

ALTERNATIVE

ALTERNATIVE

Developing alternative understandings of security and justice through restorative justice approaches in intercultural settings within democratic societies

**Deliverable 5.5:
Comprehensive final report**

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

COOPERATION PROGRAMME



“This project has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 285368”

Project start date: 01.02.2012

Project duration: 48 months

Deliverable due date: Month 46 (November 2015 – extended with approval of PO to 12 December)

Submission date: 12 December 2015

Dissemination level: PU

Workpackage: WP5

Workpackage leader: Foresee

Contact person: Project Manager, Dr. Inge Vanfraechem

Project URL: www.alternativeproject.eu



Deliverable 5.5. Comprehensive final report on RJ in intercultural communities

Hera Gabor, Benedek Gabriella, Szegő Dora and Balla Laszlo

Foresee Research Group
Budapest, 2015

Table of Content

Executive summary	4
Introduction.....	8
Security.....	9
A specific example – the case of the Civil Guard.....	14
What did the case study tell us about the interpretations of security?	16
Minority.....	18
Group discussion event organised for the Roma community.....	21
The Charity Distribution case	23
What do local residents think about the Roma minority?	25
Exclusion.....	27
The case of the Butcher Festival	29
Soccer conflict	31
Exclusion – impact, types of reactions and the differences in interpretations.....	32
Intercultural settings	36
The local groups of the village.....	37
Interpretations about the other groups.....	43
Where is the most intense fight?	44
The Burning conflict	44
Fight for the local newspaper.....	45
Conflict because of the election campaign	48
Expanding the definition of exclusion – distancing from the interethnic dimension	50
Conflict	52
Burning conflict	54
Butcher Festival.....	55
Civil Guard	57
Soccer conflict	59
Regimes of the village – experiences of a Healing Circle	60
Annex I. – Grids	62
Bibliography.....	69

Executive summary

The study describes the village of Kisvaros¹ in detail where the action research programme of the Foresee Research Group was conducted. The authors summarise the findings of the field work and introduce the way their experiences reflect on some of the concepts of the ALTERNATIVE project.

As the study clarifies, members of the local community have several core values and aims in common. Neighbours, villagers, friends and relatives pay attention to each other and intend to improve the local security. There is a strong civil society in Kisvaros and there are certain institutions (e.g. the school and the kindergarten) and events (e.g. the Day of the Village) where local residents cooperate and work together.

However, the case studies of the report demonstrate the fragmented characteristics of the community as well. There are several groups in Kisvaros without the intention of cooperating with each other. In addition, members of the various groups are prone to describe the others with negative terms and even stereotypes. Native villagers have clear ideas about newcomers – and vice versa. Residents who regularly go to mass clearly express their opinion about the villagers who do not join them – and vice versa. Supporters of the different regimes have no doubts how to describe the other groups. Members of the local Roma minority and non-Roma people have different interpretations about the way they live together – while both of them easily describe the specificities of the other groups. All in all, the specific groups of the village easily characterise the habits, values and norms of the other groups. Unfortunately, not only pure descriptions of the others but the conflicts between the local groups are also an important attribute of the field. The motive behind the fight often seems to be the intention of the groups to control resources and to create advantage for themselves within the local power relationships.

While describing the life of Kisvaros, the authors put emphasis on the differences between the interpretations of the Roma and the non-Roma about exclusion. The Roma villagers often describe themselves as victims of discrimination – while non-Roma usually refuse the existence of such practice. Fortunately, it is not the researchers' task to search for an absolute 'truth'; we accept that different actors may

¹ Within this study, all of the names are fictive in order to protect confidentiality and anonymity.

have different, subjective interpretations. However, as the authors underline, it might be important to reframe the conflicts that are labelled as 'interethnic' while analysing the situation in Kisvaros and to introduce them as a struggle of powerful groups of interests who intentionally frame the dissent as one which arises between the Roma and the non-Roma.

The study also introduces the phenomenon of 'culture of silence'; residents in the village often avoid open discussion about their conflicts and prefer conflict management practices building upon avoidance. Several case studies describe the way the villagers of Kisvaros consider collision with the 'other groups' not as an opportunity for change but as danger.

It would be important to understand why local residents create stereotypes and enemy images, why they maintain the 'culture of silence' and why they avoid open discussions about their problems with members of the 'other groups'. We may find a possible answer that is provided by social psychology: people prefer their own kind. The positive image of their own groups is usually strengthened by the negative image of the other groups (Tajfel and Turner 1979, Hewstone and Greenland 2000). As Dovidio and his co-authors (2005) summarised the findings of various research programmes, people tend to minimise differences within their own group while they are prone to exaggerate differences with others. They have more positive impressions towards the members of their own group than towards members of the others. They can more easily recall information about ways in which ingroup members are similar to and outgroup members are dissimilar to the self. They are able to evoke less positive information about the others. They are more helpful towards 'our group' than towards the others, and they probably work harder for ingroups. They tend to behave in a less trustworthy way toward members of other groups (than if they were reacting to each other as individuals). In addition, the basic social psychological characteristic of human beings – a kind of predisposition to exclude the members of the other groups – is probably amplified in case of conflict, i.e. in case of "incompatible interests or goals or in competition for control over scarce resources" (Avruch 1998, 24).

Despite these characteristics of human beings we see the opportunity of breaking the dominant culture of silence, supporting the local residents to communicate with each other and building trust in local communities. In order to achieve this aim, we consider the work of the mediators crucial who support the search "for a common truth (e.g. a

common understanding of what had happened or the outcome of the process) through dialogue” (Hydle and Seeberg 2013, 6). Other reports of the ALTERNATIVE project have already summarised the mediators’ experiences from the action research programme. Deliverable 5.3 reveals the way restorative interventions can offer an alternative understanding of security and justice in intercultural settings. The authors of the study enlist and explain in detail both helping and hindering factors of RJ practices. In addition, they introduce the way mediators can boost trust, spread information and increase knowledge and skills, as well as willingness and motivation in order to ensure a setting which is responsive and able to open up to restorative processes. Deliverable 5.4 should also be mentioned here; the study describes the local construction of active participation in relation to justice. In addition, it analyses what mediators learned about restorative justice values and principles from the various activities of the fieldwork and offers conclusions and specific recommendations regarding how to build up restorative processes in intercultural settings. Further conclusions are described related to the restorative models, where the main issues are conceptual and methodological flexibility and the need for going beyond conventional boundaries by the restorative professionals. All in all, the current study, Deliverable 5.3 and 5.4 are complementary to each other as all of these reports summarise the findings of the action research programme. However, while Deliverable 5.3 and 5.4 reveal primarily the RJ practitioners’ experiences about the implementation of restorative interventions the current report describes mainly the social scientists’ findings.

It should be also emphasised that the village where our action research programme was implemented has a lot of strengths. The team of the Foresee Research Group was able to build upon good relationships with the community and thereby managed to open up, involve and activate local residents. Some of the villagers, with whom our team worked in close cooperation, learned the skills and competences that are crucial in conflict resolution. Some of them have even the perspectives and attitudes to work as mediators in the future. Yet others experienced the way safe communication spaces, active participation in facilitated dialogues and open discussions about conflicts can intensify trust and thereby the willingness to cooperate in the community. All in all, the community where the action research programme was conducted became more responsive, open up to restorative process while the conflict management culture increased.

While enlisting the strengths of Kisvaros it is also important to underline that many villagers have the intention to accept residents who have different opinions, purposes, ideologies or backgrounds. Developing the village is a common purpose; thereby members of the 'other groups' can be legitimised if their activity supports Kisvaros and develops the local living conditions. Obviously, there are events, conversations and meetings where there are opportunities for recognition (Pali 2013, 20), where villagers can recognise the other person, perceive and understand his/her words and his/her actions. It is also a strength that children, parents, residents communicate, cooperate and work together; there are certain communities and institutions, like the school or the kindergarten, where villagers do not experience fragmentation and conflicts between groups of interests. Here, the workshops that were organised in the local primary school by the Foresee Research Group aiming at sensitisation for restorative values and approach should be also mentioned.

Last but not least, we would like to underline the strength of civil society and active citizenship as well. We can look at oppositions between the NGOs (that we describe in the study in detail) as a competition for resources or as a fight between different interests. However, we could have another interpretation: it is a manifestation of a strong third sector. Residents would like to do something for Kisvaros, express their opinion and interests, influence the work of the local government and participate in the local politics. The conflict about the local media and the other oppositions that are also introduced in the report could have a similar interpretation; some people are able to cooperate in order to achieve their aims.

We believe that these characteristics of the village are the seeds in the ground where cooperation, trust and mutual understanding will grow in the future and thereby the practices of the 'culture of silence', polarisation and creation of the enemy images will be eliminated. In addition, we believe, that the findings of the action research programme support not only the professionals, researchers and the scientific community itself but even the policy and decision makers in identifying the necessary interventions that support effective conflict-management in intercultural contexts within democratic societies.

Introduction

This study is compiled within the frameworks of the ALTERNATIVE project which aims at providing an alternative and profound understanding of justice and security based on empirical evidence on the way conflicts are handled within intercultural contexts in democratic societies. The project undertakes an interdisciplinary and inter-regional comparative investigation on how and why people, groups and institutions, through the application of restorative justice (RJ), are enabled to attain an alternative understanding and a new experience of justice and security (ALTERNATIVE 2011, 3).

The project was set-up as an action research in which theoretical work packages not only fed into action research sites in Austria, Hungary, Northern-Ireland and Serbia but at the same time the results of the actions intend to loop back into theory as well. All in all, the process does not solely run from theory to practice but the experience and findings of the field work could react on the concepts themselves and thus these concepts (and the concept-based theories and conclusions) could be validated, modified or even rejected. In order to achieve this aim, the partners conducted empirical and theoretical researches and analysed the relevant literature in the first phase of the programme. Based on the results of this work the consortium made a critical analysis of existing theoretical frameworks, developed concepts – such as ‘security’, ‘conflict’, intercultural settings’, ‘justice’ etc. – later they theoretically elaborated, finalised and operationalised them (Vanfraechem, 2012). This was followed by an empirical phase while on the one hand researchers fully described the situation in the field and on the other hand revealed what was understood locally when referring to a certain concept (Deliverables 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 7.1). The findings of this empirical work provided feedback and input to the theoretical considerations.

Here, it should be underlined that the orientation of the work was based on action research which is an umbrella term that represents several different practices. While carrying out an action research the researchers not only gain information from the field, they not only conduct studies on the target group. Additionally, the researchers form “partnerships with community members to identify issues of local importance, develop ways of studying them, collect and interpret data, and take action on the resulting knowledge” (Smith et al. 2010, 408). One of the keywords here is action. Researchers are not only objective observers without any influence on the field and

who are not influenced by the field or by their own prejudices, stereotypes and ideas. Rather, the aim of the researchers is “to effect desired change as a path to generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.” (Huang 2010, 93)

In Hungary, Foresee Research Group was responsible for implementing the action research. The Foresee team conducted interviews and participatory observations, organised workshops and implemented RJ practices with the active participation of the local residents between January 2013 and May 2015. Thereby, researchers got to know the local residents and built mutual trust and they even gained information about the way the local villagers interpreted the concepts.

The action research was supported by the use of ‘evaluation grids’ (see Annex) and by the guide that was developed by the consortium of the ALTERNATIVE project. It referred to the theories and concepts as they were developed in the beginning of the project; thereby reflection upon the loop back into the theory was supported. At the same time, the grids ensured comparability as partners followed the same guidelines while collecting and analysing information of the field work.

This study primarily focuses on the concepts about which the research team of Foresee managed to gain detailed information; we will analyse in detail the way local residents refer to the central concepts of ‘Security’, ‘Conflict’, ‘Intercultural settings’, ‘Minority’ and ‘Exclusion’. However, there will be no focus on ‘Justice’ and ‘Civil society’ as these concepts are discussed in Deliverable 5.4 in detail.

Security

During the three years of the field work, the research team of Foresee managed to reveal the various and complex interpretations of the term of security. As it came to light, some of the local residents derived their security from their common identity; from their embedded membership in Kisvaros. These villagers emphasised that their sense of ‘community security’ (Hydle and Seeberg 2013, 12) evolved due to friends, relatives, neighbours and more especially the relationship between these actors – who represent the same core values as the importance of the locality, trust, reciprocity and taking care of each other. Hereinafter, we cite from some of the residents who represented this idea:

We should pay attention to each other in our village. It is not a good point of view that ‘I don’t have any trouble and if there is something wrong in my neighbourhood I do not care about it’.

I am not afraid of becoming a victim of burglary. Both of my neighbours have alarms.

Security, for me, means daring to walk on the street. I do not have to be afraid of going to an event which is organised here. And yes, I’m not afraid as we have learned the way to live with each other.

Sometimes we say hello to each other while standing outside in a nightgown or pyjamas at night because of the barking of our watchdogs. And we discuss whether there is a dog or a drunken man walking in the street. In addition, we will inform the neighbours if we go on holiday or if we are in the hospital. This is important. It supports my sense of security.

As some of the local residents revealed, not only communities at the local level – as settlements, districts, villages or neighbourhoods – but larger entities at the macro level, as the community of the Hungarian people, were able to ensure security. On the one hand, this idea was emphasised by the ‘conservative’ and ‘nationalist’ villagers² who identified primarily themselves as a member of the Hungarian nation. On the other hand, the idea was underlined by those who felt being excluded from the community of the nation; primarily by members of the local Roma minority.³ These villagers expressed their doubts about the extreme-right-wing movements and political parties that recently became stronger in Hungary and aimed at the exclusion of the Roma and thereby endangered their sense of the ‘community security’. As one of our Roma interviewees put it: “They can win the next election. But they mark the people who should be killed. And there is no reaction from the government, the civil sector, the democratic parties and the churches; thereby I feel like shit in this country.”

