Miroslav Scheinost

Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention,
Prague, Czech Republic

Czech-Romani conflict
in criminological aspect

After 1945, due to its specific historical development, the Czech, respectively Czechoslovak state became ethnically a very homogenous country. Most of the German population was expelled. A great part of the formerly numerous Jewish minority did not survive holocaust, which is also true for the Romani population, which had lived in Czech until the war and the Nazi occupation. Until 1990, only two significantly numerous nationalities, apart from the Czechs and Slovaks, had lived in the area of the current Czech Republic, which emerged as a result of the split of Czechoslovakia in 1993. They were the Poles, living mostly in the Northern Moravian Region, and Germans, scattered along the western border of the country. Romani people had formed a specific ethnic group, majority of which had not moved to Czech only after 1945, especially from Slovakia.

After 1990, together with other fundamental political, economic and social processes, the ethnic composition of the country has changed to a certain extent as well. The Czech Republic became a segment of the migration routes not only as a transit country but, for certain groups, as a final destination. Nevertheless, it is true that most members of the countries or nationalities who come to the Czech Republic remain citizens of their respective original countries. Based on available statistical data from 2012, foreign

nationals living in the Czech Republic amounted to approximately 4.18% of the total population of the country.

Table 1. Number of foreign nationals living in the Czech Republic as of September 30th, 2012

Foreign nationals	Total	Permanent residency	Other residency types
Total number of foreigners	438,870	208,396	230,474
Out of which:			
Ukraine	115,153	55,078	60,075
Slovakia	84,607	32,778	51,829
Vietnam	57,762	39,035	18,727
Russian Federation	33,355	14,942	18,413
Poland	19,156	10,670	8,486
Germany	16,895	4,462	12,433

Source: Directorate of the Immigration Services of the Police of the Czech Republic[1].

The table shows population numbers of citizens of foreign countries in the Czech Republic with more than 10 thousand people. But the number of people who had been originally foreigners and who have acquired Czech nationality has not been significantly increasing. Moreover, we cannot say that the presence of members of the above stated nationalities in the Czech Republic has caused any serious problems from the perspective of their cultural differences or conflicts with the criminal law, caused by these differences. Slovaks are not basically perceived as foreigners in the Czech Republic, which is quite understandable because of the past, long coexistence of

---

[1] See the Czech Statistical Office, http://www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci.nsf/datove_udaje/ciz_pocet_cizincu#cr (dostęp: 12 marca 2014 r.).

Czech and Slovaks in one state. The relatively fast growing Ukrainian minority is the result of economically motivated migration and an overwhelming majority of its members does not have the desire to breach any laws apart from the labor legal regulations. On top of it, this is rather an issue of the Czech employers. Vietnamese culture is obviously quite different but it is absolutely clearly visible that the Vietnamese people strive to integrate themselves into the society and not to cause any conflicts with the majority. The cultural and social standards of the Vietnamese ethnic group are respected inside of their community as well as the authority of the so-called "esteemed men", however, these standards are used for solving internal disputes and problems and are not promoted outwardly as a possible manifestation of resistance against the standards of the majority. We can also state that the attitude of the Czechs towards the Vietnamese is mostly tolerant.

Criminality of foreigners in the Czech Republic does not represent a serious problem either, provided we do get into detailed analyses of some specific types of criminal activities, such as violent offences or organized crime. Surveys of the public opinion suggest that people tend to overestimate the share of foreign nationals on criminal activities. As a part of the IKSP survey, conducted in 2009, the respondents estimated, on average, that 20% of all crimes were committed by foreign state nationals[2]. In reality, this share has not exceeded 8% since 2008. The share of known and prosecuted offenders-foreigners (including Slovaks) has amounted to about 6 to 7% for a long time. This number is relatively stable. It is also a significantly lower number than, for example, in Germany or Austria. We cannot therefore claim that cultural differences of the foreign nationalities in the Czech Republic would cause any fundamental problems in relation to the criminal law.

What is left then is the Romani problem, which is very specific for our society. In order to get any close to its roots and nature, I will start with a brief historical excurse.

---

[2] P. Zeman et al., *Veřejnost a trestní politika* (*The Public and Criminal Policies*), Prague 2011, p. 94.

