

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES IN URBAN SEGREGATED SPACES. THE CASE OF THE ROMANIAN GHETTOS*

Viorel MIONEL
Alexandru GAVRIȘ

Viorel MIONEL

Lecturer, Department of Tourism and Geography, Faculty
of Business and Tourism, Bucharest Academy of Economic
Studies, Bucharest, Romania,
Tel.: 021-319.19.00 / int. 202, 340
E-mail: viorel.mionel@rei.ase.ro

Alexandru GAVRIȘ

Lecturer, Department of Tourism and Geography, Faculty
of Business and Tourism, Bucharest Academy of Economic
Studies, Bucharest, Romania
E-mail: alexandru.gavris@rei.ase.ro

* **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank anonymous reviewers for the invaluable comments and to Adele Youmans for her support to improve the quality of this text.

Abstract

The administrative policies of urban segregated spaces remain an unsolved issue in many of Central and Eastern European countries. This paper discusses the new emergence of ghetto spaces in Romania, analyzing different administrative policies and their effects after 1990. It develops around an ethnographic approach and reviews the actions of local administrations, aiming to assess the most significant interventions. The main findings show that the political involvement in the administrative policies focused on ghettos occurs only in certain conditions, while emphasizing the lack of coherent strategy to solve these expanding spaces. The evaluation of administrative policies identifies that Roma resettlement is an exclusion and ghettoization policy, the only one that suggests durability for local administrations.

Keywords: Administrative policies, urban segregation, ghettos, Romania, Central and Eastern European countries.

1. Introduction

Different causes of urban crisis and civic involvement, based on impoverishment, poverty and stigma, find their roots within the ghetto spaces (Bauman, 2001; Dreier, 2003; Sugrue, 2005). The spatial segregation of Roma¹ populations has generated many ghettos or the so-called areas 'of second hand' in the cities of Romania. The reality of living inside ghettos is marked by poverty, people on social assistance, lack of proper education and working skills, lack of basic utilities, increased birth rate, high density of the living space, spatial degradation, sanitation and epidemic risks, crimes and local conflicts, drugs use and begging (Mionel, 2012a). With the help of a 'circuit of disadvantages' (Omenya, 2003, p. 13), we argue that Romania is the scene of a fast process of auto-reproduction in the case of urban ghettos. Moreover, many people on social assistance live in these poor spaces, triggering the alarm of intervention for the urban administration.

The scene of administrative policies resembles that of many cities of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), both as action model as well as result. Urban administrations try to get involved actively inside communities, especially of those spatially segregated, to improve the living standards and to diminish inequalities among areas under their responsibility. The Romanian case adds value not only through diversifying the context, but exploring and establishing a typology of the directions of intervention. The analysis of administrative policies in segregated urban spaces involves anchoring the topic in the field of Roma segregation. While the number of Roma communities is controversial within the officials' discourse, their segregation expanded in many Romanian cities, despite the authorities attempt to remodel the urban image by blocking the housing access of Roma into the cities. It challenges the sustainable policies which fight against poverty and marginalization around Roma communities.

The paper develops around the characteristics and the process of segregation between Romanian cities and communities marginalized to live inside ghettos. The segregation of Roma population has occurred naturally through spatial concentration, but some cases emerged when urban administrations developed and maintained segregation. Another goal of this paper relates to the target of administrative interventions and their motivations, to see the resemblance with areas of other CEE countries. Our third focus is to identify and classify the administrative policies which target the life of the ghetto. For these, the next section explores the segregation concept, emphasizing the spatial segregation of Roma in CEE countries and Romania. The methodology section develops around an ethnographic approach, exploring the media storytelling experiences and reports, to analyze the policies applied by urban administrations. It leads to the evaluation of the most significant interventions of the local urban management, which try to grasp sustainable ways that contribute to the

1 We use Roma and not Roma or Rromani or Gypsies, to better identify different concepts and to be close to the way in which this ethnic group identifies itself.

improvement of living conditions. Then, we discuss the administrative policies, emphasizing the evaluation of policies. The conclusion section wraps up the evaluation of policies about their success, promoting critical reflections on studied cases.

2. Literature analysis

Segregation affects at different stages and with different intensities almost all countries (Feitosa and Wissmann, 2006). White (1983) suggests two types of segregation: social and geographic, which are intertwined. In general, social segregation analysis relies on the representative dimensions that generate categories; ethnicity, race, confession, alongside education, income and sexual minorities, all these represent parts of the general process of social segregation because each involves and defines population. Racial segregation analysis has been the focus of many studies, with the main focus on the segregation of the black population (Massey and Denton, 1993; Collins and Williams, 1999; Maly, 2008). Ethnic segregation has also gained the attention of many researchers (Gültekin and Güzey, 2007) who have analyzed, described and mapped levels of separation of ethnic groups in their living environments. Yet, Kain (2003) argues that socio-economic segregation and different ways of measurement of the socio-economic status have received less attention in academic studies. In the case of income distribution developed through global economy, Musterd and Ostendorf (2013) identify a strong emphasis on social inequalities and the emergence of socio-economic segregation. Other studies (Santos, 1979) mention the structuring of urban society in social classes that appear and develop simultaneously because of the income distribution. Finally, confessional segregation has received lesser attention (Knox, 1973; Glasze, 2005). This notion involves those cases where religion has generated spatial rupture of the population, causing a real social phenomenon.