All in all, the sense of the ‘community security’ would be strong if local residents at the micro level (and even citizens at the macro level, i.e. citizens of the country)

² For more information about the different ideological backgrounds in the village see Hera et al. 2011, 63-64.

³ For more information about the situation of the Roma minority in Hungary see: *ibid*, 16-23.

represented the same values, were able to cooperate and support each other and did not intend to exclude some of their members.

The researchers of Foresee were able to identify another interpretation of security: 'public security' that is endangered by crime, thefts and burglaries was also on the agenda in Kisvaros. Local residents easily associated the meaning of the concept with

1. target groups of crime; as old and lonely people, ill residents, weak villagers, naive or unsuspecting people.
2. opportunities to protect themselves against crime; as burglary alarms, locks, cameras, dogs.
3. groups who were dangerous for the local 'public security'. In the opinion of some villagers, for example members of the Roma population were strongly involved in crime – this issue will be discussed in detail later on. Immigration was also considered as a dangerous tendency. According to some local residents, the community was able to control their members – until Kisvaros was small and people knew each other by the face. From this point of view newcomers mean danger: "Emigration started from the city after the turn of the Millennium. People arrived... Please, do not misunderstand it but we were not able to track those people who arrived into our village. Maybe they were newcomers and lived in the city but maybe they were criminals." One more dangerous group was hawkers. As some of the villagers underlined, a lot of times these travelling vendors did not want to sell anything but they were only looking for an opportunity to steal goods.

It should be underlined the 'public security' and 'community security' is strongly linked to each other as the local community has a crucial role in dealing with (and preventing) crime. As some of the villagers put it: "Somebody tried to burgle... And when we went out to the street... neighbours came as well. And this is what the criminals have to feel: we join forces against criminals." Yet another local resident drew it up: "We should not be selfish. If I hear that the dog at my neighbour is barking all night... I also switch on the light, go out and ask if everything is all right. We, neighbours support each other. The whole street..."

If 'community security' is strong, people will cooperate with each other; for example they will be active taking part in the provision of safety for themselves. In the village,

residents were active and initiated a grass-root organisation, the local Civil Guard. This initiative has a crucial role in improving the feeling of 'public security'. In the opinion of one local resident: "you can feel that our members are attentive. It makes me feel stronger that they take care of me." In addition, the importance of the local NGOs in making the 'public security' stronger and in crime prevention should also be underlined. In the opinion of the leader of the soccer association "if they were not members of this community they would be criminals. (...) If there were less NGOs here, security would be worse. As they would go to the pub and relieve stress there." NGOs support socialisation and give the opportunity to be integrated to the majority of the society – that is also a type of crime prevention. "When they visit the club for the first time they are cannibals. They do not wipe their feet when they enter the dressing room. One month later, they wipe their feet without any request. These are trifles but their importance is huge!" All in all, if neighbours, villagers, friends, relatives and local NGOs pay attention to each other, i.e. if the community security is strong, the sense of 'public security' will become strong as well.

Not only the issues of 'public security' and 'community security' but even a third interpretation of security emerged during the field work. Researchers recognised that the topic of 'social security', which can be endangered for example by economic crisis, unemployment, lack of income, was also crucial for the local residents. This issue typically appeared while looking back to the period of the socialism: when workplace, income and well-being had been ensured for all of the citizens of the country (Hera et al., 2013). It was a common opinion that socialism had been the period of the "peaceful, calm life" and of safety – the period that had disappeared when the system had changed to capitalism in 1989. Nowadays, people do not feel safe as they face the dangers of unemployment, lack of income and poverty, i.e. by phenomena that risk social security. As we recognised, not only the poor and disadvantaged people may have worries for their 'social security' but also members of the local middle or even upper class. One of the local entrepreneurs declared that

I feel safe if I can work and subsist. However, I do not feel safe nowadays. Politicians can decide to introduce a new form of tax, whenever they want. (...) Government does not ensure safety for me at all. The government's task would

be to secure the opportunity for me to plan my future. However, I cannot make future plans nowadays.

It should be underlined that the concept of 'social security' is also linked with 'public security'. Some of the villagers emphasised that society was responsible for ensuring 'social security', a level of prosperity, even for "those living below". In default of such a care 'public security' will be endangered and

everybody should build barbed wires around their houses and buy guns (...) It should be communicated somehow that the path to your security leads across the relative wealth of the others. Neither will you be safe if a lot of people around you fear the uncertainty of future or suffer due to the lack of income. (...) Your safety will be strengthened if people are satisfied and have a relative level of welfare.

Yet somebody else expressed the same idea while recalling a conversation with one of the locals:

There was a villager... we had a conversation. I told him that he would not get aid as he had burgled. Then... he asked me. 'Listen to me! I cannot give food to the children. If you were me what would you do?' It was such a good question... What could I answer? If there were no other opportunities one really should commit crime.

All in all, the villagers emphasising the importance of 'social security' did not point at the importance of cameras, CCTV, fences, police officers etc. – techniques often used to increase 'public security'. Instead, they mainly focused on the responsibility of the whole of the society in supporting their members in order to ensure their welfare (and thereby avoiding to force them to commit crime).

In order to make the way the local residents think about the various forms of the concept of 'security' explicit, we will introduce a specific conflict that arose because of the work of the local Civil Guard – the grass-root organisation that aimed at improving the security in Kisvaros by the work of volunteer locals. Here, it is worth to mention that we know about the 'security dilemma' (Pali 2013, 55) and we are aware of the

disadvantages of making connections between the issues of ‘security’ and ‘Roma’. However, we start off this path in order to mirror the opinion of the local residents about the issue and to introduce the way villagers think about one of the key concepts of the ALTERNATIVE project.

A specific example – the case of the Civil Guard

We discovered the antecedents of the case of Civil Guard based on the interviews we conducted with Tibor, a Roma villager who was the leader of the local Roma Self-Government⁴ and at the same time a representative of the village council, at the end of 2013. As he shared it with us, members of a local NGO had initiated the establishment of a civil guard a few years ago. They even organised a workshop in Kisvaros and invited civil guards from the neighbouring municipality where they discussed the topic of local security. In addition, they collected donations from the local residents in order to support the work of the new organisation. As Tibor shared with us, a dissent had already emerged at that time. As it came to light, members of that Civil Guard had been clearly against involving Roma residents into the work of the only grass-root organisation which dealt with local security. However, some members of that organisation invited Tibor to join the civil guard but “no other Roma from the village were welcome. I resented by saying that for the local Roma local security was as important as for the non-Roma. It would have been great if the village had believed that the local Roma had been also for the local security, tranquillity and peace”. Finally, the conflict and harms, which arose due to the Roma’s exclusion from the Civil Guard, were not discussed. Tibor (or other local Roma people) did not join the initiative.

As Tibor shared it with us, he was motivated to do something for the local security experiencing that the number of burglaries were increasing in Kisvaros at the end of 2013. He initiated the establishment of a new Civil Guard. He was not alone in this attempt because Henrik – one of the local residents – also supported the initiative. They agreed to set up the new organisation in order to “make the sense of security of the local residents in the village stronger”. Tibor and Henrik informed the members of

⁴ Act LXXVII of 1993 (Act on the rights of national and ethnic minorities) is the legal basis of the protection of minority rights in Hungary. The most important innovation of the law was the establishment of minority self-governments which are organisations that offer a form of cultural autonomy for minorities.

their informal network about their intentions, they advertised the plan on Facebook and in one of the local newspapers. They planned to round up altogether 30-60 participants – if there had been so many participants each of them would have gone on patrol only once a week. Tibor tried to mobilise some Roma residents as well.

They invited those who would have taken part in the work of the new Civil Guard not for salary but as volunteers. In addition, they wanted to involve villagers who would have been able to support the work by covering the costs of the petrol. According to Tibor, lack of criminal record was also a criterion. Henrik emphasised that they had mainly been interested in those applicants who had had driving licences and/or a car. As it can be seen, the organisers wanted to found a real grass-root organisation without any financial support from the local government or the government – at least in the beginning. Later on, they would have wanted to establish a formal organisation.

As Tibor and Henrik emphasised, they had several problems with the current Civil Guard because the number of burglaries increased in 2013. As only two civil guards were on the street at nights and as their technical equipment was poor, they were not able to catch criminals. According to Henrik, members of the civil guard were not dedicated to their work; some of them visited the local pubs or womanized instead of going on patrol. Despite the discontents, Tibor and Henrik wanted to avoid conflicts with the current Civil Guard. As Tibor underlined: “I would like to work not against but for them.” He got in contact with the mediators of the Foresee Research Group as he was afraid of the emergence of a new dissent. As Tibor thought, members of the current Civil Guard which worked in Kisvaros anyway would have probably resented against the new initiative. As he put it: “I knew that tension would have increased because of our plan. They would have considered our initiative as a criticism. (...) Mediation would have been important in order to get them to understand that we did not want to take away anything from them.”

Finally, mediation was not possible because the grass-root initiative itself was not successful; the organisers did not manage to involve enough volunteers. I asked Henrik about the number of participants they managed to involve. And he answered: “None. We tried but... Tibor wrote an article in the local newspaper. We gave information on Facebook where a lot of users pressed the ‘like’ button... Nothing else. I wrote a note that if you were interested you could come and discuss the issue at the library. Nobody reacted.”

What did the case study tell us about the interpretations of security?

The case study of the Civil Guard, as a practical example, represents how local residents interpret the multiple senses of security.

One of the interpretations, 'community security', should be mentioned in the beginning of the description. As it has been introduced earlier, this kind of explanation points at the common identity of a community that is strengthened by reassuring set of values. However, we would like to underline here that the definition could be expanded. 'Community security' may entail "the security of the individual against possible threats from the community" (Hydle and Seeberg 2013, 13). If we take even this definition into consideration we may conclude that the 'community security' of the local Roma residents was threatened due to the Roma's exclusion from the Civil Guard – as the common identity of the locals was discredited.

The violation of the common identity resulted in an answer from the part of the Roma; Tibor, the representative of the community tried to make the bond between the local Roma and non-Roma stronger and to restore the common identity. According to him, the local Roma did not take part in burglaries at all – especially not in their own village. Tibor underlined that "burglars usually come from the neighbouring villages. We are very angry because if there is an incident the communication will be about 'the Roma who burgle' and not about 'the burglar Roma who are not from our village'." He even recalled some cases when local Roma did or would have liked to do something for security – even if they had to confront other Roma. For example, last winter one of the Roma men met a few young Roma kids late at night on the street. They were from the neighbouring municipality. The man asked them what they were doing in Kisvaros so late. And the answer came: "We are just taking a walk!" The man "sent away the kids as he knew that they did not really respect private property." As Tibor emphasised, responsible attitude has developed in the village within the Roma community. Therefore, even Roma residents agree that criminals – even Roma – should not come to the village as "the shit what they cause will remain here". Tibor fights against negative stereotypes about the Roma: "We also feel as a piece of shit when there is a burglary in the village and we are blamed as burglars. I would like the local residents

to recognise that Roma are for peace and tranquillity and they would like to do something for the security of the village.” This was also the reason why he tried to invite Roma in the new Civil Guard as well.

Mainly the non-Roma villagers emphasised that the ‘public security’ of Kisvaros was threatened – primarily by the Roma. This utterance that could be defined as a speech act of securitisation (Vanfraechem 2012) had its clear messages. As one of our interviewees put it:

I consider 100% sure that Roma from the village are involved. Here is my neighbour who let some of the local Roma take away the metal from his garden. They looked around and observed everything...two weeks later they robbed him. Let’s see another example! Richard is my other neighbour. He let some of the local Roma in his garden... a few weeks later there was a robbery as well. And the burglars knew where to go. They had knowledge about the garden and the house.

According to this idea, Roma commit crime because they need money, and they are lazy and just live on social benefits.⁵ Moreover, committing crime “somehow it is a kind of code... it is in their blood” and this is the reason why “90% of the Roma are in prisons.”

The issue of ‘social security’ also emerged during the discussion regarding the Civil Guard. Some of the local residents did not blame the Roma for crimes. These villagers rather pointed at the unemployment and poverty that may force them to break the law. These people emphasised the responsibility of the whole community in improving the local security by supporting the disadvantaged residents.

It is worth mentioning here that while describing the case of the Civil Guard, we were a little bit simplistic. The picture is more complex. The issue of ‘social security’ was equally important for the Roma and non-Roma residents as well. Many villagers underlined not the violation of the ‘public security’ but the threat of the ‘community security’ while talking about crimes that were supposedly committed by Roma. The Roma people also consider it important to live in a safe village and would like to

⁵ For more information about the topic of ‘Roma crime’ see Berkovits and Balogh (2013)

decrease the burglaries and thefts in the community; the issue of the ‘public security’ did not belong solely to the non-Roma. The picture is also more complex as the term ‘Roma’ is also simplistic. The next chapter will introduce this issue in detail and reveal the way the local residents – both the Roma and non-Roma – think about the term ‘minority’.

Minority

In the beginning of the chapter it is worth defining the concept of ‘minority’. According to Jackson-Preece (in Vanfraechem 2012, 28), a minority group is

numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a non-dominant position, well defined and historically established on the territory of that state, whose members – being nationals of the state – possess ethnic, religious, linguistic, or cultural characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion, or language.

The non-dominant position of the minorities seems to be widely accepted by scholars; members of these groups have often significantly less control or power over their lives than members of a dominant or majority group (Schaefer 2007).

