ‘illiteracy’ communicates the same meaning of a lack of discipline and planning for the future when it comes to the sphere of education and training. Even media representations of wealthy or moneyed ‘Gypsies’ or ‘Roma’ contain this same semantic element. Sumptuous ornate

49 The most crass formulation of this semantic element was doubtless that ventured by the Auschwitz Commandant Rudolf Höß, who noted in his diary, writing about the prisoners in Auschwitz: “Despite the unfavourable conditions, the majority of the gypsies did not, so far as I could observe, suffer much psychologically as a result of imprisonment, apart from the fact that it restricted their roving habits. [...] Their whole attitude was really that of children, volatile in thought and deed. They loved to play, even at work, which they never took quite seriously. Even in bad times they always tried to look on the bright side. They were optimists.” Rudolf Höß (2000 [1959]). *Commandant in Auschwitz. The Autobiography of Rudolf Hoess*. Trans. Constantine FitzGibbon. London, p. 127.

50 A female ‘local resident’ expressed herself in this ideal-typical form in an interview with *Spiegel TV*; Peter Hell (2012). Vom Wohngebiet zum Ghetto: Untergangsstimmung in Duisburg-Hochfeld. *Spiegel-TV-Magazin*, 4 November 2012 [min. 1:15-1:21].

wedding costumes and marriage festivities, noble fancy attire, the stereotypical ‘Mercedes’ or ‘Roma palaces’ in Romania can be found in numerous reports, thus replete with descriptions of luxury items, and never without some reference to the “senselessness” of this “waste of money” and the presumably shadowy origins of this wealth. Here the message is that people are not dealing with resources in a ‘reasonable’ or ‘low-keyed’ moderate manner, but rather that the money is being ‘squandered.’

This series of prejudices could be readily extended. I would only like at this juncture to point up the most frequent visual representations of this semantic element, since such images play a large role in media reportage. In current media discourse, descriptions in particular of ‘litter and rubbish,’ simple clothing that is supposed to indicate ‘poverty’,⁵¹ or of wash hung out on balconies to dry, are highlighted as a media symbol for simple and cramped living conditions. Also repeatedly noted by visual emphasis are expensive electrical appliances or other supposedly unaffordable commodities adorning ‘Gypsy’ homes.

A further special feature of the visual representation of ‘Roma’, connected with this semantic, is their predominant ‘gendered’ representation by women or children. These representations point first and foremost to a supposed inadequate regimen of contraceptive control and family planning as well as a presumed ‘primitive’ family structure. Over and beyond this, such representation by ‘women’ and ‘children’ has a deeper ideological core. This is based on the convention that down through history until the present, rationality and self-discipline have been ascribed ideologically to ‘males’ in the we-group, while ‘women’ and ‘children’ are associated ideologically with attributes such as emotionality, spontaneity and naivety, thus with the absence of discipline and rationality. To that extent, the primary representation and foregrounding of women and children reflects a strategy of communicating a purported lack of rationality and discipline among ‘Roma.’⁵² Particularly in the portrayals in the visual media investigated, one can often note a combination of features: ‘brightly-

51 See also Aschauer (2010). *Wer ist Roma?*, pp. 63ff.

52 Cf. Rafaela Eulberg (2009). *Doing Gender and Doing Gypsy. Zum Verhältnis der Konstruktion von Geschlecht und Ethnie*. In: End, Herold, & Robel (2009). *Antiziganistische Zustände*, pp. 41-66.

colored skirts,' 'bandanas,' 'lots of children'—especially in their mother's or sister's arms—as well as a multitude of 'plastic bags,' encodings designed to mark 'Roma women and children.'

The last semantic feature that will be described here refers to the presumed rupture with the norms of sexuality and sexual relations in the majority society. The majority of stereotypes of traditional antigypsyism must be interpreted as being in contrast with the norms of monogamous heterosexuality.⁵³ Numerous transgressions against these norms, explained by a supposed uncontrolled and amoral sexuality, are projected onto 'Gypsies': 'polygamy,' 'animal instincts,' 'cohabitation without a marriage certificate,' 'precocity,' 'incest,' 'lack of proper birth control' and 'prostitution' are ascriptions mentioned in this sphere. Likewise in regard to the patriarchal nuclear family, still an effective norm in the majority society, 'Gypsy images' of a matriarchal gender structure, countless children and a family organization structured in 'clans' function as an antipode to the norm. An especially threatening stereotype for the middle-class nuclear family is the notion long in circulation of 'child abduction' by 'Gypsies.' Yet even such a stereotype, which has existed for centuries as a prejudice and has just as often been refuted, has the potential to be presented in the media as a characteristic of 'Roma.'⁵⁴ Common are also visual representations of 'matriarchal structures' by showing 'wise old women' with deep facial creases or sucking on a pipe. Especially pronounced is the pictorial tradition of the 'seductive Gypsy woman.' With her purported 'love of liberty' and 'spirit of adventure,' this traditional image contrasts with that of the 'loving spouse,' 'mother' and 'housewife.' At the same time, with her supposedly self-determined and uncontrollable sexuality, she represents a threat to the 'rational, self-controlled man.'⁵⁵ This stereotype is repeatedly warmed over and served up in purportedly 'positive' reportage.

53 However, one can find even certain changes in the sexual norms of the majority society reflected in modern anti-gypsysist representations. Ever more frequent is the self-image of an enlightened, liberal conception of sexuality, based on equal rights, from which 'Roma' and 'Gypsies' supposedly deviate.

54 Reportage dealing with the so-called 'case of Maria' in Greece demonstrated this in blatantly obvious form. It could not be included in this study in its original German version for reasons of time. Romani Rose refers to this in his Foreword. For a critique of this reportage, see the press release from the Central Council of German Sinti and Roma (2013). "Gestohlene Kinder?" Roma in Europa am Pranger – die Verantwortung der Medien. Statement by Romani Rose at a press conference on 5 November 2013, and the interview with Markus End

Of course, not every single individual reproduction of one of these images signifies the presence of a marked and identifiable antigypsyism. For example, in some individual cases, an image may be in a sense cited, but only to be subsequently deconstructed. Moreover, there are even stereotypes that at the same time are utilized by some Sinti and Roma associations or individual persons as a cultural self-image. The fact that something exists as a cultural tradition does not rule out the possibility that it can be employed in racist representations as a stereotype. The best example of such a double existence is doubtless the imaging of Muslim women with a ‘head scarf.’ Although the head scarf plays a role in some Muslim religious interpretations (and in others not), it functions simultaneously as an image in a homogenizing and essentializing stereotypical representation of *the* ‘Moslems.’⁵⁶

Stereotypical representations are distinguished by undifferentiated descriptions and explanations, false generalizations and the lack of references to historical and social contexts. Yet generally many of the stereotypes mentioned are interconnected. Precisely a combination of various images which separately appear harmless is shaping the current representation of ‘Roma’ in the media. In this connection, the stereotypes must be understood in their function as counter-images to a middle-class, Christian self-image. Supposedly pre-modern and archaic semantic elements are then separated out from that self-image, on which the antigypsyist ‘image of the Gypsy’ draws down to the present.

(2013). “Anlaß für Verfolgung”. Antiziganistisches Ressentiment und das Stereotyp der Kindesentführung. Interview with Peter Nowak. *Konkret*, no. 12, p. 25. The British and American press covered this ‘story’ in the same stereotypical manner.

55 On this semantic feature, see Wolfgang Wippermann (2000). „Doch allermeist die Weiber“. Antiziganismus in geschlechtergeschichtlicher Sicht. In: Helgard Kramer, ed., *Die Gegenwart der NS-Vergangenheit*. Berlin, pp. 278-294; Scholz (2007). *Homo Sacer*; Eulberg (2009). *Doing Gender and Doing Gypsy*.

56 Cf. Yasemin Shooman (2012). *Muslimisch, weiblich, unterdrückt und gefährlich – Stereotype muslimischer Frauen in öffentlichen Diskursen*. In: *Muslime in Deutschland*. Deutsche Islam Konferenz, 9 January. Accessible online: <http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/DIK/DE/Magazin/IslamGender/StereotypMuslima/stereotypmuslima-node.html> (accessed 12 August 2015).

THE FINDINGS

The preparation and writing of this study did not come about solely based on scientific interest. A concomitant aim was also to provide a tool to those politically active in the civil rights movement and other institutions and individuals critical of antigypsyism, along with critical and reflective journalists in particular. That tool would hopefully permit them to better analyze and critique antigypsyist elements in media productions or—even better—to be able in advance to avoid such elements. Journalists often feel especially uncertain when working on these thematic areas and wish for information that goes further and more multilayered arguments. We can only hope that this study will also be an aid at work for those professionals creating reports in the media and that it can serve as a further basis for decisions in their work.

We live in a society in which antigypsyism continues to be present in all social strata, age groups and professions, a society in which antigypsyist representations are more the rule than the exception, and antigypsyist patterns of perception are more the prevailing consensus than something exceptional, and a society in which according to various surveys about half of the population openly supports antigypsyist statements.⁵⁷ In such a society, we must proceed on the assumption that no explicit conscious decision is necessary in order to communicate antigypsyism. On the contrary: in such a context, there is need for a deliberate intentional decision to reflect on and interrogate thought patterns, ways of perception and images of the world, both those coming in from the outside and one's own often deeply ingrained conceptions in order to avoid antigypsyist stereotyping.

The insight that racism and prejudices are not phenomena exclusively lurking on some 'rightwing periphery' of the society, however defined, is in the meantime a view shared within broad segments of research on racism and prejudice.⁵⁸ Nonetheless, the reaction to criticism of antigypsyist ways

57 In the already cited representative survey on group-focused enmity 2014, 55.9% of those surveyed agreed with the statement "Sinti and Roma have a proclivity for crime." Cf. Oliver, Kiess, Brähler (2014). *Die stabilisierte Mitte*, p. 50.