Unlike social segregations, geographic segregation deals with urban morphology (Sinha and Sinha, 2007; Latham *et al.*, 2008). Although social segregation implies many meanings, it is usually used for geographical separation of different social and spatial groups. Urban diversity and heterogeneity originate from the evolution through time of the social and geographic components of urban segregation, marking the urban landscape with different shapes. In other words, geographical segregation defines spatial forms of urban landscape and the quality of living in such spaces. In this context we focus on the geographical segregation of poor people, identified as ghetto.

2.1. What is a ghetto?

Wirth (1928) has suggested that the ghetto existed long before it was named like this. Its origin remains unclear, but it has been in use for over 500 years. Some time ago, the ghetto meant a Jewish neighborhood in a city. Starting with the Middle Ages, the presence of Jews in Italy was cited to be high in the neighborhoods of the outskirts and to a lesser extent in the main parts of the city. This infers that stigmatization and discrimination, main factors for the existence of the ghetto, have an old history.

Through a detailed analysis of the etymology of the ghetto, Cuceu (2010) suggests the separation of the word at its root. Despite the evidence of its Italian origins – ‘campo ghetto’, which represents the place where iron is melted, some researchers have suggested that ‘get’ comes from the Hebrew language, meaning separation (Cuceu, 2010). Therefore, campo ghetto evolved to Nuovo Ghetto to reveal the Jewish space in an institutional way and, finally, it has become the well-known ghetto. Other studies have advocated for the word ‘borghetto’ (Wirth, 1928), because this form has close resemblance to a small village or even small neighborhood; as such, it suggests the creation of small urban settlements by the Jewish population, where they were forced to live.

The social life of the ghetto gravitates around two coordinates of composition, which are simultaneous: the enhancement of integration and cohesion from within, and acceleration of isolation from the outside space (Wacquant, 2011). After a detailed description and analysis of the Jewish community from the ghetto of Venice, he emphasizes four grounding elements: stigmatization, constraint, spatial confinement and institutional parallelism. With the exception of these elements, the ghetto reveals to the outside world – almost everywhere – a distinct space with unique characteristics: poverty, which seems a derivative element (Wacquant, 2011); segregation - not all segregated spaces are ghettos, but all the ghettos are segregated; a ghetto is different of an ethnic enclave; a ghetto is isolated from the outside and congregated within; social sustainability and ghetto represents two diverging issues. Even if the spatial process approached by this paper was not named ghetto in the countries where it has developed, this does not mean its denial. Famous cases from Venice (Wirth, 1928; Wacquant, 2011; Kessler and Nirenberg, 2012), Rome (Mionel, 2012a; Mionel, 2013), from the history of Japan (De Vos, 1971; Shirasawa, 1985; Lie, 2004) or US (Wirth, 1928; Ward, 1989; Wacquant, 2011) offer plenty of arguments for ghetto analysis.

Romanian ghettos manifest a certain pattern that is conceptualized and customized in accordance with the spatial and social dimensions found in the analyzed cases. Poverty, segregation and exclusion are among the factors that favors the emergence and the continuation of stigma in many Romanian urban ghettos. Here, the poverty is not necessary a derived phenomenon, but one that has mainly implicit values and that seems perpetual. The causes of poverty from ghettos alter profoundly any relation to the outside: from equal access to the working market, education, to the simple social contract.

In Romania, the ghettos are urban spaces that concentrate dynamic Roma communities, unfolding through three facets: they evolved steadily over a long period of time, they developed through misused administrative policies, or they are formed through a combination of the previous two. Transposed in the segregation framework of ethnic communities, the facets of ghettos involve two types of segregation (voluntary and involuntary), as well as a mix of the two. Without the use of force over the decision of localization, the ethnic concentration means a voluntary ghetto (Wirth, 1928; Bauman, 2001) and relates to the individuals’ preferences. The Romanian urban

ghetto plays a specific role of social and economic coercion on one side, while on the other side it acts its institutional role (Mionel, 2013).

Communities from these areas lost their economic utility for the host cities (Wacquant, 1993). In the case of some families, children's education does not involve leaving poverty with the help of education. Transmitted from generation to generation, the 'culture of poverty' adds to the Roma's particular way of living and to their social environment. It forms a dynamic process with aggravated consequences which, in no way, diminishes the social effects. This cultural system of learning poverty is well established in ghetto communities. It is without doubt that ghettos concentrate many social assisted individuals because of poverty or other occurring disadvantages.

The different culture of these communities is of poverty and stigma. It becomes radical against the outside space and towards other communities, while acting in unity. The community chain consists of each member and is made with each one individually. Roma individuals display impressive cohesiveness when anything seems to change their interest in the community. Therefore, personal interest gains justification through group actions (Mionel, 2013). Antisocial behavior antagonizes the relationship between neighbors and Roma communities in the ghettos. The presence of social conflicts between Roma living in ghettos and the population of the host cities, in general, and the population living nearby in particular, is the source of social conflicts and the main agent of unrest against the Roma's spatial concentration.