The Romani people had been coming to the area of former Czecho-slovakia since the 15ᵗʰ century, even though we can find the first references about their arrivals in even older sources. In Slovakia, they began to live settled lives earlier. In Czech, they started doing so – with the exception of the so-called Olaski Romani – approximately from the 17ᵗʰ century. They were engaged in traditional and typical jobs, which were sometimes passed within families.

A fatal change for the Romani was represented World War II. While before the war, the number of Romani people in the area of the so-called Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia was estimated at about 6,500, not even 600 of them survived the war. The influx of Romani people to Czech started in the time of the so-called additional settlement and labor recruitment during the postwar years. The Romani people at that time were coming mostly from Slovakia.

State policies towards the Romani people went through several stages. In the beginning of the 1950s, when the Romani people were not considered a nation, respectively a distinctive ethnic group, they were characterized as a "social group with an outdated way of life", which needs to be addressed. Steps towards enlightenment and eliminating illiteracy, practically towards assimilation, were undertaken. These steps culminated by Act No. 74/1958 on mandatory permanent settling of nomadic persons. Any attempts for emancipation of the Romani people based on their own cultural basis were rejected. Even the Romani language was being suppressed in order not to conserve the old way of the "gypsy life". In 1965, Decree No. 502 was issued. It ordered "dispersion of undesirable gypsy concentrations" which, in reality, represented artificial and sometimes even forcible splitting and moving of Romani communities from Slovakia to various locations in Czech.

The result of these attempts was ambivalent. Romani people in Czech had better material and living conditions, their employment rate was increasing and the Romani children were receiving at least elementary school education. On the other hand, they were often not able to handle these better material and living conditions (which applied to, for example, their ability to handle and manage their wages paid in cash). Migration to Czech and the splitting

and moving of whole communities and even families to different locations led to deep interventions to the social structure of the Romani communities, division of large families and separation of nuclear families, which was in contradiction to their culture and way of life, governed by respect to acknowledged authorities. Apart from the above stated facts, this splitting and moving and new settling processes did not respect the traditional differentiation of the Romani ethnic group. As a result, subgroups, traditionally separated by caste and kin divisions and distances, were mixed together. New communities were thus established only spatially, i.e. they did not have any natural authorities and it was not possible to handle them as organic units. This situation represented an unknown phenomenon for the majority. Its ignorance and disrespect of this situation led to the failure of many activities, even if they were meant well. It all resulted in fundamental weakening of the traditional family connections and authorities, disorientation of the members of the Romani ethnic group and destruction of its traditional values and behavioral standards.

This phenomenon is not new or unknown. It has been described in several works and studies on the situation and development of ethnic minorities and groups moved, voluntarily or mandatorily, to a different environment with a different culture and behavioral standards. In these cases, "shocks" occur, to which moved minorities in a given new environment react differently based on the ratio of their differences in comparison with the majority environment, the degree of their internal cohesiveness and weight of their own authorities, strength of their cultural traditions, ambitions and interest in integration, and of course also based on the degree of the pressure exerted by the majority and its tolerance, etc. Nevertheless, even for minorities that come to a new environment with an effort to become integrated, a phenomenon, which could be called alienation, loss of original identity while not acquiring or accepting a new one, disillusion, resignation or even aggression towards the surrounding environment, instead of integration, has been observed and described. This situation often occurs even in the second or third generation. For example, we could mention here the recent riots and conflicts in France or the Great Britain when the initial

individual conflicts between the members of some minorities and the state authorities led to extensive violent unrests and when it is questionable if their roots were of an ethnic or social nature.

If we apply this phenomenon and process to the Romani people, at least two contrary processes have collided here. On the one hand, the Romani people had lived in the area of the former Czechoslovakia for a long time and thus did not constitute newly arrived immigrants to a completely new environment (provided we omit the transfer of the Romani people to Czech from Slovakia after World War II, which would, however, required a specific analysis). On the other hand, the factors that have had a negative impact on their integration into the society also include a relative fragility of their cultural traditions, which have been preserved, at the absence of a standard language and written memories, only verbally within individual families and which have been very vulnerable under new pressures. Yet another of these factors is the fact that they had traditionally and for hundreds of years lived on the fringe of the society, being occasionally persecuted by and significantly and permanently distanced from the majority, the so-called gadjos (i.e. non-Romani people). Their deeply rooted distrust towards the majority, clearly strengthened by the persecution and extermination during World War II, has had a negative impact as well.

