

Mari Haverinen

DESIRE TO BELONG: CONTESTING THE VIEW OF IRISH TRAVELLERS AS  
DELEUZIAN AND GUATTARIAN NOMADS

Pro gradu-tutkielma

Kansainväliset suhteet

Kevät 2014

Lapin yliopisto, yhteiskuntatieteiden tiedekunta

Työn nimi: Desire to belong: Contesting the view of Irish Travellers as Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads

Tekijä: Mari Haverinen

Koulutusohjelma/oppiaine: Kansainväliset suhteet

Työn laji: Pro gradu -työ X Sivulaudaturtyö\_\_ Lisensiaatintyö\_\_

Sivumäärä: 69

Vuosi: Kevät 2014

Summary:

In my thesis I have discussed whether Irish Travellers could be considered to be Nomads in a way that French theorists Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari have developed the concept. Nomads in this context challenge and object the normative order set by the state and the mainstream society. My research is constructed around the concept of ethnicity and namely what Irish Travellers hope to gain with the ethnic status and how this relates to the ways how Travellers are controlled by the state. As a primary material I have used a report made by a Traveller support group which discusses the challenges which Irish Travellers are facing in today's Ireland and as a method I have used critical discourse analysis.

In my thesis I have discussed how physical nomadism plays a key role constructing Traveller identity and how physical nomadism relates to Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas about Nomadism. According to my findings Irish Travellers have a strong desire to be accepted by the mainstream society and to have an access to the resources controlled by the state. Irish Travellers want to be a part of the mainstream society hence keeping their own culture and be a part of the political process of the state. In the main chapters of my thesis I employ also other Deleuzian and Guattarian concepts like Faciality, Minority and Becoming in order to outline Travellers' relationship to Nomadism.

The conclusion in my thesis is that Irish Travellers cannot be considered Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. I have based this argument on my findings that according to my primary material Travellers have a strong desire to be included to the structures of the state and be respected by the main society. These require that Irish Travellers follow the rules set by the state and the mainstream society. There is however a possibility for Travellers to change the system in the context of becoming; by challenging the normative order by entering the state structures and the mainstream society.

Avainsanat: vastarinta; kontrolli; Irlanti; nomadismi

Muita tietoja:

Suostun tutkielman luovuttamiseen kirjastossa käytettäväksi\_X\_

Suostun tutkielman luovuttamiseen Lapin maakuntakirjastossa käytettäväksi\_\_

(vain Lappia koskevat)

## Table of contents

1. Introduction .....	2
1.1. Defining the Travellers .....	4
1.2. Research questions and primary material .....	6
1.3. Secondary material .....	8
1.4. Method .....	9
2. Theoretical framework .....	12
2.1. Power .....	13
2.2. Desire and Machines .....	14
2.3. War Machine .....	18
2.4. Nomads .....	19
2.5. Deleuze and Guattari in International Relations .....	21
2.6. Travellers as Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads .....	22
3. Physical nomadism as a cornerstone of Traveller identity .....	26
3.1. Nomadism and sedentarism in the social sciences .....	29
3.2. Deconstructing the dichotomy .....	30
4. Ethnicity Denial – Exclusion and Assimilation .....	33
4.1. What is ethnicity? .....	33
4.2. Irish national identity project and exclusion of Travellers .....	34
4.3. Media and the Travellers .....	36
4.4. Othering and Faciality .....	37
4.5. Exclusion and assimilation .....	41
5. Ethnic status as a state control .....	45
5.1. Minority and Majority .....	45
5.2. Ethnic status as a label .....	48
5.3. Resources and Travellers .....	50
5.4. Democracy and active citizens .....	52
6. Becoming-democratic – A way forward .....	56
6.1. Becoming .....	56
6.2. Becoming-democratic .....	58
7. Conclusions .....	62
8. Bibliography .....	65

# 1. Introduction

When reading to exams I came across with Julian Reid's book "The biopolitics of the war on terror". One chapter in his book discussed about the theory about Nomadism<sup>1</sup> in the context of war on terror. The exact part which caught my attention concluded that "Nomadic tendency, which Deleuze and Guattari argue can be demonstrated anthropologically and philosophically to define human life in its essence, refuses to accept and live within the territorial boundaries determined by the state." (Reid 2006, 43-44). After reading further I found out that this "Nomadic tendency" included much more than refusal to respect the physical borders between the countries.

Before this encounter nomadism for me had been all about physical movement from place to place. Nomads for me had been living in Sahara or in Siberia moving where ever they found food for their herd. Nomadism that was discussed in Reid's book had nothing to do with physical movement, it was something more profound. This Nomadism was more mental and it was in relation to the society and its structures. The goal of these Nomads was not to move from one physical point to another but to stay outside the realm of everything that was structured or regulated. This theory of Nomads is formulated by French theorists Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.

I got very interested about the theory and started to think who could be the Nomads in our world today. Or could there even be people that could be called Nomads, people that would live outside all structures and control. Or have control and structures penetrated in every single action we perform in our society today. After playing with this idea for a while my thoughts came across with a group that I had seen during my trips to Ireland: Irish Travellers<sup>2</sup>.

Irish Travellers are not to be confused with Irish tourists because this has nothing to do with them. Irish Travellers are a group that has many similarities to Roma communities around the world and one of their special characteristics is physical movement from place to place i.e. nomadism (I will discuss this more in the latter chapters). When travelling in Ireland I had noticed that Travellers are very distinct from the main society. Often they looked different, had different habits and sometimes spoke strange language. However, what made them to stand out the most, was the way how the main society regarded them and how they spoke

---

<sup>1</sup> Whenever there might be a threat of confusion I will use capital letters when talking about concepts.

<sup>2</sup>From now on I will use a capital "T" when talking about Irish Travellers and Traveller population in the British isles in general.

about them. Travellers were portrayed often as misfits or menace; they broke places, did not respect the law, they were dirty and backward.

I found Travellers to be somehow anarchistic; They did not seem to care what other people thought about them and they did not seem to want to fit to the normal way of life in Ireland. I heard a story that when a Traveller family was given a subsidized house, they put their horses in to it and stayed themselves in their caravan. I also saw one Sunday how a Traveller community was attending Church and came to conclusion that the clothing that the younger girls were wearing would be frowned upon among the mainstream society. These and other encounters brought an idea to my head: Could Irish Travellers be Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads?

Besides my personal interest to this topic I find this question about different groups and their relations to the state and control to be very current and interesting. The question about nation states and their future in the globalized world, where they are not necessarily the main actors anymore, has been one of the main topics during my studies. Questions about the future of the nation state system and national identities have definitely been present in the discussions around international relations during the time I have spent at the university.

Also I find my topic relevant because of the current situation of the Irish Travellers in the Republic of Ireland<sup>3</sup>. In Ireland Travellers' request for ethnic status has been out for the past couple of years. On the other hand in the UK, but also around the Europe Travellers have been well presented in the tabloid magazines (for example housing issues and their presence in the tv-series like Celebrity Big Brother or My Fat Gypsy Wedding). I have also hoped to create something new, after all this should be the goal of every thesis and when I started I was sure that I was the first one to connect Deleuzian and Guattarian concepts with Irish Travellers, however, as I will show later in my study, I was wrong.

In this introductory chapter I will outline who are Irish Travellers. After this I will present my primary material and place my research questions. I will also briefly outline my secondary material which I have used in my study and discuss my method when searching for the answers from my primary material.

---

<sup>3</sup>In my thesis by Ireland I will refer to the Republic of Ireland.

## ***1.1. Defining the Travellers***

Making definitions and drawing borders is always risky business. By making definitions we produce reality, build the world around us and put labels on things. This is a problem that we face in postmodern world: on the other hand we produce reality with our actions but without definitions we would not have anything to grasp on. In my thesis, however, it is important to discuss who are Irish Travellers and give some kind of definition of them. Irish Travellers are the subjects in my study and for the reader it is important to be able to place them into a wider context – especially when this group is not so well known outside the Ireland and UK. However, I have been critical when defining Irish Travellers, so that the definitions would not be too restricted nor too superficial, after all the main question in my thesis is constructed around control.

Defining Irish Travellers<sup>4</sup> is not an easy task. As Robbie McVeigh (2008, 92) points out the best starting point is to conclude that Irish Travellers are "[...] self defined people known to themselves as *Minceir* or *Pavees* and more generally as Irish Travellers or Travellers." This becomes clear also from my main research material; Travellers consider themselves a group distinct from the main society, yet identify themselves strongly as Irish.

According to the latest, 2011 census there are approximately 30 000 Travellers living in the Republic of Ireland.<sup>5</sup> Irish Travellers can be found also outside the borders of the Republic of Ireland. There is Irish Traveller population also in Northern Ireland, UK and in the States. Also it is noteworthy that some Travellers are still nomadic and travel also further away like to Australia. It should be noted here that Travellers living in UK are often perceived as a separate group from the Travellers living in Ireland.

The discussion around the origin of the Travellers has mainly focused on defining who are the genuine, authentic Travellers, and trying to separate them from the fake ones. (e.g. Richardson 2006, 20.) According to Clark (2006, 11) we can highlight three "broad and inclusive" groups: Roma, Gypsies and Travellers. However, defining the origins of the Irish Travellers has always had a political agenda as Jane Helleiner (1995) points out in her article. The question of origin has several implications to the policies but also to everyday lives of Irish Travellers. In Northern Ireland Travellers have been granted an ethnic status whereas in south, in the Republic of Ireland Travellers are not considered and ethnic minority. In the Republic

---

<sup>4</sup>Also known with more derogatory terms: pikey, tinker, knacker.

<sup>5</sup>Exact number in April 2011 was 29 573, which makes 0.6% of the total population in Ireland.

Travellers are defined a nomadic group which has policy implications in regards of their living conditions but not for anything else. This example partly shows how complicated it is to define who the Travellers are. (McVeigh 2008, 92.)

As Greenfields points out (2008, 76) the most explicit way to define Travellers is to conclude that they are Others. According to Greenfields Travellers have throughout the history been subject to legislative measures which aim has been to control the Traveller population and especially their nomadic tendencies. Travellers have been a population to which the mainstream sedentary people have mirrored themselves to; Travellers have been something that the mainstream population do not want to be. Greenfields have quoted ni Shuinear that "[...] sedentary Irish population have 'very strong, uncomfortable feelings about [Irish Travellers] because they are a reminder of who and what they themselves used to be'". (Ibid.)

The origins of Irish Travellers are often traced back to the India and to the same roots where Roma people came from (e.g. Greenfields 2008). However, as I discussed in the previous chapter, defining ones origin has always a political agenda and in the post-colonial Ireland and especially in the Anglo-Irish literary Travellers were often portrayed as "[...] being the most closely linked to ancient Ireland" (Helleiner 1995, 545) and thus considered to be more Irish than others. After the birth of the independent Ireland the Catholic bourgeoisie however wanted to exclude Travellers from the new nation state and assimilate them to the wider society. Travellers were considered to be ill fitting to the new Ireland and because of this they were left out (Helleiner 1995, 549.) I will discuss this more in the following chapter.

In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century emerged a view that Travellers would not have so long ranging history but they would be Irish peasants that would have had to leave their homes because of economic reasons (Helleiner & Szuchewycz 1997, 110-111; Helleiner 1995, 549). This view was supported by a research that concluded that genetically Irish Travellers are undoubtedly Irish ancestry. This research also concluded that according to the genetical structure Irish Travellers are a mixture of people from different areas in Ireland. (North, Martin & Crawford 2000, 463.) Thus, approached from this angle, Irish Travellers do very much belong to Ireland. Interesting point here however is, that this kind of genetical research has been made at the first place; defining who Travellers are and where they are coming from have been and continues to be under scrutiny.

According to Helleiner (1995, 550) Travellers are in the modern Ireland posing a new classifications by the supranational level. Helleiner points out that where wider European gypsy community is based on their Indian origins are Irish Travellers once again forced into the margin. Also there are different groups among Travellers too (for example different Travellers groups in England, Scotland and Ireland). Probably the most notable of these is between so called ethnic Travellers and New Travellers. New Travellers are usually defined a nomadic group consisting of people who opted out from the society in the 1960's and are still living on the roads. (Clark 1999, 125-128.)

As I have shown, Irish Travellers can be defined in many ways and these definitions have never been without a political agenda. Because my thesis is intertwined together with the themes of inclusion, exclusion and identity, I will get back to these definitions later in my study. This chapter has, thus, given a broad definition of Irish Travellers and where they might be coming from.

## ***1.2. Research questions and primary material***

My thesis is constructed around the concepts of control and resistance. I am interested of the mobility in our world and the movement which transgresses and questions social and physical borders. In my thesis I have chosen Irish Travellers and their lifestyle as my object. In a broader sense I am interested how the Travellers are controlled and how, if at all, they are escaping this control. I have chosen Gilles Deleuze's and Felix Guattari's concept of Nomadism as my theoretical backbone. Because of their extensive work and vast array of concepts which are all tightly connected, I have also taken some of these other concepts to my study. However, my goal has not been to test their theories in empiria, but to find new ways of seeing Irish Travellers and their relationship to the Irish state and society in general.

To narrow down my topic I have chosen a certain theme concerning the Traveller community: ethnicity. Irish Travellers do not have an ethnic minority status in the Republic of Ireland and Irish Travellers have been campaigning to get this status formalized. Thus, I have asked two questions from my research material: *Are Travellers Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads?* And, *What are the Irish Travellers trying to gain with the ethnic status, and what implications does this have to the ways in which they are controlled?*



The starting point in my study has been to study the discourses which are produced by the Irish Travellers themselves. I have wanted to study what is the Travellers point of view and what kind of discourses they have produced and are producing in connection to the petition for ethnic status in Ireland. Thus, my main concern in finding the material which would answer my questions has been to find something that would be produced by the Travellers themselves. It has been challenging to find written material produced by Travellers which would at least somehow represent the Traveller community in Ireland.<sup>6</sup>

My initial plan was to find newspaper articles written by Travellers, but this proved to be almost impossible. The petition for ethnic status has caused discussion in the newspapers but mainly among the main society – not so much by the Travellers themselves. One, and probably the most interesting option would have been to do interviews. This would have been the best way to include individual Travellers' voice to my study. However due to resources, conducting interviews in Ireland was not possible in my thesis.

After a long search I decided to use a shadow report which was written as a reply for Irish government's report on the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD). This shadow report was published in January 2011 by Pavee Point, a non-governmental Travellers' Centre which aim is to support the Human Rights for Irish Travellers. According to Pavee Point's webpage, the organization is comprised of Travellers but also majority population which together try to "[...] address the needs of Travellers as a minority group experiencing exclusion and marginalisation."

The report (42 pages) itself consists different chapters each discussing different issue that Travellers face in the Republic of Ireland today. One of these chapters discusses Travellers' quest for an ethnic status in Ireland and it gives recommendations to the Irish government how to improve Travellers' situation. I have used this specific chapter as my primary material in answering the questions which I outlined earlier.

At this point a question of the actor is valid; is it justified to refer to the whole Irish Traveller community based on *one* report published by *one* organization? Request for ethnicity is stemming from several sources, for example from Irish Traveller Movement but also from the mainstream population. However, Pavee Point has probably been one of the most vocal in the

---

<sup>6</sup>Travellers do not have very much of literal history and like may other groups they have passed their history to other generations verbally.

quest. Their report also provides most "structured" address concerning this issue which also was one of the reasons why I chose to use it for my material. Naturally it is impossible to say that some report or text would represent the whole community – there is always as many opinions as there is people.

