

A Case Study on Roma Migrants - Simulation for Use in Youth and Adult Education

**Complete Manual with Role Cards and Guidelines for Facilitators
by Judith Andres, Jana Gottschalk, Amanda Mangaser, Nataša Perić,
Veronica Priefer and Diana Tung**

- Revised January 2011 -

Developed by:



In cooperation with:



Supported by:



This simulation is a collaborative work in progress. It was developed and tested by Humanity in Action during an international workshop in 2010.

Are you interested in using the simulation? Feel free to contact us.

Contact: Humanity in Action Deutschland e.V.
Kollwitzstr. 94-96, 10435 Berlin
Tel.: +49 (0)30 4430 82-71
Email: germany@humanityinaction.org

For most recent updates and other simulation manuals please check:

www.humanityinaction.org/germany/simulationmanuals



A Case Study on Roma Migrants - Simulation for Use in Youth and Adult Education

Content of the manual

1. Guidelines for simulation facilitators

2. Information for all participants
 - 2.1 Scenario
 - 2.2 Background Information
 - 2.2.1 The Freedom of Movement for EU Citizens
 - 2.2.2 The Situation of Roma in the European Union
 - 2.3 Human and Fundamental Rights Related to the Case

3. Information for individual participants
 - 3.1-3.7 Seven Role Cards

1. Guidelines for Simulation Facilitators

Introduction

This game addresses issues of Roma migrants. The scenario is set in a fictitious German town. In lack of proper accommodation, a group of Roma (EU citizens) chose a public park as their temporary residence during the summer. This situation led to controversy among the local residents, shop keepers, the police, the city administration and other stakeholders. The game simulates a roundtable discussion with seven different interest groups.

The game was inspired by a similar incident in Berlin in 2009.

Objective

A joint statement must be reached by consensus of all participating parties. The statement should address concrete steps and measures relevant to the situation.

Material

The general information for all participants consists of the simulation scenario, background information on the freedom of movement for EU citizens and the situation of Roma, and information on codified human and fundamental rights related to the case.

The material for the stakeholder consists of seven role cards for groups up to three participants. An ideal number of players would be 14. One could play it with less participants (minimum 7). However, discussing arguments and strategies in small teams who represent one stakeholder party considerably improves the quality of the game.

The facilitators of the game receive additional instruments to influence the course of the game (action cards).

Role cards

1. St. Samaritan Church (Moderator of the Roundtable Discussion)
2. The City Council of Kohlwitzberg
3. NGO „Civil Rights for Minorities“
4. The Kohlwitzberg Police
5. Local Roma Representatives
6. The Kohlwitzberg Neighborhood and Shopkeepers' Association
7. Embassy representatives from the Roma's Eastern European home country

Possible Action Cards

Action cards can be introduced by facilitators if they wish to impact the course of discussion. The decision as to if and when these action cards will be introduced must be made collectively by all facilitators.

Action Card 1:

The local newspaper reports that a 35-year-old Roma man has been attacked by an unknown group, and is now hospitalized for minor injuries. While no clear racial motivations were given for the attack, the police and the City Council fear that the Roma will be vulnerable to further assaults.

Action Card 2:

After an exclusive interview with an anonymous Roma woman, a local newspaper (yellow press) concludes that Roma women are extremely vulnerable to male violence in their families. The article condemns "the backwardness and patriarchal family structures" that presumably characterize the Roma culture, and calls for "the liberation" of these women.

Timeline

Overall game duration: up to 5 hours

Preparation: 1 hour

- Introduction: 10 minutes
- Individual Reading Time: 20 minutes
- Developing strategy within groups: 30 minutes

Game playing time: 2.5 to 3 hours

Debriefing: 45 minutes

2. Information for all participants

2.1 Scenario

We are located in the fictitious German city of Kohlwitzberg, with a population of one million people. The city has a long and turbulent history, and is currently facing fiscal problems due to past political mismanagement. The global financial crisis of 2009 only exacerbated existing socio-economic problems, with the unemployment rate again increasing and public spending on social welfare programs at an all-time low. The people of Kohlwitzberg are disgruntled with the dismantling of the social safety net, and generally dissatisfied with their political leaders.

