

DESTROYING ETHNIC IDENTITY

THE PERSECUTION OF THE GYPSIES IN ROMANIA

August 1991

A Helsinki Watch Report

485 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Tel (212) 972-8400
Fax (212) 972-0905

1522 K Street, NW, #910
Washington, DC 20005
Tel (202) 371-6592
Fax (202) 371-0124

Copyright © August 1991 by Human Rights Watch
All Rights Reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN
Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number

Cover Design by Charlotte Staub

The Helsinki Watch Committee

Helsinki Watch was formed in 1978 to monitor and promote observance of domestic and international compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki Accords. The Chair is Robert L. Bernstein; Vice Chairs, Jonathan Fanton and Alice Henkin; Executive Director, Jeri Laber; Deputy Director, Lois Whitman; Washington Representative, Catherine Cosman; Staff Counsel, Holly Cartner; Staff Consultant, Ivana Nizich; Orville Schell Fellow, Robert Kushen; Associates, Sarai Brachman, Pamela Cox, Mia Nitchun and Elisabeth Socolow.

Helsinki Watch is affiliated with the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, which is based in Vienna.

Human Rights Watch

Helsinki Watch is a component of Human Rights Watch, which includes Americas Watch, Asia Watch, Africa Watch, Middle East Watch and the Fund for Free Expression. The Chair is Robert L. Bernstein and the Vice Chair is Adrian W. DeWind. Aryeh Neier is Executive Director; Kenneth Roth, Deputy Director; Holly J. Burkhalter, Washington Director; Susan Osnos, Press Director.

Executive Directors

Africa Watch, Rakiya Omaar; Americas Watch, Juan Mendez; Asia Watch, Sidney R. Jones; Helsinki Watch, Jeri Laber; Middle East Watch, Andrew Whitley.

Table of Contents

Preface	
Introduction.....	
The Legacy of Slavery:	
A Historical Overview	
Treatment of Gypsies During Communist Rule	
Culture	
Housing.....	
Education	
Employment.....	
Relations With Police.....	
The Situation of Gypsies Today	
Culture	
Political Process	
Education	
Housing.....	
Mass Media.....	
Employment.....	
Police and Criminal Justice System	
Violent Attacks on Gypsy Communities	
International Law	
Recommendations.....	
Appendix A.....	
Appendix B.....	
Appendix C.....	

Acknowledgments

The research for this report was conducted during three fact-finding missions to Romania consisting of six weeks total. Theodore Zang, Jr., Staff Counsel to Helsinki Watch, and Robert Levy, Senior Attorney for the New York Civil Liberties Union, each participated in a mission to Romania during this period. The report was written by Holly Cartner.¹

Helsinki Watch conducted interviews with over 200 Gypsies, including many victims and eyewitnesses of violent attacks, and Gypsy leaders at the local and national level. Helsinki Watch interviewed Gypsies from a wide variety of backgrounds, including rural and urban Gypsies, in different trades and professions, whose mother language is Romani, Romanian, or Hungarian, and who are semi-nomadic or sedentary.

Helsinki Watch also spoke with mayors and prefects representing villages where there have been ethnic conflicts, local prosecutors, representatives from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Labor and Interior, as well as representatives from the Parliamentary Commission investigating violence against Gypsies, the Parliamentary Commission on Minorities, and the Chief of Police. Helsinki Watch also made a special effort to talk with non-Gypsy villagers living in or near Gypsy communities to get their perspective.

Helsinki Watch visited many cities and villages where Gypsies live, including: Baia Mare [Coltău, Libotin], Bolintin Deal, Braşov, Bucharest [Ferentari, Colentin, Sinteşti], Cluj [Recea Cristur, Byron, Hatvanul, Huedin], Constanţa [M. Kogalniceanu, Basarab, Cuza Voda, Palazu Mare], Covasna [Lunga], Craiova, Satu Mare [Turu Lung], Sfintu Gheorghe [Vîrghiş, B], Sibiu [Şeica Mare, Bratei, Cîlnic] and Tîrgu Mureş [Reghin, St. Gheorghe].

Helsinki Watch wishes to thank Gypsy leaders throughout Romania who provided contacts and background information, and who took time off from their jobs to travel with Helsinki Watch representatives. Special thanks goes to Nicolae Gheorghe for sharing his knowledge about Gypsies in Romania and his thoughtful analysis of the current situation. Finally, a special note of gratitude to Gabriela Hainagiu and Vera Cîmpeanu for interpreting, as well as innumerable other assistance provided over the course of the last months.

¹Portions of the section on International Law appeared previously in *Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Gypsies of Bulgaria*, and was written by Theodor Zang, Jr.

Preface

Gypsies in Romania have been the target of increasingly violent attacks during the 20 months since the revolution that toppled Nicolae Ceausescu. Their homes have been burned down and vandalized, they have been beaten by vigilante mobs or, on occasion arrested by the police and beaten in police custody, and they have been chased out of one village after another, often without any opportunity to return. Gypsies have lost their lives, their property, their security, and any hope they may have had after the revolution for a better life. One Gypsy woman expressed a view shared by many of the Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch:

It was better under Ceausescu. We were left alone. No one bothered us. No one tried to attack us. No one called us "Gypsy." Now people insult us. They say all kinds of insulting things. They try to force us out of our homes, villages, out of Romania."

In addition to the violence, Gypsies in Romania continue to experience discrimination in most aspects of life. Gypsies are frequently placed in the worst housing, in the worst area. Basic services such as water, street maintenance, or garbage pick-up are not equally allocated to neighboring Gypsy and non-Gypsy communities.

The school system also discriminates against Gypsy children. They are looked on as "slow" or inherently bad because they are Gypsies. Gypsies repeatedly told Helsinki Watch that their children are placed in the back of the class on the first day of school, before they have had a chance to misbehave.

Gypsies are not equally treated in the workplace. They are less likely than a non-Gypsy to receive a job for which they are equally qualified. Gypsies have long been directed into the dirtiest and least paid jobs, and regardless of their qualifications and seniority, they are often denied promotions. Gypsies also report that the increasing unemployment in Romania due to economic reforms disproportionately affects Gypsies.

Gypsies have been portrayed in a particularly negative way in the Romanian mass media. Romanian state-controlled television has manipulated the stereotype of Gypsies as thieves and black market dealers for political purposes. Television cameras focus in on Gypsy participants in political demonstrations in an

effort to compromise the political opposition. The Romanian media is quick to point out that a particular criminal is a Gypsy, reinforcing negative stereotypes, and in general uses derogatory words to refer to Gypsies.

Discriminatory treatment of Gypsies in Romania is nothing new. However, since the 1989 revolution, nationalism and ethnic hatred have increased dramatically. Gypsies, as the most visible and powerless of minority groups in Romania, are easily targeted. They have been made scapegoats by the authorities and have been victims of increasingly violent attacks by other Romanian citizens.

One of the unintended consequences of this nationalism, is the corresponding rise in ethnic consciousness. In the last 20 months, Gypsies have understood clearly that their treatment was directly linked to their ethnicity. As one woman who was beaten during an attack on her village put it, "Before we never thought much about being Gypsies. Now we know what it means to be a Gypsy. It has been made very clear to me what that means."

Gypsy political parties, cultural unions and newspapers have begun to raise the issues of discrimination and ethnic hatred that were not discussed for decades. They are raising the consciousness of the Gypsy people and perhaps the non-Gypsy citizens of Romania as well.

* * *

This report deals briefly with the history of Gypsies in Romania, when they arrived in the area that is now Romania, the 500 years of slavery that followed, and the deportation and killing of Gypsies during World War II. The report discusses the treatment of Gypsies under the communist regime, with a particular focus on governmental policies that were discriminatory in intent and/or effect on the Gypsy population. Finally, and most importantly, a considerable portion of this report is devoted to the situation of Gypsies under the new government, especially the violence experienced by Gypsy communities all over Romania since the revolution.

Introduction

Although scholars now agree that Gypsies migrated from northern India between the 10th and 11th centuries, the Gypsies' origin was long the source of great controversy. According to Dr. Ian Hancock, a representative of the International Romani Union to the United Nations, Gypsies were widely thought to be Turks because they arrived in Europe during the Tartar invasions of the Byzantine Empire.

The term "Gypsy" derives from the word "Egyptian"; a name "used in a vague way for any exotic, or Eastern, Islamic peoples" and was applied to Gypsies early on.² As Gypsy consciousness grows, Gypsies tend to reject the name "Gypsy" as a misnomer at best, and as derogatory at worst. Instead, Gypsies increasingly refer to themselves as "Roma" (or "Romanies" in English).³

However, it was only in the mid-18th century that scholars discovered Gypsies' Indian heritage. Until that time, the people who came in contact with Gypsies were left to speculate, sometimes wildly, about their roots. Dr. Hancock describes:

²Ian Hancock, "The Romani Diaspora: Part I," *The World and I*, (March 1989), p.614.

³In this report, Helsinki Watch uses the word "Gypsy," because it is most easily recognized in English, and because "Roma" is not used by Hungarian-speaking Gypsies in Romania. This is reflected in such bilingual Gypsy organizations as "The Union of Roma and Gypsies From Mures."

Some writers thought Gypsies were Jews from Egypt, others that they were Egyptians who chased the Jews out of that country, others that they were the lost continent of Atlantis, and still others that Gypsies came from outer space Another widespread belief was that Gypsies were not an ethnic people at all, but a population made up of renegades and outlaws from European society who made their skins brown with fruit juice and who spoke a made-up language. The idea that Gypsies are not a "real" people is still quite widespread. Partly because of this, non-Gypsies have created an imaginary Gypsy way of life with all kinds of fanciful characteristics.⁴

It is difficult to estimate the size of the Gypsy population in Romania. The last census was conducted in 1977 and clearly underestimated the Gypsy minority at 227,398, or slightly more than one percent of the population. The Minority Rights Group based in London reported in February, 1987 that it estimated the Gypsy population in Romania to be 760,000 (second only to Yugoslavia), thereby making up 3.35% of the Romanian population. While this estimate took into account high birth rates, it was also based on available census figures.

The Gypsy population in Romania is currently believed by most to be at least 2.5 million, thereby making up the largest minority in Romania and over 10 percent of the total population (Romania's population is 23 million).

Gypsies live all over Romania, in almost every town and village. The most recent figures, taken from the 1977 census, indicated that 30.1 percent of the Gypsy population was urban and 69.9 percent was still rural.

While Gypsies share a common Indian heritage, it is difficult to speak of a single Gypsy population. As Dr. Hancock explains:

It must be kept in mind that although the Romani Gypsies entered Europe six centuries ago as a single people, it is not possible to speak of Gypsies as a unified ethnic whole; nor is there today one single Gypsy culture.⁵

⁴Hancock, p. 614.

⁵Hancock, p. 616.

The population that we consider "Gypsy" is, in fact, composed of numerous distinct groups divided by tribal loyalty linked to traditional professions, language spoken, and whether they are or have been recently nomadic, or are sedentary. Members of these groups may recognize each other as Gypsies, but they frequently view other groups of Gypsies with distrust, or even outright dislike.

In fact, there appears to be some confusion in the minds of many Gypsies as to the definition of a Gypsy. Many interviewed by Helsinki Watch seem to view their ethnic identity through the eyes of the majority Romanian population, and understand the term to be pejorative. They see that they do not fulfill the stereotype of a Gypsy, and attempt to explain this by drawing a distinction between themselves and other Gypsies. The following comments are typical:

A Gypsy man from only Romanian speaking Gypsy quarters of Bratei:

We don't have problems with the police. Real Gypsies are nomads living down the road. They have their own language unlike us. We don't consider ourselves Gypsies, although others call us Gypsies. But I guess we are Gypsies.

In comparison, a Gypsy man from the Romani-speaking quarters of the same village also draws a distinction:

We don't steal. We don't deal on the black market. We are religious. We speak perfect Romani. All the children speak it. This is the most important thing because it distinguishes us from the other Gypsies. We don't allow our children to marry Gypsies who don't speak Romani. The other Gypsies have different souls and are disorganized and drink and, therefore, are poor. It is their own fault.

In Romania alone, there are at least 40 different groups of Gypsies, including: Ursari (bear trainers); Caldarari (tinsmiths and coppersmiths); Sastrari (blacksmiths); Castari (woodworkers); Corturari (Tent dwellers); Grastari (horse dealers); Lautari (musicians); Netotsi (descendants of runaway slaves who had become bandits); Spoitori (whitewashers); Rudari (); Laiesi (); and Slatari (). According to William Lockwood, these distinctions have gradually become less significant in countries such as Romania, due to "forced sedentarization, cultural amalgamation, and the refusal of governments to recognize

Gypsies as a legitimate ethnic group."⁶ However, as will be discussed below, these divisions within the Gypsy population still play an important role in present day Romania.

⁶William G. Lockwood, "Balkan Gypsies: An Introduction," Papers from the 4th and 5th Annual Meetings, Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter, (1985), p. 96.

There is also linguistic diversity among Gypsies in Romania. An estimated 60 percent of Gypsies speak Romani (Romanesc or the Gypsy language) in the family, but most also speak Romanian or Hungarian depending on where they are located geographically.⁷ (Smaller groups also speak German, Slavic, Turkish or Greek). However, there are also Gypsies who have lost the Romani language and only speak either Romanian or Hungarian.

Most Gypsies in Romania are now sedentary. As will be discussed below, those who were still nomadic at the end of World War II were forced to settle. However, this settlement program was not totally successful, and the Minority Rights Group reported in 1987 that: "It is officially admitted that 10% are on the road at any one time. During the winter, families attach themselves to the quarters of settled Roma, setting up makeshift dwellings and encampments. In spring they move on again."⁸

⁷Interview with Nicolae Gheorghe, Bucharest, September, 1990. Interview with Ina Radu, Bucharest, April, 1991.

⁸Minority Rights Group Report (1987) p. 11.

The Legacy of Slavery: A Historical Overview

Gypsies are believed to have arrived in the territory that is present-day Romania sometime prior to 1300 AD, by which time they had already begun to be enslaved. According to the Romanian scholar Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, a document dated 1387 and signed by Mircea the Great reveals that Gypsies had already been in Wallachia for almost a century.⁹

In contrast to their treatment in many countries where Gypsies were forced to leave, in the Romanian principalities they were enslaved. Comparing the situation of Gypsies in Europe, Jean-Pierre Liegeois stated:

The enslavement of Gypsies in the Romanian principalities,... is the worst case of enforced restriction. Here, from the fourteenth century onwards, Gypsies were not expelled but instead became slaves of the state, the clergy, or the lords.¹⁰

⁹See Ian Hancock, *The Pariah Syndrome*, (Koroma Publishers Inc., 1987), p. 11.

¹⁰Pierre Liegeois, p. 110.

This state of slavery was perpetuated through the legal system of the time.¹¹

The circumstances under which Gypsies became slaves are not well understood, but it is quite clear that once they were the property of landowners, churches and monasteries, they were cruelly treated. One account depicts the ruthlessness of the landowners:

¹¹In *The Pariah Syndrome* (pp. 28-9), Dr. Hancock sets out provisions of the Wallachian Penal Code of 1818 pertaining to Gypsies:

Sec. 2 Gypsies are born slaves.

Sec. 3 Anyone born of a mother who is a slave, is also a slave.

Sec. 5 Any owner has the right to sell or give away his slaves.

Sec. 6 Any Gypsy without an owner is the property of the Prince.

and provisions of the Moldavian Penal Code of 1833:

Sec. II:154 Legal unions cannot take place between free persons and slaves.

Sec. II:162 Marriage between slaves cannot take place without their owner's consent.

Sec. 11:174 The price of a slave must be fixed by the Tribunal, according to his age, condition and profession.

Sec. II:176 If anyone has taken a female slave as a concubine...she will become free after his death. If he has had children by her, they will also become free.