Of course there are Travellers who do not agree with the arguments which Pavee Point is presenting for the petition for ethnic status. However, some kind of generalizations must be made in order to conduct a study – otherwise there would not be anything to grasp on. From its own point of view, Pavee Point is representing the whole Traveller community, which, I argue, is one of the reasons why it is valid to use one report by one organization as my research material. In my thesis I have tried to point out whenever possible that my primary material is made by one single organization.

### ***1.3. Secondary material***

There is quite a bit previous study about Travellers and Roma people in general. When searching for books and articles I have tried to concentrate on Travellers and especially on Irish Travellers. I have tried to narrow down the material even more to the Irish Travellers because my research has been conducted in the context of the Republic of Ireland; In my study my starting point has been that Irish Travellers are first and foremost an Irish group hence being closely linked to Travellers living in Britain. Thus, I have used studies of Travellers in Britain also in my study cause I see that there is several points where these groups interlink – after all, Travellers travel and especially in the Republic of Ireland cross border between these two countries quite often.

I will discuss more detailed in the following chapters about my main theory of Nomadism and how it has been employed when studying Travellers, and give a brief summary here what kind of research in general has been made of Travellers before. One of the common topics has been how Travellers have been portrayed in the public media. Joanna Richardson (2006), Peter Kabachnik (2010), Jane Helleiner and Bohdan Szuchewycz (1997), and Rachel Morris (2006) have all written about this and concluded that Travellers are portrayed in negative light and excluded from the main society. These studies also show how discursive methods are used when making difference between Travellers and other parts of the society.

Another common topic was legislation and how it has changed during the centuries. David Smith and Margaret Greenfields (2007 & 2012), Colin Clark (2007) and Robbie McVeigh (2007) have all written about Travellers and their relationship to state and especially to its legal structures. Common finding has been that Travellers and Gypsies in general have been an object of vast range of different kind of regulations during the centuries, but also that Travellers should be more included to the policies in the UK and Ireland today. Robbie McVeigh (1997) and Sally Kendall (1997) on the other hand have discussed about the relationship between the Travellers and the sedentary society and Travellers' place in the margin. The theme of nomadism and Travellers' mobile lifestyle has been present in several studies because it has been but also continues to be one of the corner stones of the Traveller identity.

#### ***1.4. Method***

During my studies one concept has been much more popular than others: discourse. Thus it has been quite easy for me also to approach my thesis topic from the discursive point of view. A very common mantra in the post modern world has been that the social reality around us is discursively constructed, which means that there is no facts and the presentation of social reality is always connected to the one who is presenting it. What is a discourse? I define discourse as a set of verbal, non-verbal, visual or written practices which we use to describe the world around us. Thus, there are as many social realities as there is different descriptions.

Norman Fairclough (124, 2003) concludes that

”[...] discourses [are] ways of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the 'mental world' of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world. [...] Different discourses are different perspectives of the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world.”

Discourse is very closely linked to the power and the production of power relations. Jäger and Maier (2009, 36-37) write about power *of* discourse and power *over* discourse. Where discourse produces reality, instead of only describing it, there is always also someone using the discourse. Notable here however should be that discourses are never under a control of a

single person; no one alone can over take a discourse nor a single paper alone can produce a discourse. But there is still a source where the discourse started and where it was produced initially. At some point discourses start to live their own life and no one has a full control of their content or the direction where they are heading. There is also stronger and weaker discourses, some discourses are dominant and hence obscure the weaker ones. (Ibid.)

Because of the popularity of discourse in social sciences, for the past decade one of the most popular research methods has been namely discourse analysis. I have chosen discourse analysis also the method for my study. However, I have especially chosen critical discourse analysis (CDA) in my research. The main thing that differentiates critical discourse analysis from the other branches of discourse analysis is, that CDA looks beyond the text<sup>7</sup> and includes the surrounding society and its structures to the analyzing process. According to Norman Fairclough (202-203, 2003), the main goal of CDA is to make the life better for all by understanding better "how societies work". According to Fairclough (ibid.) one discourse is always more prominent and powerful than others. The aim of the CDA is to research and make visible the discourse structures which are connected to the use of power and control in the society.

CDA works between the micro and the macro levels; it works between the words and the social structures in the society. The research material in CDA is connected to wider scale and to wider structures. Somebody might say something in a speech (micro level) which in turn reflects for example the legal structures of the state (macro level). (Van Dijk, 352.) The total opposite for critical discourse analysis is analytical discourse analysis. Where critical discourses analysis starts from an assumption that there is power relations which need to be included to the study, stays analytical discourse analysis inside the primary material. (Jokinen & Juhila 2009, 86.)

In my study I have chosen CDA because it includes the social structures in to the research. I am interested how discourses reflect and form bigger structures in the society. In my study the starting point has been that there exists certain power relations between different groups and these power relations are also maintained by discourses. By producing texts and speech main society and Travellers have adjusted their relation to one another. Even though according to Fairclough (ibid.) one of the main goals of critical discourse analysis is to generate

---

<sup>7</sup>Text are not the only material in discourse analysis. Also pictures and other visual materials can be used as material and they can also be source of different discourses.

emancipation and to bring the voices of the quiet ones to heard, I have not approached my material with rigid and fixed perceptions of the relationship of Travellers and main society in Ireland.

Even though it has been very clear from the start that the main discourse belongs to the Irish state and main society, I have approached the material with an open mind hoping to bring a new viewpoint to the discussion but also to approach it critically from a different angle. However, this is not to say that I would try to ignore these previous viewpoints, I have just tried to grasp the topic from the other side and find a way to say something that others haven't said yet – naturally this always should be the goal when doing research.

Also, it should be noted, that because of my analyzing method, my thesis tends to look more beyond the primary research material. There is many papers written about Irish Travellers or Travellers in the UK using discourse analysis as a method. These studies have mainly concentrated on questions of racism or the dichotomy between us / others. For example Joanna Richardson (2006) has made research about how the discourse in the main society (media, politics) is used to control but also to add antipathy towards the Gypsies and Travellers. Peter Kabachnik (2010) on the other hand has studied British newspapers in order to show how the media discourse helps to strengthen the difference between nomadic and sedentaristic ways of lives.

In this section of my thesis I have discussed why I chose Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomadism and Irish Travellers as my thesis topic. I have also set my research questions, outlined who Irish Travellers are and presented my analysis method. In the next chapter I will discuss more detailed the theory of Nomadism. Theory chapter might look like a bit heavy but because of the extensive nature of the theory of Nomadism and Deleuze's and Guattari's views in general, I argue, that in my thesis more profound discussion of the theory is needed before moving on to the research findings. Research findings are presented in three chapters after the theory and they are summarized in the conclusions.

## 2. Theoretical framework

As discussed in the previous chapter my thesis is constructed around resistance and control. The main question in my thesis concerns the Irish Travellers and their relationship to the state and society. I am interested to know whether Travellers could be Nomads in Deleuzian and Guattarian sense and what in fact Irish Travellers are hoping to gain with the status of an ethnic minority.

Because my thesis is strongly connected to a certain theoretical framework I argue that it is very important to discuss it separately in my thesis. The way how Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari have approached the world we live in differs quite a bit from what I have learned during my years at the university. Also because of this I find it relevant to map their world view a bit more extensively before going to the main chapters of my study. With this theory chapter I will also show how I have understood Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas.

Traditionally nomadism refers to physical movement from place to place. Nomads can be found from Sahara or from Siberia. Nomads are people who pack their tents and belongings and move with their herds. For them nomadism is a way of life but also a way to stay alive; nomads have been following their herds for centuries to places where the grass is greener. There also exists modern nomads who do not move because their livelihoods depend on it but because they do not want to stay in one place or settle down. They also pack their bags and move to places where life is more interesting and more fulfilling. In my thesis, by nomadism, I do not however mean physical movement from place to place; for me nomadism is something more profound.

In my thesis I have used the concept of Nomadism as Deleuze and Guattari have developed it. Nomadism was mostly discussed in the book called *Thousand Plateaus* which followed their first co-written book *Anti-Oedipus*<sup>8</sup>. Gilles Deleuze and his ideas are more known the field of international relations. However, cause in my thesis I have used mostly the works that Deleuze has co-written with Felix Guattari I will refer to them both, not only to Gilles Deleuze.

In this section of my thesis I will place my study in the broader field of international relations and discuss previous studies made from this topic. I will define my main concepts but also

---

<sup>8</sup>From now on, I will refer to *Anti-Oedipus* by AO and to *Thousand Plateaus* by TP.

discuss a bit more extensively Deleuze's and Guattari's general world view in order to place my study into it. I will start by discussing what power means in this framework and then move on to Nomadism. I will finish this section to a chapter which I have named as the hypothesis chapter, in which I will discuss why it is relevant to argue that Irish Travellers are Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomads.

## ***2.1. Power***

Before discussing about resistance or escaping I need to discuss about the concept of power and how it has been conceptualized in the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework. In the realist international relations power is something that somebody has or does not have. Power is something that the states use against each other in the battlefields or in the negotiation rooms; power is money, guns and men. Somebody can force someone else to do something by using power. In *Thousand Plateaus*, which has been my main theoretical source in this thesis, Deleuze and Guattari do not explicitly discuss about power. Thus, I will use Paul Patton's interpretation but also Deleuze's and Guattari's contemporary's, Michel Foucault's ideas to describe how power should be seen in the Deleuze's and Guattari's framework.

Foucault's and Deleuze's and Guattari's views about power and works in general can be seen intersecting in many places, one of these being the approach to the concept of power (Patton 2000, 49; see also Reid 2006, 43). Thus, I will start this definition from Foucault. Foucault formulates his ideas about power in the first book of *"The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality: 1"*, which was first published in 1976 (1998). In this book Foucault argues that power was not anymore coming from above, from neither the sovereign ruler nor the state who could decide who has right to live. From the 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards power transformed into something that was not anymore placed upon the citizens by the ruler; power was now something that was spread around the population by making them to control themselves and to regulate their behavior and bodily functions. (Foucault 1998, 92-93.)

Foucault connects this transformation into the birth of capitalism. When the goal was to ensure productivity it was not wise to kill the citizens. Instead state started to make sure that they lived longer and healthier life so they could benefit the state more. (Ibid., 140-141.) According to Foucault power does not refer to institutions or mechanisms (court, police etc.) which would act as vehicles of power, neither does power refer to violence. Also power is not a situation where one group would use it against another. For Foucault power is something

much more complex. Power cannot be traced to one point; it is everywhere, it can be found in all relationships and all sections of our society. (Ibid., 92-93.) Thus it is not important to ask where the power is coming from but to discuss how it is used. (Deleuze 1999, 60.) In this context power does not have a source. It is not something that the ruling bourgeoisie class (Marxist's idea) would pose to the citizens. Power is something that is circulating among us and it is not something that someone would have or not have: power is everywhere and it is penetrated in our everyday lives. (Foucault 2003, 29.)

According to Patton (2000, 49-56) power is a force and our world is formed of different forces from whom some are more powerful than others. As an example Patton uses law and public opinion; in some cases public opinion might be stronger than law and in some cases it might be other way around. Forces are never alone either; they are always in relation to other forces and therefore have a possibility to act but also to be acted upon. When forces join together, they form a body. A political party, an institution or a friendship can act as a body. A body can increase its power by joining together with other bodies, by capturing other bodies or setting constraints, which will diminish the force of other bodies. (Deleuze 1999, 59-60; see also Patton 2000, 52.) Thus, power can be found everywhere and some power formations are stronger than others.

The cornerstone here is that force, as a power is not set upon us by a single actor nor it is coming from a single source. Our whole social sphere is full of forces which are joined together in order to reach goals. Next I will take a step forward and discuss force and bodies in the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework; namely concepts of desire and the machine.

## ***2.2. Desire and Machines***

In the core of the Deleuzian and Guattarian world view is a concept of *Desire*. As Doty (2003, 6-7) has mentioned in her study, there is no point of trying to make desire as a scientific concept. According to her by forcing Desire into the molds of the international relations' theories we would only "[...] strip it down to a sterile, inert construct". As Doty has put it (2003, 10) "Desire is an unbounded, free-floating energy, which becomes coded and channeled in particular ways as it attaches itself to the social body whose prime function is to codify its flows, inscribe them, channel and regulate them".



Thus, we are surrounded by flows which are an object of suppression. "There is no such thing as the social production of reality on the other hand, and a desiring-production that is mere fantasy on the other. [...] There is only desire and the social, and nothing else." (AO, 31). Desire is something that is always present. Desire is not lacking anything. It should be seen as a positive force, capable of doing things not as a lack (Patton 2000, 70). Desire is the force behind everything; it is a movement behind all social actions. At this point I will conclude that forces are joined together forming a body which in turn follows the desire to reach certain goals.

According to Deleuze and Guattari flows of desire are channeled and regulated towards certain goals. When discussing this channeling Deleuze and Guattari use variety of concepts; free flowing desires are regulated by overcoding, reterritorializing and striating. These actions are done by machines. There exists different kind of machines and all of them work differently and have different goals<sup>9</sup>. Every society is formed according to the principle that the machine holds. Machinic processes are, along with the concept of Desire, in the core of Deleuzian and Guattarian theories. For Deleuze and Guattari social life is a machine. A single machine includes all the social, material and economical processes which are carried out in a certain unit. A machine organizes and channels the flows and directs them into a certain end, thus the main idea of a machine is to control all the flows. (Patton 2000, 88.)

Deleuze and Guattari point out that different machines are not stages of an evolutionary process and it should be remembered that all of these forms of machines exist in our world today. (See for example Patton 2000, 100.) The first machine is the primitive territorial machine. Primitive territorial machine does not have different organs for control, it does not need them. The machine codes all the members to be part of it and it works based on kinships and lateral alliances. The main goal for territorial machine is to prevent all kind of processes that might lead to the formation of the State<sup>10</sup>. If the primitive territorial machine does not succeed in this, the next step according to Deleuze and Guattari is the formation of a despotic machine. Despot detaches itself from the primitive society and overcodes all the primitive alliances into itself forming deity. Despotic machine does not crush the territorial lineages but overcodes them to its own system. Overcoding is the way how also the modern nation state is

---

<sup>9</sup>From Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas I have differentiated four different machines (territorial-, despotic-, State- and capitalist machine, whereas for example Patton (2000, 88) discusses only about three machines (territorial-, despotic- and capitalist machine).

<sup>10</sup>As with Nomadism, when referring to a concept I will use capital letter in beginning, hence as a Deleuzian and Guattarian concept State is written with a capital S.

born. (TP, 472-483; Patton 2000, 90-91.)

In the modern nation state the despot has become invisible. State is not a real social formation, "[...] abstract State may be internalized in a field of decoded social forces such as private property, commodity production, and class relations; it may also be spiritualized in a metaphysical or religious system which overcodes everything." (Goodchild 1996, 97). State machine is capable of de- and re-coding by which Deleuze and Guattari mean processes where the machine gives new meanings to things (TP, 472) and thus attaches them to itself. State also re- and deterritorializes: the biggest difference from the despotic machine is that State makes territory as its object, it creates a homeland (Patton 2000, 92).

According to Doty (2003, 9-10) "Statecraft is Desire". Counter to the traditional international relations theory State does not exist; it is not an actor or a fixed entity. State machine is trying to capture all the flows and decode them so that they would serve the goals of the State. These flows of desire do not come from any certain point; they are present in the actions of immigrant police on the borders or in the work that apartheid police conducted in South Africa. The desire for State is present in the celebrations after the win the ice hockey world cup or in the racist attacks against immigrants.