2.2. Roma segregation and administrative policies in Central and Eastern Europe

Considered pariah among ethnic groups (Vassilev, 2004), the Roma populations remains the largest ethnic group to date in CEE. It shapes ethnic segregation, one of the most important 'unsolved' issues of the local administration of the post-socialist cities (Sobotka, 2006). The academic literature shows the actuality of Roma segregation in the countries of CEE (Barany, 2000a; Zoon, 2001; Guy, 2001; Vašečka, 2003; Vassilev, 2004; Scheffel, 2008; Toušek, 2011; Ruzicka, 2012). The amplification of segregation has evolved into an accentuated ghettoization (Farnam, 2003; Imre, 2006; Mionel, 2013). The fall of communism in CEE has marked the social and geographical segregation of Roma population in cities from Poland (Puckett, 2005; Sobotka, 2006), Czech Republic (Guy, 2001; Toušek, 2011), Slovakia (Cangár, Kotvanová and Szép, 2003; Farnam, 2003; Guy, 2001), Hungary (Barany, 2000a; Barany, 2000b), Bulgaria (Vassilev, 2004; Camerer, 2012) and Romania (Rughiniș, 2007; Crețan and Turnock, 2008; Mionel and Neguț, 2011; Mionel, 2013). These countries and others in the region represent the only instance in postwar Europe where ghettos have reemerged (Wacquant, 2005). The amplification of segregation has evolved into an accentuated ghettoization (Farnam, 2003; Imre, 2006; Mionel, 2013), indicating that a new residential form of segregation and ghettoization has emerged in the CEE after 1990, without clearly saying if such segregation practices existed during the communist period.

The dynamics of segregation belong to a cultural purification, which was on a freewill basis, but unwillingly in the case of space (Toušek, 2011). This approach fac-

es many critics, research showing that Rroma segregation relates to policies of the local administrations (Vašečka, 2003). She argues about a 'wall strategy' used by local authorities in Ústí nad Labem to separate the Rroma inhabitants, and to create a border dividing them from the rest of the population. The containment policy or the wall strategy is known in Hungary (Cangár, Kotvanová and Szép, 2003), as well as in many locations in Slovakia. All these examples of segregation suggest a strict social control of Rroma by authorities (Barany, 2000a).

The resettlement from cities to other locations corresponds to another form of social control. This policy has been analyzed in Slovakia (Farnam, 2003) and it has been active for over 15 years. Only in 1997, over 25000 ethnic Rroma were evacuated from the city of Košice (Guy, 2001; Farnam, 2003). Today, between 4000 and 5000 Rroma of those evacuated live in one of the largest ghettos of Slovakia, at the city outskirts (Zoon, 2001).

Regarding the large number of Rroma in a segregated space, the best example is Bulgaria, where over half of the population lives in ghetto neighborhoods (Camerer, 2012; Vassilev, 2004). Bulgaria has the largest ghetto out of the former communist countries: Fakulteta in Sofia comprises informal housing with over 35000 people (Vassilev, 2004).

Other studies suggest that Rroma's ghettoization has expanded from CEE to the West (Berescu, 2011). Niculae (2013) argues that Rroma segregation in France and Italy is dressed up through names as: *campi nomadi* and *les villages d'insertion*. These spatial products of administrative policies are in fact ghettos. The argumentation supports the obvious containment of Rroma population: far away from cities, surrounded by three meters fences, guarded access points, lighting systems to help 'vigilantes' patrol during the night (Niculae, 2013, pp. 49-50).

2.3. Rroma segregation in Romania

Segregation in Romania received inputs from local researchers (Rughiniş, 2007; Creţan and Turnock, 2008; Mionel, 2012), as well as from an international perspective (Tátrai, 2011; Marcińczak *et al.*, 2014). Fleck and Rughiniş (2008) explored the residential segregation, arguing that ethnic-spatial segregation is a key element of understanding the lack of interaction between Rroma communities and the rest, and that 'social distance and geographical separation are mutually reinforcing' (p. 123).

At national level, Creţan and Turnock (2008) indicated a particular development of Rroma segregation exists in Romania. Auto-segregation develops when some parts of Rroma population try keeping at all cost its 'identity', despite the progress of the country or the nearby communities, involving a 'separation from the mainstream in terms of the modernizing ethos and the rule of law' (Creţan and Turnock, 2008, p. 274). Their mapping of Rroma segregation included almost all the urban spaces of the current study in which the Rroma segregation has (been) transformed into ghettos. At local level, Tátrai (2011) explored the effects of administrative policies of three cities where Rroma segregation is high. He argues that 'the residential segregation of

R(roma) is spectacular' (p. 189), but it is challenged by the lack of data. That is why segregation cannot be fully explored, because the quantitative analysis does not have support.

3. Methodological clarifications

The first goal of the paper is to account for the administrative interventions of local authorities in urban ghettos. Then, it highlights the target of these interventions and their motivations to see the similarity to those from other CEE countries. The viability of these interventions is the last element of the analysis.

The methodology involved discarding the taboo of many Romanian researchers when they tackle urban ghettos, and to follow the journalists' path (Mionel, 2012b). Reporters interested in the ghetto phenomenon succeeded in displaying a vast amount of information, resulting from their semi-ethnographic research. The mass-media reports were our local sensors for information gathering, supporting the understanding of ghetto life recent dynamics, while we critically examined the data and connected it to the academic framework.