A minority group could be constituted on an ethnic base. The Oxford English Dictionary provides an optional definition of such a group whose members “differentiated from the rest of the community by racial origins or cultural background, and usually claiming or enjoying official recognition of their group identity” (Wikipedia 2015). However, it should be emphasised that many approaches exist regarding the term of ‘ethnicity’. Here, we only point at the primordialist approach; according to this view ethnicity as something given, ascribed at birth, deriving from human society, and hence something more or less fixed and permanent (Wsevolod 1993). Clifford Geertz (1973), who considers ethnicity as a personal identity that is commonly conciliated and presented in public, is one well-known representative of this idea. On the contrary, according to the situational approach, ethnicity is relevant in some situations but not in others. As Jenkins put it, ethnicity “based on common signs, but it’s rooted in interactions that constructs them; it is not constant, or stable, but depends on

situations; as identity it is collective and individual as well: you can seize in social interactions, and in the personal identity it became internal” (cited in Kovács and Vidra and Virág 2013, 79). This model enables us to assume borders between groups and to examine labels as a product of the context – the issue that is discussed in detail later on.

The Roma compose a minority in Hungary whose members are acknowledged as an ethnic group by the Act LXXVII of 1993 on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities. The Hungarian Roma population is a heterogeneous group. It consists of subgroups such as the Vlach, the Boyas and the Romungro (and also of several sub-groups) (Szuhay 2002). In addition, Roma differ in terms of spoken language (Kemény 2002), integration into the job market, socio-economic status etc. The Roma community in Kisvaros is also heterogeneous as it is fragmented by different types of kin (as the 'gyépasz', 'rigó' and 'kuz' families) and by different groups of interests (as the former and the current leaders of the Roma Self-Government and their supporters) (Benedek 2015, 120). There are Roma villagers in deep poverty while the living conditions of a few Roma are the same as the life standard of the non-Roma residents. In addition, some members of the local Roma community are educated while there are many Roma who did not even finish primary school. Moreover, some of the Roma men who take part quite actively in the social life of Kisvaros are rather open towards building bridges and aspire for a better relationship with the non-Roma. On the contrary, some of the Roma women who stay mainly at home as housewives while taking part in the social life of the village to a less extent, are more refusing and feel offended by the majority of the local society.

Despite these disparities, the non-Roma usually do not differentiate between subgroups of the local Roma community but rather talk about 'the Roma' as a homogeneous entity. As it has been already introduced (Hera et al. 2013), the non-Roma villagers, who are less tolerant towards the minority, emphasise: a few decades ago there were no problems with Roma (in general) as “they knew where to stay.” Unfortunately, nowadays “Roma can do what they want while Hungarians mustn't do anything.” In their opinion, Kisvaros has always had problems with this minority whose members (all of them) do not really want to change their lives. This idea is fed by the ideology “if you really want to do something, you can.” According to this opinion, (all of the) Roma should be active in order to improve their life-circumstances. Lack of

will explain why the Roma are undereducated and poor. Moreover, as some of the villagers underline, Roma enjoy undue benefits only because of their ethnic identity. One of our interviewees, while we were talking about the attitudes towards grants and aids of the local government said: “They (the Roma of the village) take everything for granted” – as opposed to the other people, who do not wait for this kind of support. All in all, the less tolerant villagers emphasise the responsibility of the individual – and at the same time use stereotypes and consider the Roma community as a homogenous entity.

On the other hand, some of the non-Roma residents of Kisvaros are more tolerant towards the minority and accept that solely the Roma themselves (one and all) cannot change their own lives. These people explain the situation of the Roma (in general) with macro-sociological reasons. “Under the period of socialism... a lot of Roma were working in the collective farms. The system has changed... farms ceased... there are no work places since that time and they cannot work.” These villagers emphasise that if the Roma (all of them) had work, there would not be problems in Kisvaros. All in all, these people have a sociological view and they highlight the responsibility of the whole society – and also use stereotypes while describing the Roma as a homogenous entity.

As it is possible to recognise, both perspectives have two common grounds; 1) they presuppose a homogeneous Roma group with a collective identity and 2) they create borders between the non-Roma (‘us’) and the Roma (‘the others’) by pointing at specific characteristics of the latter group.

Hereinafter, a third view should be introduced as well; the perspective of the Roma themselves. This study has already presented in the previous chapter the way Tibor, the leader of the Roma Minority Government, described the Roma and the non-Roma as an unified group. According to this view, both groups have a common identity and a common set of values and both of them aimed at maintaining the security in Kisvaros. However, it is possible to reveal further Roma interpretations and to recognise the way the context, specific situations and the social interactions construct the Roma identity. In order to reveal these perspectives, two case studies are briefly introduced in the next subchapters.

Group discussion event organised for the Roma community

The colleagues of Foresee recognised during the action research that some local groups were represented by ‘sentinels’ – a dominant group member, often a community leader, who interpreted conflicts, problems, opinions in his/her own way, declaring that his standpoint represented the whole group. The intention of the research team was to go beyond these dominant narratives and get to the viewpoints of other representatives of these groups. One of these well-circumscribed groups was the community of the local Roma people whose institutional representation was undertaken by Tibor, the local Roma Self-Government leader. The local Roma people also represented different views and values about the co-existence of different people in the village. We were searching for an effective way of getting closer to members of this group and finally – after some conversation with group members – a decision was made: a focus group discussion where we can see opinion formation within group settings should be organised.

As we recognised during the meeting, Roma people defined themselves against the ‘Hungarian’ or ‘Gádzsó’ (a local term, by which they mean the majority, non-Roma local population of the village) or ‘Kulák’⁶. The Roma people interpreted their identity based on the way they differed from these others. According to our findings, the cultural dimension was the most dominant aspect of the differences between the Roma and the non-Roma in Kisvaros. As a local Roma while recalling a local event put it: “It was not about us (...) Not meaning that gádzsó is a problem, but it is about the style. Our style is completely different from theirs, didn’t you see? We are poles apart from each other.”

The social context and its actors often have an intensive spatial representation that functions as a surface to acts of ‘othering’. People consider each other and express separation and distance through actions related to the geographical space. Belonging to a social group or keeping distance from a social group determines the way how people participate on a social event. Roma people reflected on this issue in discussions:

⁶ ‘Kulák’ is originally a social-historical category borrowed from Russia, used as a negative label during the state-socialist era for wealthy Hungarian peasants who held a land more than 25 acre. The state-socialist dictatorship confiscated their land and suppressed them with restrictive acts. ‘Kulák’ was indeed a negative label in the past era, and it is adopted and used by the Roma people now against the rich, non-Roma Hungarians.

“Imagine (how the festival is constructed): right side – rich people, left side – poor people. There is a street between the two. You don’t go to the right side of this street. That’s it. (...) When we were dancing, we were pushed towards the edges. And when the rich quarter stood up to dance, we did not dance anymore.”

The most expressive example to this phenomena was a concert organised as part of the Roma Day, where a countrywide famous Roma musician performed. According to the Roma people’s interpretation some non-Roma villagers were equally keen on the musician, they visited the concert, but they did not come into the venue. They were listening to the show rather outside of the fence:

Old woman: When Attila, the famous singer was here, we wanted the non-Roma people to come and be one of us. Because there were many of them outside. We invited them, we waved to them „come in”, because we wanted to experience together that a big star is in the village.

Young man: Attila doesn’t come everyday to the village. It was wonderful.

Old woman: But the Hungarian people were listening to the music outside of the fence. They stayed there.

In addition, it is important to underline that Roma people often used negative labelling mechanisms against the local non-Roma. They used attributes such as “racist”, “hater” to describe the local non-Roma people during the group discussion. What made these labels similar to the ones constructed by the majority people against Roma people was that both were homogeneous, simplified and stereotypical. The participants of the discussion either did not specify whom they were labelling, they used impersonal pronouns like ‘they’ or ‘people’ or used these labels for entire groups of people, or – when talking about a concrete person – these labels were posted without a contextual background, just as main, general attributes of people:

He hates us greatly. He is a big racist!

The mayor is not a racist, that’s why the rich people, the big bugs dislike him.

She hates Roma people. She is the main racist. I don't know, maybe she is the descendent of Hitler. There are people like her here.

The Hungarian people are desperate to take actions against us.

These labels often served as an adjustment for the Roma people to their own refusing attitudes and behaviour: Roma people explained that they did not attend events or did not cooperate with the non-Roma because of the racism of the other group. In Roma people's interpretation staying away from common spaces or events (e.g. eating together or dancing together with non-Roma) is sometimes an active withdrawal strategy, a self-imposed reaction for previous negative treatment rather than a passive position that they are allocated to.

The Charity Distribution case

Charity distribution, in this form, has been running in Kisvaros since 2010. So far, the community had organised six charity events that were powered by the central office of Red Cross while local organising work was necessary as well. By one provision, the people who are eligible to receive the packages get some food (sugar, pasta, can-food). After several charity provision actions some local residents started to criticise the organisers regarding the distribution of the packages. Claims have been expressed that the actions were unfair, as people who did not deserve support or aid could get the packages while the people in real need sank into oblivion.

We managed to get in contact with the two protagonists of the conflict. One of them, Edit, is an unemployed Roma woman who works occasionally in the social work projects of the local government. She used to work in the Roma Self-Government back in the early '90s but she is still an opinion leader within the Roma community. The other actor, Ági is the main organiser of the charity action event. She is a district nurse in mother- and childcare who also knows mostly all of the families in the village, including the Roma community.

The mediators of the Foresee Research Group organised a Peace Circle (Fellegi and Szegő 2013) where both of the actors shared their standpoints about the conflict,

discussed their possible misunderstandings, revealed their harms and looked for possible solutions. Balla already summarised in his case study (Benedek 2015, 81-112) the restorative process and the way the actors dealt with the conflict in this case. Therefore, we are here primarily focussing on the way the concept of 'minority' was interpreted and on the way the Roma and non-Roma differentiation is constructed.

During the meeting, Edit placed herself on the side of the injured as she criticised the Charity Distribution from the following dimensions: the concept and criteria of eligibility, the way the packages were distributed and the information that was provided (advertising the action) as well. In her narrative, the organisers did not share the details (i.e. the place and the time) of the charity actions at all. In addition, the criteria of eligibility ('to be in need') was not realised, as too many well-off and even rich people and too few Roma families got packages.

Ági, the organiser works voluntarily in the charity project. According to her, she received unfair critique on her job in many points. The category of 'to be in need' was not defined by herself in any measure or verifiable criteria but as she put it: "I cannot control the criteria but I try to take social disadvantages into account." As Ági emphasised, a lot of Roma residents also got packages. In her point of view, the problem lied elsewhere: there was no exact calculation at the central Red Cross office, thereby the amounts of the packages between two charity actions were unbalanced; sometimes too many, sometimes too few packages arrived to the village. In the latter case, there was no way to distribute the packages in an optimal allocation.

It should be underlined that Edit often expressed the unequal and oppressed position of the Roma during the Peace Circle while claiming: "Roma are now only on their own. They are afraid to tell their opinions, because they are afraid of atrocities they can get as answer". In addition, she pointed at discrimination as well. As she emphasised, non-Roma, rich people got packages while Roma living in poverty did not receive aid: "while you hand out packages to 70-year old pensioners, who have got very expensive cars (...) but for me that 2kg of flour does really matter, and you give it to somebody who spends more on mineral water." Another Roma interviewee also came up with the same opinion while emphasising that "opposing the original principles of this action, to support the poor, only the rich Hungarian pensioners can get the packages, who have got big cars... poor Roma only get a few, to keep their mouths shut."

All in all, even the Roma themselves made clear distinctions between themselves and the non-Roma majority while constructing the picture of the old, rich Hungarian pensioners who would not deserve any charity help. In addition, they placed themselves in the position of the oppressed and excluded group whose members live in poverty.

What do local residents think about the Roma minority?

As it is clear to see, both the Roma and the non-Roma made clear distinctions between the two groups. According to the Roma, they were different in cultural specificities (“our style is completely different from theirs”), they were excluded, oppressed and were the victims of discrimination. In addition, they often described the non-Roma as a homogeneous group (rich people who receive undue advantages) whose members were often “racist” and “haters”. Moreover, as the participants of the group discussion event emphasised, the other group (the rich Hungarians) “win all the games” – for example, they thematised all the programmes on the festivals, what to stage and what not to.

Differences were mentioned by the non-Roma as well. Especially the less tolerant villagers described the Roma as inactive, who – contrary to the non-Roma – did not want to work, “take everything for granted” and were responsible for their own poverty. In order to avoid giving a simplistic picture, another non-Roma interpretation has to be introduced here: according to the residents who were more tolerant towards the Roma, the differences between the two groups were seen as the result of macro-sociological reasons.

As it is clear to see, these descriptions have some similarities:

- 1) The differences between the two groups were acknowledged by both of the groups.
- 2) Both of the parties gave simplistic descriptions about the other group and used stereotypes. (Despite the fact that a few non-typical exceptions existed; for example Tibor, who used to be a representative of the City Council and at the same time the leader of the Roma Minority Government. As he drew it up while describing his position in the village: “I am a good Indian” – which was an ironic description about somebody who belonged to a minority but was accepted by the majority of the society as well. According to him, there is reason why locals respected him:

I can tell them my ideas, opinions and thoughts...and I am a little bit more educated than the Roma usually are in Hungary. And I am one of the members of the City Council and they may be afraid of me...that I can give them a hard time. (...) I wanted to finish the university because I wanted to be accepted and respected. However, when I came back to this community they were mostly afraid of me. I could make remarks. I had my opinions. They recognised that a lot of time I was cleverer. I felt their fear of me.

At the same time, we were able to observe an important difference between the interpretations of the two groups: while discussing the reasons of poverty and poor living conditions, some of the non-Roma (the so called ‘less tolerant’ residents) mainly emphasised the responsibility of the individual, some of them (the so called ‘more tolerant’ villagers) underlined the responsibility of the society while the Roma themselves pointed primarily at exclusion and oppression – the issue of the next chapter.