The boyars had a special penal code for Gypsies; beating on the soles of the feet until the flesh hung in shreds . . . when a runaway was caught, his neck was placed in an iron band lined with sharp points so that he could neither move his head nor lie down to rest. The boyars had no right to kill their slaves, but there was nothing said about slowly torturing them to death. No law forbade the boyar to take the most beautiful girls as his mistresses, or to separate wives from husbands, and children from parents.¹²

Similarly, the famous Romanian writer Mihail Kogalniceanu, writing in 1837, described the treatment of Gypsies that he had observed during his childhood:

On the streets of the [Iași] of my youth, I saw human beings wearing chains on their arms and legs, others with iron clamps around their foreheads, and still others with metal collars about their necks. Cruel beatings, and other punishments such as starvation, being hung into the snow or the frozen rivers, such was the fate of the wretched Gypsy.¹³

¹²Konrad Bercovici, *The Story of the Gypsies* (Jonathan Cape: London, 1928), as reported in *The Pariah Syndrome*, p. 20.

¹³Mihail Kogalniceanu, *Esquisse sur l'histoire, les moeurs et la langue des Cigains*, (Behr Verlag:Berlin, 1837), as translated in *The Pariah Syndrome*, p. 32.

Gypsies experienced similar conditions in Transylvania (then under Hungarian rule and now part of greater Romania) where they were also forced into slave labor by the Crown. Hancock also reports that Gypsies were made the property of landowners during the Austro-Hungarian Empire and that, during the reign of Empress Maria Theresa (1717-1780), special efforts were made to assimilate the Gypsies, by forbidding them to speak Romani and prohibiting Gypsies from practicing their traditional professions.¹⁴

By the mid-19th century Western Europe was beginning to urge the abolishment of slavery, and abolitionist sentiments were also growing in the Romanian principalities. Following the lead of several individual slave owners who had freed their own slaves, slavery was abolished and made illegal in Moldavia on December 23, 1855, and in Wallachia on February 8, 1856.

Many Gypsies fled the Balkans after the abolition of slavery and headed toward Europe and on to North America. For those who remained behind, however, very little changed. Many ultimately sold themselves back to their former masters because they had no means of providing for themselves or their families. According to one scholar, the distribution of the Gypsy population reflected this tendency until shortly before World War II.

At the time of their liberation, Gypsies stayed mainly in the areas in which they had traditionally been located. Today, the densest concentrations are still found around the monasteries, which had owned many of the slaves.¹⁵

[Translation from Potra, pp. 121-124]

In the pre-World War II period, Gypsies in Romania began to organize

¹⁴*The Pariah Syndrome*, pp. 50-1.

¹⁵Grauer, (1934), p. 108.

collectively. In 1933, the General Association of Roma in Romania was founded and a year later a conference was held in Bucharest establishing the General Union of Roma in Romania. The Union held numerous meetings between 1934 and 1939, but World War II halted progress in this area.¹⁶

¹⁶Jean-Pierre Liegeois, *Gypsies: An Illustrated History*,(), pp. 145-46.

The pro-Nazi government of Marshall Ion Antonescu, which came to power in 1939, was vocal in its anti-minorities and anti-Gypsy sentiment. On July 8, 1941, Antonescu made a speech calling for the 'elimination' of national minorities.¹⁷

As an Axis power, Romania occupied the Ukraine, Odessa, and the area up to the Dnieper River (also referred to as Transnistria) during the fall and winter of 1941-42. On the order of Antonescu, over 26,000 Gypsies were deported to camps located in the occupied areas from the fall of 1942 to the summer of 1944. At the war trial of Antonescu, he justified the deportations, testifying that:

Because of the [] in Bucharest and other cities thefts and murder occurred and then the public appealed to me to protect them because [the Gypsies] entered into houses at night. After many investigations it was determined that armed Gypsies, many with war weapons, were committing these attacks. All those Gypsies were deported.¹⁸

In general, Gypsies were selected randomly for deportation. However, it does appear that nomadic Gypsies were a particular target of the round-ups.¹⁹ In

¹⁷Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies*, (Sussex Univ. Press, 1972), p. 128.

¹⁸Transcript of the trial of "The Great National Traitors" [Procesul Marei Tradari Nationale] (1945), p. 66. See also Radu Ioanid, "The Sword of the Archangel: Fascist Ideology in Romania," (East European Monograph - Columbia University Press, 1990), p. 213-216.

¹⁹Interview with Radu Ioanid, researcher on Romania for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, June 1991.

1944, Ion Chelcea, a Romanian , felt that:

[N]omadic Gypsies are impossible to assimilate. And even if, by God knows what means, that assimilation could be brought about, it would gravely disturb the make-up of Rumanian blood. That is why we are for a total separation of nomadic Gypsies. A portion of them must nonetheless be set aside in a nature preserve so that the country may keep a rare species. The rest do not count. In our days they might be moved to somewhere in Transnistria or beyond the Bug . . .²⁰

Gypsies transported to occupied areas suffered untold misery. One account describes the conditions:

Dispatched from Bucharest in cattle trucks, the journey took some weeks and because of the cold nights, lack of blankets and inadequate food supply, many died of hunger and exposure before arriving at the River Bug in the Ukraine. Those that had survived were lodged in huts and made to work digging trenches. Those found with gold teeth had them pulled out.²¹

According to the Romanian War Crimes Commission, set up by the Romanian People's Court after World War II, 36,000 Gypsies died during the war period, making the number of Gypsy deaths in Romania the highest in any country in Europe.²² The War Crimes Commission reported that:

Tens of thousands of defenseless Gypsies were herded together in Transnistria. Over half were struck by typhus. The

²⁰Radu Ioanid, (translated by Peter Heinegg), *The Sword of the Archangel: Fascist Ideology in Romania*, (East European Monographs, Columbia Univ. Press, N.Y., 1990), p. 216.

²¹Kenrick and Puxon, p. 129.

²²See Kenrick and Puxon, p. 184. It should be noted, however, that while Romania had the highest number of Gypsies die during the war, as a percentage of the Gypsy population (12%), it was much lower than countries such as Germany (75%) and Poland (70%).

gendarmerie practiced unprecedented terror; everyone's life was uncertain; tortures were cruel.²³

Helsinki Watch interviewed numerous Gypsies about their experiences during World War II. A (formerly) nomadic Gypsy from Sibiu said:

"We had special problems under Antonescu. It must have been 1938-42 when we heard that Gypsies were being deported and we had to be careful not to get caught. We would have been deported.

Similarly, a Gypsy from Covasna recalled:

I must have been 11 or 12 years old when they came and took away some Gypsies living near us. When we heard this we packed up and left quickly during the night. I don't remember much except that we were all afraid, and felt lucky that we had left in time.

²³J. Schechtman, "The Gypsy Problem," *Midstream*, (November 1966) pp. 52-60, p.57.

However, surprisingly few of those interviewed by Helsinki Watch could remember anything specific about the war period. Kenrick and Puxon also report that many of the Gypsies they interviewed "could not distinguish the period of the war" and attribute this to the fact that, although many Gypsies were deported, those who were not captured remained free and comparatively unaffected by the war.²⁴

As a consequence of the deportation of Gypsies during World War II and the general atmosphere of hostility toward minorities, some Gypsies felt it wise to assimilate as best they could. A typical comment was: "Many of our people have not maintained our culture. A long time ago, during the war, they were too afraid and didn't follow their customs. So they adapted themselves, but they lost much in the process."

²⁴Kenrick and Puxon, p. 130.

Treatment of Gypsies During Communist Rule

In theory, the Socialist Republic of Romania guaranteed the fundamental human rights of all Romanian citizens without regard to national origin. Article 17 of the August 21, 1965 constitution stated that:

The citizens of the Socialist Republic of Romania are equal in all areas of economic, political, juridical, social and cultural life, without difference on the basis of nationality, race, sex, or belief.

The State guarantees the equality of the citizen. No limitations of this right and no difference in the exercise of this right based on nationality, race, sex or belief are permissible.

In practice, however, these rights were subordinated to the objectives of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) and its leadership. There was no means by which to enforce the rights in the constitution and they were essentially meaningless. As one author put it, "From the standpoint of the individual citizen, since no judicial review over the constitutionality of government acts existed, the articles of the constitution pertaining to basic rights remained unenforceable."²⁵

Gypsies were never officially considered a national or ethnic minority in Romania. Most books that discuss minorities in Romania do not refer to Gypsies at all. For example, in a publication entitled Romania's Population, published in Bucharest in 1972, Romanians, Hungarians and Germans were identified as making up almost 99 percent of the population. A fourth category entitled "other nationalities" included "Ukrainians, Ruthenians, Hutsulains, Serbians, Croats, Slovaks, Russians, Tartars, Turks, Jews, etc.", comprising one percent of the total population.²⁶ One Gypsy man jokingly told Helsinki Watch: "We weren't Gypsies at all. We were always 'and all other nationalities' or just 'excetera.'"

²⁵Richard F. Starr, *Communist Regimes in Eastern Europe*, (Hoover Institution Press, 4th ed., 1982), p.193.

²⁶*Romania's Population*, (Meridiane Press: Bucharest, 1972), pp. 91-2.

Almost immediately after the communists gained control in 1946, the first program was initiated to settle Gypsies who were still nomadic. There are no available statistics on the percentage of the Gypsies population that was nomadic in 1950. However, as discussed above, many Gypsies in Romania had already been settled for several centuries as a result of slavery. Of those that were still travelling before World War II, many had been deported and had died in transit. Nevertheless, the Romanian government considered it necessary to forcibly settle nomadic Gypsies by such measures as confiscating horses and wagons. As one Gypsy man in the town of Brasov described it:

Nicolae Gheorghe believes that the forced settlement program was an effort by the Romanian government to

In 1951, the Ministry of Interior began to disperse compact groups of Gypsies so that they could be more easily monitored by the police.²⁷ Some Gypsies were forcibly settled on the fringe of existing villages. They were resented by the villagers already living in the area, and have generally found integration into these communities difficult. In fact, several of the Gypsy areas attacked during the last year were areas where Gypsies were settled after 1950. (See M. Kogalniceanu at p. , and Bolintin Deal at p.). One Gypsy whose house was burned recently reported to Helsinki Watch: "There had been many Gypsies living [in Megidia] but we were split up by the police and sent to different areas in 1951. Only a few of us came here."

By the early seventies, the official policy was to simply ignore the existence of Gypsies. As one Romanian woman explained: "It was as if Gypsies did not even exist. We all knew that they were here. We could see them. But as far as the Party went, they simple did not exist." In fact, by 1972 the RCP had announced that it had resolved the ethnic problem in Romania. "The national problem was solved in Romania in the process of the great post-war revolutionary transformations. The creation of the conditions for the multilateral social assertion of all the country's citizens, irrespective of nationality, the strengthening of the brotherhood between the Romanian people and the co-inhabiting nationalities

²⁷"Comuna Mihail Kogalniceanu - " *EXPRES* (October 30, 1990).

underlies the national policy of the Romanian state."²⁸

²⁸*Romania's Population*, p. 92.

It is nevertheless clear that the RCP leadership was quite aware of its sizable Gypsy population and was attempting to address what it considered to be serious problems with the Gypsy minority. In 1977, the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) issued a decision that additional efforts should be made to integrate Gypsies. The motivation for this renewed effort is unclear. Sam Beck, who conducted field research in Romania during this period, reported that Gypsies "are seen in an embarrassing light, as a primitive people practicing ancient forms of life and therefore not a true reflection of the progress achieved by a modernizing and communizing Romania. Romanian officials are embarrassed by the [Gypsies] who they perceive as reflecting backwardness and underdevelopment. To alter the "uncivilized" conditions of [Gypsies], an integration and assimilation policy was instituted."²⁹

Local committees were formed within the Commission on Demographics to study the problems of integrating Gypsies. These local committees were to be made up of educators, health officials, and representatives from the Party and the police. There is very little information about the actual activities of these committees. However, Nicolae Gheorghe, who actually worked with the Commission on Demography from 198 - , stated: "Dispersion was a policy for many years to integrate [Gypsies] into society. But integration meant assimilation. It was part of the socialist program." Helsinki Watch was able to obtain a report prepared by [] in 1983 evaluating the integration effort.
[Translation of portions of report]

Culture

Prior to 1990, the Romani language was not taught in Romanian schools. Gypsy history and culture were never a part of the school curriculum. There were no newspapers printed in the Romani language, and no publications specifically for Gypsies in Romanian or Hungarian.

Ceausescu's cultural policies became increasingly nationalistic during the 1980s, and Romanian culture took priority over the cultures of minorities within Romania. As one Hungarian described it: "Ceausescu's cultural policy was one of

²⁹Sam Beck, "The Romanian Gypsy Problem," *Papers from the 4th and 5th Annual Meetings, Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter*, (1985), pp. 102-3.

homogenization of the Romanian society at any cost." The cost for Gypsy culture was great.

Gypsy musicians and singers are considered the best entertainers in Romania. However, even in this area Gypsies were frequently confronted with discrimination. Tamas Francisc, an ethnic Hungarian professor of music and member of many folk music groups, reported:

As the approach to culture became more nationalistic, Ceausescu decided that there were too many Gypsies in folk groups. I would estimate that Gypsies made up approximately 60 percent of such groups. Around 1978-79, Gypsies began to be kicked out of folk music groups. It was gradual, but it was no coincidence.

Gypsy performers were also denied on occasion the right to appear on television solely because of their "Gypsy appearance." Ion Onoriu, President of the Democratic Union of Roma in Romania (UDR), is a popular musician. He described what he had observed during the 1970-1980s:

It was often the case after 1978 that if a Gypsy was a great musician, he would be recorded, but a Romanian would be put on the television to play along to the previously recorded music. The Gypsy would not be acknowledged for playing the music. I don't think it was actually a decree. It was a decision of the [state-owned] television studios. When I think that Gypsies who looked most like Gypsies were not allowed to perform, I want the whole television staff changed. Every single one of them.

Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch also reported that they were not able to play traditional Gypsy music and were not able to sing in the Romani language. Gabi Lunca, a famous Gypsy singer (and wife of Mr. Onoriu) explained: We weren't allowed to sing in Romani, only in Romanian. I don't know what would have happened if we had, but we were afraid to have troubles.

Professor Tamas, although not himself a Gypsy, was able to confirm what Ms. Lunca had described:

At the local level there were orders not to allow Gypsies to

perform their own music. It was simply not allowed.

The 1983 Report recommended that a special effort be made to include Gypsy musical talents in the national festival "The Song of Romania", and that authentic elements of Gypsy folklore be presented.

For many years Gypsies were not able to form even cultural associations. However, in 1985 Romania tentatively permitted the establishment of a Roma cultural committee charged with organizing an annual festival. The first festival was held in Sibiu and included singing, dancing and drama performances. This festival was held with official approval.³⁰

Housing

With each assimilation attempt, efforts were made to settle nomadic Gypsies. According to Romanian law during the Ceausescu , every citizen was required to have a permanent, registered address. Nevertheless, there were Gypsy families that did not completely give up their travels. Typically, they had a fixed location where they spent the winter months, travelling only during the spring and summer. Gypsies who were semi-nomadic got around restrictions against travelling by paying fines and bribes to the police.

Gypsies were usually located on the fringe of larger towns or cities, and inevitably received the worst housing. Helsinki Watch received numerous complaints about the inequitable distribution of housing during the Ceausescu years. Furthermore, in villages where many Gypsies or only Gypsies lived, things were often left to deteriorate. Government services were turned off without explanation, or they were never provided in the first place. Some Gypsies reported that Romanian neighbors received such services as garbage collection and electricity, while they were left without.

Gypsy ghettos were targets of Ceausescu's "systematization"³¹ program, which called for the destruction of whole districts populated by Gypsies. As part of

³⁰Minority Rights Group, p. 10.

³¹"Systemization" was intended to . . .

this plan, areas such as the Linjurari district in Cluj, and the districts of Colentina and Dudești in Bucharest, were to be razed. According to Nicolae Gheorghe: "Pending this action, the basic infrastructure (electrical and water supply, shops, school, medical amenities, etc.) was shut down.