Towards the end of the 1960s, during the period of loosening of the communist regime and during the so-called Prague Spring, Romani emancipation attempts appeared. There was an effort to codify the Romani language as a distinctive language, a Union of Gypsies-Romani People was established and support of the Romani folklore was gradually developing. These attempts were significantly weakened after 1968 and upon onset of the political normalization process. The Union of Gypsies-Romani People was dissolved. Nevertheless, approach to the Romani people shifted from assimilation to "integration" efforts. The fact is that a large majority of the Romani people in the Czech Republic had a place to live and an employment, their children went to schools and education of Romani women, Romani cultural traditions, etc. were supported. However, efforts leading to the actual emancipation of the Romani people were not supported. Despite the undeniable social rise, the

Romani people remained a not fully integrated part of the society and the process of weakening of their identity continued.

The fundamental political changes after 1989 had brought, once again, some contradictory effects in relation to the Romani people. The new constitution recognized the Romani people as a distinctive ethnic group with all rights, to which the Romani people can claim affiliation. Formal obstacles related to the efforts for actual emancipation and development of cultural specifics were removed. A government advisory board for Romani matters was established and so was a museum of the Romani culture. Universities began to offer Romani studies. On the other hand, out of the estimated total number of the Romani people in the Czech Republic of 250,000, fewer than 12,000 of them claimed their Romani nationality in the census in 1992. The Act on State Citizenship from 1993 disqualified a part of the Romani people since it required that, in order to obtain the Czech citizenship, one had to be born in the Czech Republic or not to have any conflict with the law for a period of at least 5 years. This stipulation made some Romani people in the Czech Republic foreigners. In 1998, this Act was amended but the damage in relation to the Romani people and for relations between the Romani people and the Czech state had been already done. This Act is also considered one of the reasons of the exodus of the Czech Romani people abroad in 1997[3].

The position of the Romani people has been very deeply influenced by the fundamental political and economic changes in the society. The perception of the role of the state and its citizens has changed. Instead of a state that takes care of its citizens – sometimes manipulatively and against their will – people are now perceived as citizens who take their own, independent decisions and who are responsible for their own lives and fates. Individual success, measurable by an achieved social status and supported by the actual performance, has become a positive behavioral formula.

I do not wish to argue with this thesis here. I basically agree with it. However, even the greatest truths need to be measured against a particular environment, in which they are applied. We

---

[3] A. Scheinostová, *Romipen*, Prague 2006.

should be aware of their unwanted and unintended consequences. In the case of the Romani people, this approach, based on one's own initiative and performance with a limited support and care of the state, has pushed them even further to the fringe of the society. Individualism and the effort to succeed do not form a part of the Romani culture and traditional thinking despite the fact it is already quite weakened. Moreover, low professional qualification and lower education of the Roma have disqualified them on the labor market. Job possibilities in the professions that the Romani people used to traditionally perform, i.e. especially manual auxiliary labor, have been limited and the remaining positions are preferably being given to foreign workers, who are willing to work hard for relatively low wages. As a result of the above described situation, the unemployment rate among the Roma has increased dramatically and the number of them who depend on welfare benefits has thus increased as well, which has reinforced the negative feelings of the majority against the Romani people. Their long-term and, in many cases, multi-generational unemployment (solution of which is not, of course, helped by the generally high unemployment rate) and their dependence on welfare benefits, together with the negative and sometimes even discriminating attitude of the majority, currently represent a fundamental problem.

The Roma as a whole, respectively their majority, can hardly overcome this problem on their own. Civil equality of rights and the ability to identify themselves as Romani people and to develop their distinctiveness for the benefit of their development and integration on one side do not overweight their insufficient education and qualification, the distance between them and the majority society and other social problems on the other side. Despite the fact that, for example, the "Concept of the government policies towards the members of the Romani community, assisting in the process of their integration into the society", adopted in 2000[4] (it

---

[4] Concept of the government policies towards the members of the Romani community, assisting in the process of their integration into the society. Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic No. 599/2000 from June 14th, 2000.

is one of such concepts that are being gradually adopted), speaks about gradual elimination of individual obstacles (external obstacles in the form of various forms of discrimination as well as internal obstacles in the form of various education and qualification handicaps) of the integration of the Roman people into the society, the situation is not getting any better. If anything, it is getting worse.

