CHILD WELFARE DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES IN THE CZECH LANDS:

THE SEGREGATION OF ROMA AND DISABLED CHILDREN DURING THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Victoria Shmidt

Masaryk University
Brno 2015

CHILD WELFARE DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES IN THE CZECH LANDS:

THE SEGREGATION OF ROMA AND DISABLED CHILDREN DURING THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Victoria Shmidt

Masaryk University
Brno 2015

This work was supported by the project Employment of Best Young Scientists for International Cooperation Empowerment (CZ.1.07/2.3.00/30.0037), co-financed by the European Social Fund and the state budget of the Czech Republic.

Reviewed by
professor Marius Turda (Oxford Brookes)

ISBN 978-80-210-7834-5 (online : pdf)

DOI: 10.5817/CZ.MUNI.M210-7834-2015

Contents

CHAPTER 4

CHAPTER 5

Introduction

The segregation of disabled and Roma people is a daunting challenge facing social policy in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The segregation of Roma and disabled children in the Czech Republic and Slovakia has been the source of considerable academic and activist criticism both home and abroad over the past two decades (Robila 2009). Both countries are heading EU-charts regarding the use of therapeutic abortions, together with a wide range of diagnoses supporting the interruption of pregnancy and a strong pressure from the medical community in favour of sterilization (Národné centrum 2012: 57; Ústav zdravotnických 2013: 27). Current debates around the forced sterilization of Roma women during the 1970s and 1980s indicate the that health care professionals continue to approve of such treatments (Centre for reproductive rights 2003). Moreover, the exploration of communicative discourses produced by the media reveals systematic shortcomings in the public opinion regarding the connection between sterilization and segregation, a hostile attitude towards women who called for reparatory justice, and an indifferent position among the journalists (Křižková 2006). The placement of Roma and disabled children into special boarding schools remains a major option for educating these groups despite the EC*t*HR regarding this practice as segregation (European court… 2007). As late as 2010 the Slovakian government announced the plan to place a majority of Roma children into special boarding-schools (Goldirova 2010). Programmes aimed at integrating disabled children (including early intervention family visits, various forms of inclusion, etc…) do not operate as comprehensive alternatives to residential care. While legal regulations of child protection are transformed intensively under the pressure of the EU institutions, the Roma families with disabled children continue to be view as "unreliable families and children" (Homolač 2009).

Despite attempts to propose a better understanding of the sources and the consequences of segregation, the discourses and practices associated with Roma and disabled children in the Czech lands remain extremely politicised and to some extent separated from interdisciplinary approaches which can potentially exploring segregation in its appropriate theoretical framework. This book proposes an innovative methodology centred on the latest scholarly knowledge about child welfare combined with theoretical tools such as critical discourse analysis and an analysis of the institutionalised eugenic rhetoric of marginalisation and segregation. In order to better understand the present it is important to revisit child welfare discourses and practices within a broad chronological framework (nineteenth and twentieth centuries).

Contemporary discussions of Roma and disabled children – scholarly and medically alike – should take into account previous debates regarding child protection in order to identify strategies to prevent segregation. In this book, I discuss the relationship between eugenics – which made up a significant part of the arguments used by social policy reforms during the First Czechoslovak Republic – and the segregation of Roma and disabled children. At the time, in Central Europe, eugenics was a driving force in setting up procedures and criteria for health care, educational system, welfare provision. Yet, eugenics also promoted the segregation of Roma and disabled people directly, both at theoretical and practical levels (Promitzer Trubeta Turda 2011). This duality is worth noticing especially when considering contemporary attempts to sustain and spread the integrative approach to educating and protecting Roma and disabled children. Paying careful attention to the development of eugenics in the Bohemian lands makes this object more specific in order to evaluate the impact of positive (in the Czech version assimilative) eugenics on the current utilitarian discourses, which continue to slow down the development of alternatives to special education and other strategies of dealing with Roma families.

It is therefore important to focus on the practical implications of eugenic ideas and their influence on child welfare. Have eugenic ideas expressed during the interwar period continued to influence the policy and culture of segregation of Roma and disabled people until now? Scholars disagree on the importance of eugenics. Those who investigate the Holocaust of Roma people make a direct link between institutions and ideas developed in the interwar Czechoslovakia and the extreme forms of segregation practiced during the Protectorate and the socialist periods (Lhotka 2009; Nečas 1991). The obvious negative path dependence of social development during the interwar period is attributed to the specifics of building nation during the late Imperial period (Zahra 2008). In contrast to such views, some scholars consider that the current segregation is mostly connected with the practices established during both totalitarian regimes (Šimúnek 2012). The interpretation of the past directly affects contemporary discourses and provides the grounds for accepting the responsibility towards the sustainable practice of integration of Roma and disabled children.

For the past thirty years, there has been a burgeoning literature on race (Condit et al. 2002), eugenics (Turda 2007; 2010; 2013) disability (Goodley 2011; Grue 2011), children and childhood (James et al. 2003; Prout 2004). Previously seemed unbreakable dichotomies such as "rationally based multiculturalism – irrational prejudices", "social – medical model of disability", "child being – child becoming" have been reconceptualised. The result is an interdisciplinary platform which brings together ethnic and gender diversity, political pluralism

and active participation in solving social issues and the application of post-modernism and the social construction of caring professions (Kehily 2009). These theoretical developments have had little impact on current research on of the integration of Roma and disabled children in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. At best, existing Czech research concentrates on the society's intolerable attitudes and practices, even if there is no consensus among scientists regarding the issue of residential care and alternatives to it (Shmidt Bailey 2014).

The general trend to combine institutional and discourse analysis into the consistent methodological scheme reflects the intention to explain not only issues such as the segregation of Roma and disabled children but also to encompass various options for efficient social reforms (Shmidt 2010). The widespread methodologies of rational choice, historical, and sociological institutionalism are now viewed as limited in terms of their ability to approach, understand and ultimately foster change. The increasing interest in social policy in Central and Eastern European countries represents an additional support for advancing a more complex approach that combines ideas, institutions, and agents as interrelated entities. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the application of various theories of institutionalism(s) to CEE countries revealed further shortcomings of the traditional schemes of institutional analysis (Vanhuysse 2009). Exploring discursive institutionalism in the Czech Republic and Slovakia provides new options for refining its research agenda and for reinforcing its explanatory power. While the field of family policy and family – friendly labour policy have not shied away from applying the new methodologies (T. Sirovatka, S. Saxonberg), child protection especially regarding Roma and disabled children continues to exist on the margins of innovative methodologies.

Both general studies of children/childhood (Folbre 2009) and that of child protection in particular countries (Bühler-Niederberger 2005; Fishman 2002; Hendrick 1997; Kränzl-Nagl 1998) build on a communicative discourse connected to the increase influence of the authorities in regulating parenting and childhood. This view sets up the grounds for critical revision of current policies as well as academic literature about child development, the role of parents, and the mission of professional care (Kehily 2009). Alongside, childhood studies generate the discourses relevant to the new practices of family life, marriage, child raising stipulated by the deconstruction of prescriptions related to gender role, health status, ethnic, and so on (Prout 2004). These studies do not fully question the obstacles blocking practices of education, health care, and child protection because of the obvious gap related to the understanding of the composition of driving forces: neither institutions nor policy agents have been discussed pertinently in childhood studies (James&James 2004). Introducing a complex institutional analysis into the field of child welfare

requires one to *balance general trends and specific traits of particular countries*. As a result, in this project the CEE countries will be viewed through a sample of cases which can enhance our methodology of juxtaposing ideas, institutions, and agents into a coherent explanatory tool. As in other CEE countries, child welfare discourses and practices in the Czech lands demonstrate a high degree of co-existence with eugenic ideas (Veselá 2005; Turda 2007). It is therefore important to focus on the practical implications of eugenic ideas and their influence on child welfare.

Recently there has been a rising interest in the impact of eugenic ideas in CEE countries, especially on the development of social policy, health care, education, demographic policy (Turda, 2007; Promitzer et al. 2011; Baloutzova 2011). While eugenic ideas continue to influence ordinary practices, the recognition of this problematic legacy remains fragmentary. Historical testimonies can deepen our understanding of eugenics in the Czech lands: on the one hand, the widespread development of services based upon eugenics was largely based on eugenics during the pre-1918 (imperial) period (Zahra 2008); on the other hand, the specific way in which Czechoslovakian eugenics developed during the first republic determined the further development of child welfare especially in education and health care (Kasper 2008). Thus, the history of eugenics prompts an exploration of the history of child welfare and consequently an adoption of a new critical approach to revise the impact of the past on current social and political practices.

According to some authors (Feinberg 2006; Fasora 2012), historical studies of child welfare in the Czech lands are fragmented: not all periods have been studies to the same degree due to various shortcomings (limited access to the primary sources of information, predominance of pervasive clichés, false opposition to different historical periods); regions and ethnic groups are not equally treated because of previous focus on the Czech, Slovak, and German traditions (Roma cultural contexts have not been taken into account); scholars tend to see child welfare through benefits and direct state support, while health care and education continue to be viewed separately from approaches to support families with many children. The systematic lack of knowledge regarding the relationship between eugenics and child welfare is an obstacle, but it should be transformed into a positive challenge. This project will endeavour to offer an interdisciplinary and multi-causal interpretation of the concept of child welfare in the Czech lands during the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

Investigating the influence of ***the late imperial period*** **(1860–1918)** on child welfare in the Czech Lands is important as this the retrospective study sheds light on the various movements in favour of building the national idea

(Slavic and German as well) during this period (Halířová 2012). A narrow range of approaches to child welfare policies characteristic of the Czech lands can be attributed to the resistance to "alien" (German) discourses during the late imperial period and can further be traced to the dissemination of eugenic ideas and relevant practices. Debates about the secularisation of child welfare serve as the main political context for exploring the communicative discourse during the late imperial period (1860–1918). The first chapter, **"In the name of the Czech nation: Education and Eugenics in the Late Imperial Period"** aims to explore the establishing of the path dependence directly linking eugenics and the formation of education for disabled and Roma children in the Czech lands.

The next step consists of highlighting major developments in child welfare during ***the First Republic***, including the development of special education for disabled children, involuntary removal of Roma children and their further placement into boarding schools, and the institutionalisation of public care for children in need. The communicative discourse for this period will be reconstructed through interpreting the public positions held by key public figures and their work towards defining the status of children as the treasure of the nation (Zahra 2008). By looking at this period (1918–1938) the chapter **"The segregation of disabled and Roma children in the Czech lands during the Interwar Period"** traces the dissemination of eugenic ideas to wider audiences and in doing so it juxtaposes the content-analysis of public debates about such issues as the professionalization of special education, the ban on corporal punishment in residential settings, whilst considering various options provided for substitute family placement and biological family reintegration in the context of limiting parental rights for the Roma(Nečas 2005).

The Third Republic's period (1945–1949) was distinguished by the intensive development of special education which was posed as a humanistic alternative to fascist practices. The journal *Pedologické rozhledy (*Pedagogical views*)* illustrates the new ideological framework, also due, in part, by the incorporation of the Soviet defectological approach into the Czechoslovak pedagogy, as illustrated by the journal *Časopis psychologického odboru (*The Journal of psychological specialisation*). The chapter "***The education for disabled children during the first decades after the WWII in Czechoslovakia: in the game of big-time politics**" focuses on the contrast between the politics towards the education for disabled children during the first decades after the WWII.

The socialist period abounded in developments determining child protection. These includes: the first wave of large-scale institutions (1948–1963); the fight for family placement (1963–1976); and the second wave of large-scale institutions (1976–1989). This division is directly attributed to the practices of

segregating Roma during the socialist period analysed in the chapter **"Development of A special education for roma children in socialist czechoslovakia: the *pious desires* towards total segregation"**. Throughout the socialist period, the "togetherness repertoire" of communicative discourses had disguised obvious segregating practices against Roma and disabled people.

The retrospective comparative analysis of curriculums and manuals regarding core disciplines impacting child protection identifies discourses of parenting and childhood which were extended during teaching process from the 1960s to the late 1980s. Generally, the impact of family policy on the teaching process will be indicated as well as the role of scholars and lecturers in reforming the child protection system. During the short period of reinforcing family placement, debates about the adoption of Roma and disabled children demonstrated the continuities between the pre-war eugenic ideals and the ideals of the new Soviet man.

The retrospective analysis of relevant eugenic discourses will provide the background for the current situation in terms of pre-sociological notions of childhood, family, and institutional pathways. Generally, the last chapter **"Models of legitimizing inclusive education in the Czech Rep.: what ambitions may come"** indicates various actors and strategies for possible path departure for child welfare system in the Czech Republic and Slovakia which are in process of transforming it. The comparative analysis of these two countries will refine our understanding of the impact of discourses about children and child welfare together with the dynamics for reforms.

Moreover, the public debates generated by the judgements of European Court on Human rights versus the Czech Republic and Slovakia (Wallová and Walla v the Czech Republic, 2006; DH and Others v Czech Republic, 2007; IG & Ors v Slovakia, 2012), about the inclusive education for children with mental disability and the adoption of Roma children will be analysed in order to construct the current repertoire of communicative discourses. We will explore various verbal practices dodging the identity of prejudices against Roma and disabled children (Novák Capponi 1991). This strategy will help answer the following question: *What pervasive tropes are reproduced in public discourses about child welfare, Roma and disabled children in the context of relevant reforms, and how do public actors legitimise their position through prioritising various periods as models for contemporary reforms?*

CHAPTER 1

In the Name of the Czech Nation: Education and Eugenics in the Late Imperial Period

Exploring any social practice in during the late imperial period in the Czech lands cannot avoid engaging with the pervasive process of nation-building and nationalism (Hlavačka 2013). Similarly, the discourses around child welfare, development and deviances should be viewed not only as the outcome of the Czech Enlightenment, but also as the constitutive elements of a proto-eugenic cultural environment, one which beginning with second half of the nineteenth century favored the dissemination of theories of human improvement, particularly with respect to education and social care. This text aims to trace the range of discourses regarding children and childhood among Czech social scientists in the late imperial period. These discourses did not disappear with the collapse of the Habsburg rule; on the contrary, they had survived the new political order, playing an important role in shaping Czechoslovak eugenic theories about special education and social care during the interwar period.

As elsewhere, child welfare and discourses about childhood in the Czech lands reflected broader economic developments, such industrialization and urbanization (Chad 2000). Recognising the child as an economic resource contributed to the development of concepts of social control of children and their environment. Previously developed by diverse social practices, child welfare discourses began to coalesce under the influence of the instituionalisation of both the educational and social care systems (Halířová 2012). In the first place, ideas connecting the child to the environment had been reformulated – the previous univocal identification of the child with nature and innocence was replaced by the view that the *relationship between a child and his/her environment required more sophisticated research and treatment strategies (*Gittins 1998: 46). Alongside the growing influence of the Protestant ethic, the new industrialised social life played a decisive role in bringing together the previously two separated Christian discourses—the innocent child and the evil child. What emerged was a dual attitude towards the child, seen both as a threat and a victim (Goldson 1997; Hendrick 1997). This two-sided concept served as the basis for the formation of institutions protecting vulnerable children. These changes

in child protection augmented the emergence of new theories, put forward primarily by psychologists, which relied extensively on experts' knowledge about children and child development, especially in terms of biological vs. social influence, alongside an extension of pedagogical efforts (Kehily 2009).

In many ways, eugenics had a similar mission – to provide a theory *and* arguments in favour of social and biological norms relevant to a new mode of life (Turda 2013). As such, it should be interpreted as a conceptual platform not separate but in conjunction with the general currents of thoughts informing the ideological and institutional grounds for the growth of the child welfare system during the late imperial period. Currently in the Czech Republic, the history of eugenics is mostly associated with the Protectorate period and the inhuman experiments performed by Nazi physicians (Šimunek 2012). Yet eugenic ideas had also directly contributed to the formation of institutions and practices regarding the Roma and disabled children, although their impact and importance continue however to be marginalized in the scholarship.

Contemporary Western scholarship of the history of eugenics notes its close connection with various moral and religious campaigns to revitalise the nation, as illustrated, for example, by the Medizinische Polizey, a popular treatise in German-speaking countries during the Enlightenment (Labisch 1992); *the movement against national degeneration in Great Britain* (Young 1980); *the social marketing of charity in the USA based upon the idea of prevention against social diseases* (Ordover 2003). The ideological continuity between early- and later periods in the history of eugenics highlights the role of the individuals who recruited eugenics to their cause in order to advance various social, cultural and political programmes. The European trend to commodify children resonated in Czech social thinking alongside the task to emancipate the Czechs from Austria and from the domination of German language in all area of public life. At the time, most Czech-language general education became professionalized in parallel with its intensive involvement in the nationalist movement. Two of the most popular Czech-language journals in the second part of the 19th century, *škola a život*[1], (Life and school) and *Pěstoun* (Guardian), offered a platform for public debates on education, child upbringing, and parenting. By exploring the articles from these journals, one can provide a detailed overview of discourses and themes advocating a new education commensurate with the mission of Czech nation-building.

1 Until the last quarter of the 19th century some authors who published their articles in this journal preferred to remain anonymous in order to protect themselves from the highly probable persecutions of authorities during the Bach era, due to this in the list of sources some of articles are referred according to the title not author

THE CRUSADE FOR CZECH EDUCATION: FROM ASSERTING THE LANGUAGE TO EMANCIPATING THE NATION

The idea of national education for the Czech people dominated the second part of the 19th century and two first decades of the 20th century (Zahra 2011). Czech enlighteners viewed education and upbringing as an essential frame for nation-building: "in Germany, France, England and elsewhere, the idea that school curriculum's task is to refine people dominates education" (Oč se vlastně… 1860: 11). Along with the universal mission of schools, education was defined in terms of uniqueness and exceptional relevance to each of nation: "How different is the trajectory that the education of each of nation nurtures! The Germans have their specific and unchangeable toolkit for upbringing the next generations, so do the French and other nations" (ibid:13). Remarkably, the author mentioned Germany, whose pedagogical systems and *Kulturkampf* were opposed by the Czech nationalists for negatively influencing future Czech generations.

Czech pedagogues considered that Christian norms, essential for general education, could only be preached in one's native language. Furthermore, teaching in German was described as inappropriate for the needs of the Czech people. In significant degree, this argument reflected the temporary loyalty of the Czechs to the official ideology appropriating Christianity Catholicism as the consolidating ideology for all nations in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, especially during Alexander von Bach's regime (1851–1860). Later the argument in favour of the use of native language as the fittest agent of religious values was replaced with a more expanded critique against the dominance of the German language, seen as a factor of de-nationalization, especially amongst the youth (Zahra 2011).

The role of the national language as a source of natural development was stressed during debates regarding general education. Czech pedagogues insisted that "learning foreign languages" did not necessarily mean becoming a moral person; often, in fact, "foreign languages' corrupted 'the soul of the child" (Dějiny… 1887). The predominant Czech discourse at the time, which concentrated on naturally developed child, was constructed in opposition to traditional German approaches to child education.

THE NATURALLY DEVELOPED CHILD: THE CORNERSTONE OF A NEW PEDAGOGICAL THINKING

At the beginning of the second part of the 19th century, the Czechs attempted to revise educational approaches in order to bring the principle of «natural buoyancy» of the child into practice. This effort served as an alternative to the German approach, which ascribed to the child such features as thoughtlessness, roughness, irregularity, and indolence. The consistent implementation of the discourse of the "*evil child*" by German authors encouraged the Czechs to reject such strategy of punishing children. The German call for improving the procedures regarding control and penalty became a main target of the critique by the Czech pedagogues who deemed it as irrelevant to authentic child development. Any action against naturalness was marked as "a sin which echo resounded to the Heavens, an offense against people's life which has far-reaching consequences" (Neblahé ovoce… 1862). The Czech children's lack of response to German pedagogy was explained not by the lack of teachers' diligence but by their "exhausting the spring of child's buoyancy" (ibid). Teachers' arrogance and their feeling of superiority were described by the Czech pedagogues as some of the main reasons contributing to the failure to educate the Czech children in German. By contrast, the Czech educators highlighted the importance to recognise the soul of the child, alongside the ability to understand the child, both strategies described as "a vital spring of teaching methods" (Pavel 1857: 242). The term *protiduševní* (anti-spiritual) – unable to recognize the child – was used to describe the German approach.

Within this process, the Czech educators justified the unique role of schools and professionals in educating the nation. The special competencies of teachers focused on two interrelated areas of knowledge: (1) the divine origin of human beings and the mission of teaching the next generations the Christian standards; (2) Mother Nature and the child's development within it (Jak by učitel… 1856). The practical task was how to juxtapose both perspectives in various areas of education. Creating a new Czech school education also assumed the unhealthy legacy of the past should be overcome. For instance, the critique against of the Czech farmers' adoption of German agrarian techniques was based on the fact that in the past the Czech farmers "were not the owners of their own time, afraid of making mistakes because of the fear being punished" (O rolnických školách 1856). The importance of education for the aspirations of the Czech farmers was constructed in terms of a professional approach to farmers' experience, leading to the establishment of a system of colleges for them. The Czech educators described the teacher as a unique individual able to bring together these various principles into a coherent agenda of education.

The Czech educators claimed that a detailed knowledge of child was an essential source for planning and implementing the aims of the new education and nation-building. The role of the pedagogue was compared with that of a builder or a gardener – "who makes all efforts to prevent the tender sprout from the damage of wind, insects and frost" (Dvě uvahy 1862). This interpretation of pedagogical mission advanced the idea that raising a new generation is a long-term task: "a sculptor needs several week to create the figure from marble; hammering tool from iron ore takes hours and hours; a fruit tree requires six years minimum for the first harvest, and how long do we need to wait for the total independence of our youth? It takes half of our life…" (Jelínek 1888). The unique role of the education was set against the general agenda of the Czech schools, described as unable to implement the major transformation of society due to the opposition exercised by the dominant German culture.

IN OPPOSITION TO FAMILY AND SOCIETY: SCHOOL AS A MARGINAL ACTOR OF NATION-BUILDING

In terms of K. Thelen, the Czech school can be described as a marginal actor without any negative connotation with the political regime in the struggle to contest the pressure of Austrian imperial bureaucratic approach to education and to create a new vision for the Czech people. "The school is good, while the world is evil" – was one saying (Proč školské… 1858). By separating the Czech school from Austrian state institutions, Czech reformers placed education at the boundary of private and public spheres in order "to match it against the imperial pro-state approach" (Škola v poměru k rodině, obci a církvi 1855). The Czech school's opposition to imperial public life was directly built into the process of differentiating public and private realms of social life. Specifying the status of educational institutions, schools as well as day nurseries (*opatrovna*), the Czech pedagogues blurred the boundaries of private and public. Blurring boundaries also meant that schools became substitutes for families, especially those which were poor and could not provide appropriate upbringing (Další slovo… 1857).

The diversity of positions regarding the family-school relationships were echoed in the various discourses around the child and childhood formulated by the Czech educators. Some authors likened child-parental relationship to that of the servant-master. These authors bestowed upon parents the complete responsibility for controlling the child; they also viewed the school as "a small-scale but in many things a more perfect state" (ibid 147), a view corresponding with the discourse of the "*tabula rasa*", "if the pedagogical treatment

was appropriate, and the educator gifted" (Jelinek 1888). Mediating between public and private became a mainstream attitude with respect to the role of the school amongst the Czech educators: "the school operates in favour of connecting family and society, the private and the public" (Jaký jest posavadní… 1856). Thus viewed, the school promoted the view of teachers as practitioners who possessed both professional and parental competencies. Teaching started to be seen as an art: "a superior art under an ordinary art, teaching creates a maestro from the most flexible entity – the human being" (Pavel 1857). This vision of teaching elaborated the concept of child development as a complex process equally requiring special knowledge and delicate emotions (Další slovo… 1857). Undoubtedly, it was hoped that education would contribute to the decline of social inequality, while supporting the idea that education could unify social groups into a unitary nation.

Acknowledging new functions and responsibilities for the school reinforced its role in the nation-building process. By the end of the 19th century, the Czech school accepted the mission to improve not only the spirit of the children but also their physical health (Bonmariage 1888). The idea of regular medical examinations in schools became popular amongst educators because of the growing number of children from vulnerable families whose parents suffered from "social" illnesses such as sexually transmitted diseases and tuberculosis, next to the intention to prevent the spread of such diseases. Growing in importance, Czech education developed pre-school units serving the primary need of raising new generations.

A ten-year-struggle (from the middle of the 1870s to the middle of the 1880s) to ensure the survival of the Czech kindergartens suggests that the programme of educating children in the name of the nation was the main objective for the budding Czech education during that period. In 1872 the Austrian Ministry of Education made the decision to reduce the budget for Czech kindergartens because of "their low standards regarding hygiene and their inappropriate methods for preparing children for primary schools" (Zpráva o… 1889). The main argument for defending the Czech kindergartens was the crucial role they played in caring for children from poor families. Moreover, Czech school inspectors conducted a special survey in ten districts questioning school principals, physicians in local centres devoted to child and maternal assistance, and members of charity unions. At the conference of the Czech kindergartens in 1889, participants debated the survey outcomes in the context of further improving the quality of kindergartens: the main set of arguments consisted of citations from physicians' reports who highlighted the positive impact of placing children in care and the kindergartens' role on the prevention of diseases.

Shortcomings were explained by insufficient training of nurses, and the predominance of the analytico-synthetic method of teaching children, typical of the German pre-school pedagogy. While the Czech experts found this approach unsuitable to the Czech children, they encouraged spontaneous teaching based upon observing nature, folk dances and songs as the most desirable content for the preschool training of children. According to their opinion, pre-school education had to combine all benefits of family upbringing with professional care; then, the kindergarten's location should not be too far away from home, children should not feel themselves lost by being placed into a new location. The kindergartens should be aware of the mission to raise a healthy generation of Czechs and reproduce the main frames of the ideal family life. The conference also made a convincing point against the repeated change of nurses: "so many new women around children may provoke unpleasant emotional and behavioural responses among them" (O škádlení… 1888).

If experts accepted the positive role of the family in raising children to the preschool age, they also demanded professional participation in the raising of school-age children: "family encourages tender soft feelings, sharps sensitivity, but older children need more coherent guidance under the lead of professionals" (O vyhovování… 1862). The educator was gradually portrayed as a universal figure able to carry out both roles: parent and teacher, while the family increasingly became the target of critique. Such trend could be viewed illogical – especially in the context of the predominant discourse of the "*naturally developed child*", but it was precisely during this period that the dispute between various views on the child, family, and professionals, which would dominate the next periods of child welfare formation, had first appeared. Reducing the role of families in children's education was directly related to the parents' resistance to place children into schools after the introduction of compulsory school attendance in 1855. The educators explained the parents' reluctance by their backwardness and unfamiliarity with school education and its tasks: "they question: What do our children learn [in school]? And do not wait for an answer" (Navrch… 1857). In forming practices aimed at controlling school attendance, educators increasingly focused on the inability of parents to bring up their children. The intention to use their own children as labor started to be criticized: "often it happens that employed children fall in the company of adults, whose words and behaviour are a harmful influence" (Jelínek 1888). The compassionate description of the shepherd boy's destiny, whose parents had to place him in service due to poverty, provided arguments regarding the imperfection of family surroundings and the need for regular attendance of school as the only possible way to raise the youth

morally: “Even though we are not perfect we cannot make our future generation to suffer from the same miseries [as we did]. We need to make our best and break away from the vicious circle” (Zákoucký b 1889).

By equalizing poor families with the source of immoral behaviour, either potential or apparent, the public discourse of the last third of the 19th century legitimised the increased control of families of farmers and workers in order to ensure the future generations of the Czech nation. The practice of assisting the families whose children could not attend school regularly enough brought together educational and local authorities. Some teachers became school inspectors (*školdozorce*) and shared the responsibility to make a list of students not attending school. Every week they passed this information to the local priest who was usually involved into the management of school, and in the case of a persistent absence (more than 6 months), the priest could inform local authorities accompanying it by the request about a special intervention. Educators began to expect that parents not only ensure school attendance but also prepare their children for school (Čebuský 1857). According to the educators, the parents' responsibility for preparing children for school should consist of “efforts to motivate children to attend school and obey the teacher's orders” (ibid). The regular Church attendance and primarily meeting with the teacher were recommended as the desirable practices in order to prepare the child to school

In the beginning of the 1880s, the Union of Kindergartens and Similar Organisations (*Spolek škol mateřských a ústavů jim příbuzných*) started to publish *The Guardian* (Pěstoun), a journal for parents and educators alike. The mission of the journal was to inspire parents and educators to disseminate Czech national consciousness. One of the main sections was titled *Parents who bring up better children help to make a better future?* (Rodiči odchováním lepšího pokolení dopomohou budoucím k lepším časům). Unfulfilling this task often led to marking the family as ‘bad'. It is possible to recognize in this obsession with a certain style of ‘parenting' the drastic strategies for intervention in Roma families, which were applied during the First Republic period.

