The 'Roma Question' in Slovakia

Kinga MACSÓ

University of Pécs
PhD student, Interdisciplinary Doctoral School
e-mail: kingamacso13@hotmail.com

Abstract. Slovakia belongs to those states with a high number of Romani in terms of population – of the population of about 5.3 million, 480 to 520 thousand people have Romani origin. In Slovakia, only since 1999 have the Gypsies been able to call themselves Roma. In the 1991, 2001, and 2011 censuses, the Romani could decide on their affiliation, they could be considered Roma citizens, but only a few people made use of this right. Only 25% of the Roma ethnic group called themselves Roma, while the majority referred to themselves as Slovakian or Hungarian; so, these demographic data do not reflect reality. The so-called 'Atlas'-es show a more significantly accurate picture. The creators of these worked together with the local social workers who knew the local Roma communities well in the given settlements. Approximately half of the Romani living in Slovakia were able to change socially to some extent and adapt to the society's majority. The rest of the Roma minority live isolated in some parts of the city, on the edge of the city, or in the nearby. These communities are characterized by social and ethnic isolation, which may be different in some specific cases. According to different indicators, they are divided into segregated, separated, integrated focused, and integrated scattered groups. Since the year 2003, the state has introduced various social reforms. Local governments have also joined the state-initiated reforms. They create various special projects for their own Roma communities in order to help their advancement.

Keywords: Gypsies, Slovakia, Gypsy population

In Europe, there are about 7 million Roma[1] people who do not belong anywhere, have no state of their own, and therefore live scattered in other states (Prónai 2006: 364). They differ from the majority population not only in their appearance but also mainly with their distinctive culture and language. It is an ethnic group that inherits their own history and spiritual culture by word of mouth, and their

---

1   I use the Roma and Gypsy expressions alternately, as a synonym for each other. The expression Roma has been used since the First Roma World Congress because some have used the Gypsy name in a pejorative sense.

way of life reflects specific signs – they are the Gypsies, or Romani. They see themselves as discriminated, ostracized, and living on the periphery of society.

Despite the fact that the Gypsies have been living in Europe for quite a few centuries, their history is almost unknown. After a while, Gypsies living in nomadic groups more or less integrated and became part of more European nations, but most of them isolated themselves in societies and did not adapt to the lifestyle and development of the host nation. Differences in their lifestyles, their specific and often illegitimate ways of their sustainment in many cases drove the gypsies to the edge of society, and so their resettlement and assimilation into local societies often took place via anti-Gypsy actions and instructions from above. Throughout Europe, this has been accomplished drastically.

The Indian origin of the Romani today is a scientifically and generally accepted fact (Fraser 1996: 27–30). Until the 3rd–10th centuries, Gypsy groups moved westward from North-India in smaller and larger migration groups (Nečas 1998: 20). They already lived in the Balkans in the 12th and 13th centuries, and practically on one of today's migration routes, which they also used back at that time, reached continuously to the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary and further to Central and Western Europe. On the basis of some contradictory historical sources, the first Gypsies arrived to the territory of today's Slovakia in 1219. According to other sources, by the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 14th century, they had already lived on the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary.[2] The first written evidence is often referred to as the report by Iglo's Judge János Kunch (Spiská Nová Ves) from 1322. The two Slovakian historians, Jurová (1998) and Marek (2006), are sceptical about this. According to the latter historian, the first Gypsies settled in 1328 on the territory of today's Slovakia. In the 15th century, their existence on the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary is a proven fact.[3] In 1417, they arrived in a massive migration wave to the Great Plains. In the 15th century, the Ottoman Empire was expanding to the Balkans, and thus the living conditions in the country were deteriorating; therefore, a big wave of migration started westward (Marek 2006: 258). In a huge wave of migration, they arrived to the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, and this migration wave hit the western countries (Horváthová 1962: 210–225, Fraser 2002: 341). In Western Europe, however, the living conditions were quite different from those of the agrarian Kingdom of Hungary. The industry and trade was at a higher level, the operation of the guilds were better controlled, and they did not allow strangers among them (Tkáčová 2002: 31–42). Thus, Gypsies had to seek other life opportunities. Their professions, fortune telling, music, dancing, animal training, and occasional

---

2   Their existence in the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom, according to some Hungarian historians, is proved by censuses of place names (Jurová 2002: 19–30).

