

Paper Presented at the 2019 ASN World Convention, Columbia University 2-4 May 2019

Do No Cite Without the Permission of the Author.

Failed Citizens or Migrants?

Contestation Over Local Belonging of the Czech Roma

Filip Pospíšil

The paper concentrates on insufficiently thematized aspects of Romani mobility in the Czech Republic in the period of neoliberal reforms after accession to the EU. It argues that Romani mobility in the last decades takes increasingly the form of segregation driven internal migration within the boundaries of nation state and local migration within a particular region or city. While practices and structural factors related to international and intra-European Romani migration has attracted significant political and academic attention,¹ mechanisms of intra-state Romani migration and segregation so far escaped for various reasons systematic academic analysis, quantification, and classification. Based on the review of academic literature, reports commissioned for local and national authorities and original field research the paper explains how various local policies and practices of segregation contribute to this type of Romani mobility and thus utilize and further contribute to the stereotypes of “Roma/Gypsy proneness to movement”.

¹ See for instance Castañeda, H. 2014. European Mobilities or Poverty Migration? Discourses on Roma in Germany. *International Migration* 53 (3). 87–99;
De Genova, N. 2019. The securitization of Roma mobilities and the re-bordering of Europe. In *The Securitization of the Roma in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. 29-44.
Solimene, M. 2017. Challenging Europe’s External Borders and Internal Boundaries: Bosnian *Xoraxané Xomá* on the Move in Roman peripheries and the Contemporary European Union. *Social Identities*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2017.1335828>;
van Baar, H 2017. Contained mobility and the racialization of poverty in Europe: the Roma at the development–security nexus, *Social Identities*, DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1335826

Western academics theorizing of segregation and migration of Roma for a long time either omitted Central and Eastern Europe altogether or considered it as a special case due to its non-capitalist recent past.² As observed by Picker (2017) researchers also largely overlooked “the street-level dimension of segregation and the everyday economic, social and political dynamics underpinning it.”³ Inspired by the Catherine Hall’s work on interrelations between metropole and colony and Stuart Hall’s takes on the role of race in liberalism Picker proposes to further investigate the processes of segregation as well as their ideological underpinnings in comparative perspective. While researching selected “Gypsy urban areas” (GUAs) in both Western and Eastern European countries Picker pays attention to local contexts as well as broader historical and structural factors involved in their development and perpetuation. Picker defines GUA as “either partially or entirely populated by Romani households... marked by higher rates of unemployment than the rest of the city, few or no public services, dilapidated housing, poor sanitary infrastructures and harsh stigmatization,” (Picker: 2) and identifies several mechanisms of segregation involved in their creation. These include mechanisms of *displacement*, *omission*, *containment*, and *cohesion* the relevance of which in the Czech environment I will further explore in this paper.

Some of the issues related to the application of the Picker’s term of GUA are however of more general nature and need be addressed prior to detailed discussion. Picker himself stresses that by using the term “Gypsy urban areas” he intends to emphasize the power of stigma embedded in the collective name historically used in negative labeling of the Roma. (Picker: 18) Even though he originally uses the term in its critical sense, further proliferation, however, risks reinforcing the same stereotypes the author is exposing. In addition to this limitation, as I will demonstrate in the case studies described below, the important spatial aspect of the segregation in the Czech context lies in the dynamics between urban and rural areas, between fast developing cities and often decaying or depressed rural environment. In this sense rather than being concerned with Picker about “Racial cities”, this article aims to point to the practices of segregation and forced migration of Roma in racialized urban as well as rural areas.

Instead of the term GUA Czech domestic political and academic debate so far frequents rather related term *socially excluded Roma locality*. Specifics of so-called excluded localities started to be explored especially since the publication of the first *Analysis of socially excluded Roma localities in the Czech Republic and absorption capacity of entities involved in this field*⁴ (GAC 2006) financed by European Social Fund and the Czech Republic. Establishment of the governmental Agency for Social Inclusion (originally named Agency for Social Inclusion in Romani Localities) incited the production of numerous reports, analysis, and evaluations over last decade that focus on “social exclusion and inclusion” of the Roma in individual municipalities cooperating with the Agency. Additional reports and academic papers were produced thanks to various EU, national, regional and local funding.⁵ Existing extensive

² van Kempen, Ronald and Alan Murie. 2009. The New Divided City: Changing Patterns in European Cities,” *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 100 (4): 377– 398.

³ Picker, G. 2017. *Racial cities: Governance and the segregation of Romani people in urban Europe*. Routledge. p. 5

⁴ GAC. 2006. *Analysis of socially excluded Roma localities and the absorption capacity of entities involved in this field*. Praha. GAC, spol. s. r. o. Accessed 14 April 2019 at https://www.gac.cz/userfiles/File/nase_prace_vystupy/GAC_MAPA_Socially_Excluded_Roma_Localities_in_the_CR_en.pdf

literature however only occasionally and unsystematically discusses processes and practices that produce the spatial concentration of the Roma and force them to migrate within the country, individual region or municipality. Rather than on detail analysis of the structural processes and agency of the actors involved in migration and spacial concentrations of Roma the academic debate attempts to clarify typology of such spaces of concentration.

With regard to structural processes involved in the creation of “socially excluded localities”, “ghettos” or “inner peripheries” authors often vaguely point to various often interacting and overlapping factors. Hampl and Marada (2015)⁶ suggest that long-term changes in the geographic organization of the society lead to a concentration of activities, economic and administrative functions into residential centers and other localities experience decline. Ouředníček, Špačková, and Feřková (2011)⁷ determine long-term economic stagnation and depopulation of inaccessible rural areas as a main contributing factor to the marginalization of particular localities. Hruška (2013)⁸ and Hampl (2007)⁹ recognize economic restructuring after the fall of state socialism and economic liberalization as contributing factors to a decline of regions that originally specialized in agriculture and heavy industry. In their attempt to summarize discussion on socio-spatial aspects of the processes of social exclusion in the Czech Republic Bernard and Šimon (2017)¹⁰ distinguish four different type of peripheries: those that are characterized by low qualifications, lower living standards, and the absence of a middle class; peripheries with an increased risk of social exclusion; peripheries with poor accessibility; and peripheries facing demographic challenges. Each of them according to these authors produces different patterns of social disadvantage and requires different policy approaches.

The academic debate in the Czech Republic reflects in a very limited way on the effects of privatization and marketization of housing and related forced mobility as well as the role of institutional and structural racism on segregation of Roma. In recognition of this deficiency, Toušek (2011)¹¹ warns against presenting residential concentrations of Roma as a free decision of Roma to live in separate *ethnic enclaves*¹² or *voluntary ghettos* claiming that they are rather results of structural segregation processes. At the same time, however, the author insists that

⁵ *Second Analysis of Socially Excluded Localities in the Czech Republic* (GAC 2015) identified a total of 259 documents (research studies, situation analyses, reports or strategy papers) that deal with social exclusion in different localities in the Czech Republic.

⁶ Hampl, M., M. Marada. 2015. „Sociogeografická regionalizace Česka.“ *Geografie* 120 (3): 397–421.

⁷ Ouředníček, M., P. Špačková, M. Feřková. 2011. „Změny sociálního prostředí a kvality života v depopulačních regionech České republiky.“ *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* 47 (4): 777–803.

⁸ Hruška, V. 2013. *Diferenciace venkovského prostoru na příkladu Moravskoslezského kraje*. Dissertation. Masaryk University. Brno.

⁹ Hampl, M. 2007. „Regionální diferenciace současného socioekonomického vývoje v České republice.“ *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* 43 (5): 889–910.

¹⁰ Bernard, J., & Šimon, M. 2017. Vnitřní periferie v Česku: Multidimenzionalita sociálního vyloučení ve venkovských oblastech. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 53(1), 3-28.