"Systematization" rarely had the intended positive effect on the Gypsy housing situation, and frequently the results were devastating. Nicolae Gheorghe recalled:

The traditional Gypsy quarters were destroyed. In some cases this improved the lives of Gypsies. But Gypsies were concentrated in blocks of flats, in urban ghettos. When I first saw such areas, I was literally shocked by the misery there. So many people are concentrated in such a small amount of space. The blocks of flats were built in bad condition. Water is not running. Some Romanians live in these conditions as well, but mostly Gypsies. The result is a deterioration of social life.

The Ceaușescu government also had a policy of moving Gypsies into houses confiscated from emigrants. This policy created enormous resentment among non-Gypsy neighbors. For example, in the town of Sibiu, Gypsies were given the homes of Germans emigrating to the Federal Republic of Germany. As one Romanian woman recalled: "Ceaușescu put Gypsies in German communities. It was not long before the houses were ruined. This was viewed as a way to destroy the whole German community."

Education

Of all ethnic minorities in Romania, Gypsies were the least advantaged educationally. Trond Gilberg reported that Gypsies constituted:

[A]n educationally backward ethnic group in 1956. There are virtually no Gypsies in lycees and higher schools, and even at the seven-year level less than five hundred Gypsies can be found. The bulk of this nationality is enrolled in four-year schools or in "miscellaneous" institutions. Part of this educational underrepresentation at higher levels stems from the age profile of Gypsies, but the most important factor is the woeful lack of educational mobilization in this group as late as 1956. The Gypsies continued to be basically a traditional nationality as yet

only marginally touched by modernization.³²

There were also many Gypsies in Romania that had no formal education at all. The 1956 figures for illiteracy indicate that 37.7% of Gypsies eight years and over were illiterate (compared to 10.9% for Romanians and 3.1% for Hungarians and Jews, and 1.1% for Germans.³³

Progress was made during the next decade, and by 1966 Gilberg reported that "virtually every child would get some elementary education." However, these gains were "only at the primary school level. Gypsies had only token representation in professional, middle, technical, and lycee institutions. At the highest level, only one Gypsy could be found."³⁴

The 1983 Report on Integration of Gypsies revealed that there were continuing problems with education of Gypsy children. The Report stated:

Many adult Gypsies are illiterate and semi-illiterate, while at the same time [negligent] with regard to the obligatory school attendance of their children. According to statistics from the county school inspectors, in the school year 1982-83, there were 3,500 Gypsy children [not attending school]. However, a survey by the Ministry of Education revealed that, in some schools, the number of Gypsy children [nescolarizati] is much higher.³⁵

³²Trond Gilberg, "Ethnic Minorities in Romania Under Socialism," *East European Quarterly*, (Vol. VII, No. 4), p. 445.

³³Gilberg, p. 447.

³⁴Gilberg, p. 448.

³⁵*Report on Integration of Gypsies*, (1983), p. 5.

There were many factors contributing to the low school attendance of Gypsy children. The 1983 Report recognized that one reason for low school attendance was the poverty in which many Gypsy families lived. As one Gypsy mother put it:

I am embarrassed to send the children to school like this. They don't have clothes to wear and, if we send them dressed like this, they are ridiculed and laughed at. So they just stay at home.

A Gypsy man from Craiova related:

Many Gypsy families didn't have the means to dress their children well. It is normal that if you have large families you will have bigger economic problems. So parents had to send their children to school poorly dressed, with hand-me-down clothes. During Ceausescu's time, these children were viewed differently by the teachers. The teachers, seeing the children poorly dressed, put them in the back of the class where they wouldn't be seen. They also looked at their clothes and thought poverty was the same as stupidity. The children felt this animosity and, as a result, they often left school.

One problem apparently not taken into consideration by the Romanian government is the inability of some Gypsy children to speak Romanian when they begin school, having spoken only Romani in their families. No programs were ever developed to address the special problems of these children.

The 1983 Report also failed to mention the problem of discrimination³⁶ in the schools which many Gypsy parents identified as one reason their children did not want to go to school. Istvan Mocsel, a leader in Covasna, reported that:

Gypsy children were marginalized in schools under Ceausescu. Teachers didn't take care of them. They sat there and didn't learn

³⁶Article 4 of Law No. 11/1968 stated that "The citizens of the Socialist Republic of Romania have the right to education, with no distinction of nationality, race, sex or religion, and without any other restriction which might constitute discrimination."

anything. Clothes were also a problem. Children simply didn't have clothes to wear to school.

[Report's suggestions]

Employment

As discussed above, Gypsies traditionally worked independently as tinsmiths, brick makers, and woodcarvers. Such trades allowed Gypsies the freedom to travel and to have flexible work periods. Under the socialist system, however, there was little opportunity for such private enterprise. The Romanian government nationalized these home industries and strictly controlled materials necessary for such work. As part of this nationalization process, Gypsies were gradually moved into employment in such areas as agriculture. Trond Gilberg reported in 1972 that: "Available statistics do not offer conclusive evidence on this point, but it seems reasonable to argue that many Gypsies were moved from "traditional" Gypsy occupations such as handicrafts, small trading, or simply nomadism, into a more settled existence in collective farms."³⁷

Many Gypsies reported to Helsinki Watch that they had not been able to practice their traditional trades during the socialist era.

One Gypsy man from Covasnă recounted the previous decades:

We don't beg. We have always tried to live from our work. Our traditional profession is brick building. We worked from May to August. But under Ceausescu it was forbidden to make bricks. The state took the monopoly and only the state could make bricks. We had to make out the best we could.

Another man in the town of Șeica Mare reported:

We had been private farmers, but [the government] took away our authorization and refused to give it back to us. They gave us permission to raise pigs, but only if we sold them all back to the government. Finally, they took that away as well.

There were certain trades that survived even under socialism. They were

³⁷Gilberg, p. 441.

typically trades that required a skill possessed only by Gypsies and/or a skill not easily controlled by the authorities. For example, many coppersmiths and tinsmiths appear to have continued to work in their professions. Some of these had authorization from the Romanian authorities. Nevertheless, many experienced shortages of material and harassment by the police.

Another traditional Gypsy profession that was illegal in socialist Romania was trading. Especially nomadic Gypsies often were able to make a living by acquiring goods in one area and selling them in another, frequently filling a demand for goods in remote areas. Under socialism, such trading was not permitted. Nevertheless, Gypsies were widely identified with the black market for which they were alternately prosecuted and tolerated by the local police.

In general, Gypsies were not treated differently than other Romanians when it came to work authorization. As one Gypsy leader in Bucharest related:

Ceausescu never had a specific anti-Gypsy sentiment. The whole system was against such a concept of private property. Gypsies who had worked in traditional trades no longer had authorization to sell, so it was illegal. The only ones who succeeded were those who provided a service which no one else could fulfill.

Nevertheless, in the area of employment Gypsies were affected disproportionately by the socialist system's restrictions on private property and self-employment due to their own history as independent craftsmen. Ivan Gheorge, in the Employment Office of the Ministry of Labor, told Helsinki Watch:

During Ceausescu's time what wasn't obligatory was forbidden. Gypsies aren't use to laws. Most Gypsies don't like organized work, but that doesn't mean they don't like to work. If they found some work to do independently, it was usually forbidden. The state prevented Gypsies from taking initiative and working for themselves.

In the Socialist Republic of Romania, all persons able to work were required to do so.³⁸ Unemployed Romanians were considered "parasites" under the

³⁸Article 2 of the Labour Code stated that "To all the citizens of the Socialist Republic of Romania, with no restriction or distinction based on sex, nationality, race or religion, the right to work is guaranteed, . . ."

law and could be prosecuted accordingly. Helsinki Watch has previously reported on Decree 153 (See News From Romania, May 1990 and June 1990), a summary proceeding without the basic guarantees of due process.³⁹ Gypsies were frequently prosecuted under Decree 153 because they were unemployed, or because they were employed in traditional trades not authorized by the state. Gabor Gabor, a 51 year old coppersmith, reported:

During Ceausescu's time we had authorization from the police to travel and sell our goods. But the police would sometimes take away the authorization for no good reason. Then we were considered parasites under Decree 153 because we did not have a job, and we would be thrown in jail.

Dan Petre, a Romanian lawyer who has represented many Gypsies, told Helsinki Watch that there were actually two decrees related to parasitism: Decree 153 and Decree 25/1969. According to Mr. Petre:

Decree 153 was always applied abusively. Under Decree 25 the government had a responsibility to find a job for the unemployed and to supervise him; there was no prison term. Gypsies were rarely convicted under this decree. Instead, they were usually prosecuted under Decree 153 and just thrown in jail for up to six months.

Although Decree 153 did not specifically target Gypsies, Nicolae Gheorghe believes that "Decree 153 targeted Gypsies in effect. The law made work an obligation and this had a harsher effect on Gypsies."

Relations with Police

As discussed above, Gypsies often came into conflict with the police and local authorities because they did not work at all, or worked in unauthorized areas.

³⁹As noted in previous Helsinki Watch newsletters, Decree 153 is not considered a criminal decree. Nevertheless, if convicted, the defendant can be sentenced to up to six months in jail.

More generally, however, Gypsies were the target of much police abuse and brutality. According to many Gypsy leaders interviewed by Helsinki Watch, it was commonly known that in each police precinct there was a special department responsible for surveillance of Gypsies. These police officers apparently carried out their assignment by randomly searching the homes of Gypsies and intimidating and abusing Gypsy families.

In the village of Bratei a Gypsy man described his experience:

During Ceausescu's time the police would come here and confiscate some of our goods. They knew that we worked out of our homes and tried to accumulate materials and they would just take them from us. We had no recourse.

Daniel Dima, president of the Gypsy Party in Covasna, related:

Under Ceausescu it was not uncommon for police to come into Gypsy communities and beat Gypsies, even kill them. No one cared about us. We were treated like animals.

Similarly, a Gypsy man from Recea Cristur told Helsinki Watch:

We have had enough problems with the police before and now. The police would frequently say things like "Get out of here you Gypsies" as if Gypsies are disgusting. They came to our houses and if there was a theft in the neighborhood they always came here first - directly to the Gypsies to look for the thief.

Another Gypsy woman from the town of Baia Mare, related a similar story:

Sometimes fights would erupt in the factory, but even if I was beaten up and made a complaint, I was guilty for being beaten. No one cared about the Gypsies.

Adam Cornel, Gypsy leader from Huedin, also reported that:

We had frequent police visits to our area. They would enter into the houses without a warrant. They use to set off firecrackers to scare the children. They thought it was funny. They came to visit at night, usually once a week each month and they would go

to different houses each time. They would break the lock on the door if we weren't at home and enter. If we were at home we never protested because we knew we would be taken to the police station if we did. The police didn't treat Romanians the same way, but we don't have any value as human beings in their eyes.

Helsinki Watch also received numerous reports that local policemen gave orders to restaurant managers not to serve Gypsies after a certain hour. A Gypsy woman from the town of Bratei reported:

The police here gave an order that after 7 p.m. Gypsies couldn't eat in cafeterias and restaurants. This was in Ceaușescu's time.

Ludovic Pintea, a Gypsy leader from Huedin, described:

Under Ceaușescu we were frequently kicked out of restaurants and told to go away because we were not welcome. The store owners and restaurant managers told us that they were not allowed to serve Gypsies on order of the mayor and police. What is more, the police never cared about crimes committed against Gypsies.

A math professor related his experience:

Two years ago [1989] I went with my wife to a restaurant to have dinner. When we went inside the manager heard us speaking Romani and said "No, not here. Get out."

Due to the tremendous pressure to assimilate and the level of discrimination against Gypsies generally, upwardly mobile Gypsies increasingly identified themselves as Romanians. Trond Gilberg reported that:

There was a decrease of approximately 40,000 Gypsies in Romania in the period 1956-66. Out-migration appears to have been small and the bulk of the loss apparently stemmed from Gypsies declaring themselves Romanians in 1966. It seems likely that the better educated, ambitious Gypsies would "switch" nationality in order to achieve upward social mobility, thus

leaving the less educated, more 'traditional' masses of their ethnic brothers behind. . . .

In rural areas, switches from Gypsy to Romanian nationality declarations were less frequent and more of the Romanian speaking Gypsies continued to classify themselves as 'Gypsy.'⁴⁰

Helsinki Watch received numerous reports of pressure exerted on Gypsies to identify themselves as Romanian.⁴¹ Iosif Covaci, a Gypsy leader from Coltău who was a census taker during the mid-1980s, recalled that:

Only eight families (about 45 people) out of a population of 483 Gypsies admitted that they were Gypsies. Then the mayor changed the figures to indicate that only two families (11 people) in the town were Gypsy. Shortly before the census, a Gypsy area in Baia Mare had been demolished and the census takers suggested to Gypsies that they could be given land to build on if they were Romanian. They didn't beat you. They just implied that something that meant life or death to you could be arranged if you cooperated.

For those who refused to say they were Romanian, the numbers were simply altered at a later date. Ina Radu, who worked as a census taker, told Helsinki Watch:

Many of the Gypsies were afraid to say they were Gypsies. I encouraged them to identify themselves as Gypsies, but when I went to the census authorities they refused to include them in the statistics. I insisted that I be included in the census as a Gypsy and so, according to the census, there was only one Gypsy living

⁴⁰Gilberg, p. 452-54.

⁴¹The census being prepared during the mid-1980s was apparently never completed. It should be noted that this treatment was not specific to Gypsies. Helsinki Watch talked with Jews and Hungarians who reported similar pressure to identify themselves as Romanians.

in my village.

The government's assimilation policies caused increasing tensions between Gypsies and non-Gypsies, the full extent of which is only now being felt. Beck reported in 1984 that although Gypsies believed their lives had improved since World War II, they felt the prejudice against them had increased dramatically since the mid-1970s. Beck attributes this rise in ethnic prejudice to three factors: (1) that Gypsies were "increasingly visible in Romanian settlements because they were moved into nucleated and more modern villages, towns and cities"; (2) "there has been a reduction in nomadism in response to laws prohibiting full-time movement, and a consequent increase in the number of settlements"; (3) Gypsies "have decided to take on various forms of wage labor" thereby working in the least desirable jobs.⁴²

* * *

On the one hand, Gypsies clearly experienced discrimination under the socialist regime. However, Romanians tend to believe that Gypsies were protected by Ceausescu and received more favorable treatment than non-Gypsies. [How can this be explained?]

Similarly, Gypsies almost unanimously state that their lives were better under Ceausescu, not because they were treated well under the previous regime, but in comparison to the increasing violence against Gypsies since December 1989. As Ion Onoriu, President of the UDR, expressed it, "For decades we have been looked at with scorn and contempt, have been insulted and joked about. But the violence was missing."

⁴²Beck, p. 106.

The Situation of Gypsies Today

The single, most dramatic change for Gypsies since the 1989 revolution has been the escalation of ethnic hatred and violence directed against them by the non-Gypsy population. Prior to 1990, anti-Gypsy sentiments took more subtle forms of expression. Now, rarely a month goes by that without another Gypsy village being attacked. Many of those interviewed by Helsinki Watch expressed their growing sense of insecurity and fear for their families and homes. After the miners attacked her house during their June 1990 rampage through Bucharest, one Gypsy woman told us: "Now I am afraid to go on the street to buy bread. I am afraid they will say 'You are a Gypsy' and will kill me."

The treatment of Gypsies has improved in several respects. Gypsies now enjoy more cultural and political rights than ever before. They are now able to organize political parties and cultural associations, as well as their own newspapers and journals. The Democratic Union of Roma has been able to place Gypsy leaders in key ministries where they work tirelessly to improve the lives of their people.

However, for the vast majority of Gypsies, little has changed. Poverty, illiteracy and unemployment continue to present serious obstacles to advancement for most Gypsies. Furthermore, these conditions, which are the result of centuries of discriminatory governmental policies, will not be easily or quickly eradicated.