The fact is that negative attitudes of the public towards the Roma have grown stronger last few years. The issue in question is basically not related to racist attitudes or programmed unwillingness to accept certain cultural differences of other national or ethnic groups, even though this is a more complex issue and the degree of tolerance is arguable (let us remember the long time, during which the Czech society was ethnically relatively homogeneous and did not have to learn how to coexist with cultural differences of other nationalities and groups). The issue in question is that the picture of the Romani people in the eyes of the majority society is burdened with negative connotations and supported by actual or declared and especially generalized negative experiences. The picture of the Roma is based on distinctive stereotypes[5]. We could say that, based on the evaluation and opinions of the public, the Romani people overstep the "tolerated model of cultural differences" and the public assigns them features that are not culturally different but rather socially pathologic regardless of the extent, to which this picture corresponds to the actual situation and also regardless of the degree of their own responsibility for the situation, in which they currently find themselves. They are seen in a much worse light than non-Romani people when it comes to education, diligence, law obedience, discipline and reliability[6]. The public also assumes that their share on committed criminal activities is significant.

The problem is that the real social situation of the Romani people, status of criminal activities committed by Roma and other characteristics cannot be documented, demonstrated or disproved by statistical data. A person is considered Romani if this person

---

[5] M. Štěchová et al., *Romská minorita a postupy integrace* (*Romani Minority and Integration Processes*), Prague 2002, p. 7.

[6] Ibidem, p. 21.

officially declares to be one (for example, in a census). As I already mentioned, only a small part of them out of the estimated total number has done so. Other Romani statistics are not and cannot be maintained in order to preserve correctness and prevent discrimination. For example, we have no information about the number of unemployed Romani people, registered with the labor offices, we do not know how big is the share of the Romani population among the recipients of various welfare benefits and what is their share of the prosecuted criminal offenders, sentenced offenders, etc. It is thus not possible to provide, for example, a more objective summary of criminal activities committed by the Roma since this data are just not gathered. On the one hand, this effort to maintain correctness is understandable (not mentioning the problem of how to determine who a Romani person is and who is not). On the other hand, we do not have any data available that could be used for disproving the general belief that a greater part of criminal activities in the Czech Republic is committed by the Romani people.

It is difficult to assess if our legal criminal standards are in contradiction to the internal standards of the Roma. This is so not only because of the nonexistent evidence of criminal activities or criminal sanctions imposed on the Roma. It is also because it is very difficult to assess which original standards, by which the life of the Romani communities used to be governed, are still functional and which have lost their validity under the pressure of the surroundings and circumstances, together with the disintegration of the traditional communities (for example, it used to be unthinkable that the Romani women would make living by prostitution; today, not only prostitution of the Romani women exist but some male members of the community are even pimps). We could maybe point out the phenomenon of the so-called usury inside of the Romani communities, where Romani usurers impoverish members of their communities and make them completely dependent on them. However, no collision of the standards can be observed here – pursuant to the valid criminal law, usury should be prosecuted but, in reality, this is not happening in these cases almost at all either because these cases are not reported from inside of the communities of for the lack of evidence.

In the last few years the situation of the Romani communities and their position in the society has also worsened as a result of the tendency to concentrate the so-called problematic citizens in individual cities and communities into relatively delimited localities. This process takes sometimes place rather spontaneously, however, sometimes intentionally by, for example, expelling people who do not pay rent and moving them into temporary shelters or rooming houses. As a result, the so-called socially excluded locations (in other words, ghettos) are created. While the population of these locations is not made exclusively by the Romani people, their high concentration is characteristic for these locations. It is clear that the issue in question is not just the concentration of the population but especially the concentration of social problems and socially pathologic and criminal activities. We could also point out – and the question is if this is a conflict or rather an abuse of valid standards – that non-Romani owners and landlords of the rooming houses often benefit from it. By running these houses, they acquire quite decent welfare benefits provided for housing without providing accommodation with at least a basic standard to their tenants.

We cannot be surprised that the tension between the majority society and the Roma has been increasing under this situation. The Roma people were becoming targets of violent assaults already in the 1990s. Their attackers were mainly some groups of the skinhead's movement. Characteristics of this movement have been elaborated and their motivation for xenophobic and racist assaults as well as the processes of group dynamics analyzed, so we do not need to elaborate on it here[7].