Two weeks ago, a group of one hundred Roma arrived in Kohlwitzberg from an EU country in Eastern Europe. While the city has previously experienced influxes of Roma people during the summer, it has never dealt with such a large group. In addition, in the past the Roma had usually paid for their own accommodations (albeit overpriced and in poor condition), but this year—due to their numbers and desperate financial situation—they are unable to afford housing. In the meantime, they hope to earn some money during their stay.

The group consists of several multigenerational families—including newborn babies—all of whom are EU citizens. They have made the city park their home, and sustained themselves by begging and engaging in activities, such as cleaning car windows at traffic lights. Local inhabitants have complained to the police, park and city council authorities that many of the Roma spend all their time in the park, creating loud disturbances, generating unmanageable amounts of waste, and leaving their children without sufficient parental supervision.

After one week of staying in the park, the Roma followed the suggestion of the local civil rights group “Civil Rights for Minorities” that they seek shelter at the Protestant church, located two blocks away. The move did not occur with the Church’s consent. However, the St. Samaritan Church then hosted and fed them, but after one week, it was unable to continue these services due to insufficient funds. Ultimately, the Roma were asked to leave.

The church is now urgently seeking a solution for the Roma, who have since returned to the park. This church has existed for over two hundred years, maintaining a strong and well-respected presence in community affairs. It is often called upon to mediate community conflicts, and utilize its well-respected authority to call upon local community groups for an emergency meeting.

In this case, the St. Samaritan Church aims to facilitate a consensus regarding what should be done with the Roma and invites to a roundtable discussion.

At no point should forced deportation to their home country be considered an option, as EU citizens cannot legally be expelled as an entire group from another EU state. Instead, the roundtable parties will discuss whether the Roma should stay or leave the city or state in question, and if any means of support (in areas such as housing, healthcare, and residence status) would be provided in either case.

Apart from representatives of the roundtable host, the St. Samaritan Church, the following six groups have agreed to attend the roundtable:

- The City Council of Kohlwitzberg
- Civil Rights for Minorities
- The Kohlwitzberg Police
- Local Roma representatives
- The Kohlwitzberg Neighborhood and Shopkeepers' Association
- Embassy representatives from the Roma's Eastern European home country

2.2 Background Information

2.2.1 *The Freedom of Movement for EU Citizens*

The free movement of persons constitutes one of the four freedoms formulated under EU law. It is intended to facilitate the free flow and exchange of economic resources – namely, goods, services, capital, and people – within the EU.

Following the Maastricht Treaty, the Amsterdam Treaty, and their secondary legislation, Directive 2004/38/EC establishes the right of EU citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of member states, even if they are not employed. Thus, non-working or job-seeking EU citizens may freely remain in the territory of another member state for up to three months.

Article 6, Chapter 3 of Directive 2004/38/EC states that all EU citizens “shall have the right of residence on the territory of another Member State for a period of up to three months without any conditions or any formalities other than the requirement to hold a valid identity card or passport.”

From the fourth month of residence onward, unemployed EU citizens are required to register with the local administration and provide proof of having sufficient health insurance and funds for sustenance, the sufficient level being decided by individual states. From the sixty-first month of residence onward, the EU citizen has the same claims to social benefits in the host country as any other resident of that country.

After three months, if an applicant cannot prove that he or she has sufficient funds, or if he or she poses a threat to the public order, the state may deport the individual. However, it is illegal to deport entire groups based on “guilt of association”; states are obliged to investigate each case individually.

All EU citizens also have the right to free medical treatment abroad through the European Health Insurance Card, provided they are enrolled in the national health care system in their country of origin. Even in the absence of the actual card, they are entitled to treatment but may be asked to pay the doctor in advance, and be reimbursed later.

Additionally, everyone in the EU has the right to adequate housing, in the event that they are involuntarily deprived of such. In such a case, cities and communal units are obligated to provide temporary housing which may have minor deficiencies, but must be acceptable overall.

2.2.2 *The Situation of Roma in the European Union*

The Roma, with an estimated population of 10-12 million people, constitute the largest ethnic minority in Europe. The group's roots are not clearly identifiable, although it is thought to have historical connections to the north Indian and/or Pakistani population. For centuries the Roma have been portrayed as itinerant travelers, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority are currently settled in their home countries.