Within the context of general education, the arguments limiting the power of families can be evaluated as moderate in contrast to much stricter negative approaches developed within the social protection system. Professionals were acknowledged to be able “to shape the ideal soldier from the lamentable Czech” (Další slovo… 1857). In a popular story about a vagabond published in 1889, the irresponsibility of the parents remained the main theme disclosing the key reasons of the main character's social fall: “the parents did not send the boy to school on time; did not care about placing their up growing son into the hands of a good master, and finally did not find place in their soul

for loving their child" (Zákoucký *c* 1889). The impossibility to make the child acquire norms was explained by the absence of the positive influence within the family. In another story, the author of *The Vagabond* narrated his attempt to re-educate a child from an immoral family whose father was sentenced for stealing. The unsuccessful struggle against the authority of the father, referred to by the boy every time he contested the teacher, led the author to the conclusion that: "I recognized that all troubles start in the family: one time the father visited me and claimed that we could not make a lawyer from his son, could not ensure his welfare in the future, and thus we do not have any legal permission to oblige his son to do meaningless tasks" (Zákoucký *a* 1889: 129)

Even more, the positive attitude of the child towards the mother started to be viewed as a subject of professional treatment: nurses in kindergartens were recommended to cultivate good image of mothers and motherhood due to its relevance for the discourse of the naturally developed child and nation-building: "While a teacher does not plan to destroy the child's belief in himself, all words talked about parents especially about mothers should reflect the sacred tie between the child and the mother which are so closely connected with the spirit of the nation" (Škola v … 1855). Transforming the attitude to motherhood caused heated debates among the Czech educators about the education of young girls.

RAISING AND EDUCATING GIRLS: AT THE CUTTING EDGE OF THE STRUGGLE FOR NEW GENERATIONS

As in other areas of education, such as gymnasiums and technical colleges, the training for farmers, the theme of education for women became a site for the construction and the subsequent propaganda of Czech education for the Czech nation. The significance of the girls' education increased due to the growing importance of the child in national imagery, of improving its health and the role of the parents in achieving this mission. A young girl was viewed in two interrelated hypostases: as a child who belonged to the nation and as a potential mother who not only would give birth to a child, but would have to play a crucial in the child's rearing and education. The mother's wisdom, prudence and thoughtful behaviour were considered to be the essential grounds for the formation of emotional ties between the child and the world, indispensable resources for the child's development. Arguments in favour of the enlightened motherhood were drawn up from the particular concept of the naturally developed child: "the child is a holistic entity locked in the limits of the external world" (ibid: 149).

The naturalness of the virtuous behaviour that was naturally ascribed to women: "attentive to the each detail, careful, devoted and affectionate" (Jak by učitel… 1856), contrasted with the behaviour imposed by social norms aimed at seduction and flirting. Both marriage and parenthood lose their meaning in terms of the nation's health when the woman does not behave herself naturally: "Could husbands get something sweet in their lives while their marriage has turned into grief? What happens with children who make up a whole generation while their mothers embittered their lives?" (ibid).

The education of women was directly bound with the quality of implementing the mother's duties, and the Czech educators criticized the widespread opinion at the time that less a woman knew about the world the better she performed the role of housewife, wife and mother. Asking what a well-educated woman meant, an anonymous Czech author noted in 1861 that there were several opinions: "would woman speak either German or French, she would attract the men's attention". The author also recapitulated those features which were commonly accepted by the Czech educators as the poisonous fruits of the Austro-German mode of life. The traditional home schooling for girls was criticised for the mechanical memorizing which tutors practiced. The outcomes of such education were described as the "behavior of contemporary monkeys": "go, Anny, make *pukrle,* tell *kystyhant* and give *pak" (*Úvahy 1858*)*. The authentically well-educated Czech girl should be congenial to the spirit of the nation, able to perform folk songs and dances, and know the basic knowledge about the history and geography of the Czech lands (Myšlenky… 1861). The intention to teach girls "*à la française*" was compared with the dominance of German-language education for the Czech boys and marked as a threat to the nation's health. While "frenchified" education aimed to teach girls to attract the opposite sex, did not prepare them for marriage and motherhood; thus home schooling in this manner was defined as "tainted" (Jak by učitel… 1856).

Typical of the common sense the dilemmatic nature of prescriptions to parents influenced the critique against the mainstream approach to educating girls, which contained not only the idea of "impure" intentions but the overfocus on mothers as housekeepers, "a common mistake among mothers who do not know how their behaviour is against the child' interest" (ibid). The attitude of parents towards the education of their daughters, the "frenchfied" education, and the neglect to enlighten the young girls, all combined to create a universal criterion for describing parents as unable to educate the young girls in the nation's interests.

Inasmuch as educators prescribed the parents of girls a skeptical attitude toward school attendance ("as minimum useless and superfluous as maximum

harmful and threatening to the future marital plans" (Úvahy 1858), the influence of parents was evaluated as a sign of backwardness. Commenting the outcomes of the survey regarding school attendance by girls, one school inspector wrote: "Families are short-sighted" (Myšlenky… 1861). Despite the possibility to attend five years of school, less than 10% of girls did it in the late 1880s, and the average duration of regular attendance did not exceed two years. The main reason for this was the wish of parents who wanted "to see [their] daughters comfortably married". According to the Czech educators, the misconception of parents regarding the content of educating their daughters should be compensated by the thoughtful curriculum based upon the idea of *universally beneficial* action (ibid)

The increasing assurance of the necessity to educate girls as for the further implementation of the mother's duties stipulated the readiness to accept various organisational designs – for different social groups. Thus poverty was more important than school education for the girls' family (Jak až posud… 1862). This trend coincided with the dissemination of the idea that poverty and immoral behaviour were viewed as two sides of the same coin: the backwardness of the Czech people.

The arguments in favour of the reform of the education for girls were drawn from foreign sources as well. In the 1880s Czech pedagogues discussed the *Treatise on the Education of Girls* by François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1861), an eminent predecessor of the French Enlightenment whose texts affected the reforms of education throughout Europe in the 18–19th centuries (Fenelon 1887). The Czech pedagogues actively applied the arguments developed by Fénelon who consistently constructed the discourse of the child as tabula rasa in their own way of thinking. The Fénelonian focus on the priority of social driving forces, e.g. the outstanding impact of early childhood on further growth, was replaced by the idea of more natural mode of life charging the child's mind. Naturalness was contrasted to the artificial way of education which limited the child's ability to communicate with the external world. The connection between mother and child described by Fénelon as a key condition for further socialising was interpreted by the Czech pedagogues as an indispensable condition for natural development of the child. Fénelon's argument against corporal punishment was used by the Czech educators to describe German pedagogy as preferring such methods.

The education for girls was distinguished by a wide range of topics characterising "the crusade for the Czech education": the opposition to any foreign model of teaching because of its incompatibility with Czech nation-building; viewing the Czech school as a marginal but powerful agent; the discourse of

naturally developed child in combination with the arguments about families as backward. By the beginning of the 20th century, the debates around the education for the Czech nation started to incorporate these proto-eugenic ideas within frameworks directly affiliated with eugenics.

THEORISING *COMMON SENSE* IN LINE OF EUGENICS

In the last quarter of the 19th century, the Czech educators often adopted approaches that can be described as eugenic – according to their societal intention and theoretical frames binding ethnicity, heredity, and development. Primarily, treatises about the culture of other nations introduced the first reflections on eugenics. For instance, in 1872 František Zámečník published his four-part book *On the naturalness of human mental heredity* (O naturelu čili psychické člověka přirozenosti), which widely resonated among subscribers of the journal *School and life* (*Škola a život*). The text aimed to provide a complete program for the training of the Czech teachers. The argument that even the most successful family was limited in its capacities to raise children due to the predominance of spontaneous approach to educating was applied here to justifying the necessity of the multifaceted training of educators: "to be able to awake the child through a whole array of competencies" (Zámečník a 1872). The text consistently posited the bond between social and biological driving forces, which became the core of assimilative eugenics and the mainstream ideology of social care and special education in the first third of the 20th century in the Czech lands (Zámečník c 1872). For testing this approach, the author utilised ethnographic studies – in order to demonstrate the diversity of factors and the interrelations between them. Referring to the studies of aboriginal Australians, for instance, Zámečník analysed the unusual mode of life as a synthetic natural factor calling for coherent analysis. He delineated the natural factor into several interconnected parts: geographical, geological, climatic, language, cultural and further driving forces (Zámečník d 1872).

The discourse on the naturally developed child was also applied to indicate differences among nations. Matching culture and parental style substantiated the practice to prescribe nations a particular age and a degree of maturity: "Negros behave themselves as small children and would be able to acquire the behavioural patterns relevant to the adults only being placed in other cultural conditions" (Zámečník a 1872). In line with the Locke's definition, the author highlighted the impact of health, as well as of natural and social resource, on the nation-building. Consequently, nations were divided into more or less mature according to their ability to care for the health of people.

From the contemporary point of view, Zámečník's text is a classical sample of theorizing the common sense in terms of contemporary sociologists. For instance, by prescribing particular features to particular nations due to the influence of geological factors he explained the multigenerational reproducing of traditions. The pseudoscientific nature of the text is obvious and does not require supplementary exploration. There were other prominent scholars who produced a more sophisticated theory of common sense. The 1902 book *The meaning of pedopsychology* (Hodnota pedopsychologie) by František Čada became an academic manifest of the Czech education regarding the idea of naturally developed child and the ways to explore child development for the long period of the Czechoslovakian education (Cach 2000).

Focusing on methodological grounds of childhood studies, Čáda criticised two camps of scholars who according to his opinion provided an inadequate attitude towards child development. The first subject of Čáda's critique was general psychology and its attempts to study child. General psychology was unable to take into account the specifics of the child's mental development: "all these manuals evaluate the child as an imperfect entity on the way of coming-of-age"(Čáda 1902: 4). On the other hand, by trying to derive the knowledge about the general psychological regularities from scrutinizing child mentality, experimental psychology diluted the concept of the child's mind and reduced the chance to recognize its peculiarities to zero: "they take into account exceptionally the simplest traits of the child and miss the complete frame of the child's mind" (ibid: 5).

The second camp, represented by Ch. Darwin, G.S. Hall and W.X. Talbot, was criticised for its full engagement with the task to directly affect child development: "it is totally inappropriate task to work out any type of guidance aimed at providing the particular rules for managing children" (ibid: 7). As an alternative to both interpretations, Čáda highlighted the necessity to scrutinize psychogenesis as the grounds for establishing appropriate aims of educating children. He began by arguing that the science of education should create such "explanations which would be relevant to the experience of children and trainers, natural for them and not too abstract". Such explanations should be understandable and accessible not only to scholars but also to parents and children, who could thus advance their education by looking at themselves from the outside.

Čáda reinforced the unique role of the teacher, which was developed by the Czech educators in the second part of the 19th century. The key object of pedopsychology according to him was to refine the sensitivity of educators to the spiritual needs of the children. Thus in line with Hall's rejection of

research methods vivisecting the child's soul, Čáda justified methods based upon observation and the content-analysis of child's activity (especially child drawing attracted his attention). Such methods permeate the holistic approach and equipped educators with the necessary knowledge regarding the better implementation of the control of children: "the more we realise driving forces of child development the more we love our children – because previously inappropriate behavioural manifestations become for us more understandable, together with the sources of their origin".

Čada was persuaded by the necessity to introduce children to psychological competencies and to teach them by applying the psychological knowledge for improving behaviour and self-understanding. But neither social learning nor improving psychological competencies were sufficient prerequisites for the quality of education, as long as the teacher was not thoughtful and tactful in communicating with children. Debating with H. Münsterberg who opposed the professional and parental view on the child, čáda noted that the educator could rely on own parental experience and combine quasi-parental functions with professional tasks. These positions ensured, according to čáda, two main requirements to the pedagogical treatment, namely security in terms of avoiding any risks to intervene the natural way of development and the focus on morality and piety of the child.

In Čáda's texts, we could discern the first formulation of the key arguments against selective eugenics which would be elaborated later within debates on compulsory sterilisation. Additionally, Čáda claimed the conditionality of the task to recognize the child's development, which in many ways would remain "the subject for observing than correcting and transforming". He inclined towards social learning as the comprehensive strategy for reeducating the 'asocial child' based on the premise that it would rely on the spontaneous manifestations of the child's personality.

Čáda's ideas perfectly matched those in favour of the Czech education formulated in debates during the second part of the 19th century. Theorising the main frames of this agenda, Čáda offered the individual approach to the child's mind both in terms of its exploration and treatment, which accepted the role of heredity but in practice, relied on social learning. Precisely, the individual approach was based upon the intention to realize the impact of biological (heredity factors) and social (the influence of surroundings) in order to recognize the possible "cap" of pedagogical efforts. The institutional prerequisites for practicing this approach were established in two first decades of the 20th century.

CONCLUSIONS

By the end of the 19th century, the Czechs had formulated not only a definite position towards education, but drew up an agenda for its development according to the ideals of the nation-building. Powered by morality, usability and health mode of life, the new Czech education was opposed to the Austrian Empire's German-language tradition which was ultimately described as morally unfit for the future generations of Czechs. While German education was an agent of empire, the concept of the new Czech education served the people's aspirations. Shortcomings of various educational programmes were explained by their lack of national substance, an argument often invoked in debates about the danger of future generations' deviation from 'normal' behaviour.

The focus on naturalness as an indispensable condition for the appropriate education and raising of children stipulated the construction of concepts regarding the key topics of the Czech education: the education for girls, training of farmers, preschool teaching, etc. In fact, discourses about children served their commodification in favour of the state's interests, and were thus transformed by the Czech ideologues of nation-building to substantiate their emancipatory claims from the Austrian system and imperial state machinery. The Czech school and the Czech teacher became the unique resource for recognizing the child's needs and abilities, and the ways to manage them. As in other European countries, social sciences in the Czech lands began to theorise about education, childhood and parenthood, which were previously established and rooted in the common sense. The naturally developed child was fixed not only as appropriate but as the only possible concept of thinking about child development – especially with respect to children from peasant and working class families.

Social issues including the education for socially vulnerable and the mission of nation-building were seen as a challenge by the Czech-language education. Marie Červinková-Riegrová, a spiritual leader of the national movement for the Czech education, in her well-known pamphlet "The protection of the poor and the neglected youth: attitudes towards humanism across Europe" (*Ochrana chudé a opuštěné mládeže: rozhledy po lidumilství v Evropě*, 1887) laid hopes on solving the social issues, primarily poverty, as the first step by the Czech intellectuals towards the emancipation of the Czech people from the pressure of the Austrian Empire's stifling domination: "neglecting the well-being of poor is neglecting the interests of nation, [and]we cannot make such a mistake".

The new Czech education had a special role in formulating a healthy ideal of life and later in the establishment of assimilative eugenics, the most powerful ideological platform during the interwar period in social sciences, public health and social security. The definition of the proper mode of life as the core of assimilative eugenics was produced by the Czech educators in the second part of the 19th century within a broader debate about the Czech character and the mission of nation-building. Precisely, that cause-and-effect relationship between nationalism and a healthy mode of life, which determined the further development of the Czech eugenics, has its roots in the late imperial period.

CHAPTER 2

The Segregation of Disabled and Roma Children in the Czech Lands During the Interwar Period

This text puts forwards argument that the development of special education for deviant and disabled children and the formation of practices aimed at controlling the Roma population echo those developed during the interwar period. The first part explores main contexts regarding the development of eugenics in the Czech lands and establishes a temporal framework needed for an understanding of the relationship between eugenics and child protection policy. The second part discusses how did eugenic ideas were applied in the system of correctional institutions for minors with delinquent behavior and mental disability. In the third part I examine the reform towards forced legitimization of *nomad* Roma people and pay special attention to the institutionalization of Roma children. In the final part, I discuss the historical implications for such an investigation of the path dependence stipulating the segregation of Roma and disabled children in the Czech lands.

The research explores discourses around Roma and disabled children in the context of practical eugenics. The main source were (1) the journal *Úchylná mládež* – the main periodical dealing with special education during the First Republic; (2) lectures and publications by the central figures of eugenics in the Czech lands; (3) public statements of politicians and articles published in popular magazines and daily newspapers (e.g. *Magazin Melantricha, Lidové noviny*).

EUGENICS: A MEASURE FOR BUILDING THE NATION

In the Czech lands eugenics served ideals of nation building, while simultaneously reflecting the growing importance of the natural, biological and medical sciences in society. While many leaders of national movement (T.G. Masaryk, F. Drtina) glorified the past and indicated the origin of the Czechoslovakian nation in the Hussite wars and the history of resistance to German enslavement, František Čáda, one of the first Czech eugenicists did not accept a simplified version of national development and aimed instead to a systematic transformation of the national values (Cach 2000: 28). Čáda was interested in how public life and social sciences could work together,

providing for "secure mechanisms which could influence the spontaneous development of a child from proletarian family who needs more intense stimulation because of the limited external resources (Čáda 1902: 25). He identified the inappropriateness of many branches of psychology to solve this task either because they were too theoretical or they were too close to the field of child development, and thus rather reluctant to adopt new ideas. Eugenics seemed a perfectly fit option in contrast to other theories which focused on driving forces of physical and mental development and measures for its refinement. Čáda's message – "Discover the 'best self' and improve the world around" – determined the further development of eugenics in the Czech lands.

Like in other CEE countries, in the Czech lands eugenics obtained[2] a wide circulation within the process of building nation, providing a wide range of arguments for legitimising strategies of social policy and public health (Turda and Weindling 2007). Moreover, eugenicists univocally linked the negative consequences of the *WWI* to poverty, devastation, and dislocation of social networks. Eugenicists complained of moral decay and demographic crisis, and suggested that "the essence of war required immediate actions" (Schneider 1925: 86).

At the beginning of the 20th century, Czech eugenicists started to criticize the state policy as insufficient for providing the health of the nation. In 1909 the child reformer František Čáda greeted the participants of the first congress of special educators[1] arguing that the increased deviant social behaviour is a direct outcome of the ill-conceived state policy alienating the young generation from religion and morality: "We need to recognise [the need] to unite various issues regarding education into a holistic approach to the child question"

One of the most consistent examples of critique to the Imperial Austrian policy could be found in a paper by Adrian Tůma. He emphasised the crucial role of decentralization in special education in the 1010s because of the systematic lack of financial support: "special education was left to itself" (Tůma, 1920: 7).

During the 1930s eugenics developed within debates on German racial hygiene – the Czech scholars maintained a united front against determining physical and mental health by the belonging to a particular race. In the popular 1934 tract *Rasismus hrozí kultuře* (Rasism utters threats to culture) Josef Mejsner wrote that Czechoslovak eugenics did not emulate German ideals of racial superiority – race was associated with a particular type of physical constitution than ethnicity (Mejsner 1934: 50). Undoubtedly, the rejection of German-style racial hygiene echoed the common anti-German movement in

2 Between 1909-1913 three Czech congresses of special educationwere organised by Čada in order to establish the national agenda od education for children "with mental retardation and delinquent behaviour". All three (the first, in Prague, 1909; the second, in Brno, 1911; and the last in Ostrava, 1913) had attracted the public attention and connected the aim of special education with the building of the nation..

the Czech lands. The critique of Racial Hygiene focused on rejecting the superiority of German race, as the Czech scholars considered that the direct connection of racial hygiene and the ideology of the National Socialist Party did not help the cause of eugenics (ibid: 10). German racial hygiene was opposed to progressive American and French practices of applying eugenics to society. Placing Czech eugenics in opposition to the "inhuman fascist ideology", became ultimately a hindering factor for those reflecting on the impact of eugenics on social segregation, regardless of the Nazi policies.

Main discussions around the health nation and its factors touched on heredity, external driving forces, and resonated with the development of eugenics in other countries. Already in the late 1910s, two main theoretical camps emerged: selective and assimilative eugenics. Those representing the former, such as Arthur Brožek, Břetislav Foustka, and Josef Mejsner centered on genetic capital and developed the selective eugenics. They worked out a programme of preventive measures aimed to improve the health of the nation. The most consistent performance of this school of thought can be found in the texts by Stanislav Ružička, especially his detailed plan of applying assimilative eugenics (or as he called it, *eubiotics*) to such issues as correctional education and the assimilation of Roma people.

Selective eugenics encouraged measures targeting vulnerable groups according to the rule of "survival of the fittest": to protect one's self through natural selection is typical of humanity cleaning itself from those who did not have good health and internal resources to fight against bad environmental factors (Brožek 1922: 86). The negative influence of environment was coincided with the congenital defects into the joint predictor of the negative pathway of development: "we cannot forget that only those who are short in the resistance to the negative external influence because of their congenital deformity totally fall" (ibid: 86). The systematic encouragement of working women, the introduction of social benefits, and other forms of social protection were seen by ***assimilative*** **eugenicists as** inappropriate to the natural mode of life, which was identified as only one relevant to human need (Ružička 1933).

Czech ***selective eugenicists*** relied on American and British studies. They shared the direct connection between race and social class typical of the Anglo-Saxon model of eugenics (Stone 2001), and thus highlighted the inheritance of pauperism (Meisner, Štampach). This group of scholars provided detailed arguments in favour of the inheritance of moral qualities, both positive and negative. In connection to this position, the scholars expanded the notion of "low-value" people to include people addicted to alcohol; those in conflict with the law; individuals who were disabled either physically or psychologically; and those, practicing immoral behaviour (Meisner 1939).

The view that was an act of humanistic treatment for the 'low-valued' people was also adopted from the writings of British and American eugenicists (ibid). As he opposed the Nuremberg laws, Meisner indicated instead two alternatives for solving the issue of low-value people "whose reproduction is asocial" in what he described as a 'humanistic manner', namely isolation from society (placement into institutions) and sterilization" (Mesiner 1934: 61–62). Allowing a disabled person to live among intact people without a threat to the national health, sterilization seemed more preferable, according to Meisner (ibid: 63). Introducing the special permission for marriage became the main achievement of this group of eugenicists, especially in terms of institutionalising eugenics through establishing the network of marital counseling centres.

Concentrating on the preliminary/introductory measures, ***assimilative eugenics*** highlighted the improvement of the environment and living conditions, as key determinants of the national health. Decreasing infant mortality and increasing the birth rate, together with measures to protect mothers and children were placed the centre of the strategy presented by this group of eugenicists (Křízenecký 1922: 24). These new measures ran against those introduced during the late Imperial period when, according to the Czech scholars, social services focused on the illegitimate children and neglected the needs of mothers and infants (ibid 27–29). Supporters of assimilative eugenics affiliated themselves with the French school of eugenics and puériculture, particularly in the context of explaining and correcting deviant behavior: "The French conception significantly influenced Czech pedagogy because of its wide interdisciplinary explanation of delinquent behavior undervalued neither internal not external factors" (Chlup 1935: 20). The connection with French eugenics is important. Moreover, the Czech scholars extensively referenced the work of French psychiatrists, among them Ernest Dupré and George Heyuer.

Stanislav Růžička (1872–1946), one of the most outspoken Czech eugenicist belonging to this group, introduced the concept of *eubiotika or dobrožilství (eubiothics)*. It as based on two interrelated assumptions: (1) diseases were the result of inappropriate life style; (2) the improvement of the quality of life was indispensable for the health of nation (Ružička 1933: 8). Eubiothics was described as "eugenics' younger sister" (ibid). Reducing the number of diseases was accepted as a factor of increasing duration of working age and saving human resources. In line with the general trend, prompting a growing importance fo the medical profession in the nation's public life, tuberculosis, sexually transmitted diseases, and alcoholism were described "vampires", contributing to degeneration together with the destruction of traditional life due to urbanization (ibid). Ružička thus proclaimed the special mission of the Slavic people "who were more disposed toward nature than any other people".

A healthy life was described the essential condition for the nation's renewal (Šima 1934). Any deviation from what was described as 'normal life' was labeled in turn 'unnatural', 'amoral', and 'irresponsible'. The direct relationship between the life style of the population and the health of nation substantiated the vision of disease as public health danger, requiring the special intervention of state and society. The contemporary view on eubiothics remains quite positive despite the radical position of its adherers towards traditional medicine (Vojtko 2011).

In Czechoslovakia, assimilative or positive eugenics was more successful than selective or negative eugenics, and was better equipped to provide the grounds for a new social policy. Assimilative eugenics was the driving force of social policy in Czechoslovakia during the late 1920s and early 1930s. Insisting on the improvement of the environment, assimilative eugenics emphasized the role of reeducation. It became a national motto: "today reeducation is the key slogan: in schools, media, political and civil movements. [W]hat is more important, the President (Masaryk – the first President of the Czechoslovakia, V.S) [himself] has declared the importance of reeducation" (Janaček 1929). The ideals of assimilative eugenics also coincided with religious values, and the focus on transforming the life style of the population predisposed scholars to abandon some of their positivist positions, and start to interpret the factors of heredity partially in relation to vitalism. In his introductory lecture to special educators, Karel Herfort (1925)—soon however to become a supporter of selective eugenics—criticised the Mendelian concept of heredity, describing it as over-mechanistic and insufficient for explaining individual differences. He also argued that these differences were casued not by exceptionally genetic factors but by patterns of social behaviour reproduced from generation to generation. Without completing rejecting the impact of genetics, assimilative eugenicists concentrated on external factors and the willingness of the population to implement a "normal" mode of life.

In the mid-1930s, assimilative eugenics achieved political importance, as were the debates about the draft of a sterilization law (Šimúnek 2012). The most influential medical and Legal experts doubted that selective eugenics can provide better social control: "sterilization would not make a better social person; on the contrary, the consequences of sterilization are unpredictable and out of possible control" (Sonka 1938: 35).

To what extent did the focus on external non-inheritable factors contributed to the change of Czech eugenics towards a humanistic stance? Did the practical implications become less selective? When one investigates the special education for children with disability and asocial behaviour the answer is negative.

EUGENICS IN ACTION: CARE AND CONTROL

Highlighting the impact of future generations for the nation, Czech eugenics played a key role in developing new procedures and criteria of child protection. Legal regulations, institutions, services as well as training and retraining of professionals was directly influenced by eugenics. After the WWI, Czechoslovakia faced the challenge to provide the needs of abandoned children. Many of them begged, were involved into criminal groups, suffered from and spread contagious diseases. The system of detecting neglected and abused children was established as a primary response to this challenge. In 1919, the Prague police established the special department of social protection for underage citizens aimed at primary placing street children; cooperating with mainstream school in order to monitor children from vulnerable families and provide regular attendance of school; protecting children from violence. The departments of care for minors (*okresní péče o mládež*) were re-organised in 1921 in all regions. In 1929, these departments were obliged to cooperate with other professional services in their regions primarily with counselling centres established by the Czechoslovak Society of eugenics.

In 1925, the Society initiated a survey among the main schools where? In Prague? in order to gather data regarding the students who needed consistent monitoring and special encouragement (Schneider 1925). The survey pointed out the insufficiency of measures provided by schools towards encouraging parental control for children at risk. Moreover, the survey voiced the concern that mainstream schools were not equipped for coping with such issues. The survey's outcomes became one of theoretical arguments in favour of reforming the system of special institutions for children. One of practical implications of the survey was the creation of a list of minors who needed special treatment. 650 minors were placed into the residential care in Prague?, and after five years the eugenicists evaluated their progress.

The outcomes of the next survey combined selective and assimilative eugenics into the coherent range of practices regarding disabled and Roma children. While the majority of pupils who had been placed into institutions were 'corrected' and began a 'normal' life: getting a job, marriage, acquiring a particular status in community, those who were physically and mentally disabled remained incorrigible (ibid). This survey influenced the further development of special education for disabled and Roma children in Czechoslovakia. Three main interconnected assumptions dominated the common approach to educating *deviant* children: a) the close connection between physical/mental disability and deviant behaviour; b) the incapability of parent of delinquent

children to provide care and control; and c) the indispensable role of institutions and professionals in the process of re-educating young delinquents.

During the 1920s, the notion of the "morally defective child" (*mravně vadné dítě*) was used by both negative and positive eugenics, particularly with respect to the self-consistent explanation regarding the correction of underage children with deviant behavior and the assimilation of Roma children. On the theoretical level, the options for juxtaposing both domains of eugenics became the focus of debates in the 1930s when one of the most visible experts in pathopedology Otokar Chlup (1875–1965) wrote a set of articles, connecting the theory of child development with the practice of child protection. He argued the necessity to work with a number of factors, and introduced into theory and practice the focus on social factors: "the most recent studies of delinquency have persuaded [me to consider] the necessity to classify the factors of deviant behavior according to the impact of family, environment, economical circumstances, and refine individual approach to delinquent youth and transforms the grounds of assessment" (Chlup 1935: 22). Chlup shared ideas of selective eugenics in theory but he suggested only a limited practical application: "educating children with any type of delinquency should be the opposite of pessimistic fatalism" (ibid: 24). In practice, pedagogues combined assimilative and selective eugenics into the system of assessment and intervention.

Practitioners started to apply both domains of eugenics in the mid-1920s. Jan Cenek, the principal of a boarding school for delinquent children in Valticí metaphorically compared a child's soul with iron covered by wax: "who is able to judge how far does wax penetrate iron, and where does impregnable iron start?" (Cenek 1924: 28). The depth of "wax", as the transformable part of personality, would become the main criterion for planning intervention, but its measuring required more data regarding family history. Thus, the main request to child protection services was to obtain as much as possible data about the previous generations (ibid).

The educators in residential care institutions started to elaborate various typologies of delinquency underpinning the distinction between inherited and acquired deviance. Classifying children into groups according to this classification prompted practitioners to explain abnormal behavior through eugenics. They placed "the secondary nature of personality" as the core element of intervention (Kedrutek 1930: 35) – and despite the origin of delinquency, pedagogues should indicate the most accessible way to realise habits, then train positive and oppress negative (ibid 37).

According to the new Law of Juvenile Justice (O trestním soudnictví nad mládeží No 148) introduced in 1931, young offenders were divided into two

main categories: 1) those needing educational treatment ether in their own or substitute family, or for a short period of time in a special institution, and 2) those who needed to be placed into special institution for a long period in order to treat them *therapeutically*. Young delinquency was described as a disease required systematic medical intervention. In the late 1920s, professionals started to apply the notion of "defective youth" (*úchylná mládež)*.

