DYNAMICS OF CONTROL AND RESISTANCE: REACTIONS TO THE MODERN POLICY OF ASSIMILATION OF THE TRAVELLERS IN NORWAY

Rune Halvorsen

For much of the 20th century, the Norwegian authorities pursued a strict assimilation policy towards Travellers (*tatere/ romanifolket*) and their culture. As was the case in many other countries, Travellers were constructed as "the other" (Riggins 1997, MacLaughlin 1999). When compared to other Western European countries, it is, however, surprising that Norwegian Travellers were seen as such a serious problem and threat during the 20th century. The 1845 census counted 1145 Travellers out of a total population of 1.3 million in Norway (Sundt 1852, SSB 1968: Table 13). A private charity organisation acting on behalf of the state registered 5129 "itinerants" in their archives from 1900 to 1959 (Haave 2000). These were the figures that worried the elites. This paper examines the modern assimilation policy and Travellers' reactions to this policy. In particular the paper analyses the internal relation between the modern assimilation policy and the emergence of collective demands for recognition as an ethnic minority and moral redress among Travellers in the 1990s.

The modern assimilation policy
The modern public policy aimed at Travellers was structured between the mid 1800s and the First World War. The authorities emphasised strongly that Travellers should be settled and renounce and relinquish their traditional way of life and culture by providing resources such as new skills, benefits in kind and financial assistance (Schlüter 1990). Earlier attempts at settling the Travellers had been few and far between and were considered unsuccessful by the government and the Norwegian parliament. One obstacle to a successful policy was that the municipalities were reluctant to admit responsibility for "itinerants". The municipalities were first and foremost concerned about protecting their local economy and keep their relief expenses down. In line with de Swaan's (1990: 37-41) account of the collectivisation of care, the relationship between the local authorities was similar to a prisoner's dilemma game: Co-operation would have

resulted in a situation beneficial to all actors involved, but a single defector could profit from a solitary non-cooperative course of action at the expense of the loyal municipalities. When other municipalities followed the defector, all were worse off than if they had cooperated. The wanderers did not have the same proximity to and identification with the local residents. Those without permanent residence were perceived as a threat to those who owned real estate, and to tax collection and public order. Wanderers represented a social and symbolic threat, as well as potential financial costs. If they succeeded in claiming to have their domicile in the municipality they would be entitled to poor relief. All in all this fuelled the sentiment to reject responsibility and drive itinerant paupers away.

Bearing this in mind, the emergence in 1897 of the Norwegian Mission among the Homeless (NMH) as a new welfare-policy actor was a timely event, as it was an agency that could be attributed nation-wide authority to act and co-ordinate the policy aimed at Travellers across local borders. Compared to other Western European countries with travelling minorities, it is striking that a private charity organisation came to play such a major role in the publicly sanctioned policy aimed at Travellers. NMH was given considerable legal, moral and financial support by the central authorities. The state came to cover all expenses for people of Traveller origin, even in cases where Travellers had their domicile in a municipality and the local authorities normally would have been financially responsible. Thus Norway developed a particular Christian organisation that acted as a pressure group working in close collaboration with the central and local authorities.

The policy of forced assimilation was not reconsidered before the 1970s. Until then there had been broad public consensus and no general discussion on the policy since its institutionalisation. An interpellation debate in the Norwegian parliament in 1975 indicated that many still supported the policy (St.forh. 1975), but a government committee was established in 1976 to evaluate the practice. After the committee had tabled its recommendations (NOU 1980:42), the special targeted and segregation measures were gradually rescinded during the 1980s and NMH was relieved of its mandate. The government committee argued that the special targeted measures should be phased out in part because they were counterproductive and prevented full assimilation of Travellers in society, stopped them

from having regular paid work and permanent residence and stopped them from being regarded on equal terms as other Norwegian citizens, and in part because it was considered unnecessary and superfluous as most Travellers were now settled (ibid. 10). In other words, the stated reasons for reforming the policy were equivocal at best.

Policy objectives and measures

The ultimate goal was to eradicate the "itinerant problem", in part by undertaking a large-scale forced separation of children from Traveller parents who lived a more traditional life, and in part by forcing and helping Travellers to find permanent residence and occupation.