3   Sigismund Holy Roman Emperor, King of Hungary, donated imperial passports to the leaders of the gypsy caravans.

thefts demanded a nomadic lifestyle; so, they could not approach the local population and rapidly became undesirable elements. During the second half of the 15th century, the disintegration of the Byzantine Empire and the expansion of the Ottoman Empire in Central Europe also contributed to the poor situation of the Gypsies. According to some anthropologists, the nomadic migration of the Gypsies and the expansion of the Turks often converged, and in many places Gypsies were regarded as spies of the Turks. This negative situation culminated in the 16th–17th centuries, when Gypsies were classified as illegal elements in many countries (Hancock 2001: 165).[4]

In the Hungarian Kingdom, the situation of the Gypsy population was much more favourable (Horváthová 1964). This is evidenced by several historical sources. According to historical sources, several Gypsy groups settled in Spiš and on the area of Bártfa (Bardejov). The credibility of the source comes from the fact that in the feudal society of the time nobody could settle on the owner's land without the permission thereof (Jurová 2002b: 53–67). It is assumed that their skill in craftsmanship greatly contributed to this. In the richer regions, they stayed for a relatively long period of time, but we cannot interpret the term settling period as permanent habitation in the real sense of the word, rather a fluctuation in an area for a few years. Their occupation and lifestyle were passed down from generation to generation, wherefore in some areas there was a surplus supply of some occupational groups, and so these communities were separated from wandering groups and looked for other ways of living in the nearby counties and districts. In the 16th century, a number of handicraft industries also reflected that the presence of Gypsies was accepted and desirable in the contemporary society (Jurová 2002b: 53–67). According to historical sources, several groups from Western Europe returned to the area of the Hungarian Kingdom because they tried to escape from the consequences of anti-Romani laws. The number of wandering, tent Gypsies was growing steadily in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, and finally security measures were introduced here as well, which had been strengthened by the end of the 17th century. After driving the Turks out, when the wars were over, the population decreased in the area of the country, making the number of inhabitants the highest value in the country. Mary Theresa and Joseph II's enlightened ideas were reflected in the judgment of the Gypsy people. They wanted to achieve the full assimilation of nomadic and semi-nomadic Roma populations (Tkáčová 2002: 31–41). The complex measures introduced between 1760 and 1780 reflected this. The Gypsy population was to be involved in the economic life besides the resettlement. According to Samuel Augustini (ab Hortis) – who was one of the pioneers of the contemporary Gypsy research –, as a result of the actions of the enlightened rulers, the Romani would

---

4   In 1427, the Gypsies were excommunicated by the bishop of Paris, and in 1548, in Augsburg, it was decided that whoever killed a gypsy would face no consequences (Dávidová 1995: 237).

be totally assimilated within a few years, and their own traditions and customs, and later their language would be known only from the books (Tkáčová 2002: 31–41). According to the regulations, the Gypsies living a migrant lifestyle had to settle down, and they were not authorized to keep and trade with horses. They were not allowed to wear their own clothing and had to wear the garments of the majority of the society's population. They were obliged to relocate their children to farming families for re-education. Children in compulsory school were obliged to go to school and learn some kind of occupation. They were banned from using their own language and could not give a Gypsy name to their children. Endogamous marriages were also prohibited. The settled Gypsies were obliged to abide by their village magistrate, and not by their voivode. Voivodship as a function was abolished (Mann 2001: 54). Despite the great effort, the complex measures failed. One of the many reasons for this was that most of the nobility did not want the Gypsies to be resettled in their territory. They only employed those about whom they were convinced that were useful to them. The attitude of the whole nobility to the Viennese actions was distrustful. So, it was very difficult to integrate them into real life. Most of the decrees were withdrawn after Joseph II died in 1790. Nonetheless, some groups with the leadership of the voivode settled in one of the counties. The majority of the Gypsy settlements were built in the 18th century (Jurová 2002a: 19–23). Some measures were introduced at a later stage, mainly concerning tent Gypsies, but not many things changed. Until the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, there were no major changes in the Gypsy population.