Combining physical, mental and moral defects became the starting point of one of largest survey among children placed into correctional institution conducted by Josef Meisner —a notorious supporter of selective eugenics – in 1938–1939. He matched the outcomes of his survey with two previous ones, which applied a similar methodology but to different samples: normal healthy children from mainstream schools and mentally disabled children from special institutions. Despite the dissatisfaction with the sample of normal children (the sample consisted of children from low middle class families and, according to Meisner, they did not reflect the best performance of the Czechoslovakian people), the author concluded that both delinquent and disabled children demonstrated much worse physical development than 'normal' children. Smaller sizes of heads, less weight and height were taken as testimonies of retardation of the child's physical and psychological development. The assessment of mental development deepened the difference between normal children on the one side and delinquent/disabled on other.

One of the targets of numerous surveys conducted in correctional institutions was to demonstrate the incapability of parents to provide care and moral education for their delinquent children. The dichotomy ***care institution versus hopeless family*** was constructed in two main directions focusing on immoral behaviour of parents as a double source of the further immorality of children: children inherited bad behavioural patterns from their parents, and parents brought up children not to have respect for morality. Thus, Meisner provided statistical data to show the correlation between the degree of delinquency and the profile of asocial behaviour of parents. He explained the fact that illegal children committed crime more often than minors who were born in legal marriages and that by sexual relationships outside marriage was typical only of immoral people. Despite being short of data regarding the social origin of previous generations, Meisner highlighted the decline of the human capital from generation to generation in the families of delinquent children: moral degradation of well-educated fathers, who exchanged normal life for vagrancy and crime; the crime career of siblings as well as the increase of disability in families (Meisner 1939).

Karl Stejskal (1925), for instance, argued in favour of institutionalisation against family care and suggested that the abnormality of child was the result of the incapability of mother to provide sufficient care: "the child in his lack

of will is akin to his mother who is incapable to obtain elementary norms of hygiene"(Stejskal 1925: 158). He introduced the concept *slaboduché dítě* (spiritually weak child) for describing children with multiple disabilities and bad patterns of behavior instead of using the previously applied *slabomyslné dítě* (feebleminded child). The 1929 survey by J. Jeneček was based upon the exploration of letters written by parents and minors placed in correctional institutions to each other. He demonstrated the shadow side of motherly love and the intention of many mothers to cover for their children as well as be rid of guilt feelings. Jeneček also described as indifferent and selfish those mothers who were very formal in the letters to their children. He concluded that mothers of delinquent children revealed two types of attitudes towards their children: blind love without any resource for moral re-education of the child or total negligence.

In the early 1930s, the task to develop an individual approach was transformed by the choice of the system of special institutions in order to establish the appropriate institutional framework needed to refine practices for deviant children. According to Josef Blobil, "age, the degree of deviance, physical abilities, other abilities, planning further education and job defined the choice of institution" (Blobil 1930: 98). This taxonomy of children' profiles according to relevant institution consisted of eight types, ranging from the neglected to the irredeemable child. Minors with common psychosocial profile should be placed into the same institution because there was matching between the profile of the child and the strategy of treatment. Expanding residential care units in the 1930s coincided with the reforms in the system of decision-making related to the placement of children. This connection heightened the role of eugenics and of eugenic procedures for assessing the mental state and predicting the development of the child.

Residential care was not among the types of placements considered for disabled children. Additionally, medical experts discussed the economic costs needed to assimilate people with mental and physical disabilities (Křízenský 1917). The main organizational alternative was the system of family settlements in rural areas. Childless couples could be recruited for providing care for disabled and delinquent children, and rural areas were considered to be the most appropriate space for social integration (Tůma 1920: 6). In line with this approach, the placement into residential care setting was a last resort measure appropriate only for children with extremely narrowed range of abilities (ibid). In 1929 František Kříž wrote: "feebleminded youth is not able to produce anything but it should be able to do something, and our task is to build the system of residential care focused on relevant vocational training while other more complicated types of jobs would be the task of healthy people" (Kříž 1929: 9).

The continuity between residential care for underage and for adult disabled people became a central point of discussions in the 1930. A principal of one boarding school, for example, expressed his worries about the graduates of his schools, asking: "Could we leave one helpless in the boat without paddles, take back our protecting hand and lay down our control?" (Multrus 1933: 6). The lack of continuity between residential care and the uncontrolled life after the graduation was attributed to the inappropriate choice of vocational training and systematic gaps of competencies among trainers within the system of professional education: "the most frequent reason why young graduates escaped where? and committed crimes was the unmatched job they chose […] There are some pupils who demonstrate enough will to cope with such jobs, but we could not expect good performance from the majority of minors who were under special care" (Čermak 1931: 228). The main measure for solving this problem seemed to be a more refined assessment of abilities and aptitudes, as well as the option to continue placing in residential care those young people who lacked of self-regulation (ibid: 229). Some medical practitioners argued for the compulsory attendance of such institution, especially for the young people with multiple disorders (Multrus 1933). The system of vocational counseling for delinquent and disabled evolved under the direct influence of eugenics: not only were intelligence tests used for assessing abilities and aptitudes but the family background, its social capital and status were also considered (Zikmund 1935: 76).

The history of eugenics in the Czech lands can be explored in connection to the history of state intervention and regulation of health care for children with disabilities and delinquents. Gradually, eugenicists built a system of institutions aimed at providing care and control of defective people "whose ability to live independently was far below the norm" (Schneider 1930). They constructed the concept of delinquency as double-natured, created by both bad inheritance and bad environment. This, in turn, substantiated the extensive development of residential care for "special" children as a main response to the incapability of families to care for them. Eugenics delineated the alleged threat posed by antisocial behavior in the name of legitimizing itself, but later the same framework was applied to legitimizing the segregation of the Roma people.

ASSIMILATE NOT SEGREGATE: THE POLICY TOWARDS THE ROMA PEOPLE

After WWI and the creation of Czechoslovakia, the migration of the Roma people to urban areas (mostly in cross-border regions and Moravia) increased, mainly because of poverty in rural areas where the Roma people

lived before the war. This led to hard measures against the Roma people issued in the late 1920s, but also generated interest from various political groups. The Roma question became a political topic dividing voters during the period of political instability.

The experts' opinion reinforced the general intention and provided additional arguments in favour of tough strategy regarding the monitoring under Roma people. Comparing the number of crimes committed by various ethnic groups commanded the introduction of special instruments for controlling: "Gypsies are professional villains. Despite their small number behind bars, they are more than 66 times than others committed crimes regard to male population. Not surprisingly, that the Gypsy question irritates us and its solution requires the most radical measures" (Jeneček 1927: 230).

At the end of 1926, several members of the Agrarian Party wanted «to solve the Roma issue without delay». The Czechoslovak Parliament, in turn, tasked the Ministry of internal affairs to prepare the draft of the law that would regulate the migration of the Roma people and establish efficient mechanism of monitoring them. The recent Bavarian law *Gesetz zur Bekämpfung von "Zigeunern", Landfahrern und Arbeitsscheuen* (1926) (Engbring-Romang 2001) and the set of French laws introducing rules for Roma people in 1912 were taken as the sample for the planned legal act. In July 1927, after two weeks of debates, the Law No 117 O potulných cikánech a jiných podobných tulácích (*On the fight against Gypsies, vagabonds and those unwilling to work*) was passed in Parliament.

Scholars consider the law No *117* as the toughest compared to similar legal norms in other European countries (Nečas 1991). It certainly offered the legal framework for the segregation of the Roma people in the Czech lands over time (Lhotka 2009). The Law introduced the compulsory identification for the Roma people based on fingerprinting and completing a special record form contained detailed information about relatives and previous places of temporal and permanent living. All these measures were considered to be preconditions for implementing the regular monitoring of the Roma population. If during the monitoring procedures police would find the absence of legitimate status, the given person would lose some of its civil rights: freedom of association, the right to housing, the right to labour, etc. In the case of the gross violation of the Law, the Roma people could be punished with the confiscation of their property and the revocation of their professional license (the Roma people needed to get a special license for performing three occupations accessible for them: musician, blacksmith, and old-clothes dealer).

Being in consistent opposition to the Agrarian Party, the Communist Party decried the Law for its arbitrariness in the intention to monitor the life of minority: "*We do not accept that one ethnos/ethnic group has put the other under police*

control, from the moment of birth until death. We know that most oppressed people are innocent and not responsible for the crimes committed by the asocial minority […] *We definitely do not accept that the rest of vagrant people would be considered as filth, and that due to their dark skin they would be stripped of their rights belonging to any person according to our Constitution" (*Rudé právo 1927*).* Supporters of the law defined assimilation as a process leading to the de-legitimisation of vagrancy because of the threat it posed to the 'normal' way of life.

In 1928, various ministries and departments worked out additional regulations for to the new Law and handbooks regarding its implementation. The Addition to the Law 117 *About labour camps and enforced labour* (1928) was issued in order to establish procedures for punishing the Roma people who were found as residing illegally in the country. In contrast to the French laws which did not mention explicitly the Roma people, the Czechoslovakian law mentioned them. However, in practice the law applied to any person who was identified as vagrant. This practice coincided with growing racialization of Czech eugenics, and the term "*cikán*" (Gypsy) started to become a synonym for "vagrant", "thief", "criminal" (Nečas 1991).

The paragraph 12 of the Law No 117 regulated the termination of parental rights of the Roma people who did not have a legal status, and allowed for further placement of their children under care. Children under 14 of the parents without legal status should be removed from family, and parents' rights would be annulled, without any options for them to appeal against this decision. Institutions enjoyed the legal status of the guardian, and the child should stay there until becoming an adult. The law also established the mission of residential care: prepare the child for an independent life and inculcate into him/her moral values and social norms. The state took upon itself the costs of child care.

The reports of nurses from residential care units are the main testimony regarding the application of these norms in practice. Such reports highlight the precarious state of the children at the moment of accepting them into the institution, as well as their rapid progress of assimilation and acceptance of new social norms (Holub 1933). The evaluation of the child development at the moment of arrival in the institution was connected to the inability of their parents to provide sufficient care, and also in some cases to the backwardness of children. After several months, the child showed progress in physical and mental development. Practitioners used photos of children before and after arrival, as an additional argument that residential care demonstrated the pedagogues' vision of normality. During their first photo, after having just arrived in the institution, the children were described as unkempt, dressed in dirty clothes, attached to their dogs, and avoiding people. After several months

in the institution, children were seen in photos with their hair cut, and they looked as "normal as the European children". Many pedagogues derived the notion of Roma family from popular stories, and did not engage in direct communication with parents; the practitioners provided the public image of Roma as people involved in domestic violence, promiscuity, involvement of children in crime activity (ibid).

Placement into institutions remained the only one possible option for the Roma children: family foster caregivers rejected to accept the Roma child because of fear of revenge from the parents. Simultaneously, the managers of residential units tried to avoid the acceptance of Roma children, as they feared that the Roma children could negatively influence other children (Zelenka 1933). As a result, the Roma children were placed very rarely in institutions, while adolescents were placed in institutions for adults. The question of further placement of Roma children prompted the eugenicists to argue for the creation of special institutions or institutional subdivisions especially for the Roma children (Meisner 1939).

The debates around the law during its consideration in Parliament, the final version of the law, and the practice of its application bear testimony that the main argument for dealing with the Roma people was to focus on their environment, defined as absolutely inappropriate to the way of life relevant to the task of saving the healthy nation. Nomadism, moreover, was viewed as the last argument in favour of imposing a restrictive strategy: "The obstacle between society and the Gypsies was aggravated by the vagrancy and their asocial behavior", wrote František Štampach (1895–1976), a key supporter of ideas of social control for the Roma people.

Štampach conducted several surveys among the Roma people, including anthropological research in rural areas in the late 1920s. Describing in detail the way of life of nomad and settled Roma people, Štampach indicated for the natural inclination of the Roma people towards nomadism, as they had practiced it for many centuries. In addition to the anthropological analysis of the Roma life, Štampach focused on specific distinctions between the Roma and the non_Roma way of life (Štampach 1933). Main features of Roma 'abnormality' were attributed to the earlier age at which they started their sexual life; their totally different type of dressing and their daily schedule (ibid: 43). These descriptions were presented alongside those of 'Negros'. Štampach included a pamphlet by the English eugenicist R.R. Rentoul who argued for the sterilization of Afro-Americans (Done 2001: 399). While the description did not comprise direct negative statements, all of arguments and comments were built into the whole picture of Roma backwardness. For instance, in terms

of their physical appearance the Roma people, according to Štampach, were "compatible with the lowest caste in India" (ibid: 15). Accepting the natural inclination of the Roma people towards nomadism did not lessen Štampach's critical attitude; on the contrary, he believed that nomadism was a contributing factor against assimilation.

Štampach mentioned the imitating nature of Gypsy culture and indicated a great deal of influences from Hungarian and Slovakian music and traditions (ibid: 38). Simultaneously, he highlighted the extreme flexibility of the Roma people regarding their religious identity and the readiness to adopt the religion of the majority among whom they lived without any further deepening "into religious practices" (ibid). Štampach's research encouraged the conclusion that the Roma people would not be able to practice culture and religion as a source of moral norms and prescriptions to a normal behavior.

Finally, Štampach validated the priority of the Western way of life in contrast to nomadism, seen as specific to primitive societies. The Roma people who continued to practice such way of life were described as unproductive and even more, as dangerous for the developing Czech democracy: "Roma people could vote not for a suitable party or they could ask for social benefits limited for non-Roma citizens" (ibid: 47). According Štampach, the Roma people practiced a radical concept of freedom based upon the defiance of law and authorities (ibid: 48). Later, Meisner went to even greater extremes and identified nomadic way of life as a consequence of abnormal mental development while the experience of nomadism was considered to be an inevitable factor in aggravating inherited abnormality (Meisner 1939).

The dispersal of the Roma people among non-Roma population was considered to be the key strategy of their assimilation: "separated from each other, Gypsies are not thieves, liars or cheats, but in groups they conform precisely to this profile of behaviour" (ibid: 48). According to Štampach, as soon as a Gypsy child was placed into a normal environment assimilation could be expected: "a well socialized, domiciled Gypsy would find easy options to integrate into the non-Roma community" (ibid: 49). It is indicative that Štampach discovered the close connection between the level of poverty among Roma families and their difficulty to assimilate, and concluded that property qualification must be taken into account during the planning of treatment (ibid).

In line with the general significance of marriage for eugenics, Štampach paid special attention to positive and negative outcomes form intermarriages between Roma and non-Roma. Despite accepting that in some cases such marriages resulted in gifted children, the author concluded with disappointment that miscegenation operates more as a threat the social capital than a factor of

assimilation: the majority of children from mixed families preferred marriages to Roma partners and to rejoin the Roma community (ibid: 51).

During the interwar period diverse actors (politicians, academic communities, practitioners, and the general public) used a number of discourses centred on the "Roma question": the particular life style of the Roma people was described as an important problem, and in connection to it strict social control was recommended. Playing out common prejudices about the Roma, eugenics played a significant role in creating an abusive discourse against them and substantiating the necessity of systematic control of their families and children.

CONCLUSIONS

Contrary to the fact that they had focused on external conditions as core factors determining the health of the nation, the Czech eugenics promoted radical policies of segregating Roma and disabled people. Working out the rigid notion of normal timing of daily routine and prescribing it the status of indispensable condition of a healthy life, assimilative eugenics viewed any deviation from the norm as a threat to the nation, and thus argued in favour of medical and social intervention.

The new turn of eugenics was determined by practices regarding the delinquent and disabled children. While on the theoretical level the debates about selective and assimilative eugenics polarised the eugenicists, health care practitioners (teachers, helping professionals and so one) combined both versions into a composite interpretation of delinquency and disability. In the late 1930s, the previously two separate eugenic views, that is the assimilation of the Roma people and the special education for delinquent children, were brought together into a new approach towards treating the Roma children.

This exploration of the current attitudes towards the Roma people has indicated the existence of two discourses: the discourse of the normal Czech and the discourse of the nationalism and xenophobia (Homolač 2009). While the Czech's open nationalism explains the 'troubles with Roma people' by alleging that their unchangeable patterns of behaviour were inherited, the view of the 'normal Czechs' presupposes the expectation to fulfil certain social norms by the Roma people. In spite of the differences between these two discourses, both are actively preventing a collective reflection of the history of segregation against the Roma people. Both discourses originate in the practices introduced during the First Republic. When it comes to describing delinquent youth and intervening in Roma families, contemporary helping professionals tend to reproduce ideas first put forward by the eugenicists including: the

ambiguous nature of parental love; chaotic mode of life; dysfunctional child development—these ideas continue to serve as arguments in favour of removing the children from their home, and placing them into residential settings.

CHAPTER 3

The Education for Disabled Children During the First Decades after the WWII in Czechoslovakia: in the Game of Big-time Politics

The contemporary issues regarding the education for disabled children in the Czech Rep., evident backlash against deinstitutionalisation and various barriers accompanying in the attempts to establish inclusive education, are often explained by the socialist and authoritarian background. Although, this statement remains a sort of cliché preventing one from the reflection of current policies and practices until the retrospective analysis of socialist legacy would develop the thick description related to the composition of driving forces impacting the formation of policies and practices around disabled children. This text aims to explore the role of early socialist period – through the comparative historical analysis targeted to indicating the continuities and discreteness in the policy around disabled children in 1945–1948 (the Third Republic) and the first decade of socialist regime. During these periods, the agenda regarding disabled children directly contracted big-time politics – being built to the concept of resilient nation[3] typical of the Third Republic (1945–1948) and becoming the arena of political struggle between socialist Ministries and civic movements against authorities (1948–1953). Recognising the actors of the policy related to special education, their aims, strategies and mutual contradictions maps the political capital and the role of various discourses in accumulating, mobilising and spending such capital by various actors. We presume that the professionalisation of care for disabled children and racing political capital of various actors were mutually interrelated, what directly impacted the formation of helping professions linking them with eugenic discourse.

3 Laying on the resilience of the nation is an inseparable part of nationalist movements, especially after wars, social and natural disasters, contemporary examples like the movement for the resilience of Americans after 9/11 or the culture of resiliance in the contemporary China after the earthquake in 2013 provide comprehensive notion regarding the power of the concept within the general increase of the meaning of public security.

EDUCATION FOR ALL DISABLED AS A PART OF THE RESILIENCE OF THE NATION

Following to the mission to revive the Golden age of the First Republic, the Third Republic authorities attempted not only to renovate the previously existed institutions for disabled children devastated during the Protectorate but reinforce special education. The interwar special education covered children who were accepted as educable, while children who were unable to learn within the existing educational system remained beyond. Precisely, during the first three years after the war the authorities made a desperate venture to involve all disabled children into education. Prescribing the special mission to education and health care, the nationalistic pathos put forward the role of "the years of decay" and the aftermath of Nazi occupation: "*according to the experience from the First World War, we should be prepared to unusual growth of psychiatric morbidity because war and postwar hardships got mental health down, and we need to take into account that the generations born during the war and just after will demand outstanding care*" (Zemský národní výbor v Brně 1946).

The special role played the restitution of buildings used by Nazi during the Protectorate. The directors of units situated in such buildings were obliged to justify their request on funding the repair, and such claims usually practiced the contrast of Nazi and Czech view on the care for people with disability. Such rhetoric revived the typical of the late imperial period idea to prescribe the main guilty to the German invasion and explain unhealthy patterns of behavior extending amongst young people by the limited healthy influence: "*Mainly during the war the youth suffered because of the gap in school upbringing. Education was neglected, short and broken due to flight bombings, but the core reason for its worsening was the Germans' intervention. Children did not get the appropriate care from parents…*" (Krotilová 1945).

Authorities as well as public opinion public prescribed the remedial effect to the revival of the traditions established during the interwar practices. Relative to that, helping professionals started to be viewed as a vanguard of coping with the war trauma: "*Educational professionals know better than others which traces have the years of occupation left in physical, moral and spiritual conditions of our youth. In many classes there are children those behavior disturbs educational process. The main sources of such behavior, the neglect of parents, bad moral environment, shortcomings in care, negative patterns could not be overcome, and the child would not grow up in full-fledged citizen – until the child would be immune from the influence of the inappropriate space and get more attention and care exceptionally provided by professionals* " (Zemská ústřední péče o mládež v Čechách. *Výchovné ústavy Zemského* 1946).

Fixing in the Two-Year plan, the new agenda of health care, social protection and education placed priority on children and youth as a future of the nation, but also proclaimed the assistance to disabled people as an obligation of mature nation towards those who needed not *solace but meaningful existence in the name of the nation*: "*the care for people who are disabled either by origin or due to unhapiness is thankfully accepted already as matter-of-course thing not only because of humanism but the interests of national economy…weak hands can manipulate when the clever and promt head manages them, and not enough developed brains would learn unifold functions when the hands are healthy and strong…our aim is to tame disabled people and their abilitites …exceptionally working the disabled person can get rid of inferioirity or in opposite case the disabled person can become asocial entity* ". (Obor pro ochranu duševně 1945).

In their debates and plans, the Third Republic experts expanded the typical of the late First Republic idea that the disabled child could be equipped to independent life only under the tactful guidance by professionals. For the children with inherited mostly mental handicap all functions normally relevant to parental care should be transferred to residential care: "*in the majority of cas*es (children with inherited handicap – V.S.) *the consistent upbringing and care can be organised only in boarding schools*"(ibid.). The emphasis on professional care coincides with the intention to evaluate the impact of mental disability in the case of multiple disorder of development. For instance, the children who had sensory deprivation due to either visual or hearing impairment started to divided into those whose development was aggravated by mental retardation and mentally normal. The idea of differentiating children according to their degree of mental development obtained the central position not only in professional talks but amongst the parents of children. Alongside, many parents demanded to provide the access for education for those children who remained out of the care. Two different but interrelated requirements from parents towards authorities determined the policy-making around the education for disabled children: to differentiate schools according to the degree of mental development of students and to ensure that all children with disability regardless of the type and degree of retardation would get the access to the services.

EGALITARIANISM AGAINST ELITISM: MULTILEVEL EDUCATION FOR ALL?

Both professional and the activists of parental unions intended to differentiate institutions in order to cover by special education the children with different degree of mental development from early childhood. In the beginning

of 1947 the delegation of blind and visually impaired clients of the residential setting *Klára* applied to the Prime Minister with the strong request to divide all educational settings for visually impaired into three groups: the schools with curriculum relevant to mainstream education *(školni*), vocational training schools (*remeslné*) and social care settings (*zaopatřovaci*) (Ministerstvo školství a osvěty. *19*47). Such division would be relevant to the different needs of blind and visually impaired who could demonstrate different dynamic of mental development. One of the reasons in favour of separating children with mental disability from normally developed become the necessity to encourage the trust of public to visually impaired who were gifted and normal: "*children with mental retardation not only brake the educational process*, professor Fafl stressed during the special meeting of the Board of the Ministry of Education and Enlightenment, *but they aggravate the distrust of the society to blind people*" (ibid). The quantity of institutions especially for those who had multiple disorders was insufficient. Only one institution, in Opařany, the small town on the South, could not provide care for all visually impaired children with mental disability. Relevant to this issue, the Ministry of Education and Enlightenment made a decision about establishing several institutions for visually impaired children with mental disability in March, 1947. The division of education directly affected the curriculum: children without mental retardation should get the education compatible with mainstream school and supplemented by music education, while children with mental disability would be trained according to their capacities and the task to fit them to any type of vocational activity (Ministersvo školství, informaci a osvěta 1954).

The professionals initiated very similar process for the children with hearing impairment. The previous practice of accepting the children with different degree of hearing impairment into the same institution started to describe as a barrier against efficient teaching and vocational preparation. Firstly, the joint education of stammering children with those who had hearing impairment started to be criticised – the main concern was to ensure the intervention with speech development relevant to the abilities of children which varied from deaf children to children with speech disorders. The uniform scale for assessing children with hearing impairment and speech disorders was published in the central professional journal *Paedologické rozhledy*. The in-time relevant diagnosis was viewed as an indispensable for indicating the risks of deviant behavior amongst the children with hearing impairment. Intending to cover children by special education as soon as possible, the experts highlighted the negative impact of disability on mental development: "*all children who were born with disability are at risk of mental retardation what should be prevented from the very beginning*" (Zemský národní výbor. 1948). Previously established

pre-school groups started to transform into kindergartens accepting children from three years old (ibid). Early placement aimed to assess children and test their abilities to learn. New educational settings for disabled children were established within largest health care facilities. Several new services for pre-school children with disabilities got the best buildings for their purposes: the central hospital of Prague accepted the offer of the city council to rebuild the pavilion by Charlie Masaryk into special day care centre for disabled children for preparing them to school (Ministerstvo školství a osvěty 1945). The pavilion was situated in the city, but surrounded by pine forest and garden.

Differentiation of children due to the degree of mental development launched the debates around the services for those who suffered from epilepsy. In the end of 1946 the Teaching Hospital of Neurological Diseases at Charles University (Klinika neurologická Karlové univerzity) took the lead in developing the services for children with epilepsy and normal mental development. The main argument in favour of new institutions was "deplorable destiny of those who either remains at home or has to spend time together with mentally retarded children without sufficient stimulation of development"(Ministerstvo zdravotnictví Zřízení ústavu 1946). Juxtaposing medical and pedagogical efforts became the grounds for assessment and remedial programmes (Ministerstvo zdravotnictví 1946). The decision about establishing the special centre combining the functions of day care and boarding school was made by the Ministry of social affairs, but the Ministry of health took the responsibilities for its implementation. The main task was to indicate the appropriate building within the area of university campus. In total, the government devoted 340,000 crowns for reconstructing and equipping the centre. The Ministry of Finance encouraged the planned budget in full (Ministerstvo financí 1947). Remarkably, that during the Third Republic period, the local authorities and their Communist wing attempted to accommodate obstetric services in the building passed for the children with epilepsy, the chief of the local authorities offered to send the Commission and check the possibilities to place maternity hospital (Zemské ustředí péče o mládež v Čechách 1947). Both Ministries, health and social affairs emphasised the inappropriateness of the building to the needs of mother and infants: "it is impossible to guarantee the sufficient level of preventive anti-epidemic measures, and the mothers would be separated from their children due to the internal arrangement in the building[4], we cannot provide such risk for the infant's health" (Ministerstvo sociální péče věc ústav ZUPM 1947). The issue of placing mothers and

4 Later, during the first decade of socialism such reasons would be delegitimised, vice versa the separation of mother and infants was seen as the requirement for the appropriate care for children.

children in early age was evolved into the two-month debates and discussed several times on the area of central territorial Committee of child protection of Prague. Various officials who participated in this case, Central Department of Social Sare of Prague (*Ústředni sociální úřad hlav, města Prahy*), The Union of the Protection of Women's Interests (*Ochrana ženských zájmů*), the Ministry of social care demanded the Central Committee of child protection to renounce the primary request of local authorities to place mothers and infants into the unit in Velveslavin (Ministerstvo sociální péče Ústav ZÚPM 1947).

Prescribing to itself the reputation of progress and humanism, the special education was a source of national pride for the Czechoslovakian people and state. Elitist approach conciliated utilitarian view on humans as the main capital of the nation and sentimental rhetoric around future generations.. The intention to divide disabled children according to their mental development turned into indispensable part of the national mentality built on the coherent opposition to German education during the Third Republic period and later to the barbaric vision on the education for disabled children typical of the early Communists' policy. Nevertheless, relaying on professionals and refined institutionalisation, elitist strategy was irrelevant for solving the issue to place the majority of disabled children whose parents were thrown upon their own resources. In 1947 several regions reported that the parents of disabled children asked local authorities to indicate the possibilities for their children either to attend school or be placed into residential care unit: "Due to our employment our children remain beyond monitoring, regular nutrition and required hygienic procedures …they wander on streets and become victims of immoral treatment " (Okresní péče o mládež v Plzní 1947). One of the arguments in favour of the parents' requirements was the obligations of mothers to stay with their children against their duty to work: "mothers who need to pay all their attention to the child could not operate as full unit of labour". Parents asked to establish the day care centre for their children and referenced to the unsufficiently small number of places acceptable for them in only one centre only for boys operating since 1926 accepting not more than 17 boys after 14 and teaching them simple types of works (Odbor pro ochranu duševně úchylných 1947). According to the parents, more than 200 disabled children needed in placement, and the parnts of girls required the provision of such services for girls since 1945 (Rodičovské sdružení 1945). But the decision about establihing centres was made only by late 1947.

In some regions the need to place disabled children was so urgent that on February, 26, 1947 at extraordinary meeting the key experts of the Ministry of Education and Enlightenment (including Frantisek Štampach a key expert

of the Ministry of Education) discussed together with local authorities from Plzen, the fourth biggest city in the Czech part of the country, the options for placing children into all operated boarding schools in the region. The decision should be made by special Board aimed at differentiating "children into those who would be able to bring up but not educable and educable". But the necessity of immediate placement of disabled children contested with the elitist trend to differentiate disabled children according to their mental development. While the experts and some parents put forward the task of differentiation of disabled children according to the level of mental development, the rest of the parents and public required the undelayable placement of those who remained on streets and being beyond control remained a threat to public safety.

In 1947 some regions offered to transform special schools (*okresní pomocní školy*) into boarding schools, and the Ministry of Social Care had accepted the initiation to open shelters and dormitories within already operating schools (Česká zemská péče o mládež 1947). The schools were obliged to estimate their expenses for one student according to the local prices. More than 12 schools started to operate as residential care settings and additionaly accepted 50–60 children. This practice became typical of the Selesian region in mining towns – due to the extremal level of poverty.