By focusing more on the children than had been the case in earlier settlement attempts it was hoped that the assimilation would go more smoothly. The assumption was that it would be easier to settle the children, as they were not yet too influenced by their Traveller parents, than teaching or re-socialising the adults to adopt new lifestyles. The local authorities were also reluctant to allow whole families to be settled in their community. At this period of time "childhood" was increasingly understood as a separate stage of life. The public responsibility for children was extended and the openings for the state to intervene in families were increased significantly with the 1896 Act on neglected children (*Vegerådsloven*). The act was not particularly intended for Travellers' children but was applied for this purpose. Child custody interventions required consent from the local child custody committee (*vergeråd*) but NMH played a proactive role in convincing reluctant municipalities to issue the formal decision (Pettersen 1999). According to a secretary general, about 1500 children of Traveller origin were transferred to public child care (Hanich 1976). A majority of the children were placed in orphanages established by NMH or in foster homes under its supervision. Others were sent to institutions not controlled by NMH, such as special schools (Pettersen 2000).

Traveller families were also brought to the Svanviken Labour Colony for a longer period of residence (1.5-5 years) to be re-socialised and "unlearn" earlier habits. For most of the time the policy appeared to be unrelentingly effective as all signs and mention of their culture, craft and language were prohibited, but the practice was made less stringent in the 1970s (Austvik 1998). In theory the stay was

supposed to be voluntary but the staff in NMH often threatened to take the children into care if they did not accept the conditions. The practice was not backed by law but emerged as an effective practical way of keeping the families in line (Pettersen 2000). Svanviken had a capacity of about ten families or forty to sixty residents. The men were trained in permanent manual work (farming, heavy industry), while women's activities were limited to housework. This rigid division of labour between the sexes in the majority population had little in common with the Travellers' traditional family structure and way of life (Schlüter 1993). It deprived women of possibilities to work outside the home. More generally, the dominant norms and values connected to having permanent paid work, bounded loyalty and local community membership in the greater society contradicted the Travellers' value of autonomy as self-made businessmen.

Those who stayed the entire period were given to expect that they would be provided with assistance in settling down and finding paid work in a district that was peripheral to their former life. Later it became possible to be granted permanent residence without a stay in the labour colony. Families who were settled by assistance from NMH committed themselves to refrain from receiving visits from family members or other Travellers. Grown up children were not allowed to continue to live with their parents. Some families were also encouraged to keep a low profile in the neighbourhood. As NMH owned the houses and the residents had to pay rent, this gave the staff an opportunity to keep an eye on the residents and carry out home visits. In exceptional cases the organisation provided means-tested financial assistance if the municipal social services declined requests from Travellers. But as this tied Travellers even more to NMH and implied a strong degree of humiliation and dependence, many would avoid or limit such contact if possible (Marvik 1991).

The public construction of a target group
The same legislation applied to Travellers as to other target groups in the welfare state, but a number of acts had particular clauses referring to "itinerants" and authorised special measures aimed at this category of people. In particular the 1900 Vagrancy Act (*Løsgjengerloven*) was crucial in defining or "constructing" who the Travellers were, according to the central authorities. The Act gave extensive authority to enforce

settlement of "itinerants" and other vagrants, i.e. persons without permanent residence, legal work or a regular income. The "itinerant" was seen as representing a poverty problem due to a weak work ethic. An "itinerant" was seen as a work-shy person not willing to take responsibility for himself and his family through paid work. It was generally assumed that he was living off of begging, theft or other crimes.

However, self-sufficiency itself was no guarantee that one could avoid incarceration for vagrancy. According to an authorised comment on the Vagrancy Act: "An itinerant […] will usually have a legal trade to refer to as an excuse. He may say that he is a horseman, a tinsmith, peddler or the like, nevertheless he is the same dangerous person. The trade he lays claim to is only pretence. If he is to be approved it is required that the trade must be of a regular nature" (Hartman 1934:19). The aim was not only to ensure that people were financially self-sufficient. The public authorities clearly wanted to change and eliminate other parts of their lifestyle as well; one should have permanent residence and not travel around. It was also claimed that Travellers had low family and sexual morals. Their itinerant lifestyle prevented their children from being baptised and receiving a proper Christian up-bringing and thus meant that they would not be confirmed in the church. Their way of living placed the Travellers in a partly contentious, partly symbiotic relationship with a diminishing agrarian population. In the emerging industrial society, the Travellers fell outside the main pattern of wage earners organised in trade unions as the prototypical social-democratic citizen.