The geographical analysis of Romanian urban ghettos introduces the ghettos characteristics developed by Wacquant (2011), respectively Wirth (1928) and Bauman (2001, pp. 82-91). The ghetto concept involves a geographical space, mainly urban, in which a minority of a certain ethnicity, race or other type, concentrates and is forced to live there. Some caveats do arise, because of the mass-media methods of using and presenting information that makes the concept to look different from the academic definitions. Parts of mass-media write about some urban areas and considers them to be ghettos just for being physically degraded, while others suggest that a ghetto is a space with trash and squalor. Therefore, the essence of the ghetto is ignored: spatial concentration of a minority and the shortcomings it faces. It is obvious that the degradation of houses and spaces are characteristics of these spaces, but they are not the main ones (Mionel, 2012b).

3.1. Data collection

The data were collected from Internet, seen as the best alternative to process information in unreliable situations as that of Rroma dynamics. The reason lies in the poor support of institutions to provide and manage data referring to ethnic groups. Moreover, the administrative terminology avoids the word ghetto and focuses on 'community of poor Rroma' or 'pockets of poverty'.

We explored every space identified as ghetto through newspaper articles published on the Internet, containing the word ghetto in the title or in the body of the text, acknowledging the following characteristics: spatial segregation of Rroma population, poor contact with the community, physical bordering against the nearby spaces, lack of basic public facilities, impoverished population, poor housing conditions, high criminality, low employment. Those articles covering only a characteristic of the ghetto were not included. Even if some areas (Chercheci) do not have a clear spatial

border, they were considered a ghetto by having all the other characteristics. The lack of one characteristic does not affect the complex definition of the ghetto. The only exception is the spatial segregation of Roma or their low proportion within the overall population of the area discussed as being ghetto. Such areas are not ghettos, but pockets of poverty even if all the other conditions are fulfilled.

Gathering information for ghettos involved the period of August 2012 – December 2013 during which we assessed articles in relation to ghettos. This interval comprised two phases for identification and examination of changes inside ghettos. We used Google search engine to collect articles, based on a pattern containing Romanian key words: ghetou or ghetou and romi or ghetou and țigani or ghetoizare or ghetoizare and țigani or ghetoizare and romi or comunitate de romi or romi and segregare or țigani and segregare. The results helped us to identify urban spaces described by the inquired words and where local administration acted through different policies. For each identified space with characteristics belonging to a ghetto, we developed a collection of articles inside a database. The number of articles differs from one ghetto to another, ranging from over 50 (Pata Rât, Craica, Horea, Tineretului, Turturica and Muncii) to 22 (Zăvoi). Each space was coded to contain the accepted characteristics, while the papers were constrained accordingly. We found other urban spaces conforming to these requirements, but which involved some issues: the number of articles was low and the writing subjective, they approached a specific issue of the ghetto and the social component was confusing. Subsequently, at least 20 articles from three different authors was the threshold for ghetto identification.

Most of the gathered articles approached both segregation and ghettoization of Roma communities, as well as administrative actions of local authorities. The articles showed how the interest for Roma segregated communities rose in direct proportion with the administrative actions.

Monitoring the administrative policies, identified in the first phase, was specific for the next period of analysis, when a new set of articles was analyzed, written mostly by other reporters and after at least one year has passed from the policy implementation. We assessed the success of administrative policies according to particular changes that occurred inside ghettos, showing improvement or decay of living status. For example, in the cases of Bârlad and Drobeta Turnu Severin cities, when local administration tried to solve the housing issues of their respective ghettos, we followed the way in which this policy generates better housing and living conditions. If housing improved for the corresponding ghetto during the analyzed interval between the first articles and the last ones, we accepted the fulfillment of the criterion. If nothing changed, we synthesized the results of administrative policies in Table 2.

The cities of the study originated from the analysis of the whole content within the aforementioned methodology. The number of Romanian cities with their respective ghettos may differ from other approaches, giving the fact that much data is missing or ambiguous and few detailed research projects exist on the living conditions inside these segregated urban space. All these diminish the chance of an exact mapping, but

our investigation into the Rroma's urban ghetto helps authorities for better policies of integration, while it also enlarges the academic literature.

4. Results

Romanian ghettos are small and display well framed spatial landscapes. Their presence is contagious and affects the nearby spaces, especially the market value of nearby housing units. The Rroma's concentration in ghettos hastens mobility in the vicinity and housing devaluation. The wish to sell a household faces stigmatization spread from the ghetto. The effect of tainted vicinity emerges from a popular culture of fear against the ghetto; for the urban community, the ghetto signifies the place that, because of its high risks, has to be avoided at all costs.

Many ghettos are located in peripheral or semi-peripheral areas, with fewer than 3,000 Rroma. In Bucharest it is impossible to estimate the Rroma from each ghetto because they are seen as a whole, given their proximity; the exception is the ghetto from Valea Cascadelor. These ghettos record a variable ratio of Rroma, but they appear to be dominant within the total Rroma population of all these environments in the country.

The Romanian urban ghetto shares similar characteristics to the concept developed by Wacquant (2011), which is ethnic homogeneity. Craica, Horea, Colonia de la kilometrul 10, Zăvoi, Munții Tatra are urban spaces where the Rroma population reaches a distribution of over 50%, reflecting the overwhelming dominance of the Rroma population. The NATO ghetto belongs to the city of Oradea and recorded 405 Rroma from a total of 574 people, with 167 Hungarians and 2 Romanians in 2006. The inference on these data suggests a high homogeneity and an ethnic concentration of Rroma. Other information that delineates the Romanian ghetto demography is the ghetto of Satu Mare, where the Rroma population is over 90% and comprises 100 families with Rroma origins.