Exclusion

As it has already been introduced (Hera 2015), the concept of 'exclusion' is still contested and has multiple meanings. Notwithstanding all of these difficulties, some common grounds of the definitions can be identified and thereby core elements of social exclusion can be specified.

First of all, it is worth taking a look at the 'multidimensional' aspect of the term. As Shaaban summarises, scholars identified many realms of everyday life – usually the economic, cultural, social and political dimensions – where inequalities arose (2011, 120). Thereby, the concept of social exclusion encompasses not only lack of paid work or income poverty but – among many others – lack of access to education, information, childcare and health facilities, accessibility of public provisions, poor living conditions. Similar distinction is made by Silver who argues that social exclusion “is multidimensional in that it marries the material and non-material, economic and social dimensions of disadvantage” (2007, 4). It is important to underline that social exclusion emerges at more than one dimension at the same time resulting in inequality, negative consequences for quality of life, well-being and future life chances (de Haan 2001, Levitas et al. 2007, Miliband et al. 2006, Sen 2000).

Another important characteristic of social exclusion is 'dynamics' – the phenomenon underlying what is beyond the current status and the process through which people become excluded. This attribute refers to the “changing and interactive nature of social exclusion along different dimensions and at different levels over time (...) The experience of social exclusion is unequally distributed across socio-economic and ethnic groups and that it is not a static state experienced by the same social groups at all times in all places” (Mathieso et al. 2008, 13). For example, stereotypes about the Roma people and the consequences of their potential stigmatising probably differ in Canada (where the first Roma migrants have arrived just a few years ago) and in Hungary (where the Roma people live since the 13th century). At the same time, one can presuppose that Roma people's experience about their own social exclusion is different nowadays from what it was during the socialism or even before. Exclusion happens in time and can change during centuries, decades or even years, during the lifetime of a single person.

The dynamic aspect warns of the importance of the process by which the exclusion from social relationships results in further deprivations and thereby further decreasing the living opportunities. De Haan (1999, 5) underlines that “the central definition of the notion of social exclusion (...) stresses the processes through which people are being deprived, taking the debate beyond descriptions of merely the situation in which people are.” Estivill (2003, 115) gives a similar description while stating that social exclusion “designates an accumulation of confluent processes which, through successive ruptures, have their origins in the heart of the economy, politics and society, and which distance and render inferior individuals, groups, communities and spaces in relation to centres of power, resources and the prevailing values.” This approach supports the understanding of social exclusion as “succession, and cumulation, of breaks and disadvantages in an individual’s life” (Saraceno 2001, 15).

Finally, introducing the ‘relational’ aspect of the concept shifts the emphasis on the importance of social relationships and the need for comparison with others. According to this perspective, an observer cannot decide whether a person is socially excluded by looking at his/her circumstances themselves in isolation – one has to take even the others into consideration. Sen (2000, 7) cites Adam Smith in order to explain the relational aspect:

By necessities I understand not only the commodities which are indispensably necessary for the support of life, but whatever the custom of the country renders it indecent for creditable people, even the lowest order, to be without.... Custom has rendered leather shoes a necessary of life in England. The poorest creditable person of either sex would be ashamed to appear in public without them.

After the short introduction about the definition of the concept, the chapter turns to the meso level; to the village where the action research was implemented. As it has been already introduced (Hera et al. 2013), the local residents usually consider their settlement as a “peaceful island” where the relationship between the Roma and non-Roma inhabitants is calm. Although some of the villagers mentioned smaller conflicts in the past few years and sometimes tensions are also observable as they often emphasised; in comparison with other settlements, the situation was fine. However, when members of the Foresee Research Group were talking to some of the local Roma

during the action research they also told them different stories according to which they had felt excluded. The next case studies give information about some of these stories.

The case of the Butcher Festival

The conflict around the Butcher Festival⁷ emerged in 2013. As our interviewees informed us, visitors of the festival had to pay an entrance fee. Thereby, most Roma did not take part in the event. Some of the Roma referred to the Butcher Festival as the “festival of the rich people”. Poor villagers – mainly Roma but non-Roma as well – were standing outside the fence. After these antecedents some local actors fought for free entrance to the festival for all people in the name of (social) justice. These actors – the local government, the mayor and the leader of the Roma Self-Government– wanted to ensure this opportunity mostly for those with poor living conditions. However, the organiser opposed the idea of the free entrance because he wanted to avoid participation of poor villagers. As he declared during a meeting at the local government, there were solely economic reasons behind his argumentation because poor visitors “will not buy anything and thus decrease our income”. In addition, he wanted to avoid offences committed by those participants “who are not able to behave”. On the contrary, representatives of the village council and the mayor supposed that while the organiser spoke about disadvantaged people who might cause turmoil, he actually referred to the Roma.

After a three-months-long negotiation, an agreement was born and the local government and the organiser of the festival made a decision finally. The organiser of the festival declared that he would guarantee the free entrance for all of the local residents. In addition, he rented a minibus in order to organise a lift to the local residents living far from the festival. From the side of the local government a promise was made; the village council would ensure financial support (2 million HUF, about 6.500 EUR) for the festival.

Of course, one of the researchers of Foresee visited the festival that was organised in January 2014 in order to gather information by participatory observation. According

⁷ The so-called Butcher Festival where the purpose is to make a local tradition from an old-new Hungarian custom: killing a pig at the end of winter and making different types of food from it (pudding, sausage, aspic, etc.).

to his estimation, about 20 butcher teams were present at the festival, about four out of them were from Kisvaros. All of the teams were working since early in the morning. They killed the pigs at about 6 a.m. in order to prepare meal (primarily sausages) for dinner. Only team members, supporters and their guests of the butcher teams could taste these sausages. Other customers, who did not belong to any of the teams like that, could not buy and taste the food which came from the team's pig-slaughter. These participants could only buy their lunch or dinner from the vendors who were there in large numbers and sold food (and other products as well) for quite a high price. A jury tested the sausages and moreover the spirits (pálinka) which were also prepared by the butcher teams. The announcement of the results was quite long; it was going on between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m.

According to the observation, the presence of the right wing and extreme right wing symbols (flags, badges, shirts, etc.) was conspicuous. These symbols are mainly used by the radical political party 'Jobbik' (which abbreviation means 'For Better Future' in English) and by the legally banned, para-military group, called 'Magyar Gárda' (Hungarian Guard). It should be highlighted here that both of these organisations clearly exhibit anti-Roma sentiments. The high number of drunken participants was also remarkable. Concerning the participation of Roma villagers, finally none of them attended the festival.

After the festival, further interviews were conducted in order to gain information about the non-attendance of the Roma. Thereby, researchers could identify the ways exclusion of the Roma was operated.

- Financial background: Roma usually live in poor living conditions. Although, they did not have to pay for the entry ticket of the festival but the high price of the food and products decreased the chance of visiting the event.
- Timing: Roma people usually run out of their savings in January. As one of our interviewees drew it up: "January is one of the worst months. It is a poor month for the Roma. Christmas and New Year eat up all of our savings."
- Differences in status: visitors of the festival belonged primarily to the middle class. They arrived at the event in their own cars, they often wore branded and good-quality clothes and they had enough savings to buy food and products. According to some of our interviewees, Roma would not have enjoyed their time in such a group.

- Attitude: the well-known anti-Roma sentiments of the organisers probably also decreased the number of the Roma visitors. As one of our interviewees put it: “One realises if he is not loved, respected and welcome. One does not visit places where this is the situation. And this was the situation at the festival.”
- Lack of information: members of the Roma community probably were not informed about the opportunity of free entrance. As it came to light, this information got stuck at Tibor, the leader of the Roma Self-Government. He later revealed that he did not want to make propaganda for the festival within the Roma community because he had negative attitudes towards the organisers and the event. Information getting stuck had another reason as well; namely that Tibor had a kind of fear for the Roma. He was afraid of conflict between Roma and some of the organisers. As he put it: “if you are full of passions or there is a friend of yours and you drink some shots of pálinka... you may leave your hindrance and become hot-headed.”

Here, it is worth to underline that exclusion occurred on more grounds at the same time; thereby the effects of these factors accumulated. Financial background in itself may not have hindered participation of the Roma. However, several factors jointly led to their non-attendance.

Soccer conflict

Men of Kisvaros traditionally are members of the local soccer association from their childhood. As the leader of the local soccer association drew it up: “Out of 10 only 2 did not play soccer as the member of our association. Everybody participated since the war.” Soccer gives the chance to all of the people in the village to meet, to have common experience, to take part in an activity. Moreover, playing soccer is free – and almost the only opportunity to do some sports. Both Roma and non-Roma are welcome: “Roma and Hungarians come to play soccer. It is very important that they know each other, they can see that the others do not eat human flesh, they are the same human beings... This is very significant in order not to have struggles.” In addition, all of the guards at soccer matches are Roma; according to the leader of the association this fact is well-known and accepted by the fans. In his opinion, other villages that suffer because of conflicts between Roma and non-Roma probably do not have such a soccer

association. As soccer is an “opportunity to link to each other, they meet several times weekly, they get to know each other and even become friends.”

One of the local Roma residents was also an active soccer player. As he shared with us, he had started to play soccer in a new team, which had been set up by villagers outside the soccer association. “After the matches we went out for a beer. And while we were drinking our beers we could have a talk about the problems of the village.” More and more people – altogether 25 players – joined the initiative. After a while the group started to collect membership fee.

After these antecedents, it was a bolt from the blue when some of the players decided not to play with Roma. As Tibor recalled:

He called me outside and told me that ‘I would like to tell you something that is quite unpleasant. I would like to give you back your fee.’ I told him that ‘To whom would you like to give back the fee? What does it mean ‘you?’ I did not understand it. Who are the ‘you?’ He told me that ‘you’ meant Roma. I asked ‘Kálmán, what is wrong, why?’ I was shocked. I asked him what about sublime purposes, community building...that we integrate the village and do not let the extremism... ‘Are you excluding us? We have been playing soccer for months. What is wrong? Somebody was clobbered, biffed or kicked?’ ‘No, nothing happened but this is the decision of the guys’.

The decision was really a shock for the whole Roma community. Roma players and their relatives, cousins and friends felt humiliated because of the intention of exclusion. It should be underlined that the conflict has not been discussed yet. Until today, the teams of the Roma and the team of the non-Roma residents play football – separately.

Exclusion – impact, types of reactions and the differences in interpretations

The case studies give detailed information about conflicts between the Roma and the non-Roma and about the way the exclusionary practices operate. As the case study about the Butcher Festival showed, exclusion could work in a hidden way; although,

Roma may have appeared to be welcome, due to the reasons we have introduced in the case study they finally did not attend the event.

The impacts that exclusion had on the victims should be also introduced here. Tibor was the only representative with Roma background in the village council at the time of the negotiations about the Butcher Festival. Tibor felt harm and aggrieved due to the hidden anti-Roma sentiments. He shared with us his feelings about the debate: “I was working for peaceful living-together. So the opinion of ‘not to let Roma in the festival’ was a spit in my face. (...) I felt harmed because of the lack of apology from their part. They could have said that although we did not say such sentences but we are sorry for them.” Roma villagers were talking about similar feelings while describing their exclusion from the soccer team.

Roma people developed various forms of strategies due to the experiences about exclusion. Withdrawal (for example staying away from common spaces or events – as it has been introduced in the chapter ‘Group discussion event organised for the Roma community’) was one of the reactions. In addition, some Roma – primarily who were working for rich local residents – chose another strategy; cooperation with non-Roma. However, it was also possible to identify a third form of reaction in between openness and withdrawal; irony. Researchers of the anthropology of irony emphasise the importance of context to understand ironic intention. The context required for understanding irony is characterised by shared knowledge, beliefs, values and communicative strategies – what non-Roma residents do not detect in certain situations. Hereinafter, we introduce a case when Roma people were dancing as an irony while mocking the “Hungarian band” that they disliked, playing on the Village Day.

Young woman: What did I do? Marcsi, Jani – all of us were there. Recently. The Hungarian band playing was very poor. The instruments were moaning in a way like there was a problem.

Young man: It was like a punishment! Indeed!

Young woman: I started to dance... as a mockery. I called Marika in. About five people started to dance. But just to make a joke of the band. We made such a dance that about 50 Hungarian people stood up from the audience. And everybody was dancing with us. Am I correct?

Young man: Yes, the Roma started to do the party.

Young woman2: Although we only wanted to flout the band.

Questioner: But they didn't get it?

Young woman3: No.

Young man: They thought that we liked the music.

Young woman3: Such a big party worked out that they did not let us home. Ok, I know that some of you went home. But I carried on. So... By the end even such people came to me to dance that I would never have expected. (...) About 8 people were Roma, all the others were Gádzsó. (synonym of non-Roma Hungarian).

Young man: Even less Roma by the end.

Young woman3: 6-7 Roma women made 50 people stand up.

Young man: So from this story you can see how Roma people are!

Young woman3: And by the end all the Hungarians came: 'Dance with me! Dance with me!'

Old woman: You can see, nothing depends on us.

Roma people chose a note, dancing that is familiar to them but less familiar to non-Roma residents. Irony might have served as a safe form of communication that ensured first of all distance and secondly a sense of control over the situation. It saved them from being exposed of potential harm, yet offered the facade of cooperation.