In fact, only two percent of the Roma residing in the EU travel to find seasonal employment in low-skilled or illegal labor. They are often associated with utterly negative stereotypes (loud, nasty, lazy, dishonest, dirty, uneducated, unsettled, and overly fertile), but sometimes also in positive terms (free, romantic, sexually uninhibited and joyful). There is much scholarly debate focused on pinpointing who the Roma really are; yet studies show that similarities between the Roma minority and non-Roma majority in any given state are stronger than any similarities among the Roma of different states.

Although most Roma are EU citizens, they are frequently subject to racism, discrimination, and social exclusion. EU law forbids the collective expulsion of any group from an EU country, but in some member states such as France, this has occurred de facto. From January to August 2010, France relocated more than 15,000 Roma who were originally from Bulgaria and Romania. French authorities distanced themselves from the accusation of unlawful collective deportation by claiming that every case had been reviewed individually prior to deportation. They justified their actions as the prioritizing of public safety over freedom of movement.

In other cases, the Roma were offered financial incentives to return voluntarily to their countries of origin.

Following the EU's enlargement to include countries that have substantial Roma populations, this issue rose on the agenda of several EU institutions. In 2005, the EU announced that the next decade would be one of Roma inclusion. However, the campaign's benefits thus far are barely ascertainable, as persistent stereotypes and prejudices continue to exacerbate the social and economic marginalization of the Roma. Such marginalization occurs by a variety of means: through their de facto exclusion from social welfare systems such as housing and healthcare, as well as extremely limited access to education and job markets.

In addition, during the last decade, Roma individuals and even entire Roma settlements have been subject to violence from extremist groups, particularly in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. As recently as 2009, the Roma were victims of shootings and violent abuse, and their houses targeted by arsonists. These same people were often left without proper recourse from state authorities. The European Centre for Research on Antiziganism has labeled these attacks as a "new atmosphere of pogroms."

2.3 Human and Fundamental Rights Related to the Case

During the negotiations, discussions and debriefing the following codified rights might be taken into consideration and applied to the case discussed:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article 2 Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3 Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 16 (3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 22 Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 25 (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

Article 29 (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

Article 7 Respect for private and family life

Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.

Article 19 Protection in the event of removal, expulsion or extradition

1. Collective expulsions are prohibited.

Article 21 Non-discrimination

1. Any discrimination based on any ground such as sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership

Article 22 Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity

The Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.

Article 24 The rights of the child

1. Children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being. They may express their views freely. Such views shall be taken into consideration on matters which concern them in accordance with their age and maturity.
2. In all actions relating to children, whether taken by public authorities or private institutions, the child's best interests must be a primary consideration.
3. Every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests.

Article 45

Freedom of movement and of residence

1. Every citizen of the Union has the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

3. Information for Individual Participants (Role Cards)

3.1 Role Card: Representative(s) of St. Samaritan Church

You initiated the roundtable and invited several stakeholders to participate. As the public face of the church, you are extremely concerned about the public perception of your actions and reputation, and feel somewhat victimized by your portrayal in the media. You have genuine humanitarian concerns for the well-being of the Roma—especially considering their historical treatment—but you also feel responsible for responding to your congregation's concerns.

To the public, you maintain that the Roma were asked to leave the church because of insufficient resources to house and feed all one hundred individuals. But in fact, there are a number of other reasons why you asked them to leave. As time went by, more and more members of the congregation became increasingly vocal in their opposition to the Roma's presence, protesting the disruption of church services due to the occupation of the church's facilities, as well as raising concerns about general sanitation issues—points that you agree with to some extent. Some members had also expressed concerns about organized begging taking place within the confines of the church, and their being solicited for money in the surrounding area.

In fact, you did not want to ask the Roma to leave, but saw no other option. Some Roma exhibited violence toward one another (particularly older males toward their family members), and you felt that you could not condone this behavior within the church. In addition, the facilities were rapidly becoming dirty and unmanageable with people coming in and out at all hours. There were way too many people in the Church and its facilities.

You hope that your leadership in organizing the roundtable will demonstrate to the public the church's genuine sense of charity and concern: that while you are unable to directly help the Roma, you are eager to mediate and resolve the situation in a collaborative manner. The ideal solution would be for the Roma to relocate to and remain at an asylum home managed by the city. You could imagine your institution then becoming involved as a social counsel.

Ultimately, you wish to refute judgments passed against you over the expulsion of the Roma, maintain a positive public image, and retain your symbolic and practical importance to the lives of Kohlwitzberg citizens.