From after the establishment of Czechoslovakia until 1927, regarding the tent Gypsies, Law No 14015/1887 of the Ministry of the Interior of Vienna was in force. The repression of the law contributed to the fact that the Gypsies got to the edge of society (Kollárová 2002: 43–52). Only in 1927 was a new law (no 117/1927) on Gypsies passed. It was about the caravan Gypsies, who were defined by law as persons who were living a wandering, vagabond life in 'the Gypsy style' (Gecelovský 1992: 79–87). This not quite unambiguous definition of the population helped the responsible authorities to intervene in the lives of the settled Gypsies as well. Thus, the entire Gypsy population was stigmatized as an antisocial element (Nečas 1981: 155). In the second half of the 20th century, the media's inflated cases of the alleged 'Gypsy cannibalism' also contributed to sharpening the conflicts (Kollárová 2002: 61–69).

During World War II, the Gypsies got into a very extreme position. The first Anti-Gypsy Order came out in 1939 (Kollárová 2002: 61–69). The district notary offices had to review the right of residence for each of the Gypsies, that is, whether the person in the village had permanent address, and if they did not, they were deported. In addition, the regulation prohibited trading with horses – such permits were withdrawn from everyone. In some counties, trading with

all sort of animals was banned (Nečas 1981: 100–155). A new constitutional act came into force in September 1939, which divided the population into two groups. The state employees belonged in one group while the foreign elements into the other one. Only those in the first group counted as subjects with full rights – this law was clearly against the Jews. From the Roma point of view, there were two possibilities in the first case: 'If a person has a regular citizen life, having a permanent residence and occupation in the settlement and, through his education and political conviction he has reached the standard citizen degree, he can become a member of the Slovak national society' (Nečas 1981: 50). In the other case: 'If he is not adequate or only partially adequate to the above said (e.g. communicates with others in the Gypsy language) – so, he is morally and politically dubious –, he cannot belong to the Slovak nation' (Nečas 1981: 50). In June 1940, the Ministry of the Interior issued a regulation defining the term 'gypsy'. According to Article 9 of Law No 130/1940, we understand the term Gypsy as a person belonging to the Gypsy race, whose two parents are tent Gypsies or who has settled down but avoids work (Some 1981: 45–55).

In January 1940, the Defence Act came out, which prohibited the Gypsies and Jews from joining the armed forces. According to the decree issued in 1941, all the permits for migration were withdrawn; who had such a permit had to settle down within eight days in their own village or in a village where he had stayed for a longer period of time up to that moment. They were under police supervision and could not leave the village but with the written permission of the police. The regulation also applied to settled Gypsies. In case a Roma family lived near the main road or the vicinal road, they had to move away from their place of residence and move to a new place assigned to them, separated from the others. In the villages, if more than three Gypsy families lived, the district office nominated a Voivode, who was responsible for reporting to the village leader whether these norms and customs were observed (Nečas 1981: 65–75). Anti-Gypsy measures were taken in the work field (Janas 2008: 123–133). It was compulsory to move and work in the camps. The aim of the camps was to separate those who were not adequate to the majority for political, racial, and moral reasons. The main elements were the Gypsies (Kollárová 2002: 33). The designated committees arbitrarily decided who was antisocial and who was not, which gypsies had to be separated and which did not. The idea of a labour camp in the Slovak Republic was to solve the Roma question, which would probably have meant the deportation of all Gypsies to concentration camps. In 1944, after the outbreak of the Slovak National Uprising, the Slovakian state was occupied by the German army, and in some settlements they burned and massacred the inhabitants of the Gypsy settlements (Mann 2002: 49). During the existence of the Slovak state, all Anti-Gypsy regulations had the same basic principle – despite defining who is considered a migrant individual or someone who avoids work –, which concerned the whole Gypsy nation. These

regulations still have consequences – they have broken all links between Gypsies and non-Gypsies, and they made them even more isolated within the society and lowered their ethical standards. They took away their traditional living space and their opportunities (Jurová 1993: 138).