Thus, many Gypsies have come to share the view of a man from Kogalniceanu who told us: "I can't say that there is a better life now. Gypsies were always suffering, but under Ceausescu it was better. Everyone was at least united against him. . . . Now my life's work has been destroyed by a mob. Why should we be happy with this democracy?"

Education

Gypsy children continue to face significant discrimination in the education system. In fact, many Gypsy parents believe that their children are being treated worse than ever, due to the increasing anti-Gypsy sentiment in the country.

Gypsy children suffer from prejudicial treatment of school teachers. Gypsy parents spoke to Helsinki Watch about the attitude of teachers toward their children. Although school attendance is obligatory, most parents felt that no one

really cared whether their children were in school or whether they learned or not. As one parent recalled:

Our children have long been marginalized. We want our children to become civilized and to enter into society. But teachers don't take care of them. They just sit there and don't learn anything. No one cares.

Zeli Kore, from the town of Vîrghiș, stated:

The teachers don't take care of our children because they are Gypsy. They just look at their face and go by that.

Maria Stoica, from Basarab, reported:

Children don't go to school because they are afraid. The teachers put them in the back of the class, instead of the front, and say "Oh, they are only Gypsies."

Maria Varga, a Gypsy mother from Cluj, expressed anger at the teachers treatment of her children:

They call me "Gypsy" and treat my children poorly. The teachers don't pay any attention to the children. They say "you are a Gypsy and have no business sending your children here." They treat the children differently because they are Gypsy. The children are seated together in the back benches of the class.

Marina Duța, a member of the UDR from Bucharest, stated:

A Gypsy child has to know six times more to be considered "good." From day one he is considered to be a poor student because he is a Gypsy, before he has the chance to prove his abilities. The assumption is always that Gypsies are not smart, not good students.

Another Gypsy mother, from the town of Recea Cristur, stated:

I was asked by the teachers "why do you send them to school, they are stupid Gypsy kids." When taxes have to be paid we are like everyone else, but with our children they say Gypsies don't

deserve school. . . . It would be great if we had our own schools. It would be better than now, and if we had Gypsy teachers they would care more for our children.

The absenteeism rate of Gypsy children has apparently always been high. To some extent this is due to a variety of cultural factors. For example, in semi-nomadic families, children may be absent from school for periods of time while the family is travelling. There may also be a different approach to time and space which that does not easily adapt to a regimented school schedule.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the high level of discrimination against Gypsy children contributes to the absentee rate. Several Gypsies commented that the Romanian society does not fully comprehend the extent of the prejudice toward Gypsy children, nor the damage that such prejudice causes to the child. One woman stated:

No one realizes how sensitive children are to their treatment as Gypsies. They know that they are not welcome in the schools. They are made to know it in every way. How can they then be expected to want to go to school.

A non-Gypsy woman who had spent some time teaching in the schools, stated:

You can feel the prejudice in the air. I don't blame Gypsy children for not wanting to go to school. I would not go either, if I were them.

Ina Radu, Inspector for Schools in the Department of Education, observed Gypsy children sitting in the back of the class during a recent school inspection in the town of Predeal. She asked the teacher why they were in the back:

The teacher told me that they are the naughtiest and stupidest children. I told her that if that is so she should put them in front so that she can help them more.

The dropout rate is also very high among Gypsies, although the Department of Education apparently does not have exact statistics. This is due to the poverty in many Gypsy families that makes it necessary for each member to contribute to the family's economic survival as soon as possible. Some Gypsy parents reported to Helsinki Watch that they only allow their sons to attend school

until they are able to work in the family trade, usually until the 4th or 5th grade. This is equally true for Gypsy girls who frequently marry by the age of 13 or 14.

Ina Radu suggested that the government make a family's child allowance dependant on sending the child to school. However, for those children who earn money for the family, this might not be enough of an incentive for the parents.

Gypsy communities that have been violently attacked by neighbors (see below) are experiencing increasing difficulties sending their children to school. A Gypsy woman from the town of Cilnic reported:

My children were beaten by other children at school after our village was attacked. Now the children are afraid to go to school.

A young boy added:

I am afraid to go outside of the classroom at the break because I am afraid they will beat me up.

Romanians, however, express skepticism that Gypsies are afraid to send their children to school. The Mayor of Cilnic told Helsinki Watch: "I don't think the Gypsies have any reason to be afraid. I think the Gypsies make excuses because they don't want to go to school."

The Ministry of Education approved an experimental training program for Gypsy students beginning with the school year 1990-91. The program attempts to train future teachers who will be more sensitive to the cultural and educational needs of Gypsy children, and who will be able to communicate with them in Romani.⁴³ The goals of the program, however, were not well understood by parents, who resisted sending their children to study Romani. In Tirgu Mures, a Gypsy teacher told Helsinki Watch that the Union had only been able to find 20 Gypsy children, although there were 27 places. In general, the Gypsy parents interviewed by Helsinki Watch had quite mixed reactions to classes or schools in Romani. Some Gypsy parents recognized benefits from training for their children in Romani. Wilhelm Csisco, a Hungarian speaking Gypsy from the village of Reghin, stated:

⁴³Classes are currently held in two pedagogical schools to train Gypsy teachers. Classes are also conducted in the Romani language for Gypsy children in four Romanian cities (Bacau, Tirgu Mures and Bucharest).

I think it's very good that there will be teachers learning the Gypsy language. The Hungarian language doesn't have the word "Rom," only the word Gypsy. . . . The education program is very important because now children who didn't feel any connection to school before, will be proud to go to school.

A Gypsy from the town of Huedin stated;

We speak Hungarian. Very few people speak Romani. We want our children and adults to study Romani, but don't want schools. We want to learn about our history and traditions.

However, many parents feared that separate classes or schools would only further marginalize Gypsies, and believed that the best opportunity for their children was to deemphasize their ethnic origin. These comments were typical:

We are not interested in Gypsy schools. We are afraid to be more marginalized. We want to be more integrated and not to focus on being Gypsies.

Petre Anghel, a Gypsy leader from Constanta, expressed a similar view:

It doesn't make sense to have separate Romani schools. We are in Romania and should be able to write Romanian. It is my opinion that there would only be conflicts if we had such schools. We would be further marginalized. We don't have our own country like the Hungarians or Germans.

Adam Cornel, from the town of Huedin, stated:

Because we live in Romania, we don't want to make a difference between ethnic groups. We want to be friends with Hungarians, Romanians, and Gypsies. Separate schools would not help with this goal.

Culture

Significant improvements have been made in the area of cultural rights in

the 20 months since the revolution. The Democratic Union of Roma in Romania was the first cultural union for Gypsies in over 40 years. Due to the lack of funding, the Union has had difficulty carrying out its cultural plans. However, Gypsy leaders have been able to prepare a Gypsy cultural presentation that was carried on the state-run television. Recently, the UDR was also successful in obtaining a building which will house the Roma Cultural Center, and should give them increased opportunity to plan cultural programs and presentations.

Gypsies are free to speak the Romani language and currently have five Gypsy newspapers in print: *Şatra Liberă* (Sloboziă), *Glasul Romilor* (Timișoara), *Neo Drum* and *Nicovala* (Sibiu), *Avena Mentza* (Bucharest). Unlike other minorities, Gypsies do not have a regularly scheduled slot on television. However, it appears that this is due to a lack of resources and not to any discriminatory policy.

Helsinki Watch had the opportunity on several occasions to attend performances of Gypsy dance and music. Gypsy cultural associations now have the opportunity to rent public facilities and to perform in public theaters. Resources are, however, a significant obstacle. For example, in the village of Coltău Helsinki Watch representatives attended a dance and music performance in an old barn with a muddy floor and rain pouring in through the roof. The dancers had no other place to practice that evening, but the conditions in no way dampened their enthusiasm and cheer.

Housing

Gypsies in Romania continue to suffer from poor housing and discrimination in access to public services. Helsinki Watch received numerous reports of Gypsies being assigned the poorest housing, in the poorest areas. Mr. Bology, a Gypsy leader from Oradea related:

Gypsies are the last to be assigned houses. Housing is assigned from the factory where one works and I know many cases where the Gypsies are the last to get available housing and when they get it, it is always the worst type of housing in Romania. They aren't really concerned about housing for Gypsies. Gypsies are just ignored.

A Gypsy man from Bratei stated:

The streets are not very good here. We are tolerated, but never

assisted. This is because we are Gypsies. We don't have drinkable water here. We pay taxes just like everyone else. But our area, our streets, even our electricity, has been neglected.

Similarly, a man from Covasna, recalled:

Usually the Gypsies get the apartments that are not so nice. Those that are in the muddy, swampy areas, full of rats. Those are the apartments for Gypsies.

Silvia Pop, a Gypsy leader from Cluj, described the housing in areas around Cluj:

Where they live is like a hole; cardboard where as many as 15 children live. They begin to sell their children [give them up for adoption to foreigners] because of the poverty and despair.

Adam Cornel, from the town of Huedin, reported:

We don't have electricity and never had. We don't get any services at all. No water and no garbage collection. All garbage from the city goes right into the middle of our quarters. This has been the case for the last 15 years or so. We are near a Romanian area which is further away from the center of town, but there they have electricity and water.

Romanians resent what they see as the "favored" treatment of Gypsies under Ceausescu, where Gypsies were moved into the empty houses of those who had emigrated. Romanians point to the fact that the apartments and houses were destroyed by Gypsies who smashed the windows and set fires inside. Romanians sometimes suggest that Gypsies do not deserve better housing because of their allegedly destructive nature. Clearly, some Gypsies have experienced difficulties adjusting to life in high-rise apartment buildings. Especially previously nomadic Gypsies have, at times, found the modern apartments too confining. Efforts must be made to assist those Gypsies who desire to live in newer apartments to adjust to their new environments. However, this cannot be a justification for discrimination against all Gypsies in the allocation of housing.

Employment

Gypsies also experience significant discrimination in the workplace. Due to their low level of training and education Gypsies are inevitably assigned to the lowest jobs and find upward mobility in their workplace difficult. However, discrimination against Gypsies also plays a substantial role in job assignment and promotions. Petre Burtea, a Gypsy leader from Craiova, reported:

We have many cases where well-trained people tried to get jobs but couldn't because of their clothes, or because they had a long beard (traditional among some Gypsies). Gypsies often face such discrimination.

One Gypsy man in the town of Şeica Mare reported to Helsinki Watch that:

The directory of the factory in Copşa Mică said to me "We won't take anymore Gypsies. We won't receive any more Gypsies and we have no need for you." We are tinsmiths by profession but can't find the materials to do our traditional professions. They have closed down the [agricultural cooperatives] and refuse to hire us in factories. Where are we supposed to work?

Daniel Dima, President of the [] Party in Covasna related:

Even though I am much better integrated than most, I have had problems. Gypsies are always getting different treatment. They don't get the same respect. If a Gypsy makes a mistake at work he is punished more than others and often insulted. Gypsies get the dirtiest, lowest positions.

A Gypsy man from Cluj reported:

It has happened to me. The directors of the factory don't give Gypsies jobs. They frequently say we have no job, but a Romanian goes the next day and is given the same job. Of course, we frequently have no schooling, but even if we are equally trained for a given job we are simply refused the possibility to work.

Interviews with Romanian Gypsies seeking asylum in Germany also revealed that discrimination in employment was prevalent. They reported that they were "simply forced out [of their workplace] with the justification that the work was only for Romanians and not for Gypsies."⁴⁴

⁴⁴Katrin Reemtsma, "Nichts Geändert," *Pogrom*, (Nr. 157, Jan./Feb. 1991), p. 29.

The International Labor Organization has also concluded that Gypsies in Romania suffer serious discrimination in employment. In a report released on June 6, 1991 the ILO found:

The situation of members of the Rom minority was characterised by the direct and indirect discrimination. Direct discrimination was based on presumed physical or moral characteristics, such as, for example "Gypsies don't like to work". These generalisations have a racist character. They take concrete form in the field of employment, in the allocation of Roma to the most arduous jobs with the lowest social status, in wage differentiation and difficulties in respect to promotion.

Indirect discrimination occurs in training and access to employment: certain Roma are marginalised because of their low incomes; consequently, their children are unable to receive the technical or vocational training provided by the educational system. The result is that these children encounter difficulties in respect of access to skilled jobs and are reduced to a marginal status which tends to repeat the pattern set by the previous generation.

Unemployment is no longer a punishable offense under Decree 153 or other similar legislation. In fact, unemployment is increasing dramatically among all Romanian citizens, and Gypsies fear that they will be the first to lose their jobs as the economic situation becomes more severe and unemployment grows. Daniel Dima stated:

If someone must be fired, it is the Gypsy that will go first. If I compare the Gypsies with the other workers, I know that there are many non-Gypsies who are less qualified for the jobs. Still the Gypsy will be the first to be fired. I have been responsible for valuable goods and have proven myself trustworthy. I have worked for over 27 years and still I am afraid I will be one of the first to be fired, because I am a Gypsy.

Silvia Pop, also reported that:

When it comes to work, Gypsies are the first to be thrown out. Gypsies are now more marginalized than under Ceausescu. They only get such jobs as cleaning the streets, only the very dirtiest

jobs. It is the only kind of jobs they can get. There is definitely discrimination. Some of them could get better jobs, but when the [employer] hears "Gypsy" suddenly no job is available.

A Gypsy from Baia Mare, related a similar experience:

When unemployment sets in the first to go are the Gypsies. . . . Many Gypsies will have to be fired just like the Romanians. This is normal in a time of high unemployment. But it is hard not to reach the conclusion that the need to fire workers is being used to specifically target Gypsies.

Vasile Burtea, expert adviser in the Ministry of Labor, stated:

Unemployment will increase the same as it will with others in society, but the ability to find a job for Gypsies will be more difficult since they aren't being hired in new positions.

Article 2 of Law Nr. 30, adopted by the Romanian Parliament on November 16, 1990, states:

All discrimination on the basis of political opinion, ethnicity, religion, age, sex, or social status, is prohibited by law.

Violation of section 1 will result in disciplinary, administrative, civil or penal consequences, depending on the case.

In practice, however, it is very difficult to prove discrimination and according to Ivan Gheorghe, a Gypsy leader and Inspector in the Employment Department (Forță de Muncă) of the Department of Labor, reported to Helsinki Watch that:

I have received information that many factories refuse to hire Gypsies. The law is great, but no one respects the law. I give an unemployed Gypsy work authorization from our office because the factory director has notified us that a worker is needed. However, when he goes to the factory and they see that he is a Gypsy they say there was a mistake. There is no job available. This has happened over and over.

The integration process of the 1970s resulted in a high number of Gypsies being employed by state agricultural cooperatives. These cooperatives have now been disbanded as part of the government's overall reform program. Many citizens

have lost their jobs as a result, including many Gypsies. Istvan Gyorgy, from the town of B, described a typical experience:

I worked for 21 years in the CAP and now it has been closed. I have no money to take care of my family. I went to many places looking for work. No one wants to give me work. Everyone is getting rid of employees.

The new Land law which distributes previously held state land to Romanian citizens based on [], has been criticized by the UDR for disregarding Gypsies who live in the countryside.⁴⁵ Gheorghe Răducanu, representative of the UDR in parliament, also identified the distribution of land as a serious problem for Gypsies who never had land and are now at a serious disadvantage.

y
p
s
i
e
s

a
r
e

a
l
s
o

c
l
o

⁴⁵Statement by the Democratic Union of Roma in Romania, ROMPRES, (February 13, 1991).

s
e
l
y

i
d
e
n
t
i
f
i
e
d

w
i
t
h

t
h
e

e
x
p
a
n
d
i
n
g

b
l
a
c
k

m
a
r
k
e
t

i
n

R
o
m
a
n
i
a
,

a
n
d

t
h
i
s

i
s

a

p
o
i
n
t

o
f

c
o
n
t
e
n
t
i
o
n

w
i
t
h

t
h
e

r
e
s
t

o
f

t
h
e

R
o
m
a
n

i
a
n

p
o
p
u
l
a
t
i
o
n
.