We would also like to point at the huge difference between the interpretations of the Roma and the non-Roma villagers about exclusion. Already in the beginning of the action research programme, we met Roma who reported discrimination and exclusionary practices. Some of them thought that the Roma lived at the edge of the community ("We have the same, old rules; the Roma settle at the edge"), the teachers did not pay enough attention to their children ("The children have to sit at the desks at the back, there is not attention paid to them") and their parents had less rights in the school ("The gate is closed in the school. Roma parents would like to go in but they do not let them in. Hungarians would like to go and the door is open for them immediately.") They talked about prejudice ("I do not like it when they say that Roma would not like to work. They would like to but they do not have a chance."),

disadvantage at workplace (“They could tell us... ‘Listen to me, you are gipsy and we will not hire you!’ I will not resent.”) and negative attitudes towards them. If an interviewee reported physical violence he or she surely belonged to the Roma minority. Some of the Roma gave account even of life-threatening conflicts. All in all, discrimination and exclusion seemed to be part of the everyday life of the Roma. The experience of the exclusion is confirmed by the case studies of the Butcher Festival and the Soccer Conflict as well. However, according to a lot of non-Roma villagers, there was no oppression, discrimination and exclusion in Kisvaros.

At the end of this chapter, it is worth to remember that inequalities arose in more dimensions in the life of the local Roma. For example, they were rejected in the fields of labour market. However, at the same time they faced difficulties when they wanted to join civic organisations (as the soccer team) and to participate in various social activities (as the Butcher Festival). All in all, exclusion can be considered really as a multidimensional phenomenon. It is also obvious that the exclusion of the Roma can be interpreted only by taking the circumstances of the others – who on the contrary live not only in better living circumstances but do not face the experience of exclusion – into consideration. Still, the case studies give only little information about the dynamics aspect of exclusion – the phenomenon underlying what is beyond the current status and the process through which people become excluded, the attribute that refers to the “changing and interactive nature of social exclusion along different dimensions and at different levels over time” (Mathieso et al. 2008, 13). In order to reveal this aspect of the term, one should be aware of the current groups of interest of Kisvaros – of the groups that have continuously changed, rose and fall back during the recent history of the village.

Intercultural settings

As the Roma villagers shared with us, their situation had changed a lot in the past few years. During the few years preceding 2002, they were told to be victims of humiliating behaviour. At that time, circumstances at the Roma settlement⁸ were terrible as the local government did not invest in infrastructure. In addition, the attitude of the mayor and the local government towards them was expressly negative. “When the old mayor was in power the struggle began. ‘We have to civilise them!’ This was the idea.” There was no partnership between the Roma Self-Government and the village council and clashes were intense in the community. Abusing Roma by the Civil Guard and violation of human rights were everyday experience:

The regular social aid came in the form of five-thousand-forint vouchers. In all of the shops you could pay with it but, you should know, that the wife of the mayor also had a shop. And she gave customers credit. When the social benefit arrived she was always sitting next to the cashier and was deducting the debt. And she did not let you have what you had not spent. You could not leave the shop unless you spent the whole voucher.

According to the Roma residents, this situation changed a lot in 2002 when Tamas became the mayor of Kisvaros. He started a Roma settlement-elimination programme, invested in infrastructure and built upon the relationship with the Roma Self-Government. When we arrived at the field in the beginning of 2013, most of the local Roma described Tamas as the mayor who “tries to support disadvantaged people”, “eliminated the Roma settlement and made it clean”, “gave houses to the Roma” and “supported the Roma Self-Government every time.” It is interesting to cite here the ideology of the mayor as well. As he shared with us, the majority of the society was responsible for the Roma integration.

⁸ Roma settlement existed at the edge of Kisváros until recently. Within the frameworks of an anti-segregation programme that was launched in 2007 Roma families moved from bad housing conditions to better ones in the middle of the village.

If we would like to accept them... not for one year, not only in the framework of a Roma integration campaign but for years... permanently... it will have an outcome. [...] In the first 4-5 years there was no result. Seven years later it started to perform. Nowadays... there has been conflict one or maximum two times... Nowadays, it is not trendy to scold Roma on the streets.

In addition, he also underlined his Roma-friendly attitude and emphasised that “scolding the Roma has never been trendy during my period.” According to him, he built up fine cooperation with the Roma Minority Government. He considered himself as the representative of the interests of the Roma and as the villager who rejected exclusion and anti-Roma attitudes.

All in all, more or less within a decade, the situation and status of the Roma changed a lot, partly due to the Roma-friendly attitudes of the new mayor. On the one hand, this story sheds light on the relational aspect of exclusion, i. e. on the “changing and interactive nature of social exclusion along different dimensions and at different levels over time” (Mathieso et al. 2008, 13). On the other hand, it also gives information about one of the local groups that is embedded in the local power-relationships – the issue that is the focal point of the current chapter.

The action research wanted to “find out about the societal structure and especially the power relations that are ‘behind’ the conflicts and might go beyond differences of ‘culture’” (Foss et al. 2012, 24). Thereby, we were interested in the fragmented environment (Hydle and Seeberg 2013, 9) of the village and in introducing its dynamic, relation-based context. In order to achieve this aim, the research team identified the local “ordering groups” (Foss et al. 2012, 34) and their own cultures, premises, feelings, unmet needs, “incompatible interests or goals or in competition for control over scarce resources” (ibid). We presupposed that these groups also showed the multiplicity of local subcultures (Kremmel and Pelikan 2013, 17). These groups and their specificities are introduced in the next chapters.

The local groups of the village

Researchers were able to recognise many local groups within the local community. Firstly, the groups of the ‘newcomers’ and the ‘native villagers’ should be named. The

local government has been aiming at welcoming new residents and to increase the population in Kisvaros for decades. This notion fitted into the demographic trends. In general, the population living in villages have been declining in the past few decades in Hungary. The primary reason is emigration due to the lack of workplaces; young people looking for jobs have better chances to work in cities. However, the population of Budapest also dropped after 1990. In this case the motivation was different; more people decided to move out from the smoggy, busy city to the green, to peaceful villages. Although Kisvaros does not belong to the primary agglomeration, the capital can still be reached within one hour– and it is enough motivation to change residence. The immigration was fed from the countryside as well. If somebody wanted to live closer to the capital but still in a rural area the village was a perfect decision. In order to support these changes the local government established a housing estate area in 2004. Welcoming new people became part of the official local policy. Thereby, the population in Kisvaros has increased in the last twenty years. However, after a while, conflicts appeared between the native villagers and the newcomers. According to some of our interviewees, some of the dissents were born because of different claims: “The newcomers from the city disapprove of the local shop, because it is not a supermarket and they cannot buy everything here.” Other disagreements were based on different norms. For example, some of the newly arrived people did not pay attention to their gardens – what could be quite unusual for rural people: “The people who used to live in a city never run a garden, so it is weedy. The people in the village condemn this behaviour.” The incomprehension could be mutual. One of our interviewees who arrived at Kisvaros a few years ago shared with us his opinion: “Here is a freak that ‘oh, my god, the tree and leaves touch the house’... And it is the mania of the local residents that they rake the stupid shifting sand as flat as a pancake.” In addition, some of our interviewees pointed at different habits of greeting. People at the countryside greet each other from a distance. People coming from the cities only say hello when they are close. This could be the reason that some of the native villagers think of the newcomers as impolite.

The field (Bourdieu 2005) of the village is fragmented by the conflict of ‘Catholic’ and ‘non-Catholic⁹ residents’ as well. The problem of the former group is that non-Catholic residents do not respect them: “They do not approve of the fact that we visit the

⁹ This is how the local residents named those people who regularly do not go to mass.

procession at Easter or at Corpus Christe¹⁰. We go to mass. We practice our religion, our faith. And they do not like it at all. We are a good community, we exist and we respect each other. For some of the people this is annoying.” On the contrary, non-Catholic residents would not like to accept that “everything comes via the Church. They do not feel this situation to be their own.”

The groups of the ‘Roma’ and the ‘non-Roma’ have already been introduced. Thereby, the next groups of interests should be named; the different regimes and their supporters. We can distinguish altogether three periods in the life of Kisvaros from the point of view of political power relationships:

- the regime that was in power between 1990 and 2002. In that case both the mayor and the village council belonged to the group of the native villagers. Moreover, they clearly belonged to the right which means, in case of Hungary, the ideology of conservatism, the value of tradition and the religion of the (Catholic) Christians. Hereinafter, this regime is called by us ‘tradition-orientated group’.
- the period between 2002 and 2014 when the mayor was in power who identified himself as a liberal and a leftist person with sensitivity for equality. Moreover, the representatives of the village council this time were open to the newcomers and respected the mayor. This is the village council where even a Roma was among the members. Hereinafter, this regime is called by us ‘progress-orientated group’.
- the third period, when members of the ‘tradition-orientated group’ returned to power in 2014 when they won the local election.

Both of the groups had clear ideas about the other group. In the beginning of the action research programme we recognised that members of the ‘tradition-orientated group’ (who were in political opposition that time) criticised the mayor because of lack of investment in Kisvaros. According to these residents, while other village councils submitted several development applications and tried to find financial sources for developing infrastructure, the leader of Kisvaros did not pay enough attention to this issue. As a member of this group put it:

¹⁰ It is a Latin Rite liturgical solemnity celebrating the tradition and belief in the body and blood of Jesus Christ and his Real Presence in the Eucharist. Source: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus_Christi_\(feast\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus_Christi_(feast))

I cannot imagine how nothing happens in this village. I got used to the notion that every four years we stepped forward. We only had electricity in 1990. That time, we only had our naked bottom. Between 1990 and 1994 we built a gymnasium, a war memorial, a sewer, a treatment plant. In the next four years, we built piped drinking water. Stormrain water drainage. We made huge steps. However, since Tamas has been the mayor... (...) Almost nothing has happened here, in the village.

In addition, complaints were made about the mayor who favoured the newcomers and he would not have liked to cooperate with native villagers. Moreover, the Roma-friendly attitude of the mayor was also sometimes mentioned as a negative characteristic of him.

On the other hand, the members of the ‘progress-orientated group’ also criticised the ‘others.’ They claimed that spending money on infrastructure was not necessary as there were other important things to deal with in Kisvaros. In addition, they complained about the boastful behaviour of the ‘tradition-orientated group’ whose members did not show respect towards the local residents.

In the second year of the action research programme, elections were held at the local level in Hungary. The representatives of the ‘progress-orientated group’, who lost the competition in the village, drew up new critics towards the ‘tradition-orientated group’. They pointed not primarily at the results of the contest but at the preceding electioneering while describing it as an unjust and incorrect campaign that targeted primarily Tamas (the ex-mayor). Benedek has already introduced some of these “incorrect” elements of the campaign (2015, 142-145) but we also point at these critics here:

1. According to a leaflet that was spread in Kisvaros by an unknown person, Tamas was not an independent candidate of the election but the supporter of the Democratic Coalition political party (Demokratikus Koalíció in Hungarian) led by the former Prime Minister Ferenc Gyurcsány, being quite unpopular nowadays. These gossips were spread although the ‘tradition-orientated group’ itself was also not independent. As somebody put it:

Their leaflets stated their independence. However, there was the recommendation of Károly Pánczél (MP of the ruling FIDESZ party - GH). And the orange stripe (the colour of the ruling FIDESZ party - GH). They declared their independence although they have not been independent. All in all, we would have used the same expedient. However, Tamas always rejected this kind of practice stiffly.

2. Members and fans of the rivals probably took advantage of Tamas' problems in his private life and the gossips about his secret lover.
3. Malicious gossips were spread in Kisvaros about Tamas' plan to make Roma families move into the village. According to the supporters of Tamas, the opponents set out to scatter the false news.
4. After the election, harms of Tamas and his team were intensified not only because of the defeat but due to the reactions of the rivals and some of the local residents. The most serious harm was the way Tamas was informed about the results of the voting. Late at night on the day of the election, Tamas and two of his supporters (Erzsi and Tibor) attended the local government where, in the time of their arrival, members of the Commission of the Election were still working. As Erzsi described the story:

Tamas told them that after 12 years of work....he would have expected to be called up. Somebody should have called and informed him. He rebuked them. There was silence. (...) This treatment was so far from me. I was so sorry for Tamas. And Tibor was crying and I was crying. Tamas would have deserved the chance to congratulate the winners with raised head after 12 years of hard work. However, he could not do that. He could not congratulate the rivals with two bottles of champagne. He could not ask them to work with honour. This was stolen from him.

5. The next day after the election stickers with the numbers of the voters who elected Tamas (altogether 436 people) and the new mayor (a lot more, altogether 732 people), were posted everywhere in Kisvaros. As one of the supporters of the ex-mayor evaluated the incidence: "That person was able to

walk through the village and post the stickers. What hidden hate...! The result of the election was not enough reason for being satisfied. They even wanted to kick Tamas. They did not just write down the sentence usually published after an election: 'Thank you!' Instead, they decided to humiliate Tamas. This was the purpose."

Partly, these experiences explained why members of the losing side described the winners – the 'tradition-orientated group' – as dangerous and despicable people. According to the criticism, members of the rival team:

- were sly and arrogant,
- wanted to exclude other groups of the village,
- were unfair and won the election by fraud,
- were hypocrite and not honest (as one of our interviewees put it: "You are talking with them and it comes to light that you are able to help them and solve their problems... However, there is another situation when they hurt you and turn their back on you and jab you. I did not do anything to deserve such a behaviour.")
- "are blinded by their own hatred."

Hereinafter, further groups of Kisvaros could be introduced. However, as we focus only on the most significant groups and their specific contentions, we skip giving more detailed description and only warn of the dangers of our formalisation. As it has been already emphasised, there is more chance that supporters of the 'tradition-orientated group' belong to the native villagers, are Catholic and less tolerant towards the Roma at the same time (Hera et al. 2013). On the contrary, members of the 'progress-orientated group' probably are newcomers, non-Catholic and more tolerant towards the Roma at the same time. However, this classification creates homogeneous groups thereby it can be misleading. For example, not all of the people who were born in Kisvaros belong to the 'native villagers', neither do all of the newly arrived people belong to the 'newcomers'. We could meet native villagers who accept the local Roma while some of the newcomers expressed negative attitudes towards Roma. In addition, the value of tradition was important for some of the locals regardless of their ethnic background, place of birth or belief. Moreover, Roma people and poor non-Roma Hungarians felt sometimes as a part of a kind of community of interest – the impression that was built upon their financial situation. As one of the Roma residents

put it: “They stop us on the street. They invite us into the house. But this is our people, the poor. We talk to them identically like we were among Roma.” All in all, formalisation could be misleading. However, we consider its usage necessary to a certain extent as it can help us to understand the local community and the ways villagers think about concepts of the ALTERNATIVE programme.