Doty (1999, 594) also argues that the line between the civil society and the State is very dim. For Doty, State produces by channeling the flows of Desire at the same time being a product of its own controlling. As I noted earlier State is not an actor itself, but, as Goodchild (1996, 97) puts it "[State] only attains concrete existence when it serves other interests such as those of the dominant classes." Hence, State is not just out there, hanging on us like a cloud, there is always a Majority which benefits from the desire of the State (I will discuss more about Majority later in my thesis). Thus, State cannot be reduced to the legal structures or to the government. Like power and control, State is everywhere.

We are, however, not living in a world where all the flows would have been captured by the State machine. Migrant workers and capital are outside the State realm and thus form yet another machine: the capitalist one. "Capitalism is the limit of 'universal history', the outside of all societies because it is the socius of decoded and deterritorialized flows [...]" (Goodchild 1996, 100). Where the previous machines worked via territorializations, does the capitalist machine the opposite. Territory is not the object of the capitalist machine; capitalism creates flows of capital and workers, which have been captured in the State machine. (Patton 2000,

92; see also TP, 501.) Thus, capitalist machine is constantly challenging the State machine and questioning its borders.

The question between control and escape is clearly presented when Deleuze and Guattari outline Desire always moves between two poles: paranoiac and schizophrenic (see for example AO, 373). Paranoiac pole is strongly present in the State when it tries in every way control and channel the flows of Desire. Schizophrenic pole on the other hand is the essence in the capitalist machine. The goal of the capitalist machine is to free all the flows; capitalist machine is all about free movement of labor and capital. Capitalist machine challenges the borders of the State apparatus. Paranoiac pole is the creator of the striated space where schizophrenic pole produces smooth space. According to Reid (2006, 53) sovereign nation state is in a core of a constant struggle between the liberalist powers (for example United Nations or free capital) which undermine modern nation state's existence, and its own centralizing forces.

”The prime function incumbent upon the socius, has always been to codify the flows of desire, to inscribe them, to record them, to see to it that no flow exists that is not properly damned up, channeled, regulated. When the primitive *territorial machine* proved inadequate to the task, the *despotic machine* set up a kind of overcoding system. But the *capitalist machine*, insofar as it was built on the ruins of a despotic State more or less far removed in time, finds itself in a totally new situation: it is faced with the task of decoding and deterritorializing the flows.” (AO, 35)

State in essence is a violent formation. The purpose of the State is to de- and reterritorialize the flows. Deleuze and Guattari are not talking about criminal violence here, but a structural violence. With reterritorializations State machine forces everything under its control. Another characteristic of State violence is that it presupposes itself. ”State [...] uses violence only against the violent, against 'criminals' - against primitives, against nomads – in order that peace my reign” (TP, 495). This is also the reason why it is very hard to pinpoint where this structural violence happens. (TP 494-495.) According to Patton (2000, 113) State relies on the structural violence which ”[...] institutional manifestations are juridical and penal institutions of capture and punishment such as police and prisons.”

Capitalist machine is not the only schizoforce that is challenging the State machine by destroying the striated space of the State from above; this is also done by the war machine and the Nomads from below, which I will discuss more detailed in the following chapter.

### ***2.3. War Machine***

If the State machine is the capturer of the flows, what happens outside its realm? What happens to those flows that cannot be channeled? Or is there even a possibility that there would exist free floating flows, is everything under control? For Deleuze and Guattari this is possible and they have several concepts to describe this area which is not captured by any of the machines I discussed earlier. This area which is not under the State control is a smooth space, a War machine which is inhabited by Nomads, who make lines of flight whenever the control is reaching them (Patton 2000, 66). All of these concepts carry positive force with them. In this section I will discuss three of these concepts: War machine, Nomadism and the lines of flight. In the later chapters I will employ these concepts further.

War Machine is something totally different than the name presumes. It has nothing to do with neither the war itself nor the traditional weaponry. Deleuze and Guattari's war machine has totally different goals than traditional war. Traditional war aims to control whereas war machine targets for lines of flight and deterritorializations. I agree with Paul Patton when he suggests in his book (2000, 110) that we should rather speak about "machine of metamorphosis" because the essence of War machine is to cause change not to destroy (see also TP, 483).

War machine should be seen as a counterforce to the State. As Deleuze and Guattari have put it "[War machine] seems to be irreducible to the State apparatus, to be outside its sovereignty and prior to its law: it comes from elsewhere" (TP, 388). When the purpose of the State apparatus, as I discussed in the previous chapter, is to capture the flows, the purpose of the War machine is to set them free and unleash the potential that the flows carry with them.

As Patton (2000, 110) notes War machine can work in different ways; it can work in the level of thought (for example an artist) or in physical way (for example Travellers' nomadism) – in the both cases the purpose is to resist the capture, the overcoding of the State apparatus. (See also TP, 398.) If put into a historical context War machine can be seen actualized in two non-state actor levels: in a level of ecumenical organizations (like religion) or in the level of

marginal communities (like Irish Travellers) (Patton 2000, 111). In the Travellers' case the war machine is coming from both of these directions; Irish Travellers are a marginal social group in Ireland but also belong to the bigger Roma family in Europe.

However, even though War machine is pointed towards lines of flight and deterritorializations, it should be noted that after a deterritorialization there is always a reterritorialization. An absolute line of flight or a deterritorialization would end up in a total destruction, so thus, there is always some place where to reterritorialize again. From this point of view, power is everywhere – yet the question here is, how this power works. The goal for lines of flight is to move away, towards the exterior end of the power. (Reid 2003, 73-74.)

Patton (2000, 111-112) argues that the essential difference between the State apparatus and the War machine is their relation to space. However, it should be stressed that space here does not refer only to physical space; Nomadism cannot be reduced only in opposition sedentarism (I will discuss in the following chapters in my study). State machine places more importance to the points along the paths, whereas the paths are more important in the space which the War machine is occupying. (Ibid. 112.)

Deleuze and Guattari (TP, 420) write about smooth and striated space in connection to war machine and Nomadism. According to Deleuze and Guattari State apparatus produces striated space whereas War machine operates on smooth space. The easiest way to approach this is to say that State apparatus forms borders between other states and inside itself, whereas war machine tries to ward off these borders. Besides forming physical borders State apparatus striates the space by channeling flows of people, ideas, capital, products and so on. All kinds of regulations, laws but also for example preferred social behavior are striatization which the State machine performs and which the War machine tries to resist.

#### ***2.4. Nomads***

Nomads and the war machine are on the same side; "The war machine is the invention of the nomads [...]." (TP, 419) If the war machine is a smooth space, a machine capable for change and metamorphosis, then Nomads are the people living in this smooth space outside the capture of the State. Nomads are people that can make a change; they are the ones that question the "normal" and challenge the conventional ways of being and doing things. "Nomadism involves any activity that transgresses contemporary social codes through the

dissolution of cultural and territorial boundaries.” (Doty 2003, 39.) Nomads do lines of flight when they escape the control and the normalizing power of the State machine. All social actions that we do that do not fit to the norm can be considered to be Nomadism; challenging the normal is Nomadism.

As discussed earlier physical movement is not the goal of Nomads, like war is not the goal of the war machine. However, it should be noted that points are not totally insignificant for Nomads even though they do not have the same importance for Nomads than they have for others. Also Nomads have rules too, but it is the way Nomads are organized in the smooth place that makes them different from the State machine and makes them to challenge the order of the State. In Nomad packs there are no centralized power structures. (TP 420.) Nomads also have a connection to the land, but it is different than for the State; according to Patton (2000, 117) Nomads connect to the land but they do not make it their homeland or a motherland.

Doty (2003) uses illegal immigrants as an example of Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. According to Doty illegal immigrants move across state borders challenging at the same time the physical and the mental unity of the nation state. They bring with them strange habits and question and cross the borders in a way that is not acceptable. However, Nomadism cannot be extended to illegal immigrants. Immigrants do not move on their free will, they are often forced to move by political or economic reasons. Migrant also leaves things behind, immigrant moves from point to point even though the next point might not always be so clear. Nomad on the other hand does not leave anything behind because there is not a place or a point which he could leave behind: the space Nomad dominates is a smooth one without points or places, a space where the journey is more important than the destination. (TP 419; see also Patton 2000, 116)

Julian Reid (2006) has employed Nomadism in his study about terrorism. According to Reid, in the context of liberal humanist practices, liberal powers like United Nations or non-governmental organizations do not deterritorialize the flows but instead help to reterritorialize them and thus have the same mission than the State machine. Reid argues that even in the era of liberalism our lives stay under control, there can be found ways in which resistance is possible, namely Nomadism. For Reid Terrorism is Nomadism; resistance towards the reterritorialization of the State and the liberal regimes. (Reid 2006, 57-58; 126-127).

## ***2.5. Deleuze and Guattari in International Relations***

Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas might seem slightly peculiar and even at some points unsuitable for the study of international relations (e.g. Reid 2006, 13). However, important here is to understand the axiom, that there is nothing fixed in our social reality but a constant struggle between different actors. Also noting how much Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the positive qualities that the smooth space, Nomads or the lines of flight have is very important (e.g. Patton 2000, 45). Because of the extensive nature of their work and wide variety of different concepts, Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas have been used in different kinds of studies. As I show below, Nomadism has often been employed in the studies of colonialism and feminist critique (e.g. Patton 2000; Wuthnow 2002; Young 2001), but also in connection to Irish Travellers, which I will discuss in the end of this section.

The de- and re-territorializing power of the State machine has been used in social sciences to explain colonialism. According to Patton (2000, 120-122) Deleuze's and Guattari's models do not provide explicit explanation to colonialism, however, their ideas of a State as a capturing machine fit well to the colonization process where European states added land areas under their rule. The State is comprised of captured territory and people; after the capture territory becomes land and people becomes labor. Robert J. C. Young (2001) approaches the relationship between Deleuze and Guattari to colonialism from the same angle as Patton, namely via de- and reterritorializations. According to Young (2001, 82-85) the reason why Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas are valid when studying colonialism, is that they manage to combine capitalism, colonialism and space. Young argues that colonialism is first and foremost a territorial process not a discursive one. Colonial power deterritorializes the land, captures it, and reterritorializes it as a part of its own apparatus; despotic State machine supersedes the primitive territorial machine.

Deleuze's and Guattari's concepts have not been without critique. Julie Wuthnow (2002) has criticized the use of Deleuze's and Guattari's theories about Nomadism in the study of post colonialism and feminist theory. In her article Wuthnow targets her critique towards Rosi Braidotti, famous for her work in the field of feminist theory, and Paul Patton, whose interpretations of Deleuze and Guattari I have also used in my thesis. According to Wuthnow one of the problems when using Deleuze and Guattari in the study of the struggle of the marginalized subject is that Nomad does not have a location. Without a location or a place one cannot be marginalized. The idea in the concept of the Nomad is that he or she cannot be put in a box with a label. This critique is a part of a broader view of postmodernism,

poststructuralism and excessive deconstruction; how can there be racism if there is no race anymore. According to Wuthnow (2002, 193) resistance is not possible from outside the State apparatus; resistance is only possible when it is happening inside the striated, structured space i.e. the State and thus Nomadism has nothing to give to the study of marginalized groups.

Young (2001, 86) also poses Deleuze and Guattari against criticism. According to Young Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas about re- and deterritorializations in the context of colonization are too rigid and do not see the complexity in the processes. Young wants to draw attention to the layering to the mixing of different cultures and systems during the colonization. Colonialism was not only about destroying the local culture and replacing it with the one of the colonialist; different cultures mixed and formed together new cultures and new systems.

## ***2.6. Travellers as Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads***

In this chapter I will discuss the question which was the starting point for my study: The possibility of Irish Travellers being considered as Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. I will go through previous studies made from this topic and outline the points why I think the idea of Travellers as Nomads could be possible.

When I started my thesis I was sure that no one else had connected Irish Travellers with Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomadism before me. However, soon after I started to go through material about Irish Travellers I found out that I was not the first one who had made this connection. The amount of previous material is not too extensive and I argue, that most of them have not reached the essence of Nomadism and therefore studies have ended up being more or less superficial what comes to Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas.

For some academics only the connection between physical nomadism and Nomadism, i.e. mobility versus sedentarism, has been enough to argue that Irish Travellers are an example of resistance against the State. This is, however, very hasty conclusion. As I have shown Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomadism is more, even though nomadic way of living is in stark difference to the conventional, sedentary way of living and thus one part of the resistance towards the State machine (this will be discussed in the following chapter).

In the book called "Gypsy politics and Traveller identity" (1999) two different authors discuss Irish Travellers as a representatives of Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. In his article about sedentarism and anti-nomadism Robbie McVeigh (1999, 9) writes that Deleuze and Guattari



have made interesting "[...] explanatory work on the nomadic/sedentary interface." McVeigh, however, does not take this any further in his article. McVeigh has brought the concept of Nomadism also to his report about physical nomadism called "Misli, Crush, Misli", in which he stressed the way Deleuze and Guattari emphasized Nomadism as a counterforce for sedentary way of living.

Colin Clark (1999, 127), on the other hand in the same book argues that New Age Travellers, who are a separate group from Irish Travellers, are left out of all research and therefore he ends up quoting Deleuze and Guattari when he argues that "[...] history has always dismissed the nomads". Clark continues and discusses the New Age Travellers' role in the society and in relation to the state. He also asks the question that are New Age Travellers really a group "outside society" and can there, in the end, be a group that would be outside. Despite this analyze Clark does not discuss Deleuze's and Guattari's notions any further.

Peter Kabachnik (2010) has discussed the relationship between Irish Travellers and Nomadism further. Kabachnik has studied the dichotomy between sedentary and nomadic ways of life in the context of Travellers in Britain. For Kabachnik the modernist view has regarded nomads as disruptive and threat to the order of things where postmodernism has celebrated nomadism as way of resistance. To this postmodernist view Kabachnik also connects Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas about Nomadism; according to him Nomadism in essence is resistance to the State control.

Kabachnik argues that even though the modernist and postmodernist celebrate different sides in the nomad-sedentary dichotomy they both still see the world and the place in the same way. This is what Kabachnik (2010, 103) has found out in his study of Travellers and their place in England. Nomads are threat and challenge to the sedentary society because they do not have a place where they are coming from they are "place invaders" in physical and metaphorical senses. Kabachnik also criticizes Deleuze and Guattari's way of seeing Nomads only passing by the physical places. According to Kabachnik places are as important for nomads as they are for sedentary people. Kabachnik (2010, 102) criticizes the view that "Place is reduced to a traditional, reactionary organ of state control." I will discuss more of Kabachnik's notions in the next section of my thesis.

From the material that I went through for my study, Margaret Greenfields (2008) was the only one discussing more explicitly the Nomadism as a counterforce for the sedentary order, but

also as a resistance pointed towards the normative way of life of the mainstream population. Greenfields argues in her article that while most of policy makers in Britain agree that Travellers are an excluded group who are not granted enough accommodation sites, the reality is still that Travellers are a group which "othered" by the mainstream society. "By refusing to accept notions of territoriality and differentiated 'owned' spaces that impinge on customary paths and behaviors, nomads both threaten the social order of sedentary society and offer (through the concept of 'nomadology') an alternative perspective on civilization, history and normative constructs of 'society' and 'state'." (Greenfields 2008, 76.)