N
i
c
o
l
a
e

G
h
e
o
r
g
h
e

a
d
d
r
e
s

s
e
d

t
h
i
s

i
s
s
u
e
:

S
o
m
e

G
y
p
s
i
e
s

d
e
a
l

b
e
c
a

u
s
e

t
h
i
s

i
s

a

G
y
p
s
y

t
r
a
d
i
t
i
o
n
.

T
h
e

G
y
p
s

i
e
s

b
u
y

t
h
i
n
g
s

f
r
o
m

t
h
e

s
h
o
p
s

a
n
d

t
h
e
n

r

e
s
e
l
l

a
t

h
i
g
h
e
r

p
r
i
c
e
s
.

T
h
i
s

u
n
d
e
r
s
t
a
n
d

a
b
l
y

m
a
k
e
s

p
e
o
p
l
e

a
n
g
r
y
.

.

.

.

G
y
p
s
i
e
s

a
r
e

a
l
s
o

m
o
r
e

v
i
s
i
b
l
e

i
n

t
h
e
i
r

c
o
m
m
e
r
c
i
a

l
a
c
t
i
v
i
t
i
e
s
.

R
o
m
a
n
i
a
n

c
u
l
t
u
r
e

i
s

a

p
e
a

s
a
n
t

c
u
l
t
u
r
e
.

R
o
m
a
n
i
a
n
s

d
o
n
'
t

a
p
p
r
e
c
i
a
t

e
d
e
a
l
e
r
s
.

T
h
e
y

d
o
n
'
t

a
p
p
r
e
c
i
a
t
e

c
o
m
m
e
r

c
e
.

H
o
w
e
v
e
r
,

I
o
s
i
f

C
o
v
a
c
i

b
e
l
i
e
v
e
s

t
h
a
t

G
y
p
s
i
e
s

a
r
e

o
n
l
y

t
h
e

l
o
w
e
s
t

l
e
v
e
l
,

a
n
d

m
o
s
t

v
i
s
i
b
l
e

p
a
r
t
i
c
i
p
a
n
t
s
,

i
n

a

b
l
a
c
k

m
a

r
k
e
t

t
h
a
t

i
n
v
o
l
v
e
s

m
a
n
y

R
o
m
a
n
i
a
n
s
.

H
e
s

t
a
t
e
d
:

Is there a single factory director who is a Gypsy? If not, then who is selling the goods to Gypsies? Who is really the guilty one? If someone does dealing, we should ask why?

Covaci, and other Gypsy leaders, believe that it is not only tradition, but need, that causes many Gypsies to participate in the black market, and urges Romanians to consider why Gypsies turn to the black market in the first place. Covaci continues:

It is because he sees no other way out - no hope. Only a lot of children, no job, no money, and no food.

Similarly, Ion Cioabă, head of the nomadic Gypsies, said:

In many factories it is difficult for Gypsies to find work. They are often thrown out because they are Gypsies. So what alternative do they have except to deal? Kent cigarettes are sold in hotels at an inflated price. So what is wrong with Gypsies selling them? The people who want to do these dealings should be allowed to, but they should be regulated and authorized by the state. Then they will have to pay taxes and will contribute to society.

The government has initiated a campaign against black market dealers in order to keep prices under control and to prevent inflation. One of the target groups is Gypsies who are dealers.

Many Gypsy leaders anticipate increasing confrontations between the police and Gypsies, as police target Gypsy dealers. Ivan Gheorghe related his concern that: "

"

Vasile Burtea, expert adviser in the Ministry of Labor and a Gypsy leader, has prepared a comprehensive proposal for addressing the employment problems of Gypsies. [Bisnita - Citeva Consideratiuni]

Mass Media

The mass media in Romania has become increasingly nationalistic, and racist attacks on Gypsies are now common. "The Romanian media, reflecting a general public attitude among Romanians, often depict Gypsies as thieves, beggars, and black marketeers, or as people who do nothing but cast spells, make curses, and foretell the future."⁴⁶ As one Gypsy man from the village of B stated: "The only Gypsies shown on television are those Gypsies who are dirty, with long dresses, who have done something bad. I am embarrassed when I see how they portray Gypsies."

This anti-Gypsy sentiment comes at a time when racism and ethnic hatred in general are growing in Romania. Romania's wartime dictator Marshall Antonescu has been rehabilitated in the Romanian press, and was honored with a moment of silence in the Romanian parliament on , 1991 (the 4th anniversary of his execution).

The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Romania, reported that Gypsies suffer from a variety of human rights abuses, including defamation in mass media and incitement to racial hatred. [E/CN.4/1991/30, par. 140] The ILO also found that a climate of "intolerance or racial hatred" is developing against Gypsies, aggravated by media reports using them as scapegoats for the country's ills. (RFE/RL No. 106, June 6, 1991)

Gypsy leaders complain that the press emphasizes the ethnicity of Gypsies who have committed crimes thereby contributing to the anti-Gypsy sentiment and escalation of violence against Gypsies. The UDR called on the press, radio and television to:

Examine more carefully the information that they present about Roma, as people and as a collectivity. It is preferable to avoid the selective presentation of only negative behavior, that is then generalized to the whole Rom population.⁴⁷

⁴⁶Special Report: Gypsies in Eastern Europe," Soviet/East European Report (Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Vol. VII, No. 39, August 1, 1990), p. 1.

⁴⁷Nicolae Gheorghe, "Declarație pentru presa a Uniunii Romilor," *România Liberă*, (March 31, 1990).

The UDR has accused the Romanian government of manipulating the press to fuel ethnic tensions and to shift attention away from the social and economic woes of the country. Nicolae Gheorghe reported that governmental officials fueled attacks on Gypsies by "blaming them for the nation's troubles and calling them 'social anarchists' and 'parasites.'" Gheorghe added: "We have few Jews so the need to find scapegoats is focused on Gypsies. I know many people who are feeling insecure."⁴⁸

The state-controlled television has also been accused of inciting the Romanian population to violence by their often inaccurate and inflammatory portrayal of Gypsies. During the marathon demonstrations in University Square in the spring of 1990, television cameras often lingered on Gypsies who were selling goods in the Square. This was a clear effort by the television to discredit the political opposition by giving the impression that the majority of demonstrators were Gypsies (ie. thieves, black market dealers, and drifters).

The television carried this inaccurate reporting further on June 13, when the director of the television, Mr. Emanoil Valeriu, went on the air and announced that the television had been attacked and destroyed by Gypsies, and calling on the Romanian population to protect and defend the institution. During the following two days, June 14-15, vigilante mobs of miners arrived in Bucharest and, among other things, sought out and attacked Gypsy quarters around Bucharest. (See News From Romania, July 1990)

⁴⁸Marlise Simons, "East Europe's Gypsies: Unwanted Refugees," *New York Times*, (July 30, 1990).

The Ethnic Federation of Roma filed a complaint against Mr. Valeriu for nationalist and chauvinist propaganda (Art. 317 of the Penal Code); for incitement to violence (Art. 324); and for slander (Art. 206).⁴⁹ (See Complaint attached as Appendix B). The complaint was later dismissed by the Prosecutor's office.

Helsinki Watch condemns efforts by governments to promote ethnic hatred in violation of their obligations under international law. To the extent that the Romanian television is controlled by the Romanian government, it has an affirmative obligation to take steps to

Helsinki Watch is also disturbed by the rising level of ethnic hatred in the Romanian press, and condemns all forms of discrimination on the grounds of nationality, whether by governmental or private bodies. Human Rights Watch has adopted a formal policy statement on the protection of "hate speech" which is attached as Appendix C.

Political Process

⁴⁹Article 317 of the Romanian Criminal Code states:

Nationalistic-chauvinistic propaganda, the instigation to racial or nationalist hatred, if it does not constitute the penal offense stipulated in Art. 166* will be punished by imprisonment from 6 months to 5 years.

Article 166 of the Romanian Penal Code condemns fascist propaganda as well as propaganda directed against the state system.

After the 1989 revolution, Gypsies were quick to establish political parties to represent their interests as a minority in Romania. Representing one of the few improvements for the Gypsy population, the Romanian government did not attempt to obstruct the formation of Gypsy parties. At present at least six parties are officially registered. These parties include: the United Democratic Party of the Romanies, Fiddlers and Wood Carvers of Romania (Râmnicu Vâlcea), the Tinsmith Romanies' Progressive Party (Bucharest), Free Romanies' Democratic Party (Sfintu Gheorghe), the Gypsies' Party of Romania (Sibiu), the Free Democratic Union of Romanies (Cluj), and the Christian Democratic Party of Romanies (Cluj).⁵⁰

Gypsy leaders were represented in the Provisional Council of National Unity that governed Romania during the early months after the revolution. However, no Gypsy candidate was elected to parliament during the national election on May 20, 1990. Gheorghe Răducanu, the Gypsy representative in parliament, was appointed based on a provision of the Electoral Law that guarantees a representative for each minority unable to win representation through the elections.

In part, political progress has been hampered by splits within the Gypsy community. Petre Burtea, a Gypsy leader from Craiova, reported:

As an ethnic group we have not yet united, so we cannot work with the Romanians to reform the government. . . . In Europe, all Gypsies have a similar culture. Political differences explain why the Gypsies even in Romania don't all look to one leader. There are splits based on nomads versus those who are sedentary, splits based on professions. This made a difference in the election results.

Gypsy leaders also attribute their poor showing in the elections to their lack of experience in organizing an election campaign, as well as the lack of funding. Others also point out the low level of literacy among the Gypsy people as a further obstacle. As Nicolae Gheorghe put it:

We didn't reach our electorate. It was our fault. We had bad

⁵⁰Dan Ionescu, "The Gypsies Organize," *Radio Free Europe Report on Eastern Europe*, (June 29, 1990), p. 42.

organization and coordination. We spent a lot of time organizing ourselves, but Gypsies didn't take the elections seriously because they didn't know that the new parliament would be different from the old one. There was also a split of votes between three different Gypsy parties without any kind of coalition. These organizations had disputes among themselves and this was shown on television just before the election.

Petre Anghel, a leader from Constanta, related:

There are still many Gypsies who don't know about the Union. We have to be able to do something concrete. If we organize, we will be able to show our strength. We want to conduct a census so we will know the size of our population.

Many Gypsy leaders interviewed by Helsinki Watch view future elections as critical to their efforts to improve the lives of Gypsies in Romania. As Mr. Anghel put it: "

We have to prepare for the next election. It is critical for us. I want to make sure that the very last Gypsy that is eligible to vote knows exactly why he is voting and what for.

Romania has not yet scheduled local elections. Local elections will, however, be extremely important for it is at that level that officials have the most day to day contact with the population. Most officials, such as mayors and prefects, were appointed by the National Salvation Front without regard to the ethnic composition of the population of the given area. Therefore, there are no Gypsies on local councils or in local government. The UDR hopes to organize an effective campaign to gain a voice at the local level when elections are held.

The UDR has also worked effectively to reestablish contact with Gypsy organizations worldwide and Gypsy leaders from Romania have been active in placing the special concerns of the Gypsy people on the international agenda.

Relations With Police/Criminal Justice System

Many Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch talked about the abuse they receive at the hands of the Romanian police. Especially at the local level,

policemen continue to discriminate in their treatment of Gypsies without regard for their obligations under international or Romanian law. As one Gypsy woman from the town of said:

When our children go to buy bread, they are hit by the police. This is after the revolution. The police say "Your father [Ceausescu] died already, so go home."

Janos Mocsel, from Covasna, described:

It happens from time to time that the police say "Oh, he is a Gypsy. He is a thief." They treat us all as criminals without having any evidence that against us.

Radu Rostas, from Huedin, related:

Our biggest problem is that the police won't leave us in peace. When we gather in a small group of 3-4 people, immediately the police come to us and say "Get going." Romanians can stand in groups of 20-30, but they are left alone. Only Gypsies are seen as problematic,

By contrast, as will be discussed below, the police remain almost completely passive when Gypsy villages are attacked by vigilante mobs, and even reveal a tendency to arrest and interrogate Gypsies who have been attacked. Gypsies living in areas that have experienced violence described frequent mistreatment by the police. As a woman from Cilnic reported:

Since the events in July we are afraid to go to the town because we don't want to run into the police. They openly ridicule us when we walk by and insult us.

The police point out that they must constantly struggle against the high level of crime in the Gypsy community. Although there are apparently no statistics on the actual crime rate, it does appear that the Gypsy community suffers from a higher level of criminal activity. Several prosecutors interviewed by Helsinki Watch estimated that 50 percent of all crimes are committed by Gypsies.

While many Gypsy leaders acknowledged that crime plagues their communities, many Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch pointed to discrimination in hiring and the poverty in which they live as pushing Gypsy

families into crime. In fact, one woman volunteered that she steals, stating:

I have eight children. If we didn't steal we would die. I have no husband. One of my daughters already died, and she had three children of her own. I have been given no help at all. How am I supposed to raise my children?

Another Gypsy mother talked about her economic plight:

My husband works in the mine, but the mine is being closed. I don't know what we will do. I cannot say that I will never steal. I am embarrassed to say so, but if I am left with no land to work, and my husband is without a job, I can't say what I might do. I may become desperate, even more desperate than I am now.

These same families repeatedly talked about the large quantities of western assistance that have been sent to Romania, but have rarely reached most needy families. Helsinki Watch interviewed Gypsy families in several villages who claim that the local officials refused to distribute clothes and food to Gypsies. Zeli Kore, a young Gypsy mother from Covasna, reported:

Foreigners came here to give supplies. It all went through the Mayor's office. They didn't give a thing to Gypsies. It was all given out to non-Gypsies.

A Gypsy man in the village of Bratei stated:

Someone came to this area to give us assistance and the police stopped them. The police would control who got assistance. The Gypsies said please give us food too, but the people refused. Gypsies entered the place and took food and clothes and they were arrested and put in jail. But what would you have done if you had seen your children hungry and others getting help?

Another Gypsy man from Bratei added:

Why do you think all of our people are going to Germany? That is the reason. We feel we don't get [western] assistance because we are Gypsies, because of the reputation we have. But how are we supposed to live?

Baronița Adam, a Gypsy woman from Huedin, also described:

Whenever there is foreign aid, we get only what Romanians refuse. Pediatricians made packages of medicine and clothes for Romanians at the policlinic, but we went to get a package and they said it wasn't for us. I saw how Romanian mothers went out of the clinic with big boxes of assistance and we, the poorest in the country, got one little thing. They said to me personally, "This is not for you." They meant it was not for Gypsies. It was for Romanians.

Some Gypsy leaders reported cooperative relations with police representatives in addressing problems within the community. Florin Munteanu, a Gypsy leader from Tirgu Mures, reported that:

We frequently have meetings with the police, and they have agreed not to mention ethnicity in connection with the perpetrator of a crime. The police have also come to us and asked us how they can reduce crime.

Gypsies are considered criminal as an ethnic group, and this stereotype is reflected in their treatment at all levels of the criminal justice system: by the police, prosecutors and judges. Helsinki Watch repeatedly received reports of abuse and maltreatment of Gypsies when in police custody, and this abuse was confirmed by their lawyers.

Dan Petre, a Romanian lawyer who has frequently represented Gypsies, talked to Helsinki Watch about discrimination in the criminal justice system. He related:

Gypsies are much more frequently arrested and the presumption of guilt is much stronger. During the investigative stage Gypsies are frequently abused and there is no chance to present evidence of innocence.

Police and Prosecutor view them in a very distorted way. I have represented many Gypsies and they are rarely treated fairly in the judicial process.

Judges have racism which is exhibited in the courtroom.

Speaking for a Gypsy in court - judge doesn't listen formally polite and conclusion already decided ahead of time. Prosecutor - mentions in the complaint that the defendant is a Gypsy, in fact underscores the fact that he is Gypsy.

I estimate that 40-50% of arrested are Gypsy.