Interpretations about the other groups

The findings of the first phase of the action research programme help us not only to describe the local groups but also to introduce the way the members of these groups think about each other. According to our findings, local residents usually create stereotypes about the others. Native villagers have clear ideas about newcomers – and vice versa. Residents who regularly go to the mass clearly express their opinion about the villagers who do not join them – and vice versa. Supporters of the different regimes have no doubts how to describe the other groups. Roma and ‘Gádzsó’ people have different interpretations about the way they live together – while both of them easily describe the specificities of the other groups. All in all, the specific groups of Kisvaros usually emphasise the other groups’ different habits, values and norms.

Undoubtedly, fight of the specific groups of interests is an important characteristic of the field. However, as emphasised by Hera (2013), the motives of the fights are probably not solely the cultural differences. At the same time, they can be explained by the intention of the local groups to control resources and to create advantage for themselves within the local power relationships. The local Roma, as a disadvantaged group without strong representation, power and resources, cannot usually change or even influence the field. The real fight arise between powerful groups – especially between the ‘traditional-orientated group’ and the ‘progress-orientated group’ whose members are (or used to be) in power, representatives of the village council and members of specific committees of the local government. Some members of these groups are active both in the political field and even in the business sector; they run enterprises and employ locals. In addition, a few of them established local grass-root organisations and thereby made their informal network wider. All in all, the local villagers who mainly control information channels, possess financial and human resources and are primarily able to influence the public opinion of the community are

the real competitors. In order to understand the conflict between these two groups we turn back to the issue of exclusion in the next chapter.

Where is the most intense fight?

As the previous chapter introduced, the local Roma were only one of the many groups of the village. And as the research team recognised, they were not the only victims of social exclusion. Almost all of the groups of the community used exclusionary practices in order to reject the ‘outsiders’, to control their boundaries and thereby defeat their rivals. This chapter introduces some specific examples that confirm our statement.

The Burning conflict

The research team of Foresee managed to identify several conflicts that arose between the newcomers and the native villagers. Here, focus will be directed on the ‘Burning conflict’ that became one of the central issues of the local public speeches. The opposition between the two groups turned into a heavy struggle four years ago. The story began in a hot, summer night. Peter, a newcomer, left the windows open in order to cool the house. When he woke up in the morning, his room was full of smoke as somebody was burning leaves in the neighbourhood. “I was so angry that I thought I would explode. I went there and shouted at him. ‘You motherfucker, I have to wake up at six to find my flat full of smoke!’ I came back, logged in to Facebook and wrote a post ‘Smelly peasant, he is burning again’.” This was a turning point, as this comment appeared not only in interpersonal communication but in social media as well. Arguments and counterarguments followed the note of Peter who deleted his post three hours later and apologised for it – but it was too late. The news spread in the settlement: “a newcomer called us smelly peasants.”

The reactions were quite harsh while various exclusionary practices appeared. An unknown person printed leaflets and distributed them into the mailboxes during the night. The anonymous author warned villagers that Peter who was working at that time as the local postman and was a leader of a local NGO had negative opinions about the

residents of Kisvaros. “Folks, think about it, what kind of a man he is!” – voiced the last sentence. Thus Peter found himself personal conflicts with local residents.

The local policeman stopped next to me with his car and got off. ‘Wait a minute, did you really say this?’ I answered ‘Yes, I wrote it but I would like to tell you what happened.’ ‘No, no. I’ll never talk to you again’ – this was his answer, he got in the car and drove away. After this... for months, until the next spring... if somebody glimpsed me in the village, they pointed the finger at me... I was afraid to go the other side of the village. There was somebody who came to my house and threatened me...that I should not go out at night, because I could have some troubles.

As it is clear to see, Peter, as a newcomer became the target of social exclusion from the part of the native villagers.

Fight for the local newspaper

A further conflict that arose also between the newcomers and the native villagers came about in 2011. The debate was focusing on who should be the editor of the local medium called *Hírmondó*. The newspaper is published by the local government three times a year. It aims to support local communication, give information about the events of public life and about the decisions which influence the village. The local residents read *Hírmondó* regularly as the journal is available not only free of charge but it is even dropped in the letter boxes of the local residents.

Teri and Anna were the informal chief editors from 2002. Anna was a native villager, she was born and has worked in Kisvaros in her whole life. She was member of the Council of the Catholic Parish in the village, president of the German Minority Government, leader of the local library and several times a member of the village council as well. She was chosen to be the honorary citizen of Kisvaros in 2006. Teri was also an active person among the native villagers.

Some of the local residents found the quality of the newspaper unsatisfactory because of stylistic problems and as “some of the articles were indigestible”. At the same time,

the style and the content of the newspaper was too 'traditional' for them. Moreover, according to these readers the news about the Catholic Church was often dominating the issues. Newcomers had problems with *Hírmondó* not only because of its quality and content. As one of them framed it:

The newspaper – by its content, values – mirrors the traditional mentality of the village. Preserving tradition. That it is a very good and beautiful purpose. However, it is not easy to smuggle in anything new and to change anything. And we had an initiative...we asked them to give us a chance to contribute...but no...it was not possible. There was an offer that others can write an article – but it was for them to decide whether it was accepted or not.

All in all, in the opinion of the newcomers, the native villagers did not want to share the floor with them. As one of the native villagers told us: “Why do we not accept somebody from the people who has only arrived recently? We think they should convince us first... They told me that I was not the editor... They told me that ‘we are taking over *Hírmondó*’. I looked at this person and asked ‘who are you at all?’”

The peak of the conflict was a public hearing where the groups and their opinions were outlined. Altogether sixty local residents took part and twenty-two of them commented on this debate, which was held in December 2011. Taking the notes of the minutes into consideration, the debate was tense – this was our opinion after reading hurtful sentences, deleted remarks and accusations. The participants agreed that the conflict was not about the newspaper; the division ran, again, between the native villagers and the newcomers. Both of the groups had harms. On the one hand, the representatives of the newcomers highlighted that they would have liked to contribute to editing *Hírmondó* – and the other group misunderstood this and presumed they had bad intentions. On the other hand, the native villagers were complaining about Peter's post about 'smelly peasants' and refused to “do what the newly arrived tell us”. A participant of the meeting thought that native villagers “felt we attacked them. They felt we wanted to steal their *Hírmondó*. They felt like we wanted to pull out the carpet from under their feet.” However, in the opinion of the mayor the debate was fruitful. At the end of the public hearing he emphasised that “I thank you for your remarks, I do think it was useful. (...) It is necessary if we want to understand the pure intentions. (...) I hope

nobody thinks we were against each other during this public hearing but we were only sizing up each other's intentions.”

As the conflict was going to remain, members of the village council finally agreed to appoint one of the editors who previously had been working at *Hírmondó*, Teri.¹¹ The mayor warned that “I only ask her to let in others who would like to work as well.” However, the line-up of the committee of the editors did not change.

As a reaction, newcomers decided to found a new medium and initiate their own newspaper, called *Helyi Lap*. This newspaper is also free of charge and is published almost every month. The publisher is OVNA (Our Village Non-Profit Association) – the NGO that was founded by the newcomers. Researchers were not surprised to hear that some of the representatives of the native villagers have negative opinion about this *Helyi Lap*.

The government has a newspaper. The Catholic Church has a newspaper. And there is...the other side...the strangers...although a lot of native villagers joined them. OVNA, am I right? They write there...I cannot say they stabbed us in the back...but what I read there hurts ... (...) They do not like the fact that the Church can publish a colourful newspaper. The local government as well, publishes that cultured newspaper. And the OVNA? They publish their medium on an A4 size sheet of paper and drop it in everywhere.

At the end of this story, we would like to give once again voice to the importance of power relationships. It is worth underlining that the local newspaper is not only a source of information. It is the source of power as well. The owners of this significant and powerful resource can influence, involve, mobilise or convince the local residents. In the fight of newcomers and native villagers the question of who edits *Hírmondó* is a crucial one. In our opinion, this was the hidden reason of the intensive debate.

¹¹ Anna, as the member of the village council, could not be at the same time the chief of the editor.

Conflict because of the election campaign

As it has already been introduced, after an intense electioneering, local elections were held in 2014 in Kisvaros that was eventually lost by Tamas (who had previously been the mayor in the village for twelve years) and the ‘progress-orientated group’. Our research team managed to gain primarily information about the way Tamas and his supporters interpreted the defeat due to the Healing Circle that was organised by the mediators of the Foresee Research Group for some members of the ‘progress-orientated group’.¹² While taking the experiences of the Healing Circle into consideration, Benedek has already described (2015, 144-45) the exclusionary practices that clearly emerged during these months:

1. At the Harvest Festival that was still organised before the election, Tamas and his election team offered tea and mulled wine for the participants of the event. The local newspaper, *Hírmondó*, published many photos and articles about all of the groups and organisations taking part in the festival – except Tamas’ team. According to one of our interviewees, the members of the journal’s editorial board were not neutral; some of them were even the candidates of the rival team. All in all, not to write about the action of Tamas’ team was not an accident but a conscious decision. As somebody put it: “there was not even a picture about our action. Although, the newspaper was full of photos about the tables where they represented themselves. It is important to note that this was the first issue printed in the ‘new’ era, after the latest election.”
2. Only one member of the previous village council, Akos received enough votes to continue his work as a delegate. Some local residents would have considered this work important as “there should be at least one person who will be able to hold them back from doing mucks”. However, supporters of the new regime continuously provoked debates with Akos and made him angry and upset. Finally, he decided not to join the new village council being openly hostile towards him.
3. The attacks towards Tamas should also be mentioned here. As one of his supporters put it: “They declared that they would have only felt alright if Tamas

¹² For more information about the meeting see Chapter ‘*Regimes of the village – experiences of a Healing Circle*’).

went to prison. (...) They started to search for mistakes in the administration. Tamas was a little bit nervous that time. He even told me: ‘if they really want to find something not signed or with wrong dates... they will find it’.” Although official proof that would have confirmed the guilt of the ex-mayor was finally not found, the new leader of Kisvaros pointed at some problems in the next issue of the local newspaper. She revealed the deficit in the budget of the village and declared:

This is the current financial situation of the village. I had to write down all of this as I would like to avoid the impression that the outgoing mayor ensured all kinds of opportunities for us. The new village council will do its best in order to fulfil the obligations in time and the management of the village will not be endangered.

As members of the ‘progress-orientated group’ declared: the local government had no debits, the new village council was simply not able to understand and interpret the budget lines. According to them, the ominous publication was written not only because of incompetence but hostility as well – as before writing the article nobody asked Tamas to clear up the situation.

4. The local newspaper usually publishes information about the local events of the particular year. As somebody underlined, the list of the programmes for 2015 was insufficient as information had not been divulged about the events organised by OVNA. One has to know the gaps within the community in order to understand the importance of this mistake; the editors of the newspaper clearly belong to the ‘tradition-orientated group’ while the OVNA was primarily founded by the ‘progress-orientated group’. According to the latter faction, publishing the insufficient list was not an accident but was part of a conscious decision.

The friends and ex-colleagues of Tamas had the same interpretation about the incidents of these months; the new mayor, village council and their supporters excluded the previous mayor, village council and their supporters. They considered exclusion as an unfair and ignoble attack on those local residents who worked for

Kisvaros hard and selflessly. These attacks caused grief and disappointment – especially for Tamas, the previous mayor.

Expanding the definition of exclusion – distancing from the interethnic dimension

As it is clear to see, the targets of exclusion are not solely disadvantaged, vulnerable and marginalised groups, as the Roma people. Exclusion is not an ethno-specific phenomenon but rather a typical attribute of groups created by human beings. In case of the given village, newcomers and native villagers, supporters of the different regimes also take part in the game. And the list of the groups in Kisvaros – similarly to other communities – is quite long: there are active members of the Catholic Church and at the same time residents who regularly do not go to mass. There are poor and rich residents. There are people representing the ideology of liberalism while others stand up for conservatism or socialism. There are supporters of the right and at the same time fans of the left wing parties. Some of the people live at the upper side of Kisvaros, while others are inhabitants of the lower side. The village where the Foresee Research Group was working could be considered as a typical community where people live in an intercultural context, form groups and thereby boundaries, and feel inclined to exclude members of the other groups. All in all, the gap between the Roma and non-Roma is only one – and not even the widest – division within the community. Sometimes the tension is more intense between those groups that own resources and mobilise their power in order to get in a better position.

From this point of view, even conflicts that are easily labelled as ‘interethnic’ (as the primary stakeholders belong to specific ethnic groups and/or the issue is centred about ethnicity) could be reframed and introduced as the fight of powerful groups of interests who maintain the pretence and intentionally frame the dissent as one arises between the Roma and the non-Roma. Here, the Soccer Conflict – that appeared because some of the non-Roma excluded the Roma from the soccer team – should be cited once again as an example.