58 See, for example, Andreas Zick, Beate Küpper, & Andreas Hövermann (2011). *Die Abwertung der Anderen. Eine europäischen Zustandsbeschreibung zu Intoleranz, Vorurteilen und Diskriminierung*. Berlin, p. 189: "Initially we can state fundamentally that something is happening in the countries investigated here that we have observed for a long time here in Germany: group-related animosity is not by any means a phenomenon found only among

of communicating is most often indignant denial, spurning any personal attachment to ‘racist rightwing’ ideas. Generally this indignation is based on the false belief that a person who is racist is well aware of that and advocates such views. More recent research on racism and prejudice, by contrast, has repeatedly pointed out that this is by no means the case. Thus, the Expert Commission on Antisemitism created by the German federal interior ministry states:

“It [Everyday antisemitism, M.E.] does not come from ‘antisemites’ but rather from ordinary people who subjectively are generally convinced that they are not antisemites, and who would indignantly reject any such corresponding imputations. Antisemitism cannot be clearly defined socially, regionally and ‘ethnically,’ culturally, religiously or politically. We can encounter it at the center of society as well as on its margins—independently from whether ‘center’ is defined in terms of sociology or politically.”⁵⁹

It is reasonable to assume that these attributes—presence in the ‘middle’ of society and the subjective conviction that one is not antisemitic—can also be applied to communication of antigypsyism in everyday life and the media. That does not mean that those who express antigypsyism bear no responsibility for their actions; nor does it mean that antigypsyism as a result is less dangerous. It only means that not every antigypsyist communication requires a willful conscious decision or points to the political ‘rightwing margins.’ For that reason, it would appear appropriate in the light of the present research findings not to be hasty in rejecting criticism of media productions. Rather, it is important to bear in mind that antigypsyist patterns of prejudice can exist in the ranks of one’s own editorial staff and even in one’s own mind, without this being at the level of subjective awareness or even deliberately intended. One conclusion for those active in the media as writers and producers could be: don’t reject possible criticism in a knee-jerk reaction, brushing it aside or even branding it as some sort of exaggerated political correctness. Rather, view it as an opportunity for reflection

marginal political groups; rather it exists right in the middle of society. By no means are prejudices found only in marginal groups; they also exist right in the middle of societies.”

59 Unabhängiger Expertenkreis Antisemitismus (2011). *Bericht des unabhängigen Expertenkreises Antisemitismus. Antisemitismus in Deutschland – Erscheinungsformen, Bedingungen, Präventionsansätze*. Bundestag, Printed matter 17/770, 10 November 2011, p. 64.

and self-reflection that can set in motion a process of learning and greater awareness. The detailed analysis undertaken here of the mechanisms and operating modes of the communication of antigypsyism in the media is intended to open up a possibility to initiate and support such processes of reflection.

List of the Mechanisms

In the course of the study, the theses posited initially were largely confirmed. Antigypsyism in the media consists not just of ascription of criminal behavior and is not based exclusively on employing the designation 'Gypsy.' Antigypsyism in the media likewise does not necessarily entail a negative representation. Even supposedly 'positive' representations can reproduce antigypsyist patterns as a form of philogypsyism. In addition, antigypsyism in the media more recently is generally not expressed openly but rather is encoded in a multitude of various ways.

It should be noted that the majority of the media mechanisms analyzed and criticized here are not specifically for the communication of antigypsyism. On the contrary: for the most part, these are common media practices that can be evaluated differently from context to context and topic to topic. None-theless, all these media mechanisms and operating modes contribute in the respective specific contexts to communicating or reproducing antigypsyism, or to rejecting or disguising responsibility for that. In this light, it is not the mechanisms as such that should be criticized but rather the mechanisms within their manner of employment as here analyzed, very specific and often supplementing one the other.

1. Stereotypical Selection of Images against the Backdrop of a Cultural Framework of Interpretation Shaped by Antigypsyism

The first mechanism to mention must be an extensive **stereotypical selection of images**. On various levels of production of media reports, images are selected in such a way that they reproduce existing stereotypes. This mechanism only becomes understandable in its full magnitude if the existing **antigypsyist framework of interpretation** in terms of which the

selection is made is taken into account. Speaking at a conference on the discrimination of Sinti and Roma in the media, the political scientist Peter Widmann commented:

“The corresponding stereotypes belong, like the antisemitic ones, to the cultural heritage of the European majority societies. In the form of corresponding figures from novels, operas and operettas, films and paintings, the conceptions became a solid component within the European cultures. Down to the present day, they are reflected on quite a number of labels for a grill sauce ‘Gypsy style’ on the shelves of supermarkets. [...] Whoever thinks nowadays about the relation between a ban on discrimination and media freedom has to look at the historical and social dimension in order to grasp the context of a media product.”⁶⁰

In other words: a feature on German Sinti who live in a caravan stands within a different cultural context from a program about German Sorbs who live in a caravan, although both groups have the same legal status

as national minorities. In this connection, it is irrelevant whether what is shown is a genuine picture of a segment of actual reality or a manipulated image. The selection of the images is influenced by a cultural framework of interpretation that is shaped by antigypsyist elements. On the other hand, a selection of imagery for reports on the topic “Sinti and Roma” must consciously reflect about such a framework of interpretation in order to prevent the reproduction of antigypsyist stereotypes. The analysis of the mechanism of image selection encompasses various aspects that in the following will be broken down once more into categories.



Source: 'Neuzeitliche' (2012): Sinti und Roma (00:59)

Another context: The ‘caravan’ as a visual stereotype can reproduce prejudices.

60 Peter Widmann (2010): Die diskrete Macht des Vorurteils – Bedeutung und Grenzen des Diskriminierungsverbots im Pressekodex. In: Zentralrat Deutscher Sinti und Roma, ed. *Diskriminierungsverbot*, pp. 37-41, here p. 40.

*a) Selection of Persons to be Portrayed or Topics Worth Being Reported on,
Focus on the Unusual*

The selection of persons to be portrayed or topics worthy of being reported on is already influenced by the cultural framework of interpretation shaped by antigypsyist elements. It is supplemented by a mechanism that Peter Widmann has called “**focus on the unusual, exotic and uncanny**”⁶¹ and was described by Patrik Ettinger in a contemporary study on reportage about Roma and Yenish in the Swiss media as “media logics such as conflict orientation or negativism.”⁶² The two mechanisms are so closely interwoven because the stereotypical image of ‘Roma’—as a negative spin-off from the we-image—contains precisely such supposedly exotic, conflict-ridden or uncanny features such as are demanded by the media logics of conflict orientation and/or negativism. Thus, the stereotypical image already provides a stimulus for a reportage that frequently concentrates on reporting on what is out of the ordinary or negative. Consequently, a ‘normal’ marriage between two Serbian Roma or two German Sinti down at city hall or in a church service, at which there are not an unusual number of guests arriving in ‘caravans,’ no exceptionally ‘archaic’ rituals are practiced or no unusually large amounts of pork are consumed, are precisely regarded as not suitable as material for a sensational reportage about a ‘Roma wedding’ or a ‘Sinti wedding.’ Likewise, a Romanian family from a Roma background enjoying a good relationship with its ‘German’ neighbors, separating out its garbage into different dumpsters and living inconspicuously, is only suitable for a portrait if an opposite stereotypical image of ‘Roma,’ producing piles of litter and rubbish is present in such a way that a ‘normal’ family appears ‘exotic.’ In such a case, it is selected in a sense over against the background of a stereotypical framework of interpretation and focus on the exceptional, but with the signs reversed: as the counter-example to existing

61 Ibid., p. 41.

62 Patrik Ettinger (2012). Berichterstattung über Roma in der Presse. *Tangram. Bulletin der Eidgenössischen Kommission gegen Rassismus*, no. 30, pp. 30-36, here p. 30. See also Bohn, Hamburger, & Rock (n.d.), Die Konstruktion der Differenz, pp. 15f., and Gilda Nancy Horvath (2013). Perception, Fortune-Tellers and Truth. Images of Roma in the Media in Between Majority Society and Self-Organization. In: IG Kultur Österreich, ed., *Romanistan is everywhere. Tracing Treacherous Terrain*. Vienna, pp. 36-39, here p. 37.

prejudices and as an exceptionally ‘normal’ ‘Roma family.’⁶³ That is why such a representation of ‘good examples’ in individual instances can even be perceived as a confirmation of the existing prejudices. That is to say: the selection of what is to be reported is already guided by the cultural framework of interpretation shaped by antigypsyist elements and the prime focus on what is exotic, exceptional and negative.

b) Selection of What is Filmed

The **stereotypical selection of images** is continued in the selection of what is filmed or photographed, and in the selection of what is included in the finished report or article. Here too, the selection of images is guided by the cultural framework of interpretation and a focus on the out-of-the-ordinary. This was exemplified in the feature *Junge Roma in Deutschland—Tradition ist alles!* (Young Roma in Germany—Tradition is Everything!) aired by the TV-channel Vox. The decision by the editors to foreground the events “buying a bride” and “test for virginity” in such a manner as happened can only be explained by the ‘knowledge’ in the cultural framework of reference about a supposed ‘archaic culture’ of the ‘Roma’ and the focus on what is unusual and exotic.

The concrete selection of the film material also is governed by these two mechanisms, as is made clear in particular by the shots that are used as background images for the voiceover explanations at the beginning of the program. The voiceover explains: “In Germany officially people say “Sinti and Roma.” The term “Gypsy” [*Zigeuner*] has been frowned on since the persecution by the Nazis. But part of the minority continues to refer to themselves as Gypsies. Derived from the Slavic word *cigáni*.”⁶⁴ The editorial team has full freedom during this explanation when it comes to the selection of the images; at the same time, these images, on the basis of the spoken text, explicitly provide a visual representation of ‘Sinti and Roma’ or ‘Gypsies.’

63 These are the prerequisites that make possible a documentary, for example, like *Die Insel*: Only if first of all, the stereotypical and negative image of a ‘problem house’ is firmly established can a program or feature that only presents ‘normality’ develop any kind of an impact in the media. Cf. Tamara Milosevic and Tanja Häring (2014). *Die Insel*. Report, WDR series *Hier und Heute*, 11 January 2014.

64 Julian Lerch, Sebastian Hampl, & Christoph Jens (2011). *Junge Roma in Deutschland – Tradition ist alles!* Joker Productions, VOX. First airing, 6 August 2011 [min. 4:08-4:28].

Consequently, this sequence contains numerous images that are meaningful only in a stereotypical framework of interpretation. Among the 18 shots, six focus on the faces of older women. All are wearing a brightly-colored head scarf, visible are gold jewelry, 'striking faces,' a missing tooth. By means of this striking selection of imagery, the antigypsyist image of the 'witchlike old Gypsy woman' is made visual reality. This does not mean to say that the women shown do not exist. The mechanism of stereotypical selection of images only describes how such a sequence can arise, where a third of the shots are focused on older women—and this although the program is entitled "Young Roma in Germany."

c) Recontextualization and Repetition

A special form of stereotypical image selection is operative when not only stereotypical scenes and images are selected but images are in addition also adapted through various mechanisms in order to generate the desired result. That was exemplified in analyzing how various TV news and documentary feature programs deal with images of litter and rubbish. The result desired was quite obviously to substantiate visually the statements by 'local residents' in all the reports that 'the Roma' were littering streets and houses with rubbish. To this end, in numerous programs, by means of the strategies of **recontextualization** or **repetition**, pictures of rubbish and trash were staged in such a way that visual 'proof' was presented.

Thus, to offer such evidence, pictures that were actually not suitable, showing garbage in dumpsters, pictures of overflowing trash bins or of a minimal amount of rubbish and litter in public space were in a sequence together with pictures of large piles of bulk household rubbish and discarded furniture and appliances, thus underlining the impression of littering. In several programs, one and the same pile of rubbish was shown from various angles in order to increase the impression of the presence of litter. In at least three instances, archival photos of garbage were clipped into daily reportage where the camera team was actually on location; this created the impression that the garbage shown had been there at the time the team was shooting, even though in the most drastic case, the rubbish so staged was 14 months

old. Such strategies of recontextualization and repetition are mechanisms that can even strengthen the mechanism of a stereotypical image selection—here shown by the example of rubbish as evidence for ‘dirty’ and ‘primitive’ ‘Roma.’