Gypsies frequently receive higher sentences and lawyers don't really fight for them. Attorneys that have Gypsy clients are viewed badly by colleagues and the judges. Many lawyers simply refuse to represent them. (Several lawyers refused to talk to Helsinki Watch about Gypsies and even referred to them in disparaging terms)

I have also attempted to present the argument that racism and the discrimination that results therefrom result in an unfair trial. This has had no effect. But the discrimination isn't in the way they speak, behave etc. in court. It is what happens behind the scenes when they say 5 years - the maximum sentence.

As a lawyer representing a Gypsy you start with a handicap. It is more difficult because you know already from the start the general response. I have to devote much more time and attention than in a normal case.

The people are the same in the court, the police the prosecutors office. The desire continues that the defense be weak and not draw attention to abuses by the police and prosecutor.

[Nicolae Maci (Son of Vasile) October 8, 1990 he went into a bar to buy a pack of cigarettes and was refused services. Villagers claim that he threatened them with a knife and started to fight. He ran out and into a block nearby. The villagers surrounded the block. About 12 p.m. the police came to get him out of the building. He thought they were going to save him, but instead they arrested him. He was severely beaten by the villagers as he was taken out of the building in police custody.

He was held in police lock-up for two weeks. He was charged with a violation of Decree 153 which provides for a summary proceeding. However, because of the severity of his bruises the police didn't want him to be seen by a judge until the injuries had healed. Asked the police to take him to a doctor so he could get a certificate showing that he had been beaten. They refused. Had no lawyer. He did not ask for one. "I didn't even know I could have a lawyer." For 1 1/2 weeks the family did not know where he was. Family was looking for him. Asked at Police lock-up and they said not here, but in fact he was there. "They couldn't show him to

us because he was so beaten." (Mother)

Taken to tribunal. Not public trial. Family not notified. Found guilty and sentenced to 6 months. Five witnesses appeared that he had never seen before. He tried to show the judge his injuries but the prosecutor said that taking his shirt off in court would be indecent.

two police in car beat him a few times after he had been beaten by the mob. Convicted of disturbing public order.

Also insert examples from Tirgu Mures and June

Violent Attacks Against Gypsy Communities

Violent attacks against the homes and persons of Gypsies by their neighbors, and the failure of the Romanian authorities to provide protection against such violence, is currently the most serious human rights concern for the Gypsy community. During the 20 months since the December 1989 revolution, the Ethnic Federation of Roma in Romania reports that there have been at least 16 attacks on Gypsy communities in Romania. Gypsy homes have been burned, their possessions destroyed, they have been chased out of villages and, in certain areas, have not been allowed to return to their homes. Many Gypsies have been beaten and some have been killed. Yet, no one has been arrested for these attacks and there appears to be little interest on the part of governmental officials to deal with the crisis.

Helsinki Watch conducted numerous interviews throughout Romania with Gypsies who were the victims of violent attacks. In addition, Helsinki Watch spoke with villagers who were involved in or at least supportive of attacks on Gypsy areas, and with local governmental officials who are responsible for dealing with the rising level of violence against the Gypsy community.

LUNGA (February 12, 1990)

On February 5, 1990 the houses of Gypsies living in the village of Lunga, in Covasna County, were attacked by the Hungarian villagers at approximately 7p.m. Six houses and other buildings were burned down or ransacked. Four Gypsies were killed when they were attacked with axes by the villagers.⁵¹

⁵¹Those killed were Zoltan Majlat (Sr.), Zoltan Majlat (Jr.), Attila Majlat and Mihail Majlat. These deaths were confirmed by the local prosecutor's office.

The villagers do not deny that the attack occurred, although no individual interviewed by Helsinki Watch admitted to having personally participated. One Hungarian man reported that:

The attack was organized at the Agriculture Cooperative. A group of villagers met there after work and decided that the Gypsies had to be forced out of the area. About 100 villagers were involved. They just wanted to get the Gypsies out of the village. After the attack people in the village collected money to pay the Gypsies back, but we don't want them back here. We won't let them return.

Helsinki Watch asked some of the Hungarian villagers why the attack had occurred. One 89 year old woman stated:

Before the revolution Hungarians were afraid to have a glass to drink because the Gypsies controlled many bars. Now they are not so powerful. They were thieves. They stole from the Hungarians. The militia didn't do a thing to catch the thieves. They preferred not to be involved. The Hungarians had had enough and decided to attack.

A 46 year old Hungarian man admitted that many of the Gypsies were not thieves, stating:

The Gypsies would go to a restaurant and not pay. They stole, drank, and didn't work. They rode through the village with their shovels in a threatening manner. I can't say all of them, it was usually the young. The teenagers. I guess about 50% of the Gypsy population is innocent.

Helsinki Watch interviewed the only family able to return to the village. Lajos Maljat, whose house was ransacked, reported:

I was standing in the courtyard of my house when I saw something burning. When I ran out to see what it was, I saw a large group of villagers setting Gypsies houses on fire. My family and I grabbed the horses and fled to my Mother's house in another village. We stayed away for two months and were only able to come home after [the local Gypsy leaders] intervened on our behalf with the mayor. The others have scattered to other areas because they are afraid to come back.

Mr. Maljat's wife described what she saw when they returned:

They split the door and cracked the walls. The windows were broken. They destroyed everything. I am afraid they will come back. They threw our belongings, even our washing machine, in the well. It was a war. I don't know how many villagers there were but I know that they wanted to kill all the Gypsies. I am afraid to take the bus. It is better to walk. Hungarians threaten us, but I don't know where we can go.

Helsinki Watch also spoke with a local prosecutor in Sfintu Gheorghe who had conducted the criminal investigation of the Lunga attack. The prosecutor, who wished to remain anonymous, reported that:

In the case of Lunga, no one has been arrested or tried for the burning of houses and murdering of four Gypsies. Over 250 people were involved in the attack and it is impossible to determine who was responsible. The investigation, however, is ongoing.

TURU LUNG (January 10-11, 1990)

On January 8, 1990, a meeting was held in the village of Turu Lung to discuss whether the local, political leadership should be changed. The Hungarians, who make up the majority of the village population, demanded that the President of the village be replaced with an ethnic Hungarian, while the Gypsies opposed the change. The discussions became quite heated. Two days later, on January 10 at about 9 p.m. approximately 1000 Hungarians gathered and headed toward the Gypsy area of the village and began to set fire to houses.

Many of the Gypsies fled the area when they saw the crowd with torches. Other Gypsies tried to defend their home. Gheorghe Gyopjes, a 28 year old Gypsy, reported that:

All those who didn't run away were beaten. I was hit with a metal rod in the head. I had blood running down my face. Then I started to run, too. There were too many of them. It was impossible to protect our house. I had to go to the hospital for my injury. There were between 5 and 7 other Gypsies in the hospital with me because of the attack.

An older woman stated:

Many of us had injuries. Not serious enough to require medical treatment, but still bruises and cuts. My hand was bruised and swollen from being

hit. But we ran away as fast as we could. I think they were most interested in destroying our houses.

Thirty-six of the 41 Gypsy houses were burned or destroyed. Although many of the houses had been repaired by the time of Helsinki Watch's visit, damaged houses were still visible throughout the village.⁵²

In addition to the property damage and the injuries reported above, Istvan Varga, a child of 3 years apparently died during the attack. The child's burned clothes and bones were found in a haystack. However, the circumstances surrounding the child's death are not known. Elizabeta Varga, the 41 year old grandmother of Istvan, reported to Helsinki Watch that:

⁵²The Gypsies reported that they received money from the local government in early May, 1990 for the damage to their houses. Apparently 10,000 lei was paid to each adult and 5,000 to each child from the local government.

We had to get out of the house because it was being burned. When we ran out of the house we [she and her daughter-in-law] were carrying the two younger children in our arms. Istvan was supposed to run along behind. Somehow the child got separated in the chaos. We never found him, but burned clothes and bones of a child were later found in a partially burned haystack.⁵³ My husband had a heart attack two days later.

A local policeman was in the area and apparently called the police for assistance once the attack began. However, the police did not arrive on the scene until approximately 11 p.m., almost two hours after the attack began. Forty-four year old Alexandru Deutsch reported to Helsinki Watch that:

The firemen were the first to arrive, but the villagers blocked the way and wouldn't let the firemen into the village. The police arrived about 11 p.m. I think there were about 40 of them, but they could not convince the villagers to move aside. They didn't arrest anyone. But the police told us that we have to make our peace with the Hungarians because there is no other place for us to go.

Apparently the only people arrested during the events in Turu Lung were a group of six Gypsies who had been at work during the attack and were arrested on their way home. According to reports received by Helsinki Watch, these individuals were intimidated and physically mistreated while in police custody. Petre Berki, a 35-year-old worker, described his arrest:

I was on my way home from the night shift at about 3 a.m. when I was stopped by a captain and two policemen on the road leading back to [the village where I live]. They asked me how the events in Turulung had happened and I told them I had been at work the whole time. I was handcuffed and then they asked me again what happened. The police said "Why are you lying?" I was hit in the head with a pistol and thrown in the back of a police van with 5 others [Gypsies] from the village. They had all been beaten.

⁵³The village leaders reported that the bones were sent to Bucharest for a forensic study which identified the bones as those of a child of approximately Istvan Varga's age.

Mr. Berki, along with the other five Gypsies, was taken to the police station in Satu Mare (a neighboring town). He recounts his treatment in police custody:

We were taken from the van and placed in a room where I was hit on the shoulder with a gun. We were then taken one by one to another room where we were interrogated. During my interrogation the policemen hit me with a rubber stick and punched me with their fists in the most sensitive parts of my body. Blood flowed from my nose and mouth. They took my statement and told me not to tell the others [detainees] what questions they had asked me. I was then returned to the first room where I stayed for about 24 hours. During that time I got no food. I was handcuffed the whole time except when I went to go to the toilet. I got water to drink only when I was in the toilet.

When I was released I went straight to the hospital where I stayed for one week. I was treated for the injured caused by the beatings, as well as injuries around my wrists caused by the handcuffs.

After Mr. Berki was released from the hospital, he joined his family who was sleeping in a railway station. They reported that they were afraid to return home. The Gypsies from Turulung whose houses had been burned lived in the nearby town of Satu Mare, in a cabana provided by the local government. Most returned to the village in May. However, some ten Gypsy families have not returned.

No one has been arrested for the violence that occurred in Turu Lung against the Gypsy population. The villagers reported to Helsinki Watch that they tried to submit a complaint to the police, but without success. One Gypsy from the village related his experience at the police:

I went to the police station to make a complaint. A few days later, I was called to the police station and told by the chief of police that if I made a complaint I would be arrested and that I would not have the right to return to the village. Finally I withdrew my complaint.

TÎRGU MUREȘ (March 19-20, 1990)

[ROB'S NOTES]

The Prosecutor's Office in Tîrgu Mureş conducted an investigation into the events intended less at getting at the truth than in making a few individuals scapegoats for the violence. Helsinki Watch interviewed the Chief Prosecutor for the County of Mures who reported that 31 people were investigate in connection with the events of whom two were ethnic Romanian, five were ethnic Hungarian and 24 were of Gypsy origin.

Four persons are still on trial for crimes allegedly committed during March.⁵⁴ Their trial has been conducted sporadically, but not completed.

In addition to the 31 mentioned above, between 14-18 Gypsies were tried and convicted of various offenses such as possession of weapons and disturbance of the peace. These Gypsies were tried under Decree 153 which was first published on April 13, 1970, and which was directed against those who were "parasites" of the socialist order.

After the December 1989 revolution, Decree 153 was identified as an extremely abusive tool of the Ceausescu regime. Although it was targeted to be abolished, it remains in force. Portions of Decree 153 are extremely vague and do not adequately indicate the behavior that is being restricted, consequently inviting arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement. For example, some of the Gypsies were charged under Article 2(g) which prohibits the "illegal disturbance of the peace of residents, by producing noise with any apparatus or object, or through screaming or making noise."

In addition to the overly broad language of the decree, the expedited procedure that it requires violates basic principles of due process. Helsinki Watch interviewed Ildiko Jung, the attorney for seven of the Gypsies tried and convicted under Decree 153. Ms. Jung stated that her clients were arrested on April 28 and

⁵⁴**Ioszeif Suto, Ioszeif Szilaggi, Ioszeif Lorinczi and Petre Szilveszter. All were released in the fall of 1990 except for Ioszeif Lorinczi who is still in custody due to his previous criminal record. Arpad Toth, who was also on trial for the March events and had also been released from preventive detention in the fall of 1990, died in December of a heart attack.**

the first court hearing was held on April 29. Ms. Jung was given no opportunity to speak to her clients until she saw them in the corridor outside the courtroom and did not see the dossier until a few minutes before the hearing. At that first hearing Ms. Jung requested that the judge find Decree 153 inapplicable to the defendants and set them free. When the judge refused, Ms. Jung asked for an extension to prepare the defense and the judge granted an adjournment until the next day.

On March 30, Ms. Jung presented witnesses who testified to the innocence of the defendants. She also presented evidence of their employment. The prosecutor presented two witnesses whose testimony was in the dossier. One of these witnesses contradicted his previous testimony, stating that he had no memory of what he had seen on March 20 as he had been drunk. The second witness for the prosecution had a long history of convictions and was at the time of the hearing himself in jail for his involvement in events on March 20.

The prosecutor presented a written statement signed by each of the defendants acknowledging his guilt. However, the defendants had no more than a second- or third-grade education and were unable to read the statements written by the police. These statements were contradicted in part by the defendants' own testimony at the hearing. Moreover, the defendants did not recognize certain facts that were included in the statements. Ms. Jung argued that the police wrote statements for each of the defendants and forced them to sign without first having read the statements out loud.

One of the defendants also reported to Ms. Jung that a policeman had held a knife to his throat until he agreed to sign the statement. This was apparently done in the presence of the other defendants. However, the defendant did not want this reported to the judge because he said he was afraid of the consequences if he were then sent back to jail.

All seven defendants were found guilty. Decree 153 does not allow an appeal to a higher court, but does allow a retrial by the same court with two judges instead of one. At the retrial on April 4, Ms. Jung requested that one of the judges be ethnic Hungarian, but her request was refused. Ms. Jung also reported that the judges ordered an ethnic Romanian substitute for an ethnic Hungarian prosecutor who happened to be assigned to the court for April 4, in accordance with the normal assignment calendar. The verdict was upheld for all the defendants and they were given sentences ranging from 3 months of work with a penalty, to five months in prison.

Ms. Jung consulted her clients immediately after the trial to see if they wanted her to request an extraordinary appeal to a higher court. The defendants, however, expressed fear that the police might try to punish them for such an effort and declined her assistance.

As the above examples reveal, one trademark of the ethnic conflicts in Romania was the failure of the local police and army to protect ethnic groups under attack and, at times, the active participation of the authorities in the attacks. In the case of Tirgu Mures no serious attempt was ever made to clarify the role played by the authorities during the events. A parliamentary commission was established to investigate the violence, but its findings were never made public. Thus far, a parliamentary commission investigating the June events has not made public any findings.

BUCHAREST (June 14-15, 1990)

During the events of June 13-15, when miners were called into Bucharest to put down anti-government demonstrations, many of the Gypsy areas around Bucharest were specifically singled out by the miners for violent attacks.⁵⁵ Miners entered Gypsies' houses, ransacked their homes, stole their belongings, and severely beat many of the inhabitants. Helsinki Watch received numerous reports that the miners were led to the areas by "civilians" and/or police in uniform. What is more, Helsinki Watch received many reports that Gypsies were attacked on the streets by miners for the sole reason that they were Gypsies. Many of those attacked were also arrested. Sebastian Țaralunga, a photoreporter who was arrested and detained at Magurele (a detention center for those arrested during the June events) estimated that 70-80 percent of all those detained there were Gypsies.

One Gypsy woman who asked that her identity not be disclosed, reported to Helsinki Watch that she was at home around noon on June 14 when miners, led by a policeman, entered the courtyard of her house. She ran to the attic with her family and hid. "The miners entered the house and destroyed everything. They stayed about 10 to 15 minutes and when they left they took all of our blue jeans. These were things which we had bought legally. I suspect that not all of them were really miners. One had a pistol in his belt. I stayed away from home for four days after that because I was afraid to return."