There is reason to believe that many Travellers achieved respect for their practical skills and craft in the general population (Hvinden 2000). Pejorative and negative images were hardly the only attitudes that circulated in the general public. But popular sympathy and recognition had little impact on the images presented and measures pursued by the public authorities. The official accounts identified Travellers as a separate, alien and unwanted category of people outside Norwegian society (Carlsen 1922, Lyngstad 1947). The accounts of who the Travellers were and what characterised them justified and constituted a rational for the reactions from the dominant sections of society. The public images of Travellers were not arbitrary, independent of or without any relationship to the existing structures of

social and cultural dominance. On the contrary, the particular social construction of Travellers as a target group or the dominant definition of the social situation had major consequences for those concerned (Merton 1968). In other words, the social construction of Travellers as objects of other people's concern created the basis for an aggressive policy towards the minority (Schneider & Ingram 1993).

Individual and family-based counter-reactions

For a large part of the 20th century Travellers were not in a position to speak up against the depreciatory images presented by the public authorities. However, letters to NMH from Travellers, retrospective interviews, biographies and other historical accounts from Travellers who directly or indirectly were affected by the assimilation policy suggest that many Travellers made an effort to avoid or modify the consequences of the dominant images (Marvik 1983, Fodstad 2000, Sandvik 2000). The traces of the power dynamics have been blurred, due in part to concealment and a more oral tradition among the minority, and in part to the inattentiveness, indifference, lack of sympathy or disinterest on the part of the dominant majority. Despite the lack in historical documentation of the culture, viewpoints, resistance and coping strategies of the dominated Travellers, it has been possible to identify some of these features. Individual and family-based counter-strategies included resistance and coping strategies, as well as open negotiations with the authorities in the pursuit of their objectives.

In some cases Travellers succeeded in their efforts. Although they were not in a position to change the national policy as such, they managed to influence its implementation. Their strategies, actions and non-actions, at Time 1 had an effect on the opportunities that presented themselves to individual Travellers and their families at Time 2. In sociological terms they managed to ameliorate the micro-level opportunity structures that concerned relatively few people but not the macro-level opportunity structures that concerned all Travellers and society as a whole (Archer 1995). In other cases, their coping and resistance strategies led to even more drastic control. Nevertheless, such actions on the part of Travellers probably strengthened their self-esteem and gave them a sense of having done everything they could to resist the unwanted intrusions or interventions. The symbolic

significance of the protests or counter-reactions may have been the most important effect for them.

(i) *Residents in institutions* (orphanages, labour colony): The residents were expected to demonstrate adherence and compliance to the programme at the institution but were sometimes able to introduce some distance between themselves and the expectations (Goffman 1962). Such actions could help maintain a Traveller's identity despite the best efforts of the staff to reprogramme their identities**.** Travellers have referred to clandestine production of traditional craft at the labour colony while pretending to accept the formal restrictions as they "played to the gallery", or they stole equipment and supplies to sell to the majority population outside the institution. Others told of ridiculing and embarrassing the staff or making threats or actually reverting to violence, escaping of brief periods of time or dropping out. Through uncooperativeness, feet-dragging, obstruction or non-attendance the residents could also impede the work of the authorities (Bloor & McIntosh 1990).

(ii) *Traveller parents who were deprived of their children*: NMH archives reveal that some parents sought to negotiate access to visit their children, obtain the address of where they lived, and send letters and gifts. In other cases there were efforts to negotiate the possibility of having their children returned to them: Parents claimed they complied with the norms and values of greater society (working full time, pious) and there were no valid reasons for removing the children (not undernourished or mismanaged). Parents also referred to the emotions and preferences of the children and their own close relationship to their children. Additionally, there were attempts at discrediting people who had provided information about the parents or had recommended transference of the custody of the child to the public authorities. In other cases the parents threatened to contact other and higher-ranking public authorities. There were also attempts at taking the children back without consent and escaping from NMH, and instances of unannounced visits to the institutions.