2. The Word ‘Gypsy’ as a Metaphor

Just how present and operative the cultural framework of interpretation shaped by antigypsyist elements is can also be made clear by looking at **how the word ‘Gypsy’ is employed as a metaphor.** Such a manner of employment of the term can be demonstrated to exist in numerous articles in the nation-wide press. The word ‘Gypsy’ is used in such a way that it must be ruled out that the intended reference is to real individuals. Instead the signifier has the sole task of invoking the stereotypical semantic content associated with the word. Thus, for example, the Swedish table tennis player Jörgen Persson was referred to in the *FAZ* as “table tennis Gypsy” (“*Tischtenniszigeuner*”) in order to express that he has travelled around a great deal.⁶⁵ The meaning of the lexeme ‘Gypsy’ here is totally detached from a real existing ‘ethnic’ or national minority. The signifier stands solely as a metaphor for ‘roving,’ ‘vagabonding’ or being ‘frequently on a trip.’ Such usage provides further evidence that the lexeme “Gypsy” is not a ‘neutral’ term but rather is inseparably interwoven with antigypsyist attributions.⁶⁶ Such uses could be demonstrated both in the editor’s passages in the articles and also in statements by interviewees. They reveal a striking lack of sensitivity for antigypsyism.

The employment of the lexeme ‘Gypsy’ as metaphor simultaneously has a journalistic ‘added value.’ Once again it consists in invoking what is unusual and exotic. That can also be seen in the fact that the metaphorical



Staging of ‘littering’ by the recontextualization of familiar images.

Source: Neumann, B./Kathage-Milonga, A. (2012). Schwereck: Integration Report. *WZL/WDR*, 14 October 2012 [00:43]

65 Peter Hess (2012). Alter Schwede! Der 45 Jahre alte Jörgen Persson schafft es, dem Chinesen Ma Lin Druck zu machen. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 27 March 2012, p. 23. Accessible online: <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/sport/mehr-sport/tischtennis-wm-alter-schwede-11699446.html> (accessed 28 April 2015).

66 Cf. Alexandra Bartels (2013). Antiziganismus benennen. Zur sprachlichen Diskriminierung durch das ‚Zigeuner‘-Wort. In: idem, Borcke, End, & Friedrich (2013). *Antiziganistische Zustände 2*, pp. 20-38.

use appears over-proportionately in headlines, as a narrative framework, as subheading or subtitle and in the introductory part of the articles examined. By analyzing this manner of use, it becomes clear how the traditional ‘Gypsy’ images can be reproduced even though the lexeme is not being used as a stigmatizing signifier for real individuals in these concrete instances.

3. Image Identification

Discursive ‘Roma’ images or representations function not only to transmit the stereotypical semantic content but are frequently also used in precisely the reverse way. Thus they already presuppose a certain stereotypical knowledge. The stereotypes represented then invoke by visual stimulus this previous knowledge and at the same time confirm it. This process of **image identification** can be illustrated ideal-typically in an edition of the program *RBB-Abendschau* on 22 June 2011. Precisely during the first mention of the word “Roma“ in voiceover, a cut appears on the visual level and the camera gives a close-up of a rose- and purple-colored cloth item hanging out of a window.⁶⁷ Whether this is a long brightly-colored skirt, as a cliché-ridden first glance seems to perceive, or whether this is a curtain or bedspread, as a second more precise look suggests, remains unclear and is of secondary importance.

It is clear that the cut in combination with the zoom-in focused on the cloth item constitutes a visual marking of the discursively named “Roma and Sinti from Romania and Bulgaria.”⁶⁸ The mechanism of image identification is thus meant to undergird the linguistic information ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma’ on a visual level, where it is not absolutely necessary that spoken text and image fall together in simultaneity as in the above example. However, this mechanism depends on the stereotypical ‘knowledge’ about ‘Roma’ being common knowledge, because otherwise the image identification will not be understood by the viewing audience.

67 Katalin Ambrus (2011). Title unknown (Roma). Program feature, *Berliner Abendschau*, RBB, 22 June 2011 [min. 00:42-00:50].

68 Ibid.

A video short for the *ZDF-Morgenmagazin* on the topic “poverty migration” contains two shots that seek to create an image identification on a visual level. In both shots a number of people are visible.⁶⁹ Who is meant or what person is functioning here as a visual representation of ‘Roma’ can only be understood through the activity of begging, which in each case only one of the persons visible is engaging in. If the stereotypical prior knowledge about ‘Roma beggars’ were not familiar from the cultural framework of interpretation, the two beggars could not function as an image identification for ‘Roma.’ The recourse to the cultural framework of interpretation is thus the prerequisite for the image identification, which on the other hand in turn can strengthen the framework of interpretation. In present-day television reportage, along with well-established stereotypes such as caravans and begging, there are often images of women with children, dressed in brightly-colored head scarfs and skirts, wash drying out on the line on balconies or hanging from clotheslines, as well as images of rubbish and litter as visual representations of ‘Roma’ that create an image identification.



Image identification for ‚Roma and Sinti‘.

Source: Ambros (2011): Unbekannter Titel [00:07]



At VOX as well, representations of begging persons function as a code symbol for Roma.

Source: Leich/ Hampf/ Jost (2011): Judge Roma in Deutschland [01:46]

4. Thematizing Persons Who are not Thematized

A frequently employed specific form of camera work springs from the mechanism of image identification. Pictures of individuals can be broken down roughly into two categories, depending on whether or not the camera

69 Jochen Klug (2013). Armutszuwanderung steigt drastisch. Report, *ZDF-Morgenmagazin*, 20 February 2013 [min. 01:50-01:55].

work, by means of zoom-in, panning shot, focus shot or the like, thematizes the persons shown, i.e. explicitly focuses on them or not. On the one hand, photos of passers-by in numerous news reports serve as background images. These persons are in a sense only accessories, not the topic under focus, and thus are not explicitly thematized by the camera. On the other, when individual persons are thematized, focused on or followed by the camera, then in most cases it is because they play a role in the respective report: as persons who are being reported on, as later interviewees who will appear, etc.

The camera work in regard to ‘Roma’ as staged or foregrounded persons often deviates in the reports examined from this clear dichotomization. In numerous cases there is a focus here on individual persons, captured by zoom-in or followed on camera, although they have no relevance for the reportage except that they are considered to be ‘Roma’ by the program. This **camera work thematizing persons who are**

not thematized corresponds here to the mechanism of image identification. The individuals shown are explicitly thematized, not because of their individual person but as a representation of ‘Roma.’ They function for image identification of ‘Roma’ and thus are not filmed as individuals but in a certain sense as ‘examples’ of another ‘species,’ namely the ‘Roma.’

This form of camera work is exemplified in a reportage for the *RBB-Abendschau*, 22 June 2011.⁷⁰ A very long shot in which we can see a five-storey building from the opposite side of the street is followed in the next take by the medium long shot of a woman walking with two children in hand on the pathway in front of the building.⁷¹ Since

Source: Herr, Alpha (2011): Verein Humanitas und die Genesungstätigkeit. Report for *Berliner Abendschau*, RBB, 20 September 2011 [00:15]



Secret photos: Image identification by means of a hidden camera.

Source: Anhorn (2011): *Abendschau* [00:55]



The three persons left of the tree are focused on in the next shot.

this woman can already be recognized in the very long shot, she was evidently filmed from the other side of the street from behind. This passer-by was filmed and shown in the reportage because she was externally identified by the film team as a ‘Romanian Romni.’ She has no function in the reportage as a person, she is only staged here as a representation of ‘Roma.’

Most such representations evince typical visual stereotypes connected with behavior that is deemed deviant or incompatible with the norm. Thus, for example, individuals with ‘shabby clothing,’⁷² women with ‘many children’ and in ‘long skirts,’ ‘beggars’ or ‘musicians’ are selected as representations of ‘Roma.’

5. Camera Techniques

Along with a content-focused connection between the ‘Roma’ representations and behavior deviating from the norm, there are other mechanisms that strengthen the perception of ‘Roma’ as ‘threatening’ and ‘alien.’ **Camera settings that promote the production of alienness** and imply that the persons shown are criminal and threatening contribute in particular to this. One such technique is to photograph persons from a great distance, suggesting it is dangerous to come any closer. Another is to show persons whose identity has been concealed by making them unrecognizable, who consequently were filmed against their will; or employing a hidden camera, likewise a technique used to film what is forbidden or secret. In the coverage dealing with ‘poverty migrants’/‘Roma’ analyzed here, such techniques and methods were used on a regular basis to draw attention to ‘Roma.’ Thus, people here are not only marked as ‘Roma’ by showing features ‘typical’ of ‘Roma,’ but also associated with crime and staged as a threat by means of special camera settings.

In a short video shown in the talk show *Menschen bei Maischberger*, there were several of these distancing camera settings.⁷³ In those scenes, the individuals shown are marked as ‘poverty migrants’/‘Roma’ by the voiceover

70 Ambrus (2011). Roma [min. 00:53-00:57].

71 Ibid. [00:57-00:59].

72 Cf. Aschauer (2010). Wer ist Roma?, pp. 62-67.

73 “Menschen bei Maischberger” (2013): Die Armutseinwanderer: Ist Deutschland überfordert? Reportage, 26 February 2013 [min. 32:40-33:10]. Accessible online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nolfo0_Jfc (accessed 24 April 2015).

spoken by Maischberger⁷⁴ and by features such as ‘poor shabby clothing.’ In the case of several settings, one can see that the camera was positioned at quite some distance; in one instance, this is even emphasized by the camera disappearing from the picture by means of a tracking shot. Cars and lamp posts that partially conceal the image indicate that it was not possible to assume an ideal camera position without leaving the ‘secure cover.’ The camera techniques mentioned above—such as emphasis on a great distance, making faces unrecognizable or a ‘hidden camera’—are familiar to viewers of reportage on criminal, forbidden or dangerous

events. Thus, they produce an association of ‘Roma’ with the topics ‘typical’ for these camera techniques: crime and threat. In that respect, they are suitable for strengthening and consolidating already existing stereotypes of ‘Roma as criminals’ on a subtle level.

A brief summary of the results shown until now:

Almost all the analyzed reportages or documentaries on the level of image show elements of the mechanisms analyzed in points 1, 3, 4 and 5. By means of specific image selection, guided by a quest for stereotypes and a focus on the unusual and exotic, strengthened by camera techniques generating an impression of alienness, a stereotypical media representation of ‘Roma’ is created that stands in contrast with the diversity of individual life situations, attitudes and personal life projects of real existing Sinti or Roma. At the same time, such media images function to reinforce existing stereotypical perceptions of ‘Roma.’ In this way, they provoke, promote or legitimate indirect discriminatory behavior toward Roma, Sinti or other groups or individuals stigmatized as ‘Gypsies.’