¹¹ Toušek, L. 2011. Purification of space: Spatial segregation of Roma in the Czech Republic. *RESPECT Research Project (GA no. 244549)*.

¹² Baršová, Andrea. 2002. Problémy bydlení etnických menšin a trendy k rezidenční segregaci v České republice.” (Housing of Ethnic Minorities and trends to residential segregation). pp. 5-29 in *Romové ve městě*. Prague. Socioklub.

„economic forces are ethnically blind or colour-blind by principle” (Toušek: 13) and the main role in segregation needs to be attributed primarily to the discriminatory municipal housing policies.

In an attempt to better understand the processes of segregation of Roma within emerging neoliberal society Růžička (2012)¹³ and Růžička and Toušek (2014)¹⁴ introduced Wacquant’s analysis of the classical and modern US ghettos and French banlieues to the Czech context and suggested that the processes of sociospatial concentration or “ghettoization” of the Roma are likely to be treated to wider trends of labor market transformation, stratification of society and ethnization of poverty during post-socialism. They observed though that so-called “socially excluded localities” inhabited by Roma in the Czech Republic are smaller, partially ethnically mixed and have a relatively low level of criminality when compared with the American ghettos and at the same time they also don’t fully resemble the French banlieue.

In their discussion, Růžička and Toušek elide introduction of the term anti-ghetto, which Wacquant’s uses to characterize some neighborhoods in Germany, Italy, Belgium and Holland. Wacquant suggests these anti-ghettos differ both from classical ghettos, or contemporary US hyperghettos as they are marked by deep penetration by the state, lack demographic coherence and do not seek to create parallel structures of the state. Unlike the ghettos, anti-ghettos are “not incubators of homogeneous ethnic 'communities' clamouring for recognition as such in the public sphere. On the contrary, the demands of their residents are fundamentally social, having to do not with difference or 'diversity'... but equality in treatment by or access to the polices the school system, housing, health care and, above all employment.”¹⁵ As I will demonstrate later, this definition fits to some of the Roma “communities” described in the case studies below.

A further possibility of the application of Wacquants’ terminology on so-called “socially excluded localities” in the Czech Republic was explored by Walach (2015).¹⁶ While attempting to answer the question of whether these localities are products of an advanced marginalization or ghettoization Wallach highlights that Wacquant himself was aware of certain specifics of the marginalization of the Roma of eastern Europe. According to Wacquant the Roma live in these countries dispersed as well as segregated in both “monoethnic rural villages and urban districts combining the four structural components of stigma, constraint, spatial enclosure, and institutional parallelism.”¹⁷ Walach agrees with Wacquant that living situation of the Roma in the Czech Republic vary and does not fully resemble anti-ghettos common in Western Europe

¹³ Růžička, M. 2012. Wacquant v romském ghettu: poznámky k procesu ghettoizace v českých městech. in Temelová, J. – Pošpišilová, L. – Ouředníček, M. *Nové sociálně prostorové nerovnosti, lokální rozvoj a kvalita života*. Aleš Čeněk. Plzeň. 20–45.

¹⁴ Růžička, M., & Toušek, L. 2014. Sociální exkluze: její prostorové formy a měnící se podoby. *Šubrt, Jiří a kol.: Soudobá sociologie VI (Oblasti a specializace)*. Praha. 117-141.

¹⁵ Wacquant, L. & Howe, J. 2008. *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Polity. p.284.

¹⁶ Walach, Václav. 2015. Advanced Marginalization or Ghettoization? An Analysis of a Czech Socially Excluded Neighbourhood in Terms of Inhabitants' Representations. In Kateřina Nedbálková, Kateřina Sidiropulu Janků. *Doing Research, Making Science: The Memory of Roma Workers*. Brno: Centre for the Study of Democracy and Culture (CDK). Muni Press. 2015. pp. 141-188

¹⁷ Wacquant, L. 2011. ‘A Janus-Faced Institution of Ethnoracial Closure: A Sociological Specification of the Ghetto.’ in Ray Hutchison, Bruce Haynes (eds.). *The Ghetto. Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press. p. 19

neither US (hyper)ghettos. Though Wallach insists on the usefulness of Wacquants' terminology in his case study of the socially excluded locality in Havířov-Šumbark he nevertheless concludes that "it is not possible to definitely decide which of the processes of socio-spatial differentiations [...] affected it."¹⁸

The overuse and misuse of the concept of the *Socially excluded localities* with respect to the spaces of the concentration of the Roma in the Czech Republic were criticized by Hurre, J, et al. (2016).¹⁹ While clarifying the relations of the theoretical concepts of ghetto, socially excluded locality and social exclusion the authors deduced, that social scientists as well as state institutions, politicians and broader public use the term "socially excluded locality" as a synonym of places "where Roma live, more or less independently of the actual social situation of these people." Thus, they according to the authors often conflate different processes that led to the concentration of Roma, ignore the local socio-economical context of individual localities and further contribute to the stigmatization of the Roma.

Most recently was the issue of segregation and internal migration of Roma in the Czech Republic addressed by the study commissioned for governmental Agency for social inclusion in 2016. According to the researchers, socially excluded localities are the result of regulated and "natural" migration processes. Common is cyclical migration caused by growing indebtedness and migration from the cities to rural areas caused by lack of affordable housing. Cyclical migration of Roma between municipalities is according to the authors characteristic especially for some parts of the Středočeský, Ústecký and Moravskoslezský region. The study further argues, that accumulation of socially excluded individuals causes tensions within local communities because of their "nonstandard" behavior and the fact that their presence devaluates prices at the real estate market.²⁰ The causes and mechanisms of ethnic segregation and discrimination on the housing market and housing and social policies of the municipalities are not elaborated in the study though authors mention that "The Roma ethnic [group] often faces the problem of discrimination. Without employment it is a problem to ensure adequate resources for rent and keep the current housing which inevitably leads to migration," and "respondents were facing discrimination from their neighbors."²¹ The authors further downplay the agency of the local institutions in migration control by stating that "Municipalities are with respect to the migration of socially excluded practically defenseless. They cannot prevent migration, and have to deal with its consequences which include establishment, extent and impacts of the presence of socially excluded localities."²²

Methodology

Two short case studies discussed below are based on analysis of the secondary data (academic studies, reports commissioned for national and local authorities, official documents on the national and local policies, human rights and media reports) and primary data (interviews with

¹⁸ Wallach 2015, p.182

¹⁹ Hurre, J., Sýkora, L., Trlifajová, L., & Kučera, P. 2016. Socially excluded localities revisited. *Geografie*, 121(4), 544-565.

²⁰ Foltynová, I., Juráš, J. and coll. 2016. *Výzkum vnitrostátní migrace sociálně vyloučených a sociálním vyloučením ohrožených obyvatel ČR*. Ostrava: PROCES – Centrum rozvoj obcí a regionů, s.r.o. p. 14

²¹ *ibid*, p. 93

²² *Ibid*.

officials, experts and Roma, participant observation) on the practices of segregation and local migration control of Roma, which author collected while working at the Agency for Social Inclusion at the Ministry of Human Rights of the Czech Government (2012–2015) and during research trips from 2016 to 2018.

The collected data involved practices in dozens of the Czech municipalities and villages but the quality and density of a data does not allow for an easy and straightforward comparison of individual aspects of segregation and Romani mobility. The quality of the data is affected mainly by following limiting factors.