Note: The question might come up why the Roma in the park were not invited to the table. You may share the following information with the participants of the round table discussion:

You established contact with the Roma in the park. None of the people you spoke with felt in a position to speak on behalf of the Roma families in the park vis-a-vis a formal body such as the roundtable. The Roma were unfamiliar with how German politics work and were very hesitant to enter a structured discussion with officials from the local government etc.

Your approach to have Roma voices in the discussion was to turn to the local Roma in your community and ask them to join.

3.2 Role Card: Representative(s) of City Council

You have been invited to the roundtable to represent the interests of the state and your constituency. You consider the Roma's presence in the park to constitute a major threat to public order. You view them as disturbers of the peace who generate excessive noise and waste, to the detriment of the surrounding neighborhood and broader community. In light of this threat, you would consider drastic measures such as officially requiring individual Roma to register to document their presence in your city.

In addition to your concerns about public order, you are also worried about the well-being of the Roma children. According to neighbors and policemen, unsupervised children have been roaming freely around the park and the surrounding neighborhoods at all hours of the night. The youth welfare office, which you also represent, sees an urgent need to protect these children from parental neglect and from what you consider squalid living conditions.

You are willing to enlist all of your connections and resources to ensure that the Roma leave the park. However, you fear that incentivizing the Roma's departure may create 'pull-factors' that attract even more Roma to your city. Given the fiscal difficulties your city already faces, this added burden would be very undesirable. You are therefore quite hesitant to accommodate the families or provide medical care for these unwanted migrants.

Ultimately, you favor collective deportation, but given that this would be an illegal act under European law, in its place you have opted to make their situation as uncomfortable as possible in order to prevent any sort of pull factor. The use of financial incentives to encourage their voluntary return might serve as a last resort, but is not the ideal scenario. In general, the most effective – i.e., less costly – solution is the former strategy. However, you are aware of Germany's violent and brutal history towards the Roma as a group, and wish to appear sensitive to the issue while avoiding any possible association with the nation's extremist past.

Overall, you regard the main responsibility as resting in the hands of the states from which the Roma immigrants originate. You strongly criticize the lack of

commitment on those countries' part regarding the educational, medical and social supports for this group. As European member states, they receive funds for this purpose, but are only spending a small portion in the manner intended. If those countries would create decent living conditions for the Roma, this unwanted migration would not be occurring in the first place.

3.3 Role Card: Representative(s) of Civil Rights for Minorities

You are part of a local branch of a transnational civil rights association that closely observes, and takes a strong stance against, any kind of discrimination against minorities in Europe. Your group has been monitoring the increasingly dangerous situation for Roma all over Europe, with growing concern. For example, you might quote the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navanethem Pillay, who said in a speech in September, 2009, that anti-Ziganism (i.e. hostility towards Roma) is on the rise. According to her, these Roma are subject to murder, severe abuse, and humiliation in many European states such as Hungary, Italy, and Slovakia. Despite their having legal status as citizens of EU member states, you are convinced that they face discrimination, violent expulsion, and general social exclusion in nearly every country within the EU.

You strongly oppose these developments, and advocate for fair and legal treatment as well as opposition to human rights violations committed against the Roma people. Given the massacre of half a million Roma that occurred in Nazi Germany, you believe that Germany has a special historical responsibility to ensure their safety. In your mind, the recent deportations of Roma, who came to Germany from Kosovo, back to an uncertain future in Kosovo is a clear sign of how ignorant and dangerous German policy towards Roma people can still be.

You have a very strong interest in supporting the Roma who live in your city, and take a strong stance against any move toward deporting them or pressuring them into "voluntary return". Your goal is that they be legally recognized as EU citizens who are part of a threatened minority; not "tourists". In fact, you see yourself as the only reliable ally of the Roma families, and would go so far as to identify yourselves as part of their group.

It was your decision to lead the Roma to the church, which you viewed as a necessary move in order to draw public attention to the discrimination and harassment the Roma families have had to endure in the city. Such political pressure is necessary to make these problems visible to decisionmakers.