These assaults, which, back then, represented a new phenomenon for our society and target of which would occasionally also be non-Romani foreigners, attracted considerable attention and negative reactions in the society. New legislative and organizational measures were adopted (for example, incorporating new bodies

---

[7] For example, see M. Štěchová et al., *Interetnické konflikty* (*Interethnic Conflicts*), Prague 2004.

of crime into our criminal law and establishing specialized police units that focus on extremism).

Despite the above stated measures, the situation is getting rather worse. While in the 1990s these assaults were sporadic and committed by relatively small groups of youngsters (and these conflicts did not include only attacks on the Roma but also brawls between skinheads and anarchists etc.), these days they are mass disturbances and organized "protest" marches led by supporters of extremist movements. Destinations of such events are usually localities inhabited by the so-called socially inadaptable citizens, i.e. mostly the Romani people. Violent conflicts between individual Romani and non-Romani people are used as impulses or some kind of detonators. Of course there are also cases of assaults of non-Romani people by the Roma. However, these cases are rather individual criminal violent offences or property offences and not organized demonstrative demonstrations of tens or hundreds of people.

A dangerous feature, which demonstrates that the situation has been escalating, is the fact that while these events are organized by supporters of extremist groups, they are supported by a wider circle of "normal" citizens. The motives of such support are the long-term problems of the coexistence of the Romani and non-Romani people, manifested behavior of the Romani people, not accepted by the majority society, and especially a feeling that the appropriate state administration and executive authorities are not addressing these problems. These problems are intensive especially in socially excluded localities, which become the targets for manifesting the dissatisfaction of the majority and an easy opportunity to exploit this discontent. Apart from these mass demonstrative actions, there have also been individual assaults on houses or locations inhabited by the Roma, some of them with tragic consequences (for example, the incendiary attack on a house inhabited by a Romani family in Vítkov in 2009).

The Penal Code of the Czech body of law includes stipulations for prosecuting criminal acts committed with racial, nationalistic or ideological motives[8].

---

[8] Act No. 40/2009 Coll. from January 8th, 2009, Penal Code.

In Section 352, Violence against a Group of People or an Individual, states:

1. Whoever threatens a group of people by death, bodily harm, or by causing large-scale damage, shall be punished by a prison sentence of up to one year.
2. A person who uses violence against a group of people or individuals, or threatens them with death, bodily harm, or by causing large-scale damage due to their actual or perceived race, ethnicity, nationality, political belief, religion, or because they are actually or allegedly non-religious, shall be punished by a prison sentence of six months to three years.
3. The same punishment as in **Subsection 2** shall be imposed on a person:
   a) who conspires or riots for the commission of such an act,
   b) who commits an act referred to in **Subsection 1** by the press, film, radio, television, publicly accessible computer networks, or other similarly effective means.

Similarly, Section 355, Defamation of Nation, Race, Ethnic or other Groups of People, states:

1. Whoever publicly defames:
   a) any nation, its language, any race or ethnic group,
   b) any group of people for their actual or perceived race, ethnicity, nationality, political belief, religion, or because they are actually or allegedly non-religious, shall be punished by a prison sentence of up to two years.
2. An offender shall be punished by a prison sentence of up to three years if they committed an act referred to in **Subsection 1**:
   a) with at least two persons,
   b) by the press, film, radio, television, publicly accessible computer networks, or other similarly effective means.

Similar provisions and penalties are included in Section 356, Encouragement to Hatred Against a Group of People or to Restrict their Rights and Freedoms (whoever publicly encourages the hatred of any nation, race, ethnicity, religion, class or another group of

people, or to restrict the rights and freedoms of their members… etc.). The Czech Penal Code also prosecutes the so-called establishment, support and promotion of movements seeking to suppress human rights and freedoms (a person who establishes, promotes, and supports movements which clearly seek to suppress human rights and freedoms or which preaches racial, ethnic, national, and religious or class hatred or hatred against another group of people, shall be punished…), expressions of sympathy for such movements etc.

Racial or nationalistic motives represent aggravated circumstances for several other criminal acts as well. In 2011, the following cases were recorded: 33 cases (20 of them were solved) of defamation of nation, race or ethnic or other group (Section 355), 15 cases (7 of them solved) of incitement of hatred towards a group of people (Section 356) and 97 cases (68 of them solved) of supporting and promoting movements that lead to suppressing rights and freedoms (Section 403)[9]. In 2012, the number of persons prosecuted and indicted for the above stated acts increased insignificantly (by 6, respectively 5) to a total of 224 criminally prosecuted and 214 indicted persons.