(iii) *Travellers in relation to greater society*: Concealment emerged as a significant strategy for many Travellers. Sometimes they de-emphasised their attachment to other Travellers but their relationship to this status was not unequivocal. The Traveller's status could be played out in certain local or situational contexts and down-

played in others. One way of achieving this was audience segregation; to maintain segregated networks and to make the Traveller status relevant only in selected arenas or to selected others. The choice of a differentiated information strategy and insulated self-presentations to certain people emerged as an opportunity for agency (Coser 1975, Goffman 1959). But problems could arise in managing to organise and control the different self-presentations. They could manage to administrate a differentiated or limited visibility; avoid mentioning or playing out their Traveller status or actively seeking to withdraw such information. This could work as long as actors from other arenas did not appear in places where they had given a different self-presentation. But sometimes such efforts collapsed and led to "disclosure", as when other Travellers appeared in places where they were not known as Travellers themselves.

Contrary to what one would have assumed and in contrast to the prevalent images of the "poor", "disadvantaged" or "dominated", Travellers did not only use passive defence strategies. There were also open negotiations with the majority population about the definition of the social situation (Strauss 1979). In certain cases they could achieve pity and sympathy by presenting themselves as victims of circumstances outside their control. But such self-degradation could swiftly be replaced by more self-assertive and aggressive strategies; i.e. using humour against their counter-part, pointing out how the majority population failed to live up to their own normative standards, or playing on stereotypical images of Travellers to create fear or uncertainty.

A new social movement: demands for redress and recognition

At the beginning of the 21st century, the dominating and prevalent representation of Travellers is that they used to be an exotic, fascinating but also frightening phenomenon in pre-industrial Norway. It is assumed that Travellers have vanished as they are not visible in public anymore ("you never see Travellers on the road anymore"). But this invisibility is clearly the result of a proactive and persistent policy to assimilate Travellers into Norwegian society.

One could have argued that the particularities of Travellers' culture would have disappeared regardless of government policy, as societal changes made it difficult to sustain traditional business

(roofing, producing cutlery, small-scale peddling). But other countries, e.g. the United Kingdom and Ireland, did not have the same assimilation policy, and in these countries Travellers have adapted to the new conditions of industrialised society and developed new types of business and found new "niches" (Pavee Point 1993, 1998). Travellers in these countries have also continued to be more visible in the public compared to Norway.

It was only a decade after the abolition of the assimilation policy that a social movement emerged among Travellers. Since the mid 1990s, six to seven organisational efforts among Travellers have appeared where the Romani People National Association (RFL) has been the most successful. Increasingly Travellers have demanded to define themselves, who they are and which denominations they prefer, not the least as a reaction against the representations and naming of Travellers produced by others. They have laid claim to a collective history, particular traditions, values and a separate language, in short they emphasise that they constitute an ethnic minority and differ from other Norwegian citizens. A dictionary has been published and an introductory course has been established to maintain Romani as a living language. CDs have been produced with Traveller ballads, and publications about Travellers' history for adults and children, lyrics, biographies and testimonies of individual Travellers have also been published (Borge 1998; Granly 1992, 1996; Karlsen 1993; Karlsen 2000, 2001a, 2001b; RFL 1997, 1999; Rydberg 1994; Sørsdal 1994, Sørsdal & Karlsen 1994; Torp 1995; Yrvum & Johansen 2003). They have protested and argued against what has been written about them in newspapers, magazines and pulp literature, the definitions provided in dictionaries, and the representations in the theatre and movies.

The ongoing attempts at revitalisation and redefinition of the Traveller status may constitute a new social basis for participation and inclusion in a "multicultural society" (Habermas 1998, Kymlicka 1995). A renewed understanding of Travellers as an ethnic minority could provide more cultural autonomy and recognition on equal terms with the majority population. However, much of the social mobilisation is still focused on distancing oneself from the former policy. The participants in the social movement have often focused more on demands for moral redress for past atrocities than on improving their current situation and future opportunities in life and on revitalising their

culture. In many respects the participants have come to act in their capacity or status as "survivors" of NMH. In other words, it has been very much as objects of other people's concern and control in the past that they have acted as subjects in the present.