In your opinion, the City Council should offer acceptable housing that meets the needs of the families: family members should be able to stay together, and not

be separated or isolated on the outskirts of the city. Furthermore, social support should be extended to those Roma who are unable to find work, and healthcare offered to those who are sick. The children should not in any circumstance be taken away from their families. You feel that the authorities have long neglected these basic rights, thereby endangering many children as well as adults. Therefore, you refuse to temper your criticism of the City Council and especially, the police, whom you regard as posing the greatest threat of all to the Roma's well-being.

Unfortunately, you are not able to provide housing yourselves, as the community building you share with other political and social groups has neither the capacity nor the facilities for a group this large. You definitely do not consider a longer stay in the park to be an option for the Roma; you fear another outburst of harassment, as well as illness and vulnerability to unpredictable weather conditions.

3.4 Role Card: Representative(s) of Kohlwitzberg Police

As representatives of the local law enforcement agency, you have been invited to the roundtable because you have been the recipients of several complaints from neighbors and shopkeepers regarding the Roma's presence in the city park.

While patrolling the area, you have had many encounters with members of the Roma minority, and have tried to make evident your disapproval of their staying in the park. For the sake of public order, you have taken on the responsibility of monitoring their behavior and movements by conducting frequent visits to their location. Should the City Council decide upon a forcible evacuation of the Roma from the park, you will be responsible for carrying it out.

In your view, the Roma in your city are illegal workers who find employment outside of the formal economy. You perceive them to be a menace—a threat to the public safety and order—due to a presumed inherent element of “Roma criminality” which accounts for their overrepresentation in delinquent activities such as petty theft, violent encounters, organized begging, and illegal work. Apart from this, you are also worried that the Roma's windshield-cleaning activities at busy traffic intersections constitutes a public safety hazard for all parties involved and provokes confrontations with local residents, which you must prevent.

However, you are concerned that you will be perceived as racist or unnecessarily discriminatory because of your vocal opposition to the Roma's stay in the park. Your aim is to be perceived as unbiased, yet firm—acting always in the best interest of the state and for the well-being of all Kohlwitzberg citizens. It is especially important for you to present yourself as a crucial voice at this meeting, given the possibility of budget cuts by the City Council due to the financial crisis. In the light of the trend toward increasing criminality in the city, a reduction in resources, equipment or personnel is the worst thing that could happen to the police force right now.

Therefore, your main priority is to remove the Roma from the park—and ideally, evacuate them from the city or even from the state—in the name of public order, and to advocate for this without allowing yourselves to be labeled as racist or

biased. In your ideal scenario, the Roma would leave voluntarily. However, if this cannot be achieved, you are determined only to concede to minimum compromises at the very least preventing the Roma from staying at the park, or in the city on a long-term basis. In order to sustain a positive public reputation and authority, you also see it as important to play a major role in the negotiation process, and thus would not favor an option where the police are excluded.

3.5 Role Card: Two Representative(s) of Local Roma

As two local Roma residents of Kohlwitzberg, you have been invited to act as cultural and linguistic mediators. You both feel the need to educate the other groups in the roundtable about the recent history of Roma settlement and integration in Germany, from their arrival in the 1960s as guest workers, to the 1990s after the war in the former Yugoslavia, when approximately 23,000 Roma immigrated. You share a mutual distrust and dislike of the Civil Rights Group, which pretends to speak on behalf of the Roma, but whom you see utilizing the Roma families for their left-wing agenda instead of having the Roma's best interests at heart.

More generally, you both want to raise awareness about the problem of exclusion, and give the Roma a more prominent voice in public affairs. You see yourselves as part of a group that is constantly discriminated against and typecast by mainstream society, and frequently abused and neglected by the very entity meant to protect your rights - the state. However, your approach to this issue is split.

Roma Representative 1: You are a well-established German citizen, who identifies first and foremost as German, and then Roma. You are sometimes confronted with negative perceptions of your ethnicity, which you feel are exacerbated by incidents generated by the traveling Roma. While the Roma suffer some injustices, you believe that they must stop traveling. You are currently the head of the local cultural Roma organization.

Since many traditional Roma customs have persisted in your family, you insist that Roma travelers can assimilate into society and still retain their unique cultural heritage.

You are very concerned about the way Roma are presented in the media and quite sensitive to anti-ziganistic stereotypes and derogatory comments about the Roma. Yet at the same time, you are concerned about the associations people will make between you and the negative publicity surrounding the camping Roma, and the possibility that your work at the cultural organization will be negatively affected.