Thus, there are grounds for the argument that Irish Travellers are Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. As I noted earlier, making connection between these two based only on the physical movement is too hasty and superficial. However, this aspect should not be ignored because it is still one of the main elements in Nomadism; sedentarism is the norm in the nation state and physical movement is something that differs from it. But, it is not only the nomadism that has differentiated Travellers from the main society; their professions, habits, culture, language have been in stark contrast to the ones of the mainstream society. And because of these, Travellers have been target of wide variety of methods of control.

Based on this could it be argued that all the ethnic minorities are Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads? After all, they all have distinct cultures, habits and languages and in many cases they are a threat to the unity of the nation state? What makes Irish Travellers a special case? I argue that what makes Irish Travellers distinct from other ethnic minorities is that Irish Travellers do not have a place; Irish Travellers do not have a physical place which they would call their home. In most cases ethnic groups have a land that they call their own. In some cases they have come from somewhere else (immigrants) where they have a place that they call home. Irish Travellers do not have that.

So, based on the previous study made from the topic and to my discussion above, I argue that there is a ground to argue that Irish Travellers are an example of the Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. I have tried to keep in mind that the goal of my thesis has not been to validate a theory but to create something new, provoke new ideas and new ways of seeing things. I will try to do this during the three following sections of my thesis.

In the next section I will discuss how physical nomadism has been and continues to be the backbone of the Traveller identity. In this section I will also discuss how nomadism relates to

Deleuze's and Guattari's concept of Nomadism in the context of sedentary-nomad dichotomy in social sciences. The chapter which follows this has been divided in two sub-chapters in which I will argue that based on my research Irish Travellers have a strong desire to be included to the Irish nation state. In the last main section I will take a step forward and discuss what implications different choices would have for Travellers in the Deleuzian and Guattarian theoretical framework.

### 3. Physical nomadism as a cornerstone of Traveller identity

I will start my analysis chapters by discussing about physical nomadism. Travellers have been throughout the history commercial nomads. Their nomadism, however, has always been a target of different kind of policies and legislative measures which have aimed to control their movement. Physical nomadism has been and according to my research findings, continues to be an integral part of Traveller identity and the concept around which the difference from the main society is constructed. A discourse of nomadism as a corner stone of Traveller identity was very visible in the report and in this chapter I will discuss Travellers' relationship to nomadism and to sedentarism, and how the relationship of these two groups have changed. I will finish this chapter with discussion how physical nomadism relates to Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomadism.

”[S]edentary space is striated by walls, enclosures, while nomad space is smooth, marked only by 'traits' that are effaced and displaced by trajectory” (TP, 420)

Till now I have been underlining that Nomadism is not at all about physical movement and that these two concepts should not be mixed. Hence, one's relationship to land, place and movement have played a key role when making difference between striated and smooth space. Striated space is controlled by the State machine which tries to capture all the flows and channel them. This controlling is done by making laws and creating a ”normal” way of living that all people should follow. The norm of living in the modern nation state has been sedentarism. Because Nomadism is all about opposing the norm and resisting the control of the State machine, is physical nomadism resistance par excellence and thus one important part of being a Nomad.

As I noted, in my research material the main discourse around which the difference between Travellers and the main society has been constructed is the nomadic lifestyle of the Travellers. However, it becomes very clear from the report that nomadism is something that belongs to the good old days and that nomadism is not necessarily possible anymore. The report quotes a Traveller saying that *”We used to travel in the country.”* (14) The report also points out that *”Nomadism was an integral part of Traveller culture, but many Travellers are no longer nomadic either by choice or due to lack of support.”* (14) In the report nomadism is connected also to an erosion of the Traveller culture: *”It was also felt by participants in focus groups that*

*the recognition of ethnicity would have given more legitimacy to the Traveller way of life, so that nomadism for example would have been respected and accommodated. As it is, it has been stifled by lack of suitable transient sites and the criminalisation of camping through the Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2002. These changes are resulting in a gradual erosion of traditional Traveller culture.” (15)*

Even though nomadic lifestyle has been made very difficult in the present day, are Travellers still constructing their identity against the sedentary people. Even when not directly talking about nomadism, the mainstream society is referred as the sedentary one. For example when discussing about political participation, the legal structures are referred as “[...] *another settled person’s institution.*” (17), or when making distinction to the mainstream society a Traveller has said that *“I’d sooner be a Traveller than a settled person”* (15). Also nomadism is linked to the ethnic status that Travellers are requesting: “[...] *Travellers with a long shared history of nomadism and associated lifestyle and traditions meet this definition [ethnic group].*” (14) Thus, Irish Travellers still construct their identity on nomadism and in opposition to sedentary people even though nomadism would not be part of their everyday life anymore.

Thus, place and ones relationship to the place has been and continues to be at the core of Traveller identity and also the main factor which distinguishes Travellers from the sedentarist main society. Nomadism is not necessarily possible anymore and this has also implications to the Traveller identity, their lives and how they perceive themselves. What has caused the erosion of nomadic way of living and why are not Travellers nomadic anymore, especially when it plays such a big role in their lives?

In the pre-modern Ireland Travellers were nomadic and worked in areas that were usually considered to be Traveller jobs, e.g. tinker-smith, horses, entertaining. These professions required a nomadic way of living but also enabled it. Everything changed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the wake of modernity. Societies in general became very structured in the modern era. Mechanisms of control replaced physical power as a means of ruling and space came target of control. Rigid boundaries of new nation states cut previous borders and space became territory. “[...] territory was used as a tool in the hands of the state for standardizing, homogenizing and disciplinizing social and material reality [...]” (Antonsich 2009, 797). This was a move from despotic machine to a State machine; people were not attached anymore to the Despot but to the land – one nation inside common borders. According to Bancroft (2005,

51) "Space was perceived either as a passive and static object to be molded, or as an obstacle to be overcome". State machine started to striate space with walls and by creating policies but also creating a norm, a sedentary way of life which made nomadism divergent. This naturally influenced also Travellers and Roma in general whose nomadic way of life became under careful control and made their moving even more difficult.

The modern independent Ireland was not an exception. In the wake of modernity Irish Travellers faced big structural changes that affected their lives profoundly. Travellers faced national but also global changes; nation building process in Ireland left Travellers outside the society whilst global modernization left them without a role in the economic structures. The nation building process in Ireland prized the connection between the land and the true Irish people. According to Reddy (2009, 151) in the United States "the foundational binary" has been between black and white, whereas in Ireland it has been between settled and nomadic people.

In the nation building process Travellers were seen as the remains of the past, a group which lived outside the civilization. A nomadic group of people who did not have a stable income let alone stable housing did not fit to the new Ireland. (Mac Laughlin 1999, 139-140.) According to Mac Laughlin (1999, 138) in Ireland nomadic people were seen dangerous when identity for the new nation state was built. The connection between the land and the people was the axiom of the whole process and people without this connection to the motherland needed to be excluded because otherwise they might jeopardize the whole project.

Nomadism is a threat to the State machine because it challenges the sedentary logic which, in turn, is one of the main ideas behind the nation state. Following Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas, Capitalist machine is trying to unleash the flows which the State machine is trying to keep channeled according to its logic. Capitalist machine is creating flows of workers, immigrants and capital which do not respect the boundaries of nation states. Travellers are not part of the Capitalist machine per se, but they both have the same goal: objecting the territorialization of the State machine.

### ***3.1. Nomadism and sedentarism in the social sciences***

Peter Kabachnik (2010) has studied mobility and nomadism and used Travellers and Gypsies in Britain as an empirical source. According to Kabachnik (2010, 96) we can see stark difference in how nomadism and mobility in general have been regarded and treated in modern and postmodern eras. Modernist viewpoint saw nomadism as a negative feature where postmodernists regarded nomadism something that should be celebrated. Modernist lived in an era where a strong nation state was the only acceptable actor in the international relations and movement across physical or mental borders not admissible. Vagabonds and vagrants were a threat to the nation state because they challenged the order by not settling down and not having a property, by crossing physical and perceived borders they challenged the whole existence of the nation state.

Postmodern world however is all about transgressing and challenging the borders. Capitalism is shaking the foundations of sovereign nation states and different kind of non- and intergovernmental organizations are playing bigger role in the world politics. Also the movement of people and different kind of groups across borders has become more and more intense. Postmodernism theorists have welcomed mobility and nomadism and have regarded it as a way of resistance, a counterforce to the state. The shaking force that mobility holds, is seen by postmodernists as a very positive thing, a tendency that should be celebrated rather than restricted. (Kabachnik 2010, 96.) Even though philosophers might admire the fluidity and mobility of nomadic people, the reality is different. In the Great Britain today Travellers are considered as "place invaders" who cause havoc by crossing rigid sedentary boundaries and by entering places that do not belong to them.

It is not a surprise that sedentary-nomadic dichotomy has been one of the most common themes in the research concerning also Irish Travellers. For example Robbie McVeigh (1997) discusses in his article about sedentary logic as a source of anti-nomadism. According to McVeigh the binary logic between sedentary and nomadic way of life has resulted in anti-Travellerism. In accordance with Deleuze and Guattari (TP, 421) McVeigh (1997, 17) outlines that the nation state system has been the most successful in capturing the flows and suppressing all the nomadic ways of being by building rigid borders and controlling the territory with a "property regime". Nomads, like Travellers have been a threat to the sedentary State logic and thus they have been labeled unwanted.

Nomadism as a physical movement "[...] illustrates alternatives to the order and control exercised through settlement and individual property rights." (McVeigh 1997, 22). Nomadism is resistance for the hegemonic sedentary life which applauds the proletarian values like private property rights and wage labor. Even though not explicitly, McVeigh follows the footsteps of Deleuze and Guattari when arguing that sedentary and nomadic people exist in the same space but use it in different ways; for the nomads space is smooth and they do not attach themselves to it in the same way than sedentary people do. McVeigh also makes clear distinction between the ethnic nomads (i.e. Irish Travellers) and other nomads like New Age Travellers, and he praises latter as a pure form of resistance towards the state control since their way of life is par excellence resistance towards sedentarism. (Ibid.)

### ***3.2. Deconstructing the dichotomy***

Kabachnik (2010, 101-102) criticizes the static boundaries between sedentary way of life and nomadism and calls upon deconstructing the dichotomy between these two. "If we do not alter the dynamic, reproduction of the nomad-sedentary binary will continue, and sedentary metaphysics-the idea of a natural order in which certain group of people belong in certain places-will dominate." According to Kabachnik (ibid.) this "territorial trap" is the biggest problem that Travellers face. As long as sedentary logic is the norm and identity is strongly place bound, nomads will not have a place in the society because they do not fit to the space striated by the State apparatus. McVeigh (1997, 24) on the other concludes that instead of seeing sedentary and nomadic ways of living opposed, we should see these two completing each other. Occupying space in different ways would have positive effects to all areas in our societies.

I think that it is important to point out here, that Irish Travellers build this same dichotomy in the report. As I discussed earlier nomadism is seen as a very important part of a Traveller identity and disabling nomadism has resulted in many problems in the Traveller community. However, even though in the report nomadism seems to be one of the key issues, it should be also remembered that Travellers use the place and space in many different ways: for some Travellers it is enough if they just have the possibility for movement whereas for some the movement itself is important. Good example of this are trailers which Travellers use for living; Travellers might be living so called sedentary life in a trailer, this gives them at least a possibility for movement even though this possibility might not ever be used.



Thus, it would be wrong to say that places do not have any importance to Travellers. In fact, if this would be true, there would be no problems for Travellers in Ireland because places would simply not have any importance for them. Travellers need places to stop and to rest, and often these places are the same year after a year (Kabachnik 2010, 97). The main point here is that, as explained earlier, Nomads use space in different way than sedentary people, they do not attach themselves to it, but this does not mean that Nomads would have no connection to the territory. Nomads need places too but the way the Nomad uses these places differs from the sedentary ways; for Nomads places are only "relays", they have no more significance. This is also the main difference between migrants and Nomads: Nomads do not leave anything behind. Sedentary people's relationship to the land is regulated by the State where as Nomads do not have this. (TP, 419.) Nomads do not bring flags with them when they arrive to a new land.

Places have even more importance in the modern Ireland because halting sites are more regulated and Travellers cannot park their caravans just beside the road anymore. When all the space is regulated by the State and by laws, it is very hard for the Travellers to practice nomadism. As I discussed earlier, it is very clear in the report that nomadism has had and keeps having a big role in Traveller identity as non-sedentary people. However now, when nomadism is not an everyday activity for Travellers, have Travellers lost an integral part of their identity? And could Travellers be Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomads if they are settled down and adopted sedentary way of life?

Deleuze and Guattari discuss also about (physical) nomadism in *Thousand Plateaus* and from my point of view it is sometimes very hard to see which form of nomadism they are referring to. In the end, for Deleuze and Guattari all forms of being that transgress the "normal" are Nomadism, let it be philosophers or revolutionary artists. Yet, in the world today sedentary way of living is the norm. The axiom of the State machine is to striate space with fences and making sure that everyone has their own place – Nomads are following and opposite logic, that is, nomadism. Thus, in the case of the Travellers, being nomadic is a cornerstone of being Nomadic. "[...] sedentarization is a stoppage that settles the nomads." (TP, 475). It is not necessary to follow a nomadic way of life in order to resist the capture of the State machine, however, being mobile is one way of opposing the State logic.

What comes to the question of identity, Margaret Greenfields (2008, 86) has pointed out that Travellers who have chosen sedentary way of living, are a good example of the "cultural

dynamism” of a Traveller way of life and sees this change in a more positive light – not just a death blow for Traveller identity. Is this view, Travellers adopting a sedentary way of life, in the core of Nomadism or is this just a perfect example of the capturing power of the State machine? Are sedentary Travellers Nomads who transgress the borders of their own norm and the expectations projected on them by the sedentary society, or are they oppressed objects of the capture of the State because they have been forced to move into houses? If this question is reflected to the report and my analyzing, Travellers are still looking back to the good old days, seeing nomadism in the core of their identity and fearing that settling down will destroy their culture and identity.

Sedentary identities are bound to a certain territory, but in the case of the Travellers their identity is bound to the way that the space is used. I argue that here we end up in the ”territorial trap” that Kabachnik (ibid.) was writing about. Instead of seeing place just as a target of control, we should deconstruct the dichotomy between sedentary and nomadic ways of being. Unfortunately Deleuze's and Guattari's theory about Nomadism and their ideas of sedentary way of living as a ”stoppage” for Nomads are not the best tools for this. Their works only pose these two ways of being against each other and do not offer an alternative where sedentarism and nomadism would complement each other. But as I discussed earlier, for Deleuze and Guattari sedentarism per se is a threat to Nomadism and hindering the creation of something new in the society.

In this chapter I have discussed Travellers' relationship to the main society and to the State via their different perceptions to the space and placed this discussion to the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework. In the following chapter I will move on to discuss how the ethnicity denial can be seen as a State control towards the Travellers.

## **4. Ethnicity Denial – Exclusion and Assimilation**

According to the analysis Irish Travellers want to have more respect for their culture and they want to feel that they have a place among the Irish nation. Both of these discourses challenge the hypothesis that Irish Travellers would be Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads, after all Nomads are a group which is outside all State structures and ones who are not looking for an acceptance from anyone.

According to the report Irish Travellers identify themselves strongly as Irish even though they have their own culture. However, the mainstream society has excluded and keeps excluding Travellers based on the cultural difference. At the same time Irish government is denying this difference, a discourse which was also present in my research material. Thus, Travellers are in a situation where they are excluded from the main society and perceived negatively by them, when the government is denying Travellers' cultural difference. Being excluded and assimilated at the same time places Irish Travellers in a very complicated situation in the Republic of Ireland.