Many Travellers have focused on attributing responsibility for the consequences of the former policy. This project has achieved fairly broad acceptance from official Norway:

- The government and the Church of Norway have apologized and voiced their regret over the former assimilation policy (Government report 2000-2001).
- The majority in the Norwegian Parliament (all parties except the Progress Party) has approved that Travellers may claim rights as a national minority pursuant to the Council of Europe Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities, if they so wish (Government bill 1997-98, Negotiations in the Parliament 1998).
- The majority in the Norwegian Parliament (all parties except the Progress Party) has also endorsed an ex-gratia payment scheme as compensation for loss of primary education to people of Traveller origin (generally NOK 60,000). Since 1996, a number of individuals have been granted such compensation for neglect and ill-treatment in the past.
- The majority in the Norwegian Parliament has granted financial support to the establishment of a documentation centre for Traveller history and culture as part of the Glomdalen Museum. The centre should be completed in 2005-2006.
- From 1997, several Romani organisations have been granted financial support for administration and/or various government projects.

The renewed public focus on Travellers has to a considerable extent concerned the present political and religious elites' self-reflections on and distancing from the former policy. With few exceptions the representatives of official Norway find it unproblematic to recognise Travellers as a national minority. A new understanding of Travellers and the problems they faced emerged around the same time the assimilation policy was rescinded. Travellers' difficulties were increasingly understood as the outcome of the former policy and not

as being self-inflicted. As opposed to the former approach, Travellers have come to be understood as victims of the former policy rather than as "somebody one has to do something about". Additionally, Travellers are hardly considered a threat against the rest of society anymore, as their presence in everyday life has largely become silent and invisible.

It has also been discussed earlier whether Travellers should be considered an ethnic minority (*Klassekampen* 18 November 1978, Moe 1979, Schlüter 1993). But only after many of the particularities of their culture had been undermined or become less distinct, did it become possible to accept Travellers' distinctiveness as legitimate. Today Travellers are mainly present in the media and in cultural arenas; through theatre plays, films, and so on. In certain respects the representations emerge as more important than those they represent. Media coverage has been especially voluminous over the last decade. The way Travellers are mainly presented in the media gives others the opportunity to distance themselves from the former policy.

It is striking how little Travellers are seen as victims of negative discrimination in the present, even though this is sometimes reported by the Romani organisations and some mass media (e.g. *Glåmdalen* 8 June 1999, *Gudbrandsdølen Dagningen* 20 July 1999). There appears to be less sensitivity and empathy from most non-Travellers when it comes to negative discrimination and the depreciatory or offensive observations experienced by Travellers today. The emphasis on the past converges with the efforts to protect historical monuments and antiquities and reported interest from museums. Travellers' self-presentation as victims appears to be woven into the production of the official view of Norway. The renewed attention given to Travellers perhaps first of all serves the political and administrative elites, associating them with care, humanity, compassion and sympathy, while glossing over the demands for conformity that today are perhaps addressed to a larger extent to other social categories in Norwegian society.

More problem conditions facing the social movement

The relation to the NMH over the last 80-90 years has to a great extent influenced the Travellers' subjectivity and what it means to be a Traveller. The modern assimilation policy as it was formulated in the late 19th century invented "itinerants" as an administrative category

and placed Travellers in this category. If they did not have the attributes associated with itinerants prior to this, many of them became victimised, dependent and were marginalised as a consequence of the policy. Even people of Traveller origin who were not directly affected by or in contact with the NMH have clearly been traumatised by the former policy.

Travellers have been aware of their professional proficiency, their contributions to the economy of the local community and the value of their culture and language to society as a whole. But Travellers have not been entirely unaffected by the long-lasting and immense disparagements they were exposed to. Solid social networks, cultural resources and defence strategies are needed to resist pervasive and systematic devaluation from the greater society (Hvinden 2000). We know from other research that a persistent pressure from the community will sooner or later influence a person's self-esteem, lead to diminished self-respect and self-worth, and in the worst case inflict self-hatred and an excessive critical stance to other members in the same social category or group (Lemert 1972, Minde 2003).