Despite the obvious crisis in special education, the main task of mainstream schools was to indicate disabled children as soon as possible and place them into special schools. In-time assessment corresponded with both elitist and egalitarian strategies regarding the educational policy around disabled children, even the procedures were more coincided with large-scale approach to special education. The Ministry of Education and Enlightenment agreed with the Ministry of Health Care to oblige the physicians who were introduced into the staff of the mainstream schools since 1946 to provide primary assessment and delegate children to specialists in the case of indicating disability. Additionally, physicians had to train pedagogues to assess children's sense of vision and hearing based upon the special tables (Ministerstvo školství a osvěty, 1947). In 1947 the in-service training for teachers was introduced into schools in order to equip them by assessment toolkit.

Although elitist and egalitarian approaches would be in potential conflict with each other in terms of the access to the sources, both relied upon the networks consisted of professionals and activists what made elitist and egalitarian approaches mutually convenient. Such unusual coincidence inspired the diverse tactics of collaboration towards the compensation of chronically missing financial and material resources.

NETWORKING VS. FINANCIAL DISASTER: THE MIRACLE OF COLLABORATIVE TACTICS

Despite prescribing to specialists the role of the rescuers of the nation, the education for disabled children practiced various tactics aimed at accumulating the efforts of civic activists and professionals. Obviously, the Third Republic period was exceptional in terms of cooperation between the Ministries, never before and after the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education operated in such comprehensive alignment accompanied by the shared vision on priorities. Mainly, this outstanding collaboration can be explained by the necessity to confront with the crisis of executive power and increasing influence of the Communist Party. Both Ministries were led by the politicians from the liberal and center-left parties who were interested in putting together their efforts in contesting the incline of Communists' popularity amongst people[5].

Nevertheless benevolent intentions contradicted to limited resources – the extent of the crisis in educational system including education for disabled children demanded significant cash injections. Between 1945–1946 more than half of institutions for disabled children appealed to either the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Health with the request to put up money for the urgent repair due to the damage of flight bombing and other aftermaths of the war. The Ministries processed the following scheme for communicating the institutions: (1) the institution should account how much money do they need and substantiate their claims; (2) in the case of accepting and registering the request, the Ministry (in the major part of cases the Ministry of Health) would ask to provide the data about institution's operation for last years (how many children were educated, types of training and other educational activities, budgets and the source of financial supports during the Protectorate); (3) the Ministry would ask the guarantees that after the repair the institution would start to operate immediately and accept as much as possible children. The typical example of applying this scheme in practice was the case of the shelter for disabled children in Boleslav (Spolek pro vybudování a vydržování 1945). Primarily, the institution got the third of demanded budget and used it for the repair of internal arrangement, while the improvement of exterior remained unsolved issue (Ministerstvu zdravotnictví odd. II/3.1945). The process of repairing the damage extended to two years due to the irregular payments

5 Both being lawyers, Jaroslav Stránský, the Minister of Education, representative of National Social Party and Adolf Procházka Minister Health, representative of People's Party, were in aliens against the communist party generally and the pro-Communist Ministry of Social Affairs particularly. Ovseiko Pavel 2008 *The Politics of Health Care Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: the case of the Czech Republic* D.Phil Thesis; Yaki Ieva (2009) (Ed.) *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees* Palgrave Macmillan p.115

smaller than planned and not sufficient for completing the task. The institution started to operate only in 1948 (Ministerstvu zdravotnictví 1946).

Not only material, but human resources also required the systematic intervention. Some regions allocated funds for training nurses – in Prague and Brno young women from vulnerable environment (orphans, poor families) got a fellowship for learning at the school of care for mothers and children (škola péče o matky a děti). Such approach was viewed as solving two issues: supplement human resources and prevent asocial career amongst young women at risk (Ministerstvo zdravotnictví 1945).

Alongside, precisely such communication between local authorities and central departments became a driving force setting the culture of self-government typical of the special education in Czechoslovakia. One of the main features of this culture was the closest cooperation of the staff and parents. Starting during the Protectorate, the active participation of parents in school life flourished during the Third Republic Period. Established by the special decree of the Ministry of Education, the number 54–840, issued in May, 1939, parental units especially in special education took responsibilities for social provision and keeping the process of education "in action". In 1944 František Štampach highlighted the indispensable role of parents in ensuring social well-being and health care for children(Štampach 1944). Parents were those who mediated the contact with churches, abbeys, charity foundations in order to transfer boarding schools and day care centres due to the expropriation of buildings by Nazi; parents volunteered as nurses and teachers; they gather money and kept the system transparent and open as well. The last year of German occupation was extremely hard due to flight bombings and general worsening of economic situation, but parents' participation was "a few force towards coping with disastrous circumstances" (Melkusová 1948). During the Third Republic, parents initiated various reforms and participated in the renovation of buildings. Their activity coincided with the general increase of citizen participation reflecting the ideal of the resilient nation.

By the Communist coup in February 1948, various inconsistencies between intentions and resources permeated the situation around the education for disabled children. After the communist upheaval of political elites including the changes in the Ministries responsible for the disabled children, these contradictions were significantly aggravated and transformed into the conflicts of interest of different branches of executive power as well as the struggle between authorities and civic activists.

EARLY SOCIALIST PERIOD: RACING FOR POLITICAL CAPITAL

The first decade of socialism was distinguished by increasing the conflict of interest around disabled children and services for them. While the task to cover all children by education and care remained, the Ministries tried to shift these obligations on others. Partially, this conflict was built into the process of redistributing the resources between the Ministries. While the Ministry of Health become responsible for the care provided on a non-repayable basis for working people, the Ministry of Social Protection and Labour remained responsible for the rest of assistance. Only curable children could get the assistance free of charge as well as be placed into institutions under the Ministry of Health. The rest should be transferred to the settings under the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour. In 1951 the Ministry of Social Protection and Labour was transformed to the Ministry of Labour, due to "the unnecessariness of social protection for the socialist society", and in 1957 it was dismissed until 1968 when it was reestablished.

Undoubtedly, other tasks possessed the public attention as well as the priorities of politicians and professionals – who were interested in enriching their influence and political capital. Thus, the Ministry of Health under command by Josef Plojhar[6] focused its efforts on developing obstetric services[7] and directly deprived the care for disabled children reallocating the material resources previously belonging to special education system. Finishing by the issue of the Law about preventive and health care (Zákon č.103/1951 Sb., O preventivní a léčební péči), the mass campaign in favour of refining obstetric services put forward the mission to increase the number of maternity hospitals and other relevant settings for mothers and infants. Minimasing infant mortality as well as maximising birth rate became a main priority for the Ministry of Health for first years of socialism (Projev ministra… 1952). The Ministry was ready to hurl all effort into implementing this mission, but the resources especially material were limited.

6 Josef Plojhar, irreplaceable Minister of health care for 20 years (1948–1968), was an example of unique politician able to combine various strategies of reinforcing his political capital: having questionable past as a former priest, he was able to advance his career in Communist Party and had a permanent need to reinforce his political image and symbolic capital. According to the Western experts, he operated as an agent and implemented special missions in Austria and Germany during his official visits, but undoubtedly, focusing on obstetric services and health of mothers and children, Plojhar achieved most visible results in improving the image of his Ministry and himself also.

7 The development of obstetric services was one of three priorities amongst preventive anti-epidemic measures and institutionalization of occupational health, but precisely obstetric services became the great success of the Czechoslovakian health care system and personally the Minister Plojhar. Accepted by WHO, the Czechoslovakian model of obstetric services was recommended to developing countries in the early 1960s, and the Czechoslovakian experts were appointed by international organisations in favour of disseminating good practices. Projev ministra zdravotnictví dr. J. Plojhara na konferenci zdravotnických pracovníků dne 6.III. 1952 *Časopis českých lékařů* 1952 4.14 s.409–410; Ovsejko, ibid p. 188

The urgent requirement to increase the number of settings, their patient capacity and generally improve hygienic and sanitary conditions disposed the Ministry to look at the well-equipped and renovated buildings of special schools situated in the best localities[8] as more suitable for the purposes of providing care for the future healthy generations than disabled children. Aimed at transforming special boarding schools and other institutions for disabled into maternity hospitals, the long-term campaign presented itself as the further stage of differentiation of the care for disabled children started during the Third Republic period. The main idea of campaign was to transfer the settings for disabled children to the surrounding countryside and rearrange former settings for the purposes of mother and child health. For instance, in 1951 the Ministry made decision about the move of the 1000 m^2 square boarding school for deaf and hard of hearing children from the centre of Hradec Kralov, into the sanatorium K Dr. Kutíka Hořičky u České Skalice (Úřad předsednictva vlády 1951), one of backcountry locations where many other schools and settings for disabled children should be transferred.

Clearly, that contrasting their policy to the previous "backward" approach of the Third Republic, the Ministry of Health worked in favour of its legitimising towards the Communist Party – but not of the rest of professionals and other stakeholders of special education: parents and unions of disabled. In order to substantiate their actions, the authorities applied very compatible with the Third Republic period discourses around disabled children: they differentiated children according to their ability be socialized (Projev ministra zdravotnictví Dr. J. Plohara 1953). Three different categories were distributed amongst the Ministries: the Ministry of Health took the responsibility for those who could be cured; the Ministry of Education – who could be educated despite permanent disability; and the Ministry of social affairs – who could be neither cured nor educated[9]. This approach was based upon the idea of planned economy and centralisation adopted by the Ministry of Health in very consistent way(Janouch, 1951; Sjednocení zdravotnictví… 1951). The local cells of Communist Party were obliged to record all disabled children in order to indicate the necessity in special settings. Relevant command regarding the recording of disabled was done to schools (Ministerstvu školství, věd a umění 1948).

8 During the first third of the 20.century, the institutionalization of the care for disabled children especially those who had either visual or hearing impairment was incorporated into the building of nation: during the interwar period, the best architectures were invited for working out the projects of buildings which were established in the best localities. Pučelík Tomáš Sociální péče o hluchoněmé v Čechách a na Moravě *Paedologické rozhledy* 1947 Ročník III. S.273–283

9 After dismissing the Ministry of Social affairs in 1951 the new official body, the State Department of Social Security (Státní úřad sociálního zabezpečení) and local authorities took formal responsibilities for disabled children, but the children with the most difficult forms of disability (neither educable nor cureable) were excluded from the system of care.

Remarkably, that offered division according to the degree of curability, educability and ability to be socialised can be viewed as shifting focus from the sources of disability typical of the First and Third Republic according to the weight of heredity and environment to the consequences of disability. This approach to divide disabled children was also relevant to the Soviet approach to the education for disabled on the same period. Being under the pressure of the ban on testing and other measures marked as pervasive after issuing Special Decree "On Pedological Perversions in the Narkompros System"of VKP(b) Central Committee in 1936, Soviet special education operated by symptomatic indicators focused on the consequences not causes of disability. In combination with the decisive role of medical treatment, such approach toughly limited children who were not cureable in the access to social protection and education.

In line with this division, the reform of settings for disabled children started from the general assessment of children and settings. This reform not only reproduced the eugenic discourse but deepened arguments in favour of contrasting the interests of health and disabled children. Several legal regulations were introduced in order to shape the process of differentiation, the Law about school education (Law No 95 1948 Ústavodárného Národního shromáždění o základní úpravě jednotného školství) introduced the claim to place disabled children in order with "the degree of their handicap". The main requirement, the relevance of care, education and social assistance to the child's perspectives, stipulated further monitoring under operating settings. Overcrowding in institutions and placement of children with different degree of retardation remained the main issue. Special boards were established for monitoring and evaluating each of the settings within the system of special education. These Boards were made up of representatives of local authorities, health care, education and social affair and aimed to assess the material resources of settings as well as the development of children for their redistribution if the building would be acknowledged appropriate for the goals of obstetrics services.

Even the official aim of monitoring was to indicate inappropriately placed children (because of the handicap, type of education, the order of indicators clearly noted the main target: to evaluate the resources and their appropriateness for the purposes of improving the services for mother and infants. The official monitoring record was unified for all boards and included following points: 1) the precise number of patient capacity of the setting, and each of the spaces (classrooms, dormitories, halls, workrooms and washrooms); 2)the number of flats for stuff who stays at setting due to their obligations; 3) spaces used beyond the professional objects e.g. for renting; 4) health condition of

children, their mental development. Nevertheless, the intention to put disabled children on the margins of social policy faced the consistent resistance from the parents and professionals (Ministerstvo sociální péče Ústavy pro hluchoněmé 1949). From the very beginning, the stage of negotiation between the Ministry and local authorities regarding the launch of differentiation, the officials run into problems. In autumn 1948 when the differentiation of the settings for deaf and hard of hearing should be started in South Morava, the local professionals three times (24. 9., 23. 11., 8. 12.) were invited in Prague by the Ministry of Health for discussing the programme of differentiation, but the plan was not finally fixed (ibid).

THE CIVIC RESISTANCE: THE CURSE OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC

The first wave of the socialist differentiation in 1948–1949 failed because of the efficient counteractions of the staff and parents. Both groups bombed the Ministries and the Government by the enormous number of absolutely identical letters targeted to persuading authorities in the necessity to keep children in the settings (Rodičovské sdružení 1949). The staff and parents adopted the new Communist rhetoric, stressing the mission to bring up "fool-fleged citizens who would be able to serve to their state". The textual and stylistic resemblance of the letters from different regions confirmed the high level of self-organisation amongst parents as well as efficient operation of their network over regions. Published in the report in February, 15, 1950, the official comment to this countercheck was laconic and rejected the collective nature of resistance: "the facile implementation of differentiation was braked by narrow selfish interests of certain people amongst staff and parents, but the differentiation runs in schedule" (Ministerstvo sociální péče Diferenciace ústavů 1950).

In 1949 the special government decree (Vládní nařízení 10. května 1949) introduced changes into the regulations of parental units at schools, which became subordinated to the local Communist Party cells and could not directly appeal to central officials without relevant permission. In the article about the new approaches to cooperation with parental units, the teacher of special school for mentally retarded children Josef Dubec performed the benevolent paternalism towards parents especially those who were unable to take part in the life of their child before engaging the unit: "I admit great doubts about possible outputs before organising initial meeting, but the participation of more than half of mothers was pleasant surprise. They asked a lot questions… giving me great opportunities to teach them more about the new regulations and rules regarding special schools" (Dubec 1950).

Starting in the end of 1950, the second wave of differentiation achieved far more success than previous attempt: some settings were moved, while others united with each other, several large-scale institutions were built, and some of previous increased their patient capacity. In order to minimise the resistance from the staff, the Ministry of health tried to move special schools under its order before transforming them. In January 1950, only one institution for children with hearing impairment fit fur surgery was under command of the Ministry of Health, but a half year later the Ministry initiated the devolution of all schools for deaf and hard of hearing children under its order. While the grassroots activism of parents was oppressed, the resistance from professionals against differentiation had been increased. Exploring the correspondence between the Ministry of Health and of the oldest settings for deaf and hard of hearing children, *Výmolův ústav*, sheds light on the extent of mutual contest (Výmolův ústav 1950). The main argument against transforming educational centre into health care setting was the mission of the care for disabled: not cure but educate and socialise. Highlighting the sufficient level of health care, the staff and administration focused on describing their efforts towards better the preparation to independent life and ability to understand other people, speak naturally and properly. The internal arrangement, specially equipped classes, dormitories and workshops were definitely suitable for this target group. Also, the role of social workers, who were responsible for mentoring young adults, former students, was stressed. But the Ministry of Health denied these arguments and mentioned that the regulations of placements should be revised in order to guarantee that only potentially curable children could be placed into settings for the free-of-charge grounds. The Ministry's intention to unify several settings gave a hostile reception amongst professionals who stressed the need of children to be in touch with their families what would be blocked in the case of consolidating several settings. The setting's staff asked the support from various bodies, both public and professional who also sent letters to the Ministry of Health and the Government: the Union of workers of Communist party (Zavodní organizace KSČ), the Union of parents and friends of the school (Sdružení rodičů a přátel školy), the Union of the principles of the schools for deaf children (Svaz ředitelství ústavů) People's Academy for deaf (Lidová akademie pro neslyšící). Final decision was in favour of the setting remaining the school for deaf and hard of hearing students until now.

But not only direct menace to wellbeing of disabled children disposed professionals to attack the Ministry of Health. In 1951 the Union of Disabled People of Czechoslovakia appealed to the Ministry of Health with the request to encourage the development of services for children with Cerebral Palsy (Ústřední jednota invalidů 1951). The total number of such children was

approximately 10,000, and majority of them were placed into hospitals exceptionally for health care, without any attempts to organise education and social rehabilitation. Referencing the successful abroad experience in socialising children with Cerebral Palsy, the authors of the letter noted the options for improving the training, first of all vocational. They demonstrated the irrelevance of current practice to place the children into the settings for children with multiple physical disability: "The children with Cerebral Palsy need definitely different strategy of treatment than children with physical deprivation". At the moment of sending letter, the Union had already established the day care centre for these children operating as a pilot, but obviously one centre could not cover the demand of assistance. Alongside, the activists coherently criticized the Masaryk Institute (Masarykův ústav) the only one medical centre directly aimed at treating with children with Cerebral Palsy for its "backward medical focus" and low quality of care. Despite well substantiated arguments, their request for new approach to organising care and education remained without relevant answer until the end of 1950s.

The culminating point of the campaign against differentiation was the more than thirty-page report prepared by the Union of disabled people of Czechoslovakia (Svaz československých invalidů)[10] in cooperation with the independent experts by 1957. They systematically investigated the consequences of differentiation in the settings for physically disabled children. The report was sent to the Prime Minister and the Government in order to introduce them into "the miserable situation of children with physical disability and the urgent demand to ensure their socialisation". According to the report, medicalisation remained the main issue blocking the mission of "social up-bringing" – the preparation of children to adulthood and as more as possible independent life. The authors, Jaroslav Pluhař and Rudolf Tyl, highlighted the negative impact of the dismissal of the Ministry of social care and differentiation on the recent state of the care for disabled. Exploring six different settings from different regions, Prague, Plzen, Bratislava, Liberec, Humenne and Slávnici Ilava, the authors demonstrated the diversity of issues as well as options for its solving. opposing the current unbearable state of care to the achievements of the First Republic, they reconstructed the interwar approach more focused on training and the preparation to adulthood than "meaningless attempt to indicate the level of retardation". The pride of previous achievements contrasted with the shame for the current situation: "while in 1928 we achieved the world standards and in some sense were the best, now in the settings under command of

10 The Union was established in 1952 within the movement Národní fronta which united various political parties and after the Communist coup d'Etat operated in favour of citizen participation in Kaplan Karel (2012). *Národní fronta 1948–1960*. Praha : Academia.

the Ministry of Health they made decision either the child is curable or not…" The settings were "in the grip of wrong administration"

Both in terms of quantitative and qualitative indicators, according to the report, the new system operated "in wrong way". The core disagreement was related to the intention to provide care only for those children who were curable. The differentiation destroyed previous wide networks of settings and blocked the options for interdepartmental cooperation at the local level. Removing settings under command of the Ministry of Health led to "the administrative crisis": the new principals, who were physicians focused on medical treatment, simultaneously worked at other hospitals and accepted their duty to manage settings as "supplement to their main activity". The thoughtless attitude of new administrators directly manifested in the neglect to building and the needs to invest in their repair and the readiness to dispose from the responsibility for the buildings. The children with multiple handicap who needs more and various care started to be "extremely limited". Replacing teachers by nurses directly influenced the decline of rehabilitation and special training targeted to improving life skills. The systematic lack of educational activities provoked the secondary mental retardation and aggravated the development of children. The settings were unable to solve the access due to the unsufficient capacity, but under the pressure of authorities and circumstances some of settings started to accept more children than they could. In Humenné children had to sleep in camp-beds, and health care staff spent no more than two hours with them. The authors concluded: "any meaning of placement in such conditions was lost". In other settings (in Liberec and Plzen), the number of children waiting for the acceptance amounted up the number of already placed and exceeded it. The authors stressed the threaten trend either to replace children to families and leave the parents without any support or place children into large-scale institutions incapable to organise the complex approach. Recently established large-scale institutions (e.g. in Brno for 215 children) were criticised for inappropriate level of care. Planned as a measure for placing he majority of children, even large-scale institutions were unable to accept all children who needed the special education (e.g. in Brno more than hundred children were not placed because of the limited capacity of the setting).

The authors acclaimed the multidimensional approach, which should solve the tasks of "up-bringing, researching, socialising, inseparable from the mission to care for the children with physical disability". The inability of current system to solve such issues was illustrated by the case of *Jedličkův ústav*, where "prioritizing the medical care blocked the development of educational strategies: neither teaching methods nor curriculum have not been upgraded according to the resent changes in labour sphere and children remained being

separated from life the general backwardness of the socialist health care". The authors provided coherent evidences in favour of the diversity of options for employing disabled people: they dared mention the experience of Liberec institution before 1945 belonging to the German-speaking branch of education as the best example in terms of professional pathways offered to disabled children[11]. The authors highlighted the collaboration between special schools and local employers as the main requirement for keeping the system of vocational training relevant to the demand of labour domain.

In June the Union got the official extremely cautious response to their Report from the Ministry of Education. The Ministry's experts agreed with the facts and admitted the lack of the monitoring under the settings for disabled children "even it would be our direct obligation towards the nation". Alongside, the Ministry withheld to evaluate the situation and accept either party's opinion regarding the conflict of priorities, education vs. health care. Vice versa, the necessity to divide settings into "educationally-remedial and remedially-educational" was fixed as well as the reasonability to differentiate them between the Ministries. Being dead set against the turn of settings in the Ministry of Social Affairs, in the last part of its response, the Ministry of Education asked guarantees that the Union would do its own best to keep the capacity of settings as well as the quality of care. Later, the arguments from the report were used by the Ministry of Education in order to provide the budget for massive professionalization of assessment for disabled children.

This outstanding case of civic resistance demonstrates the dual role of social capital in charge with the non-democratic regimes[12] – even the movement aimed to guarantee welfare for children, the final beneficiary was the authoritarian rulers who were able to expropriate the social capital of the network and spend it in its own aims – in favour of further institutionalisation of the care for disabled children.

---

11 Precisely in the 1950s at this unstitution, the Ministry of Education organised the annual retraining for special educators Gaňo Villiam Selekcia defektivných deti (1960) *Otázky defektologie*. 2(4), 107–111.

12 The massive scholarship regarding the ambiguity of social capital in authoritarian regimes can be found in the surveys focusing on the transit of postsocialist countries and Latin American countries, for instance Hooghe, M., Stolle, D. *Generating social capital. Civil society and institutions in comparative perspective* New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2003; Roßteutscher Sigrid Social capital worldwide: Potential for Democratization or Stibilizer of Authhoritarian rule? *American Behavioural Scientist.* 2010 53(5), 737–757,

OFFICIAL RESPONSE TO THE CRISIS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION: TURN TO PROFESSIONALISATION

In the second part of 1950s, the authorities could not ignore the disastrous consequences of neglecting the care for disabled children. In 1956 the Ministry of Justice as a Department responsible for the "protection of future generations" claimed to the Ministry of Education with the demand to solve the issue of "the gap of settings for young idiots and compatible with them under age who could be neither educated nor brought up" (Ministerstvo spravedelnosti v Praze 1956). Obviously that settings within health care and special schools did not accept them, and the shelters organised by the Catholic Church remained the one and last option for placing 'non-educable' disabled children, but the capacity of such missions was limited by 2,000 places, and the major part of their clients were elderly disabled people. Started in the second part of 1950s, the secularization included the devolution of these shelters under command by the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Justice required to increase the capacity of shelters in order to place as much disabled children living and/or working on the street as possible.

Intending to decrease the sweeps of public places providing by police in order to control neglected children, the Ministry of Justice analysed the number of requests from the parents of disabled children about placing them into the churches' shelters and concluded that by March, 1956, 851 were not assessed, while 15% of the requests were applied in 1953, 40% – in 1954, and the rest – in 1955. Additionally, it was mentioned that in many cases, shelters did not accept the request "in order not to suggest vain hopes". Along with the requirement to increase the capacity of shelters, the Ministry of Justice required to establish the regular monitoring under the disabled children who remained beyond the control both of parents and local authorities. Providing arguments in favour of residential care, an expert of the Ministry of Justice, Dr. Litora, constructed the image of disabled child as a hindrance which should be eliminated (Ministerstvo spravedlnosti *Dětské asylové 19*56). While some motives in his arguments repeated the rhetoric of the Third republic (the conflict between care for child and employment for mothers): "the mothers of these children cannot work because the children demand permanent care and attention…", the main line highlighted the incompatibility of family upbringing and the interest of the nation: …the economic issues of families, communities and the country in total are aggravated… the living standards decrease …the family situation could become so negative that would influence the development of healthy siblings… and if the mother cannot pay attention

to the child, the family is blamed by the majority of citizens "(Ministerstvo spravedelnosti v Praze 1956). Both professional and family care for disabled children contested the main priorities of social policy during the early socialist period: the development of obstetric services and the employment of women. Additionaly, the official position of the Ministry of Education reproduced the Soviet distrustful attitude to special education stipulated by the ban of testing and other measures regarding the assessment of children with disability (Lebedová 1951; Souček 1953).

In the second part of 1950s, the position of the Ministry of Education has changed towards intensive development of professional assessment and educational intervention. It is reasonable to take into account the composition of driving forces stipulating the turn to professionalisation: the general departure away from authoritarian regime and its practices, the appointment of new Minister of Education, František Kahuda, who was interested in reinforcing his political capital, and the remained call for actions towards disabled children.

Undoubtedly, the intention to increase political capital stipulated the Ministry of Education to profesionalise special education as a channel for reinforcing its influence – the example of the care for mother and children which established cosmic public success of the Ministry of Health as well as the glorious history of special education within the nationalist movement during the First and Third Republic periods persuaded to throw the great cast and start to transform the system of schools for disabled children. Slightly, the Czechoslovakian education for disabled recovered its excellent reputation for their socialist neighbours – in 1954 the Ministry of International Affairs of Poland appealed to their colleagues in Prague with the request to organise a contact with the special schools for blind children due to the plans to develop the education for blind in Poland (Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí... 1954). Later, the Eastern Germany appealed to the Ministry of Education and Culture with the request to advice the best special schools for establishing the collaboration with new German schools (Regierung der Deutschen… 1957). Later, the Czechoslovakian special education started to operate as a benchmark for the rest of the socialist block.

Starting the reform towards the professionalisation of care for disabled children, the Ministry of Education presented the official statistical data regarding the number of children out of the systematic care – more than 32,000 children with disability (more than one third of total number was those with mental disability) were neglected (Teplý 1960). The catastrophic situation was in Slovakian part where the majority of only officially recorded disabled children were out of systematic care. While the number of children placed into special

schools increased twofold for ten years – from 21718 in 1951 to 42247 in 1960, the capacities of special education did not grow respectively[13]. Obviously, in the first decade of socialism not only material but also human resources of helping professions were invested in developing the care for mothers and children, while special education developed within strict medical model.

The systematic call for professionalisation of special education focused on the causes of disability and the options for preventing it – in contrast to the previous "simplified" approach of dividing disabled children into the groups according to their degree of curability, educability and the capacity of socialisation. The precise moment of transfer from the previous oppressive policy against education for disabled children to its consistent professionalisation and expanded institutionalisation could be indicated in the writing by one of the most famous special educators Villiam Gaňo[14]. The Slovakian pedagogue did not officially disavowed early measures, vice versa formally established the continuity between the first decade of socialist policy and planned reforms highlighting the increased resemblance of Czechoslovakian special education with the Soviet benchmark (Gaňo Villiam 1960). Alongside Gaňo stressed still existed gap – the absense of the central research insitution compatible with the Institute of Defectology in USSR. Also Gaňo deepened the arguments against medicalisation: "from the pathological point of view medical diagnosis is right but can say nothing about educability and socialization of the child… how to start the intervention with child ". Logically, that stressing the determinants of disability, special education laid all its hopes on special psychology – even the psychological surveys of maternal deprivation and attachment played the core role in the theoretical framework of the care for mother and children, the most prioritised area of social policy during the early socialist period (Ludvik 1960).

CONCLUSIONS

In Czechoslovakia, the post-war period was distinguished by numerous reforms around the education for disabled people and such huge turns in the strategies regarding special education that it is reasonable to define its history during the first after-war decade as dramatic – for the staff, students and

13 The statistical data regarding the particular types of schools and children with different disabilities started to gather only since 1956 – when the Government began to make efforts towards ensuring the systematic education for children with disabilities.

14 Villiam Gaňo was a Slovakian special educator mostly focused on the deaf and hard of hearing children, but conducted applied surveys regarding various target groups of disabled children, he directly cooperated with the Soviet special educators and distributed the Soviet approach in Slovakian special education. Matić Miodrag. čo zanechal Villiam Gaňo jako dedičstvo pedagógom špeciálnych škôl *Otázky defektologie* 1967–1968. 9, 321–324.

their nearest surroundings, parents. The turbulent formation of institutions, from the very consistent focus on intensifying special education typical of the Third Republic period (1945–1948) to putting it on the margins of social policy priorities in the early 1950s, was determined by the obvious shortcomings in the services for disabled children aggravated by the general economic crisis. In combination with the ruthless struggle for political influence, the limited resources (financial, material, first of all buildings, and human) forced socialist authorities, Ministries of Health Care, Social Affairs and Education, to manipulate by the discourses around disabled children in order to advance their own political priorities. Reproducing eugenic discourse put the disabled children into the opposition to the healthy rest of the nation. Selecting disabled children into curable, educable and partially socialised, the socialist authorities, first of all, the Ministry of Health, substantiated medicalisation of the care for disabled children and attempted to expropriate the material resources belonging to special education in favour of obstetric services – a main priority of social policy and the path of professionalisation.