Spatial location of the ghettos within the city limits differs from case to case (Table 1). With some exceptions, urban ghettos from Romanian cities are new and structured after 1990. Among the generating factors of the ghettos the most active ones are institutional policies, poverty and the new dimension of the neoliberal economy, which has flourished especially after 2000. The economic downturn and the unequal free market competition have set the stage for poverty and exclusion in the Rroma communities (Stănculescu and Berevoescu, 2004; Wacquant, 2005), who were deeply affected by the new economic dimension. The lack of education, their hard skills proved of little use in the new environment and so, the labor utility of the Rroma population was not found useful anymore, generating ruptures.

Inside the Romanian urban ghettos, local authorities display a wide range of actions (Table 2). They were analyzed and then identified and classified accordingly into: inventory of informal households; demolition of informal households; sanitation and garbage collection; environmental public awareness; implementation of projects; partial or total rehabilitation of households; moving into new homes; training courses

Table 1: Romanian urban ghettos

No.	Name	Host city	Relative location	Location within urban space	Estimation of inhabitants
1	Craica*	Baia Mare	Near Păltinișului street, within Vasile Alecsandri neighborhood, in the South of the city, alongside the Craica brook	outskirts	582 (Craica area) and 1100 (with the ones moved at Cuprom)
2	Chececi***	Arad	West, between Conțeșii and Șega neighborhoods	outskirts	-
3	Colonia de la km. 10*	Brăila	10 km distance of the city, near the chemical industrial plant Chiscani	outside the city	700
4	Wastewater plant*	Miercurea Ciuc	West part of the city, near the wastewater treatment plant	outskirts	200
5	Tineretului Park*	Botoșani	park area	nearby center	2500
6	Munții Tatra street*	Constanța	Palas neighborhood, West of the city	outskirts	over 100
7	Zăvoi*	Sibiu	Near Zăvoi street from Turnișor neighborhood	outside the city	150
8	G1*	Bărlad	Cpt. Grigore Ignat street, NE of the city	resettled from center to outskirts	500
9	G4*	Galați	South of the city, at the limit of Micro 19 neighborhood	outskirts	1200
10	Horea*	Baia Mare	West of the city	outskirts	750
11	Istru*	Giurgiu	SW, near Slobozia street	outskirts	500
12	L2***	Drobeta Turnu-Severin	Serpentina Roșiori street.	resettled to outskirts	280
13	NATO**	Oradea	near Voltaire street, SW of the city	outskirts	570
14	Ostrovului*	Satu Mare	Soarelui neighborhood	outskirts	400
15	Pata Rât*	Cluj Napoca	Landfill area	center area	2000
16	Turturica***	Alba Iulia	Arnsberg street of the central neighborhood Cetate	outskirts	over 300
17	Ghetto 'Berlin Wall**	Sfântu Gheorghe	Varadi Jozsef street, Orkő neighborhood	center	1000
18	Muncii*	Piatra Neamț	Near 1 Mai and Mărăței neighborhood	outskirts	1000
19	Speranța*	Piatra Neamț	3 km outside the city near the new real estate Speranța	resettled to outskirts	175
20	Zăbrăuți*	București	Ferentari neighborhood	outside the city	1000
21	South Ferentari*	București	Ferentari neighborhood	outskirts	12.000 (Livezilor, Tunsu Petre and Amurgului streets)
22	Valea Cascadeilor*	București	Militari neighborhood	outskirts	-

Notes: * formed after 1989; ** formed during communism; *** before communism;

for inhabitants, containment of Roma population. These measures were further explored and, when more ghettos were involved, the degree of success is emphasized.

- *Inventory of informal households.* The officials of Baia Mare City Hall took accounting of the houses of the ghetto Craica in 2010. All poor households on Craica streets were checked, each person was identified and the shanty houses were tagged. This was the solution for keeping at bay the Roma concentration of the largest ghetto of the city.
- *Demolition of informal households.* The cities of Baia Mare, Satu Mare and Bucharest took accounting of demolitions of shanty households. In Baia Mare, three years after the inventory, the local officials demolished the makeshift housing. The first phase recorded the demolition of Romas' households, then followed the houses where people lived illegally. The Ostrov ghetto encountered a similar action when about 50 individuals were left aside from the households of the two block of flats found in the ghetto. Mainly Roma, they built illegal barracks on the nearby public space. In 2010, the City Hall of Satu Mare decided to demolish the barracks. The Bucharest case was similar, but the two ghettos that were demolished every year, reappeared after some time.
- *Sanitation and garbage collection* took place in three of the ghettos analyzed: Craica, Ostrovului and G4. The first two recorded frequent actions of sanitation because of the amazingly fast accumulation of garbage in the area. The garbage and pollution are striking in the Ostrov ghetto, where the level of ammonia in the air is three times higher than the accepted standards. For example, in one of the sanitation procedures from the Ostrov ghetto a volume exceeding 6m³ of garbages was gathered (Satu Mare City Hall, 2009). It is the same case as in Craica, where the sanitation eliminated massive quantities of garbage. And in the G4 ghetto, the ecological mess from the underground level of the block of flats pushed the limits of the assigned workers, who in two consecutive years, struggled to extract the huge amount of garbage.
- *Awareness and reports on environmental protection.* While the above locations required environmental reports and information, little has changed. The Colonia de la km. 10 ghetto was the only one where such actions did take place. The Brăila City Hall and the Romanian Association of Nature Lovers started a project to improve ghetto life. With 160,000 Euros, the partners tried to inform inhabitants and raise their awareness of the local environment, which should be clean and without garbage.
- *Implementation of projects.* The first and the biggest project started in a Romanian ghetto is Turturica. This one differs from Brăila, being developed through a detailed analysis of the ghetto and involved the whole neighborhood. The project (Stănculescu and Berevoescu, 2004) brought a new philosophy to change the behavior of tenants and, as a consequence, the housing conditions of the whole Cetate neighborhood. Despite the proven quality of the project and the rewards proposed to the people, the results were not the expected ones.