Table 2. Summary of criminal acts committed with racial, nationalistic and other hatred motives in 1995–2012

Year	Total number of prosecuted persons	Total number of indicted persons
1995	508	461
1996	616	552
1997	569	495
1998	535	439
1999	580	510

---

[9] *Report on the situation in the area of internal security and public order in the Czech Republic in 2011*, Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic 2012.

Table 2. Summary of criminal acts committed...

Year	Total number of prosecuted persons	Total number of indicted persons
2000	535	451
2001	529	369
2002	467	435
2003	325	286
2004	351	326
2005	294	264
2006	22	192
2007	204	197
2008	200	185
2009	194	183
2010	225	213
2011	218	209
2012	224	214

Nevertheless, in order to assess the intensity of anti-Roma attitudes, we cannot just simply use the number of prosecuted and indicated criminal acts with racial or nationalistic overtones. But the results of the survey of opinions of young people in relation to extremist attitudes, conducted by the Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention in 2011, could be a certain guide for us. The survey was conducted on a sample of 3000 respondents between 16 and 18 years old from high schools and vocational schools. Moreover, additional 300 young people, who currently do not attend any school, were subjected to the survey as well. The survey results can be compared with the results of an identical survey conducted 15 years ago, i.e. in 1995[10].

---

[10] J. Holas, *Politický radikalismus a mládež* (*Political Radicalism and the Youth*), Prague 2013.

It is obvious that the opinions of people are formed in a certain social context. It is therefore important to know general feelings of the respondents. In the introductory part of the questionnaire, the research attempted to map the sample from perspective of basic satisfaction with the social situation. This provided an opportunity to further classify the respondents as generally satisfied and dissatisfied. The comparison with the 1995 research is marked by profound differences: whereas at that time three quarters of young people were satisfied (even if they, of course, had some reservations), today we can classify only about one half of them as similarly "satisfied". Every seventh (!) respondent thinks that it is necessary to principally restructure the society. The reasons are clear – in all researches concerning satisfaction with the political development we can see distinctly aggravating frustration of citizens.

Table 3. What is your opinion on contemporary situation in our society?

	% in 1995	% in 2011
Everything goes fine, generally I´m satisfied	3	5
There are many things which need to be changed	73	46
I don´t like many things and I´m upset by them	20	34
This society is bad root and branch and it is necessary to rebuild it thoroughly	3.5	15

The biggest differences between 1995 and 2011.

The objective of the survey was to determine problems in the society, which young people consider the most important.

Table 4. What are the biggest faults of contemporary society?

	% in 1995	% in 2011
Politicians are bad, they think only of themselves	22	60
Bribes and dirty money are everywhere	49	45
The state does not have a strong hand, criminality is on the rise	49	18
People take only care of their profits	33	18
National consciousness is declining	13	8.5
Nature is being devastated	59	21.5
There are many immigrants and people of color	18	30
The state does not care about the poorest well	8	10
High unemployment	17	33
Injustice (the same yardstick is not used for everybody)	----	36
Other	7	2
I don´t see any faults	0	0

The biggest differences between 1995 and 2011

Table 5. Attitudes towards selected social groups

evaluation (%)	1+2 (positive)		3 (neutral)		4+5 (negative)	
	1995	2011	1995	2011	1995	2011
Common citizens	48	44	40,5	48	7,5	7

Table 5. Attitudes towards...

evaluation (%)	1+2 (positive)		3 (neutral)		4+5 (negative)	
	1995	**2011**	**1995**	**2011**	**1995**	**2011**
Neo-Nazis	5	6	27	29	58	65
Policemen	37,5	29	44,5	41	16	30
Homosexuals	16,5	28	54	48	27,5	24
Homeless	18,5	4	45,5	27,5	32,5	68,5
Communists	7,5	6	38	35.5	51,5	58
Crim. recidivists	1	1,5	11	22	84,5	**76**
Members of religious sects	8	5	41	33	48,5	62
Young businessmen	70,5	57	24,5	34,5	4	8
Roma (gypsies)	7,5	5	29	19	**61,5**	**76**
Jews	36.5	16	51,5	62	9	21,5
Chinese and Vietnamese	14	19,5	48	48,5	35	32
Arabs	15,5	10,5	52,5	52	29	37
Blacks	48	37,5	42,5	47,5	7,5	15
White immigrants	19,5	16,5	52,5	60	24,5	23
Anarchists	17	8,5	35	35	44,5	56
Skinheads	15	---	29	---	54	---

In this context, we can also evaluate attitudes towards various social groups.