Despite the obvious ruptures of institutional development, after the WWII the ideological grounds of special education consistently evolved towards the focus on consequences of disability mainly in terms of the human capital than the origin and causes of disability. During the Third Republic, the main marker, the degree of mental development, stipulated the start of the differentiation regarding the institutions for disabled children. Early socialist era introduced three criteria, curability, educability and ability to be socialised, for organasing the services. Both sets of criteria operated in favour of radical selection amongst disabled children stipulating the segregation of those who were mentally disabled and unable to be either cured or educated. Later, this trend would be deepened in the consistent formation of assessment procedures as the grounds for further decision-making regarding the placement of children with disability.

Exploring the continuities and discontinuities in the educational policy around disabled children between the Third Republic period and the first decade of the socialism highlights the forming of multiple oppositions between different Ministries, local and central authorities, administrators and experts, parents and professionals what later led to the longtime mutual alienation between the key stakeholders of education for disabled children. The weakening of parental activities resonated with increased professionalisation and led the education for disabled children to that benevolent paternalism which remains the main strategy until now.

CHAPTER 4

Development of a Special Education for Roma Children in Socialist Czechoslovakia: the *Pious Desires* Towards Total Segregation[15]

The analysis of various educational programmes for the Roma children during the socialist period in Czechoslovakia is divided into two parts: the exploration of procedures and organisational approaches to teaching the Roma in institutions of special education; and the recognition of eugenic discourses in the arguments put forward by professionals in favour of segregation. This division aims to trace the twofold role of professionals in the socialist period, as a *driving force* and as *an object* affected by other driving forces, socio-economic changes and political interests. Primarily, accepting this dual role of the Czech professionals in charge with the special education of Roma children ensures the historical vision which prevents one from over-politisation and simplification when investigating the education of the Roma during the socialist period. Indicating the dual role of professionals can provide a better understanding of the secondary path dependence which distinguishes current attitude towards "the Roma issue" in the Czech Republic. Challenging our reflexivity, the following questions are relevant: "To which degree is the position of professionals endorsed by political strengths?"; "What determines professionals to apply one theory and avoid another?"; "In favour of whom does the professional speak?" The answer to the question "What should be done to provide sustainable rights for the Roma people and to prevent their segregation?" juxtaposes institutional frameworks with professional discourses which mostly remain in the background when the reforms towards a better education for the Roma are discussed and planned.

15 The research to this chapter was sponsored by Közép-Európai Egyetem and the International Visegrad Fund. The theses explained herein are representing the own ideas of the author, but not necessarily reflect the opinion of KEE.

THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE ROMA: TOWARDS THE UNIVERSALISATION OF RESIDENTIAL CARE

EDUCATION FOR THE ROMA CHILDREN: DEEPENING CONTROL UNDER ALIENS

In the socialist period, several waves of Roma migration and their high birth rate (see Table 1) directly impacted on the realms of social and public policies including education. After the expulsion of the Germans after 1945, many Roma moved into the border regions, their numbers having increased as a result three times, according to the internal statistics of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Zaraženi… 1947). The main concern regarding this new wave of Roma migration was their behaviour "at the interface of illegal activities" which provided "grave" threats to public security. In the earliest documents prepared by the Ministry of Social Affairs, the movement of Roma people was viewed as a high risk – "burden for our villages" (ibid). Due to "the high risk of fluctuation typical of this ethnos", it was suggested, that all necessary measures should be applied in order to detain Roma population within the location of their permanent residence. Relevant to this procedure, the forcing the Roma children to attend schools regularly, was built into the concept of *osidlování,* that is limiting the Roma to particular localities and placing them into special settlements.

In December 1946, the Ministry of Education and Enlightenment issued the instruction for district schools aimed at organising the education for Roma children. In the clarifying note (marked "cito"), the referent of the Ministry mentioned: "During the previous year mostly in the bordering regions a significant number of Gypsies have arrived, whose families have many school-age children. It was indicated that local authorities do not pay enough attention to preparing themselves for the education of this group" (Převýchova… 1947). Local educational authorities were obliged to record children and families, as well as inform local social security offices about each new child involved in regular education. By the end of the Third Republic, out of 450 registered Roma children (there were also 159 registered in Moravia) who attended mainstream schools only 20 were redirected to the special schools (Navrch... 1948). In Moravia, non-Roma parents prevented the placement of the Roma children into kindergartens, and the authorities were not able to overcome such resistance. In the report of the Ministry, social diseases (scabies, lice, parasitic worms) were mentioned as the main reasons, but the main additional argument was "the alien behaviour of the Roma children" described as "irrelevant and irritating for others" (ibid). The backwardness in mental development and the lack of the language were also mentioned.

From the very beginning of the socialist period, the solution of the Roma issue was seen as to require an interdepartmental approach to systematic "care and control". While the prime idea was to place Roma people into special settlements – *osady*, by the end of the 1940s Roma people started to be sent to labour camps and recruited for the hardest types of hand-works: in quarries, gravel pits and brick manufactures (The settlements… 1954). The Ministry of Defense rearranged former army camps into labour camps. The Ministry of Internal Affairs monitored the Roma population for the local authorities, and after the communist coup de tête (1948) this procedure was undertaken by local Party sections – *Místní národní výbor*. The Party gathered information not only about the number of Roma people, their gender, age and other demographic characteristics, but collected data regarding employment and address that transformed the information into the toolkit for the local authorities in charge with the task of solving the Roma issue. The Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs wanted to ensure the participation of the Roma people in the work production and transform them into regular workforces. Moreover, the Ministry of Education was obliged to guarantee regular school attendance for the Roma children (Školeni... 1948).

In terms of organisational design and its formation, the socialist special education for the Roma was distinguished by its continuity with previous periods and directly expanded ideas and practices first initiated during the First Republic. In line with the ideology and practices regarding the Law against vagabonds and Roma people (1927), tough measures were introduced against the parental rights of Roma whose children did not attend school and became an integral part of the strategy devised in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Reorganising the care for youth did not change the previous practice to prescribe the solving of various issues regarding the Roma children to the Department of Child Protection – the subdivision of the local social protection authorities which were directly connected with the courts and legal order of decision making related to the termination of parental rights (Pozvání k… 1948).

Frantishek Shtampach was the scholar who explored the Roma question in the 1900s and applied eugenic approach to investigating the Roma mode of life during the First Republic. He was also an important official in the Ministry of education responsible for working out the concept of intervening with the Roma people until the middle of the 1950s. It was he who wrote '*The involvement of Gypsy people in labour settlements, the re-upbringing and reeducation of their children and youth'* (Zaražení... 1947), which regulated the school attendance of Roma children whose parents were placed into labour camps. Aiming to alienate children from the "backward family influence" and keeping

in mind the strong resistance of mainstream schools, as well as of the special institutions, to accept Roma children, during in the interwar period the Ministry of Education developed special units – classes and schools. In the 1950s, the formulation of a specialized education for the Roma coincided with the differentiation regarding the education for disabled children and children with behavioural issues.

Table 1 Roma population in Czechoslovakia, 1938–1979

Year	*Number of people, thousands*	
	Total amount	*Czech part/Slovakia*
1938	*60*	*N/A*
1941	*67*	*7/60*
1947	*101*	*N/A*
1966	*221*	*56/165*
1968	*226*	*61/165*
1970	*219*	*60/159*
1980	*288*	*88/200*

Source: Státní statistický úřad, 1938–1980, data regarding 1938, 1941 and 1947 were based upon the records of police, in later years – upon enumerations.

SPECIAL CLASSES: THE FIRST STEP AWAY THE MAINSTREAM EDUCATION

Due to "the probable high risk of retardation among children because of the neglect of parents' duties", in 1948 the Ministry of Education offered to establish helping classes – *pomocné třídy* – for the Roma children. Special attention was given to the pre-school education – in order to compensate the gaps of family upbringing and indicate the "substitute toolkits for educating children instead families" (Školení... 1948). Simulteneously, the idea about special classes and also schools for the Roma children was debated, and the general approach to teaching (contemt&methods) was reflected by both types of solutions.

The guidance documents issued by the Ministry of Education shaped the model of communication between schools and local communities and the Roma people in which the key position was prescribed to the teacher: "while Roma parents are distinguished by the absence of the interest to raise children, placing children into school compensated missed skills" (Navrch… 1948). The main principle of this model was as follows: "The more time the Roma child spends in school, the more efficient the pedagogical efforts". It, in other words, stipulated the practice of schools to intervene in Roma families and communities in order "to push aside negative influence of the family on the child" (ibid). The task of the primary medical assessment was laid upon schools too – especially because of the growth of the institute for school physicians during

the 1950s. Schools were obliged to report the younger siblings of Roma pupils, and to assist to their placement into preschool institutions. In professional periodicals, there are a few examples of applying this model which was considered to be good practice.

In 1960, Zdenek Šafr, a teacher of the special class for the Roma children from the cross-border town Jablonec nad Nisou, described his long-term experience of educating the Roma children according to this model. He noted the outcomes obtained from a group of 24 children selected from 70 other children for an education in the special class "with the further perspective to move them to the mainstream class" (Šafr 1960). It can be said that the teacher – with his systematic and long-term involvement – operated as *a case manager* who built a wide interdisciplinary network around the Roma children and families: he appealed to the local section of the Communist Party in order to solve the issue of housing for families of his students, insisted that children required more intrusive health assessments, and step by step he involved both the Roma and non-Roma children into common activities in order to overcome prejudices among non-Roma parents towards the Roma families. Regular visits to the Roma families were meant not only to monitor progress but also to establish an intensive, emphatic, relationship: "to treat humanly [and to] lend a willing hand to people who have not been met with such good attitude yet" (ibid). The relevant changes in the Roma mode of life were taken as the main criteria for evaluating the effects of intervention. While the mission of describing this experience was obviously to impart a more optimistic view on the education of the Roma children, neither the introduction nor the conclusion encouraged such view. At the beginning of the article, the author noted that in the case of failure in the special class the one possible option left for the Roma children was the special school, "the smallest of evil" (ibid). At the end, the teacher stressed the importance of success and recognition for children, and recommended to teachers, in whose classes students should be replaced, that it was a very significant point for "changing their practice". The article also expressed concerns regarding the abilities of some teachers to adopt to the new practices of education.

The teachers of mini-classes did not have privileges as the teachers of special schools even the general public remarked on the necessity to establish higher fee for these individuals, "the best educators among our teachers" (Kača 1963). The obvious difficulties and unpleasant financial conditions prevented some teachers to follow this career path. The analysis of statistical data during the socialist period and the reports from the Ministry shed light on such ambiguous attitudes towards special classes for the Roma children. For instance, in Eastern Czechoslovakia, the region with the highest concentration

of Roma children, only one of the districts was able to keep the small classes for the Roma. Moreover, between the 1978–1982 from among 849 pre-school Roma children assessed by psychologists, only 56 were recommended for such classes (Janišová 1984).

By the late socialist period, the practice to place the Roma children into small classes in order to help with their development became rare. It often depended directly on the enthusiasm of particular teachers wanting to put their efforts into the "speed integration" of the Roma children. While the special classes for the Roma children remained the official legal option during the socialist period, the attempt to solve the issue of their unpreparedness within this strategy run into problems. The majority of children did not attend kindergartens, and this fact was presented as an explanation for the failure of special classes. The next organizational approach – the special schools for the Roma children- achieved more success, offering Roma children regular education.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS FOR ROMA CHILDREN: INTEGRATION VS. SEGREGATION IN PRACTICE

Already by the end of the 1950s the strategy to place the Roma children into special classes began to reveal its limits. Also, the special schools for Roma children did not follow the previous aim to organise their education within mainstream schools but separate from other children.

Developing special schools for the Roma children coincided with the campaign against *cikánské osady,* settlements of Roma people "in which the Gypsy people practice a backward mode of life which obstructs their integration [in society]" (Zeman 1962). Approximately 15% of all Roma population lived in such settlements by the mid-1960s (Každý... 1966). Life in settlements was directly connected with widespread asocial patterns amongst children because of irresponsible parents who were separated from the mainstream trends in society and who "did not recognise the significant role of school attendance. Even more they asked their children to abandon schools saying that they could get more money than the well-educated people…" (Znovu o... 1962). The Roma children from these settlements were recommended to spend as much as possible time out the settlements: special directives required local authorities to organise summer camps for the Roma groups (Zeman 1962), and later to put the Roma children into special schools (Mertin 1986a). While the attempt to replace the Roma in urban areas failed (the Roma people reorganised their settlements and inclined to continue their traditional community life beyond outside the rest of society), the intention to isolate their children from alleged negative influences was reinforced. Czechoslovak authorities faced the issue of school attendance especially in Slovakia where the Roma parents

ignored recommendations and penalties: "when we prescribed the penalty to the mother because her 8-year old daughter did not go to school, she ignored it and even more stopped to send her younger son to school" (Lipa 1966). Next to other tasks such as "to disperse the Gypsies amongst the majority of population" and "to ensure [their] long-term job placement", the school attendance was officially proclaimed as a priority of the strategy to integrate the Roma people (Co chcete… 1966). As a result, enforced measures against families in favour of regular school attendance were applied.

Undoubtedly, augmenting the trend to place the Roma children into special schools conformed with in the emergence of a more negative public discourse about the Roma population in the early 1960s. The critical focus on teachers and local networking shifted on to parents who were presented as unable to ensure the relevant upbringing and care of their children: "there is no need to remind all these testimonies of irresponsible parenting: breakdown of social norms, rowdyism, poor labour morality, criminal behaviour…" (Hovoří... 1966).

Creating special units for the Roma coincided with the general trend to differentiate the schools for children requiring special care (*vyžadující zvláštní péči*), and towards more precise division of students according to their deficiencies. In 1954, the syllabus for the special schools for the Roma children (Učební osnovy... 1954) was developed under the active participation of educational practitioners from the Brno branch of the National Institute of Pedagogical Research (*Výzkumný ústav pedagogický*). Introducing specific recommendations regarding the methods and content of teaching particular subjects, this document aimed to prepare the Roma children for the mainstream schools. Special schools were viewed as a temporal placement – until children would obtain language competencies as well as hygiene skills, and would be able to attend mainstream schools together with the "normal children approximately of the same age" (ibid). Primarily, the special schools for the Roma children should provide the first five academic grades – in the last two, the Roma students should be, according to this strategy, moved to mainstream schools. Planning the workload of teachers and the number of institutions needed, the authors of the strategy assumed that the total number of special schools should be moderate, and the primary estimation was done only for 20 schools, which should be established exceptionally in the districts with a large number Roma community.

Comparing the draft of the syllabus and the final version accepted as the action plan after several months of debates reveals the changes in the state of mind of discussants: they were definitely optimistic at the very beginning and then much more moderate in terms of expectations in the resulting text. While in the first draft, the special school was defined as a supplementary institution aimed at socialising children, the final document indicated its aim to implement

a comprehensive set of tasks relevant to the mainstream school (Organizační… 1955). The draft explained the necessity to establish special schools for the Roma children affected by general neglect and the lack of language competence amongst them. Finally, the main argument was the obvious backwardness of the Roma children which would require "systematic and long-term measures towards their preparation for becoming responsible citizens" (ibid). Even the symbolic message remained the same: equip the Roma children with skills and competencies, but neither the draft nor the revised syllabus identified the procedures for moving the children from the special to the mainstream school. The syllabus was not issued as a separated document despite the primary intention of the Ministry to equate these units for the Roma as compatible with the mainstream schools. In November 1955, the syllabus was included with other syllabuses for "the children and youth requiring special attention" (ibid). Thus, on the organizational level from the very beginning the schools for the Roma children were regarded as a system of special education.

The statistical data regarding the educational trajectory of those Roma children who were placed into special schools indicates the inability of this system to ensure further integration into the mainstream schools: even in the regions whose experience regarding to the special schools for Roma children was identified as successful, the majority of students finished their education after the fifth grade of the special school, and only a small part (less than 15%) successfully finished the mainstream school (Piňosová 1976). Simultaneously, the number of children who were primarily placed into the special school for the Roma children and then transferred into special school for children with mental retardation exceeded 20%. The efforts of special schools were regarded as insufficient for achieving long-term consistent outcomes in the upbringing of the Roma children because of "the necessity to involve local authorities, the activists from factories and special schools" (Motyčková 1962). In the early 1970s, debates relating to the ways of improving the education for the Roma children, renewed the arguments in favour of the special classes, but did not gain widespread success – because of the negative attitude towards the Roma families, due to their behaviour regarding the new regulations of natality introduced in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

PLACING THE ROMA INTO SCHOOLS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN: BECOMING "SPECIAL"

By the end of the 1960s, the Roma children began to be more regularly placed into special schools for the mentally retarded children, while the schools for the Roma children began to decline. In 1969 the *Guidance About*

the education and the upbringing of neglected and seriously retarded Roma children (Smernice... 1971) introduced the special regulations regarding compulsory attendance of schools and the administrative responsibility of parents for the school attendance. Roma children with any type of disability should be placed in relevant boarding schools, and not in schools for the Roma children. Even children without mental deficiencies were recommended to be placed into special schools for the mentally retarded either because of the lack of essential hygiene skills or long-term systematic school absence which "aggravated the primary moderate retardation" (ibid). While this practice conflicted with the main Law about schools, which banned the placement of children without disability into special schools, the combination of various factors contributed to its rapid application. By the end of the 1970s the number of the Roma children in special schools for the mentally retarded children increased twofold in comparison with the end of 1960s (Vávrová 1979).

Starting to encourage the families with more than two children to overcome the long-term demographic crisis, the new pro-natalist policy stipulated further the placing of the Roma children into boarding schools for the mentally retarded children. The increasing success of the new social policy (introducing generous benefits for families, extending the maternity leave, promoting the importance of keeping the child in constant contact with the mother for three first years) directly stimulated the birth rate in Czechoslovakia and, according to the intention of the health reformers, it ought to have decreased the demand in kindergartens and other services which were permanently limited because of the lack of staff and buildings (Shmidt and Bailey 2014). Being with many children, the Roma families were caught up in this policy and began to attract much more attention from the authorities who were interested in controlling the risk families and their reliance on benefits.

In the second part of the 1960s, the trend to limit the parental rights of the Roma included the refusal to pay benefits to parents whose children did not attend school regularly. Even in the mass-media this measure was posed as extreme and not desirable, and another, softer, type of intervention (mentoring parents and children) was recommended, which was directly governed by the local authorities and by their good will to engage with such "time-consuming efforts" (Co chcete… 1966). It is remarkable that the mass-media presented the problem of school attendance as "surprisingly not exceptionally typical of the Roma children" and yet the non-Roma child was described as "behaving like the Gypsy". According to statistical data 40% of the Roma students missed more than one half of classes (Sojka 1966). Parental irresponsibility was opposed to the rights of the children, and the previous practice of negotiating with parents was criticized: "neither [school] boards nor teachers are able

to persuade parents to send children into schools" (Negramotnost… 1963). Viewing the Roma parents as unable to ensure regular school attendance was fixed in legal procedures.

The new 'Law about the consequences regarding the neglect of parental care' (Zákon o některých důsledcích zanedbání péče o děti č. 177/1966) introduced the procedures for allowing the decision to ban parents from benefits. Actually, this law legalized the already developed practice, especially in Slovakia, to punish the Roma parents whose children did not attend school. In 1965 applying this measure led to increasing the number of children who started to visit school two times (Špiner 1966). Before issuing the law, the local section of the Communist Party made such decisions. Gradually, the intention to limit the rights of the Roma parents expanded to their termination, and even more, to prescribing criminal responsibility for the breach of their duties regarding the school attendance of their children. The rapid growth of fertility amongst the Roma, the tough policy against the parents, and the lack of services aimed at instructing the parents, all contributed to the second wave of mass institutionalization of the Roma children: their placement into large-scale residential care units.

The mass-media reported the stories about Roma parents who bought alcohol with 'benefits' money (Sojka 1966). The increasing number of surveys opposing the good education of children in boarding schools to the failures of children placed into mainstream schools, worked in favour of further segregation of the Roma children. One teacher from a special school for Roma children asked in the journal *Issues of Defectology* (Otázky defektologie, 14(7), 280): "Why do obviously normal children, who are able to cope with the mainstream curriculum learn at the special school, and what can be done in order to integrate them?". The teacher also insisted that: "all Roma children should be placed into special schools according to the their problems, either behavioural difficulties or mental retardation".

The mainstream school began to be viewed as an inappropriate institute of socialisation for those children whose "surroundings are unable to provide the sustainable acquirement of skills and competencies" (Žáková 1983: 12). As it gained widespread support, the monitoring of the Roma students at special schools focused on the continuity – either positive (in the case of special education) or negative (related to the education in the mainstream schools) – and on the dynamic of academic achievements and socialisation. Thus, the Roma pupils at mainstream schools were less integrated and performed poorer in academic activities than the Roma pupils at special schools. The exception was the Roma children who attended the mainstream school but

were brought up in children homes: because "they were prepared, washed and dressed daily" (Žáková 1983: 14). Placing the Roma children into special school was described as "relevant to the typical of the Roma retard mental development", while educating them at mainstream school was seen as the source of the threat to "reproduce academic failures which inevitably decrease the motivation to learn" (Zeman… 1962). Later on, the connection between school failure and delinquency was deployed and prompted the development of new approaches to assess the Roma children in order to identify on time those of them at risk.

LAST SOCIALIST PERIOD: INCREASING ARBITRARINESS IN DECISION MAKING

By the end of the 1970s many regions had experienced problems related to the Roma population which had increased, especially in the Czech part of the country (see Table 1). Also, experts stressed the growing delinquency amongst the Roma youth – the official statistics disclosed that 44% of young offenders, younger than 14, in various institutions were of Roma origin, while the general number of under-age Roma population was less than 3% (Štipek 1988: 261). According to experts, neither the capacity of institutions nor the approaches to re-education could cope properly with the 'deviant behaviour' of the Roma youth (Kára et al. 1975).

Directly explaining the increase of criminal activity by the lack of an efficient approach to educating the Roma, authorities started to develop the method of psychological assessment, aimed at indicating early on the Roma children at risk, before the start of secondary education. Gradually, new administrative decisions replaced previous practices, allowing however that the Roma children be included in the mainstream education. While until the mid-1970s the decision about the educational trajectory for the majority of the Roma children was made after finishing the first grade in mainstream school; towards the end of the 1970s, the centres of pedagogical-psychological assistance (*pedagogicko-psychologická poradna*) selected the Roma children from the very beginning, refining the procedures of psychological assessment for pre-school Roma children and introducing various versions of culture-free intelligence tests (Mertin 1986a). Establishing a consistent system of listing the Roma children, the local branches of the Communist Party and their special sub-division, the Board of re-educating the Roma population, required the Roma parents to visit the centre and undergo the assessment of their child. This practice was rapidly disseminated: in one of the Moravian districts with the high number of the Roma population, the number of children passing though such an assessment increased from 92 children in 1978 to 225 in 1981

(Žáková H. 1983). The local branch of the Communist Party made the final decision about the placement of the child based upon such assessment. The range of options was thus: to postpone school entrance for one year and to place the child into a kindergarten or to place him/her into a special class or a special school. The recommendation to learn at a mainstream school was a rare option – because the main prerequisite for such decision was based on the regular attendance of the kindergarten and on direct recommendation from the pre-school pedagogues. As the Roma children did not attend kindergartens, it was thus impossible for this strategy to provide for them integration into the mainstream school.

Considering that most the Roma children were deemed to be unprepared for the school (approximately half of all children who passed through the assessment), the Boards of re-educating the Roma population delayed their school entrance (Vavrová 1979). Only a small number of these children visited kindergartens, and many stayed at home, without any regular efforts towards their preparation for school. Relevant to this lack of socializing practices, the number of children whose school entrance was postponed, and who after this were placed into special school, remained high – more than 22%. Conducted in the regions with a high number of Roma population, the survey of the educational trajectories of the Roma disclosed the fact that amongst 38% of the children who were placed into special schools, after unsuccessful finishing the first academic year, were children whom the Boards primarily postponed their school attendance (Janišová 1985: 253). This data substantiated the later practice of reducing the period of postponement for the Roma children, and their placement into special schools.

Moreover, not only the beginning of the education but its final stage too, that is vocational training, had been dependent on the special schools. Due to the long-term official view on the professional preparation as a toolkit of social control of 'unreliable' groups, encouraging the Roma youth to take this route remained the significant task of the Czechoslovak educational policy. By the early 1980s, the Roma graduates of special schools were automatically placed into vocational schools, while the Roma graduates of mainstream schools could avoid it (Mertin 1986b). This difference informed the debate about the long-term placement of the Roma children into special boarding-schools. Both arguments, the importance of putting the Roma children in a special school from the very beginning and keeping them there until the end blocked any options for integrating the Roma children in the mainstream education. The special education obtained all qualities of the universal pathway for such "risk group" as the Roma children.

It would be over unwisely to consider that the alienation of Roma children in favour of special education took place without the experts having considered the negative outcomes of such an approach. Especially in the 1960s, when the call for family care for children had advanced the value of attachment, professionals started to discuss the placement into residential care as a dead-end option because "beyond family care the child cannot raise in normal way" (Problémy... 1965). Simulteneously, experts acknowledged the abject poverty of the Roma families and the impossibility to overcome it: "one pot for several families, regularly undernourished children, desperate mothers, who lose their children in hospitals" (ibid). Professionals started to think about the Roma issue within the dilemma of "family, but insufficient vs. institution, but powerful", thus avoiding other options for intervention and using the concept of 'retardation' as an universal explanation for the mistreatment of the Roma children. Thus, Josef Štěpán, the principal of the special school for the Roma children in Dětenice, and one of the most important experts on the education of the Roma, who published several articles in professional periodicals, asked colleagues: "What helps the defective individual more? Segregation with further socialisation in collective institution or staying in family with its deep mutual ties?"(Štěpán 1976: 48). Accepting the sustainability of the attachment between the child and the parents even after placing the children into boarding schools and removing them from abusive parents, Štěpán argued for the priority of special education but only under the condition that "it would operate in open and healthy society" (ibid). A decade later, finalising her long-term survey of the Roma children, another well-known expert Helena Malá notified the impropriety of disseminating the negative view about the Roma people who had been already integrated. Thus she explained this trend by the fact that "family upbringing remains the restraining factor for the in- and out-school education of the Roma children – not because of the lack of motivation among the Roma parents but due to the huge gaps in their competencies and the absence of skills which were explained by their "sociocultural backwardness unattainable by management" (Malá 1985). The sophisticated and multi-extent platform of arguments in favour of residential institutions developed during the socialist period should be understood in the context of the high-demand for educators to reinforce the meaning of special education and overcome the obvious conflict of this strategy with the view of the family as an indispensable source for the child development.

THE IDEOLOGICAL PLATFORM OF THE EDUCATION FOR THE ROMA CHILDREN: PROFESSIONALISATION IN FAVOUR OF SEGEGATION

THE DISCOURSES AROUND THE EDUCATION FOR THE ROMA: OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES

While the public (or communicative) discourse around the Roma had experienced significant metamorphosis due to the interest of the authorities to manipulate the Roma issue in favour of legitimizing themselves and delegitimizing the enemies of the regime, the coordinative or professional discourse relied on the historical continuity within professional attitudes formed in the interwar period and during the Protectorate. In the early 1950s, the professional rhetoric introduced two main concepts related to the Roma children: reeducation and rehabilitation – primarily, the selection of the Roma people was meant to group together those who needed reeducation, and approve their placement into special settlements and institutions. The selective way of thinking about the Roma but within the assimilative objects of education permeated the formation of academic knowledge as well as applied assessment and intervention. In the surveys conducted amongst the Roma families the division into families of the first and the second categories were mentioned as the grounds for further decision about the educational trajectory of the child (Žáková 1983). The socialist experts opposed the selection based on social characteristics and favoured a more biological view on the Roma issue – which was reproduced again and again within debates centred on the question "How can the socialist society protect itself from the threat of degeneration and from social groups with high proportion of degenerates?" (Sovak 1975)

Established in the first part of the 1950s, the specification related to the teaching of major subjects to the Roma children identified the initial steps towards the construction of a discourse around "the asocial environment" as the main argument for further discrimination of the Roma children. For example, in teaching mathematics the focus should be on the "critical and logical thinking, both typically weak in the Roma children" (Učební… 1954). On the other hand, the intense learning of the Czech language (while in the draft of curriculum both Czech and Slovak languages were optional, according to the priority of children and parents, in the final document this choice was excluded) aimed to increase "the interest in reading and to prepare for the learning of Russian as the language of political literacy". Teaching the Czech language was seen as a measure to prevent the alienation of children from backward surroundings, while the learning of the history of the Czech people should "highlight the difference between the Czech and Roma people, their approaches towards the development of natural resources". The close history of the Czech and Slovak

people became the other major point "for translating communist morality". In line with the wellspread stereotype regarding the inability of the Roma to cultivate crops and care for live-stock, the biology should provide the essentials of a solicitous attitude towards fauna and flora. Physical education was revised in order to provide more skills regarding hygiene and self-care, and arts (music and drawing) should improve self-discipline. According to the beliefs in the special abilities of the Roma, music was described as a subject particularly important for discovering the children's talents and supporting their self-esteem. Selecting the educational techniques more suitable for the Roma children notified further steps towards discriminating the Roma. Teaching should be based upon the special toolkit reinforcing repetition and redundancy. The guidance put forward the role of visualisation in teaching geography because of "the enormous shortcomings in [their] vocabulary".