The reason why the Gypsy question did not reach the 'final solution' was that they were poor and had few economic relations with the local population. For a deported Jew, the Nazi Germany paid 500 German marks to the Slovakian state (Hubenák 2008: 22–41), but there could be no question that the Gypsies would have had a similar fate.

In the first years after the war, relations with the Gypsy ethnic group developed in two directions. In the first case, it was a social aid approach: the Gypsies were considered to be victims of the war who had to be helped by the state. They could get the flats of the deported Germans and got food ration stamps (Matlovič 2005: 22). According to the other direction, they had to be excluded from the socio-economic system, the Gypsies had to be discriminated and persecuted. The President's Law No 89/1945 on the mobilization of workforce and Law No 52/1935, which deals with black trade, stepped in against begging, vagrancy, etc. and thus increased the number of anti-Gypsy movements. Law No 105/1945 was about labour camps, and Law No 89/1946 forced antisocial workers into labour camps, which mainly meant the Gypsies (Jurová 2002b: 53–77).

When the communists came to power, for the time being, the Gypsy question took the back seat, except for the 1950s, when the Gypsy community became legally equal with the population of Czechoslovakia. All the other decrees concerning the Gypsies were abolished with a single blow. Two kinds of views developed on the Roma issue: according to one of them, gypsies must be accepted as a nationality and their situation redressed within that. By the 1950s, the attitude had been formed that they were also nationalities. But at that point it was obvious that this would not be accepted in general. The other view was that the underdevelopment of the Gypsies had to be solved by the state in a social and paternalistic way (Šebesta 2003b: 11–31). In addition to the two views, a utopian idea emerged that an area should be designated within the state where the entire Roma population would be relocated (Jurová 2002b: 79). Despite the state-subsidized effort, the situation of the Roma had become worse in reality. They took away their original livelihoods, abolished their rights to play music, their private business licences were withdrawn (craftsmanship), and they could not work in agriculture for private farmers because of the rapid collectivization of the countryside. Hence, the Gypsies lost the last remnant of their specific lifestyle (Šebesta 2003a: 45–50). All this led to the fact that the Gypsy population was only able to work in industrial sectors requiring strong physical labour, as unskilled labourers. Moreover, in those cases where the Gypsies tried to solve their housing problems by themselves, they were rejected because the leaders of the villages

did not want them to settle down. As a result of the violent ghettoization, they were isolated, and Gypsy colonies were created, which meant that they had little possibilities to be integrated into the majority society. In 1952, according to the guidelines of the Ministry of the Interior, the solution to the Gypsy question was seen in the total assimilation, which would have led to the abolition of their underdevelopment lifestyle (Jurová 2009: 45–50). According to the state's policy, Gypsies live in such living conditions because they have been exploited, and if they were given work, housing, and education, everything would change (Pavelčiková 2004: 183). This solution, however, meant a great economic burden and an ideological problem for the socialist state. The Communist Party sharply rejected the solution of the problems by ethnic means. According to them, Gypsies could not be considered as a separate nationality but as part of the population that was socially and culturally underdeveloped and with a specific lifestyle. They rejected the introduction of literary Gypsy language in the schools visited by Gypsies because they believed it would have led to further isolation, hindered their re-education, and only strengthened their old primitive Gypsy lifestyle (Jurová 2002a: 30–35). The main ideological trend was the centrally directed full assimilation of the Gypsies. Based on the Soviet pattern, Law No 74/1958 was adopted, which completely eliminated the wandering lifestyle. On the other hand, it became clear that this law could not be realized because the state was not able to afford so much housing and so many jobs, they had no financial cover. The main problem was that the state wanted to solve all the problems quickly and immediately, but there were no suitable circumstances (Šebesta 2003a: 45–50).