Table 2: The administrative policies and their results

Name of the ghetto	Administrative policies	The result of administrative policies
Craica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inventory of informal households; - demolition of informal households; - moving into new homes; - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inventory of informal households was preceded by the demolition of houses; - many resettled families returned and rebuild their shacks.
Checheci	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - garbage reappeared.
Colonia de la km. 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - total and partial rehabilitation of housing; - awareness and reports on environmental protection; - skill training courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limited rehabilitation. - the classes of environmental awareness and protection are null, as garbage is all over the place. - only 40 people from 700.
Ghetto of water treatment plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - extreme marginalization at the city outskirts, nearby the water treating plant.
Ghetto of Parcul Tineretului	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - total and partial rehabilitation of housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - buildings were devastated and sanitation installation broken.
Ghetto of Munjii Tatra Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - garbage reappeared.
Ghetto of Zăvoi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - informal settlement is the results of the expulsion of social assisted Roma families by administration.
G1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - moving into new homes; - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - extreme marginalization at the city outskirts;
G4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - total and partial rehabilitation of housing; - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the new building were shattered. - same look, despite the rehabilitation; - garbage reappeared.
Horea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the fence fully isolate the Roma houses.
Istru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - garbage reappeared.
L2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - moving into new houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Roma were moved outside the city; - degradation of the new building.
NATO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sanitation and garbage collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
Ostrovului	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demolition of informal households; - sanitation and garbage collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the shacks reappeared in the same day of demolition; - garbage level is high.
Pata Rât	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - moving into new homes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roma were resettled nearby the city dump, where other two communities live.
Turturica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - implementation of projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - same behavior of the population; - garbage level is still high.
Zidul Berlinului / Berlin Wall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - physical borders;
Muncii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - moving into new homes; - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - moving to several kilometers outside the city.
Speranța	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sanitation and garbage collection; - containment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - garbage level is still high. - physical borders.
Ghetos of Bucharest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - demolition of informal households. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shacks reappeared.

- *Total and partial rehabilitation of housing* took place in the following ghettos: Parcul Tineretului, G4, Colonia de la km. 10. G4 recorded not only sanitation in 2007-2008, but the blocks of flats received consolidation. Colonia de la km. 10 involved much more attention: 20 households from four block of flats entered a rehabilitation program, alongside the nearby green spaces. The largest administrative actions were in the Parcul Tineretului ghetto, where, inhabitants received new heating systems in 1998 and then, in 2000-2004 a new investment focused on sanitation and heating. The final intervention was in 2007, when a renewed thermal rehabilitation and an overall facade restoration brought improvements to the buildings of the ghetto.
- *Moving into new homes*. Only a few inhabitants of the ghettos (G1, L2, Muncii, Pata Rât) received such an opportunity. The new homes were equipped with modern features and installations, everything with money from the city halls budget. The case of Pata Rât brought some issues, though, as the people were moved to container modular houses located near the city garbage deposit area.
- *Skill training courses* were only in Brăila, where about 40 persons received support for different occupations.
- *Containment of Roma population* was applied by four local administrations: Baia Mare, Piatra Neamț, Sfântu Gheorghe and Miercurea Ciuc. Romania is not the only case where such actions took place. Similar actions occurred in Slovakia and the Czech Republic (Guy, 2001). In Romania, the oldest example of spatial exclusion is the 'Berlin Wall' from Sfântu Gheorghe (Kovacs, 2009; Mateescu, 2010; Székely, 2012). It started during 1985-1987, when local officials built a wall in the last 200 meters of Váradi József street, on its axis, a wall separating 'local Roma community from the 'civilized world'' (Kovacs, 2009). On one side of the wall there are blocks of flats with ethnic Hungarians and Romanian, while on the other side are lined the Roma houses. Miercurea Ciuc records another example of the containment of Roma behind a wire fence. The Roma population of about 140 people was moved near the wastewater treatment plant, outside the city, in an area of about 800 square meters. Another example is of the Horea ghetto, where the local officials declared the necessity of the wall because of the risk of accidents, which seemed high for children playing near the national road. Similar to the Sfântu Gheorghe case is the ghetto of Piatra Neamț, which has a wall separating the Romanian villas and blocks of flats from about 160 Roma people. These Roma live in reequipped buildings, which belonged to a former poultry farm.

5. Discussions

Based on the goals of the local administration, three main characteristics emerged from the administrative policies undertaken in the segregated urban spaces of Romanian ghettos; they are: administrative policies for the improvements of living conditions inside the ghetto; administrative policies for population control and sur-

veillance; mixed administrative policies, which target improvements of living conditions and population control. The first category includes sanitation and garbage collection, actions of environmental protection information; total or partial rehabilitation of housing and inhabitants training. The second gathers policies of counting the informal housing, demolition of insalubrious shelters and wall-separating building. Meanwhile, the third includes only the movement action.