The guidance prioritised the role of social control and reduced the mission of developing the intelligence of children: "teachers should revise the academic agenda in favour of the task to replace the asocial [and] undesirable behavioural patterns of the children by the adequate habits and skills" (Organizační… 1955). The guidance hoped to replace the Roma routine life with competencies unknown before but which were considered to be "indispensable for developing hygiene and cultural life" (ibid). For instance, the children should stay in after-school groups (*školní družiny*) doing their home-work and engaging with leisure activities under the control of the school staff. Later, the regulations regarding the special schools for the Roma children prescribed the significant meaning to the out-school activities and the role of teachers in monitoring children's non-study time. The obvious intention to supersede the family by educational activities indicated the increasing contest over children between the school and the parents (Štěpán 1982).

The conflict between the Roma family and the school could be seen both in early socialist documents regarding the special classes and in the latest instructions worked out for the special schools. Engaging the Roma children in school continued to be viewed as a challenge to their previous mode of life. In the 1960s the confrontation between the Roma parents and schools was built into the increasing trend to oppose the Roma mode of life by a reference to morality: "Is it possible to recognize the morality of those Gypsy mothers who without any worry leave their children in hospitals believing in the state's obligation to care for their children" (Negramotnost… 1963). Consistently opposing the 'progressive' school with the 'backward' family, it was prescribed to teachers "to suppress emotional reactions typical of this ethnic group; overcome the language barriers which inevitably appear; advance the acquisition of the skills whose meaning was unknown to both children and their parents; keep down

and limit children's intention to move during the learning process; develop endurance; teach children to save their school materials from younger siblings; compensate the lack of parental interest with the school achievements; and [finally] provide more attentive approach to the Roma students" (Žáková 1983).

Aimed at comparing the educational trajectories of those Roma children placed into institutions and those who stayed at home, the surveys, which were conducted in the late socialist period, supplemented the traditional view on the Roma family, as unable to benefit from institutions, with new arguments. Accepting the extremely moderate progress in socialising the Roma children, various authors recognised two main obstacles: the high level of infant rate among "socially immature and mentally retarded mothers", and the migration due to that "the backward Roma families were added to more socialised families in this community, for whose progress we struggle with all of our efforts" (Žáková 1983: 14). The experts emphasised the parents' inability "to build the multidimensional strategy of raising their children and prevent the spontaneous development of child who usually is shut in upon oneself" (Vavrová 1979). Echoing the interwar period rhetoric, the experts prescribed the main responsibility to mothers and stressed the deficiencies of the Roma women in implementing the role of responsible parent because of their dependence on their husbands, preoccupation with birth, avoidance of contact with the wider social environment » (Štěpán 1982).

The most negative concept regarding the Roma family and its inability to raise children was shaped in the surveys of the delinquent behaviour of youth. Comparing young offenders amongst the Roma and non-Roma origin led to the conclusion that the Roma delinquents were often brought up in two-parent families (thus, even this traditional marker of child well-being did not work regarding the Roma) and the educational degree among the Roma parents was significantly lower than amongst non-Roma parents (Štípek 262). With the fact that the number of older Roma siblings who were already placed into correctional institutions was bigger than those of non-Roma, the evident limits of parents determined the development of practices aimed at controlling the communication between offenders and their families because of "the ambiguous impact of the relatives [and family] on the reeducation of the Roma youth" (ibid 263).

Deconstructing the Roma model of parent-child relationship, the socialist authors conveyed arguments against the discourse of the child, which is currently considered an indispensable part of contemporary parental and educational practices (Lee 2005). The readiness of the Roma parents to take the side of the child in the conflict with the school and the teacher, the lack of how to garner their love as parents as a toolkit for improving the social behaviour

of the child, the vague idea about the future of the child and the focus on "here and now" were considered deficient. In contrast to the First Republic, the socialist experts stressed the necessity to take into account the strong link between Roma parents and their children: "the love of the parents is decisive for the socialization of children, including the Roma." But this approach remained univocally utilitarian. Considering the parent-child relationship in terms of functions, the socialist experts created common stereotypes about the Roma families which contemporary helping professionals shared and actively applied in their research and educational practices.

While in the 1950s and 1960s the communicative discourse viewed the teachers recruited for the special education for the Roma people as "brave pioneers who would place the people's hopes under the vigilant monitoring of the Party", by the end of socialism pedagogues who worked with the Roma children were posed as experts: "Currently treating the Roma children and obviously being busied with the task to overcome the difficulties in socializing the Roma children in the future, teachers should be sure that their experience would be disseminated and applied in the planning and implementation of the relevant policy" (Malá 1984). Describing the teacher as a key mediator between the Roma child who requires the enormous number of behavioural patterns, and the normal space into which the child should be integrated, the socialist pedagogy rejected the Roma the right to autonomy and spontaneous development. The main argument in favour of limiting autonomy in such a radical way was the causal relationship between the lack of school attendance and illegal behaviour: "the data regarding the criminal career of the Roma youth confirm the high correlation between lying to their teachers, not-doing their home tasks, academic failure and further expansion of asocial and antisocial behavioural patterns" (Žáková 1982: 16).

Reproducing the pre-sociological discourse of the child, the socialist pedagogy marked the Roma family as a source of threats and placed great expectation upon professionals and institutions. Undoubtedly, the intensive formation of special education for the Roma assumed developing more sophisticated ideological grounds for approving the abnormality of the Roma children. In the socialist period, the special education for the Roma children passed included the attitudes that had appeared in public discourse earlier and then became fixed in the common sense. Adding professional reasoning to public concerns, scholars and practitioners consolidated the stereotype of Roma backwardness. Two main interrelated trends, psychologisation and medicalisation, characterised the formation of epistemic communities entrusted to solve the Roma issue.

PSYCHOLOGISING THE DISCOURSE OF THE ROMA CHILD: THE CONSISTENT ECLECTICISM OF THE ARGUMENTS

Within the organisational approaches for the education of the Roma, the traces of Soviet influences are easy to discern. The Czechoslovak experts actively applied the concepts worked out by Soviet educational psychology to explore the specifics of the Roma children's development. However, in contrast to their Soviet colleagues, the Czechoslovak experts combined the Soviet approaches with the arguments derived from the Western psychology in order to develop the consistent ideological arguments in favour of special education. They kept away from the opposite view on the sources of child development typical of the Soviet and Western psychology, also from the Soviet critique of "the bourgeois science", and juxtaposed the pro-social, Soviet, profile for recognizing child's issue and the pro-biological, Western, pattern of thinking about the child development. According to Žáková "the compatibility with the claim put forward by Elkonin and Davydov, Saurey and Telford that the negative attitude to learning is stipulated by the inability of the child to cope with the school prerequisites even its sources can be varied…" (Žáková 1982). Both explanations regarding child development, Soviet and Western, were adopted for refining already entranched arguments, and neither the obvious difference between two camps of psychologists, nor the common utilitarian approach to child development were the subject of critical revision among the Czechoslovak scholars and practitioners.

Most intensively and consistently, the experts appropriated the constructs which asserted the precise standards of mental development in terms of its dynamic. In line with the Vygotskian approach about ontogenesis and its stages, the Czechoslovak authors explained the shortcomings in the development of the Roma children by missing the sensitive periods of development because of parental neglect. Linking the academic failure with not having sensitive periods substantiated the placement of the Roma children into residential care units from early childhood: "we have to bring the sensitivity of the young child, outstanding and short-term flexibility of the child mind to our efforts into action, and implement more intensive intervention as soon as possible, before entering the school" (Žáková 1983: 11). This psychological argument supplemented a more traditional suggestion developed by physicians who approved the high positive correlation between failing the first grade and further deterioration of academic achievement amongst the Roma pupils because of the link between cumulative failure and the inability of families to overcome gaps in skills and competencies of the child (Reisenaure 1962: 867). Put together, these arguments delineated the unique role of educational

institutions as corrective actors of the Roma children, guiding them towards more civilized patterns of behaviour.

In line with previous periods, this discourse reinterated the mental (under-)development of the Roma. Viewing the specific traits of the Roma children as similar to those of primitive men, the Czechoslovak experts explained the left-handedness amongst the Roma people by their habit to manipulate both hands. The outputs of the survey aimed at exploring the acquisition of school curriculum by left-hand Roma pupils were compared to the outcomes of the survey of the Malaysian tribe from the island Celebes (Štěpán 1976). The obvious differences between the Roma and non-Roma mentally retarded children were explained by the different degree of being accustomed to "the right-hand civilization". In conclusion, the author shared the idea to compare his results collected amongst the Roma with the performance of left-handedness in different Indian castes, including that from which the Roma had descended.

In agreement with the Soviet psychologists's surveys of the small numbered people (Alexander Luria, Aleksei N. Leontiev, Aleksei A. Leontiev), the Czechoslovak authors applied the colonial discourse to identify the shortcomings of the Roma children because of the primitive nature of the Roma language. The growing number of such surveys in the early 1970s could be explained by the increased trend to place the Roma children into boarding schools for mentally retarded – helping professionals approve the removal of the child from the family even though the attachment between the child and parents was seen as an indispensably valuable for mental development. The reason to remove the Roma children from families in favour of institutions was unique, and the previous concept of deficient parenting did not satisfy the need of professionals to be in line with the public discourse. Defining language as a decisive factor of the backwardness of the Roma, the experts solved the dichotomy "asocial/family – socializing/institution" in favour of residential care. Consistently depreciating the Roma language by emphasizing its deficiency, not because of the inability of the Roma to learn the Czech language, but due to the diverse misconnections between thinking and speech indicated by the experts. Coinciding with the traditional nationalist idea that "only one's own language would advance the nation" and the Soviet theories regarding the connection of thinking to speech, Štěpán defined the Roma language as "being in its phonetic phase' [its] vocabulary, [and] the systematic lack of unification and the absence of writing language, different than the Czech language, could not help to implement the task of advancing the child's mind and teaching them the Czech language" (Štěpán 1975: 148). The Roma language was accepted as inappropriate for teaching children the majority of cognitive functions because

of the absence of abstract notions. The limited number of vowels restrained the ability to recognize the diversity of syllables in the Czech language.

Comparing the issues of teaching the Czech to the Roma with the mistakes of Lithuanian children who had learnt Russian, the author concluded that "the native language stipulates the ability to fix, change and generalize the frames of the adopted foreign language"(ibid: 149). In combination with the idea that the Roma parents did not provide sensitive periods to the child, the derogation of the Roma language determined extremely segregating statements against the Roma: "Missing all sensitive periods when acquiring the language, the Roma students are unable to use non-Roma words even in the order to initiate communication, while the school prerequisites expect recognizing the grammar points and abstract concepts… " (ibid). Deriving the principle of the indissoluble link between thinking and speech from the theories of Vygotsky and Piaget, the author described the thinking of the Roma as inevitably primitive. The language barrier was aggravated by the deficient social interactions "which – in the Roma community – [were] conditioned by the environment with the minimal display of influences to development. Here there are no options for overcoming the barrier of minority and integrating the potential members of our society because there are no chances for them to become relevant to the expectations of majority" (ibid: 150). The Roma family was not viewed as a potential actor of language integration – according to the outcomes of the survey, only 4% of the Roma parents spoke Czech or Slovak, while more than 46% – the Roma language, and the same number spoke both languages while preferring the Roma language (Kára et al. 1975). Thus, belonging to an ethnicity distinguished by "primitive language" and "irresponsible parenting" became the direct explanation for the mental retardation of the Roma children.

Psychologizing the discourse of the Roma child transformed the concept of social environment in favour of substantiating the necessity to separate the Roma child from the family and community, which directly impeded socialization. Medicalisation of the discourse regarding the Roma children put forward the phenotypic characteristics as a source for corroborating the placement of the Roma children into special institutions in order to compensate for their alleged "inherent defects".

MEDICALISING THE ROMA CHILDREN: FROM EXPLORING THE ENVIRONMENT TO INVALIDATING THE CHILD

The medicalisation of the surveys regarding the Roma began in the interwar period and grew in importance during the Protectorate. It also remained influential during the socialist period. Typical of the first decade of

the socialist period, the studies about the connection between health and academic achievement were directly based upon the methodology worked out by the Czech scholars in the 1940s, who determined the secondary mental disability by the low standards of hygiene and the high level of contagious diseases amongst mothers and infants. Similar to studies elaborated during the Protectorate, the early socialist surveys aimed to differentiate the sources of disability both physical and mental by either heredity or the shortcomings of health and social care.

Acquired disability was put forward, and its prevention became the mission of health care: "we consider that those infections not yet recognized are hidden beyond the extended diagnosis *cretinism of unknown etiology,* and the lack of recognizing its efforts on mental retardation as well as overcrowding special schools" (Reisenaure et al. 1962). This approach reflected the interests of the Ministry of Health to improve its political capital within the reform targeted to perfecting the care about mothers and children due to the crisis of obstetric services and increasing infant mortality in the first decade after the WWII. The cross-regional comparisons measured the dissemination of contagious and parasitic diseases (hepatitis, helminthes, measles) and the varied number of mentally retarded children. The parasitic contamination was determined by the social status of the parents and led to the significant decline of children in learning (Přivora 1951). Remarkably, scholars constructed the concept of mental retardation mostly in terms of academic achievement: repeating a class, irregular school attendance, and bad marks. Asserting the medical approach to prevent acquired disability, Czechoslovak scholars proposed the notion of *social oligophrenia* – the retardation in mental and physical development because of worse living conditions, and responding to this challenge, they had substantiated their participation in social care and education as a comprehensive strategy "for cultivating the health of young generations" (Křemenová 1962). Such rhetoric accompanied the dispute between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Social Affairs over the influence on social policy, which started in the early 1950s and which continues to this day. No doubt, that opposing the role of professional to the phenotype of the Roma child became the seductive construct for various groups of experts.

By the mid-1970s, Helena Malá conducted several surveys aimed at arguing the necessity to place the Roma children into residential care institutions – she started to apply the concept of acceleration for deriving criteria and indices regarding the evaluation of the Roma children and their development. Viewing Roma "backwardness" as a multiple issue, she defined the source blocking their social integration, in combination with the concept of social-cultural

retardation transferred from generation to generation and aggravated by an 'unhealthy mode of life'. The authors directly determined the implementation of social norms by using a particular anthropometric profile constructed upon the average Czech: "it (*anthropometric norms – V.S.*) operates as the essentials for successful socialisation" (Malá 1985). Contrasting anthropometric characteristics of the Roma to those of the ethnic majority, Mala differentiated the Roma children into those who were raised in families and institutions. She noted the positive impact of residential care on the anthropometric profile of the Roma children, who were significantly not different from their non-Roma peers in contrast to those who remained at home with families: "in their physical development, the Roma students who learn in boarding schools for considerable length of time can be placed between their Czech peers and the Roma children from families" (ibid). Highlighting the role of anthropometric features, Malá reinstated the issue of parenting – directly connecting the unhealthy patterns of the Roma mothers' behaviour during the pregnancy to the further problems of the child's development (Malá and Hajnišová 1984). Due to the modest success in the socialisation of the Roma and the high birth rate typical of this ethnic group (by the middle of 1980s more than 40% of the Roma population were children under 14, while the total number of children was less than 25%), Malá suggested that the special boarding school should remain the long-term strategy for socializing the Roma children. Based upon the study of Frantishek Shtampach (1929), Malá arrived at the conclusion that the anthropometric indexes of the Roma children became more compatible with their Czech peers – but whose standards, in their turn, had significantly changed (Malá 1985). This argument was coupled with the idea that the Roma children never paid their arrears. Malá's surveys were well disseminated: she and her colleagues published more than 20 articles from 1975 and two manuals, for higher education, *Somatologie a antropologie. Vysokoškolská učebnice*. SPN Praha (the first edition was published in 1976 and the last in 1981), and *Výchova a vzdělávání cikánských dětí a mládeže*. SPN Praha (the first in 1982, and the last in 1989).

Medicalising the discourse of the Roma child directly influenced the attitude of educators –practitioners began to use arguments from anthropometric surveys in favour of their strategy to control the Roma children. The irregular school attendance was directly connected to smaller height and weight, and the efforts to apply the Roma students to the "anthropometric norm" were seen as grounds for ensuring academic achievement (Vávrová 1979: 217). Educators supplemented the anthropometric approach by studying laterality and its functions. Štěpán (1976), for instance, explained the various issues of speech development typical of the Roma children by their left-handedness.

The author mentioned four main factors fixing the left-hand pattern of manipulation skills: the Roma families "are not in the habit of practicing activities forcing children to use the right hand"; "the Roma children do not play with toys which would advance right-hand skills, and their play activities have nothing in common with the traditional preschool games aimed to prepare children for learning'. Moreover, Štěpán continued, "unhealthy nutrition negatively influences neural development and precisely aggravates eye-hand coordination" – which according to Štěpán remains a key factor of academic success. In general, "the life of the Roma children mostly flows outside or on the oldest districts of our cities, where the oligophrenic Gypsy children in their semi-wild games, trimming sticks and tossing stones would use the hand which is dominant according to their phenotype" (Štěpán 1976).

Compatible with the psychologising of the Roma child, the trend to medicalise it juxtaposed the depreciation of families and children. The lack of basic personal hygiene of the Roma parents was directly linked with contagious and parasitic diseases, infant mortality, and obstacles for acquiring socially accepted patterns of behaviour. Alongside, the menta and physical development of the Roma children was constructed in terms of retardation because of bad conditions for their mental development.

CONCLUSIONS

While the communicative discourse around the Roma people including their education experienced significant changes during the socialist period, the coordinative discourse remained the successor of the practices and concepts which had first appeared in previous periods. In line with the interwar triangle of principles regarding the Roma children «backward family – socialized institution –negative effect of social and hereditary factors», the socialist experts construed their arguments in favour of special education which had evolved towards the most extreme degree of segregation – marking all Roma children as "mentally retarded".

The professionalization of the discourse around the Roma children aimed to consolidate psychological knowledge (both Western and Soviet) and the medical approach into a coherent theory about deficient childhood and parenthood as exemplified by the Roma people. The obvious intention of experts to combine biological and social factors into the comprehensive explanation ensured the legitimacy of removing the Roma children from their families and their placement into residential care units. Anthropometry remained the most visible theoretical approach in studying the specific traits of the Roma and

conditioned other directions of studying the Roma children. The experts interposed the insufficiency of the Roma language in their traditional intolerance towards the Roma mode of life, with arguments regarding the irresponsible Roma parenting. Additionally, the credibility of such arguments was guaranteed by the status of experts who mostly combined teaching and applied research. The majority of authors who published their articles in professional periodicals were educators and principals in special schools.

"The main reason to view the Roma children as a very specific group, who require very special attention in education and growing up, is based on the significant difference of the biological, cultural, and socio-economic conditions regarding the formation of this ethnic group in contrast to the majority of our population". This argument, voiced by Helena Malá in 1984, remained the most popular explanation for the system of special Roma education to this day. Special education was combined with social control of the Roma people. Solving a wide range of issues, from monitoring reproductive patterns to limiting criminal activity amongst the Roma youth, special education gained the status of universal strategy in the array of instruments for solving the Roma issue. According to it, and with great probability, the Roma child would be placed into a special school. Is it possible to break this vicious circle without a redefinition of the professional attitudes regarding more modern notions of childhood, parenthood and ethnicity?

CHAPTER 5

Models of Legitimizing Inclusive Education in the Czech Rep.: What Ambitions May Come[16]

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN THE CZECH REP.: MISSION IMPOSSIBLE?

According to the international and national-level legal norms, inclusive education obtains the legal status in the contemporary Czech Rep.. The Law about Education (2004) prescribes mainstream educational units to integrate children with special educational needs, especially those who are disabled or live in vulnerable conditions, primarily Roma origin. The European Court of Human Rights (European Court… 2007) had directly marked the practice of placing Roma children into special schools as segregation. This obviously tough definition of special education stipulates the constant pressure of EU on the Czech state towards more intensive distribution of inclusive practices among educators. Between 2007–2010 the Ministry of education, youth and sport made several attempts for introducing special regulations regard to the implementation of obligations towards disseminating inclusive approaches in educational system. At the beginning two special regulations, No 62 "About assessment and counselling services" aimed at transforming the procedures of evaluating child development before engaging primary school in order to replace previously dominated focus on diagnosis on describing needs and strengths, and No 116 "About establishing inclusive education" targeted to posing standards in terms of how many children with SEN could be placed and professionals should be recruited, were frozen on uncertain length of time due to the request of local educational authorities, and then were annulled because of "limited resources for seamless transfer to the new approach towards educating children with SEN". (MŠMT 2011).

Alongside, the surveys conducted among main stakeholders of inclusive education educators, parents of both disabled and intact children, assures that the contemporary Czech Rep. needs to develop public discourse around

16 This chapter was written in coopertion with Dr. Karel Panchocha, the early version of this text was published in *the Journal of social policy studies* in 2013, 11(4), 547–560. Available at: http://jsps.hse.ru/2013-11-4/107169837.html

disability, education and childhood, which would be relevant to the objects of inclusion (Průchová 2008). Despite existing financial opportunities provided by projects *Honest school* (Ferová škola) and *Community school* (Komunitní škola) which cover the expenses regarding the recruitment of additional staff and purchasing of relevant equipment, less than 1% of school have taken part in such projects. To experts' opinion, more than half of schools which obtained the status "inclusive" are situated in localities of Roma population permanent residence, and the participation in such projects aims to equip a school by professionals in order to bring teaching process more in line with special education. In response to several attempts of principals to integrate children with SEN into mainstream schools, the parents of intact children started to remove their children to more prestigious and less inclusive schools. The monitoring of 60 schools randomly chosen by Ombudsman in 2011 approved the fragmentary development of inclusion and the minimal number of children with SEN in mainstream school (Informace o plnění 2012). While the number of students at special schools has declined after issuing the Law about Education (2004) which restricted options for placing children into such educational units, the number of children with SEN placed into special classes at mainstream schools has increased. If in 2005/2006 less than 5% of students in mainstream schools had special educational needs, and each fifth of them learnt in special classes, in 2012/2013 two thirds of the same share of students with SEN learnt in special classes x (Ústav… 2013).

Inclusive education as an embodiment of social integration and democratic governance, the priorities of EU social policy, can be viewed in the contexts of legitimacy – how do citizens accept new political trends in terms of eligibility (Shmidt 2013: 9). Inclusive education in the contemporary Czech Rep. is legal but not enough legitimized. Such point of view on the obstacles of inclusive policy in the Czech Rep. encourages applying the approach which differentiates diverse types of legitimacy in order to reconstruct the issue in terms of the resources of legitimizing reforms and following changes.

LEGITIMACY: OVERLOADING MATRIX?

Primarily three types of legitimacy, *input, output, throughput*, were differentiated in order to recognise diverse models of local governance in Western countries compatible with the matrix of welfare state regimes (Haus, Heinelt 2005). The Scandinavian profile was associated with the predominance of *input*-legitimacy based upon the direct participation of citizens; *throughput-legitimacy* was connected with the Anglo-Saxon profile providing transparence

and consistency of procedures as a guarantee of the access for citizens to decision-making process especially in the case of the conflict between a citizen and authorities; and output legitimacy was affiliated with corporatist regime which would achieve the legitimate status only being relevant to the citizens' expectations. The European integration and the sequence of crises directly challenging the ideal types of welfare regimes stipulated scholars to coincide all three types into the consistent array of criteria for the multilevel evaluation of strengths and weaknesses regarding the process of democratisation (Bekkers 2007). For instance, local governance was posed as a cyclic succession of all three legitimacies typical of any type of welfare state – while one types operate better than others. Previously typical contradiction between *input-* and *output*-legitimacies has been overcome within redefining the role of throughput legitimacy as a connecting element between two other types of legitimacy, which ensures the balance of participation, and policy making (Shmidt 2013).

Despite significant differences in recognising the types of legitimacy and their impact on the current policy, experts converge on evaluating European policy as over-focused on output legitimacy against other types (Peters, Pierre 2010; Shmidt 2013). The predominance of output legitimacy is closely linked with prescribing citizens the position of recipients not active participants of political processes (Scharpf 1999). In Belgium, inclusive education runs into problems because of shortcomings in parents' involvement: while local authorities have established the network of services aimed at advancing inclusive practices, parents prefer to place their children into special units even more residential care centres, explaining their decisions by the disinclination to waste their time and participate in complicated procedures (Sebrechts, Jef 2012).

There are diverse ways for answering on the question how to ensure consistent legitimacy regarding the variety of attitudes to the connection between ideas and institutions which remain key elements of constructing the notion of legitimacy (Shmidt 2013). Those who prioritise institutional profile in explaining focus on gatekeeping procedures: assessment and placement of child into school, management of diverse educational trajectories, decision-making regarding the role of parents and other actors in the case of the conflict of interests. The proponents of discourse-analysis highlight the communication between actors which is equalised with the space of ideas and the contests between them. The diversity of discourses provides the continuum of ideas for further affiliation of actors and their emancipation from the previous prescriptions in favour of more pluralistic concept of inclusion.

Applying both perspectives, institutional and discursive, to the issue of inclusive education and its legitimacy enables to avoid contrasting adherers and opponents of inclusive education, develop the consistent notion of operating practices either encouraging or blocking the reforms towards integrating children with special needs.

LEGITIMISING INCLUSION: THE IMPACT OF PROFESSIONALS

The debates around special and inclusive education turned to the tough contest in the end of the 1990s due to several factors: introducing a more complex notion of inclusion in policy making (Pickering, Busse 2010); redefining traditional concepts of childhood and parenthood (Honig 1999; Kehily 2009); challenging fundamental objects of educational system and its placement in social relations (Andreotti 2011). Emancipating social sciences from the task to serve the interests of authorities incited the systematic revision of the concepts and theories that legitimised the task to control, prescribed to social knowledge the status of expert's opinion, attributed children and parents to the position of passive recipients. The new one, sociological approach to this array of concepts elaborated the line of reasoning against previous traditional ideas through explaining what drove them to leading position in public discourses and professional attitudes as well. Thus, the noticeable success of classical developmental psychology in the 20th century directly was stipulated by theorizing mainstream ideas of child and parenthood disseminated in the 19th century (Kehily 2009). Recognising political and cultural underpinning of concepts that are taken for granted, e.g. progressive nature of child development or mother-child attachment, adapted redefining both the theoretical grounds and traditional practices of upbringing and education. The contemporary critical review of "apparent" ideas around childhood and parenthood map special education and other practices relevant to inclusion/exclusion dichotomy in terms of actors and the manipulative strategies that advance their interests (McKeever, Miller 2004; Walkerdine 2009).

The contemporary childhood studies aim to overcome the dilemma biological factors vs. social factors typical of pre-sociological approaches. contrasting bio- and socio permeates the formation of two main strands of special education: (1) normalization of disabled children and (2) placement of disabled children in special conditions relevant to their specific characteristics (James, Jenks, Prout 2003). Despite the difference in the approaches to explaining the driving forces of mental development and mental retardation, both platforms highlighted the role of expert as an agent of control under the

situation around disabled person. Contemporary critics interpret this common point as a source of limiting inclusion as a practice that proclaimes the equality of professionals and other actors: parents, children, and people from close surroundings. If inclusion calls for new approaches to childhood, parenthood and disability relevant to the task to implement Human Rights, the dichotomy *bio vs. socio* should be overcome in favour of a more complex notion of relevant notions. One of the main sources for elaborating alternative approaches becomes the widespread idea of twofold temporality of contemporary child who simultaneously lives in two domains, (1) becoming more equipped for future adulthood (in terms of socialisation) and (2) being here and now (prescribing a child's life meaning upon the idea of autonomy and dignity without any connotation to potential worthiness of a child as an usable citizen) (Zeiher 2008). In line with the double nature of contemporary childhood, many experts define mental development as a not homogeneous often internally contradicted process (Burman 2006).

Complicating approaches towards childhood directly connects human capital and human rights, two main strands for drawing arguments in favour of inclusion, into the ground dilemma of education for disabled people. Compatible with obvious obstacles in achieving the balance of two temporal domains of childhood, human capital and human rights are positioned in mutual contest due to various difficulties in working out a strategy for integrating these values into a coherent platform for advancing inclusive practices. The arguments in favour of human capital are criticized for bounding the role of childhood by the task to prepare to the adult life and the mission of education – by teaching main competencies (Thomas, Loxley 2007). Alongside, the approach of Human rights leads the inclusive education to the struggle of interests – e.g. between adherers of inclusive and special education (Tickly, Barrett 2011). Avoiding the risk to fall into one of these extremes directly depends on existing options to practice diverse approaches in local contexts. Thus, solving the dilemma of human capital vs. human rights puts forward the role of those actors who would do it in their routine professional practice – teaching children, cooperating with parents, making decisions related to the placement of children with SEN.

Since the 1960s, the confrontation of independent teachers against schools as outmode institution oppressing children has been expanded not only in the practice of alternative teaching methods, but become one of the most popular genre of the mass culture (e.g. the book *Up the Down Staircase* by Bel Kaufman, 1965, and the film based on it, R. Mulligun, 1967). During the second part of the 1980s and until now, the idea of opposition between

teachers who were on the side of students and the school as a segregative bureaucratic machine has evoked several cohorts of books reflecting the experience of real teachers, their stories and methods. The popular filmmakers and actors transferred this trend in mainstream cinematograph: *Stand and deliver*, by R. Menéndez, 1988; *Dangerous minds*, by J. Smith, 1995; *The Ron Clark story*, by R. Haines 2006; *Freedom writers*, by Richard LaGravenese, 2007 and many others. The image of teacher as a person who defends the traditional approaches towards educating children with special needs has gathered simultaneously with recognizing and articulating the hot topics of inclusion: the conflict between integrating into wider society (e.g. "white" Americans) and keeping the affiliation with the original community (e.g. Latin American immigrants); dilemma of individual approach vs. the intention to intervene with more students due to the demand, etc.