In the 60s, several plans were developed to solve the issue. One of these was the 'plan of deportation and dispersal'. The worst conditions were in the East Slovakian district. According to the state order, 3,823 family supporters should have been granted a job outside the perimeter, which would have removed around 14,000 people from the district (Haišman 1999: 137–183). In 1965, according to the central control, the previous decrees were unsuccessful because too many Gypsies lived in Eastern Slovakia; so, according to the new solution plan, they ought to have been systematically removed from the district and scattered in areas where fewer people lived. According to Law No 502/1965, the new plan had three basic points: a) to eliminate Roma colonies, hovels and solve the housing issue, b) to insure school attendance for Gypsy children and education of the youth, and c) to employ male workers for employment (Jurová 2002b: 53–77). The plan should have been implemented on two levels: a) the Roma population should have been relocated to Slovak districts and boroughs and b) the Slovakian Roma population should have been relocated to the Czech districts in a coordinated manner. In reality, this would have meant exchanging people between these two countries. For the West Slovakian Roma, the Central and South Czech district was designated, and they had to go to Southern Moravia

from the Central Slovakian district and move from the East Slovakian district to North Moravia and the Eastern Czech district. No people were located in the North Czech and West Czech districts because the Roma population was high in those districts. According to the Central Committee's plan, by 1970, 611 Gypsy colonies from Slovakia (1,027 Roma settlers) would have been wound up. So, in the Czech Republic, 2,177 families would have been resettled, which meant about 14,000 people. In the Slovakian districts and boroughs, about 10,000 families would have been dispersed, representing 63,000 people. In reality, this 'effort' showed just how each national committee[5] wanted to get rid of its own Gypsies. This plan was not implemented directly, it was only recommended to the leaders of each district. That is why the whole plan collapsed as indirectly none of the authorities could agree (Pavelčíková 2004: 1–183). In spite of the financial support, in 1967–68, it had already been apparent that the plan was gradually collapsing and becoming more and more unsuccessful. In the 1970s, the Czech Republic withdrew this plan of assimilation, two years later followed by the Slovak Republic. In total, between 1966 and 1971, 4,750 hovels were wound up and 24,000 Gypsies were relocated. They failed to accomplish the plan both quantitatively and qualitatively. It was unsuccessful in a qualitative way because the Gypsy population could not be re-educated according to the socialist social image (Jurová 1993). This kind of assimilation of the Gypsies was condemned from the second it started (Vašečka 2001: 453–457). Decisive factors, such as different identities, a strong community consciousness of the Gypsies, or a completely different cultural environment, were not even taken into account. Ethnic attitudes were completely ignored. This method did not help the displaced ones and had a negative impact on the communities that stayed at home (Víšek 1999: 174–184). The other plan was the 'general social and cultural integration' plan. This plan was adopted in the Czech Republic under Law No 231/1972 and in the Slovak Republic under Law No 94/1972 – in reality, it ended in 1989. The central part of the plan was the following: to employ working Gypsies, to oblige Roma youth to study, to re-educate adults, to solve the problem of permanent residency, and to reduce crime. According to state authorities, Gypsies were uncultured, and this plan had to eliminate this fact. During the implementation of the programme, in reality, new schools and kindergartens, the improvement of classroom facilities, and re-training centres had to be provided. Gypsy children were given financial support to go to kindergarten, to Gypsy students for meals; they were provided subsidies for clothing and free summer camps (for Roma students). The state allocated large sums to improve the new housing conditions. They bought their huts for them, gave them new flats and furniture. All these were not received by the non-Roma population. As a passive crowd, the Gypsy population was offered an enormous social support. All this deepened the conflicts between Gypsy and

---

5   The leaders of the villages and towns.

non-Gypsy inhabitants. This plan was in place for nearly 20 years; in every five-year plan, the number of hovels and camps to be wound up was marked and also how many gypsies were to be educated and how many Roma men were needed to be employed. These plans were repeated in cycles, but they were constantly failing due to the limitations of financial resources (Víšek 1999: 184–218).