The first obstacle in comparison represents the complexity of the issue of identification of Roma. While there is an ongoing debate among academics on “what do we mean when we (or others) use the term ‘Roma’ or ‘Gypsy?’”²³ most of those who are labeled as Roma by experts and majority society in the Czech Republic do not self-identify as such. The reasons for low self-identification are multifold and still contested. While some point to the fact that “Roma is a dynamic political identity constructed mainly from above and from out-side by political and expert communities and thereafter applied or adopted by people subjected to public labelling and policy interventions”²⁴ others explain low self-identification by complex stratification of different Roma sub-groups and their language differences, diverse historical experiences, ways of life, caste system and a strong preference for endogamy.²⁵

This article refers to Roma according to their ascribed identity (and not the self-perceived one) as this identity plays the most important role in the creation of the local policies and practices. Experience from my field research in the Czech Republic confirms similar observations by Csepeli and Simon (2004) from Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, that institutional and other actors often base their labeling of individuals as Roma on their “[p]hysical anthropological traits such as skin colour, linguistic cues, cultural traits, tags of identification such as family name”,²⁶ yet such labeling is often highly inconsistent and might vary in different situations and under different circumstances.

²³ Tremlett, A., McGarry, A., & Agarín, T. 2014. The work of Sisyphus: Squaring the circle of Roma recognition. *Ethnicities*, 14(6), p. 728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814542185>; McGarry, A. 2014. Roma as a political identity: Exploring representations of Roma in Europe. *Ethnicities*, 14(6), 756–774. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814542182>

²⁴ Surdu, Mihai, and Martin Kovats. 2015. Roma Identity as an Expert-Political Construction. *Social Inclusion*. 2015. 3 (5): 5.

²⁵ Zdeněk Uherek and Karel A. Novák argue based on their findings from Eastern Slovakia, that the „residue of the caste system helps explain why the Roma identify only with some other groups of Roma“ and not with all Roma in general. See Uherek, Z. and Novák, K. 2003. The ethnic identity of the Roma in Vašečka, Michal. *Čačipen pal o Roma: súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: Inštitút pre verejné otázky. 2003. p.75.

Similar findings were reported from settlements in Eastern Slovakia by Budilová, L. and Jakoubek, M. 2005. Ritual Impurity and Kinship in a Gypsy Osada in Eastern Slovakia. *Romani Studies*. 12/2005; 15(1):1-29.

²⁶ György Csepeli & Dávid Simon. 2004. Construction of Roma identity in Eastern and Central Europe: perception and self-identification, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30:1, 129-150, DOI: 10.1080/1369183032000170204

In addition to this inconsistency is the production and storage of official evidence of ascribed national (ethnic) identities outlawed in the Czech Republic since 2001.²⁷ Though some evidence suggests that various actors attempt to compile unofficial lists of Roma,²⁸ these attempts remain rather episodic and secretive.

Another limitation of the analyzed data comes from the vested interests of their authors. Official documents obviously reflect the agenda and interests of individual institutions as well as the political environment in which they were produced. More importantly, most of the “independent” research reports were funded and produced by various academic and other contractors on the order of national or local government institutions, many times subject of prior approval by funder before publication.

Finally, my own research was restricted to repeated short-term visits to individual municipalities and the lack of time and other resources prevented me from conducting long-term field research in individual municipalities that would in some of the cases help to ascertain for instance migration trajectories or allow for more detailed insight into the local power dynamics.

Case studies

The 2015 *Analysis of Socially Excluded Localities in the Czech Republic* recognize „[t]he growing levels of migration of the socially excluded [predominantly Roma], their increased diffusion into isolated rural houses, the dispersal into smaller localities in larger cities, the unstable situation at the dormitories” (GAC 2015: 32) as an acute social problem. It also estimates that while in the capital Prague the number of “socially excluded” nearly halved in the period between 2006 and 2014, some peripheral regions like Ústecký and Moravskoslezský experienced in the same period almost twofold increase (GAC 2015: 40). Yet mechanisms that contributed these changes and related migration and segregation are rarely addressed in the report. Beside mentions of the prejudice that socially excluded (Roma) face at the commercial housing market the authors only generally state “the lack of transparency and frequent discrimination inherent in the system of distribution of council housing” (GAC 2015: 81) as main factors contributing to the segregation.

Gaining the insight into the mechanisms of migration and practices of segregation is possible only through more detail research that allows to disentangling knots of various structural processes as well as interests and agency of the actors involved in shaping their manifestations on the local level.

Following case studies of segregation and migration of Roma in selected municipalities attempt to unwind these complexities using Picker’s classification of the mechanisms involved in the creation and maintenance of GUAs. The following discussion will expose specific benefits as well as limitations of this theoretical concept in the context of the Czech Republic.

²⁷ § 4, Act No. 273/2001 Coll., on Rights of Members of National Minorities

²⁸ Kašparová, I., Ripka, Š., & Janků, K. S. (2008). *Dlouhodobý monitoring situace romských komunit v České republice-Moravské lokality*. Úřad vlády České republiky, Kancelář Rady vlády České republiky pro záležitosti romské komunity. p 77.

Segregation and local migration control in Janov

The first case study aims to present dynamic and often ambivalent processes that resulted at segregation and forced migration of Roma in, from and within Janov, the neighborhood at the outskirts of former industrial town Litvínov. The neighborhood of six thousand inhabited mostly by residents labeled as ethnic Roma was identified as one of the largest spatial concentrations of Roma in the Czech Republic already in 2006.²⁹

The evolution of local policies in Janov is necessary to relate to the wider socio-economic processes that affected the whole Ústecký region in the northern part of the Czech Republic. Janov was built on the outskirts of Litvínov in the 1970s for the local workforce, mostly relocated from surrounding villages demolished to make way for coal mining. With the decline of the mining industry in the 1990s, part of the original Janov population moved out to seek better opportunities in other parts of the country. Most of the newcomers were Roma and other socially disadvantaged individuals who were, through a combination of economic pressure, privatization and discrimination, pushed out from more lucrative areas within the city of Litvínov or from other cities in the country. Immigration of Roma to the neighborhood fueled further outmigration of better off citizens from Janov, led to the stigmatization and marginalization of its population according to the report commissioned for governmental Agency for Social Inclusion in 2011.³⁰ By the late 1990s, the Janov suburb showed higher unemployment rates than Litvínov, a high level of indebtedness of the local population, increased drug use, and rapidly declining real estate values.³¹ While many of the newcomers to Janov were young Roma families with children, many of those who remained were elderly people of Czech ethnic origin. A generational conflict amplified internal conflicts and the polarization between “problematic (Roma) newcomers” and “decent (original) inhabitants.”³²

While municipal authorities in Litvínov in the late 90ties and early 2000s supported laissez-faire policies of privatization of housing and refrained from preventing the spatial concentration of Roma in Janov, facing growing discontent on the part of the local population they stepped up their rhetoric against Roma as undeserving poor in the following years. At that time similar discourse started to dominate also at the national level.