Criminological methods against littering.

Source: Neuhans / Karlsruhe-Magde (2012): Schwärzige Inszenierung (01:40)

74 He says: “Many of them are Roma.” Ibid. [min. 32:52].

6. Generalizations

In particular in those reports and documentaries that seek to inform and enlighten viewers about the ‘culture’ and ‘style of life’ of ‘Roma,’ a further mechanism is operative. It serves to further intensify the mechanisms of the selection of those persons to be portrayed guided by stereotypical pre-assumptions and the search for the exotic. In the two analyzed documentaries—the Vox reportage *Junge Roma in Deutschland – Tradition ist alles!* and *Sinti und Roma* in the ARD magazine for children *Neuneinhalb*—which each provide a portrait of one or two families, **generalizations** are explicitly made that are totally inappropriate. Cultural tradition, language, concepts of identity or political orientation among various Roma or Sinti groups can show significant variation, as well as among groups in the German majority society. The life situations, attitudes and personal life projects of individual members of the Sinti and Roma groups are also just as variegated and heterogeneous as those of non-Roma and non-Sinti.

Generalization is one of the mechanisms whose genesis can partially be understood based on the conditions operative in journalism and the media. It goes without saying that no single article or reportage can in itself depict an appropriate spectrum. It is also a correct observation, as Widmann commented, that “a short report coming under ‘miscellaneous matters’ [...] cannot be an ethnological seminar.”⁷⁵ Nonetheless, those absolutely undifferentiated generalizations that can be found in media reportage on ‘Roma’ must be clearly rejected, since they support the homogenizing perception of a group, where the members in the group are not seen as individuals with their own very different characteristics and attributes but rather are reduced solely to their being ‘Roma.’

The very titles of the reportages examined here make it clear right from the start that no differentiation was planned. They are entitled *Junge Roma in Deutschland – Tradition ist alles!* (Young Roma in Germany – Tradition is everything!), although the documentary deals only peripherally with the specific situation of teens and young adults, or bear just a general title like

75 Widmann (2010). Die diskrete Macht des Vorurteils, p. 39.

Sinti und Roma. They explicitly claim to be presenting very large groups even though only a few individuals or several families are portrayed. Already at the beginning of the reportage in *Neuneinhalb*, where a 16-year-old girl is accompanied by the camera team, the moderator Malin says: “[...] what this is about is the Sinti and Roma people. And what they have to say about it, that is what I want to find out today.” What “the” “Sinti and Roma” say, do or are cannot be discovered by sketching a portrait of one teenager and her family.

While the reportage in *Neuneinhalb* mostly deals quite carefully with such generalizations, in the *Vox* documentary there are repeated statements like “Buying of the bride is considered to be contrary to customs today in Germany. But among Roma it is an integral component of tradition that they don’t wish to give up.”⁷⁶ It is highly doubtful whether this is an accurate statement about “young Roma in Germany” or even Roma in general.

In particular, generalizing from the cultural practices of two specific families about the characteristics of “the” Roma must be questioned. In addition, there is no reflection about a possible ethnicization of social relations. As Widmann stresses in respect to a similar reportage,⁷⁷ it would be appropriate, for example, in the case at hand to research whether the practices shown are specific to Roma in the homeland areas of the families portrayed, or whether they are perhaps bound up with a rural-traditionalist social structure or a specific religious interpretation.

Both reportages thus contain generalizations of actually existing attributes that are highlighted here by a process of pre-selection. It is important at this point to turn our attention to the partially complex relation between cultural traditions and antigypsyist stereotypes. It is quite possible for certain attributes, such as a musical tradition, to exist as the cultural features of certain groups and at the same time to be part of racist attributions. Homogenizing and essentializing statements must be distinguished from differentiating descriptions. Various different questions can serve as an aid to orientation: is musicality described as something inherited, in the

76 Lerch, Hampl, & Jens (2011). Junge Roma in Deutschland [min. 29:40-29:49].

77 Widmann (2010). Die diskrete Macht des Vorurteils, p. 39.

blood, in the DNA or as the veritable essence of being ‘Roma’? Is there any reference to other traditions as well? Are there also reports about persons who are not musical? Are statements about musical traditions linked with other antigypsyist attributions, such as ‘spontaneity’ (‘playing without notes’), ‘primitiveness,’ ‘living at others’ expense,’ or ‘lust for life’?

It is important here not to confuse the media mechanism of generalization with the formation of prejudice itself. The wellspring of prejudice does *not* lie in falsely generalized but actually existing qualities. Rather, it lies in the projection of socially undesirable characteristics onto a supposed alien group.⁷⁸ The statements made in the reportages can accordingly only be generalized using the media mechanism because the prejudice in principle already exists; consequently, the recipients already have a pre-knowledge, a readiness to believe the generalization. Even if a concrete stereotype should be unknown, knowledge about the ‘otherness’ of the targeted group is the basic prerequisite for a generalization: “Nonetheless, the reader probably would encounter such generalizations more rarely in reports involving the members of one’s own group, of the majority society.”⁷⁹

The ascribed attributes must also seem in some way ‘strange,’ ‘alien’ or ‘exotic.’ The opposite would not work. If an academically successful Romni were portrayed and the reportage were to state implicitly or explicitly that the reading of books was a typical ‘Roma’ attribute, this would clash with the existing cultural framework of interpretation shaped by antigypsyist elements; the generalization activated through the media would be incompatible with the antigypsyist prejudices of the recipients and the communication of the generalization would fail.

7. Deviation from the ‘Normal’ Individual

The tendency toward this generalization is bound up with the ethnocentric basic position of media reporting in Germany. From the vantage point of such a positioning, one’s own majority society’s cultural framework is

78 See fn. 37.

79 Widmann (2010). *Die diskrete Macht des Vorurteils*, p. 39.

set as ‘normality’ and goes unquestioned. In this framework, purported ‘strangers’ or ‘outsiders’ are reduced to possible ‘deviations’ and these at the same time are generalized. In order for such supposed deviations to be made visible in the media, in numerous media reports **members of the majority society function as ‘normal’ people**. Their role within the media narrative is to mark ‘deviant behavior’ by an implicit or explicit reference to their own ‘normal’ person or to comment, for example, by expressing astonishment or embarrassment.

In the following dialogue, the moderator Malin represents this norming position of the majority society.⁸⁰ In response to the question about “rules that are only valid in your group,” Gina, the teenager from a Sinti background answers: “boys simply are allowed to do a lot more. It’s simply a whole lot more [...] They don’t have as many prohibitions as the gals.” Instead of responding “crazy, but that’s exactly the same in the German majority society!,” Malin represents the position of equal rights—fundamentally to be endorsed—and inquires empathetically: “What do you think of that?” Gina evidently feels pressured to defend this: “Sure, it’s not just, but . . . that’s just the way it is . . .” To which Malin, slightly saddened, replies: “Well, so for you, like it’s OK?” Gina answers: “Well, that’s the way I was brought up.” This is followed by three seconds of silence.

In this innocuous dialogue, it becomes clear how simply through the questions in response from the moderator, an implicit norm is created (in this case equal rights), to which Gina has to justify herself. The fact that in the majority society this also has not become the widespread practice either is totally ignored. That boys are allowed to do more than girls is thus implicitly declared to be a specific cultural feature of Sinti and Roma.

This marking becomes even stronger when it is expressed by an individual person who is part of the ‘alien’ group but who has ‘managed’ to ‘opt out,’ i.e. to live ‘according to the norm’ against the tradition. Many such statements can be found especially in the *Vox* documentary *Junge Roma in Deutschland*. Both the musician Joey Kelly, who at the start of the documentary is reported

80 “Neuneinhalb“ (2012): Sinti und Roma. ARD reportage, 7 April 2012 [min. 06:00-06:37].

to have grown up “with Roma,” and also the older sister of the Romani girl portrayed, Adelika Selimovic, are staged in this role of ‘chief witness.’ The voiceover commentary attests that Selimovic appears “with her permanent regular job to have integrated better into German society” and she “deals more critically with the Roma traditions.”⁸¹ She is presented in this way as a positive counter-image to her sister Djuliana Selimovic.⁸² In the course of the reportage, Kelly gets the chance to give his opinion about the so-called ‘virginity test’: “It’s insanity, here today in Germany, in Europe,” it is not necessary, and “in no case” would he do that with his own children.⁸³



Kelly “grew up together with Roma” and thus functions as a kind of ‘chief witness.’

Source: Lerch/ Hampl/ Jens (2011): Junge Roma in Deutschland [88:44-89:11]

A further purpose becomes clear in connection with this statement, an aim fulfilled by this marking of difference via ‘normal’ individuals: it makes it possible for journalists to occupy positions within media products without formulating them in the framework of the actual editorial sections. In this way, neutrality can be maintained and at the same time the responsibility for statements that possibly could be criticized can be passed on to another. Such a brusque assessment as the word “insanity,” for example, if expressed by an editor, would be subjected to strong criticism. But if by contrast it is stated by an interviewee, it only appears as an expression of a personal opinion. By marking such a person as representative of the majority society, such a statement achieves a powerful norming function, and the criticized characteristic or way of behavior is at the same time marked as something ‘alien.’ Likewise in reportages that focus on ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants,’ criticism and rejection are generally expressed by interviewees, who are marked in this context as being ‘normal’ persons.

81 Lerch, Hampl, & Jens (2011): Junge Roma in Deutschland [23:00-23:13].

82 At the same time, through these sentences, the “permanent regular job” is assigned to and associated with “German society” and contrasted with ‘Roma tradition.’

83 Lerch, Hampl, & Jens (2011). Junge Roma in Deutschland [min. 88:44-89:11; 91:37-91:54].

In these cases, the claim to be allowed to set the norm is frequently validated by an explicit reference to one's own conformity with the norm. Thus, for example, 'local residents' repeatedly state how long they have been living in a certain quarter of town or how regularly they pay their taxes. Through such statements, the norm is upheld, while on the other hand, the subsequent criticism of the 'outsider aliens' is supported, of whom it is implicitly claimed that they do not share these specific attributes.