⁵⁵For a more detailed account of the June events, see *News From Romania*, July 1990.

Stelian Ilie told Helsinki Watch that he was at home on June 14 around 12:30 p.m. with his son and his wife, Maria, who was recovering from a heart attack. About 20 miners came to the house with a policeman by the name of Radu Gheorghe. "The miners looked through the house and took our goods. Then they beat me and my son and took us to the police station for about 1 to 2 hours. When we returned, we found out that my wife had been terribly frightened when the miners ransacked the house and that she had had another heart attack. We went for a doctor, but on Saturday night (June 16) she died. We just buried her." Ilie's daughter also said: "Now I am afraid to go on the street to buy bread. I am afraid they will say 'You are a Gypsy' and will kill me."

Lucia Petre, a 27-year-old mother, described to Helsinki Watch how her building was surrounded by miners at about 8 a.m. on June 14. "The police knocked first. They said they were looking for arms and I allowed them in because I knew that I didn't have any and wanted to prove it to them. Then about 20 miners entered the apartment and began to beat me with a big wooden club. I guess they were in the house about 15 minutes altogether. They took a lot of money which I had on the table. It was money given to us for our wedding. They broke the window in the bedroom where my 3-year-old boy was playing and he was hurt when part of the glass fell on his head. When he started to cry, one of the miners picked him up and said 'I want to kill you.' My boy started to cry more and the miner hit him in the face."

M.M., a Gypsy woman who was three months' pregnant, went with her niece to Unirii Market to do some shopping around 11 a.m. on June 14. As they left the subway, they were surrounded by a large group of miners. "They grabbed us and accused us of doing business (Black market dealing). They started to beat us, and I lost consciousness for a moment and fell down. Then they dragged us to a covered truck parked down the street, beating us along the way, and threw us into the back. Two young miners got in with us. One miner had his hand on my niece's mouth and had her hand twisted behind her back. The other miner started to undress me and then he raped me in front of my niece. My niece started to cry and one of the miners said 'if you keep on I'll rape you, too.'"

"After 30 or 45 minutes in the truck, two policemen came and started to throw others in the back with us. The miners got out to help. Many of the

people were badly beaten. We were all taken to a military base, but there was no more room so we were taken to Magurele. When we got out of the van my niece was punched and kicked in the back."

[statement in the Parliamentary Co. report]

CÎLNIC (June 1990)

On July 20, two Gypsy boys and two Romanian boys had a fight at a local disco in the town of Cilnic near Sibiu. The next night, after another fight broke out between Gypsies and a Romanian shepherd, about 300 Romanians in the village marched into the Gypsy community. Windows were smashed and several Gypsy homes were damaged. Several Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch reported that the Romanian villagers were accompanied by police and that the police did not intervene when the villagers attacked the houses. One Gypsy man reported:

The villagers were saying "You Gypsies, we're going to kill all of you," and they told us "If you don't leave, we'll come back with gas and set fire to your houses."

Another Gypsy recounted:

The police were walking with the villagers. I was hiding in the bushes nearby and I did not see the police do anything to restrain the villagers. They were not trying to stop them at all. In fact, they were threatening us. One of the policemen with the villagers yelled out, "If you don't get out of here within the next few nights you're all going to be dead." Since that night we are afraid to go to the town because we don't want to run into the police.

The Mayor of Cilnic confirmed that police went with the Romanian villagers to the Gypsy area. He reported to Helsinki Watch that:

The problem started with the Gypsies who beat up a shepherd. It is normal after these conflicts that the Romanians get agitated. The Romanians went with the police to look for the guilty Gypsy boys.

The Mayor did not seem to view the attack as serious and expressed skepticism about the reported fears of the Gypsies to, for example, ride the buses or send their children to the school. The Mayor stated:

I don't think the Gypsies have a reason to be afraid. I think the Gypsies make excuses because they don't want to go to school.

The Gypsy leaders of the village attribute the growing tensions between Romanians and Gypsies to a mistaken view of all Gypsies as violent, instead of dealing with the individuals who actually violate the laws. Gheorghe Ban, a leader of the Union of Roma in Romania, stated:

We are not violent. We are peasants who work the land. The older people work on the land and the younger one in factories. The whole July problem came about because two young Gypsies and two Romanians had a fight. It was just a personal disagreement. In the past they had always gotten along. They even played soccer together. The police should have picked up the guys who were fighting rather than asking the Romanians to come to the Gypsy area with them.

Another Gypsy leader, Ilie Graurus, criticized the local government's lack of interest in dealing with the growing tensions.

The Union requested a meeting at the local police station and they refused, saying that they didn't have time. The same was true with the Mayor. No one takes this kind of event seriously because only Gypsies were the victims. No one really cares.

HUEDIN (August 29, 1990)

On August 29, 1990, at 2 p.m., a group of five Gypsies finished work and went to the center of town where they were met by their families and friends. Adam Cornel, the 36-year-old Mayor of the Gypsy area, described what happened next:

I went into the restaurant with some friends and ordered a drink. The waiter refused to serve me. He said he would not receive Gypsies. He was joined by some Romanians sitting in the restaurant who said that they would not sit with a Gypsy at the same table. Then one of the customers came over to me and hit me over the head with a bottle. Blood was running down my face.⁵⁶

I ran out of the restaurant along with my friends. Those in the restaurant chased after us and they were joined outside by others. I guess the people

⁵⁶Mr. Cornel had a "medical-legal certificate" of his injuries.

on the street saw that the Gypsies were running out of the restaurant and thought we were thieves. They began to shout "Grab the Gypsies. Grab them. Catch the thieves."

A crowd of approximately 100 people gathered on the street and began to beat any Gypsy they saw. According to eyewitness reports, there police walking along with the crowd. Ludovic Pintea, the Vice-Mayor of the Gypsy area, was also an eyewitness to the attack:

There were many other Gypsies in the town including women and children sitting out in the park. The crowd chased after all of them. I was hit by someone in the crowd. I saw the mayor of the town looking out the window at the chaos. He didn't intervene. There were four policemen in the front and the mob was behind. People were yelling "Catch the thieves." All together between 10 and 15 people were beaten, mainly women and children. Most of them had to have medical treatment. They were hit with cranks, bottles, pitchforks and wooden bars. My wife's nose was broken in two places. The police didn't do anything.

A women who wished to remain anonymous reported to Helsinki Watch that she had also been injured during the mob violence:

I was wounded during the attack in August. A man hit me in the kidney with some kind of tool. I had to miss work for almost a month. I received 29 days disability. The prosecutor has done nothing. If a Gypsy beats a Romanian you can be sure they find out who did it. Not for us.

Another women joined in:

We were surprised that almost the whole village came after us. On the other hand, we are viewed well. They always say that Gypsies do all kinds of bad things. We are more afraid to go to town now. Some [of the Gypsies] from the village have left for Germany.

MIHAIL KOGALNICEANU (October 9, 1990)

The first attack on a Gypsy community to receive any significant coverage in the Romanian press was in Mihail Kogalniceanu where non-Gypsy villagers, made up of many ethnic groups including a large number of Macedonians, burned 25 houses and destroyed another 8 houses on the night of October 9, 1990.

In 1951, a group of Gypsies were moved to the outskirts of M.

Kogalniceanu as part of the government's forced settlement program. (See Section , above) As the size of the Gypsy population increased over the years tensions with the non-Gypsy villagers apparently grew.⁵⁷

On October 4, 1990, tensions in the village escalated after a Macedonian and a Gypsy teenager got into a fight at the local disco. Their dispute was apparently personal. Petre Anghel, a local Gypsy leader, stated: "If the police would have intervened at that time, all could have been avoided, but the police didn't take any initiative."

Apparently the attack on the Gypsy community had been prepared in advance and was scheduled to take place on October 11. According to an article in the newspaper *Opinia Studenteasca*, Gypsies were told to "take care, your game is over. Next Thursday we are going to set fire." [statement by the priest] However, a tractor driver was beaten by a Gypsy on October 9, apparently providing the spark for an earlier attack.

Between 9 and 10 p.m. the church bells were tolled as a signal to the villagers to gather in the center. Approximately 1,000 to 1,500 villagers were congregated in front of the Catholic Church by 10 p.m.

Because there had been rumors that the villagers would attack the Gypsy quarters, the tolling of the bells served also as a warning to the Gypsies. Purece Tudora, 78-years-old, and her husband, reported to Helsinki Watch how they ran from the approaching mob:

When we heard the bells and saw torches, we ran. We had already been threatened by the villagers. We ran into the forest and only returned to look at our houses one day later. The houses were still burning when we returned. We left and stayed away for over a month.

The role of the local authorities remains unclear. The Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch report that the police and mayor were instigators in the violence. As one Gypsy stated:

The police and the mayor came to our area with the mob. They were

⁵⁷"Pogrom in Kogalniceanu," *Opinia Studenteasca*, October , 1990.

walking at the front of the villagers and they did nothing to try to stop them.

However, the local authorities claim that they were actually trying to stop the crowd and were simply unable to control a group that large.

Around 12 midnight two buses of riot police arrived in M. Kogalniceanu and patrolled the area. According to a newspaper reports, as well as local leaders, these patrols were not to protect the Gypsies who had all fled the area by that time. Instead, they were to protect the non-Gypsy villagers who feared that the Gypsies might counterattack.

As reported above, some 33 houses were destroyed (25 burned and 8 destroyed) and approximately 200 Gypsies have been without proper homes ever since.⁵⁸ At the time Helsinki Watch visited M. Kogalniceanu in April 1991 most of the houses were still seriously damaged. The Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch were angry that no one had attempted to help them and that they had spent the whole winter without roofs on their houses. Luci N. Luci, a 54-year-old Gypsy, told Helsinki Watch:

We are very angry. We have been living here like rats in stables with 7 to 8 children per family. No one does anything about it and no one cares. I am not asking for all the things that were in the house to be reimbursed . . . All I ask is that I have a house. Is that too much?

⁵⁸ Many people have pointed to the fact that six Gypsies houses were not burned as evidence that the attack was not motivated by ethnic hatred, but because the village had become fed up with the criminal activity of the Gypsies. However, others interviewed by Helsinki Watch reported that the only reason certain houses were not burned was because they were located near houses of non-Gypsies who were afraid their own homes would catch fire.

The consequences of the attack have been quite devastating. A young Gypsy mother, Georgeta Guguci, described the effect the attack had had on her family:

I lost my house in October and I had no place to live. I have two children but I had to give the youngest to the state because I could not take care of two children without a home. If I had a house I would take my child back, but the way it was this past winter, the children got sick living in the open and had to be put in the hospital several times.

According to many villagers the attack must be viewed in the context of the high level of crime committed by Gypsies and the lack of police effort to deal with the crime. As one woman put it, "The Gypsies were constantly stealing from us and the police never did a thing. We had simply had enough. It was time to act." The same viewpoint was conveyed in an article published in *EXPRES* magazine entitled "Mihail Kogalniceanu - We Didn't Send Away The Gypsies, We Sent Away The Thieves."⁵⁹

The predominate opinion appears to be that all those attacked were guilty of criminal conduct. However, it seems much more likely that the activities of a few were the basis for generalizations about the whole Gypsy population. It cannot be denied that most of those who lost their houses had no criminal record and that many of them were, in fact, very young children. Some of the villagers admitted as much. One villager stated "Gypsies didn't really bother us. It is stupid if someone says this. It was just a few who would steal. They would be arrested and the next day they would be released."⁶⁰ Another villager said "Only a few were bad, mainly children and teenagers." Similarly, the daily newspaper *România Liberă* reported that the tensions in the village were caused by "one single family of criminals."⁶¹

Petre Anghel, local leader of the UDR stated, "We admit that some of them are truly bad, some are undisciplined, just like they are in other ethnic groups. But

⁵⁹*EXPRES*, October 30, 1990.

⁶⁰"Agresiune sau Răspuns la Agresiune" *România Liberă*, October 30, 1990.

⁶¹ *Id.*

that cannot mean all Gypsies houses should be burned to the ground. If one is guilty, he should be punished, of course. But not all Gypsies should have to suffer for the acts of one."

The Gypsies interviewed by Helsinki Watch were particularly bitter about the failure of the local authorities to and prosecute the crime. As one Gypsy whose house had been ransacked stated:

Here is a life of work totally destroyed. Seven months I worked just to pay for this furniture. Now look at the state it is in. . . . We want to sell our house. How can we stay here with everyone looking at us with such hate. How can we know that they won't come again. If they haven't arrested anyone, haven't done anything. If they had arrested the people and had done something to protect us . . . But it has also happened in Basarab, in Bolintin.

While the prosecutor's office in Constanța (which is responsible for M. Kogalniceanu) has apparently completed an investigation no one has been arrested or tried for the crimes committed on the night of October 9. Helsinki Watch interviewed the Prefect of Constanța who explained why there have been no arrests or prosecutions for the violence:

We prevented arrest and trials because we don't want to cause a war. The villagers know that we have evidence against them so they understand why we are not making the arrests. If we had made arrests and trials, the Gypsies would not have been able to return to the village. It would have been a civil war. Police did everything they could do. Some of the police were removed after the events. We have also increased the number of police in the area.

BASARAB (December 1990)

In Basarab, also in the county of Constanta, a group of villagers (five Gypsies and two Romanians) were returning from a restaurant about 4 p.m. on December 13, 1990. They had been drinking. A fight broke out among them though it is unclear who started it and what the cause of the fight was. Dimofte Lucreția, whose husband was one of the five Gypsies involved, reported to Helsinki Watch what happened after the fight:

My husband went with the others to the police to complain that they had been beaten by the Romanians. I went to talk to my husband about 7-7:30 p.m. and at that time there were already people gathered at the police

shouting threats such as "We will kill you." I went inside the police station along with the other wives. About 10 p.m. the men were arrested. The wives were allowed to go home about 3 a.m. When I returned home I saw that my house had been destroyed. The woman who had been staying at the house with my children had taken them and run away when she saw the crowd coming.

Another woman claimed that she was at home when the villagers began attacking the Gypsy quarters and that she saw the Chief of Police walking along with the mob.

The Chief of Police Jarnea was walking along with the villagers. There must have been 400 of them. I heard him say to those around him, "Don't set fire to the houses. Just beat them." Then I ran.

According to the Gypsies in Basarab interviewed by Helsinki Watch approximately 15 houses were destroyed and 10 to 15 people were beaten during the attack on December 14. [CONFIRM?] The next day the violence continued.

Maria Stoica, who was beaten, describes what happened to her:

I was at home with my four children when a large group of villagers came to the block of flats where I live (called NATO). This was on the second day at about 4:30 p.m. I lost my front teeth from being hit in the mouth by one of the villagers. My children were also beaten. One was hit in the head, but the injury was not serious. I didn't go to the doctor, but you can see I have no teeth. I was afraid to go out for about a month.

I also saw Laura Stoian who was pregnant being beaten. She had to be put in the hospital because of her injuries and after that she moved to another village.

On the second day approximately 10 apartments were attacked and another estimated 10 people were beaten.

Lucreția Dimofte describes the way her life has changed since the attack:

For one month we travelled around, stayed under a bridge in railways stations etc. It was cold and rainy and my little girl got sick. She had never been sick before and finally she died on March 14.

When I go to market now people threaten me, they say they will kill me. We are afraid to go to sleep in the house at night. We have children. My husband is arrested and I am alone at night with three children. Of course, no one has been arrested for the damage to our homes or for beating us.

BOLINTIN DEAL (April 7, 1991)

On the night of April 6, 1991 an argument between a Gypsy man and a Romanian student home for the Easter holiday lead to the student's death. When the student refused to let the Gypsy ride back to Bucharest with him and his friends, the Gypsy stabbed the student and then ran away. Emilian Niculae, a young, articulate Gypsy man interviewed by Helsinki Watch came upon the crime scene a few seconds after the stabbing and described what he saw:

It was Easter and I had been at church for the service. On the way home I met a boy who told me that something had just happened up the road ahead. I walked on and saw a person lying on the road in a pool of blood.