In this section I will discuss how and why Travellers have been excluded from the main society and why Irish government is denying Travellers' cultural difference even though they see themselves different from the main society. I will place these discourses to the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework, and discuss how ethnicity denial by the state and exclusion by the mainstream society relate to Nomadism.

### ***4.1. What is ethnicity?***

Culture and namely ethnicity have replaced race in the social sciences in the later part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. After the Second World War it has not been politically correct to refer to race when talking about different populations or use genetics to determine someone's place in the society. Also there has been a turn in social sciences which has diminished the concept of race by stating that genetical and physical qualities do not predict the behavior of the person of the group (Fenton 2003, 20). However, it is not that we would not segregate people according to their decent or different habits in a world today. In our world flows of people across the borders are happening more than ever before. These flows are questioning all the borders, physical and imagined ones constantly. States and societies are facing new faces, cultures and religions every day and they need a right box, a place where they belong. Thus,

segmentarizations are still playing a big role in our societies.

Like nations, ethnicity is also an imagined concept; it is always a choice and a result of negotiations whether someone belongs to a certain group or not (Mitchell 2011, 6). The borders around an ethnic group are not given but they are drawn and maintained by inclusions and exclusions – like the ones in the nation states. I have been discussing how nation is an imagined community which is a result of inclusions and exclusions, sometimes it however feels that ethnic minorities are considered more pure forms of being which, naturally, is not the case – belonging to a group is always a choice. In the Travellers' case a good example is the distinction between so called "ethnic Travellers" and New Age Travellers<sup>11</sup>, where New Age Travellers are separated from the true Travellers (Clark 1999, 125-126) i.e. borders are drawn in the local level. On the other hand distinctions can be made in the higher level also. There is a constant discussion of who belong to the wider Roma community and Irish Travellers are often placed into the "small tent" which covers all the nomadic people who do not speak Romani language (Bancroft 2005, 40).

As I discussed in the earlier section, it is always a risky business to make definitions, especially from outside. In my study it has not been important to study who are the Irish Travellers or what belongs to the pure Traveller life, but to study the power relations between the Traveller population and the mainstream society. Now when I have concluded that ethnicity is constructed concept and that belonging to a certain group is always a result of exclusions and inclusions.

#### ***4.2. Irish national identity project and exclusion of Travellers***

According to the material, Irish Travellers feel that they differ from the main society – which is also naturally the bottom line in their petition for ethnic status. Irish Travellers feel that they are excluded from the main society and that their culture should be respected more. A discourse of inferiority is explicitly present in the report. Phrases like "*Pavee Point believes that this recognition [ethnic status] leads to more respect for Travellers in Northern Ireland, rather than being viewed as a sub-culture of poverty as is often the case in the Republic of Ireland.*" (14); "*Recognising Travellers as an ethnic group would be very symbolic. It would be emotional; it would mean that we are something of substance and not some misfits.*" (15);

---

<sup>11</sup>Often described as a group of people who have freewillingly opted out from the main society (see for example Clark 1999, 128).

*”Pavee Point also feel that there are opportunities for positive portrayal of Travellers in the media, for example on television programmes.”* (16) show how Travellers consider themselves as inferior to the main society in Ireland and how, according to the report, they feel that they are treated as some kind of misfits or second class people by the mainstream society. Travellers have a strong desire to belong to the nation in Ireland and get respect for their culture. I will now briefly discuss the origins of this exclusion in the context of Irish national identity project.

Exclusion of Travellers and pushing them to margins is connected to the national identity project in Ireland. Modern nation states are far from being natural entities and their existence is a result of an exclusions and inclusions. A common ideal of a nation state as a container of one nation is valid also in the Irish context; one nation, one country. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries when Irish nation state was built, Travellers were left out. Travellers did not fit to the new nation and they were often labelled as dirty or backward (Mac Laughlin 1999, 137). The main goal of the modernity projects around the Western world was to get rid of all old fashioned, which included also Gypsy-Travellers (Bancroft 2005, 25). According to Reddy (2009, 151), distinctive for Irish nation building has been to emphasize authenticity i.e. who is originally Irish. However in the Irish context, both the sedentary society and the Irish Travellers have been claiming to be real Irish, thus creating more division between these two groups.

Naturally, as I discussed in the previous chapter, one of the main differences was the relationship to the space, but it was also the habits and culture of Travellers' that were considered negatively different and thus they were a threat to the new Irish nation which was built on bourgeoisie catholic class. Irish Travellers were in every way against the social progression that was the driving force of the Irish modernization progress. (Mac Laughlin 1999, 137.) Thus, control of the State machine was working in two ways: by restricting Travellers' nomadism by laws but also by labelling their way of life unwanted. The goal of this was to control the flows and construct Ireland as an unitary and modern nation which did not have space for Travellers.

Bancroft (2005, 43-44) has discussed about status hierarchies and the *”culture of poverty thesis”* which was also visible in my material when stating that Irish Travellers should be respected *”[...] rather than being viewed as a sub-culture of poverty [...]”*. According to Bancroft, instead of taking ethnicity as a starting point, we should rather speak about the

values that each group respects and maintains. He argues that the mainstream society places Travellers in the lower category because they do not confront their values, whereas Travellers themselves perceive their values as the right ones. Mainstream population regards Travellers' culture worse than their own. These ideas are in line with my findings; Irish Travellers value their own beliefs but realize that their way of living is frowned upon by the mainstream society, and thus call for more respect of their culture and values.

### ***4.3. Media and the Travellers***

As I discussed in the methodology chapter, discourses and control are interlinked. Discourses are created and constructed on a daily basis and they are mostly produced by the media which reflects the ideas and values of the main society. According to Helleiner and Szuchewycz (1997, 112) especially in Ireland most of the elite discourses are distributed to the main society via media which portrays Travellers in a negative light.

A group can be excluded by enacting laws that restrict the life of the group, for example what happened in the apartheid era South Africa. However, it is not only the state which does the controlling. It is also the nation, the mainstream society which is defending their own existence by labelling Travellers unwanted. Us-Them dichotomies are very common and widely used in the international relations and in social sciences in general. Us is always constructed against Them and national identities are built on dichotomies and exclusions; there would not be identities if we all would be the same. Excluding is done by using discourses which portray the other group different and in a negative light.

In Ireland and Britain, but also overseas, Irish Travellers are present in the popular media via tv-shows (My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding, The Riches), movies (Snatch) and tabloid press (for example Daily Mail) which all create a certain kind of discourse of Travellers. This is why it is not surprising when the report states that: *"Pavee Point also feel that there are opportunities for positive portrayal of Travellers in the media, for example on television programmes."* (16) There are several studies of Travellers and Roma in general (e.g. Richardson 2006, Kabachnik 2010) which discuss how Travellers are excluded from the mainstream society by using discursive tools. As Richardson (2006, 99) notes, attention is often paid more to the differences than to similarities between the Travellers and the mainstream society. My research, which is done from the Traveller's point of view, unfortunately only confirms this dichotomy; Irish Travellers see that they are perceived

”negative others” by the main society. According to the report the tool for exclusion are negative discourses which are produced and distributed to the society via media.

By portraying Travellers in a negative light is the State machine controlling the Travellers but also the mainstream society; constructing Travellers as a threat can justify legal actions done by the State. However, the report clearly points towards the popular media when calling for more positive portrayal; it thus is not a one way street, in most of the cases it is impossible to say whether it is the government which is producing the discourse or is it the media and the mainstream society. (Richardson 2006, 99; 110.) Some discourses are more dominant than others and some people have more control over the discourses, e.g. politicians or scientists. Popular media is a very strong and powerful contributor to the discourses and as I noted before it is often the only source where the big masses get their information from.

I argue that State machine is in work in here. As I discussed in the theory section the State machine does not refer directly to the government but to the whole system which is creating the nation state. Discourses are created and sustained in our everyday practices and it could be said that Pavee Point's report adds its own contribution to the discourses. Following the idea of Othering<sup>12</sup> are the State machine and the mainstream population producing and keeping alive discourses which differentiate Travellers and exclude them from the main society thus creating unity among the mainstream population. How does this then relate to the Deleuzian and Guattarian idea of the State machine as a unifying and all-embracing system? I will next move on to discuss how Deleuze and Guattari see the difference in the nation state system.

#### ***4.4. Othering and Faciality***

Irish Travellers have been excluded and are excluded from the main society by using discourses which portray Irish Travellers in a negative light and by enacting laws which restrict traditional Traveller way of life. However, according to Deleuze and Guattari European societies have never had an Other or a Stranger nor have their goal been to exclude anyone. What comes to the State machine and its operational principle, there should not be an outside, no Nomads, everything should be under the control of the State. The sole purpose of the State machine is to control all the flows and there should not exist anything outside the State realm. This, however, does not mean that Deleuze and Guattari would deny the existence of separate social groups and inequality between them. The main point here is, that

---

<sup>12</sup> Here, like before, I will use a capital letter when referring to a concept.

everything, every single flow must be controlled and channeled in a way or another. Even though people might be different, everybody should still be under the State machine's umbrella. (TP, 197-198.)

The main difference to the traditional social sciences is that for Deleuze and Guattari there is no exclusion as such, no one is left outside by the State, there is no Others. According to Deleuze and Guattari, segregation happens through faciality, yet another machine introduced in *Thousand Plateaus*. This machine works by deviation; there exists a face which is a norm and all the faces that deviate from this are not excluded but they are under control as long as they do not differ anymore. "From the viewpoint of racism, there is no exterior, there are no people on the outside. There are only people who should be like us and whose crime it is not to be." (TP, 197). The face which is the norm creates Majority (I will get back to this in the following section), the mainstream society which is the nation in the nation state. People coming from different ethnic backgrounds or different cultures are not, according to faciality, excluded from the society but first labelled and then assimilated into the mainstream society. The purpose of this machine is to make all the people the same, to make sure that all the people living under the control of the State would have the same face and would follow the same logic.

How does this then relate to the idea of the Other and the situation that Travellers are facing in today's Ireland, namely exclusion by the mainstream society? As I discussed, Travellers are often regarded as others and thus excluded from the society. But Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas do not give space for Othering because for them State should have a desire to control everything. Could the Other then be a Nomad? I argue that this would be a too straightforward conclusion; other is a constructed by the mainstream society and it is following the State logic i.e. it is a production of the striated space. An Other does not carry with itself the features that the Nomad has and especially in the case of the Travellers this Othering is viewed as a negative unwanted feature, not a positive one.

Also I find the question of identity problematic in the concept of faciality. If there is only one model that passes, one face that is acceptable by the State machine, how are for example national identities built? Identity always needs the Other, "we" or "I" is always constructed by mirroring it to the Other. Why is the society creating negative, exclusionist discourses on Travellers if they should be trying to assimilate them into the wider society? From my point of view the idea of faciality goes err. On the other hand while negative media discourses other



the Travellers, they can be also seen as assimilationist. By pointing out what is wrong in the Traveller lifestyle and their culture the State and the mainstream society are trying to change Travellers into normal. Even though Othering is not pointing towards the Nomads, could it be concluded that Othering in fact is a labelling method which the State machine is using to include and assimilate Travellers?

The space of the State is striated and State has a capability for subjectification and signification (TP, 200). Thus constructing Travellers as Others is not necessarily against the State logic. Othering a group is precisely subjectification and Others are very much controlled by the State machine. This however does still not explain the idea of Faciality machine as a unifying force; Others play an important role in the society because they are different. And assimilating them to the mainstream society, to the face which is the norm, would take away this position as a mirror which is used to construct the national identity.

Here we should however remember that it is only the nation in Ireland which is excluding the Travellers; the state in fact is doing the opposite. By ignoring the difference, denying that Travellers would consist a separate ethnic group, is the Irish government using it's power to control the flows. Here we come to one of my main points in my thesis: both denying ethnic difference but also ethnic status can act as tools of the State control. As McVeigh (2007, 93) has pointed out: "We must therefore problematise *any* state reformism regard to Travellers – including state anti-racism and multiculturalism."

Irish Travellers perceive themselves and are perceived different by the main society. Hence, they are not outside the Irish borders, they have been in Ireland for centuries and identify themselves "strongly" as Irish. According to the report: "*Nonetheless, the Traveller identity remains strong and distinct from the rest of Irish society, although Travellers strongly identify as Irish.*" (14) I find this interesting and argue that based on this, Travellers cannot be considered others or outsiders in the Irish society.

Kabachnik (2010, 99) has referred Travellers as internal others which I think is much better concept than Others when studying Travellers' place in the Irish society. What makes internal others different from more traditional view of Others is that they are among us, they are not outside. Usually Others are situated outside the borders of the nation state (Finland – Russia) or then they have come from different places and/or have distinctively different cultural habits (immigrants). According to Kabachnik (ibid.) Travellers are "out-of-place" and invading the

space of the mainstream society in Britain. However, the emphasis is not given to their origin, yet invaders are usually coming from across the border, but the difference is made based on their nomadic way of life and all the other features that are attached to it. Thus, Travellers are internal others, they are not coming from far away countries but they are definitely not genuine Irish or British either.

The concept of internal others fits better to Deleuze's and Guattari's idea of the Faciality and it as a tool of control. Internal other places more emphasis to the idea that the Other is not outside, yet still being different from the mainstream society. I argue that placed in the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework, internal other is in fact under the State control. Others are excluded and placed outside the State, which is in stark contradiction to the Deleuzian and Guattarian model, internal other on the other hand are under the control, hence still fulfilling their important role in creating unity among the mainstream society.

Ni Shuinear (1997) has discussed how Travellers are scapegoats in Ireland. According to Ni Shuinear the main society projects all its negative features to Irish Travellers, which is possible because Travellers are close enough. Ni Shuinear's idea about Travellers as scapegoats in the Irish society and Kabachnik's view of Travellers as internal others go hand in hand; Travellers have enough similarities with the mainstream society so that the "real" Irish people can still relate themselves to the Travellers. The mainstream society sees Travellers as a group that has not managed to keep up with the modernizations in the society, thus Travellers are something that the mainstream society once were but are not anymore.

Deleuze's and Guattari's Faciality machine places Travellers in the other end of the line which determines the "true Irishness" and

"Any changes 'they' [Travellers] make that bring them more into line with things 'we' approve of, are noticed and give 'us' a feeling of satisfaction, since this just proves that we were right all along and the others are finally seeing the light" (Ni Shuinear 1997, 31).

Travellers are an example for the mainstream society how not to live, at the same time highlighting the mainstream society's life as the right one. (Richardson 2006, 117; Greenfields 2007, 76). This is all about creating the norm towards which everything in the society should move to. And as Ni Shuinear pointed out, this norm is without any flaws; the problems in the

society always are somewhere else than among the mainstream society.

#### ***4.5. Exclusion and assimilation***

Travellers are among the mainstream society hence still being excluded. I argue that Travellers as internal others is behind the ethnicity denial. Kabachnik (2010, 103) points out that "Where do we send an individual or a group constructed over centuries as not having a place of their own?" Place here refers also to a place in the society, not only a physical place. The question of the place is very interesting and I argue that this is one of the main reasons why the government of Ireland has not granted an ethnic status for the Irish Travellers; Irish Travellers and their origins cannot be located, they do not have a place where they would be coming from or where they could be sent back to.