8. Ethnicizing Representation of Social Processes

The thread of an **ethnicizing representation of social processes** runs through the entire current coverage on 'Roma'/'poverty migrants'.⁸⁴ The entire topos of a 'poverty migration' is being made a topic of discussion solely in regard to the 'ethnic' group of the 'Roma.' The terms 'Roma' and 'poverty migrant' are generally used as synonyms in this coverage.⁸⁵ In part, even all migrants from Romania and Bulgaria are identified as 'Roma.' Thus, the moderator of the ZDF *Morgenmagazin*, Wulf Schmiese, refers to statistics presented earlier during the show in a short video, there with the heading "migration from Bulgaria and Romania,"⁸⁶ and states: "In the last five years, we just heard the figures in the report, the number of Roma here in the country has doubled [...]."⁸⁷ In this manner, without further ado, the migration from Romania and Bulgaria is ethnicized.⁸⁸

However, this equating of 'Roma' and 'poverty migrants' is not only limited to discursive fine points. The entire reportage equates these two terms. In talk shows on the topic of 'poverty migration' from Bulgaria and Romania, such as *Maybrit Illner*⁸⁹ or *Menschen bei Maischberger*,⁹⁰ a German

84 On this, see also Bodrogi (2012). "Gypsy" stereotyping in the media, pp. 3f.

85 Cf. likewise Graevskaia (2013). "Die machen unser schönes Viertel kaputt!," p. 106.

86 Klug (2013). Armutszuwanderung steigt drastisch [min. 00:28-00:41].

87 Markus Löning (2013). "Armutszuwanderung nicht unlösbar". Interview with Wulf Schmiese. In: ZDF-*Morgenmagazin*, 20 February 2013 [min. 01:00-01:11].

88 This equating of the two was frequently criticized in the debate that erupted in early 2014 over the slogan of the CSU "Whoever cheats must leave" ("*Wer betrügt, der fliegt*") (see CSU-Landesgruppe im Deutschen Bundestag (2014). Beschluss der Klausurtagung, p. 3). Generally there the reference was to qualified immigrants from Romania and Bulgaria; however, it was admitted at the same time that there were 'problems' with a small group. In labelling this group and its 'problems,' the above described equating of 'poverty migrants' and 'Roma' was often reproduced.

Rom with roots in Kosovo and a German Sinti woman are invited, both of whom have no special relation with Bulgaria or Romania. In these talk shows as in numerous other programs, the social phenomenon of a supposed ‘poverty migration’ is equated with a purported ‘Roma migration.’ This equation is both reproduced there and is also presupposed as common knowledge. Numerous reportages and documentaries are not fully comprehensible without the ‘knowledge’ of this equating of ‘poverty migration’ and the ‘Roma.’ Thus, a reportage in the rubric *Heute – in Deutschland* in the ZDF online video portal is entitled “Sinti und Roma,”⁹¹ although the words “Sinti” and “Roma” do not appear anywhere in the report, with the exception of the designation of the institutional affiliation of one interviewee. The connection between the title and the topic dealt with in the program, in this case the influx of Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants to Duisburg, is presupposed as presumed ‘common knowledge’ among the viewers.



Ethnicizing representation of social relations. Pictures of refugees from Serbia are supposed to provide images for ‘poverty migration’ from Bulgaria and Romania.

9. Reduction to Being ‘Roma’

In such a perspective, ‘Roma’ are not conceded any other attribute except that of being ‘Roma.’ It plays no role whether they are politically on the left or the right, whether they are traditional-minded and conservative or liberal, whether they are family persons or oriented to a career. Rather, in reportage there is an implicit negation of the notion that ‘Roma’ could have certain attributes that go beyond just being ‘Roma.’ This was exemplified in

89 “Maybrit Illner” (2013). Elend dort, Angst hier – kommen jetzt die Armen aus Osteuropa? *ZDF Talkshow*, 28 February 2013. See also “Maybrit Illner” (2014). Armut auf Wanderschaft. Wie viel Freizügigkeit können wir uns leisten? *ZDF Talkshow*, 16 January 2014. Accessible online: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zjEka3RMgYg> (accessed 24 April 2015).

90 “Menschen bei Maischberger” (2013). Die Armutseinswanderer.

91 ZDF.de (2012): Sinti und Roma. Accessible online: <http://www.zdf.de/ZDFmediathek/beitrag/video/1736038/Sinti-und-Roma-#/beitrag/video/1736038/Sinti-und-Roma-> (accessed 22 Oct. 2012).

reporting on ‘Roma’ in the Camp of the anti-capitalist Occupy movement in Frankfurt am Main in 2012. Without any other additional information, it was possible to declare that the presence of ‘Roma’ or in individual cases of ‘members of national minorities’ was proof that the Camp had lost its political character. This was even mentioned in the press release of the Administrative Court as one of the reasons why the camp could no longer be allowed to continue.⁹² It was ruled out a priori that there could be Roma critical of capitalism who had joined the camp out of political conviction. The newspaper *Bild* even commented as follows in its online reports on a photo where persons can be seen who are leaving the Camp: “So these people are supposed to be critics of capitalism”⁹³ Since those shown are marked as ‘Roma,’ it appeared inconceivable to the editors they could espouse anti-capitalist views.

This reduction is also very apparent in reportage on the so-called ‘poverty migration.’ Only very rarely is any distinction made between ‘Roma’ of different nationalities, for example, or from different social strata. Such an imprecise use of the word can often also be found in reportage that otherwise is differentiated and reflective. The caption for a photo in an article in the online reportage offerings of the *Deutsche Welle*, dealing with the debate on ‘poverty migration,’ reads, for example: “Roma in Duisburg-Rheinhausen.”⁹⁴ Information that would have been relevant for the article, such as whether the individuals shown there are German or foreign citizens, university graduates or low-skilled, persons who complain about ‘poverty migration’ or those about whose migration there are complaints, is not given. The term ‘Roma’ would appear to say it all.

92 Verwaltungsgericht Frankfurt am Main (2012). Verwaltungsgericht Frankfurt am Main lehnt Eilantrag von Occupy ab [Administrative Court Frankfurt a. M. rejects emergency appeal by Occupy]. Press release No. 07/2012, 6 August 2012. Accessible online: <http://goo.gl/wtDyDN> (accessed 15 Jan. 2013).

93 Wer hat sich denn da alles eingenistet? (2012). In: Online, *Bild*, 6 August 2012. Accessible online: <http://www.bild.de/geld/wirtschaft/occupy-bewegung/polizei-raeumt-occupy-camp-25519156.bild.html> (accessed 15 Jan. 2013).

94 Sabine Kinkartz (2014). Armutszuwanderung: Merkel beendet Koalitionszwist. In: Online programme, Deutsche Welle, 3 January 2014, Accessible online: <http://dw.de/p/1AkrT> (3 Jan. 2014). The caption was changed in the meantime after a critical response into “EU migrants in Duisburg-Rheinhausen.” See *ibid.* In: Online programme, Deutsche Welle, 3 Jan. 2014. Accessible online: <http://dw.de/p/1AkrT> (accessed 10 April 2014).

10. Explicit Attributions

The mentioning that the persons involved are ‘Roma’ and nothing else means at the same time that they are ascribed various attributes from the structure of meaning of antigypsyism depending on context. Within a number of debates, these ascriptions are made explicitly, in others they only occur implicitly (see below). **Explicit attributions** were found in the coverage of ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants’ and in the documentaries that aim to describe the ‘culture.’ Striking there is that in the descriptions of ‘culture,’ a distinction is made between obvious prejudices and putative cultural traditions. While in both documentaries examined, an attempt is made to interrogate evident prejudices (see Point 12), at the same time, by means of the mechanism of generalization, ascriptions are made that likewise spring from a tradition of antigypsyism. Thus, in the documentary *Junge Roma in Deutschland – Tradition ist alles!*, there is explicit discussion of the prejudice of ‘criminality’ in order to interrogate it; on the other hand, purported cultural traditions are labeled ‘archaic’ without any concomitant reflection on their stereotypical content, thus reinforcing prejudices.

While descriptions of cultural difference in reportages about ‘Roma culture’ are usually communicated by the portrayed Roma and Sinti themselves, in the current coverage on ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants,’ the attributions of cultural ‘alienness’ are presented both by interviewees and also in voiceover commentaries. Thus, in an edition of the *RBB Abendschau*, 22 July 2011, we are told: “At Schöneberger Ufer two cultures collide. Several Roma extended families, door to door with good middle-class condos.”⁹⁵ The collision between the cultures is manifested according to this documentary and in several other cases in complaints about too much noise, a lack of cleanliness and loud behavior. The situation could stand as an exemplary example of neighborly disputes among ‘Germans,’ but in this case is presented as an unbridgeable difference in culture. In this way, ‘noise,’ ‘trash,’ and ‘swearing and vulgar behavior’ are stylized as a cultural attribute of ‘Roma extended families.’

95 Ambrus (2011). Roma [min. 00:48-00:58].

In the case of police press releases between 2010 and 2014 explicit antigypsyist ascriptions are an exception. Nonetheless, two cases were documented. A joint press release of the State Prosecutor's Office Stuttgart and the Police Directorate Ludwigsburg dated 16 December 2011⁹⁶ states that the "commission of crimes of theft of any kind" is perceived among "Kalderashi"⁹⁷ as a "natural and valuable form of work," and that "young children" were already trained "by their parents and grandparents" to engage in theft. The text thus suggests that the tendency toward theft was part of the 'culture' of the 'Kalderashi.' This statement is supplemented by a reference to its being rooted in the Indian "caste system."

On 1 July 2013, the police headquarters in Lüneburg published a report on a specific way of theft by trickery, called the "Budscho" phenomenon by the police. After a description of the progression of events in the crime and the suspects, the following explanation can be found under the subheading "Background Information": "In the Roma language, 'Budscho' means 'bag,' 'handbag,' 'bundle,' and denotes a modus operandi that nearly all Roma women living according to tradition have mastered as an operating procedure."⁹⁸ No further commentary is necessary here.

Such explicit and essentializing attributions of 'criminality' can scarcely be found in the decade after 2010 in police press releases as well as other reports, aside from in certain rightwing publications. Instead, other forms of explicit and implicit ascriptions of antigypsyist stereotypes are practiced.

a) Attributions through the Frame Narrative

The references to 'opposed' cultures and the explicit ascriptions of 'litter and rubbish,' 'noise,' 'lack of hygiene,' 'abuse of social welfare' and 'theft' are similarly expressed very openly both by interviewees and in voiceover

96 Polizeidirektion Ludwigsburg (2011). Organisierter Taschendiebstahl: Kriminalpolizei Ludwigsburg führt bundesweites Ermittlungsverfahren – Neun Tatverdächtige in Haft. Joint press release, State Prosecutor's Office Stuttgart and Police Directorate Ludwigsburg, 16 December 2011.

97 "Kalderashi" is a designation for one of the largest Roma groups.