Today the former assimilation policy appears to be the most obvious common denominator that most clearly constitutes Travellers as different from others. As a consequence of this policy many Travellers today are not themselves convinced that they belong to a cultural minority. The differences in values and lifestyle between Travellers and non-Travellers appear to have become less explicit than they used to be. The empirical credibility of a self-presentation as an ethnic minority has been negatively affected by the former policy. The knowledge of the Romani language has been undermined and familiarity with the culture is lower.

Distancing oneself from this and revitalising the culture has become a complicated process, a problem of defining what it means to be a Traveller in the present beyond wearing the traditional clothing on special occasions to signify one's origin. The former lifestyle and cultural features do not distinguish them to the same degree, or they have taken on new meanings and have different consequences in post-industrial society (high technology, de-industrialisation, global economy and so on). Lack of formal education combined with greater demands for professional skills, liability for damages and credentialism

in modern society have exacerbated the situation for many of them and excluded them from the regular labour market. More people have become mobile than before, and travelling no longer distinguishes Travellers from other inhabitants. It has become a challenge and unsolved issue to give a positive and distinct content to the Traveller identity today. Consequently there is a risk that the social movement will mainly recruit Travellers with claims against the state. The older generations are tied up with the past, while the younger generations identify to a lesser extent with this project. Many of the younger generations also appear to be indifferent to or unfamiliar with the traditional culture.

Concluding remarks

It is possible to identify a connection between Travellers who have demanded redress and the members of the political elites today who have distanced themselves from the policy in the distant past. Support for self-organisation among Travellers and individual ex-gratia payment could support the self-image of the representatives of the government and the State Church of Norway. Representatives of official Norway appear to have attained a target group for their expression of sympathy, excuses and bad conscience. In this way, Travellers appear in new ways to serve as a mirror for the greater society.

It remains an unanswered question whether the Norwegian authorities are willing to provide the resources necessary to maintain and revitalise Travellers' language and culture (State Report of Norway 2001, 2002; Council of Europe 2002; Comments of the Norwegian Government 2002). At the time of writing, Travellers have not been awarded a collective ex-gratia payment to compensate for the former policy against the Travellers as an ethnic minority and not only as individuals (correspondence between the government and the Romani Foundation 2002-2003). Neither have more systematic efforts to document, analyse and teach the language to new generations been initiated, nor have systematic efforts to document their history been made. There is still a lack of teaching material, textbooks and so on, on national minorities in primary and secondary schools. Overall, the main challenge is to define in positive terms and give substantial

content to the Traveller status and what it means to be a Traveller in Norwegian society today.

At the time the assimilation policy was institutionalised, Norway was still a young nation state. It was important to emphasise cultural unity and common denominators in constructing the nation. Minorities such as Travellers, the Sami people and Kvens disturbed this image and various measures were therefore implemented against them (Eriksen & Niemi 1981, Niemi 1997). Preliminary data also indicates that the Norwegian authorities pursued the assimilation policy more aggressively and for a longer period of time than many other Western countries (Minde 2003). As argued by Hvinden (2000), the typical and "real" Norwegian culture was constructed of more or less romanticised images of the life and culture of farmers, as presented in museums, literature, music, fairy-tales, national costumes and so on. Even in post-industrial society the dominant representation of what is typical of Norway relies much on the reconstruction of the agrarian culture in the second half of the 19th century.

Gullestad (1989) has argued that the assumption that one needs to be similar to be of equal value has been especially emphasised in Norway. At the same time, since the 1970s there has been an increasing tendency to accept differences in lifestyle and social identity, often understood and accounted for as tolerance of so-called "minorities" and in this respect alleged small and explicit social categories. Similar to Gullestad (1996), I would argue that the increasing tolerance of or indifference to lifestyle differences to a large extent emerged independently of the new immigration to Norway from the 1970s. It may rather be considered in connection with a more general development of modernity in Norwegian society. Increased information about other cultures and lifestyles, participation in more differentiated social arenas and geographical mobility have contributed to make the cultural reference points less stable. Lifestyles cannot be taken for granted *tout court,* and it has become more important to actively choose one's lifestyle and values. Questions of authenticity and the creation of one's own biography have also gained more importance (Giddens 1991). The challenge to construct an identity and define who you are can be met through the staging of ethnicity.