In the ghetto, improvement of living conditions displays a different situation from the one expected. Policies of the first category are the ones considered to be essential. But did they reach the goals pursued by officials? Is there any improvement in the life of the ghetto? Is there the same intensity of poverty, degradation and misery? What has followed allows a no answer to the first two questions and a yes to the third. We explain why in the following analysis.

The effects of administrative actions have left many caveats. Limited or temporary results have materialized from the first category. Regular visits showed the everlasting presence of garbage and that the reckless behavior has remained unchanged, even in Turturica ghetto. The project suggested clear regulations for inhabitants, which were followed for a period, but one year later, old habits returned to previous (ab) normality. Interviews confirm that 'the regulations were followed, to clean daily, but, you see, [people] adhere to it for some months and then the mess settles once again... that you are terrified to enter the block of flats, given the garbage and squalor' (Bumb, 2010). The meeting between the mayor and inhabitants of Turturica confirmed the deterioration, the mayor reminding inhabitants that the assets gained through the project have to be maintained clean and functional (Stanciu, 2010).

Neither did the actions taken in Brăila have produced consistent and positive outcomes. The ghetto of this city looks like nothing has ever changed or that the results are indistinct, given the amount of money used '73,0000 Euros... for access to sanitation and for rehabilitation of the spaces they live in' (Butnaru and Șerban, 2008). Yet, the Roma community does not have more access to sanitation in comparison to the past and the same things happened to cleaning and employment. Among 700 members of the active population of the ghetto, only 40 individuals gained working skills.

Another finding is that housing rehabilitation caused, surprisingly as it seems, a new degradation. The investments from Parcul Tineretului ghetto, proved the lack of sustainability of such approaches. The three rounds of renovation were futile; after each intervention for rehabilitation, the inhabitants devastated the new installations and households. After the project was completed and all the reparations done, the ghetto looks the same, like no improvements or interventions have ever been addressed there (Sauciuc, 2008).

Further results have shown that the second administrative set of actions, directly coordinated by local administrations, accomplished their goals. The accounting of households, which happened only in Craica, seemed a soft policy in comparison to the containment one; in fact, it was a transitional policy. The accounting was the first action part of a more general policy, which targeted the Roma concentration and

the demolition of the ghetto. The second action was to move a part of the Roma of Craica, not to new homes, but to the so-called 'necessity households' erected inside the former office building of the Cuprom company. There were some families that returned to the ghetto to rebuild their informal houses. The action to move the Roma from their hovels was on the same day of elections, suggesting that the accounting was a premeditated procedure of resettlement, an action of control in fact. The demolition of hovels, which belonged to the people, who did not find a place in the two blocks of flats of the new ghetto, was a failure in Satu Mare. According to local police, who supervised each action, such procedures do not have success, because the Roma (re)build hovels on the same spot.

Policies of social control are common in CEE (Barany, 2000a; Vašečka, 2003). They are retrogressive at their core, but building walls of separation or total containment truly represents an administrative policy that leads to the ghetto. Their viability exhibits the way of permanent control that was applied in several cities and that triggered controversies, intensifying the national and international wave of critics towards the administrative actions. The wall durability implies the success of the policy and, for local officials, the alleviation of fear that Roma might trigger new troubles. It is the same pattern of containment encountered in the first dated ghetto of Venice.

An Roma from Miercurea Ciuc ghetto, compares the ghetto to a penitentiary, adding that 'the only difference is that, there (in prison), there are guards. Here there aren't and you may go outside. Except for this, everything looks the same'. And he remarks more: 'in the prison there is food and you have an address, but no when you live in the ghetto' (Mionel, 2013). The ghetto location is relative, being presented as somewhere near the wastewater treatment plant.

Similar is the case of Horea ghetto that has raised the biggest controversies. In spite of the fine received by the mayor from the National Council against Discrimination and of different recommendations, which suggested the demolition, the wall of two meters tall is still in place.

The analysis of the third category of measures raises some questions. Is the classification of administrative policies of this category a constrained action? The resettlement is without doubt a segregation and control step. In all the cases, local officials built houses in the city outskirts and not somewhere else. The finding is true for Cluj-Napoca in the same degree as for Drobeta Turnu Severin, Bârlad or Košice in Slovakia (Zoon, 2001; Guy, 2001; Farnam, 2003). The building of new houses is a trick which diverts attention from the real goal. The quality and the features of the new houses (PVC windows, new sanitary installations, showers, hot water and many others) aim to exhibit how well the officials care for the 'outcasts' (Wacquant, 2011). Even so, the new houses bring an added value to the living environment. For a while, the resettlement has removed the shortcomings of the old space.

A second question addresses how much success did the resettlement action gain. We foresee two paths of evolution. The positive path reveals a normality, in which the population looks after households in the spaces nearby, and everything develops

normally. The second path is negative, because the people transform the living space into a poor and squalid one, where living is no less than an ordeal.

Many journalists' predictions, foreseeing the transformation of the houses into a new ghetto, become true. In this context, the ghetto concept has been used to describe the squalor, garbage, chaos, degradation and decay of the new housing estates. This reenactment adds to the reality of the ghetto spaces of the analyzed cases. Resettlement in the outskirts reinforces Roma segregation towards the urban space and people living at urban standards. Old ghettos recompose themselves in the new addresses, not only because of the segregation caused by resettlement, but because of the garbage and decay produced by residents. The decay of the new households unveils a new caveat of the administrative policies: lack of investment in people and their education.