98 Polizeiinspektion Lüneburg (2013). "miese Betrugsmasche" – Täterduo erlangt mehrere tausend Euro Bargeld einer jungen Lüneburgerin – Polizei warnt vor sog. "Budscho-Phänomen". Press release, 1 July 2013. Accessible online: <http://goo.gl/wEKpa5> (accessed 24 April 2015).

commentary. The articles and documentaries of current reportage on ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants’ examined in this study follow a relatively rigid narrative pattern, containing in a one-dimensional and ethnicizing manner the two following statements that build one on the other: “Roma are a problem” and “Local residents/Germans are the victims of the Roma.” In the debate in 2012/13 on ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants,’ the narrative was generally expanded by one more statement: “The state is powerless.” An extremely incisive summary of the narrative is contained in a moderator’s introduction for the RBB *Abendschau*: “Everywhere a lot of Roma appear, there are problems and no solutions.”⁹⁹

The differences between the individual reportages and articles in respect to this narrative reside largely in nuances. The basic narrative structure is almost never breached. The first two statements in particular are found even in articles and reportages that do not rigidly essentialize the purported ‘attributes’ of the ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants’ but rather look in social-historical terms for explanations. Even when a connection is forged to economic insecurity or discrimination, the ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants’ nonetheless remain in the narrative position of those who represent a ‘problem’ for the ‘local residents,’ who appear as those affected by this ‘problem.’ The frequent statement added, namely that the state is powerless, increases the explosive character of this ‘problem’ in that for the German ‘local residents,’ the narration provides only two forms of a solution. One is: ‘give up,’ ‘flee’ or accept their fate. At the end of the narrative, these options constitute a kind of indictment against ‘politics’ as such, and many

Duisburger Roma-Haus irger



nd das Problemhaus in Duisburg, nachdem Anwohner von Unt
Foto: Ai

olizei hat am Freitagabend das Roma-Haus im Stadtte
hatten sich mehrere Personen versteckt, die Besuche

In the paper WAZ, the terms “Roma house” and “problem house” are used interchangeably.

Source: Richter, Thomas (2013). Polizei-Einsatz – Polizei räumt Duisburger Roma-Haus nach Angriff auf Richter. In: Online programme: WZL 24 August 2013. Accessed online <http://www.dresdener.de/nachrichten/duisburg-polizei-rueumt-duk-burger-roma-haus-nach-angriff-auf-richter-188754175.html> (accessed 14 Feb. 2016).

99 “Abendschau” (2011). Edition, *Berliner Abendschau*, RBB, 22 July 2011.

'local residents' feel the state has left them abandoned and alone in the face of the 'problem.' The other frequently mentioned solution is that the 'local residents' could take matters into their own hands. The resultant threat of 'vigilante justice' is explicitly rejected in all statements communicated by the media, but at the same time, it is declared by the narrative structure to be a form of 'emergency self-defense,' and thus implicitly suggested to be a legitimate form of action: Erjavec draws a very similar conclusion in her analysis of the media coverage about an occurrence in Slovenia: "The dominant majority population was not only depicted as the actor, but was also shown to act in self-defence in a very deliberate and determinate way."¹⁰⁰

b) Who is Talking?

In order to guarantee this narrative and the associated ascriptions, there is recourse to many of the mechanisms described above. In addition, it is quite evident that the possibility to speak in these articles, reportages and documentaries is very unequally distributed. People marked as 'Roma'/'poverty migrants' rarely have a voice. If nonetheless they are interviewed, then it is almost never about the social problems discussed and ethnicized (such as 'littering and trash,' etc.).

'Roma' are thus not asked about their views regarding conflicts about 'trash and garbage,' 'cleanliness' or 'noise.'¹⁰¹ The conflicts that are often the occasion for a report are one-sidedly and almost exclusively described solely by the 'local residents.' Many of them very often raise their voices and can present their complaints without any differentiations; most of the time, the reports accept this unchallenged as factual truth. In order to secure this one-dimensional perspective, reference is made in many places that those interviewed or the 'citizens' initiatives' presented are neither 'right-wing' nor 'racist.' These statements, in part contrafactual, are generally directly accepted by the media instead of pointing to racist and antigypsyist remarks that were expressed or published by the persons or groupings involved.

¹⁰⁰ Erjavec (2001). *Media Representation*, p. 721.

¹⁰¹ The only exception found is in the *Abendschau* of the RBB, 22 July 2011, cf. Ambrus (2011). Roma [min. 02:01-02:18].

However, it is not the case that in the reportages mentioned, there are no individuals marked as ‘Roma’/‘poverty migrants’ who get a chance to speak and have their say. However, these interviews are situated for the most part in a totally different context. Foregrounded in almost all questions in these interviews is the question about the economic situation. While it would be absolutely uncustomary in an interview with members of the German majority society to ask about wages, income and social benefits, film crews of the *Heute-Journal*¹⁰² or *Spiegel TV*¹⁰³ stop and address people on the street whom they perceive to be ‘Roma’ and proceed to ask them about their income situation. In addition, they often ask about their housing circumstances and the situation back in their home countries.

In many of these questions, the impression arises that they are trying to discover whether the interviewees are receiving a child allowance, unemployment benefit or a housing benefit. The reference to state social welfare benefits and the associated burdens this engenders for ‘the taxpayer’ serves within the narrative to undergird the second statement (“Germans are the victims of the Roma”). In this context, for example, the following interview passage with Kaldar Cesar was aired in the *Heute-Journal* on 19 February 2013:¹⁰⁴

Kaldar Cesar: “In Germany is better. Got work. Got everything ...”

Interviewer: “Do you have work?”

K. C.: “Not yet, looking job.”

Interviewer: “Are you earning anything?”

K. C.: “Have them child allowance, such thing, but ... more nothing at all.”

The selection of the interview questions and answers helps to elucidate for what the statements by Mr. Cesar were needed: to confirm what was already ‘common knowledge’: ‘Roma’ don’t work, don’t earn anything,

102 P. Böhmer and A. Roettig (2013). Europäische Zuwanderer in Duisburg. Reportage, *ZDF-Heute-Journal*, 19 February 2013 [min. 00:25-00:40].

103 Hendrik Vöhringer (2012). Einwanderer aus Bulgarien und Rumänien melden Gewerbe an. Reportage, *Spiegel-TV-Magazin*, 20 May 2012 [min. 00:35-00:45; 01:55-02:05; 02:15-02:30]. Accessible online: <http://www.spiegel.de/video/einwanderer-aus-bulgarien-und-rumaenien-melden-gewerbe-an-video-1197780.html> (accessed 28 April 2015) and Peter Hell (2012). Vom Wohngebiet zum Ghetto: Untergangsstimmung in Duisburg-Hochfeld. Reportage, *Spiegel-TV-Magazin*, 4 November 2012 [min. 02:50-03:05; 06:55-07:10]. Accessible online: <http://www.spiegel.de/video/duisburger-wohngebiet-hochfeld-verelender-video-1232514.html> (accessed 28 April 2015).

104 Ibid.

they live on child allowances. The interviewee is virtually guided and presented to the audience by the almost harsh and pointed questions of the journalist. He is not needed for any further information. In numerous current programs and documentary features focusing on ‘poverty migration,’ interview extracts are presented in a similar manner.

11. Implicit Attributions

Along with explicit attribution, there are diverse forms of **implicit attribution**. In order to be able to reconstruct such indirect statements about ‘Roma,’ the above-mentioned key question in the analysis was put to the various documentaries and articles: is there a connection between the event described and a person’s belonging to a national or ‘ethnic’ minority? Since in most cases this connection does not exist, the segue is the following question: what stereotypical ‘knowledge’ about ‘Roma’ is presupposed among the recipients so that references to ‘Roma’ in the respective reportage have some meaning?

a) Relevance as a Prerequisite: Implicit Attribution

The analysis found that such a relevant nexus within the sources examined is only conceivable—except for the source material analyzed above that explicitly deals with the ‘culture’ of the ‘Sinti and Roma’ as a topical focus—if terms such as “Roma” or “Sinti and Roma” convey prejudicial imagery and clichés and do not solely refer to real persons or groups. Because the information about what ‘ethnic’ or cultural group people belong to is irrelevant for reportage about criminal acts, about the Occupy Camp or the effects of a purported ‘poverty migration,’¹⁰⁵ just as irrelevant in fact as information about what religion criminal offenders, critics of capitalism or impoverished migrants have, what hand they use for writing or what football club they

105 By contrast, discrimination and persecution may play a decisive role among the underlying causative factors driving migration. Such connections are broached in individual media reports, but are rarely grasped and dealt with in their full scope. A wholesale ascription of characteristics and traits generally comes about despite reference to the discrimination or persecution that has factually occurred.

support. The semantic nexus of meaning in which the terms “Roma” or “Sinti and Roma” stand relating to the topics mentioned is only evident when these are understood as signifiers for something else. In media representations, they generally have to be translated with descriptions like a ‘group with a proclivity for crime,’ ‘apolitical and dirty occupants of tents,’ or ‘primitive foreigners who would like to live at the expense of the Germans.’

In the reportage on crime that is based on interviews with police officers or public prosecutors, and in the press releases of various police offices, there is repeated ‘ethnic profiling,’ namely a reference that the suspects or convicted offenders belong to the group of the ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma.’ If it is not presupposed that there is a connection between crime and a person’s belonging to the ‘ethnic’ groups mentioned, no other conceivable concrete nexus between these two bits of information can be construed. In this connection, the statements extend from those that clearly mention such a nexus to more subtle linkages. Headlines such as “7 in 10 robberies and break-ins involve Roma as offenders”¹⁰⁶ create or strengthen a direct linkage between ‘Roma’ and ‘crime’ in the minds of the recipients.¹⁰⁷ This is all the more clear since in this headline, only the two signifiers ‘Roma’ and theft or break-in appear. Thus, the mechanisms of generalization and the recourse to a cultural framework of interpretation and a focus on the unusual constitute the basis of such statements.

The long-discussed and criticized yet still continuing references in police press releases to belonging to the group of ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma’ must be viewed as a more subtle form



IN KÖLN ERWISCHT

Bei 7 von 10 Diebstählen und Einbrüchen sind Roma die Täter

7 in 10 robberies and break-ins involve Roma as offenders. Scarcely implicit ascription by Bild.de.

Source: Brücher/ Xanthopoulos (2013); Bei 7 von 10 Diebstählen

106 J. Brücher and G. Xanthopoulos (2013). Bei 7 von 10 Diebstählen und Einbrüchen sind Roma die Täter. In: Online programme, *Bild*, 6 March 2013. Accessible online: <http://www.bild.de/regional/koeln/einbruch/bei-7-von-10-diebstaehlen-und-einbruechen-sind-roma-die-taeter-29386148.bild.html> (accessed 28 May 2013).