He was an acquaintance of mine and I went to him and held the candle (used in the Easter worship service) near his face until he died. This was around 12 p.m.

Three or four hours after the crime the police arrested the perpetrator.

Around a.m. the village alarm was sounded and villagers began to gather in front of the victim's house. At approximately 11-11:30 a.m. the mob of several thousand headed toward the Gypsies' houses. At first the idea was apparently to set fire to the alleged perpetrator's house, but quickly turned into an all-out attack on

all semi-nomadic Gypsies in the village.⁶²

According to many of those interviewed by Helsinki Watch, about 13 policemen gathered along with the villagers. At first they apparently tried to calm the crowd and then, according to one eyewitness, "they seemed to give up. After a few minutes they didn't seem to do anything. It was only at 1 p.m. that more forces came to the village. But the houses had already been burned."

Helsinki Watch also received unconfirmed reports that the mayor and local priest were direct instigators of the events. One eyewitness reported that he heard the Mayor say "What are you waiting for? Go on." when the villagers began to set fire." Another reported that he heard the priest urging the crowd on.

Other eyewitnesses reported that the mayor knew about the plan to burn the Gypsies houses several hours before the attack actually occurred and, while he warned the Gypsies to flee, he did nothing to protect them or their property. Another eyewitness interviewed by Helsinki Watch reported that:

The mayor came to the house and told us to leave because people would set fire to the houses. It was about 7:30-8 a.m. He came again around 10-10:30 a.m. I didn't leave until I saw houses were on fire and I was nearby when I saw the flames coming from my own house. The mayor warned us because they didn't want deaths. They just wanted to get the Gypsies out of the village.

Although the mayor appears to have anticipated the attack when there was still time to avoid violence, the police remained at their station. They were not called out to patrol the village.

The alarm apparently was the signal for the whole village to gather. Again,

⁶²There are two groups of Gypsies in Bolintin Deal. A group of builders and painters who had not been nomadic for centuries, had settled in the village much earlier and are better integrated. Their houses were not burned. The second group of Gypsies are still semi-nomadic and were forced to settle in the village as part of the government's forced settling program of the early 1950s.

many of those interviewed believe that the mayor is responsible for having sounded the alarm, although there is no direct evidence that he did so. A Gypsy woman reported:

The mayor must have been partially responsible because only he had access to the Cultural Hall [Casa de Cultură] and was able to set the alarm or give someone else authority to do so. . . . If they hadn't set the alarm, people wouldn't have gathered and begun to get aggressive.

The villagers burned 22 Gypsy homes and destroyed another five. Those whose houses had been destroyed, as well as many who were simply afraid to stay in the village, fled to family or friends in nearby villages. Others lived on construction sites or camped outside. A few Gypsies who had no place to stay tried to return to Bolintin Deal on May 7. They arrived in the morning and tried to move into the houses that had been devastated but not burned. Again the village alarm was sounded and the village gathered. The five houses that had not been burned on April 7 were set on fire and the Gypsies who had tried to return were chased out of the village.

On May 8, Helsinki Watch went to Bolintin Deal to interview Gypsies and the villagers. Shortly after arriving in the village the alarm was sounded and several hundred angry villagers quickly surrounded the delegation. One Romanian woman expressed the shared sentiment of the crowd:

Why don't people leave us alone. We have work to do here. Don't you understand that they were thieves. They stole from us. They were all bad. The young student was murdered on Easter while he was home visiting his family. Is something like that possible? Can you tell me how much more we have to take?

Many Romanians who talked to Helsinki Watch seem to share the opinion that all of those whose houses were burned were criminals who deserved what they got. Many Gypsies, however, feel that they are the victims of a stereotypical view of all Gypsies as thieves. Emilian Niculae told Helsinki Watch about the attack on his house:

They [the Romanians] say that they only attacked the criminals' homes. But my house was also burned down. A sociological study on Gypsies that I had been working on for years was lost in the fire. Some neighbors tried to help save our house but they were nearly lynched. These

neighbors knew that my family was innocent. There were seven of us living in the house. They had to know that we weren't thieves. Sure, there are one or two Gypsy families who have problem children, but there are also Romanians in the village who are thieves. The man who stabbed the student didn't even have a criminal record before. He was simply drunk.

Lucian Niculae, whose house was also burned during the attack angrily reported:

I am 56-years-old. If I've done all the things they accuse me of why didn't the police come to arrest me. Before there was one criminal in the group and suddenly some 200 people are considered criminals.

OGREZENI (May 17, 1991)

BOLINTIN VALE (May 18, 1991)

There have been two additional attacks on Gypsies in the area near Bolintin Deal. ["Vingt-huit maisons de Tziganes ont ete incendiees pres de Bucarest," Le Monde (May 21, 1991)]

CARTENIȘU (June 6, 1991)

2 houses burned down and 7 houses vandalized

* * *

There are many similarities in the violent attacks discussed above, although they have occurred in geographically dispersed areas. In most instances the mob violence was sparked by an argument or conflict between an individual Romanian and Gypsy. These conflicts were frequently the result of a high consumption of alcohol, and often occurred outside a bar or disco.

As discussed above, the villagers were frequently called together by the village alarm or church bells. These attacks are designed to force Gypsies out of the village and, by destroying their houses, to prevent them from returning. In all cases investigated by Helsinki Watch, the villagers accuse the Gypsies of being thieves and report that they have been the victims of numerous crimes over the years. The villagers almost unanimously complain that the police never dealt with crimes committed by Gypsies, because the police were corrupt, lazy or themselves afraid of the Gypsies. As one Romanian put it:

The police and local officials have played a very questionable role in many of the attacks discussed above. In some cases they have actually been accused of participating in the violence by calling the villagers together and urging them on. In almost all of the cases to date, the police have failed to provide any protection to the homes and property of Gypsy families even when they were aware of the likelihood of violence.

The Romanian government has an obligation to protect all of its citizens from violence or bodily harm without discrimination on the basis of race or ethnic origin. This obligation extends to violence whether inflicted by government officials or individuals. In most of the cases discussed above, the Romanian authorities failed to fulfill this obligation.

These acts of vigilante violence, which are clearly violations of Romania's own criminal code as well as its international obligations, have gone unpunished. Helsinki Watch has not received information that a single Romanian villager has been arrested or tried for attacks on Gypsy communities. The failure of the local prosecutor's offices to deal with these cases denies the Gypsy population the equal protection of Romanian law. Considering the enormous cost in human suffering, the uprooting of lives and the costly property damage involved, this is an abhorrent failure of the Romanian authorities.

The debate stirred up by the repeated attacks on Gypsies has, unfortunately, been reduced to a discussion of the criminality rate among Gypsies. As mentioned above, many argue that these attacks are motivated by frustration with the high crime rate in communities with a large number of Gypsies, and are not motivated by ethnic hatred. There is little recognition of the ethnic hatred and bias inherent in a view that defines all members of a community as criminals. From the interviews conducted by Helsinki Watch, it seems apparent that the majority of those attacked were attacked because of they are Gypsies, who are considered by definition criminals. The consequences are devastating for Romanian citizens of Gypsy ethnic origin.

Of course, it must be emphasized that even if an individual is accused of committing a crime, it is the responsibility of the criminal justice system to determine guilt or innocence, and to establish appropriate punishment. Under no circumstances is this the responsibility of civilians.

Helsinki Watch is extremely troubled by the failure of the Romanian government to firmly and clearly denounce these acts of vigilantism on the part of

the Romanian population. The Ethnic Federation of Roma in Romania called on President Iliescu and Prime Minister Roman to take a public stand against such acts of violence against the Gypsy population after Gypsy quarters were attacked by the miners during their rampage through Bucharest in June 1990. (See translation attached as Appendix A). Thus far, however, the Romanian government has taken little initiative.

[parliamentary commission]

* * *

As an organization, Helsinki watch does not deal with social and economic issues, focusing instead on political and civil rights of the individual. Some of the problems discussed above, appear at first glance to be economic in nature. However, the host of problems, from illiteracy and economic backwardness, to the high rate of unemployment, are all quite closely interrelated and, more importantly, are the direct result of discriminatory governmental policies that began with the inception of slavery. Thus, the seemingly economic nature of these problems is, in fact, the result of discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant.

Establishing equality in the law and in practice, while critically important, does not wipe out the injustice that has existed for centuries, nor the wide-ranging effects of that injustice. It is, therefore, necessary for the Romanian society to accept its share of the responsibility for the plight of its largest minority and to act as a nation to ensure an effective remedy for past discrimination which Gypsies have undeniably suffered.

International Law

International law protects the right of individuals to belong to an ethnic or national minority, and to express, preserve, and develop their cultural traditions:

To belong to a national minority is a matter of a person's individual choice and no disadvantage may arise from the exercise of such choice. Persons belonging to national minorities have the right freely to express, preserve and develop their ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity and to maintain and develop their culture in all its aspects, free of any attempts at assimilation against their will. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE (1990), Paragraph 32.)

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language. (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1976), Article 27.)

The participating States...reaffirm that respect for the rights of persons belonging to national minorities as part of universally recognized human rights is an essential factor for peace, justice, stability and democracy in the participating States. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 30.)

International law prohibits states from discriminating on the basis of ethnic or national identity, and requires states to take positive measures to prevent discrimination on these grounds:

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. (Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Article 7.)

All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race,

colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 26.)

The participating States will adopt, where necessary, special measures for the purpose of ensuring to persons belonging to national minorities full equality with the other citizens in the exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 31.)

The participating States...commit themselves to take appropriate and proportionate measures to protect persons or groups who may be subject to threats or acts of discrimination, hostility or violence as a result of their racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, and to protect their property.... (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 40.2.)

In Copenhagen, the CSCE countries (i.e., the countries that signed the Helsinki Final Act and follow-up documents, among them Romania) specifically recognized the problems of Gypsies, and pledged to take measures to remedy them:

The participating States clearly and unequivocally condemn totalitarianism, racial and ethnic hatred, anti-semitism, xenophobia and discrimination against anyone as well as persecution on religious and ideological grounds. In this context, they also recognize the particular problems of Roma (gypsies). They declare their firm intention to intensify the efforts to combat these phenomena in all their forms.... (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 40.)

Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity [without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status]...and without unreasonable restrictions: (a) To take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives.... (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 25.)

International law allows parents the right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children:

Everyone has the right to education....Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit....Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26.)

International law requires states to ensure that minorities have adequate opportunities for instruction in their mother tongue:

The participating States will protect the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of national minorities on their territory and create conditions for the promotion of that identity. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 33.)

The participating States will endeavour to ensure that persons belonging to national minorities, notwithstanding the need to learn the official language or languages of the State concerned, have adequate opportunities for instruction of their mother tongue or in their mother tongue, as well as, wherever possible and necessary, for its use before public authorities, in conformity with applicable national legislation. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 34.)

International law requires states to take account of the history and culture of national minorities when preparing curriculums, and to take other measures to promote racial and ethnic tolerance through education:

In the context of the teaching of history and culture in educational establishments, [the participating States] will...take account of the history and culture of national minorities. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 34.)

The participating States [will]...endeavour to ensure that the objectives of education include special attention to the problem of racial prejudice and hatred and to the development of respect for different civilizations and cultures.... (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 40.4.)

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26.)

International law requires states to take additional measures to promote mutual understanding and tolerance:

Every participating State will promote a climate of mutual respect, understanding, co-operation and solidarity among all persons living on its territory, without distinction as to ethnic or national origin or religion, and will encourage the solution of problems through dialogue based on the principles of the rule of law. (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 36.)

The participating States [will]...take effective measures, in conformity with their constitutional systems, at the national, regional and local levels to promote understanding and tolerance, particularly in the fields of education, culture and information.... (Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE, Paragraph 40.3.)

International law allows states to take special measures (i.e., "affirmative action"), for a limited period of time, to ensure members of all ethnic groups the equal enjoyment and exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms:

Special measures taken for the sole purpose of securing adequate advancement of certain racial or ethnic groups or individuals requiring such protection as may be necessary in order to ensure such groups or individuals equal enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms shall not be deemed racial discrimination, provided, however, that such measures do not, as a consequence, lead to the maintenance of separate rights for different racial groups and that they shall not be continued after the objectives for which they were taken have been achieved. (International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1969), Article 1.)

Recommendations

Helsinki Watch urges the Romanian government to:

Abide by its obligations under international law to respect and promote human rights; and specifically, to:

- Guarantee the security of all persons from violence or bodily harm, whether inflicted by Government officials or by any individual or group.
- Conduct a criminal investigation into each incidence of violence against the Gypsy community and prosecute cases where there is evidence of guilt.
- Investigate the failure of the Romanian authorities to intervene to protect Gypsies under attack.
- Investigate the role of Romanian authorities in the attacks on Gypsy communities.
- Conduct an immediate investigation into all allegations of abuse and mistreatment while in custody, and prosecute all those responsible for violations of the law.
- Take steps to remedy past discrimination against the Gypsy minority.
- Prohibit all forms of discrimination against Gypsies, including harassment and intimidation by government officials. Provide all citizens with effective remedies against discrimination.
- Assure Gypsies the right to equal participation in local administration and local government.
- Guarantee Gypsies equal rights, in policy and practice, to education.
- Guarantee Gypsies equal rights, in policy and practice, to obtain land, and equal access to housing.
- Guarantee Gypsies equality in the workplace.
- Ensure that the Gypsy minority has adequate opportunities to learn the Romani language. Optional Romani language classes should be offered in elementary and secondary schools.

- Include teaching about the history and culture of Gypsies in secondary and elementary schools.
- Direct the state-controlled television and radio to provide objective and balanced reporting when airing stories about Gypsies.

Appendix A

Protest sent to Iliescu and Roman:

From beginning of 1990 not a month has passed that a Gypsy community was attacked. Nevertheless, the Union decided not to make these attacks public because it thought that the attacks were local in nature. Realize that this was not a good idea, now that Kogalniceanu happened.

There has to be some government intervention as well as by the Gypsy organizations in order that these events can be avoided in the future. If you consider that Gypsies have equal rights before the law,

Local authorities were informed:

Kogalniceanu - had been planned for the 11th of October and attack signal was the same as in Cuza Voda. Local authorities did nothing to avoid the attack, were passive and even refused to cooperate with the police.

We have addressed ourselves to the Government but it has done nothing just as the local bodies did nothing. Since no parliamentary commission or governmental commission bothered to go to the areas where the Gypsies were attacked to form their own impressions of the events, Since the 35 families were removed from the 33 houses, of which 25 were burned and 8 were devastated, do not have a home except the blue sky. At the end of October a block of apartments was given to the villagers and another block of flats exists near the forest which could be used by the Gypsies

The county bodies are as indifferent as the local bodies.

We strongly protest, being convinced that such things happen because the citizens believe that they can act as they will without in consequences. We ask for the following:

1. urgent housing for 176 still without housing (29 elderly, 91 are children, and several are TBC patients)
2. rebuilding of houses and possibility of gaining what they have lost
3. Position be taken by the President or Prime Minister on radio or TV at

prime time requesting that such acts not be repeated.

4. Removal and sanctioning for complicity and failure to Mayor, Sub-mayor (Ionescu, Constantin, Costica Dan and Stefu Sterian)
5. Sanctioning of the Catholic priest Farkas Ion and Orthodox priest Grigorescu Costache for refusing to cooperate with police in order to hide the guilty.
6. Prevent the teachers from teaching because they have instigated to pogroms.
7. Investigate and sanction those who are guilty and the instigators.
8. Remove chief of police and prefect.
9. Remove the chief prosecutor from Prosecutor's Office in Constanta county for lack of cooperation and refusal to investigate the situation in the village.

Appendix B

(Translation of the UDR Complaint)

Appendix C

(Human Rights Watch policy statement on "hate speech")