²⁹ GAC. 2006. *Mapa sociálně vyloučených nebo sociálním vyloučením ohrožených romských lokalit v České republice*, Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.esfcr.cz/mapa/>

³⁰ SocioFactor. 2011. *Evaluace v Lokálních partnerstvích 2008-2010 – Litvínov*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-pro-lokalitu-litvinov/evaluace-v-lokalnich-partnerstvich-2008-2010-litvinov-sociofactor-s-r-o-2011/download>

³¹ ASZ. 2009. *Situační analýza soc. vyl. lokalit na území města Litvínova se zaměřením na sídl. Janov*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-pro-lokalitu-litvinov/situačni-analyza-soc-vyl-lokalit-na-uzemi-mesta-litvinova-se-zamerenim-na-sidl-janov-asz-2009/download>

SocioFactor. 2011. *Evaluace v Lokálních partnerstvích 2008-2010 – Litvínov*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-pro-lokalitu-litvinov/evaluace-v-lokalnich-partnerstvich-2008-2010-litvinov-sociofactor-s-r-o-2011/download>

³² SPOT. 2014. *Analýza související literatury a návržení konceptuálního aparátu k výzkumu nulové tolerance v českých sociálně vyloučených lokalitách: Nulová tolerance, kontrola zločinu a sociální vyloučení*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/vyzkumy-male-a-dopadu/nulova-tolerance-kontrola-zlocinu-a-socialni-vyloucení/download>

In 2002 mayor Petr Gandalovič of the nearby city, Ústí nad Labem declared a program of *Nulová tolerance k narušování veřejného pořádku* (Zero tolerance on violation of public order) referring to his personal experience in New York where he served as Consul General of the Czech Republic in 1997 – 2002. Mayor Gandalovič publicly denounced concentration of problematic inhabitants (meaning Roma) in some districts of his city and requested that “The legislation should also be changed so that social benefits are no longer misused.”³³ In the following years’ term “nulová tolerance” (*Zero tolerance*) as well as “neplatiči” (Defaulters – used as a substitute label for Roma) gained increasing popularity among many local Czech politicians. In 2003 Mayor Ivo Rubík announced the program of “*Program nulové tolerance vůči neslušnosti*” (Program of Zero tolerance on indecency) in the city Slaný. Besides of more strict approach to the offenders of minor disorders “nulová tolerance” in Slaný encompassed also evictions against tenants who owed for rent in public housing and implementation of controls on the social benefits payments. In result, several (predominantly Roma) families were evicted from temporary housing at “*ubytovna Mexiko*” (hostel Mexiko). These steps and the program of Zero tolerance itself were denounced by human rights activist and in 2003 also by The Public Defender of Rights.³⁴ Nevertheless, similar programs were introduced in the early 2000s also in Kladno (2003), Vsetín (2004), Bohumín (2005) and other places.

Inspired by these local practices that attempted to prevent payments of social benefits to “problematic” Roma, Litvínov’s municipal authorities started “Project on minimization of misuse of social benefits” in 2007. As a part of the project city administration and the local branch of national Employment office replaced regular social benefit cash payments with food vouchers to those who were unemployed for more than 6 months. This policy was presented as aimed not on Roma but rather on supposed “misusers of social benefits” or undeserving poor who are supposedly unwilling to work and got dependent on social benefits. By limiting their income through the withdrawal of social benefits undeserving citizens were supposed to “adapt“ and assimilate or move elsewhere. After a limited period of application though Litvínov’s “Project” was subjected to criticism of The Public Defender of Rights who described it as discriminatory³⁵ and eventually terminated in 2009.

Launch of the “Project” however did not allay anti-Roma sentiments in the neighborhood. Rather on contrary - soon after its start more than two and half thousands of inhabitants of Janov and Litvínov signed the petition requesting local authorities to prevent immigration of „socially inadaptible citizens“ to Janov. In the autumn next year far-right political party „Dělnická strana“ (The Workers Party) organized series of widely medialized anti-Roma protests in Janov under

³³ Quoted according to newspaper article *Ústí does not want more Matiční* (Ústí už nechce další Matiční), MF Dnes, (October 5, 2002), http://zpravy.idnes.cz/usti-uz-nechce-dalsi-maticni-d16-domaci.aspx?c=A021004_220533_domaci_pol

³⁴ The Public Defender of Rights. 2003. *Zpráva o průběhu šetření ve věci sociální péče o obyvatele ubytovny Oupalova č. p. 392 ve městě Slaný* accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://blisty.cz/art/15285.html>; See also newspaper article *Non-payers from Slaný went to their relatives* (Slánští neplatiči šli k příbuzným), MF Dnes (October 10, 2003) at http://zpravy.idnes.cz/slansti-neplatici-sli-k-pribuznym-d5f-domaci.aspx?c=A031010_142936_domaci_has

³⁵ See The office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2008. *Payment of social benefits by vouchers display range of serious malpractices* (Výplata dávek formou poukázek v Litvínově vykazuje řadu vážných pochybení) Brno. November 26. 2008. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.ochrance.cz/aktualne/tiskove-zpravy-2016/vyplata-davek-formou-poukazek-v-litvinove-vykazuje-radu-vaznych-pochybeni/>

the slogan „Against positive discrimination and police violence“ blaming city representation of insufficiently protecting the interests of its “majority” inhabitants against Roma. These protests which culminated in a violent confrontation of the anti-Roma protesters with the Police and local Roma on 17. November 2008.

In an attempt to reclaim the image Roma-tough politician mayor of the city reacted to anti-Roma protests by the introduction of Litvínov’s version of Zero tolerance. Its first steps and the aims were summarized by a former chief of Municipal Police and vice-mayor in an interview:

„We came around whole Janov with social workers and Municipality Police and controlled everything...where we saw some problem, we have sent social field workers there to start working with them...There were families from Slovakia, one community, about 54 of them came...bigger part of them already left and I don’t say it was not our purpose little bit... we were glad they have left. “

The municipality made clear that they want to deter Roma from further settling in Janov and get rid of those, who were portrayed as a threat to public order. The rhetoric of anti-Roma protesters and city administration on the causes and solutions of the decline of the Janov neighborhood thus became in the following years almost indistinguishable. With one little exception – reference to Roma in official documents was often indirect and political representatives and officials preferred usage of terms like socially disadvantaged or inadapttable.

In the first months of the Zero tolerance, the municipality attempted to address alleged Roma immigration from Slovakia and other regions of the Czech Republic with a set of new measures. The main one – so-called “monitoring” – included inspections of households executed by the municipal police, the officials of the municipal social department and, occasionally, other institutions. The data collected through this monitoring enabled the creation of a database of inhabitants of the city. The database allowed for crosschecking of personal data and data on household income gathered by social workers, the municipal policemen and employment officers. The purpose of such crosschecking was to identify migrants, “non-citizens” and “misusers of social benefits”. In four months, the officials checked individuals and living conditions in over two thousand households in Janov and identified over a hundred people who did not administratively registered their permanent residence in Janov and twenty-four “problematic families”.³⁶

In the following years, Zero tolerance evolved in a complex set of measures of increased policing and disciplination of private lives of Roma executed by a range of institutions under various jurisdiction including Municipal Police, municipal social department, local branch of national Employment office, firefighters, NGOs, schools, national revenue officers, public transportation.

The Zero tolerance also included restriction of usage of public spaces for Roma. In 2010 and 2013 municipality issued two public notices redefining “public order”. These documents provided that public drinking as well as sitting elsewhere than on benches (benches were earlier removed from most of the Janov neighborhood), barbecuing and leaving objects on public spaces would constitute an administrative offense. Compliance with new regulation was enforced through intensified patrolling of Municipal Police and installation of CCTV. Limitations on usage of public space were applied especially on local Roma who were un-proportionally fined

³⁶ Press release of the city administration: Monitoring of problematic families in Janov is getting finalized, March 11 2009, Accessed 16 April 2019 at : <http://www.mulitvinov.cz/dokoncuje-se-monitoring-problemovych-rodin-v-janove/d-423902>

by Municipal Police for offences like sitting on stairs leading to the building, at the curbs and constructions, on brought out chair, on the drain cover, stepping on the grass, playing loud music from a car and loud conversation.³⁷ In 2016 was a public notice in Litvínov as well as similar ones in other Czech cities criticized by Czech Public Defender of Rights³⁸ who asked Constitutional Court of the Czech Republic to overturn some parts of ordinances banning people from sitting down outdoors on low walls or steps which eventually the Constitutional Court did in 2017.³⁹