107 I refer once more to the opinion survey 2014 cited earlier according to which 55.9% of the Germans surveyed agreed with the statement “Sinti and Roma have a proclivity for crime.” Decker, Kiess & Brähler (2014). *Die stabilisierte Mitte*, p. 50, see fn. 57.

of such a linkage. In these cases as well, the reference to such membership in an 'ethnic' group cannot be based on any conceivable relevant material nexus, if there is not a prior presumption of a connection between being 'Roma' and 'crime.' Consequently, even isolated individual references to such group membership must be seen as a generalizing ascription of criminal behavior.

b) Implicit Attributions Through Encoding

Apparently, at least in part, there is an awareness present that such a message can have a discriminatory effect, or at least there is a recognition that such references are politically incorrect and undesirable. In any event, the encodings utilized and present in an incalculable number in police press releases point to that. Since the official termination of the Centers for Travellers in the state criminal investigation offices in the Federal Republic in the 1970s,¹⁰⁸ the various files that continue to be created and collected dealing with Sinti and Roma are maintained under a range of cover names and code names such as "TWE" (Daytime Domestic Burglars [*Tageswohnungseinbrecher*]), "HWAO" (Frequent Change of Residence [*häufig wechselnder Aufenthaltsort*]) or "MEM" (Mobile Ethnic Minority [*mobile ethnische Minderheit*]).¹⁰⁹ These code names serve as a substitute for the now discredited designations "Gypsies" and "Travellers."¹¹⁰

Thus, in press reports with formulations such as "the woman robbed described [the perpetrators, M.E.] as members of an ethnic minority,"¹¹¹ one can assume this is an act of translation by the police press office. The signifiers "Gypsy," "Roma," or "Sinti and Roma," which the witnesses pro-

108 Cf. Romani Rose (1987). *Bürgerrechte für Sinti und Roma. Das Buch zum Rassismus in Deutschland*. Heidelberg, pp. 44f.

109 Cf. Wolfgang Feuerhelm (1987). *Polizei und "Zigeuner". Strategien, Handlungsmuster und Alltagstheorien im polizeilichen Umgang mit Sinti und Roma*. Stuttgart, pp. 145-168, and Andrej Stephan (2011). "Kein Mensch sagt HWAO-Schnitzel" – BKA-Kriminalpolitik zwischen beständigen Konzepten, politischer Reform und "Sprachregelungen". In: Imanuel Baumann et al, *Schatten der Vergangenheit. Das BKA und seine Gründungsgeneration in der frühen Bundesrepublik*. Cologne, pp. 247-312, here pp. 268-284.

110 Feuerhelm (1987). *Polizei und "Zigeuner"*, pp. 145-168. See also idem (2005). Ethnische Diskriminierung durch die Polizei. In: Christina Kalkuhl and Wilhelm Solms, eds., *Antiziganismus heute*. Seeheim, pp. 29-45, here pp. 34-39.

111 Polizei Marburg-Biedenkopf (2011). Einbrüche; Graffiti-Täter ermittelt; Diebstahl im Schuhhaus; Kabeldiebstahl; Pavillon a.d. Gleisen; Bäume abgesägt; Führerschein in weiter Ferne; Ladendiebe gesucht; Vermissten-suche mit Polizeihubschrauber. Press release, 26 July 2011. Accessible online: <http://proteus.ad-hoc-news.de:9000/pol-mr-einbrueche-graffiti-taeter-ermittelt-diebstahl-im-schuhhaus--/de/News/22311318> (accessed 28 April 2015).

bably used, were replaced by the encoding “members of an ethnic minority.” This must be interpreted as a conscious act aimed at avoiding the use of the discredited signifiers, while at the same time retaining the original information in the designations “Gypsy” or “Roma.”

The encodings here have in the meantime become so differentiated that they are only comprehensible to those who deal regularly with this form of reportage. This helps to achieve the goal of communicating the desired information to other police forces and the journalists who deal with this, while at the same time disguising as much as possible the discriminatory action. In particular, encoding by means of certain specific contexts, patterns of a crime or offender is virtually unassailable as a practice. It is based on the fact that as a result of numerous police and media discourses, a specific local or contextual ‘knowledge’ has already established itself. Such ‘knowledge’ can be described as a “police framework of interpretation.”

Building on such discourses, press releases can get along without any explicit or encoded ethnicizations and nonetheless contain and convey antigypsyist semantic content. Thus, already at the beginning of the 1990s, the research team of the German Research Foundation project “*Die Konstruktion der Differenz. Diskurse über Sinti und Roma in der Lokalpresse*” (The Construction of Difference. Discourses on Sinti and Roma in the Local Press) noted:

“The inference to a specific ‘group of perpetrators’ that came about here can be attributed to the structure and content of the underlying police press releases [...]. As already suspected, certain specific features of the crime and offender, previously labeled as typical, make possible a clear and unambiguous ethnic categorization of the suspects. It can be assumed that such a process of re-identification can occur on the basis of those press reports in which, although there is no direct ethnic labeling of the suspected offenders, certain content provided by the police is presented.”¹¹²

This means to say: after a time of explicit ethnic marking of specific crimes, modes of proceeding, or contexts, it is possible to forego this explicit marking; nonetheless, an ethnic categorization continues to be communi-

112 Bohn, Hamburger, & Rock (n.d.). *Konstruktion der Differenz*, p. 137.

cated. This is clearly exemplified in reporting on the so-called “grandson’s trick,” where tricksters pose as long-lost family members to trick old people into giving them money. After for a number of years on various occasions, police authorities stressed that this offense would be committed exclusively by ‘Roma,’ now there is no need in a police report on such a “grandson’s trick” for an explicit reference in order to nevertheless send the message that the

perpetrators were ‘Roma.’ At least in the case of police officers and journalists who deal with crime stories, this ‘knowledge’ can be presupposed to exist.

All these references from the police serve to create a powerful implicit attribution of ‘crime’ to the imagined group of the ‘Roma’ or ‘Sinti and Roma.’ It must be termed ‘implicit’ only because it is generally not expressed in the form “Roma are criminals” and because in most cases there is likewise no reference to a ‘culture’ or the like in general. Nonetheless, precisely such attributions must clearly be subjected to criticism.

Die Tricks der Roma-Sippe Lakatos

Eine undurchsichtig organisierte polnische Roma-Sippe nimmt seit Jahre sogenannten Enkeltrick ältere Leute systematisch aus. Der Kölner Polizist Ludwig kennt die Familienmitglieder und verfolgt sie.

Von Christoph Landolt



Criminal investigation with a family tree (on the wall behind the police officer). The “grandson’s trick” is closely associated with Roma.

c) Implicit Attribution Through the Presumption of a Cultural Framework of Interpretation Shaped by Antigypsyism

Antigypsyist ascriptions in the press reportage of various media, also analyzed in the present study, in the main published in daily newspapers, dealing with ‘Roma’ who according to these reports were living in the Camp of the anti-capitalist Occupy Movement in Frankfurt, were even more subtle. For this analysis, useful was again the question as to what ‘knowledge’ about ‘Roma’ had to be presumed among the recipients so that the various statements would make any sense. Looking at the report about complaints regarding the “homeless as well as the Sinti and Roma who had sought

refuge there,”¹¹³ it can be shown in exemplary fashion what presumptions regarding ‘Sinti and Roma’ can be presupposed in the mindsets of the readers. It is impossible to understand the sentence unless the familiar stereotype from the cultural framework of reference is presupposed, according to which ‘Sinti and Roma’ generally exhibit a problematic behavior.

This stereotype is also confirmed at the same time by the statement itself. The unreflected **presupposition of antigypsyist ‘knowledge’**—i.e. of the cultural framework of interpretation—must be evaluated as a media mechanism to communicate and disseminate antigypsyism. This mechanism can be regularly encountered in reporting. By referring without any reflection or criticism to this framework of reference, it bestows on it at the same time a new legitimacy.

Inherent in the sentence quoted above is a second reference to this cultural framework of reference. Neither when it comes to the group of the “homeless” nor the “Sinti and Roma,” who are clearly differentiated from each other by the expression “as well as,” is there any answer to the question as to why they should seek “refuge” in the Occupy Camp. In regard to the “homeless,” a possible answer directly suggests itself: by definition they have no home and so are potentially looking for a place of “refuge,” which for example can exist inside a tent in the Occupy Camp.

The “Sinti and Roma” do not appear to be part of the group of the “homeless,” because enumerating them, especially with the expression “as well as,” means in customary language that there are several different elements.¹¹⁴ So two separate groups are mentioned here, the “homeless” and “Sinti and Roma.” This states implicitly, one can infer, that the “Sinti and Roma” mentioned are not homeless. So why should they want to join the protesters in the Camp? Such a reason can only be derived from the stereotypical ‘knowledge’ available regarding ‘Sinti and Roma,’ namely that they are

113 “Obdachlose sowie Sinti und Roma, die dort Zuflucht gesucht hätten.” This is how the *Frankfurter Rundschau* quoted the CDU politician Helmut Heuser: Claus-Jürgen Gopfert and Hanning Voigts (2012). Occupy-Camp entzweit Koalition. In: Online programme, *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 2 May 2012, Accessible online: <http://www.fr-online.de/frankfurt/occupy-bewegung-occupy-camp-entzweit-koalition,1472798,15091760.html> (accessed 15 Jan. 2013).

114 Of course, an enumeration can also contain various words that are meant to describe one and the same referent more precisely; however, that is clearly not the case here, given the expression “as well as.”

‘nomads’ and so potentially lived in tents and camps, that they were ‘poor’ and ‘living in squalor,’ and that for this reason, such a tent camp was perceived by them a place of refuge. Through small semantic subtleties, a word

meaning is created that already contains stereotypical ascriptions. The journalists may well be completely unaware of such an ascription, maybe they even explicitly reject it. Nonetheless, such implicit formulations also go back to the stereotypes of ‘Sinti and Roma’ within the cultural framework of reference.

"Armutzuwanderung"

"Es kommen nicht nur Roma - es kommen auch Akademiker"

Roma aren't the only ones who are coming – there are also academics. Implicit attribution: without the antigypsyist framework of interpretation it would not be comprehensible.

Source: Heintz.de (2013): "Es kommen nicht nur Roma - es kommen auch Akademiker". Accessible online: <http://www.heintz.de/Es-kommen-nicht-nur-Roma-es-kommen-auch-Akademiker-2469192.html> (accessed 18 June 2013).

d) Attribution Through Classifying in Lexical Fields

A further subtle form of ascription is also reflected in the analyzed reportage on the Occupy Camp. It consists in inclusion of the signifier ‘Roma’ in a specific lexical field. Thus, the paper *Taz* pointed out that the “homeless, drug addicts and Roma families”¹¹⁵ came into the Camp, and the paper *FAZ* commented: “Already a number of weeks ago, the Camp had fallen into disrepute because ever more homeless, drug addicts, alcoholics and members of national minorities had moved on in.”¹¹⁶ The mere statement that a camp should fall “into disrepute” if “homeless, drug addicts, alcoholics” are living there points to a strong negative bias that exists against these groups.¹¹⁷

Aside from the necessary criticism of the resentment against “those who are not in keeping with the ideas of a well-regulated, middle class existence,”¹¹⁸ ‘members of national minorities’ stick out once more from this enumeration: belonging to a national minority is the only attribute

115 T. Reuter and S Erb (2012). Bewegung im Abbau. In: Online programme, *Tageszeitung*, 30 July 2012, Accessible online: <https://www.taz.de/198362/> (accessed 15 Jan. 2013).