Organisation of self-presentation and self-understanding on the basis of claims to be different may serve as a kind of identification with

delimited sections of the population and thereby legitimate claims against the state or other sectors of society. In this respect the new recognition or embracing of Travellers may illustrate more general features in identity management and social boundary drawing in the Norwegian society since the 1970s. As identity management has become more problematic for larger sections of the population, the former demands of conformity emerge as unreasonable. At the same time, it remains a test case whether the new tolerance will include ethnic groups that represent challenges or break with conventional forms of life and demand reorganisation of society or adjustments from others in society (Jentoft, Minde & Nilsen eds. 2003). It remains an unfinished project whether the state representatives will accept demands and support differences in lifestyle in areas where this is considered to have substantial practical impact on other sections of the population or the organisation of society as a whole.

References

Archer, M.S. 1995 *Realist Social Theory*. Cambridge University Press

Austvik, A. 1998 *Folket som reiste – og forsvant*. Seim, AgA-Bok

Bloor, M. & J. McInstosh 1990 "Surveillance and Concealment", in S. Cunningham-Burley & N.P. McKegany (eds) *Readings in Medical Sociology*. London, Routledge

Borge, L. 1998 *Solens og månens barn*. Oslo, Aschehoug

Carlsen, I.B. 1922 *Et hjemløst folk*. Kristiania, Luthersk bokmisjon

Comments of the Government of Norway 2002 on the opinion of the advisory committee on the implementation of the framework convention. GVT/COMINF/OP/I(2003)003, Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Coser, R.L. 1975 "The Complexity of Roles as a Seedbed of Individual Autonomy", in L.A. Coser (ed) *The Idea of Social Structure*. New York: Jovanovich

Council of Europe 2002 Opinion on Norway. Advisory committee on the framework convention for the protection of national minorities. ACFC/INF/OP/I(2003)003, Strasbourg

Eriksen, K.E. & E. Niemi 1981 *Den finske fare*. Universitetsforlaget, Tromsø

Fodstad, H. 2000 "Erfaringer fra tvangssterilisering og andre tap", in B. Hvinden 2000 ed. *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Giddens, A. 1991 *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Goffman, E. 1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* London: Penguin

Goffman, E. 1962 *Asylums*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Granly, J. 1992 *Håpets budbærer.* Oslo: ES Grafisk

Granly, J. 1996 *Mor som ga håp*. Drammen: Rex forlag

Gullestad, M. 1989 *Kultur og hverdagsliv*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Gullestad, M. 1996 *Likhet og mangfold*. Key-note speech, Folkets Hus

Haave, P. 2000 *Sterilisering av tatere 1934-1977*. Oslo, Research Council of Norway

Habermas, J. 1998 *Inclusion of the Other*. Cambrigde Ma: The MIT Press

Hanich, T. 1976 *Om sigøynerspørsmålet*. Oslo, Institutt for samfunnsforskning

Hartman, C. 1934 *Lov om løsgjengeri, betleri og drukkenskap av 1900*. Kristiania, Grøndahl & Søns forlag

Hvinden, B. 2000 "Innledning", in B. Hvinden 2000 ed. *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Jentoft, S., H. Minde & R. Nilsen eds. 2003 *Indigenous Peoples*. Delft: Eburo Academic Press

Karlsen, L. 1993 *Romanifolkets ordbok*. Oslo, Norbok

Karlsen, H. 2000 *Ordbok*. Stiftelsen Roma

Karlsen, H. 2001a *Vandriar - enkelt innføringskurs i romani*. Stiftelsen Roma

Karlsen, H. 2001b *Kjerkloane – Fuglene*. Stiftelsen Roma

Kymlicka, W. 1995 *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford University Press

Lemert, E. 1972 *Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control*. Engelwoods Cliffs. N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Lyngstad, O. 1947 *Landeveiens folk i Norge*. Oslo, Land og Kirke

MacLaughlin, J. 1999 "The gypsy as 'other' in European society", *The European Legacy* 4, 3, 35-99

Marvik, E.M. 1983 *Et merke ble satt på personer og slekter.* thesis in anthropology. University of Oslo.