It is very hard to say where the Travellers are coming from or going to. Travellers have always been physically among the main society in Ireland even though there might have not been so many connections between these two. Unlike Travellers in Ireland, illegal immigrants or international crime can be traced to some point and sent back. Also if the origin is know it is much easier to put a label on the thing. Travellers proximity poses a threat to the dominant sedentary society; Travellers can cross the borders, physical and mental, freely and enter the space of the dominant society without a a warning. (Kendall 1997, 78-79.)

Being without an origin is one of the qualities of Nomads. I criticized in my theory section Doty's (1999; 2003) research of illegal immigrants and argued that illegal immigrants are not Nomads cause they have a place where they are coming from. However, Irish Travellers do not have an origin either. They have been hanging around for centuries and it is very hard to pin point a time or a place where or when Travellers would have been born or entered to the country. Travellers perceive themselves different from the main society but share many things with them and sometimes it is very hard to say where the border between these two is.

Pavee Points report discusses that the government in Ireland has been reluctant to grant the ethnic status for Irish Travellers on basis that "[...] *there is no domestic legal significance*" (15). The report concludes that "*The Government's report concludes on the issue of ethnicity that: "Whether or not Travellers are considered to form a distinct ethnic group in Irish society is of no domestic legal significance."* (para. 9, p.3). *The question then has to be asked, if there is no domestic legal significance, why the strong resistance by the Government to this*

issue?" (15) Pavee Points report mentions that "*Travellers have been excluded from the Office of the Minister for Integration's scope*" (16) and "*only migrants were invited to apply for the Ministerial Council of Integration.*" (16) Report sums that "*Indeed Pavee Point would like to understand the rationale for the Government's inflexible stance on Traveller ethnicity.*" (15). Thus, from the governments point of view Irish Travellers do not differ or do not differ enough to be considered as an ethnic minority. Because Travellers do not have an origin and because they share some same cultural features, they do not meet with the definitions of ethnic minority.

According to the report Irish officials have said that "[...] *there is no domestic legal significance*" (15) in granting ethnic status for Irish Travellers. According to McVeigh (2007, 94) this is just one way of racism in the Republic of Ireland. McVeigh also discusses that the starting point for this assimilationist policy was in the 1960's when Commission on Itinerancy concluded that Irish Travellers should be absorbed to the general community. McVeigh (ibid.) argues that the discourse has not changed that much since the 1960's and the government and mainstream society still see the problem being the Travellers, not the rigidity of the mainstream society in Ireland.

According to McVeigh (2008, 96) this whole situation inevitably leads to a point, where Irish Travellers cannot complain that they are facing racism, if they are not considered from the governments point of view as a distinct group from the main society. Put in a wider context, Traveller and Gypsy ethnicity was denied also after the World War 2 thus forestalling the claims of a genocide (McVeigh 2007, 101). This is in line with Julie Wuthnow's (2002) critique towards the Nomadic thought which I discussed earlier: without a place (in this case ethnic status), it is impossible to speak about racism. Travellers are excluded from the main society but they cannot do anything to it because in front of the juridical system they are not different. Good question is also, is there any point of talking about difference and making reports if, in the end, Irish Travellers are not considered different from the main society? (McVeigh 2008, 96)

This leads into situation where the mainstream society in Ireland is othering the Travellers whilst the State is ignoring the difference and trying to assimilate the Travellers to the main society. In this case the State machine is using its control in order to channel the flows of desire. This is not a question of structural fragmentation but above all a question of national unity which in the end affects to the structural unity also. If too many sections of the society

have their own identity will the role of national identity diminish which will lead to weakening of the nation state; the State machine cannot work properly if too many flows break free. In the case of Irish Travellers the State machine is keeping the control very strict: Irish Travellers are not different enough in order to form an ethnic minority.

After this section, are there any grounds to argue that Irish Travellers are Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads? Irish Travellers perceive themselves and they are perceived different by the main society. However at the same time they strongly identify themselves as Irish and thus have a desire to belong to the Irish nation. Travellers also have a desire to be respected and approved by the main society. However, this desire is captured from two directions: from the State and the nation. The mainstream society keeps seeing Travellers as a second class people and thus building their own identity against them. On the other side the State do not want to see the difference – the State is trying to assimilate the Travellers by ignoring and undermining their status as an ethnic minority.

The main idea about Nomad thought is that Nomads are opposing and challenging the control of the State machine and strange to the State logic. Being Irish, being part of the nation is State control. On the other hand cultural difference of the Irish Travellers is a threat to the Irish nation state and questioning the values and culture of the main society. From this point of view Irish Travellers have same qualities than Nomads. However, Travellers want to be included and want to be Irish – Irishness being the axiom of the State. Irishness requires obedience and loyalty to the State; nation and state cannot be separated.

Travellers are very much under the control. I discussed how the Deleuzian and Guattarian machine of faciality might not be the best one here to describe the situation that Travellers are facing in Ireland. If we take faciality only as a unifying concept, it does clash with the more traditional idea of the Other. Other is constructed and maintained by the mainstream society so it could keep its unity. However, if we approach faciality more as a signifying machine, a machine which points out subjects giving them a place in accordance to the difference they hold from the norm, then faciality can work also in the case of the Travellers. The assimilationist policy which the government of Ireland is conducting, however, is a good example of faciality; there is no racism, no Other, Travellers just should be like the rest of the society.

For the Travellers a society inside one common borders can be formed of different ethnicities. Being an Irish does not depend of the culture or the ethnic background. From the society's but also from the governments point of view, the only right way of doing things is the one of the main society's. I will now move on to discuss how ethnic status, if granted, would also work as a tool of control.

## **5. Ethnic status as a state control**

In the previous chapter I discussed how the State is using ethnicity denial to control Irish Travellers. By denying their difference State is controlling the flows, which unleashed might compromise the unity of the Irish nation state. Unleashing the flows in this context would mean accepting the difference and giving Travellers special privileges that differ from the ones that the mainstream society has. However, in this chapter I will argue that granting an ethnic status would also be a tool of control and that there are discourses in my material which back this argument. As McVeigh (2008, 93) has pointed out: "We must therefore problematize *any* state reformism regard to Travellers – including state anti-racism and multiculturalism." In this chapter I will argue that ethnic status like ethnicity denial can be a form of control. I will contextualize my argument using Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of Minority<sup>13</sup>.

Irish Travellers have been requesting for ethnic status for several years now<sup>14</sup>. Irish Travellers have ethnic status in the United Kingdom (including Northern Ireland) which is seen very contradictory and criticized also in the Pavee Point's report. Therefore it should be noted that ethnicity as a concept is far from being natural, ethnicity like nation states should be approached something that is constructed and maintained constantly in each case.

As discussed earlier discourse of exclusion is explicitly connected to the ethnicity denial in the report. The report notes that "*One of the main issues with non-recognition of Traveller ethnicity is that it further excludes and already excluded group in Irish society [...]*" (15). Thus, if one wants to belong to the society, a label must be made in order to be recognized. According to the report ethnic status would be the only way to be included to the Irish society as a full cast member.

### ***5.1. Minority and Majority***

In the previous chapter I discussed how, according to Deleuze and Guattari, State machine divides and segregates people by using a Faciality machine. This machine segregates people into groups based on their difference from the norm – which in the Western world is a white sedentary man. Faciality machine divides people into Majorities and Minorities, hence under

---

<sup>13</sup> As I have done also in the previous chapters, I will use a capital letter when referring to a concept. Minority with a capital "M" refers to Deleuze's and Guattari's concept of Minority, not to a marginalised group of people i.e. minority.

<sup>14</sup>For example The Irish Traveller Movement's ethnicity campaign was launched on 2008.

one machine they can always be only one Majority. In this chapter I will argue, by using concepts of Minority and Majority, that ethnic status can be seen as a tool of State control.

Minority, according to Deleuze and Guattari, does not have anything to do with the amount of people that are belonging to it. Minority is not minority according to the numbers but according to its relationship to the Majority and its difference from it, thus Minority always requires a Majority. Minority is based on qualitative, not quantitative, difference from the Majority; Majority is the norm and Minority is the deviant. "Majority implies the state of domination, not the reverse." (TP, 321; Patton 2000, 47.) For example in Apartheid era South Africa black people were much bigger in numbers than whites, yet they were the Minority because all the structures, laws and social norms were controlled by the white Majority. Thus, Minority has nothing to do with numbers or not even the identity as such, it is Minority's difference from the Majority and Majority's power which makes minority a Minority.

The main point here is the difference from the norm which the Majority has set. For Deleuze and Guattari one example of the Majority today is a white man. Everything else that differs from the white man are Minorities; women, flies, blacks, even though they would be bigger in numbers. (TP, 321.) This same can be extended for nation states where we live in; Majority is the one that is in power, Majority is the nation, the society which is referred to whenever talking about the whole country – Minority cannot be the nation in the nation state.

Nation state is built around this Majority and everything else is pushed to the margins. For example in Ireland Majority would be a white, sedentary, catholic man, born in Ireland. Following to this logic Irish Travellers are a Minority mostly because they are nomadic, but also because of their language and traditions. Faciality machine takes the norm as a starting point and then places all the others on a line based on their difference from the norm. Deleuze's and Guattari's view about difference does not take the identity as a starting point, but the size of the gap which is between the norm and the deviant (Patton 2008, 47).

According to Deleuze and Guattari (TP 230-233) human beings are fundamentally segmentary animals. In the modern societies lives are arranged in three different ways: in a dualistic, circular and linear manners. Segmentation happens for example between men – women, town – state or between childhood and adulthood. Deleuze and Guattari note that segmentation has been present in all social formations; in primitive societies it has been more supple and concentrated more on dualizations. In modern societies segmentation is more rigid



and it works through overcoding. Also, these both ways of segmentation, rigid and supple, are not exclusionary, there is always present macro and micro levels. (TP 230-233.)

Deleuze's and Guattari's world is divided into three levels: Minorities or Nomads, States or Majorities and to higher level ecumenical organizations which also includes capitalism. Deleuze's and Guattari's logic is not at all about an individual against the system, the difference is between groups which are working according to different logic. Minorities and Nomads are both resisting the State because they are inherently different whilst ecumenical organizations and capitalism are posing a threat from a different direction. (Watson 2008, 202; 207.)

It should be noted here that these different levels do not follow each other in any ways and Minorities can pass the State and form non-governmental international organizations (ibid.). Irish Travellers have done this when they are referring for example to United Nations in their petition for ethnic status. This way they are challenging the State order from two directions: below and above. This is exactly the case when Pavee Points report refers to the non-governmental organizations in their ethnicity request. *"However, calls for recognition of Traveller ethnicity have come not only from Traveller representative organisations, but from a broad range of national, European and international bodies."* (14) In Deleuzian and Guattarian context this an example of the three level view of actors in international relations which I discussed in the previous chapter; State machine is contested from below by Nomads and Minorities but also from above by capitalism and ecumenical organizations. (See also Watson 2008, 207.)

As I have already argued in my study, Irish Travellers indeed feel that they are different from the mainstream society, yet, at the same time identifying themselves strongly as Irish. They argue that their history, culture, habits are different from the sedentary society but that they should be included, not assimilated, to the mainstream society without losing their own identity. As I will show next, in the Deleuzian and Guattarian framework of Minority and Majority, including Travellers as a distinct ethnic minority to the mainstream society is challenging or even impossible combination.

## ***5.2. Ethnic status as a label***

Minorities and Nomads both have the power of transformation in them and they both are challenging the State logic, which is to striatize the physical but also social area that it is controlling. Nomads are a fuzzy set, a non-denumerable group which cannot be counted, they are existing outside the State. This is their advantage because they cannot be grasped or controlled by the State machine. Minorities are also resisting the State control by not adjusting to the norm which is set by the Majority.

The desire of the State is to striate and to segmentarize the area and the people it is controlling. Following this logic, I argue that ethnic status is a way to striate and to segmentarize. Putting a label on a group of people, will make it easier to count and easier to grasp. This label is decided by the State and is following the State logic. According to Deleuze and Guattari, State adds axioms on the Minorities which it wants to control. State is "[...] translating minorities into denumberable sets or subsets, which would enter as elements into the majority, which could be counted among the majority." (TP, 519).

Majority and the State are on the same side and they both represent the same logic i.e. striated space. State machine creates borders around itself but also striates the space inside these borders. It creates, modifies and sustains social space that will not threaten its existence. State creates boxes in which it places people and decides who belongs where. Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomads do not have an identity. Identity is an invention of the State machine and sustained by it. "[Nomad thought] does not repose on identity; it rides difference." (TP, xii). The whole idea of being a Nomad is to be uncountable, beyond the reach of the State machine. Thus, ethnic status would also be one of these boxes containing a group called Irish Travellers.

Janell Watson (2008) has written about European ethnic politics and whether a supranational European identity would be possible or even desirable. Watson discusses the minorities in Europe and their role as a counterforce for the State. Using Deleuze and Guattari Watson concludes that a common European identity would eliminate a possibility for social transformation and cultural creativity in Europe, and therefore a supranational identity is not possible or not even desirable. A common identity for the whole Europe would basically mean a new Majority which would over code the Minorities i.e. the current nation states.

According to Watson (2008, 209) "[...] 'culture' and 'ethnicity' can be used to hierarchise". Europe is trying to control the flow of people not so much anymore by physical borders but via classifications and dualisms. "Molecular insecurity inspired by reef of unruly immigrants allows the State and the Majority to respond by defending their rigid hierarchies." (Ibid., 210.) Controlling is done not by physical oppression or by physical borders, but by creating subtle labels based on the cultural background of the person. These labels in turn would presume certain kind of behavior from the one who is labelled.

If the ethnic status would be granted, it would mean that a decision who belongs to the group and who does not would be made. State could define who is a real Traveller and who is not. For example which criteria would need to be filled before one could claim to belong to the Traveller group (language, physical nomadism)? This would be State control par excellence. Ethnic status would make "Travellers" a rigid concept which would presuppose certain kind of behavior. According to McVeigh (2008, 93) sometimes it might be even better option to neglect the Travellers than "respect" them, meaning that helpful state interventions might cause more damage. Being "protected" by under the ethnic status label would restrict all the cultural dynamism that the Travellers might have.

At this point I will briefly discuss a discourse of counting which I found from my material. Counting, unlike different statuses based on the cultural difference, is a much more rigid and visible way of control. As I already pointed out earlier, counting, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is one way of Majority's ways to control Minorities. I argue that by counting Deleuze and Guattari do not mean counting as such, but all kinds of actions that point towards some kind of definition. Statistics, surveys and presentations are a form of control (see for example Watson 2008, 1999), and this is exactly what Pavee Point is calling after when they state that "*The Government should ensure that Travellers are included in all relevant data collection and research initiatives so that the reality of their experiences is captured.*" (17).

Statistics and surveys would segmentarize Travellers and help to create a discourse who and what Travellers are. At this point we come closer to Foucault's idea of biopower, which aims of control of populations via knowledge. By collecting information and making statistics, State is making people into a population which is controlled by regularizations. (Foucault 2003, 246-247.) Counting Travellers and making statistics of them would help the State to adjust its own mechanisms of control towards them. Statistics would also create an "average Traveller", which would partly force all the Travellers to the same mould and reduce the

possibility for change and dynamism.