The evidence on migration collected by the local authorities during the execution of Zero tolerance contravenes partly the original narratives of its proponents. The data from official monitoring did not confirm mass immigration to Janov (particularly not from Slovakia) at the time of the introduction of Zero Tolerance in 2008. Nearly 97% of those Janov inhabitants who were contacted in the early months of Zero Tolerance were permanently registered in Janov. Only 2% of the citizens who were controlled were administratively registered outside of Litvínov, out of which only 0.3% were registered in Slovakia.⁴⁰

At the same time data indicate, that during the Zero tolerance level of in-migration of benefit recipients from other cities significantly decreased. But this decline was arguably more than by municipal policies caused by the decision of some of the large landowners in the neighborhood to wall up the buildings and leave them empty rather than to invest in repairs and rent them. The physical condition of the Janov suburb continued to deteriorate despite large municipal investments into the revitalization of the neighborhood, partly funded by the European Regional Development Fund. In early 2015, 34 out of 113 existing panel houses in Janov were sealed off, destroyed, or endangered by complete abandonment. These buildings were affected by an increasing number of break-ins and thefts of metal parts, fires (some of them intentional attempts of insurance fraud), and production, distribution, and abuse of drugs. More importantly, ongoing monitoring pointed to increased internal migration within Janov (nearly eight hundred people moved within Janov just in 2014).⁴¹ High internal migration within the neighborhood caused by the deterioration of the houses, real estate speculations, the rising level of over-indebtedness and impossibility for Roma to find decent housing outside Janov remained a characteristic feature of the neighborhood.

³⁷ Janov: Municipal Police in Litvínov bully and threaten local Roma. One of them beaten up young woman. (Janov: Litvínovští strážníci šikanují a zastrášíjí místní Romy. Jeden z nich zmlátil mladou ženu). Romea.cz., July 10 2013. Available at: <http://www.romea.cz/cz/zpravodajstvi/domaci/janov-litvinovsti-straznici-sikanuji-azastrasuji-mistni-romy-jeden-z-nich-zmlatil-mladou-zenu>

³⁸ Czech Public Defender of Rights says municipal bans on sitting in public are unconstitutional, Romea.cz, February 1 2016, Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.romea.cz/en/news/czech/czech-public-defender-of-rights-says-municipal-bans-on-sitting-in-public-are-unconstitutional>

³⁹ Constitutional Court of the Czech Republic. 2017. *Obecně závazná vyhláška města Litvínova č. 3/2013 a obecně závazná vyhláška města Varnsdorfu č. 2/2012 (tzv. sedací vyhlášky)*. July 17. Accessed 10 May 2016. <http://nalus.usoud.cz/Search/ResultDetail.aspx?id=98163&pos=11&cnt=60&typ=result>

⁴⁰ SPOT. 2016. *Analýza politik nulové tolerance v Litvínově a Duchcově*. p. 44. Accessed 16 April 2019. [http://www.socialni-](http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=doc_download&gid=863&Itemid=6)

[zaclenovani.cz/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=doc_download&gid=863&Itemid=6](http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=doc_download&gid=863&Itemid=6)

⁴¹ Municipal Police Litvínov. 2015. *Report on situation and activities of Municipal Police in 2014 (Zpráva o stavu a činnosti městské policie za rok 2014)*. Litvínov. Accessed 16 April 2019 at https://www.mulitvinov.cz/assets/File.ashx?id_org=100115&id_dokumenty=2498

The dynamic process described in Janov case study comprises of simultaneous as well as asynchronous mechanisms of segregation and migration control of Roma. The initial period of segregation of Roma in Janov was characterized mainly by resignation on the social role of the local authorities, racist stigma and discrimination of Roma at the emerging housing market. Similarly, with Pickers classification in the case of Italian Pescara, we can qualify the socio-spatial condition of Roma in Janov of the late 90s and early 2000s as the “politics of omission.” (Picker: 69) The municipality was avoiding recognition of the presence of social marginality and racist exclusion while concomitantly withdrawing public services and increasing police presence.

In the late 2000s, however approach of the local authorities to segregation and migration control of Roma significantly changed. Tapping into the neoliberal discourse on undeserving poor dominating public debate on the national level, policies of the local authorities attempted to identify and sort Janov residents into several categories (good, tolerated, failed citizen and migrant). Similar categorization of citizens was analyzed by Anderson in 2013 at the level of nation-states especially with regards to migrants. According to her understanding, modern states in their approach to immigrants portray themselves as a *community of value*.⁴² In the case of Janov, we see that it is the local government and other local institutions which within the nation-state itself decide which membership rights will be guaranteed to which groups of citizens. In Janov, a *good citizen*, a full member (manifesting the values of the community and valued by the community – ethnic Czech) is defined in relation to a *failed citizen* (benefit dependent, criminal - Roma), “incapable of, or fail to live up to, liberal ideas” who “does not have rights, because he does not have values and economic worth” and to a *migrant* (Slovak Roma or Roma without residence registration) - an outsider and non-citizen whose presence needs to be conditioned and eventually removed. Most importantly, as Anderson points out (Anderson: 5), these categories become especially relevant for those who are at risk of failure/non-belonging, and who thus need to dissociate themselves from those excluded from the community of value. These *tolerated citizens* often become popular guardians of “good citizenship,” keen to support the discursive distinctions as well as restrictive measures against the failed citizens or non-citizens to prove their own membership in the “community of value.” Borders of such belonging to the local community of value were in Janov ethnicized by local ethnic Czechs and symbolically marked by emphasizing “decency” and work ethic that Roma were supposedly lacking. Newly created policies based on these narratives cemented social hierarchies between local Roma and non-Roma populations but they failed to push out the majority of Roma from the neighborhood.

While the rhetoric of Janov policies echoed practices described by Anderson, the use of the Pickers typology of the mechanisms of segregation of Roma in the case of Janov turns out to be problematic. First, the involvement of the local authorities in forced evictions - or in terms of Picker’s classification *displacement* (Picker: 48) of the Roma - remained limited, Roma migrated mostly within the neighborhood and housing policies were dominated by the commercial rather than municipal actors. Second, mechanisms of spatial segregation of Roma in Janov during implementation of Zero tolerance also did not fully resemble the Picker’s category of *omission* (Picker: 69) because the increased policing (executed mainly by Municipal Police) was complemented with increased activities of social services and other local institutions as well as investments in revitalization of public spaces and infrastructure of the neighborhood. Thirdly, though Roma largely remained living in the enclosure of Janov suburb affected by territorial stigmatization, these conditions did not amount to their full socio-spatial *containment* (Picker:

⁴² Anderson, B. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. OUP Oxford, p.2

84) given the presence of non-Roma residents and availability of city infrastructure in Janov. Finally, with regard to the fourth local segregating mechanism that Picker calls *cohesion* (Picker: 117), municipal authorities in Janov and Litvínov during the implementation of Zero tolerance did not really try to fix “the racially deemed, the “outlandish,” and the “troublemakers” into bounded urban spaces, isolated from the majority and watched over until social cohesion is guaranteed, with fewer and fewer resources for social care” (Picker: 117) Rather on contrary they attempted (largely unsuccessfully) to push out some of the „problematic“ citizens and discipline the others with extensive policing, intimidation and social work. Through the combination of various methods of disciplination, stigmatization as well as investments and development the local authorities helped to create Janov as a space that is deeply surveilled, populated mostly by socially disadvantaged (but not exclusively Roma) population that does not feel any mutual solidarity or sense of community. In this sense, Janov neighborhood in Litvínov fully corresponds with Wacquant’s typology of the anti-ghetto.