116 Katharina Iskandar (2012). Polizei räumt Occupy-Camp in Frankfurt. In: Online programme, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 6 August 2012. Accessible online: <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/nach-gerichtsentscheid-polizei-raeumt-occupy-camp-in-frankfurt-11845751.html> (accessed 15 Jan. 2013).

117 In addition, the author in *FAZ* employs here the above-described strategy of encoding, which in this case is totally obsolete. In concrete terms, she often uses the code term “rotating Europeans.” This can also be a reference to her rejection of a kind of ‘political correctness’ in this connection: “However, it is difficult for the police and Office of Public Order to get a hold on these groups. This starts already with the signifiers. The terms ‘Sinti and Roma’ as well as ‘Gypsy’ cannot be employed by the authorities nowadays because of their use by National

conceptualized as essentialist and thus not individually ‘acquired.’ It is at the same time the only attribute to which no content of reality has to correspond: what homeless, drug addicts and alcoholic are can be derived from the signifier itself, even if naturally there are also associated negative feelings toward them and the ideas about these groups have nothing to do with the reality of life of many of these individuals. But what ‘Roma’ are according to this discourse is exclusively determined by the prejudice. No actions or decision by the persons so labeled are necessary, their mere existence is sufficient for classifying them in this lexical field.

By means of such enumerations, a lexical field is ultimately generated where it can be assumed that all the groups mentioned share a common attribute. A possible umbrella term for this lexical field is the term “marginal social group,” which already at the beginning of the debate was in fact used by the head of the office of Public Order.¹¹⁹ Afterwards, ‘Roma’ were then included in this word field through enumerations, thus declaring them likewise implicitly to be a ‘marginal social group.’ The fact that an enumeration such as the “homeless, drug addicts and Roma families” can at all arise in discourse is due to the cultural framework of interpretation shaped by antigypsyist elements.

12. Examination of Prejudices

The two television reportages on questions of the culture of Sinti and Roma examined in greater detail in this study had set themselves the task of interrogating such ascriptions. The informational texts on the two programs indicate that an **examination of prejudices** would be part of this task. Both

Socialism. Thus, in their inquiries, the officers often resort to expressions such as ‘individuals who often change their place of residence’ or ‘mobile ethnic minorities,’ in short: ‘Mems.’ The most recent term now to be in greater currency is the formulation ‘rotating Europeans.’ But the officials suspect it is only a matter of time before this designation will no longer be permitted in official use, for reasons of ‘political correctness.’ Katharina Iskandar (2009). Aggressive Bettelei. Ordnungsamt vor schwierigen Aufgaben. Online offering, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2 Nov. 2009. Accessible online: <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/rhein-main/frankfurt/aggressive-bettelei-ordnungsamt-vor-schwierigen-aufgaben-1881053.html> (accessed 22 Aug. 2013).

118 Wilhelm Heitmeyer and Jürgen Mansel (2008). Gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen und *Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit*: Unübersichtliche Perspektiven. In: Wilhelm Heitmeyer, ed., *Deutsche Zustände*. Folge 6. Frankfurt a. M., pp. 13-35, here p. 19.

119 Stadt Frankfurt (2012): Stadtrat Frank hält an Beendigung des Occupy-Camps zum 31. Juli fest. Press release 20 July 2012. Accessible online: <http://www.lifepr.de/inaktiv/stadt-frankfurt-am-main/Stadtrat-Frank-haelt-an-Beendigung-des-Occupy-Camps-zum-31-Juli-fest/boxid/333743> (accessed 12 Aug. 2015).

in the documentary *Junge Roma in Deutschland – Tradition ist alles!* and in the *Neuneinhalb* program entitled *Sinti und Roma*, there are actually longer passages that focus on the question of prejudices. However, in the two documentaries, there were clear inadequacies in the way they dealt with these prejudices. The main problem is that both programs did not view the prejudices investigated, ‘crime’ and ‘travelling’ respectively, as prejudices but rather as antiquated or explainable, yet nonetheless to a certain degree correct representations of reality. ‘Crime’ in the *Vox* documentary was, on the one hand, explained in social terms by insufficient legal possibilities for those classified as “tolerated” aliens, a special legal status in Germany. On the other hand, at a later point, ‘work’ is implicitly defined as an element of ‘German’ society and being ‘without work’ is described as ‘typically Roma.’ Thus, a possible ‘criminality’ can be interrogated in regard to its respective causes; nonetheless, a tendency toward ‘crime’ as a reaction to social relations is imputed to be something likely among ‘Roma’ under the circumstances. The prejudice is thus not really interrogated but rather even confirmed, in that a turn toward ‘crime’ in the family portrayed is suggested as a probable development, given their situation.

In the documentary aired by *Neuneinhalb*, we find a similar structure of argumentation. ‘Wandering’ is, on the one hand, explained in social-historical and thus anti-essentialist terms, yet in regard to the past it is falsely generalized. With an eye to the present, ‘wandering’ or a ‘migrant lifestyle’ is described as a tradition recently abandoned, and in this context the prejudice is presented as a correct albeit antiquated (i.e. ‘outdated’) description of reality.

In the documentary aired by *Neuneinhalb*, both on the visual and discursive levels, there are clear breaks with prejudice as well. On the other hand, important visual confirmations clash with these breaks. It is impossible to investigate here whether young viewers who watch a program on “Sinti und Roma” retain in their memory as an association the caravan high-



Source: “Neuneinhalb” (2012): Sinti und Roma [06:40]

A break with antigypsyist image traditions in the ARD.

ted visually at the beginning, or rather the half-timber German-style house, later spotlighted as a clear rupture with the stereotype.

Underlying these inadequate examinations of prejudice is a widespread false understanding of prejudice as such. In both these documentaries, it is assumed that prejudices are falsely understood and incorrectly generalized or no longer topical and relevant perceptions of real attributes of ‘Sinti’ and ‘Roma.’ The long lines of development of the patterns of prejudice, whose causes should not be sought in the actual real history of the Sinti and Roma, and in particular their ideological utility for the majority society,¹²⁰ are not discussed here at all. So prejudices are not fundamentally interrogated: the central finding of research on antisemitism, racism and prejudice—namely that the genesis of prejudices and stereotypes generally has nothing to do with the objects of the prejudices, but by contrast has a great deal to do with those expressing the prejudices¹²¹—is not touched on or explored in any way in these two documentaries. On the contrary: the *Vox* documentary and less clearly so, the *Neuneinhalb* program as well, can to a certain extent be even viewed as an affirmation of the prejudice.

120 See Cristian Tileagă (2006). Representing the ‘Other’: A Discursive Analysis of Prejudice and Moral Exclusion in Talk about Romanies. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 16, pp. 19-41, here p. 37.

121 See fn. 35.

CONCLUSION

The media reportages analyzed here allow for several conclusions. Initially it must be noted that antigypsyism is widespread in the media and takes on myriad forms. It is manifested both in open and readily recognizable forms as well as in a subtle manner that can only be determined through analysis. We must assume in regard to the entire German media landscape that there is little sensitivity for and awareness of antigypsyist statements and representations; often existing stereotypes are reproduced, unawares and undesired, ethnocentric positions are taken and antigypsyist discourses are perpetuated. Even in cases where there is some recognition that the topic of “Sinti and Roma” is a ‘sensitive’ one, this does not automatically mean that the statements in the media are free from stereotypical comments and representations. Frequently these also occur against better judgment and desire.

Nonetheless, and precisely for that reason, it is important to stress the great importance of a non-stereotyped media coverage that is sensitive to minorities and free of discrimination. Even if journalists and editorial teams have to make great efforts to guarantee that, this should not be seen as a burdensome task or even a form of censorship. Rather, such a mode of reporting could contribute to curtailing the ongoing nourishment of the continuing and widespread phenomenon of antigypsyism in German society, and perhaps even counter this phenomenon with relevant, powerful and audible voices. To date, media representations have very frequently functioned to confirm or even reproduce these antigypsyist views and attitudes. Here it is necessary to emphasize that criticism of antigypsyist views is not simply some kind of aloof intellectual game played using a few linguistic tricks. On the contrary: such views and attitudes provide a background and legitimation for discriminatory or even violent social actions.

In this sense, the present study views itself as part of a debate in society attempting to counter the views here described. The media of course are not alone responsible for these views but rather function as communication channels for their dissemination. Nonetheless, the media are in a position to raise issues, to position images and thus also to shape discourses. The media must thus be clearly seen as a highly relevant medium for

the reproduction of antigypsyism in society. Yet they can also become and function as a relevant medium for the struggle against antigypsyism.

The present study makes no claim to being complete and exhaustive. Rather it seeks to motivate a more profound analysis of stereotypical representations in the press and other media and forms of social communication such as film and television, music, literature and last but not least, discourse in the political sphere. A critique of antigypsyism often is limited to noting that something is antigypsyist but without analyzing the deeper interrelations and the mode of operation of these stereotypes. The analysis and criticism of media mechanisms developed in this study is meant to counter that. In this connection, it should be stressed that many of these mechanisms are in themselves part of the tools of the journalist's trade. Under the prevailing social conditions today, few journalists can afford to spend extensive time and resources in researching what they report on, pausing to argue differentially or deciding to do without sensational and spectacular elements in their reporting. But nonetheless and precisely for that reason, it is all the more necessary to investigate these mechanisms in the ways they function to generate an antigypsyist media coverage. A mechanism like the generalizing representation may be relatively harmless in sketching a portrait of the workaday life of a pedicurist, for example, or some woman in Hamburg, or a guitarist. But in fashioning a portrait about Roma or Sinti, such generalizing has the potential of reproducing, reinforcing and consolidating antigypsyist views and attitudes. The specific historical background and deeply ingrained prejudices demand a more powerful differentiation and a greater awareness and sensitivity. People working in the media have to develop a consciousness of that difference.

The aim of dealing scientifically and politically with antigypsyism must be to empower one and all to publicly express their belonging to groups like Roma or Sinti on the basis of a free decision and without any trepidation, and to live this belonging in a way that fits with their own individual conceptions and desires. As long as an antigypsyism widespread in society and deeply ingrained in minds, hearts and the media continues to exist, such empowerment remains utopian.

“The media must thus be clearly seen as a highly relevant medium for the reproduction of antigypsyism in society. Yet they can also become and function as a relevant medium for the struggle against antigypsyism.”

Markus End

The present study demonstrates by means of exemplary analyses that anti-gypsyism is widespread in the German media and is manifested in very different forms. The author focuses in his study in particular on the subtle mechanisms by means of which the existing stereotypes are reproduced. He concludes that there is little awareness of antigypsyist thought patterns throughout the entire media landscape, so that corresponding discourses, often unconscious and undesired, are perpetuated.

Study prepared for the Documentation and
Cultural Centre of German Sinti and Roma

© 2015 Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum
Deutscher Sinti und Roma
Bremeneckgasse 2 · D-69117 Heidelberg
www.sintiundroma.de