### ***5.3. Resources and Travellers***

In the previous section I argued that Travellers hope that their way of life and their identity would be respected and acknowledged by the mainstream society. The grounds for this claim are emotional and as such, do not necessarily reflect to the material realities of the Traveller life. However, according to my research Travellers do not want only respect and recognition, but also an access to the same material resources which are available for the Majority. I base my argument to the following quotes: “*Nomadism was an integral part of Traveller culture, but many Travellers are no longer nomadic, either by choice or due to lack of support for and criminalisation of nomadism. Travellers also have their own language; however due to lack of recognition and support, this is gradually dying out*” (14). Also, according to the material “*It was also felt by participants in focus groups that the recognition of ethnicity would have given more legitimacy to the Traveller way of life, so that nomadism for example would have been respected and accommodated.*” (15).

Access to resources and a possibility to influence the legal structures of the state are explicitly connected to the survival of the Traveller community in Ireland. Without the state support, Travellers see that their culture will die out and that they will be assimilated to the Majority. According to the report, legal ethnic status in the Republic of Ireland is the way how Irish Travellers can guarantee their cultural survival. How much should Irish state or nation state in general support different cultures inside one borders? In the previous chapter I concluded that one way of State control is denying the difference i.e. supporting the Majority, and thus following this logic, it is not surprise that Irish State is reluctant to grant special permissions for Travellers – after all in front of the government they do not differ from the mainstream society.

Nation states are formed of citizens who live inside common borders. These citizens have access to the resources that the state provides; the State takes care of it's citizens who in turn are objects of the state control. The resources are defined and controlled by the State and they do not necessarily accommodate all the people. In order to gain access to the resources, people need to behave in a certain manner and lead a certain kind of lifestyle which is in line with the Majority lifestyle. Clark (1999, 138) has studied New Age Travellers and argues that the structures in the society and legal system do not recognize the (New) Traveller way of life,

which values different things like nomadism and non-materialism. According to Clark (*ibid.*, 132) it is very hard to claim social benefits if you for example do not have a permanent address.

Irish Travellers also confront the normative way of life, as we have already noted several times. The culmination point in the Travellers' case is the question about nomadism. As I discussed earlier, nomadism as a way of life is not approved by the sedentarist Majority and a threat to the State logic and thus controlled and restricted by laws but also by labelling it backward. Enabling nomadism is clearly the biggest benefit which the Irish Travellers hope to get via access to the resources. In the Travellers' case lack of transient places in the Republic of Ireland is a question of legal structures in the country, not whether Travellers have a distinct ethnicity. Thus, Watson (2008, 197; 205) has called for a shift from identity to structures; “[...] from the level of interpersonal relations to social relations mediated by the estate and its various apparatuses [...]” (*ibid.*, 197). According to her (*ibid.*), concentrating too much for building identities alone does not help the minorities who are struggling to get their voices heard, structural changes are also needed.

Existence of Minority does not necessarily require cultural difference from the Majority, it is the difference between these two groups which makes minority a Minority. Thus, Deleuze's and Guattari's theory about Minorities and Majority is a good way to approach this topic from a non-identitarian angle. (Watson 2008, 197.) Distinct identity alone does not bring minorities to resources, which are mostly controlled by the state. More emphasis needs to be given to structures which prevent minorities access to resources and living their lives. However, as I noted earlier, ethnic status – which is connected to the question of identity and how ones perceive themselves – is needed in order to access the resources. As long as Travellers are not considered as different, they cannot claim access to resources either.

Ethnic status as a structure, would give Travellers an opportunity to access the resources that are controlled by the state. Ethnic status would mean that Irish Travellers as a distinct group exists in front of the State and the Majority. As I argued earlier, this would also mean that the borders around Irish Travellers would become more fixed and belonging to this group would be also defined from outside – not only by the Travellers themselves. I argue that this might lead into a situation where State could also decide which resources would be available to the Travellers; for example state could reject some benefits on the basis that some Travellers do not lead a nomadic life.

The question of a label would give the State a possibility to decide who are counted in and who are left out. State machine could then decide what belongs to the "real" Traveller life and what does not. On the other hand the State is already doing this when its not granting the status to Irish Travellers. State is defining the Traveller identity by denying their difference. The same could happen if an ethnic status would be granted to the Travellers. The state of Ireland could for example deny social benefits based on their view about true Traveller lifestyle.

Following Deleuze's and Guattari's logic this would also mean, at least partly, assimilating to the Majority and following the State logic. It is not a question changing or adjusting the Majority but adjusting Minority and their way of life to fit to the Majority norm. In the Travellers' case this would mean that Irish Travellers would need to confront the expectations and adjust themselves to the box that is provided them by the State machine and Majority. Hence, ethnic status gives more possibilities for minorities and gives them access to the resources but also strengthens their identity and belonging to the society. However, the resources are still in control of the State which can also determine how these resources should be used and who have access to them.

#### ***5.4. Democracy and active citizens***

Ireland is a democratic country and every citizen should have an access to the democratic process. According to the material however Irish Travellers are not part of these processes. The report explicitly indicates that Irish Travellers should be included to all political structures and democratic decision making in the country. The report states that "*Pavee Point feel that the Government should give serious consideration to recommendations by the CERD Committee and the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights who have suggested affirmative action for Traveller participation in political decision-making, such as a reserve seat in the Dáil or Seanad.*" (17).

The discourse of political participation in the report gives the active role to the state and the decision makers. The report does not describe Travellers currently participating actively to the democratic processes in the country, and thus hopes that the government in Ireland would include Travellers to it's realm; not that Travellers would enter there themselves. According to the report "*Pavee Point feels that the real issue in relation to participation in the democratic process is apathy among the Traveller community who see political institutions as the*

*exclusive realm of the majority population.*” (17) The question here is that why Travellers feel this apathy? Pavee Point's report quotes one Traveller who concludes that “*We feel completely disillusioned by the political process and we feel let down by it. What has it ever achieved for us? It's just another settled person's institution.*” (17) This comment shows how Irish Travellers feel excluded and even betrayed by the system. This comment also confirms yet again the division between the Travellers and the main society, which is referred as the settled part of the nation.

In the State Machine there is only one set of structures and those structures are defined and maintained by the State and the Majority. These structures follow the Majority logic. According to Patton (2008, 190-191) democracy is always a majority rule and important question here is, who are counted to this majority. As discussed earlier Majority does not necessarily mean that everyone would be counted nor that even the biggest group would be the Majority; it is always a question of inclusion and exclusion. Majority rule i.e. democracy is the rule of the qualitative norm, not the quantitative, nor the average. According to Patton (2008, 185) democratic society “[...] would not be the result of a simple *modus vivendi* [<sup>15</sup>] but would derive from publicly endorsed opinions about what is right and just.”

Using the concepts of Minority and Majority, Patton argues that nation states have always had a conflict when deciding who are counted in the Majority (for example women, immigrants). The ones who are included can enjoy the political and legal rights but also access to resources. Minorities are controlled according to the “nationalitarian opinion”, which means that unwanted or ill-fitted are left outside of the Majority and the democratic decision making. It is the ideals and the values of the one in question society which also define the democracy in each case. Thus, following this logic, there is no universal democracy, but democracy is always creation of the current Majority and its ideals. (Patton 2008, 187; 193; Deleuze and Guattari 1993, 107.) In Ireland democracy is built on the nationalitarian opinion of the sedentary middle class, which makes participation harder for everyone else, let them be Travellers or immigrants.

I argue that what Pavee Points report calls after is active citizenship of the Travellers. According to the report Travellers are currently passive citizens who need to be activated by making them to take part to the democratic processes in Ireland. According to Schinkel (2010, 167) there are active and passive citizens in each society. By using Foucault's biopolitics and

---

<sup>15</sup>Modus vivendi is Latin and can be translated as an agreement to disagree.

Giorgio Agamben's "bare life", Schinkel argues that instead of having only citizens and non-citizens, we have three categories of which active- and passive citizens both are part of the society, whereas the third one, non-citizens are outside it. (Ibid., 156.)

Passive citizens have all the same rights that active ones, but they do not participate to the life of the society in the same manner. Active citizens are active in the society; they vote, they participate to the public discussion, they make sure that the streets are clean and they behave in a correct manner. Passive citizens do not do this, their citizenship is merely formal, not including the moral aspects which the active citizens have. (Ibid., 167.) Thus, because of the "apathy" that Travellers are feeling towards the system they fall into the latter category, Travellers are citizens of Ireland in the formal way because they do not participate to the democratic duties nor have the correct way of life which I discussed in the previous section of my thesis.

Activation is a tool of control. By generalizing and "[...] turning citizenship into the mechanism of membership of the nation-state" citizenship is formulated as a way of State control (Schinkel 2010, 165). No one should be outside the control of the State machine which also means that all of us should also be a part of the decision making in the system – this after all is the whole idea behind the democracy. It is our responsibility to be active - not opt out - and participate to the building of a better country for all of us. By calling for democratic participation, but also inclusion to the statistics, Pavee Point's report is trying to activate the Travellers in Ireland and thus bring them under the State control.

Schinkel formulates an interesting idea which, I argue, fits well to the situation of the Travellers. According to Schinkel (2010, 167-168) people who are not integrated well enough to the society but are still citizens of the state are "[...] the production of a social schizophrenic who is a 'member' of the nation-state but not of 'society'." He also continues that "society" is a production of discursive methods which include namely dividing people into active- and passive citizens. This idea connects to my argument that I made in the previous section of my thesis, that Travellers in Ireland are full members in front of the state but Othered by the society. Thus, following Schinkel, Irish Travellers are members of the state but not of the society. (Ibid.)

Active- and passive citizens are both under the State control. I do not think that a straight connection between active citizens and Majority, and passive citizens and Minority can be



drawn here, but I argue that a State machine would not function if it would not be the people in the Majority who are the most actively participating to the democratic processes and reconstruction of the proper ways of being a citizen. Deleuze's and Guattari's Nomads on the other hand are not active citizens, they are not passive citizens either – they are outside the whole citizenship system, they are Schinkels non-citizens. They act according to different logic, thus Irish Travellers are not Nomads. Ethnic status and constructing Travellers as active citizens are both forms of control.

I have now discussed the main research findings in my thesis. Before going to conclusion chapter I will discuss a way forward – after all these previous chapters have not given much hope for the survival of the Irish Traveller population. A way forward can also be found from the works of Deleuze and Guattari: an idea of Becoming.

## **6. Becoming-democratic – A way forward**

According to the Pavee Points report, ethnic status is a positive and desirable thing. The report does not discuss any negative sides that the status would bring nor the responsibilities that would come along with it. In my thesis I have argued that if ethnic status would be granted to Irish Travellers, it would constrict the life of the Travellers because then Travellers would need to confront the expectations of the Majority and the State. On the other hand ethnicity denial is also a way of control; State as a machine of capture does not allow difference and Irish Travellers there is a threat that Irish Travellers will be assimilated to the mainstream society in the end if the situation continues.

The results of my study do not give much hope for Travellers or ethnic minorities in general. Is there anything good to be found in this situation? Could the label of ethnic group help Irish Travellers? Does Deleuze's and Guattari's theoretical framework in general have a concept which would shed a light for ethnic minorities searching for a better future?

I argue that there is a way out and that there is something positive to be found from this situation. In this chapter I will use Deleuze's and Guattari's concept of Becoming to outline a possible way forward. I discussed about Minorities in the previous chapter and here I will take this a step forward by adding the idea of becoming to it. I will end this chapter to a discussion of idea of becoming-democratic.

### ***6.1. Becoming***

Mobility and change are fundamentally positive things for Deleuze and Guattari. Lines of flight, war machine, Nomadism and Minorities are all on the same side, challenging the striatization and normativity of the State machine. Thus, they argue in *Thousand Plateaus* (320-321) that everybody should become Minotarian, even those who already consider themselves in Minority. By becoming they mean that the power for change is in the Minority and in order to actualize it we all need to become Minotarian. Minority does not follow the State logic and thus is capable of creating something new.

Paul Patton (2000) has discussed Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas about difference, politics and change. He argues that instead of talking about multiculturalism or gender neutrality we should all become Minotarian (*ibid.*, 46-48). For Patton becoming Minotarian is a process

where a subject makes a line of flight and breaks away from the conventional normal way of being. Becoming, like the war machine, should be seen as a process of metamorphosis, not a repetition of the old. (Ibid., 110.) Becoming might be a new scientific invention or a new social practice among the Majority. Concept of becoming emphasizes the process, not the end-point (Schrift 2000, 152).

Becoming is a positive force. It is not about anarchy or destruction but a hope of something new. Becoming Minotarian is a process which continuously escapes and confronts the norms of the society (Patton 2008, 190). According to Deleuze (1990, 171-172) May 1968 was a perfect example of a Becoming because student protestations in France that time lead to changes in the political system. Deleuze (ibid.) finds it interesting how groups like women or youth can cause change in the systems and rules that European technocrats have been creating and maintaining for decades. Becoming can also come from the direction of art and according to Deleuze (ibid.), art is resistance.

In the previous chapter I discussed how Minority is a counterforce for the Majority. However, even though Deleuze and Guattari value Nomads, lines of flight and celebrate Minotarian becomings, they acknowledge the importance of striated space in relation to smooth space. "[...] molecular escapes and movements would be nothing if they did not return to the molar organizations to reshuffle their segments, their binary distributions of sexes, classes, and parties" (TP, 238-239). Without Minorities, Nomads or lines of flight there would not be any creativity, no change and no becomings; it could be even said that the responsibility of the Nomads and the Minority forces is to shake the normative foundations of the striated space.

"Perhaps we must say that all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space." (TP, 537). All the realities of life exists in the striated space of the State, and Minorities need Majority but also the State structures in order to survive (Deleuze 1990, 173). Smooth space cannot create structures or continuity which are needed for progress. But on the other hand, if the structures are too rigid then there would be no creativity and no new innovations. If all the social actions would stay in the channels women probably would not have a right to vote.

Thus destroying the Majority is not in favor of the Minorities – structures are needed. However, the danger here is that when coming to the striated space, Minority will be captured for good by the State machine and the Majority. According to Janell Watson (2008, 212) "A

minority borrows Majority ways only at the risk of stifling minority creativity, 'drying up a spring or stopping a flow' [(TP, 304)]". If all the flows and becomings will be captured by the State and Majority, there will not be any creativity or dynamism left. According to this, Irish Travellers are balancing on a fence: ethnic status grants them access to resources that they need and boosts their self-perception, but at the same time it can restrict the movement and "dry up the spring". In the Travellers' case, moving to sedentary houses could be considered one example of the stifling, but on the other hand a Minority Becoming which I discussed earlier in the chapter about physical nomadism.

Watson has used French banlieue<sup>16</sup> culture as an example of a Nomadic power that uses State structures on its own benefit. Hip hop music that is produced in the French banlieues is distributed to the wider audience via channels that are in the control of the State machine. (Watson 2008, 213.) Hip hop music is born in the smooth space by the Minority but it is moved to the striated space where it is hopefully unsettling the logic of the State and the Majority. Following the music example we could say that when an artist becomes "too commercial" has the artist been captured by the State machine and attached to the striated space.

According to Patton (2000, 82) Deleuze's and Guattari's idea of Becoming has been criticized by the feminist of making the women to take the first step. I argue that this criticism can be extended also to the Travellers. Critique is pointed towards the idea that Becoming (a woman) makes the women to take the first step, that women have to take the lead in breaking the Majority gender roles. It is the Minority that needs to take the lead in order to make the change. Patton however rejects this criticism by pointing out that Deleuze and Guattari celebrate Becoming in essence and that Becoming as a process cannot be put in to a historical context. Becoming is a two-way street. (See also TP, 322-323.)