Segregation and Eviction of Roma from Vsetín

The second case study discusses specific mechanisms of segregation and eviction of Roma that evolved in the municipality Vsetín in Zlínský region in the Czech Republic. This analysis is based predominantly on the results of the studies commissioned for the Office of the Czech Government in 2007⁴³ and 2011⁴⁴ and reports of the Czech Public Defender of Rights.⁴⁵

In brief summary of the history of Roma in Vsetín (city of 28,500 in the eastern part of the Czech Republic), the authors of the study produced for Government Council for Roma Minority Affairs in 2007 suggested that Vsetín Roma settled in the city mainly in three immigration waves during the fifties, sixties and seventies. Most of Roma were then employed at the local Zbrojovka Vsetín (Arms factory Vsetín) and housed in the company housing in various parts of the town. (Grygar: 11). Following regime changes in 1989 was part of the housing stock transferred from the company to the municipality which later privatized some of its buildings. The report further describes some of the city policies, that led in the following years to the concentration of many Roma in the balcony house no. 1336 at Smetanova street and later on to their eviction to the container camp at the outskirts Vsetín city and also to the villages outside of the Zlínský region.

⁴³ Grygar, J. and Stöckelová, T. 2007. *Příčiny a souvislosti stěhování vsetínských Romů z pavlačového domu č. p. 1336 v říjnu 2006. Zpráva z šetření*. Masarykova Univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Brno, Accessed 18 April 2019 at https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/zalezitosti-romske-komunity/aktuality/vsetin_final_070228_FINALE.pdf

⁴⁴ Vomastková, K. 2011. *Vystěhování Romů ze Vsetína na Jesenicko a Prostějovsko: Popis a analýza dopadů vystěhování na romské rodiny, práci obecních úřadů, krajské samosprávy a NNO působících v regionu*. Masarykova Univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Brno, Accessed 18 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-k-oblasti-bydleni/vystehovani-romu-ze-vsetina-na-jesenicko-a-prostejovsko-k-vomastkova-fss-mu-v-brne-2011/download>

⁴⁵ The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2007a. *Eviction of Romani families from Vsetín*. Accessed 18 April 2019 at <https://www.ochrance.cz/en/news/press-releases-2007/eviction-of-romani-families-from-vsetin/> https://www.ochrance.cz/uploads/tx_odlistdocument/Vsetin_stanovisko.doc

The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2007b. *Vyhodnocení splnění uložených opatření k nápravě ve věci vystěhování romských obyvatel pavlačového domu na ulice Smetanova č. p. 1336 ve Vsetíně*. Accessed 18 April 2019 at <http://www.ochrance.cz/tiskove-zpravy/tiskove-zpravy-2007/kauza-vsetin-vyhodnoceni-ulozenych-opatreni-k-naprave/>

In their interpretation of the process authors of the report however, refrain from analyzing processes of discrimination of Roma in the housing market as well as broader structural processes of segregation of Roma.

In what they describe as the *process of ghettoization* authors of the 2007 study point predominantly to the tactics and strategies of the municipality that involved, for instance, discriminatory use of *City housing rules*. The *Rules* adopted by the municipal representation prevented renting of city apartments to the members of the households and their relatives who are indebted to the city, unemployed, committed offense or misdemeanor, were reported for unruly behavior, etc. Another documented discriminatory practice of the municipality involved use of the unofficial *Integration quotient*. Officials of the city responsible for the distribution of the municipal housing allocated housing for Roma based on self-invented 1:10 ratio. As they explained to researchers, integration of the Roma can succeed only when there is maximum 1 Roma family to 10 ethnic Czech families in the building. Given the fact that municipal housing stock was in the previous years significantly reduced, application of such a rule meant that municipal housing for Roma was never assigned in other parts of the city. The only exemption from above-mentioned rules was applied to the housing of Roma in No. 1336 at Smetanova street.

Authors of the 2007 study suggest that it was through the application of these and other tactics by the municipality that the balcony house in No. 1336 at Smetanova street ended up housing significant part of Vsetín Roma. The technical conditions of the building required reconstruction already in the '80s and building further gradually dilapidated over the following decades. Though there were several plans drafted for the reconstruction of the balcony house city council finally refused to fund it in 2005. (Grygar: 17) In the following year city councilors decided to demolish the building. Seven families from the demolished balcony house in Smetanova street were moved to the municipal housing elsewhere in the city, six families (70 individuals) evicted to villages in Olomoucký region, where the Vsetín municipality arranged for them (often inadequate) housing and 36 families (230 individuals) were evicted to the outskirts of the municipality to the newly build container houses in locality Poschla. (Vomastková: 13).

The authors of the government funded 2007 study reveal also other important aspects of the process of segregation and eviction of Roma in Vsetín. Firstly, they discuss some of the discursive practices of the municipal authorities, media and Czech majority population that facilitated the process. These involved stereotypical presentation of Roma as undeserving poor - "dlužníci" (Debtors), "neplatiči" (Defaulters) and "nepřizpůsobiví" (Unadaptable). (Grygar: 39) This labeling contributed to the symbolic exclusion of Roma from the local *community of value* that was followed by physical removal of some of the Roma from the city environment. Another discursive practice related to the creation of the state of the emergency and inevitability (Grygar: 30). The physical condition of the balcony house in Smetanova was the outcome of a long-term process of deterioration and lack of maintenance. The concentration of Roma in the building was the outcome of more than a decade long processes of segregation. Yet the eviction in 2006 was presented by city representatives as well as other local institutional actors as the only possible response to the situation of emergency. Finally, authors point to the ability of the local authorities to resist several attempts of the national institutions (particularly The Office of the Government) to prevent the eviction of Roma or reverse municipal policies and allow return of the evicted Roma back to Vsetín (as requested by The Office of the Public Defender of Rights). Not only were the local politicians able to defy the political pressure of some of the national

authorities but above that they managed to shape the national discourse on Roma, exploit public support for repressive measures against Roma in national elections (Grygar: 4) and even utilize some of the national funding programs for building of the segregated container housing for Roma (Grygar: 23).

Unlike policies in Janov, Vsetín case in some ways better corresponds with the Pickers typology, though rather than example of a single category of segregation mechanism it represents the combination of several mechanisms that mutually influence each other. First, in the eviction of Roma from the balcony house in Smetanova street we can identify the mechanism that Picker calls *displacement* (Picker: 48). The initial segregation of Roma in the balcony building could be to some extent characterized as *omission* (Picker: 69) especially because of the reluctance of the authorities to invest in the repairs and reconstruction of the building. Third, the relegation of part of Roma dwellers from Smetanova street to container housing in locality Poschla does certainly amount to their *containment* (Picker: 84). Though locality in Poschla does not completely resemble to fenced “nomad camps” and “incorporation villages” described by Picker in Florence and Montreuil, the housing inhabited exclusively by 180 Roma is isolated and set aside from urban life as it is situated at the outskirts of Vsetín, separated by industrial park and brings about spatial stigmatization of their residents.⁴⁶ Their segregation in the locality resembles a miniature version of ethnically as well as class homogenized space of *hyperghetto*.⁴⁷ Finally, by segregating Roma Vsetín authorities definitely attempted to create some kind of social *cohesion* (Picker: 117) in which many of the “troublemakers” were isolated from the majority and watched over while few of the other racially deemed, were allowed to disperse in majority through careful application of *integration quotient*.

The process of segregation and eviction of Roma in Vsetín, however, highlights yet another dimension – it took the form of forced migration between urban and rural areas and places with different levels of peripherality. Vsetín municipality represents a small regional industrial center that was affected by the restructuring of the economy in the early 1990s and experienced only moderate gradual recovery until 2007. Yet its economic potential and socioeconomic conditions of its population were significantly better than the ones of the remote villages in Jesenický a Prostějovský microregion where some of the Vsetín Roma were evicted. These villages are characterized by their remoteness, high unemployment and lack of social services. (Vomastková: 20 -21) The Vsetín municipality was able to utilize their economic and political power to facilitate the transfer of the unwanted population of Roma to the municipalities and villages that lacked the resources of the small regional center.