Along with the necessity to activate parents and children, the consistent revision of the approaches towards educating puts forward the attitudes of professionals both scholars and practitioners as an indispensable condition for the sustainable development of inclusion in terms of their ability to provide consistent redefinition of the concepts around childhood, education, disability. Being distinguished by various shortcomings and obstacles, the current situation around the inclusive education in the Czech Rep. prompts to deepen our understanding the role of epistemic communities through analysing the deficiency of their models of legitimising inclusive education.

THE MODELS OF LEGITIMIZING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: OSTENSIBLE CONTRADICTIONS?

Due to the task to derive the current operating models of legitimising inclusive education, we analysed two audio-records and supplementary materials of public debates around the relevant issues (the problem of selective approach to framing contemporary school system in the Czech Rep., within the project The Czech Republic talks about education – Česko mluví o vzdělávání http://ceskomluvi.cz/tema-3-je-pravdive-tvrzeni-ze-na-nasich-skolach-prilis-brzy-rozdelujeme-deti-na-schopne-a-mene-schopne/; the role of inclusive schools in integrating children with special needs http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/socialni-programy/kulaty-stul-k-problematice-inkluzivniho-vzdelavani. The main reasons to rely on this source of information were: (1) the array of participants who were key stakeholders of inclusive education: scholars who monitor the projects targeted to disseminate inclusion; officials who

lead relevant Departments in the Ministry of education and ministry of labour and social affairs; school principals and teachers of the schools which have started to implement inclusive practices; civil rights activists who lobby inclusion; and (2) the comprehensive range of practices which were discussed, not only direct teaching, but gatekeeping procedures, decision making related to a choice of educational trajectory, and the involvement of parents as well; (3) a high level publicity of these debates which were posted on the most popular e-sources and discussed by public. The soft NVivo was applied in order to coincide the attitudes of various actors into the models of legitimising inclusive education. Three relevant models were identified: (1) inclusion as a toolkit for individualising teaching&learning process and general refinement of school environment; (2) inclusion as an institute of the joint education for children from different social segments and ethnic groups; (3) inclusion as an ideology that transforms the array of attitudes towards education and its operation.

INCLUSION IN ACTION: THE PRACTITIONERS' APPROACH

Mostly, teachers and school managers pose inclusion as a very usable but expensive toolkit for individualisng education:

"the quality of inclusion remains exceptionally financial matter: how many special educators could I recruit, how many hours des psychologist spend with students, what ways of motivating teachers are accessible for me" (principal). This position is directly connected with the intention to saturate the school space by professionals who would be directly focused on children with special needs: "*the project assists us to involve speech therapist, helping professional for children with behavioural problems, clinic psychologist*" (principal). Alongside, the professional qualities of mainstream teachers were under discussion rarely and mostly regarding the requirement to decrease the number of students in a class: "There is no any option to bring into action individual approach while there are 30 children in the class" (school psychologist).

The necessity of inclusion is posed as an indispensable for public security: "The selection in able and disable aggravates the misunderstanding between children from different social and ethnic groups, with different level of abilities. And it is a great challenge for the contemporary public life" (principal). simultaneously, the education is defined as directly attributed to public life and its trends: "Marx had not achieved a success trying to persuade in absolute equality between everyone – what do you expect from schools? You could not force a reach man to drink in shabby beerhouse and poor man to eat with knife and fox. Then why have we force parents to choose in favour of inclusive school? " (principal). According to this, the main object of education

refers to individualizing the strategies towards refining human capital assets: "The high-quality education? It is education "for all" or that which is able to get adjusted to the needs of every child and to indicate the most efficient way of social integration?" (school psychologist). The obvious priority of human capital under human rights closely links with the predominance of child becoming discourse that was typical of participants.

Despite quite a few number of utterances about the attitude to childhood, mostly of them highlighted the assessment of child's abilities and its role in planning educational process. The meaning of emotional ties in terms of child being discourse was mentioned by two principles exceptionally in their comments to their own parental not professional experience: "I have two boys. Me and my wife we are attentive to their feelings – what do they like in school, and what stops being attractive" (principal). While these utterances originated from the private personal domain, the attitude to disability was constructed exceptionally in terms of individualised control: "The boy with autism likes being engaged in looking boiler-facility – that's why I should go together with him and take the chance to improve my understanding" (principal).

In this model, the predominance of output-legitimation is characterized by noncritical acceptance of the values regarding achievement and stratification that are posed as the unalterable traits of recent life. Even more, the permanence of these values is taken as a core argument in favour of the individualized approach to children which remains segregated in its intention.

INCLUSION AS AN AGENT OF CHANGES

Scholars, higher school lecturers who affiliated with Human Rights movement and NGO activists have presented the further model of legitimizing inclusion education through its posing as a new institution which revises the idea of efficient education. According to this camp of stakeholders, the selective approach and the formal criteria of academic achievements remains the main challenge for sustainable development of inclusion:

> *there are schools focusing on outcomes and in contrast to them the schools which intend to promote good climate and relationship. I wish that the second type would be uppermost in the Czech Rep., and our teachers would be able to think not only about marks but about what does a child learn and under which conditions* (higher school lecturer, activist NGO).

Alongside, the one of key arguments for the priority of relationships was obviously better academic outcomes, which would be achieved easier:

It is important to recognize that where the staff cares about a peaceful mood, knowledge are acquired better and without over efforts

(NGO activist).

Relevant to this, often repeated utterances regarding child being subordinate this realm of childhood to the task to prepare child to future life:

a child should not be limited in his/her feelings, it is important to teach expressing them and control – all of these competencies are ultimately demanded by the modern labour market

(NGO activists).

A definitely sensitive topic of testing children in order to indicate a particular educational trajectory mostly was discussed in the context what should be tested and which indices should be taken into account:

All these classical tests – what do they bring on the practitioners… we need to know which social competencies are missed…

(NGO activist).

More general concept of education supplemented the importance of social competencies by the necessity to teach them on-time: "if child would not be taught in 10–12 years integrating in the collective of peers (s)he would be lost for normal life, labour market for next 50 years" (higher school lecturer). Alongside, the confidence to childhood as an array of sensitive periods closely connects the mission of education with the task of socialization and independent life skills:

The issue of education for Roma children is not the question only related to the equal access but potential profit – the problem consists of not the lack of money for integration but our current over-costs for residential care and further total dependence of graduates on social benefits

(Human rights activists).

Compatibly with the previous model of legitimising inclusion, the framework of arguments provided by the most progressive epistemic communities prescribes the most influential role to the environment, but in terms of its negative impact on child development and the intention to view societal driving forces as a comprehensive explanation:

Not some anthropological specific traits but outrageous poverty explains us why does Roma child not differentiate circle from square

(Human Rights activist).

Inclining to societal driving forces as totally negative, adherers of total inclusion as an institution of social integration pay more attention to professionals than children and parents who remains the recipients:

> *We do not need any special efforts from our side to involve parents into process like in Norway: teachers should establish special contact hours and apply not too complicated activities…*
>
> (the manager of NGO).

If the previous model appealed to authorities which should run the process of funding inclusion, the ideologists of institutional reform define a school principle as key agent of changes: "*If school principales remain those who do not intend changing the vision of education what could we expect from others*?" (researcher). Civil society activists consider that authorities are obliged to encourage those principles who advance inclusion, even it is not still well spread in the relations between central and local levels of educational management: "*The principal who operates according to marketing rules could get more support than the principal who has a know-how and tries to become an agent of changes. Neither local authorities nor mass media would encourage such things… "* (NGO activist).

In this model, the argument in favour of *output*-legitimation links the role of inclusive school and the task to teach children new competencies more important for contemporary social life than the current standards regulating the Czech mainstream education.

INCLUSION AS A NEW IDEOLOGICAL PLATFORM

The officials, representatives of Departments and Ministries, derived from the inclusive education the frames for a new ideology of education aimed at transforming the relationships between different levels of educational system: central departments, local authorities, and schools. How do schools provide the equal access for everyone has become the central issue of the new approach towards systematic monitoring under the schools: "*From the very beginning it is important to know how many children with SEN are in school, and it is the point*" (specialist of school inspection panel)

Compatibly with previously discussed models of legitimising inclusion, this model does not pay attention to gatekeeping in terms of procedures, which regulate the diversity of educational trajectories and the access to them. The main concern related to the testing system was connected with the urgent need to revise the academic grounds of operating approach: "*We are required to introduce other theoretical framework for testing which would be able to measure not a child's abilities but his/her needs*" (specialist of Ministry of education). The

focus on the theoretical grounds disposed participants to explain main issues of inclusive education by the shortcomings of teachers' knowledge: "*Our pedagogical faculties are like from another planet, they just are not able to train teachers for implementing such task as inclusion*" (specialist of regional department of education).

In many utterances, the needs of children were opposed to the capacities of environment: "*compatible with families, schools face away from these children (Roma – V.S., K.P.), even schools are the first among those who should compensate the gaps of environment*" (specialist of regional Department of education). The lack of consensus among main actors, schools and families, regarding the indices of high-quality education was viewed as a main consequence of existing insensitivity of local authorities to the opinion of the actors within schools: "*The quality of education mentions different: for children it is enough options for having good time, for parents it is the output of their investments in the child's education, and for teachers – the external assessment of schools from various panels*" (specialist of the Ministry of education).

Thus, the role of central authorities is led to the task to translate the relevant approach to measuring the quality of education: "We should coincide the efforts of schools and the outcomes of students" (specialist of the Ministry of education). If previously discussed models of legitimizing inclusion focused on various types of outputs expected from the inclusion, this model had highlighted main conditions for bringing them into action: the revision of the theoretical grounds for testing and monitoring under the supervision of central authorities.

CONCLUSIONS

The inclusive education calls for coherent legitimising: input legitimation provides the participation and informal networking, throughput legitimation ensures the fair gatekeeping procedures, and output legitimation poses new standards. Pluralizing the approaches to disability, childhood and education towards more complex notion correlates with transforming the functions of actors participating in educational policy primarily key epistemic communities: scholars, managers and pedagogues. The previous mission of epistemic communities, to work out the theoretical platform for the state policy, has been replaced by advancing academic autonomy as an indispensable condition for transparent contesting procedures around implementing the rights of disabled children. Compatibly with other spheres of public life in the contemporary EU social policy, inclusive education runs into problems with the

comprehensive strategy towards its legitimizing, and the case of the Czech Rep. provides more detailed picture of current shortcomings.

Our survey has evidenced the variety of models for legitimising inclusive education among the Czech epistemic communities: practitioners, academics, and officials. The task to map the current field of public policy around inclusive education was beyond our ambitions, but the models, which we have constructed, incline us to think that the array of contemporary actors is distinguished by mutual contesting as well as common lack of the practices towards redefining their approaches.

Despite obvious differences in recognizing main conditions for sustainable development of inclusive education, actors have coincided in their arguments in favour of inclusive education because of its usability, which they attributed to output legitimation based upon the positive outcomes of practicing inclusive education as ultimately more efficient and fashion version of education. The predominance of output legitimation closely connects with the consensual intention to transform the space of school not to reconstruct the whole framework of educational system. The systematic lack regarding other types of legitimation blocks recognizing the main targets of reforms which are demanded for disseminating inclusive practices, prescribes over-meaning to organising the process of teaching but neglects the issue of other procedures e.g. of making decision, involving parents, providing the options for children to be heard, etc.

Summary

In terms of methodological approaches, this book puts together eugenic studies and the segregation of Roma in order to indicate the new approaches to exploring the impact of the past on the current policies and routine practices in postsocialist world. It is possible to differentiate two camps of social scientists who practice historical method for reinforcing their attitudes towards the segregation of the Roma. In terms of retrospective analysis, both camps focus on the socialist period as a source of current issues regarding Roma, their discrimination and the intractability of practices. The main difference between these camps is the way of explaining the issue of segregation. Performed by applied scientists who study the strategies for well-balanced co-existence of the Czech and Roma, the first camp of scholars reproduces various essentialist concepts regarding Roma – putting forward the insuperable difference between the "white" majority and Roma as a call for more tolerant attitude. Utilising transhistorical disclosure of "traditional" values, the other camp leads the sources of segregation to the inappropriate discourses disseminated amongst public as well as professionals. Catching others in the act of producing essentialist notion, these scholars often criticise the first camp but remain unable to construct the sustainable alternative to segregation. While the critical response to the first camp connects it with the previous practices and policies of segregation, the critical deconstruction of postsocialist transhistorism ensures the necessity of deeper contextualization in order to recognise options for sustainable integration.

In the 1970s, the majority of constructivist theories recruited historicity in order to manufacture phenomena as constituted by the past but recent past – in contrast to taken-for granted suggestions about the role of women, disability, childhood, sexuality, ethnos as generated by the long history of human wisdom. Consistently prescribing the origin of common sense notions to modernity, scholars like Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Erika Burman and many others redefined the attitudes and norms towards disclosing the connection between stigmatisation and thinking in pseudo-historical categories. The search of arguments against biologism and essentialism directly stipulated the reinforcement of historical approach in the second-wave feminism (Blencowe 2011). However, historicising the production of common sense in order to criticise it, this cohort of scholars could not avoid the consuming *fewer of history*, the point introduced by Nitzsche in his essay On the "Use and Abuse of History for Life" (*Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben, 1874*), who

led the role of history to the manipulation by humans in order to command various models of imitations against authentic life. Precisely, this Nitzschien metaphor gained widespread later within the systematic critique of historicism regarding uncrossable opposition between the history of local objects reach of details but weak of ideas and the history of events full of deep meanings but fully discursive (Honkanen 2005). In line with the revised historical approach, sex/gender schema has started to be criticised due to its obvious dichotomy (Blencowe 2011: 19).

Mainly, the crisis of historicising social issues is reported as the twoness made up of overdescriptiveness on one side and overgeneralization on the other. Prioritising the role of material objects, historicism inevitably misses the systematic analysis of gathered data and remains empirical due to particular localisation of derived knowledge. Constructing the concept of events, transhistoral approach over-amplifies theoretical frameworks loosing particular contexts. Both antagonists and devotees of historical method desire themselves achieving the balance between specification and theorization, contextualization and empathetic reflection – either applying transhistorical constructions or immersing in the past. Nevertheless, theoretically informed historiography directly depends on the empathy establishing connections of the scholar to the subject of studies (LaCapra 2004: 503).

The boom of constructivist approach had come by the historical sciences in socialist countries due to the predominance of dialectical materialism leading the task to explore the past to the determination of political regime by macroeconomic factors. Being as much as possible distant from the point of no return for applying the Marxism-Leninism vision, the material history become only one available alternative to avoid over-ideologised methodology. Studying social issues in terms of retrospective contexts was not a priority because of the general view on socialism as a social order producing equality and excluding any chance for discrimination. Mostly, segregation presented as a fetish of dark past and the evidence for better life in socialism. For instance, labelling the interwar policy against Roma in Czechoslovakia as discriminative operated in favour of propaganda and stressed much more positive conditions for Roma in socialist state. Remarkably, that after 1989 very compatible cliché applied for exploring the socialist policy around Roma as totally discriminative and prescribing the responsibility of current issues to the previous stage and its consequences. Negating the past blocks recognising the path dependence, which would be indicated within understanding the continuities between socialist and previous stages. But this option was extremely limited because of rapid dissemination of transhistorical approach after the Velvet revolution

Gaining the access to Western theories, postsocialist scientists were seduced by transhistorical approach easily coinciding with other constructivist approach to history, Marxism-Leninism. Mainly, the critical analysis aims to disclose discourses – even the historical contexts, institutional frames and procedures remain unknown and disconnected with the discourse-analysis. Criticising contemporary segregative practices, many scholars simply transfer the frames created for the critical deconstruction of Western history of ideas to the postsocialist contexts. The critical analysis of biopolitics, pre-sociological theories, essentialism equalises the (post)socialist contexts with their Western counterparts. Labelling the socialist ideas as backward, such critique offers new approaches but out of the historical contexts different for the socialist countries. Forfeiting previous attitudes as inappropriate due to their discriminative risks, those who would share the anti-discriminative rhetoric remain limited in the sustainable evolvement of alternatives. Because of decontextualisation of socialist background, recognising discriminative approaches remains limited by general evaluation beyond understanding the particular contexts and background. Understanding segregation in terms of backward practices common for different regions, postsocialist scholars fall in postcolonial attitudes – thinking about the alternatives in terms of progressive measures opposing to regressive socialist past. Missing the array of interconnected contexts, such scholars reproduce the colonial discourses combining them with quite neutral contemporary theories in order to achieve the relevance to current "fashion" of social ideas. Such experiences note the specific risks of applying transhistorical approach to postsocialist public life and social science: the artificial separation of socialist period from the previous times concentrates on the discreteness and misses continuities. The case of eugenics brings the issue of juxtaposing both elements of timeline to a head of methodological approach due to the obvious but hardly described impact of the past on the contemporaries. Fixing in the practices and ideological platforms of various epistemic communities, the history of eugenics provokes them not only identify the mutual determination of professionalising their practices, institutionalising segregation and theorising common sense, but discerns limits for developing integrative strategies.

There is no paradox of more emphatic demands to historicism from its critics – who accept the necessity of exploring backgrounds but on the assumption of getting the thick description especially in the case of such ambiguous issues as the segregation of the Roma or disabled people. While the history of segregation is full of misconceptions (e.g. regarding the decisive role of socialist period in fixing discrimination against the Roma and disabled) and still uncrossed gaps (e.g. interlinks between the interwar time and further periods), the task

to obtain capable standpoint on the role of the past expects equipping such investigations by the concepts derived from contemporary social sciences. But is it acceptable in terms of the historical plausibility – to recognise the impact of practices and policies belonging to the past on contemporary approaches?

Eugenics studies demand the recognition of proto-eugenics era and the thought-kernels evolving into eugenic movement. Contemporary Western scholarship of the history of eugenics links its development with various moral and religious campaigns to revitalise the nation, as illustrated, for example, by the *Medizinische Polizey, a popular treatise in German-speaking countries during the Enlightenment* (Labisch 1992)*; the movement against national degeneration in Great Britain* (Young 1980)*; the social marketing of charity in the USA based upon the idea of prevention against social diseases* (Ordover 2003). In CEE countries, the timeline of eugenics studies should take into account the history of iterated attaining and loosing of sovereignty over the 20th century. The late imperial period became the era of proto-eugenics when nationalist movements claimed the role of their own language, culture and history as prerequisites for demanding independence and sovereignty. The specific or even unique mode of life was also posed as the element of building nation as well as the attempts to recognise the markers of nations becoming more consistent during and after the WWI. The proto-eugenics phase due to the history of confrontation between Austria-Hungarian Empire and its enclaves gains increasing significance in recognising the specific trajectory of eugenics in CEE countries. The process of emancipating from Austria-Hungarian Empire required arguments against the interest of empire, and eugenics started to serve the task to argue inappropriateness of imperial approach in terms of national specifics. The first chapter follows the step-by-step coinciding of eugenic ideas and the movement in favour of building the nation.

The interwar period prescribed eugenics the decisive role in the debates around boarders and nations. It is reasonable to talk about very specific function of eugenics during the interwar period when precisely eugenicists converted the ideas produced in late imperial period within building nation movements into the platform of social policy. Participating in forming the national identity, early eugenics substantiated the special mission of those who should take the core responsibility of the health of the nation: future generations and actors empowered to raise them, primarily educators, mothers and helping professionals who cared about the biggest treasure of the nation, children. Eugenics legitimised the policy of the state ready to ensure the needs of citizens in trade of their readiness to alienate their own autonomy in the name of the nation. The second chapter aims to explore the two-side eugenic approach juxtaposing

selective and assimilative wings onto the coherent scale for substantiating the discriminative approach to deviant, disabled and Roma children.

During the socialist period previously established practices and eugenic ideas (in terms of the health of the nation) continued affecting public life and professionals while such influence remained latent and unknown because of the ban on genetics in the USSR and the choice of vulgar Lamarckism. Laying on common sense, eugenic discourse should be extremely attractive for socialist authorities in shaping public opinion about unfit groups (poor, Roma, homosexuals, etc…) and inclining citizens to behavioural patterns according to state's interests (especially in such realms as marriage, parenting, labour hygiene). Undoubtedly, authorities recruited eugenic discourse in their public campaigns, while the historical analysis of such *needs talk* (in terms of Nancy Fraser) especially regarding CEE countries is not yet advanced. Taking into account the influence of eugenic discourse during the socialist period would implement two interrelated tasks: to indicate the continuity with previous periods (e.g. in the Czech case interwar and Protectorate) and to circumstantiate the application of eugenic discourse during the socialist period. That historical interval remains not enough discrete in terms of recognising the changes in institutional approaches and ideas related to the practices of segregation, while précising the link between eugenics and the socialist policy deepens understanding the current intractability of segregative practices and policies. Obviously, socialist authorities applied eugenic discouse for deligitimising particular social groups marking them as degenerates, for forming the image of disabled and Roma people and recruiting people into new patterns of social policy as well. Permeating the socialist period by recognizing the reproduction of eugenic discourse in various realms assists to build the history of segregation into wider contexts. Two chapters, dedicated to the first after-war decades and the history of education for Roma, investigate reproducing eugenic discourse by socialist authorities and professionals in favour of solving various issues.

Establishing timeline in order to measure the history of eugenics in terms of modernity – when did the concept compatible with contemporary ideas start to operate and how was it evolved, scholars emancipate themselves "from a dependency on universalising abstractions" (Hesford, Diedrich 2014: 105) and expand that self-reflective intellectual history which focuses not only on meanings "but possibilities and limits of meaning" (LaCapra 2004: 502). Introducing such categories as experience and empathy to its methodological framework, such way of historical thinking localises multiple contexts regarding the trend to globalise the social issues. Aiming to make social reality transparent – for those who need to interpret it, the histories of trauma and

difference produce narrative devices – historicising current social issues and speaking on behalf of a marginalized past (Hesford, Diedrich 2014: 107). Both, the history of trauma and history of difference empower those who practice the empathic search of the evidences of experience to reflect historical echoes – incomplete reproductions of the past ideas and practices in order to replace them with the comprehensive narrative based upon thick description.

In contemporary segregation of the Roma and disabled, the eugenic echo has become hearable – however, the task to study the segregation of the Roma and disabled people challenges in two interrelated ways: through high politisation seducing by simplification and enormous number of gaps in data limiting the recognition of the past and current status of the issue. Both challenges make the studies of segregation very sensitive to theorising its sources and the strategies of coping with it. The last chapter puts forward the issue of pseudo-diversity of approaches presenting amongst key stakeholders of the policy towards integration – the reform of inclusive education. We demonstrate how do various epistemic communities reproduce pre-sociological attitudes and connect inclusion with more understandable utilitarian approach missing any chance for reflexivity and redefinition of educational aims. Revising the past remains the indispensable prerequisite for setting such process.

Thus, the core task is to juxtapose two methodological lenses, transhistorism induing with theoretical frames and historicism providing the thick definition. In many surveys either historical or social, such convergence happens of its own accord (LaCapra 2004). In fact, in simple gathering and handling historical data which usually pretends to be purely historical it is possible to recognise the attitude to driving forces, discourses of procedures or the affiliation with particular paradigms. In spite of aspirations to transfer theoretical frames from one spatial and temporal realm to another, transhistorical studies remain within their particular geographical and historical frontiers. The "disautomatisation" of juxtaposing thranshistorical and historical frames seems not only useful exercise for the scholars' reflexivity but the essential practice for crystallising historical recognition "against a formalistic, free-floating history of ideas and simultaneously against a reductionist, overly contextualizing … sociocultural history as well as an indiscriminate, methodological populism " (ibid: 512).

Augmenting eugenics studies falls in expanded crisis of historical method, and it impacts the scholars in a twofold way. On the one hand, compatibly with other areas, eugenics studies stand in need of revising methodological frames due to the diversity of contexts in which eugenics is tend to be built. On the other hand, more often the "strange case" of eugenics is viewed according

to its unique opportunities to integrate approaches which recently were posed as hard to compliant or even more mutually conflicting: discourse- and institutional analysis, Human rights and anthropology, or transhistorical schemes and thick description. Eugenic studies have already developed the wide range of nuanced narrative devices – open for further refinement within their juxtaposition on the issue of the segregation against the Roma and disabled for instance in the Czech lands.

Literature

SOURCES FROM ARCHIVES

Budou žít s námi, nebo vedle nás (21. 11. 1966). Radio Praha broadcast, the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Co chcete vědět (2. 11. 1966). Radio Bratislava 1 broadcast, the source HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Česká zemská péče o mládež *Internáty pří okresních pomocných školách Ministerstvo sociální péče v Praze X-1009-17/1.17.* 5. 3. 1947, Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Hovoří redaktorka Ota Plavková 16. 6.1966, Radio Bratislava 1, the source HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Kača, J. (1963). Velcí žáci z nižších tříd *Osvětová práce 12*, the source HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Každý cigán nie je cigán (1966). *Ľud* 29. 10, the source HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Lipa, J. (1966) O výchově cikánů *Osvětová práce.* 21. 12. 1966, the source HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Ministerstvo financí *č.j. 744/47 – I/2* (21. 2 1947). Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13

Ministerstvo sociální péče *Ústav ZUPM Zemskému ústředí péče o mládež v Čechách C –II-1122-7/5-47*. 15. 5. 1947, Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13

Ministerstvo sociální péče (25. 6 1947). *Ústav ZÚPM v Čechách ve Veleslavíně Zemskému ústředí péče o mládež v Čechách v Praze III C-II-1123-19 /6-47*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo školství a osvěty. *Ústavy pro slepé: požadavky slepců číslo 39.061/47.* Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo školství a osvěty, *Ústavy pro slepé; požadavky slepců číslo 39.061/47.* Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministersvo školství, informaci a osvěta. *Slepecké písmo a některé údaje o slepeckých školách v ČSR, 83 544 1954.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo školství a osvěty (18. 9. 1945). *Krč Městská mateřská škola, žádost o další užívání propůjčené budovy čp. 92 v Krči pro mateřskou školu, A-80.829/45-I/3. k č.17024-VI-45, 22. 8. 1945.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvu školství, věd a umění *Dopis od Ministerstva sociální péče, C-II/4- 1312- 24/12-48.* 24. 12. 1948, Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo sociální péče *Ústav ZUPM Zemskému ústředí péče o mládež v Čechách C –II-1122-7/5-47.* 15. 5 1947, Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo zdravotnictví (15. 10. 1946). *Zřízení ústavu pro epileptické dětí Praha Veleslavín, IIa/3-7400/46.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo sociální péče (11. 4. 1949). *Ústavy pro hluchoněmé diferenciace v Praze, CII-1312-11/4-49*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo sociální péče (1950). *Diferenciace ústavů pro hluchoněmé a slepé. Dopis Ministerstvu školství, věd a umění. Ministerstvu zdravotnictví, Praha*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo spravedelnosti v Praze (1956). *Nedostatek dětských asylových ústavů, 3107/56 HSOS/2 1956 Dopis Ministerstvu školství k rukám I.nám.mín.B.Muchy.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo spravedlnosti (1956). *Dětské asylové ústavy nedostatek, 39 027 /56.* Praha Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí (1954). *133827/54/GL210.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo zdravotnictví (30. 12. 1946). *Zpráva Praha-Veleslavín ústav pro epileptické dětí, IIa/3 – 10742/1946*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvu zdravotnictví (31. 5. 1946). *Žádost o podporu na znovuzřízení budovy a zařízení budovy a zařízení sociálního ústavu pro děti úchylné v Ml.Boleslavi, poškozené bombardováním německými letci 9. 5. 1945, odd. II/3*. Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvu zdravotnictví V Mladé Boleslaví dne (1. 3. 1947). *Věc: Ml. Boleslav, sociální ústav pro úchylné děti podpora v r.1946 vyúčtování, 45/4/46.* Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo zdravotnictví (1945). *Na uvolnění částky 1 500 000 K na individuální péči o děti v r. 1945, II/1-128*. Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvu zdravotnictví (28. 1 1949). *Dopis rodičovskému sdružení při pomocné škole v Plzní*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Ministerstvo zdravotnictví (26. 2. 1951). *Ústřední jednota invalidů sociálně politický odbor 071/51.Z.t ústavní střediska a asyly pro osoby stižení Morbus Little*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Motyčková, R. (19. 4. 1962). Převychová cikánské mládeži postupuje velmi pomalu. Trutnov. *Tvorba č. 16*, The source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Navrh vlastního usnesení o převýchově cikánských dětí a dorostu. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13, Reedukace cikánských dětí.

Negramotnost a polgramotnost nemizne ale narastá. (17. 9. 1963). The source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Obor pro ochranu duševně nebo mravně úchylných pří OPM v Plzní. *Zpráva o činnosti v roce 1945.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Odbor pro ochranu duševně úchylných při okresní péči o mládež v Plzni (1947). *Žádost o podporu na zdravotní zařízení a léčebnou péči Ministerstvu zdravotnictví J.M 146 Pl/ 1-11-VI.1947.* 21. 6, Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Okresní péče o mládež v Plzní, Odbor pro ochranu duševně neb mravně úchylných krajské odborové radě v Plzní (5. 3 1947). *Zřízení záchranného útulku č. 28 V Plzní.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Organizační řad škol pro cikánské děti *Reedukace cikánských dětí č. 45/ 217/ 1955.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Pozvání k první řádné ustavující schůzi Komise ÚMPM. (29. 9. 1948). In *Zápisy o schůzích komise ústřední městské péči o mládež v Brně za rok 1948–49*. Archiv města Brna.