Marvik, E.M. 1991 *Situasjonen for omstreiferne etter avviklingen av Norsk misjon blant hjemløses engasjement og overføringen av ansvaret til kommunene*. Ministry of Social Affairs, Oslo

Merton, R.K. 1968 "The self-fulfilling prophecy", *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York, The Free Press

Minde, H. 2003: "Assimilation of the Sami - Implementation and Consequences", *Acta Borealia*, 2/2003, 121-146

Moe, T. Lande 1979 "Er tatere en etnisk minoritet?", *Dagbladet* 23.03.1979

Negotiations in the Parliament 1998: om *samtykke til ratifikasjon av Europarådets rammekonvensjon*. møte i Stortinget, sak. nr. 4, 11. December 1998

Niemi, E. 1997 "Kulturmøte, etnisitet og statlig intervensjon på Nordkalotten", in R.B. Andersson (ed) *Den nordiska mosaiken*. Uppsala: Studentbokhandeln

NOU 1980:42 *Omstreiferne*. Ministry of Social Affairs, Oslo

Pavee Point 1993 *Recycling and the traveller economy*. Pavee Point Publications. Ireland

Pavee Point 1998 *Market Economies*. Pavee Point Publications. Ireland

Pettersen, K.S. 1999: *Tiltak rettet mot barna av tatere*. NTNU, Trondheim

Pettersen, K.S. 2000 "For barnas skyld?", in B. Hvinden 2000 ed. *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Fagbokforlaget, Bergen

RFL 1997 *Oppreisning for et folk. Tatere før og nå.*

RFL 1999 *Oppreisning for et folk. En tater forteller.*

Riggins, S.H. 1997 "The rethoric of othering", in Riggins (ed.) *The Language and Politics of Exclusion*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Rydberg, R. 1994 *Uten livets rett*. Åsen: Dokumentarforlaget

Sandvik, A.B. 2000 "Å være tater i barne- og skolehjem", in B. Hvinden 2000 ed. *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Schlüter, R. 1990 *De reisende – en glemt minoritet*. Levanger, Høgskolen i Nord-Trøndelag

Schlüter, R. 1993 *De reisende. En norsk minoritets historie og kultur*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal

Schneider, A. & H. Ingram 1993 "Social construction of target populations", *American Political Science Review* 87, 2, 334-47

SSB 1968 *Historical Statistics*. Statistics Norway, Oslo.

State Report of Norway 2001 Initial report submitted by Norway pursuant to article 25, section 1 of the framework convention for the protection of national minorities.

State Report of Norway 2002 European charter for regional or minority languages. Second periodical report. Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs, Oslo

St.forh. 1975 "Interpellasjon fra repr. Torild Skard om å bedre omstreifernes sosiale kår og lette deres integrering i samfunnet", *Forhandlinger i Stortinget* nr. 481, 23. April 1975, 3715-3729

Government report 2000-2001 *Nasjonale minoritetar i Noreg.* St.meld. nr. 15. Ministry of Regional Affairs, Oslo

Government bill 1997-98 *om samtykke til ratifikasjon av Europarådets rammekonvensjon om beskyttelse av nasjonale minoriteter.* St.prp. 80. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo

Strauss, A. 1979 *Negotiations*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Sundt, E. 1852 *Beretning om fante- eller landstrygerfolket i Norge*. Christiania, Abelsted

Swaan, A. de 1990 *In Care of the State*. Polity Press

Sørsdal, K. (ed.) 1994 *Ludvig Karlsen. Fra landstryker til landsevangelist*. Rex forlag

Sørsdal, K. & J. Karlsen 1994 *Karl Lindstrøm. Med evangeliet langs landeveien*. Trondheim, ES grafisk

Torp, J.A. 1995 *Kåre Ivan Holm – Ikke født til morder*. Rex Filadelfia-forlaget

Yrvum, L. & L. Johansen 2003 *Viser fra et folk på vandring*. Oslo: Musikk-Husets Forlag