Conclusions

Selected cases studies of segregation and migration control of Roma in the Czech Republic is impossible to separate from their larger historical and socio-economic context. At the supra-national economic level was this period characterized by enlargement of the EU in 2004 with its integration to the common market and impacts of the economic crisis of the late 2000s. At the national level, it was dominated by the neoliberal discourse, austerity measures and growing

⁴⁶ GAC. 2015. *Výstupy z terénního šetření GAC 2015, Kvalitativní report Poschla, Analýza sociálně vyloučených lokalit v České republice*. Praha. GAC, spol.s.r.o.

⁴⁷ Wacquant, L., & Howe, J. 2008. *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Polity. p.3.

disparities between economic development of the central and peripheral regions in the Czech Republic. The transformation of the economy rendered much low skill or menial jobs previously occupied by Roma superfluous and led together with discrimination at the job market and in many cases to their unemployment.⁴⁸ Privatization and marketization of housing fueled further exclusion of many Roma from lucrative urban areas due to the combination of high costs of housing, high security deposits, low legal protection of tenants and racial discrimination.⁴⁹ These factors contributed to the concentration of socially vulnerable (often Roma) households in peripheral regions of the country (Ústecký, Karlovarský, Moravskoslezský region) and “in the so-called inner peripheries, i.e. especially around the administrative boundaries of regions, where municipalities are unfavourably located with respect to administrative centres, job opportunities and various facilities.”⁵⁰

Yet two presented case studies of segregation and migration control of Roma demonstrate that despite of these larger socio-economic process municipalities and various local institutions continue to shape their population and its racial composition through range of distinctive policies and practices. The mechanisms and dynamics involved in these practices display many similarities as well as differences with those engaged in creation of GUAs and analyzed by Picker.

On the discursive level the key local actors tend to essentialize Romani culture and fix Roma in a position of backwardness. (Picker: 132) This supposed backwardness of Roma institutional actors, media and non-Roma public present more specifically as unadaptability, lack of decency and ability of Roma to uphold their economic commitments (pay debts). In a similar way to the processes observed by Picker (Picker: 138), characteristic feature of the Roma related discourse in above described case studies comprises also denial of racism and structural character of a racist segregation and ethnicization of poverty. Such narratives of local actors and their omissions provide the space for blaming Roma for their situation and contestation over their local citizenship or belonging to the local *community of value*. Exclusion of the *failed citizens* or *migrants* from this community than takes symbolical as well as physical form.

The physical or spatial display of the mechanisms involved in these processes resists simple Pickers classification. As discussed above initial phase of the Litvínov case partially resembled to “*politics of omission*,” but local authorities abandoned this approach with the introduction of the Zero tolerance policy. This policy involved further policing, stigmatization and intimidation of local Roma but failed to *displace* (Picker: 48) most of them from Janov neighborhood while not amounting to their full *containment* (Picker: 84) or *cohesion* (Picker: 117).

⁴⁸ The Office of the Government of the Czech Republic. 2013. *Zpráva o stavu romské menšiny v České republice za rok 2012*. p.9. Accessed 18 April 2019 at <https://www.vlada.cz/cz/ppov/zalezitosti-romske-komunity/dokumenty/zprava-o-stavu-romske-mensiny-v-ceske-republice-za-rok-2012-113913/>

⁴⁹ Foltynová, I., Juráš, J. and coll. 2016. *Výzkum vnitrostátní migrace sociálně vyloučených a sociálním vyloučením ohrožených obyvatel ČR*. Ostrava: PROCES – Centrum rozvoj obcí a regionů, s.r.o. p. 91, 94, 98.

⁵⁰ GAC. 2015. *Analysis of socially excluded localities in the Czech Republic*. Praha. GAC, spol.s.r.o. p. 60. Accessed 14 April 2019 at https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Housing/InformalSettlements/PublicDefenderCzechRepublic_2.pdf

Contrasting with Litvínov is the Vsetín case where we identified all the mechanisms listed in the Pickers typology (*displacement, omission, containment and cohesion*). Yet these mechanisms do not appear in Vsetín as individual “ideal types”. It is rather difficult to clearly separate these mechanisms as they interacted with each other at various points and were often exploited by local authorities simultaneously as well as consecutively.

Application of various municipal practices and policies aimed at segregation and migration control of Roma depends on the extent of the peripherality or social-economic deprivation of the municipality and their other resources including housing ownership that would allow them to more directly control presence of the Roma in the municipality. Through combination of various mechanisms of segregation available to the local actors they actively seek to exclude parts of local Roma residents and thus contribute to their circular migration in peripheral regions. Such migration at the same time consolidates the image of Roma as nomads lacking local belonging and ability to “adapt” to the community. The uncompetitive real estate market, the limited resources and administrative capacities of the institutions in depressed rural areas makes them the ideal repository place for unwanted Roma population of more affluent municipalities.

References

- Anderson, B. 2013. *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. OUP Oxford
- Constitutional Court of the Czech Republic. 2017. “Obecně závazná vyhláška města Litvínova č. 3/2013 a obecně závazná vyhláška města Varnsdorfu č. 2/2012 (tzv. sedací vyhlášky).” July 17. Accessed 10 May 2016.
<http://nalus.usoud.cz/Search/ResultDetail.aspx?id=98163&pos=11&cnt=60&typ=result>
- ASZ. 2009. *Situační analýza soc. vyl. lokalit na území města Litvínova se zaměřením na sídl. Janov*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-pro-lokalitu-litvinov/situačni-analyza-soc-vyl-lokalit-na-uzemi-mesta-litvinova-se-zamerenim-na-sidl-janov-asz-2009/download>
- Baršová, Andrea. 2002. Problémy bydlení etnických menšin a trendy k rezidenční segregaci v České republice. (Housing of Ethnic Minorities and trends to residential segregation). pp. 5-29 in *Romové ve městě*. Prague. Socioklub: 3-42.
- Bernard, J., & Šimon, M. 2017. Vnitřní periferie v Česku: Multidimenzionalita sociálního vyloučení ve venkovských oblastech. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 53(1), 3-28.
- Budilová, L. and Jakoubek, M. 2005. Ritual Impurity and Kinship in a Gypsy Osada in Eastern Slovakia. *Romani Studies*. 12/2005; 15(1):1-29.
- Castañeda, H. 2014. European Mobilities or Poverty Migration? Discourses on Roma in Germany. *International Migration* 53 (3): 87–99.
- De Genova, N. 2019. The securitization of Roma mobilities and the re-bordering of Europe. In *The Securitization of the Roma in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham: 29-44.
- Foltynová, I., Juráš, J. and coll. 2016. *Výzkum vnitrostátní migrace sociálně vyloučených a sociálním vyloučením ohrožených obyvatel ČR*. Ostrava: PROCES – Centrum rozvoj obcí a regionů, s.r.o.

GAC. 2006. *Analysis of socially excluded Roma localities and the absorption capacity of entities involved in this field*. Praha. GAC, spol. s. r. o. Accessed 14 April 2019 at

https://www.gac.cz/userfiles/File/nase_prace_vystupy/GAC_MAPA_Socially_Excluded_Roma_Localities_in_the_CR_en.pdf

GAC. 2015. *Analysis of socially excluded localities in the Czech Republic*. Praha. GAC, spol.s.r.o. Accessed 14 April 2019 at

https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Housing/InformalSettlements/PublicDefenderCzechRepublic_public_2.pdf

GAC. 2015. *Výstupy z terénního šetření GAC 2015, Kvalitativní report Poschla, Analýza sociálně vyloučených lokalit v České republice*. Praha. GAC, spol.s.r.o.