Převýchova cikánských dětí: *Reedukace cikánských dětí A 191.560/1947* (1947). The source: Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Problémy cikánských kojenců a děti podle posudku lékaře (1961). *Literarní noviny 22,* 29, the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Rodičovské sdružení při pomocné škole v Plzni. 5. května V Plzní (10. 10. 1945) Národní archiv, MŠK SIG.

Regierung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. Ministerium für Volksbildung. Gesamtdeutsche internationale Beziehungen (2007). Gee/Pe 19. 9.1957. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Směrnice ministerstva školství ČSR (14. 7. 1971). č.j. 20632/69-I/2 O Výchově a vzdělavání výchovně zanedbaných a prospechově opožděných cikánských dětí.

Sojka, J. (1966) Problém nejen populační *Vlasta 19, 9,* the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Školení a výchova cikánských dětí (1946). *Reedukace cikánských dětí A 261.198/46,* the source: Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Školení a výchova cikánských dětí (1948). *Reedukace cikánských dětí 48 037/48,* the source: Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Špiner, J. (23. 7. 1966). Negramotnost na postupe. Dokedy? *Pravda*, the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Spolek pro vybudování a vydržování sociálního ústavu pro úchylné dětí v Mladé Boleslavi č.j. 18 45 v Mladé Boleslavi (2. 7.1945). *Věc: žádost o podporu na znovuzřízení budovy a zařízení sociálního ústavu pro děti úchylné v Ml. Boleslavi poškozené bombardováním německými letci 9. 5. 1945* Národní archiv MŠK SIG. 13.

The settlements of Gypsies as medium for communist propaganda (1954). The source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box180.

Učební osnovy škol pro děti cikánské výnos ministerstva 65 798 /54A I/5 (27. 8. 1954). The source: Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13, Reedukace cikánských dětí

Úřad předsednictva vlády (15. 11. 1951). *Usnesení vládní dislokační komise z Ustav hluchoněmých v Hradci Králové č.j. 205.489/51 17. 11. 1951. Ministerstvo zdravotnictví k rukám ref. Jíši.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG.

Výmolův ústav pro hluchoněmé děti v Praze XVI.-Radlicích (22. 5. 1950). *Námitky proti předání Výmolova ústavu do kompetence Ministerstva zdravotnictví* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

V zrkadle krajských údajov. Broadcast (21. 10. 1965). The source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Zaražení potulných cikánů do pracovních osad a převychova a přeškolení jejich dorostu a dětí (1947). *Reedukace cikánských dětí, A.60754.47,* the source: Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Zeman, O. Ještě o cikánské otázce (1962). *Kulturní práce* č, 7, the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

Zemské ustředí péče o mládež v Čechách (1947). č.j. 534/1 – 23/1.47. Dopis Ministerstvu zdravotnictví *Věc: Porada o zřízení ústavu pro matky a děti*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Zemský národní výbor v Brně. (6. 2. 1946). *Věc: Zemská léčebna pro duševně a nervově chore v Jihlavě a zemský chorobinec v Jihlavě č.j. 6004-V/18/1946.* Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Zemský národní výbor. (4. 11. 1948). *Zemská péče o mládež v Brně číslo jednání 17430/48 S.D. V Brně.* Archiv města Brna.

Zemská ústřední péče o mládež v Čechách. (7. 2. 1946). *Výchovné ústavy Zemského ustředí péče o mládež pro mravné narušenou mládež. Praha Jedn. zn. 527-Vš-S-8. II.46*. Národní archiv, MŠK SIG. 13.

Znovu o problému cikánského obyvatelstva (1962). *KSČ a státní zřízení.* 242–243, the source: HU OSA 300-30-3 box 37a.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES FROM THE JOURNALS OF THE PAST

Bonmariage, M. (1888). O lékařském ošetřování a výživě dítek škol mateřských a obecných *Pěstoun* 7: 57–61.

Blobil, J. (1930). Specializování ústavů pro úchylnou mládež *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 98–99.

Brožek, A. (1922). *Zušlechtění lidstva* Praha: Topič.

Čáda, F. (1902). *Hodnota psychologie*, ČM.

Čebuský, F (1857). Jak by si měl učitel počínati, když mu dětí školu špatně navštěvují – a jak by tuto nedbalost sám svým příčiněnim mohl odstraniti? *Škola a život* sešit VI: 136–138.

Cenek, J. (1924). Výchovná města Brna ve Valticích *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1*: 26–32, *sešit 2*: 61–66.

Červinková-Riegrová, M. (1887). *Ochrana chudé a opuštěné mládeže: rozhledy po lidumilství v Evropě*. Praha: spolek Ochrana opuštěných a zanedbaných dívek v komissi universitního knihkupectví Bursíka a Kohouta.

Chlup, O. (1935). K otázce mravních úchylek mládeže. *Úchylná mládež***,** *sešit 1*: 20–24.

Cikánské obyvatelstvo podle výsledku sčítání lidu, bytů a domů (1970). *Zprávy a rozbory FSÚ 1973, 25.*

Další slovo o opatrovnách (1857). *Škola a život, sešit 6*: 133–136.

Dějiny gymnasia v Čechách (1887). *Škola a život, sešit 4*: 7–9.

Dubec, J. Sdružení rodičů a přátel školy pří zvlaštních školách. (1950). *Nápravná pedagogika, leden 1950, ročník XXVI*: 189–191.

Dvě úvahy o vzdělávacích prostředích národního učitelství (1862). *Škola a život, sešit 6*: 207–209.

Fenelon, F. (1887). O výchově dívek. *Škola a život, sešit 8*: 198–200, 244–248.

Gaňo V. (1960). Selekcia defektivných deti. *Otázky defektologie ročník 2*, 4: 107–111.

Holub, O. (1933). První cikánské dětí dívčí výchovně české zemské komisi o péči pro mládež v Jilemnici *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 44–46.
Jaký jest posavadní stav národního školství našeho? (1856). *Škola a život, sešit 5*: 262–265.
Jak až posud měří a provádí se rovnoprávnost na gymnasiích a reálkách v Čechách a na Moravě (1862). *Škola a život, sešit 2*: 4–6.
Jak by učitel i mimo školy mohl a měl na dobré mravy mládeži působiti? (1856). *Škola a život, sešit 5.*
Janišová, D. (1985) K problematice úspěšného zaškoleni cikánských děti. *Otázky defektologie 7*: 249–254.
Janouch, F. (1951). Lidově demokratické zřízení spolehlivá základná péče o zdraví lidu. *Časopis českých lékařů 8*: 225–227.
Jelínek, J. (1888). Je li třebá poučovatí se o vychovování dítek. *Pestoun 4, 6:* 81–85.
Janeček, J. (1927). Zločinnost mladistvých ve světě statistiky. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 75–77.
Jeneček, J. (1929). Mladiství zločincí a jejich převýchová. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 31–52.
Kára, K. a kol. (1975). *Ke společenské problematice cikánů v ČSSR*. ÚFX ČSAV vnitřní tisk.
Kedrutek, F. (1930). Psychologie trestanců. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1*: 33–38.
Křemenová, J., Reisenaure, R., Svobodvá, H. (1962). Příspěvek ke studiu souvislosti výskytu endemických degenerací s prospěchem a školní docházkou u mládeže v Čechách a na Moravě. *Časopis českých lékařů, třetí část, 37:* 1110–1113.
Křízenský, J. (1917). *Ochrana mládeže a eugenika* Praha: J. Otto.
Kříž, F. (1929). Národohospodářský význam péče o úchylnou mládež. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 7–10.
Krotilová, J. (1944). O příčinách zločinnosti ženské mládeže a jejich odstranění. *Paedologické rozhledy ročník II*: 148–151.
Lebedová, A. (1951). Boj s přežitky buržoasní psychologie a pedagogiky v naší škole. *Pedagogika 1–2:* 22–44.
Matić, M. (1967–1968). Čo zanechal Villiam Gaňo jako dedičstvo pedagógom špeciálnych škôl. *Otázky defektologie 9*: 321–324.
Malá, H., Hajnišová, M. (1984). Příspěvek ke sledování tělesného vývoje cikánských novorozenců okresu Kladno a Chomutov. *Otázky defektologie*: 297–300.
Malá, H. (1984). *Výchova, vzdělání a biologický vývoj cikánských dětí a mládeže v ČSR*. Praha: UK.
Malá, H. (1985). Význam některých poznatků z vývojové antropologie cikánské etnické skupiny a jejich uplatnění ve výchovně vzdělávací práci učitelů a vychovatelů. *Otázky defektologie 3*: 93–97.
Meisner, J. (1934). *Rasismus hrozí kultuře.* Praha: Nakladatelství Volné myšlenky.
Meisner, J. (1939). Mravné vadné dítě s hlediska eugenického. *Úchylná mládež 9–10:* 169–197.

Melkusová, H. (1948). „Marianum“ v Opavě (Reportáž s návštěvy léčebního a ošetřovacího ústavu. *Paedologické rozhledy.* 4: 13–15.
Mertin, V. (1986a). Příspěvek k problematice vyrovnávacích a specializovaných tříd. *Otázky defektologie 3:* 87–97.
Mertin, V. (1986b). Příspěvek k problematice vyrovnávacích a specializovaných tříd. *Otázky defektologie 4.*: 127–132.
Multrus, V. (1933). Spolupráce pomocných škol se sociálně zdravotními institucemi. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1:* 5–8.
Myšlenky o vyučování a vyhovování divek (1861). *Škola a život, sešit 6*: 16, 182–186.
Návrh, jak by pilná návštěva školních dítek snadně se docílila (1857). *Škola a život, Sešit 7:* 242–244.
Neblahé ovoce z potlačování české národnosti (1862). *Škola a život, sešit 1*: 4–9.
Oč se vlastně vedou ty nové hádky ve vychovatelství a školství našem (1860). *Škola a život, sešit 5*: 13, 146–148.
O patronáte školském (1862). *Škola a život, sešit 6*: 16, 202–206.
O rolnických školách (1856). *Škola a život, sešit 3*: 12–16.
O škádlení a zlobeni dětí (1888). *Pěstoun 8*: 167
O vyhovování domácím a školním (1885). *Škola a život,* sešit 6: 209–211
Pavel, J. (1857). Jaká jest úloha národního učitelství. *Škola a život* sešit 7: 7, 242–246.
Piňosová, J. (1976). Nástin historie a současný stav péče o cikánské děti v Jihlavě. *Otázky defektologie 7:* 268–278.
Přivora, M. (1951). Příspěvek k rozšíření parazitických červů u děti v Košicích. *Časopis českých lékařů 31*: 933–936.
Proč školské vyučování a vyhovování nemívá tvrdého zdaru, a jaké v tom třeba vyhledávati pomoci (1858). *Škola a život, sešit 5*: 13, 146–148.
Projev ministra zdravotnictví dr. J. Plojhara na konferenci zdravotnických pracovníků dne 6. 3. 1952. (1952). *Časopis českých lékařů 4*, 14: 409–410.
Projev ministra zdravotnictví dr. J. Plojhara v Národním shromáždění dne 28. 3. 1952 při projednávání vládního návrhu zákona o hygienické a protiepidemické péči (1952). *Časopis českých lékařů 15*: 441.
Projev ministra zdravotnictví Dr. J. Plohara na zdravotnické konferenci dne 7. 1. 1953 o zdravotnickém dokumentu (1953). *Časopis českých lékařů 4*: 89–94.
Pučelík, T. (1947). Sociální péče o hluchoněmé v Čechách a na Moravě *Paedologické rozhledy*, 3: 273–283.
Reisenaure, R., Křemenová, J., Svobodvá, H. (1962). Příspěvek ke studiu souvislosti výskytu endemických degenerací s prospěchem a školní docházkou u mládeže v Čechách a na Moravě. *Časopis českých lékařů, první část, 28:* 864–869.
Růžička, S. (1926). *Eubiotika.* Bratislava: Academia.
Řadění loupežných cikánů v jižních Čechách (1927). *Lidové noviny 5*: 1.
Šafr, Z. (1960). Několik poznámek k práci v cikánské třidě. *Otázky defektologie 2*: 54–56.
Škola v poměru k rodině, obci a církvi (1855). *Škola a život, sešit 2.*

Schneider, J. (1925). Mravné vadní. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 2*: 85–90, *sešit 3*: 127–134.
Schneider, J. (1930). Péče o dítě ze škol pomocných. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 9–10*: 221–225.
Šima, J. (1934). *Výchova a sociální eubiotika*: *Črta z užité sociologie výchovy.* Praha: Kapper.
Sjednocení zdravotnictví Ministr zdravotnictví Dr. b.c. J. Plojhar (1951). *Časopis českých lékařů 50:* 1477–1479.
Sonka, J. (1938). Dědičné choroby a sterilizace. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 2*: 101.
Sovak, J. (1975). Perspektivy speciálního školství. *Otázky defektologie 10*.
Souček, J., Doležal, J. (1953). Příspěvek k problému výběru děti do zvláštní školy. P*edagogika 5*: 284–296.
Štampach, F. (1933). *Dítě nad propastí. Dítě toulavé, tulácké a cikánské , jeho záchrana, výchova a výučba.* Plzeň: Nakladatelství Marie Lábkové.
Štampach, F. (1944). Rodičovská sdružení jako nástroj sociálně zdravotní péče o mládež *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1*, 20: 181–186. Additional evidences could be derived from the records of schools.
Stejskal, K. (1925). Kam s nimi? Přednáška, konaná při výročné valní schůzi spolku pro péci o slabomyslné v Čsl. rep. *Úchylná mládež*, *Sešit 4*, 1: 11, 154–159.
Štěpán, J. (1976). O lateralitě mentální retardovaných žáků cikánského původu. *Otázky defektologie 8*: 316–320.
Štěpán, J. (1975). K jazykové situaci mentálně retardovaných Romů (Cikánů). *Otázky defektologie 4*: 145–153.
Štěpán, J. (1976). Perspektivy sociálního školství (diskuse). *Otázky defektologie 2*: 48.
Štěpán, J. (1982). Sojuz rodičů a přátel školy (SRPŠ) a výchova cikánských dětí. *Otázky defektologie 3*.
Štipek, J. (1988). K charakteristice cikánské částí části obtížně vychovatelné mládeži *Otázky defektologie 6*: 260–263.
Teplý, J. (1960). Pojetí a rozvoj škol pro mládež vyžadující zvlaštní péče (Z jednání v kolegiu ministra školství a kultury). *Otázky defektologie 1,* 3: 7–10.
Tůma, A. (1920). *Zařízení sociální a výchovná péče o mládež duševně vadnou, zvláště slabomyslnou*. Třebon: Česká zemská komise pro péči o mládež.
Vávrová, A. (1979). Cikánské děti na zvlaštní škole v Praze-Břevnově. *Otázky defektologie 5*.
Žáková, H. (1983). Zařazování cikánských děti do zvláštních škol – vliv těchto škol na sociální adaptaci (Zkušenosti ze Severočeského kraje). *Otázky defektologie 10:* 10
Zákoucký, K. (1889a). Zkažený. *Pěstoun 6*: 129.
Zákoucký, K. (1889b). Pasák. *Pěstoun 7*: 148.
Zákoucký, K. (1889c). Tulák. *Pěstoun 8:* 102
Zámečník, F. (1872a). O naturelu čili psychické člověka přirozenosti. *Škola a život, sešit 8*: 123, 232–239.
Zámečník, F. (1872b). O naturelu čili psychické člověka přirozenosti. *Škola a život, sešit 9*: 271–275.

Zámečník, F. (1872c). O naturelu čili psychické člověka přirozenosti. *Škola a život, sešit 10*: 313–318.
Zámečník, F. (1872d). O naturelu čili psychické člověka přirozenosti. *Škola a život, sešit 11*: 440–448.
Zelenka, B. (1933). Příčiny úpadku mravního stavu a přestupnosti mládeži. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1*: 32–36.
Zikmund, A. (1935). Psychotechnická zkušebna v nápravné výchově dospívající mládeže mravně úchylné. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 1*: 69–76.
Zpráva o zemské konferenci učitelské v Opavě tykající se škol mateřských (1889). *Pěstoun 11*.

CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Andreotti, O. (2011). *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Baloutzova, S. (2011). *Social Legislation and Population Policy in Bulgaria, 1918–1944.* Hungary: Central European University Press Studies in the History of Medicine series.
Bekkers, V. (Ed.) (2007). *Governance and the Democratic Deficit: Assessing the Democratic Legitimacy*. USA: Ashgate.
Bühler-Niederberger, D. (2005). *Kindheit und die Ordnung der Verhältnisse : von der gesellschaftlichen Macht der Unschuld und dem kreativen Individuum.* München: Juventa-Verl.
Burman, E. (2006). Engendering Development: Some Methodological Perspectives on Child Labour. *Forum Qualitative Social Research. 7*, 1. Available online at http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/69/141.
Cach, J. (2000). *František Čáda a mezioborové vztahy a experimenty*. Praha: Karolinum.
Centre for reproductive rights (2003). *Romani women subject forced sterilisation in Slovakia*. Available online at http://reproductiverights.org/en/press-room/romani-women-subject-to-forced-sterilization-in-slovakia. [accessed 24 July 2013].
Čermak, J. (1931). Odchod z ústavu do života. *Úchylná mládež, sešit 3:* 226–229.
Engbring-Romang, U. (2001). Die Verfolgung der Sinti und Roma in Hessen zwischen 1870 und 1950. *Frankfurt am Main 2001:* 119 ff.
European court of Human rights (2007). *Case of D.H. and others v the Czech Rep.* Available online at http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-83256#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-83256%22]}. [accessed 24 July 2013].
Fasora, L. (2012). Mikrogeschichte Und Arbeiterkulturgeschichte. Beispiele Aus Der Neuen Tschechischen Forschung. In Hiebl, E., Langthaler, E. *Im Kleinen Das Grosse Suchen. Mikrogeschichte In Theorie Und Praxis:* 69–78. Innsbruck: Institut Fuer Geschichte Des Laendlichen Raumes.

Feinberg, M. (2006). *Elusive Equality: Gender, Citizenship, and the Limits of democracy in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1950*. USA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Fishman, S. (2002). *The Battle for Children: World War II, Youth Crime, and Juvenile Justice in Twentieth-Century France*. USA: Harvard University Press.
Folbre, N. (2009). *Greed, Lust & Gender: A History Of Economic Ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Fishman, S. (2002). *The Battle for Children: World War II, Youth Crime, and Juvenile Justice in Twentieth-Century France*. USA: Harvard University Press.
Gittins, D. (1997). *The Child in Question.* England, Palgrave: Macmillan.
Goodley, D. (2011). *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. UK: Sage.
Grue, J. (2011). Discourse analysis and disability: Some topics and issues. *Discourse & Society 22*: 5, 532–546.
Goldirova, R. (2010) Brussels cautions Slovakia over boarding schools for Roma available online at http://euobserver.com/social/29665. [accessed 24 July 2013].
Goldson, B. (1997). 'Childhood': An introduction to historical and theoretical analyses. In Scraton, P. (ed.) *'Childhood' in 'Crisis'?* London: UCL Press.
Halířová, M. (2012). *Sociální patologie a ochrana dětství v Čechách od dob osvícenství do roku 1914: disciplinace jako součást ochrany dětství*. Pardubice: Univerzita Pardubice, Fakulta filozofická.
Haus, M., Heinelt, H. (2005). How to achieve governability at the local level?. *Urban Governance and Democracy: Leadership and Community involvement*. London: Routledge.
Hendrick, H. (1997). *Children and social policies and English society, 1880-1990*. Great Britain: Cambridge university press.
Hlavačka, M. (Ed.) (2013). *České země v 19. století. Proměny společnosti v moderní době*. Praha: Historický ústav akademických věd.
Homolač, J. (2009). *Internetové diskuse o cikánech a Romech* Praha: Karolinum.
Honig, M.-S. (1999). *Entwurf einer Theorie der Kindheit*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
Hooghe, M., Stolle, D. (2003). *Generating social capital. Civil society and institutions in comparative perspective.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Informace o plnění usnesení vlády týkajících se integrace romské menšiny a aktivního postupu státní správy pří uskutečňování opatření přijatých souvisejícími usneseními vlády ke dní 31. 12. 2012. Praha (2012). Available online at http://www.romea.cz/dokumenty/romove-vlada-2012.pdf.
Kaplan, K. *Národní fronta 1948–1960. (2012).* Praha : Academia, 2012. 912 s.
Kasper, T. (Ed.) (2008). Německé *a české reformně pedagogické vzdělávací a výchovné koncepty - analýza, komparace* ČR: Liberec
Kehily, M. J. (Ed.) (2009). *An Introduction to childhood studies* England: Open university press.
James A., Jenks C., Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Kränzl-Nagl, R., Riepl, B., Wintersberger, H. (1998). *Kindheit in Gesellschaft und Politik: Eine multidisziplinäre Analyse am Beispiel Österreichs (Wohlfahrtspolitik und Sozialforschung*). Berlin: Kampus Verlag.

Křižková, M. (2006). *Média nemají paměť. Mediální konstrukce nedobrovolných sterilizací v České republice (2003–2006) II.* Available online at http://www.migraceonline.cz/cz/e-knihovna/media-nemaji-pamet-medialni-konstrukce-nedobrovolnych-sterilizaci-v-ceske-republice-2003-2006-i-ii. [accessed 24 July 2013].

Kučera, R. (Ed.) (2012). *Identity v českých zemích 19. a 20. století: Hledání a proměny*. Praha.

Labisch, A. (1992). The Social Construction of Health: From Early Modern Times to the Beginnings of the Industrialization. In Lachmund, J., Stollberg, G. (Eds)*The Social Construction of Illness. Illness and Medical Knowledge in Past and Present.* Institute für Geschichte der Medizin.

Lee, N. (2005). *Childhood and Human Value: Development, Separation and Separability*. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.

Lhotka, P. (2009). Pojem cikána v právních normách od začátku 20. století do roku 1945. In *SbFF Ostrava*: 229–246.

Lyle, L. (2009). French Perspectives on Eugenics as Seen Through Selected Writings of Georges Duhamel. *French Cultural Studies 20*, 3: 257–272.

McKeever, P., Miller, K. (2004). Mothering Children Who Have Disabilities: A Bourdieusian Interpretation of Maternal Practices. *Social Science and Medicine 6*, 59: 1177–1191.

Menchini, L., Redmond, G. (2009). Poverty and deprivation among children in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 18: 225–236.

MŠMT (2011). *Závěrečná zpráva z hodnocení dopadů regulace č. 62*. Available online: http://www.komora.cz/Files/PripominkovaniZakonu/Materialy/118_09_oduvodneni.doc.

Národné centrum zdravotnických informácií (2012). *Potraty v SR 2011.* Bratislava: Edícia Zdravotnická statistika.

Navrátil, P. (2010). How helping professionals construct the problems of Roma families: contribution of general and specific stereotypes about parenting. *The journal of social policy studies 3*, 8: 353–372.

Nečas, C. (1991). *Společenská problematika Romů v minulosti a přítomnosti*, Brno: Masaryková univerzita.

Nečas, C. (2005). *Romové na Moravě a ve Slezsku (1740–1945)* Brno: Matice moravská.

Nečasová, D. (2008). Ideologické obrazy mateřství v české poúnorové společnosti. In *Od početí ke školní brašně*. Pardubice: Východočeské muzeum v Pardubicích, 35–74.

Novák, T., Capponi, V. (1991). Náhradní rodinná výchova v zrcadle českého a slovenského tisku, *Psychológia a patopsychológia dieťaťa 26*: 473–477.

Ordover, N. (2003). *American Eugenics: Race, Queer Anatomy, and the Science of Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minessota Press.

Ovseiko, P. (2008). *The Politics of Health Care Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: the case of the Czech Republic.* D.Phil Thesis.

Pickering, D., Busse, M. (2010). Disabled Children's Services: How Do We Measure Family-Centred Care?. *Child health care 2,* 14: 2000–2007.

Promitzer, C., Trubeta, S., Turda, M. (Eds.) (2011) *Health, Hygiene and Eugenics in Southeastern Europe to 1945* Hungary: Central European University Press Studies in the History of Medicine series

Prout, A. (2005). *The future of children* Great Britain: Routledge Falmer

Průchová, P. (2008). *Integrace – inkluze, děti se speciálními potřebami do škol hlavního vzdělávacího proudu (přehledová studie z předmětu Školní a poradenská psychologie).* Praha: FF UK Available online at http://www.tarantula.ruk.cuni.cz/KKP-14-version1-petra_pruchova.doc.

Pulmann, M. (2011). *Konec experimentu: Přestavba a pád komunismu v Československu* Praha: Scriptorium.

Rákosník, J.(2007). *Sociální ústav 1920-1941 – mozkové centrum československé sociální politiky*, *In:* Svoboda, M. (sest.), *Svět historie – historiků svět: Sborník profesoru Kvačkovi*, Liberec, 295-316.

Robila, M. (2009). *Family policy in Eastern Europe: Developments and Recommendations*, the presentation for the Expert Group meeting on family policy in a changing world: Promoting social protection and intergenerational solidarity

Roßteutscher Sigrid Social capital worldwide: Potential for Democratization or Stibilizer of Authhoritarian rule? (2010). *American Behavioural Scientist 53,* 5: 737–757.

Scharpf, F. (1999). *Governing in Europe: Effective and democratic?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Shmidt, V. (2010). Taking ideas and discourses seriously: explaining change through discursive institutionalism as the fiurth new institutionalism *European Political Science Review 2,* 1: 1–25.

Shmidt, V. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. *Political Studies 1,* 61:2–22.

Shcmidt, V., Bailey, J. (2014) Institutionalisation of children in the Czech Rep: a case of path dependency. *Journal of sociology and social welfare*. 1, pp. 53-75

Sebrechts L., Jef B. (12. 1. 2012). *Families of Children with Special Needs in Flanders: Their Vulnerability within the Citizenship Paradigm.* CSB Working Paper. Available online at http://www.centrumvoorsociaalbeleid.be/sites/default/files/CSB%20Working%20Paper%2012%2011_November%202012.pdf.

Šimúnek, M. (2012) Pro et contra: debaty o zavezení tzv. eugenické sterilizace v Československu, 1933–1938. *Speciální pedagogika 3,* 22: 224–240.

Šimúnek, M. (2006). Eugenics, Social Genetics and Racial Hygiene: Plans for the Scientific Regulation of Human Heredity in the Czech Lands, 1900–1925. In Turda, M., Weindling, P. (Eds). *‚Blood and Homeland' : Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940.* Herndon, VA, USA: Central European University Press (CEU Press).

Stone, D. (2001). Race in British Eugenics. *European History Quarterly 31,* 3: 397–426.

Thomas, G., Loxley, A. (2007). *Deconstructing Special Education and Constructing Inclusion.* New York: Open University Press.
Tickly, L., Barrett, A. (2011). Education Quality for Social Justice Social Justice, Capabilities and the Quality of Education in Low Income Countries. *International Journal of Educational Development 1,* 31: 3–14.
Turda, M., Weindling, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940.* Budapest: CEU Press.
Turda, M. (2010). *Modernism and Eugenics.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Ústav pro informace ve vzdělávání (2013). *Vývojová ročenka školství v ČR.* Praha: ÚIV. Available online at http://toiler.uiv.cz/rocenka/rocenka.asp.
Ústav zdravotnických informací a statistiky ČR (2013). *Potraty 2012*. Praha.
Úvahy o vychovávání dívek zvláště městských (1858). *Škola a život, sešit 7:* 149–151.
Vanhuysse, P. (Ed.) (2009) *Post-Communist Welfare Pathways: Theorizing Social Policy Transformations in Central and Eastern Europe* Basingkstoke: Palgrave
Večerník, J. (2008). Social Policy in the Czech "Republic": The Past and the Future of Reforms. *East European Politics & Societies, 22,* 3*:* 496-517.
Veselá, R. (2005). *Rodina a rodinné právo: historie, současnost a perspektivy.* Praha: Eurolex Bohemia.
Vojtko, T. (2011). Nové město, nová generace, naděje pro společnost», aneb úsilí o vybudování osady Růžičkov v Praze-Troji (1925–1930). *Lidé města 3,* 13.
Walkerdine, V. (2009). Developmental Psychology and the Study of Childhood. In Kehily, M. J. (ed.) *Introduction to Childhood Studie:* 112–123. London: Open University Press.
Yaki, I. (Ed.) (2009). *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S.: Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees* Palgrave Macmillan
Young, T. (1980). *The eugenics movement and the eugenic idea in Britain 1900–1914: a historical study.* PhD thesis, London: LSE.
Zahra, T. (2008). *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Zeiher, H. (2008). Valuing children's temporal quality of life. In Wintersberger, H., Alanen, L., Olk, T., Qvortrup, J. (Hg.) *Childhood, Generational Order and the Welfare State: Exploring Children's Social and Economic Welfare. (Volume 1 of COST A19: Children's Welfare).* Odense: University of Southern Denmark Press.

Name Index

Subject Index

CHILD WELFARE DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES IN THE CZECH LANDS: THE SEGREGATION OF ROMA AND DISABLED CHILDREN DURING THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

Mgr. Victoria Shmidt, Ph.D.

Published by Masaryk University in 2015

1st Edition, 2015

Typeset: MSD spol. s r.o., Lidická 23, 602 00 Brno, www.msdbrno.cz

ISBN 978-80-210-7834-5 (online : pdf)

DOI: 10.5817/CZ.MUNI.M210-7834-2015

UNIVERSITAS MASARYKIANA BRUNENSIS
FACULTAS PAEDAGOGICA

muni PRESS

ISBN 978-80-210-7834-5