As it has been already introduced, native villagers, supporters of the 'tradition-orientated group' and Catholic residents could have problems with Tamas. As we highlighted: he identified himself as a liberal and a leftist person, he was an atheist and he was cooperating with the newcomers. We would like to reveal that the mayor not only represented a different ideology but he also challenged a lot of interests. He managed to build up a successful political ally – thanks to this work native villagers fell out of the formal leadership of Kisvaros for twelve years. The editors of the local newspaper were mainly native villagers – and the mayor wanted them to involve newcomers in the work of their committee. He supported the newcomers in founding a new local NGO – and the organisation not only managed to involve a lot of residents into their work but they started publishing an alternative local newspaper regularly as well. In our opinion, the mayor offended interests and the actors who were attacked, reacted. And if anybody wanted to harm or attack the mayor, they could as well harm or attack his allies, as we explain in the following paragraphs.

Who were the allies of the mayor? For example Jozsef who was the leader of the soccer association. He was known as a “friend of the Roma”, whose sport association was open for Roma and non-Roma as well, whose Roma colleagues were the guards at soccer matches. He was not only supportive with the Roma but he was akin with the mayor – what may have been enough reason for attacking him: “The leader of the local soccer association belongs to the team of the mayor. It is a common team. For native villagers they are the common enemy, they have to be removed and the other guys will run the sport and the local government.” Somebody else pointed out that “I am afraid the soccer conflict is not only racism but politics as well. Local politics. Here is the era of Tamas and Jozsef is his relative. They have family relationships. In my opinion, those who did not want to play with Roma saw an opportunity to attack the system.”

Not only persons but groups belonged to the allies of Tibor – for example the Roma who were supported by him. If somebody wanted to harm or attack the mayor, they might as well have harmed or attacked his allies – and in case of Kisvaros the Roma also belonged to this alliance. If this really is the situation, the conflicts between Roma and non-Roma are not interethnic. The real underlying reason for conflicts is the clashes of the powerful groups of interests in the village. Among other factors, this

could also be a reason why some of the local residents did not support or even caused harm to the Roma – for one of the most vulnerable, powerless group.

Conflict

We understand the term of ‘conflict’ in line with Avruch’s definition: „conflict occurs when two related parties – individuals, groups, communities, or nation-states – find themselves divided by perceived incompatible interests or goals or in competition for control over scarce resources” (1998, 24). It is also important to define the meaning of ‘resource’ as the term refers not only to material but immaterial resources, as social and symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1986), as well.

This study has already introduced that harmful conflicts are part of the everyday life in Kisvaros. Local residents feel harms and have hurt feelings that arise because of these dissents. The newcomers are disappointed because the native villagers did not let them take part in the work of the local newspaper. The native villagers are angry as the newcomers “wanted to pull out the carpet from under their feet.” The Roma people are disheartened because of their experience about exclusion. The non-Roma fear for their security that supposedly is endangered by the Roma. The members of the ‘tradition-orientated group’ are frustrated because the mayor did not support their aims and values. The members of the ‘progress-orientated group’ are distressed because they lost the election. Harms and grievances are part of the everyday life, all of the individuals and groups who are involved in conflicts face these feelings.

According to our impression, these sentiments seem to support the process of creating enemy images. While describing this process we will use the description of Foss and his co-authors:

polarisation and enemy images come into play, legitimising violence and destruction of ‘the other’. Here ‘culture’, religion, ethnicity and other identity markers are mobilised as legitimising means in physical, psychical, cultural or structural violence. People mobilised into a polarised conflict on a higher conflict level may be unaware of the former ‘root-conflict’, hence adopting the enemy images and concerns of the conflicting groups (Foss et al. 2012, 35).

One is not honest, does not share their feelings and would not like to cooperate with 'enemies' – one does not even care for the enemies' hurt feelings, harms and grievances. This is the way the gap will appear and become wider between groups, this is the way the lack of communication will be the main characteristic of fragmented communities.

Even in the village, lack of communication is typical. As Benedek has already introduced (2015, 7-25), the cultural view is based on avoiding, the local residents rather keep off open discussion about their conflicts and they consider collision not as an opportunity for change but as danger – despite the fact that the community has many disagreements or even harms that are not resolved and are still remembered as painful.

A lot of conversation confirmed this observation already in the beginning of the action research. As a non-Roma resident drew it up in 2013 while describing the Roma: "They have a different culture and we have to accept it. We shouldn't argue with them and in that case they will not hurt Hungarians either." Somebody else declared while she was talking about a particular rivalry: "I do forgive but I will never forget it." Another interviewee maintained that "I do not think you should deal with this conflict. If we focus on it, it will be worse." Somebody was talking about the clashes among native villagers. In his opinion "all the time, native villagers also talked about these oppositions. However, they were not loud as they were sisters-in-law, sons-in-law... They knew it but they did not talk about it." We met the headmaster of the school who disclosed that about conflicts "officially there is no communication. They are drowning. There is a drowning and everybody feels their own justice. However, it never comes up to the surface." A Roma resident shared with us information about a violent conflict. Although, somebody was hurt seriously, that rivalry has not been solved until now, as "if we do not offend each other, we do not tell it into their face, it is not such a big deal". All in all, participants thought that it was better not to talk about conflicts, not to break with accepted practices that were based on avoidance. Local residents who were affected by various conflicts did not have direct communication with each other. All in all, the phenomenon that we entitled as 'culture of silence' (Benedek 2015, 7-25) is dominant in Kisvaros.

Since the beginning of the action phase of the action research (January 2013), further empirical evidence confirmed that the cultural view of conflicts in the village was based

on avoiding. Hereinafter, we briefly refer to the case studies that are already introduced in the previous chapters and reveal the way the villagers keep off open discussion about their problems.

Burning conflict

We have already introduced the way one of the newcomers became victim of social exclusion due to his post on the Facebook. Kisvaros is quite small and people often meet on the street or at events of the village. All of the actors who were involved in this strife could have had the chance to discuss the conflict and to find out what happened, what the reason of the native villager's reaction was, how the community should handle this and similar clashes in the future. However, this happened only a very few times due to the lack of open discussion about the problems.

Several years after the burning strife (even during the action research), people were still talking about what Peter did. However, people did not ask Peter why he wrote his note on Facebook. They did not communicate and did not try to clarify the affair. All in all, people did not share their opinions with each other, their problems and their harms.

Until today, the newcomers and native villagers have two, completely different interpretations about the 'burning conflict'. Moreover, not only the judgements each villager made are distinct but also the ways they relate the story itself. In the opinion of the latter group, Peter's behaviour was not acceptable especially because he filed a lawsuit against his neighbour for burning in the garden. As Peter related this story to us this was in fact not the truth.

Butcher Festival

The story of the conflict that arose in connection with the Butcher Festival has also been introduced previously. However, we did not focus on the way the local residents remained in silence and did not openly discuss their problems and harms.

In this specific case, signs of silence were observable already in the beginning of 2013 – as feelings of harm and discontent concerning the Roma and poor residents' exclusion from the festival were not discussed openly by the community. The conflict was no longer among the subjects of the local public discourse by the end of the year. For ten months, the community itself did not manage the conflict, initiate open discussion and restore harms.

It was possible to recognise further signs of 'culture of silence'. It is not known until today why the idea of the free entrance was opposed; was it because of the poor residents (as the organiser emphasised) or because of the Roma (as the village council supposed)? At this point it should be mentioned that in the beginning of the action research an interview was conducted with the organiser of the festival. He was one of those few residents who openly talked about thefts which were presumably committed by the local Roma. In addition, as he reported he once was a victim of a crime assumed to be perpetrated also by Roma. Unfortunately, his damage was restored neither by the police, nor the court, nor the local community – which intensified his negative attitudes. Moreover, as he drew it up during that interview: “the local government wants me to ensure tickets for free for the disadvantaged... In this case, I would not like to organise the festival. It is a huge investment and Roma are not able to behave. I do not want it to be free. I want all of the participants to have a good time.” Taking his opinion into consideration, one can conclude that he may have really wanted to hinder the free entrance of the Roma residents.

Not only the organiser but members of a local NGO, the 'Young People of the village Association' were also working on the preparation of the festival. As we recognised, the members of this civic organisation may also have been among the actors who opposed the entrance of the Roma residents – as one of the characteristics of this civic organisation (at least according to several interviewees of ours – even according to some members of the NGO themselves) is anti-Roma sentiments. The mayor, who was

in power that year, wanted to clarify the issue thereby he asked the association whether they were against the entrance of the Roma villagers. However, the NGO refused the supposition. As the mayor drew it up: “They told me that they did not say such a thing.” Despite all of this, the mayor was convinced that members of the NGO were not brave enough to undertake their opinion. As he put it: “I am sure that was what they said. I know their approach. This is the approach which emphasises that Roma are not welcome in the village and especially not in such a festival. They completely agree with this idea. Maximum one out of the thirty members of the association may not agree with it.” This opinion was confirmed by the leader of the Roma Self-Government as well.

The picture is quite blurred, as according to the organiser of the festival, members of the association were the ones who protested against the free entrance as they did not welcome Roma participants. However, according to an informal hint from the leader of the 'Young People of the village Association', the organiser of the festival was the one who did not want to accept at all the idea of the Romas' presence at the event. All in all, we conclude that the organiser of the festival or the 'Young People of the village Association' probably avoided open communication. They remained in silence; they did not reveal their opinion and they did not utter explicitly their problems with the Roma.

Finally, the role of Tibor who was the only Roma in the City Council during the negotiations about the free entry should be mentioned here. As it has been already introduced, he felt harmed due to the intention of the exclusion of the Roma. Although, he was honest and open with the researchers he was not so straightforward with the organiser and members of the 'Young People of the village Association'. As we mentioned earlier, none of these actors uttered anti-Roma sentiments explicitly – and it was not easy to react on their hidden and untold accusations. Therefore, Tibor remained mute, he did not talk openly about his harmed feelings and did not reveal his disappointment caused by the racist and discriminative attitudes. ‘Silence’ from the side of the organiser hindered Tibor in revealing his harms. All in all, ‘silence’ resulted in ‘silence’.

Civil Guard

Let us see where the signs of ‘culture of silence’ can be tracked in this case.

- 1) Within the local community of Kisvaros people know each other. This is why two of the local residents started to talk about the problem which is important for both of them. As one of them (Tibor) told us: “Henrik got in contact with me because we are in a good relationship. We have known each other for ages....since our childhood”. However, the organisers of the new Civil Guard were afraid of conflict with other villagers; with members of the current Civil Guard. As one of them drew it up: “This is why it would have been important to emphasise the friendly intentions and the common aims. (...) We would have increased the tension... They would have thought “what do those new ones want to achieve? We do our work honestly and they do not like and accept it!” All in all, an initiative that aimed at improving the security in Kisvaros and the new Civil Guard would have been considered purely as criticism and not as a supportive initiative. And according to our interviewees, the originators would not have been able to clarify their intentions and aims. As a whole, friendship, kinship and living in the same village do not mean open communication between those who are involved in a conflict.
- 2) As it has already been introduced, the Roma’s potential to join the Civil Guard decreased the chance that non-Roma would also contribute. As Henrik put it: “It also exists... that... Tibor is a... you know his colour. I know a guy who will not join the initiative because Tibor is a Roma.” Some residents were clearly against Roma civil guards because “if Roma go on patrol they will just check where to break in later on.” This opinion originates in the idea of the local Roma being contributors to several burglaries. According to this opinion, Roma commit crime because they need money, they are lazy and just live on social benefits. Moreover, committing crime “somehow it is a kind of code... it is in their blood.” This is the reason why “90% of the Roma are in prisons.”

On the contrary, a completely different description was provided about the local Roma by other villagers, for example by Tibor (the leader of the Roma Minority Government). As he underlined, they do not take part in burglaries at all. As he

drew it up: “We also feel as a piece of shit when there is a burglary in the village and we are blamed as burglars. I would like the local residents to recognise that Roma are for peace and tranquillity and they would like to do something for the security of the village.” This message describes the local Roma community as an unified group whose members are clearly not responsible for any of the local crimes.

We presuppose that none of the extremist ideas – the ‘all of the Roma are criminals’ and the ‘none of the Roma are criminals’ – is true. Probably, there are members of the local Roma community who may have criminal records. This opinion is confirmed by some of our Roma interviewees as well. According to these villagers, the criteria regarding the criminal record do not allow the Roma to join the Civil Guard because “several Roma used to be offenders.” These residents also emphasised that Roma civil guards could catch those Roma criminals who are their relatives which “cause conflicts in your private life.”

However, it is not our task to decide now whether there are any Roma criminals living in Kisvaros. We would like to focus on an entirely different aspect here; on the communication strategy that operated in the case of the Civil Guard. Lack of open discussion was also characteristic of this case. Despite the presuppositions and negative stereotypes about the Roma, aversions against their participation did not come to the surface. Nobody openly expressed their doubts against the involvement of the Roma.¹³

We were also interested in the opinion of other villagers about the issue of the Civil Guard. However, we could not gain more information, instead we faced silence. We asked questions for example from Gyuri, the leader of the 'Young People of the village Association' – the organisation which initiated the establishment of the current Civil Guard in Kisvaros a few years ago. Gyuri made it clear at an informal meeting that he would not give information about conflicts between Roma and non-Roma residents of the village. As he drew it up: “I will tell you nothing about

¹³ Instead, ‘professional reasoning’ emerged. According to some of the local residents no one could take part in the work of the Civil Guard without experience and ‘professional knowledge’. As Tibor emphasised, this opinion was only “a communication bluff in order not to welcome everybody. They will tell you what ‘professional’ means and who is suitable for that work. (...) One does not have to attend the ‘University of Security’...”

the Roma issue”. Unfortunately, Gyuri forbade even the members of the association to talk openly about problems with the local Roma.