György Csepeli & Dávid Simon. 2004. Construction of Roma identity in Eastern and Central Europe: perception and self-identification, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30:1, 129-150, DOI: 10.1080/1369183032000170204

Grygar, J. and Stöckelová, T. 2007. *Příčiny a souvislosti stěhování vsetínských Romů z pavlačového domu č. p. 1336 v říjnu 2006. Zpráva z šetření*. Masarykova Univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Brno, Accessed 18 April 2019 at https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/zalezitosti-romske-komunity/aktuality/vsetin_final_070228_FINALE.pdf

Hampl, M. 2007. „Regionální diference současného socioekonomického vývoje v České republice.“ *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* 43 (5): 889–910.

Hampl, M. and Marada, M. 2015. „Sociogeografická regionalizace Česka.“ *Geografie* 120 (3): 397–421.

Hruška, V. 2013. *Diference venkovského prostoru na příkladu Moravskoslezského kraje*. Dissertation. Masaryk University. Brno.

Hurrle, J., Sýkora, L., Trlifajová, L., & Kučera, P. 2016. Socially excluded localities revisited. *Geografie*, 121(4), 544-565.

Kašparová, I., Ripka, Š., & Janků, K. S. 2008. *Dlouhodobý monitoring situace romských komunit v České republice-Moravské lokality*. Úřad vlády České republiky, Kancelář Rady vlády České republiky pro záležitosti romské komunity.

McGarry, A. 2014. Roma as a political identity: Exploring representations of Roma in Europe. *Ethnicities*, 14(6), 756–774. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814542182>

Municipal Police Litvínov. 2015. *Zpráva o stavu a činnosti městské policie za rok 2014*. Litvínov. Accessed 16 April 2019 at

https://www.mulitvinov.cz/assets/File.ashx?id_org=100115&id_dokumenty=2498

The Office of the Government of the Czech Republic. 2013. *Zpráva o stavu romské menšiny v České republice za rok 2012*. Accessed 18 April 2019 at

<https://www.vlada.cz/cz/ppov/zalezitosti-romske-komunity/dokumenty/zprava-o-stavu-romske-mensiny-v-ceske-republice-za-rok-2012-113913/>

The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2003. *Zpráva o průběhu šetření ve věci sociální péče o obyvatele ubytovny Ouhavlova č. p. 392 ve městě Slaný* accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://blisty.cz/art/15285.html>

The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2007a. *Eviction of Romani families from Vsetín*. Accessed 18 April 2019 at <https://www.ochrance.cz/en/news/press-releases-2007/eviction-of-romani-families-from-vsetin/>

https://www.ochrance.cz/uploads/tx_odlistdocument/Vsetin_stanovisko.doc

The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2007b. *Vyhodnocení splnění uložených opatření k nápravě ve věci vystěhování romských obyvatel pavlačového domu na ulice Smetanova č. p. 1336 ve Vsetíně*. Accessed 18 April 2019 at <http://www.ochrance.cz/tiskove-zpravy/tiskove-zpravy-2007/kauza-vsetin-vyhodnoceni-ulozenych-opatreni-k-naprave/>

The Office of the Public Defender of Rights. 2008. *Payment of social benefits by vouchers display range of serious malpracticies (Výplata dávek formou poukázek v Litvínově vykazuje řadu vážných pochybení)* Brno. November 26. 2008. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.ochrance.cz/aktualne/tiskove-zpravy-2016/vyplata-davek-formou-poukazek-v-litvinove-vykazuje-radu-vaznych-pochybeni/>

Ouředníček, M., P. Špačková, M. Feřtová. 2011. „Změny sociálního prostředí a kvality života v depopulačních regionech České republiky.“ *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* 47 (4): 777–803.

Picker, G. 2017. *Racial cities: Governance and the segregation of Romani people in urban Europe*. Routledge.

Růžička, M. 2012. Wacquant v romském ghettu: poznámky k procesu ghettoizace v českých městech. in Temelová, J. – Pospíšilová, L. – Ouředníček, M. *Nové sociálně prostorové nerovnosti, lokální rozvoj a kvalita života*. Aleš Čeněk. Plzeň. 20–45.

Růžička, M., & Toušek, L. 2014. Sociální exkluze: její prostorové formy a měnící se podoby. *Šubrt, Jiří a kol.: Soudobá sociologie VI (Oblasti a specializace)*. Praha. 117-141.

SocioFactor. 2011. *Evaluace v Lokálních partnerstvích 2008-2010 – Litvínov*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-pro-lokalitu-litvinov/evaluace-v-lokalnich-partnerstvich-2008-2010-litvinov-sociofactor-s-r-o-2011/download>

Solimene, M. 2017. Challenging Europe's External Borders and Internal Boundaries: Bosnian *Xoraxané Xomá* on the Move in Roman peripheries and the Contemporary European Union. *Social Identities*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2017.1335828>

SPOT. 2014. *Analýza související literatury a návržení konceptuálního aparátu k výzkumu nulové tolerance v českých sociálně vyloučených lokalitách: Nulová tolerance, kontrola zločinu a sociální vyloučení*. Accessed 16 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/vyzkumy-male-a-dopadu/nulova-tolerance-kontrola-zlocinu-a-socialni-vyloucení/download>

SPOT. 2016. *Analýza politik nulové tolerance v Litvínově a Duchcově*. Accessed 16 April 2019. http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/index.php?option=com_joomdoc&task=doc_download&gid=863&Itemid=6.

Surdu, Mihai, and Martin Kovats. 2015. Roma Identity as an Expert-Political Construction. *Social Inclusion*. 2015. 3 (5): 5.

Toušek, L. 2011. Purification of space: Spatial segregation of Roma in the Czech Republic. *RESPECT Research Project (GA no. 244549)*.

- Tremlett, A., McGarry, A., & Agarín, T. 2014. The work of Sisyphus: Squaring the circle of Roma recognition. *Ethnicities*, 14(6), p. 728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814542185>
- Uherek, Z. and Novák, K. 2003. The ethnic identity of the Roma in Vašečka, Michal. *Čačipen pal o Roma: súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: Inštitút pre verejné otázky. 2003.
- van Baar, H 2017. Contained mobility and the racialization of poverty in Europe: the Roma at the development–security nexus, *Social Identities*, DOI: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1335826
- van Kempen, Ronald and Alan Murie. 2009. The New Divided City: Changing Patterns in European Cities,” *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 100 (4): 377– 398.
- Vomastková, K. 2011. *Vystěhování Romů ze Vsetína na Jesenícko a Prostějovsko: Popis a analýza dopadů vystěhování na romské rodiny, práci obecních úřadů, krajské samosprávy a NNO působících v regionu*. Masarykova Univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Brno, Accessed 18 April 2019 at <http://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/dokumenty/dokumenty-k-oblasti-bydleni/vystehovani-romu-ze-vsetina-na-jesenicko-a-prostejovsko-k-vomastkova-fss-mu-v-brne-2011/download>
- Wacquant, L. 2008. Ghettos and Anti-Ghettos: An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty. *Thesis Eleven*, 94(1), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513608093280>
- Wacquant, L., & Howe, J. 2008. *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Polity.
- Wacquant, L. 2011. ‘A Janus-Faced Institution of Ethnoracial Closure: A Sociological Specification of the Ghetto.’ in Ray Hutchison, Bruce Haynes (eds.). *The Ghetto. Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Walach, V. 2015. Advanced Marginalization or Ghettoization? An Analysis of a Czech Socially Excluded Neighbourhood in Terms of Inhabitants' Representations. In Kateřina Nedbálková, Kateřina Sidiropulu Janků. *Doing Research, Making Science: The Memory of Roma Workers*. Brno: Centre for the Study of Democracy and Culture (CDK). Muni Press. 2015. pp. 141-188