When we summarize the table, we can generally state that the tolerance of the Czech youth has declined. We can only speculate about the reasons – whether the numbers from the 1990s were positively influenced by being "intoxicated by freedom", followed by disillusionment, or whether the current generation merely reflects global disillusionment and nervousness in its attitudes.

Significant decline in popularity concerns many observed social groups of absolutely different types. Fellow citizens with different color of skin remain generally stable in their popularity; the immigrants from Eastern Asia even rose. The exception to this trend, and let's say that a very unfavorable one, is formed by the Romani people. Even if they have been a part of Czech population for centuries, their integration has been clearly failing. We can only state that more than three quarters of Czech young people have a very negative attitude towards this minority. In 2011, 48% of the respondents even demonstrated an absolute negation – mark 5 on the scale. From among all the other categories, the same negative feeling was recorded only towards criminal recidivists.

Overall – and especially because these are the opinions of young people – we can state that the attitude of the majority towards the Romani people is worsening and radicalizing. Despite all the positive proclamations, the measures, adopted so far, have not improved the situation of the Romani people when it comes to education and employment. To the contrary, the spatial as well as social segregation has deepened. The current situation and the sometimes objectively negative experience from the coexistence with the Roma are abused by the bearers of political populism, radicalism and extremisms. This development is dangerous and we can only say that solving this situation will be neither easy, nor fast.

STRESZCZENIE

Czesko-romski konflikt w aspekcie kryminologicznym

Artykuł krótko opisuje narodowy i etniczny skład populacji Republiki Czeskiej, a szczególnie koncentruje się na historii i położeniu Romów

żyjących na terytorium Czech. Przeanalizowany zostaje rozwój polityki państwa wobec Romów i wysiłek integracji – czy asymilacji – ich w społeczeństwie. Autor zwraca uwagę na czynniki, które utrudniają ten wysiłek, a zwłaszcza analizuje rozwój państwa po upadku komunizmu i wpływ nowych czynników społecznych, gospodarczych i ideowych na stanowisko i położenie romskiej mniejszości. Wskazany zostaje także problem rosnących konfliktów między większością a mniejszością romską, jak również wzrost postaw ekstremistycznych w Republice Czeskiej, zwłaszcza wśród młodych ludzi.

Słowa kluczowe: Republika Czeska, mniejszość romska, różnorodność kulturowa, przepaść społeczna, konflikt społeczny, postawy ekstremistyczne.

SUMMARY

Czech-Romani conflict in criminological aspect

The article shortly describes the national and ethnic composition of the population of the Czech Republic and especially focuses on the history and situation of Romani people living on the Czech territory. It analyses the development of the state policy towards Romanies and the effort to integrate – or assimilate – them into the society. Author turns the attention on factors that hinder this effort and especially analyses the development after the fall of communism and the effects of new social, economic and ideological influences on the position and state of Romani minority. Finally the problem of growing conflicts between majority and Romani minority is targeted as well as the growth of extremist attitudes of the Czech public, especially of young people.

Keywords: Czech Republic, Romani minority, cultural diversity, social distance, social conflict, extremist attitudes.

BIBLIOGRAFIA

Penal Code, Act No. 40/2009 Coll. from January 8th, 2009.

Concept of the government policies towards the members of the Romani community, assisting in the process of their integration into the society, Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic No. 599/2000 from June 14th, 2000.

Czech Statistical Office, http://www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci.nsf/datove_udaje/ciz_pocet_cizincu#cr, (dostęp: 12 marca 2014 r.)

Holas J., *Politický radikalismusa mládež* (*Political Radicalism and the Youth*), Prague 2013.

Report on the situation in the area of internal security and public order in the Czech Republic in 2011, Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic 2012.

Scheinostová A., *Romipen*, Prague 2006.

Štěchová M. et al., *Romská minorita a postupy integrace* (*Romani Minority and Integration Processes*), Prague 2002.

Štěchová M. et al., *Interetnické konflikty* (*Interethnic Conflicts*), Prague 2004.

Zeman P. et al., *Veřejnost a trestní politika* (*The Public and Criminal Policies*), Prague 2011.