You hope that the Roma will compromise and cooperate with the German authorities, and try to integrate themselves by seeking legal employment; thus you take a strong stance against them pursuing illegal work such as cleaning car windows at intersections. In your opinion, a temporary shelter provided by the city would be the best option at this moment.

Roma Representative 2: You have a strong distrust of the authorities. In your opinion, the St. Samaritan Church should have done more to support the poor families. You strongly accuse the police of discriminating against and harassing the families in the park.

Your main concern is that many of the Roma are in need of medical care, and that the City Council should do something about this. You also feel that if there is money to build huge memorials, it should be possible to accommodate one hundred people in a decent space. In fact, frustrated by the City Council's inaction, you have raised funds and organized basic medical care for those in urgent need. This didn't cost a fortune, so why can't the city step in?

Deportation is not an option. You strongly oppose measures taken by the German state against Roma from non-EU countries such as Kosovo, who have recently been deported back in huge numbers. You know about the difficult situations faced by Roma in their home countries, in no small part because you escaped the exact same situation, making a life here in Germany.

You get very angry at the leftist activists who have essentially pushed the Roma further into illegality—the families would have never squatted a church by themselves!

3.6 Role Card: Representative(s) of the Neighborhood & Shopkeepers' Association

Your Association was invited to the roundtable because you lodged complaints about the Roma to the police, and later the City Council; now, you feel the need to justify your complaints. You wish to demonstrate your concern for the community by protecting family values and advocating behavior which is more similar to your way of living. You are bothered by the uncontrollable amounts of waste and noise generated by the camping families. Other concerns relate to the lack of parental care which you observed when you saw unsupervised children wandering around the ground at all times, day and night. You feel that this situation constitutes an unsafe environment for your children. You also consider it a threat to your businesses, since profits might be affected if customers choose not to come because of the nearby park's unattractiveness.

Although you want the Roma to leave the park, you are concerned about being perceived as racist. Yet now that they are back a second time, you are increasingly desperate, as there seem to be fewer options left for moving them out of the park and your neighborhood. You disagree with the human rights activists and Roma representatives who advocate letting them stay, should they wish to do so. In your mind, those groups are essentially helping the Roma to remain in your city with the aid of welfare benefits that are paid by your taxes.

Now that the first temporary solution has failed, you are even more willing to take action, even if this means sending the Roma away or giving them housing in some other part of the city. In your view, there must be a permanent solution found to prevent the possibility of the Roma coming back to the park later this year, or in subsequent years. Meanwhile – at least, as best as possible – you would like to make sure that you are not labeled as racist and discriminatory.

To convince the other representatives at this meeting, you must decide upon the reasons why you do not want the Roma to camp in your neighborhood. These reasons include: dirtiness of the park, excessive waste in the park, bad parenting, excessive noise, loitering in the park, concerns about theft, loss of revenue, the loss of public space, and safety concerns.

3.7 Role Card: Representative(s) of Eastern European Embassy

Your role at the roundtable is to represent the interests and concerns of the Eastern European country from which the Roma in Kohlwitzberg originally come from. You wish to be perceived as an up-and-coming member state that can now be described as an upper-middle income country. The Roma issue threatens to overshadow this potential.

You are concerned that the waves of seasonal Roma migration from your country into richer EU states will continue to stigmatize the country as a “problem state”, and create conflict with other states.

The Roma issue has always been very problematic in your country. The public opinion in your country is that despite opportunities provided to the Roma, those generous services are generally wasted due to the Roma’s unwillingness to integrate and constitute a functioning part of society.

However, you maintain that as an EU member state, you grant the full rights and full protection to all your citizens, and any accusations depicting the Roma population as being marginalized in your country are completely false.

Ideally, one solution to this current situation would be to discourage Roma migration to Germany. By this reasoning, it is essential to be tough and especially, to avoid creating pull factors that will be attractive to seasonal migrants. However, you cannot state any of this publicly since you do not want to be perceived as discriminating against the Roma; instead, you must find an indirect way of expressing your interests.

In order to get your point across, you might wish to remind the other groups that the mayor of Helsinki succeeded in peacefully dispersing an improvised Roma settlement in 2009, on the grounds of sanitary restrictions and fire-hazard regulations. These people were taken care of by various NGOs. Given recent incidents in other parts of Germany and France, you believe that a tough “no tolerance” approach is needed.