Local residents did not discuss the way they could decrease the burglaries and thefts in Kisvaros. They did not have an open communication about the way the work of the current Civil Guard could be improved. They did not utter explicitly why Roma should not have been involved in a local initiative that aimed at improving local security. As a result of ‘silence’, local residents did not discuss questions such as ‘Why does somebody commit a crime?’ ‘What are the reasons behind burglaries?’ ‘Is only the perpetrator, the individual responsible for crime?’ ‘What should our local community do for human or existential security?’. All in all, the common interest of the community was hurt due to the inability to discuss the dissent openly.

- 3) While we were conducting our interviews we recognised other patterns of silence as well. As it came to light, a few years ago, a personal conflict emerged between Henrik and the leader of the current Civil Guard; the latter one fired Henrik from the team without any notice and according to Henrik in an unfair way. This conflict has not been discussed until now either and as Henrik feels the case is harmful.
- 4) Last but not least we should mention that the organisers of the new Civil Guard were afraid of foreseen conflicts with some of the applicants who have a criminal record: “You cannot tell them if they would like to join voluntarily but... You cannot tell them that ‘you cannot join us. Because you are not ‘clean’, you already had some problem with the police or the law’.” As it is clear to see, the organisers were having trouble communicating their opinions to various groups.

Soccer conflict

Previously, a clear description was given about the soccer conflict when Roma players were excluded from the team. In this case, Roma players and their relatives, cousins and friends felt humiliated because of the intention of exclusion. However, this conflict has also not been discussed until today. None of the soccer players – neither the non-Roma or the Roma – have asked questions to each other in order to clarify the dissent.

It is still an open question why some of the non-Roma wanted to play without the Roma. On the contrary, the Roma villagers' exasperation has not been resolved yet.

Regimes of the village – experiences of a Healing Circle

The different groups of interest (supporters of the different regimes) have already been introduced. However, up until now, lack of open communication between these factions was only partially discussed. It is now time to reveal that a Circle – based on the methods and approach of restorative justice – was organised by the mediators of the Foresee Research Group for some members of the 'progress-orientated group'. Originally, the facilitators of Foresee initiated a circle where the rivals and Tamas and his supporters could meet, reveal their grievances, clarify their disagreements and find solutions for the future. However, it seemed to be obvious after a while that neither Tamas nor his supporters and friends were ready to take part in such a meeting. Especially the ex-mayor refused the idea of meeting the rivals. Thereby, a Healing Circle was finally organised where solely supporters of Tamas could meet and talk honestly about their feelings of disappointment, anger and sadness. However, the harms caused by exclusion were not openly revealed by Tamas and his supporters until today.

All in all, the investigation about the Healing Circle confirmed the statement about the 'culture of silence' in the village. However, the idea of the lack of communication between groups was partly confuted as well. As the mediator of the case underlined, avoidance of open discussion about problems could be observed even within groups, in our case among the participants of the Healing Circle. As she drew it up: "They have their opinion but they do not share it with each other. Or... they talk about it only to some extent. (...) They may talk about it in privacy, in a face-to-face conversation. However, some of them were not brave enough to talk openly about their opinion in the Healing Circle." As an example, the dialoguer referred to Peter, who during the preparation of the circle declared his intention to give feedback to Tamas about his work. However, he

did not even give a hint about this issue in the circle. He did not talk about the things that should have been done in another way by Tamas. He did not even tell a word about things he was talking about during the preparatory interview. He did not mention the bad communication skills of Tamas and his lack of openness to involve other people in his work.

The case studies that have been introduced in the chapter described the way local residents in Kisvaros avoid open discussion about their conflicts and prefer conflict management practices building upon avoidance. The existence of this attitude which we define as 'culture of silence' was confirmed by our investigation.

According to our impression, there could be several reasons for the silence that arise between and even within the local groups. Local villagers probably do not want to hurt each other; especially because the relationships within the group are crucial for them. As one of the mediators of the Foresee Research Group put it: "They do not want to risk their bonds as they need each other." In addition, sympathy and empathy, as basic characteristics of human beings should be paid attention to. In case of the Healing Circle, Tamas was disappointed and broken; thereby nobody wanted to criticise him. "The man who used to be an active, open, initiator person...he changed. He became a silent, closed, negative, critical person. The people who knew him recognised this change. And of course, they do not kick somebody lying on the floor. They may have thought: 'this is not the time and place to tell my opinion'." There could be other reasons of silence. Maybe, the villagers would simply like to live in a community where tensions and conflicts do not disturb the "peaceful coexistence". They may be afraid of the consequences of the opinion that is undertaken publicly. We cannot be sure in the causes. However, we can be sure that lack of open discussions results in lack of information; which only makes stereotypes, assumptions and suspicions about the other groups stronger. This is how the local groups become homogeneous entities which consist only of the same kind of people without any exceptions. This is the way, local residents create stereotypes about the other villagers – the process that has been already introduced in the chapter *Intercultural settings*.

Annex I. – Grids

I. Session-centred version: it records several observations and related concepts occurred during a research session – interview, focus group, meeting etc.

Date		Place	
Researcher		Method	
WP		Your ref.	

Thick description:...

ETIC – EMIC session note #1	
ETIC	
Key concept	
Secondary concepts	

ETIC – EMIC session note #1	
Conceptualisation	
EMIC	
Local language for concept and related terms	
Societal ecology	
Questions and observations	

ETIC – EMIC session note #2	
ETIC	
Key concept	

ETIC – EMIC session note #2

Secondary concepts	
---------------------------	--

Conceptualisation	
--------------------------	--

EMIC

Local language for concept and related terms	
---	--

Societal ecology	
-------------------------	--

Questions and observations	
-----------------------------------	--

ETIC – EMIC session note #...

ETIC

ETIC – EMIC session note #...	
Key concept	
Secondary concepts	
Conceptualisation	
EMIC	
Local language for concept and related terms	
Societal ecology	
Questions and observations	

Final comments and observations:

[Key] Concepts:

Active participation
Civil society/community
Conflict
Dialogue
Identity
Interculturality
Minorities
Recognition
Restorative principles
Restorative processes
Security
Security/safety
Social inclusion/exclusion
Strategic communicative action
Victim/victimisation
Violence

Citizenship
Community
Conflict/crime
Hospitality
Intercultural setting
Justice
Post-conflict society
Restoration

II. Concept-centred version: a note for the chosen concept, more notes for the same concept possible on separate sheets

Date		Place	
Researcher		Method	
WP		Your ref.	
Topic			

Thick description:...

ETIC conceptualisation	
Key concept [characterising what is thickly described above]	
Secondary concepts	
Conceptualisation	

EMIC	
Local language for concept and related terms	
Societal ecology	
Questions and observations	

Final comments and observations:

[Key] Concepts:

Active participation

Community

Dialogue

Intercultural setting

Minorities

Restorative principles

Security/safety

Victim/victimisation

Citizenship

Conflict

Hospitality

Interculturality

Post-conflict society Recognition

Restorative processes

Social inclusion/exclusion

Violence

Civil society/community

Conflict/crime

Identity

Justice

Restoration

Security

Strategic communicative action

Bibliography

ALTERNATIVE, 2011. DOW ALTERNATIVE. THEME [SEC-2011.6.5-1]. Conflict resolution and mediation. Grant agreement no: 285368.

Avruch, Kevin. 1998. *Culture and conflict resolution*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Benedek, Gabriella (ed.). 2015. *Deliverable 5.3. Implementation report on the application of RJ in the community. Grasping action and research*. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Berkovits, Balázs, and Eszter Balogh. 2013. *Deliverable 5.1. Theoretical report on the main concepts in the communities*. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by Richardson John, 241-260. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. *A tudomány tudománya és a reflexivitás*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.

Bradbury Huang, Hilary. 2010. "What is good action research?" *Action Research* 8:93-109.

de Haan, Arjaan. 1999. *Social exclusion: towards an holistic understanding of deprivation*. London: Department for International Development. Accessed 08.10.2015.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/sdd9socex.pdf>

Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, Gordon Hodson, Melissa A. Houlette, and Kelly M. Johnson 2005. "Social Inclusion and Exclusion: Recategorization and the Perception of Intergroup Boundaries." In *The Social Psychology of Inclusion and Exclusion*, edited by Abrams, Dominic, Michael A. Hoggand, and José M. Marques, 245-265. New York, Hove: Psychology Press.

Estivill, Jordi. 2003. *Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Fellegi, Borbála, and Dóra Szegő. 2013. *Handbook for Facilitating Peacemaking Circles*. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Foss, Espen Marius, Sarah Cicilie Hassan, Ida Hydle, Marie Louise Seeberg, and Bettina Uhrig. 2012. *Deliverable 2.1.: Report on conflicts in intercultural settings*. Oslo: NOVA.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3-33. New York: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers.

Hera, Gabor. 2013. "Roma and non-Roma conflicts in the light of power relationships." *Temida 16*:95-115. Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://www.doiserbia.nb.rs/img/doi/1450-6637/2013/1450-66371304095G.pdf>

Hera, Gabor. 2015. "Mechanism of social exclusion and the way of counteracting." In *Restoring Justice and Security in Intercultural Europe*. Unpublished.

Hera, Gabor, Éva Gyórfi, Dóra Szegő, László Balla, and Koppány Kelemen. 2014. *Deliverable 5.2.a: Problem Analysis. Bulding The Bridges of Trust With and Within The Communities. From Getting to Know the Village to Getting Closer to Cases*, edited by Benedek Gabriella. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Hewstone, Miles, and Katy Greenland. 2000. "Intergroup conflict" *International Journal of Psychology* 35(2):136-44.

Hydle, Ida, and Marie Louise Seeberg. 2013. *Deliverable 2.2.: Report on conflict transformation and security*. Oslo: NOVA.

Kemény, István. 2002. "Linguistic Groups and Usage among the Hungarian Gypsies/Roma." In *The Gypsies/The Roma In Hungarian Society*, edited by Kállai Ernő, 28-35. Budapest: Teleki László Foundation.

Kovács, Éva, Zsuzsanna Vidra, and Tünde Virág. 2013. "Az etnicitás reprezentációi és mindennapi gyakorlatai." In *Kint és bent. Lokalitas és etnicitás a peremvidékeken*, edited by Éva Kovács, Zsuzsanna Vidra, and Tünde Virág, 78-112. Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Kremmel, Katrin, and Christa Pelikan. 2013. *Deliverable 4.1: Theoretical research report on activating civil society*. Vienna: Insitute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology (IRKS).

Levitas, Ruth, Christina Pantazis, Eldin Fahmy, David Gordon, Eva Lloyd, and Demi Patsios. 2007. *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Bristol: Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy Townsend Centre for the International Study of Poverty and Bristol Institute for Public Affairs University of Bristol. Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/poverty/socialexclusion.html>

Mathieso, Jane, Jennie Popay, Etheline Enoch, Sarah Escorel, Mario Hernandez, Heidi Johnston, and Laetitia Rispel. 2008. *Social Exclusion. Meaning, measurement and experience and links to health inequalities. A review of literature*. Lancaster: Institute for Health Research. Accessed 08.10.2015. http://www.who.int/social_determinants/publications/socialexclusion/en/

Miliband, David. 2006. *Social exclusion: The next steps forward*. London: ODPM Publication. Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://www.revolving-doors.org.uk/documents/david-miliband-social-exclusion-speech/>

Pali, Brunilda. 2013. *Deliverable 1.1: Theoretical analysis report on alternative epistemologies*. Leuven: Leuven Institute of Criminology.

Saraceno, Chiara. 2001. "Social exclusion: Cultural roots and diversities of a popular concept" Paper presented at the Conference on Social Exclusion of Children, Institute on Child and Family Policy, Columbia University, May 3–4 2001. Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://www.childpolicyintl.org/publications/Saraceno.pdf>

Schaefer, Richard T., 2007. *What is a Minority Group?* Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://academic.udayton.edu/race/01race/minor01.htm>.

Shaaban, Safaa. 2011. "A Conceptual Framework Review of Social Exclusion, and its Relation with Social Cohesion and Poverty in Europe." In *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations* 11(1):117-31.

Sen, Amartya. 2000. *Social exclusion: concept, application, and scrutiny*. Manila: Asian Development Bank. Accessed 08.10.2015. <http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29778/social-exclusion.pdf>

Silver, Hilary. 2007. *The process of social exclusion: the dynamics of an evolving concept*. Working paper. Providence: Chronic Poverty Research Centre. Accessed 08.10.2015. http://www.chronicpoverty.org/uploads/publication_files/CP_2006_Silver.pdf

Smith, Laura, Lucinda Bratini, Debbie-Ann Chambers, Jensen Russell Vance, and Romero LeLaina. 2010. "Between idealism and reality: Meeting the challenges of participatory action research." *Action research* 8:407-25.

Szegő, Dóra. 2015. *Deliverable 5.3. Action Research report*. Budapest: Foresee Research Group.

Szuhay, Péter. 2002. "Self-Definitions of Gypsy Ethnic Groups." In *The Gypsies/The Roma In Hungarian Society*, edited by Kállai, Ernő, 24-28. Budapest: Teleki László Foundation.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. 1979. "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict." In *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, edited by Austin, William G., and Stephen Worchel, 33-47. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Vanfraechem, Inge. 2012. *Deliverable 8.1: Work document on operationalisation of theoretical concepts*. Leuven: Leuven Instituut Voor Criminologie.

Vanfraechem, Inge. 2013. *Deliverable 8.3: Comparative framework and data-recording system*. Leuven: Leuven Instituut Voor Criminologie.

Wikipedia. 2015. "Ethnic Group" Accessed 08.10.2015. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnic_group.

Wsevolod, Isajiv W. 1993. "Definition and Dimensions of Ethnicity: a Theoretical Framework." In *Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World: Science, politics and reality: Proceedings of the Joint Canada-United States Conference on the*

Measurement of Ethnicity, edited by Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 407-27. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. Accessed 08.10.2015.
http://www.culturementalhealth.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Def_DimofEthnicity.pdf