The change of regime in 1989 hit the Gypsy population in Slovakia unprepared and drifted them economically and socially to the edge of society (Radičová 2002: 79–92). Nevertheless, for the first time, it was possible to integrate this ethnic group properly; while preserving their own cultural characteristics, they could minimize the problems facing a dominant society during the process. An organization called 'Romská občianská iniciatíva'[6] (ROI) was formed, which gathered mainly the intellectuals. However, only the name Roma was used as a 'nationality' for the 1991 census; before that, they had been registered as a 'social group'. At the same time, the district commissions thoughtlessly abolished the network that had been dealing with the Roma question that far and dismissed those workers who provided communication between the state authorities and the Gypsies. An adequate institutional system was not created. Before Czechoslovakia disintegrated, Slovakia had accepted the government's actions concerning the Gypsies. First of all, the Romani had to be accepted and recognized as a nationality, and, secondly, they wanted to avoid special institutions to deal with the Roma question and wished to join the general social system that deals with every citizen (Tokár–Lamačková 2003: 187–202). The new system provided a greater control over everyone as the representatives of the minorities also participated in it. During the 1992–98 period, not much attention was paid to the Roma issue. During this period, the problems of ethnic minorities and ethnic groups ended up in the crossfire of harsh political debates. Several politicians made comments in an extreme way as, for example, that the Gypsies should not be considered as citizens (Šebesta 2003a: 66–73). During this period, the solutions were severe sanctions, discrimination, and isolation. For example, in the case of a crime committed by Roma, the procedure was much more rigorous than if they had been committed by a non-Gypsy citizen. There were voices that birth control should also be provided by law. The contemporary social policy of the state was more likely to exacerbate the problems of the Roma society and did not help real integration (Kotvanová–Szép 2003: 33–44). This lack of respect for human rights and minority rights led Slovakia to be considered not to meet the Copenhagen criteria, and so they were not accepted into the European Union (Alner 1999: 311–327). The consequence of this, however, was that the Roma problem was rediscovered. By 1999, 230 Roma organizations had been operating in the country, and their representatives were Romani as well. After the changes, a strong linguistic group was working on the development of an integrated Roma

---

6   Roma Civil Initiative.

language based on the Eastern Slovak dialect. The language was also taught at the University of Charles. The Romany language became formally a standard language in 2008, and textbooks and dictionaries appeared in this language.[7] Besides, the Roma issue was a priority, and specific goals were set such as raising Roma living conditions to the Slovak average level, improving the status of their education, or adopting the Roma language (Jurásková 2002: 60–66). Thus, in 1999, the government issued a draft resolution to solve the problems of the Gypsy national minority. In the first phase, according to the content of the document, there were more political arguments than real proposals for the solution. There was no concrete proposal in the social sphere regarding the solution for housing problems and elimination of unemployment (Vašečka 2002: 364–400). It was rather an operational plan than a whole of actual proposals. The second phase gave a little more concrete, detailed description of the role of the various institutions and activists on the national, district, borough, and local levels (Matlovič 2005: 79–90). This had been the most detailed and best-developed plan on this topic since 1989. In the following two years, an action plan was devised to terminate discrimination, racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and all forms of intolerance. Various programmes were prepared on the form in which the government could communicate with the Roma minority, a complex programme was created for the development of Roma colonies, for the responsibilities of social and field activists, and they also created a national action plan to solve unemployment. During this time, some important laws were introduced. These laws were mainly related to the minorities and punished racist manifestations against them harder. On 1 July 2000, a social law was inaugurated and social benefits were reduced, the purpose of which was to encourage Romani to work. According to the main idea, unemployment benefits were disbursed only for two years; after two years, the benefit was halved (Alner 1999: 49–69). The Gypsies' attitude towards work was so far negative as for them it was not worth working if the unemployment benefit was barely less than the minimum wage. The first Dzurinda government, between 1998 and 2002, set up a number of institutions that dealt with the solution of the Roma question (Lamačková–Tokár 2002: 187–202). In 1998, a state institution (Úrad splnomocnenca vlády SR na riešenie problemov rómskej menšiny) was specifically opened to solve the Roma problem, through whose intercession Gypsies became a minority, which was modified to community status in 2001 (Úrad splnomocnenca vlády SR pre rómske komunity) (Jurásková 2002: 91–118). The period between 1998 and 2002 can be considered as outstanding in terms of the Roma issue. After Slovakia had been admitted to the European Union, the Roma issue was gradually off the agenda (Šrámková 2006: 55–60). In 2003, however, during the second Dzurinda government, some constructive measures were taken, some projects were elaborated, and the main idea was to integrate