## ***6.2. Becoming-democratic***

I will now turn to a concept of becoming-democratic in order to employ the idea of becoming to the Travellers' case. As a source I have used Paul Patton's (2005; 2008) writings about the topic. According to Patton (2008, 193) "The concept of becoming-democratic points towards the deterritorialisation of existing democracies and their reconfigurations in new social and

---

<sup>16</sup>A banlieue is a low income housing estate which is "[...]known for high unemployment, drug dealing and angry youthful rioting[...]" (Watson 2008, 213).

political forms.” Thus, what is called after here, is a broader understanding what are considered fair and just in our societies today. After going through Deleuze's and Guattari's main works one can quickly see that democracy does not play a big role for them. As Patton (2005, 400) points out ”[Deleuze and Guattari] offer neither descriptive nor normative accounts of democratic political processes.” What defines democratic state for Deleuze and Guattari is its relationship to the capitalist market and to the Majority.

We can approach the concept of democracy from two directions; we can discuss democracy as a broad philosophical idea or as a technical concept which defines how democracy should be implemented (Patton 2008, 185). For Deleuze and Guattari there is no universal democracy. Each and every ”democratic” state has their own nationalistic opinions deriving from the Majority which defines what is right and just. As I discussed in the previous chapter, democratic societies are far from being egalitarian. Democracy is always based on the values and ideals of the Majority. Deleuze and Guattari argue that democracy is a point where capitalism reterritorializes itself in a current context and thus current democratic states are supporting the inequality which capitalism promotes. (Deleuze and Guattari 1993, 103; 110-111.)

Following Deleuze's and Guattari's ideas, Patton (2008, 188; see also Patton 2005, 400) argues that capitalism has subordinated our democracies and thus creates poverty and oppression. Majority by setting the values and ideals of a given society, but also capitalism both hinder Minorities access to public resources. As I discussed in the chapter about Ireland's national identity project, capitalism did push Travellers more to the margin by moving their traditional jobs elsewhere. On the other hand we could argue that capitalism could help Travellers' movement across Europe in search for work by making border crossing easier.

Minoritarian movements have a power to add more subjects to the processes in our current systems. Changing institutional structures and enabling them to be reached by previously marginalized groups can change the Majority i.e. the democratic rule. For Patton active citizenship which I discussed in the previous section of my thesis is closely connected to the process of becoming-democratic. For him being a passive citizen is neither a choice nor resistance towards the State control. Passive citizenship is directly connected to the marginalized position of the Minority. (Patton 2008, 190-191.) Patton's view is in stark contrast with the discussion which I had in the previous section of my thesis. Activating citizens should be seen as a tool of control instead of emancipatory. Here the problem

however is that the change can be made only by playing by the rules of the Majority.

According to Patton (2008, 190) Minorities and becoming minor are in the center of the process of becoming-democratic. Minorities have the power to question the foundations of normative order of the Majority and the State. Becoming minor will hopefully lead to a change in the structures, broadening the mainstream society and more dynamic life for the traditional nation state system. Is there not a contradiction between becoming minority and becoming-democratic? As Deleuze and Guattari (1993, 113) point out, democracy is always about the Majority rule. Becoming is always trying to escape the Majority, not to become one. As I discussed earlier becoming is a constant open ended process which does not put much weight to the results of the process. Thus becoming-democratic should also be seen as a process which does not aim to build a democratic state per se but to cause change and add new voices to the Majority. According to Patton (2005, 411) Deleuze and Guattari are calling for "pure event of democracy".

Deleuze and Guattari (1993, 112) argue that what we are missing in the world is resistance towards the current order. We need new ways of thinking and concepts for which current democratic states are not the optimal foundation. Even though it looks like Deleuze and Guattari are hostile towards democracy Patton (2008, 188) argues that it is not democracy as such they are opposing, it is the way how democratic states are led by the capitalism and by the nationalitarian opinions what Deleuze and Guattari are in contradiction with. (See also Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 111.) What Deleuze and Guattari are calling is change, new earths and people, which can only be achieved by Becoming. Those who are in Minority are the ones who hold the key to change. (Patton 2005, 404; 408.)

Entering to the mainstream society and the State machine, by Becoming, Irish Travellers could be the force that is changing Irish nation state. Societies have always had flows that cannot be bound up or channeled, Travellers and Roma people in general being one of these. These flows can, however, bring change and movement to the striated space of the nation state by questioning the old models of doing things. This change can also help releasing the flows that have been captivated by the State. However, as Patton notes (2005, 408), the possibility for change is always dependent of the Majority and how much it is willing to accommodate the new ways of being. It is the nationalitarian opinion which determines whether Majority will accommodate Minority's new ways, but also the capitalist axiomatic which restricts the distribution of social goods in a new way.

Irish Travellers are on the move from the smooth space, inhabited by the Nomads, to the striated space of the State. Instead of concluding that Irish Travellers will be assimilated to the Majority in the end and that their cultural identity will be fixed to the State model, we should note the potential for a change that Travellers bring with them. If we approach this situation from this angle, we can argue that in fact, Travellers have the keys for the change in the striated space not that the striated space would bound the Travellers or dry up the spring. This however, also depends greatly from the willingness of the Irish state and society to adapt to this change.

## 7. Conclusions

This thesis for me has been quite of a journey. It has been a long one but now thinking back it was the only way for me to do this. The starting point for my thesis was probably not the easiest one but in the end it has kept me motivated through the journey. When I first time opened *Thousand Plateaus* I felt baffled: how could I ever make sense or use of this cacophony of ideas, theories and concepts! But bit by bit I made my way through and managed to pick up some brilliant ideas and construct a path for myself. I used quite a bit previous research which had made use of Deleuze's and Guattari's theories in order to navigate through *Thousand Plateaus* and *Anti Oedipus*.

The first question that came to my mind was: Could Irish Travellers be Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads? Naturally this question changed along the way and was framed with the question of ethnicity. The final research questions were: *Are Travellers Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads? And, What are the Irish Travellers trying to gain with the ethnic status, and what implications does this have to the ways in which they are controlled?*

At first it looked like that answering my main question would be easy but discussing a bit further my research started to get more levels and shades. The first impression was that Irish Travellers cannot be Nomads because their lives are also controlled by rules and traditions. After this I realized that it is not the lack of "paths" which is the essence of Nomadism; it is the way these paths are used and how they are opposing the norm in the society. After this it was not so clear at all could Irish Travellers be called Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads.

In the end, there must be an answer and in my thesis the conclusion is that Irish Travellers are not Deleuzian and Guattarian Nomads. I base this argument on my findings that according to my material Travellers have a strong desire to be included to the structures of the state and be respected by the main society. According to my thesis and material Irish Travellers are not outside the State system; Travellers cannot be considered a group that would be living outside the state control. Travellers might have previously been outside the control, but according to my material Travellers strongly want to belong to the Irish society and to the Irish state.

My research was constructed around the ethnicity request of the Travellers and namely what Irish Travellers hope to gain with the ethnic status and how this relates to the ways how Travellers are controlled by the state. My analysis chapters were sectioned that the first one



answered more to the question about Nomadism and the two last ones more to the question of ethnicity and control. I also included a chapter which discussed a way forward in the context of the idea of Becoming.

According to my research Travellers' relationship to place continues to be in the core of Traveller identity even though most of the Travellers today lead sedentary lifestyle. Nation states are built on the idea a sedentarism and nomadism is something that needs to be controlled, and following this logic physical nomadism is Nomadism par excellence. Based on this Irish Travellers are not Nomads because they have been captured by the State machine and they have been forced to the sedentary way of life; for Deleuze and Guattari sedentarism is a stoppage for a Nomad. However, if we ignore the previous we could actually conclude that Irish Travellers are challenging the normative order by not giving a place that much of an importance: they are living in a trailer but not moving it.

Irish Travellers want to have a place in the Irish society and they want to be respected by them. Travellers feel that they are treated like a second class people and hope that ethnic status would bring them the respect and place which they see belonging to them. By using concepts of Faciality and internal other I argued that Travellers are not actually excluded from the main society but kept close enough to fulfill their role: to create unity among the mainstream society. Travellers are different but not different enough to be excluded totally, this leads into situation where Travellers are not granted ethnic status but where they are still excluded from the main society.

Irish Travellers do not only want to have respect from the main society but they also want to be part of the legal structures of the state. They want to be active citizens and have access to resources which are controlled by the state. Ethnic status would work as a label or a box. It would define who is a true Traveller and thus make Travellers a rigid bulk. Travellers want to be counted, included into statistics and be active citizens which all are text book examples of a state control. Irish Travellers want to be full members of the Ireland which means that they need to follow the State logic and its rules. Or do they?

At this point of my thesis I got depressed: is the world around us becoming more and more rigid all the time and can there even be space for difference anymore? Luckily I found a concept of Becoming which pointed a way out from this situation. Becoming is a process of change. Ireland could be in a process of becoming-democratic. Granting an ethnic status

would not need to be a one way street, it could be that Travellers would be the ones helping to find new ways of being and doing things and change the structures of the current order. After all, this is what Deleuze and Guattari are after: new earths and new people, constant process of becoming.

## 8. Bibliography

### Primary material:

Irish Travellers and Roma: Shadow Report (2011). Dublin: Pavee Point Travellers Centre.  
[http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/ngos/PPTC\\_Ireland78.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/ngos/PPTC_Ireland78.pdf) (Last checked 7.11.2013)

### Secondary material:

Antonsich, Marco (2009). On territory, the nation-state and the crisis of the hyphen. *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol 33(6), pp. 789-806.

Bancroft, Angus (2005). *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Clark, Colin (1997). "New Age" Travellers: identity, sedentarism and social security. In Thomas Acton (Ed.). *Gypsy politics and Travellers identity*, pp. 125-141. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Clark, Colin (2006). Who are the Gypsies and Travellers of Britain? In Colin Clark & Margaret Greenfields (Eds.). *Here to stay. The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, pp. 10-27. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Clark, Colin (2007). Introduction Themed Section Care or Control? Gypsies, Travellers and the State. *Social Policy & Society*. Vol 7(1), pp. 65-71.

Deleuze, Gilles (1990). *Negotiations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles (1999). *Foucault*. London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1993). *Mitä filosofia on?* Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (2004 [1988]). *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Continuum.

Donahue, Mark; Robbie McVeigh & Maureen Ward. *Misli, Crush, Misli*.

<http://itmtrav.ie/uploads/publication/MISLI-CRUSH-MISLI.pdf> (Last checked 7.11.2013)

Doty, Roxannde Lynne (1999). Racism, Desire, and the Politics of Immigration. *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*. Vol 28(3), pp. 585-606.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn (2003). Anti-Immigrantism in Western Democracies. Statecraft, desire, and the politics of exclusion. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman (2003). Analysing Discourse. Textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Fenton, Steve (2003). Ethnicity. Cambridge: Polity.

Foucault, Michel (1998). The Will to Knowledge. The History of Sexuality: 1. London: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (2003). Society Must Be Defended. London: Penguin.

Goodchild, Philip (1996). Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire. London: Sage Publications.

Greenfields, Margaret (2007). Accommodation Needs of Gypsies/Travellers: New Approaches to Policy in England. *Social Policy and Society*. Vol 7(1), pp. 73-89.

Helleiner, Jane and Bohdan Szuchewycz (1997). Discourses of Exclusion: The Irish Press and the Travelling People. In Stephen Harold Riggins (Ed.). *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*, pp. 109-129. London: Sage.

Helleiner, Jane (1995). Gypsies, Celts and tinkers: colonial antecedents of anti-traveller racism in Ireland. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Vol 18(3), pp. 532-554.

Jokinen, Arja and Kirsi Juhila. Diskurssianalyttisen tutkimuksen kartta. In Arja Jokinen, Kirsi Juhila and Eero Suoninen (Eds.). *Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä*, pp. 54-97. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Jäger, Siegfried and Florentine Maier (2009). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 34-61. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Kabachnik, Peter (2010). Place Invaders: Constructing the nomadic threat in England. *The Geographical Review*. Vol. 100(1), pp. 90-108.

Mac Laughlin, Jim (1999). Nation-Building, Social Closure and Anti-Traveller Racism in Ireland. *Sociology*. Vol. 33(1), pp. 129-151.

Mills, Sara (2003). Michel Foucault. Routledge critical thinkers. London: Routledge.

Mitchell, Jonathan (2011). Race, Nation and Belonging in Ireland. *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies*. Vol. 11(1), pp. 4-13.

McVeigh, Robbie (1997). Theorising sedentarism: the roots of anti-nomadism. In Thomas Acton (Ed.), *Gypsy politics and Traveller identity*, pp. 7-25. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

McVeigh, Robbie (2007). 'Ethnicity Denial' and Racism: The Case of the Government of Ireland Against Irish Travellers. *Translocations*. Vol. 2(1), pp. 90-133.

McVeigh, Robbie (2008). The 'Final Solution': Reformism, Ethnicity Denial and the Politics of AntiTravellerism in Ireland. *Social Policy and Society*. Vol 7(1), pp. 91-102.

Morris, Rachel (2006). Nomads and newspapers. In Colin Clark and Margaret Greenfields (Eds). *Here to Stay: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, pp. 236-258. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Ni Shuinear, Sinead (1997). Why do Gaujos hate Gypsies so much, anyway? A Case study. In Thomas Acton (Ed.), *Gypsy politics and Traveller identity*, pp. 26-53. Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press.

North, Kari E., Lisa J. Martin and Michael J. Crawford (2000). *The Origins of the Irish*

Travellers and the genetic structure of Ireland. *Annals of Human Biology*. Vol 27(5), pp. 453-465.

Patton, Paul (2000). *Deleuze & the Political*. London: Routledge.

Patton, Paul (2005). Deleuze and Democracy. *Contemporary Political Theory*. Issue 4, pp. 400-413.

Patton, Paul (2008). Becoming-Democratic. In Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn (Eds.), *Deleuze and Politics*, pp. 178-195. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Reddy, Maureen (2009). Representing Travellers. In James P. Byrne, Pdraig Kirwan and Michael O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Affecting Irishness: negotiating cultural identity within and beyond*. Bern: International Academic Publishers.

Reid, Julian (2003). Deleuze's War Machine: Nomadism Against the State. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*. Vol. 32(1), pp. 57-85.

Reid, Julian (2006). The biopolitics of the war on terror. Life struggles, liberal modernity, and the defence of logistical societies. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Richardson, Joanna (2006). *The Gypsy Debate. Can discourse control?* Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Schinkel, Willem (2010). From Zoepolitics to Biopolitics: Citizenship and the Construction of 'Society'. *European Journal of Social Theory*. Vol. 13(2), pp. 155–172.

Schrift, Alan D. (2000). Nietzsche, Foucault, Deleuze, and the Subject of Radical Democracy. *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*. Vol. 5(2), pp. 151-161.

Smith, David and Margaret Greenfields (2012). Housed Gypsies and Travellers in the UK: work, exclusion and adaptation. *Race & Class*. Vol53(3), pp. 48-64.

Young, Robert J. C. (2001). Colonialism and the Desiring Machine. In *Postcolonial Discourses, An Anthology*, pp. 73-98. Oxford: Blackwell.

Watson, Janell (2008). Theorising European Ethnic Politics with Deleuze and Guattari. In Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn (Eds.) *Deleuze and Politics*, pp. 196-217. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wuthnow, Julie (2002). Deleuze in the postcolonial: On nomads and indigenous politics. *Feminist Theory*. Vol 3, pp. 183-200.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *Critical Discourse Analysis*.

<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf> (Last checked 7.11.2013)