---

7   The dictionary was compiled by Milena Hübschmennová.

the Roma community from a multicultural perspective. Social integration, such as unemployment, education, health, or housing problems, needs to be solved on a political basis (Jurásková–Kriglerová–Rybová 2003). This programme includes, for example, the zero grade introduced for Roma children and the Roma Assistant Programme (Šrámková 2006: 51). The main obstacle in Slovakia was the limitation of financial possibilities for resolving the Roma issue. The amount allocated from the budget for this matter was too small to start this programme with good perspectives. Financial support from the European Union's PHARE was a great help. The EU provided further support from the social fund and the region's development fund. Slovakia's attitude towards the international, intergovernmental project is not effective enough for the developments of the 2005–2015 period. The Hungarian minority self-government system is unique in Europe and can represent the interests of the Roma much more effectively from the local to national level. In the other countries, including Slovakia, the Roma minority has only civil society organizations. In Slovakia, the National Strategy Group developed a basic draft plan for marginalized Roma communities for the period between 2007 and 2013. This mainly aimed at solving social problems. The main areas of education, social inclusion, health, and economic growth involving competitiveness were discussed.

The Slovak state wants to solve the integration of the Romani between 2014 and 2020. State officials assigned three regional areas: Banska Bystrica, Prešov, and Kosice. The proper persons of the Ministry of Bratislava, the representatives of the state administration, the leaders of the non-governmental Roma organizations, and the academic authorities make the right decisions for the so-called 'Roma problem'. Their strategy is aimed at three target groups: for the Roma as a national minority, the Roma communes, and the marginalized Roma communes. Many so-called integration programmes are not integration in reality. The Roma minority does not need a mother tongue to be able to integrate because it is not required from them. But it would still be important to develop a vernacular culture for their own benefit, and this should start out from them.

References

ALNER, Juraj. 1999. Integračné procesy na Slovensku. In: Ivantyšyn, Michal (ed.), *Slovensko 1998–1999*. Bratislava: IVO.

FRASER, Angus. 2002. *Cikáni*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.

GECELOVSKÝ, Vladimír. 1992. Právne normy týkajúce sa Rómov a ich aplikácia v Gemeri (1918–1938). In: Mann, A. B. (ed.), *Neznámi Rómovia*. Bratislava: Ister Science Press.

HAIŠMAN, Tomáš. 1999. Romové v Československu v letech 1945–1967. Vývoj inštitucionálního zájmu a jeho dopady. In: *ROMOVÉ v České republice (1945–1998)*. Praha: Socioklub.

HANCOCK, Ian. 2001. *Země utrpení. Dějiny otroctví a pronásledování Romů*. Praha: Signeta.

HUBENÁK, Ladislav. 2008. Právne normy a ich praktický dosah v slovenskom štáte. In: Majkútová, Anna (ed.), *Fenomén holokaustu: zborník z medzinárodnej vedecko-odbornej konferencie konanej dňa 27–28. marca 2008 pod záštitou predsedu vlády SR pre vedomostnú spoločnosť, európske záležitosti, ľudské práva a menšiny Dušana Čaploviča*. Bratislava: Ševt: Úrad vlády SR. 22–39.

JANAS, Karol. 2008. Utrpenie slovenských Rómov. In: Majkútová, Anna (ed.), *Fenomén holokaustu: zborník z medzinárodnej vedecko-odbornej konferencie konanej dňa 27–28. marca 2008 pod záštitou predsedu vlády SR pre vedomostnú spoločnosť, európske záležitosti, ľudské práva a menšiny Dušana Čaploviča*. Bratislava: Ševt: Úrad vlády SR. 131–146.

JURÁSKOVÁ, Martina–KRIGLEROVÁ, Elena–RYBOVÁ, Jana. 2004. *Atlas rómskych komunít na Slovensku 2004*. Bratislava: S.P.A.C.E.

JUROVÁ, Anna. 1993. *Vývoj rómskej problematiky na Slovensku po roku 1945*. Bratislava: Goldpress Publishers.

1996. *Rómska problematika 1945–1967. Studijní materiály výzkumného projektu Československo 1945–1967*. Dokumenty. 19. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.

2002a. Od odchodu z pravlasti po prvé asimilačné opatrenia. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO, 19–39.

2002b. Rómovia v období od roku 1945 po november 1989. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 53–77.

KOLLÁROVÁ, Zuzanna. 2002. Rómovia v období I. ČSR, II. ČSR a Slovenského štátu. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 43–52.

KOTVANOVÁ, Alena–SZÉP, Attila. 2003. Najnovšie koncepcie politiky vlády SR vo vzťahu k riešeniu problémov rómskych komunít (1998–2002). In:

Kotvanová, Alena (ed.), *Vládna politika a Rómovia 1948–2002*. Bratislava: Slovenský Inštitút Medzinárodných Štúdií. 1–59.

LAMAČKOVÁ, Adriana–TOKÁR, Adrian. 2002. Legislatívny a inštitucionálny rámec riešenia rómskej problematiky. In: Vašečka, Imrich (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 187–201.

MANN, Arne B. 2000. *Rómsky dejepis*. Bratislava: Kalligram.

MAREK, Miloš. 2006. *Cudzie etniká na stredovekom Slovensku*. Martin: Matica slovenská.

MATLOVIČ, René. 2005. *Geografia Slovenska so zreteľom na rómsku minoritu*. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove.

NEČAS, Ctibor. 1981. *Nad osudem českých a slovenských Cikánů v letech 1939–1945*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně v Brně.

    1998. *Romové v České republice včera a dnes*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

PAVELČÍKOVÁ, Nina. 2004. *Romové v českých zemích v letech 1945–1989*. Praha: Sešity Úřadu dokumentace a vyšetřování zločinů komunismu.

PRÓNAI, Csaba (ed.). 2006. *Cigány világok Európában*. Budapest: Nyitott Könyvműhely.

RADIČOVÁ, Iveta. 2002. Rómovia na prahu transformácie. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačpien pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 213–247.

ŠEBESTA, Michal. 2003a. Formovanie politiky štátu vo vzťahu k Rómom v prvých rokoch samostatnej Slovenskej republiky (1993–1998). In: Kotvanová, Alena (ed.), *Vládna politika a Rómovia 1948–2002*. Bratislava: Slovenský Inštitút Medzinárodných Štúdií. 45–50.

    2003b. Rómovia pod patronátom socialistického štátu (1948–1989). In: Kotvanová, Alena (ed.), *Vládna politika a Rómovia 1948–2002*. Bratislava: Slovenský Inštitút Medzinárodných Štúdií. 11–31.

TKÁČOVÁ, Anna. 2002. Rómovia v období od vlády Márie Terézie po vznik I. ČSR. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 31–42.

TOKÁR, Adrián–LAMAČKOVÁ, Adriana. 2002. Legislatívny a inštitucionálny rámec riešenia rómskej problematiky. In: Vašečka, Imrich (ed.), *Čačipen pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 187–201.

VAŠEČKA, Imrich. 2001. Migrácia Rómov zo Slovenska do krajín EÚ – príčiny a podnety. *Sociológia* 33(5): 457–471.

    2002. Problematika migrácie Rómov zo Slovenska. In: Vašečka, Michal (ed.), *Čačapien pal o roma. Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku*. Bratislava: IVO. 364–378.

VÍŠEK, Petr. 1999. Program integrace – řešení problematiky romských obyvatel v období 1970 až 1989. In: *ROMOVÉ v České republice*. Prague: Socioklub. 54–91.