6. Conclusions

Two directions resulted from the three categories of administrative intervention: actions of social interventions and improvement of living conditions is the first one, while the second refers to monitoring and segregation. While welcomed, new houses located at the outskirts of different cities produced only more separation between Roma and the rest of population. This last direction has a long lasting effect as long as the resettled population is poor and without any alternative. But we cannot conclude the same for the first mentioned directions.

The administrative policies of ghettos in Romania remains blurred. In some regards, similar solutions were applied in many ghettos and the results look similar, which is no change. The viability of different programs and administrative investments rely a lot on their harmonization and hierarchic structuring in time. Thus, scattered projects and incoherent actions will bring again futile and limited results that will show no sign of intervention in that respective space.

Administrative policies targeted obvious issues which were monitored for short periods of time, without considering a broader strategy. The results were transient and their aftermath become visible in most of the analyzed ghettos. Degradation and squalor, which were troublesome for officials before resettlement, have returned inside the households, as well as in the nearby space. We argue that the old ghettos have been resettled with all their components. Likewise, solving the ghettoization involves hiding these spaces. Once evicted outside the city, their control becomes a powerful administrative intervention. The resettlement of Roma population outside the urban space in 'new' houses is a cynical action of social control that empowers the invisible wall of separation.

The current situation, which is the failure of many administrative policies, has its origins in the administrative chaotic system and poor finance management. The analysis showed that administrations lack vision and develop limited actions; their actions targeted specific issues and did not involve the larger framework of segregation. Many times, administrations appeared overwhelmed by the extent of the phenome-

non, or they did not truly wish to act accordingly to an European framework. To reach social sustainability, some actions were required, but they have exceeded the physical structures of consolidation and housing repairs, resettlement and others alike.

To eliminate the poverty spaces many years are required in Romania, which involves a visionary policy on the long term. But it overlaps many electoral cycles and political interests, hindering the solutions. Policies have to emerge from the space facts and be transplanted into them. For example, a Roma who collects materials informally should receive administrative policies helping his/her integration into a specific company. Hence, interventions and policies should emerge from the local characteristics.

Not all the ghettos develop at the outskirts of cities. But the institutional trend is to push Roma population from the cities, to exclude it socially and to create spatial segregation with or without fences. The result indicates that Roma resettlement is an exclusion and ghettoization policy, the only one that suggests durability for local administrations.

References:

1. Barany, Z., 'Politics and the Roma in State-Socialist Eastern Europe', 2000a, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 421-437.
2. Barany, Z., 'The Socio-Economic Impact of Regime Change in Eastern Europe: Gypsy Marginality in the 1990s', 2000b, *East European Politics & Societies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 64-113.
3. Bauman, Z., *Community. Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2001.
4. Berescu, C., 'The Rise of the New European Roma Ghettos: a Brief Account of Some Empirical Studies', 2011, *Urban Research & Practice*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 344-352.
5. Bumb, C., 'Blocul Turturica – între haos și normalitate', *DPM Online*, 7 December 2010, [Online] available at <http://alba-iulia.reporterdeliceu.ro/?p=1872>, accessed on May 20, 2013.
6. Butnaru, N. and Șerban, L., 'Sute de Mii de Euro Pentru Accesul Romilor La Sănătate', 2008, *Centrul pentru Jurnalism Independent*, [Online] available at <http://www2.cji.ro/userfiles/file/documente/braila.pdf>, accessed on May 24, 2015.
7. Cahn, C. and Trehan, N., 'Time of the Skinheads-Denial and Exclusion of Roma in Slovakia', 1997, European Roma Rights Center Country Reports Series, European Roma Rights Center, [Online] available at <http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/media/00/15/m00000015.pdf>, accessed on May 24, 2015.
8. Camerer, S., 'The State of Human Rights for the Roma People in Bulgaria', 2012, *ESR Review: Economic and Social Rights in South Africa*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 12-15.
9. Cangár, J., Kotvanová, A. and Szép, A., 'Depiction of the Roma in the Media', in Vašečka, M., Jurásková, M. and Nicholson, T. (eds.), *Čačipen pal o Roma (A Global Report on Roma in Slovakia)*, Institute for Public Affairs, 2003, pp. 249-266.
10. Collins, C.A. and Williams, D.R., 'Segregation and Mortality: the Deadly Effects of Racism?', 1999, *Sociological Forum*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 495-523.

11. Crețan, R. and Turnock D., 'Romania's Roma Population: From Marginality to Social Integration', 2008, *Scottish Geographical Journal*, vol. 124, no. 4, pp. 274-299.
12. Cuceu, C., 'Spațiul Ghetoului', 2010, *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 164-175.
13. De Vos, G.A., *Japan's Outcasts*, Minority Rights Group, 1971.
14. Dreier, P., 'America's Urban Crisis a Decade after the Los Angeles Riots', 2003, *National Civic Review*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 35-55.
15. Farnam, A., 'Slovakian Roma Forced to Ghettos', *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 3, 2003, p. 4.
16. Feitosa, F.F. and Wissmann, A., *Social-Mix Policy Approaches to Urban Segregation in Europe and the United States*, Bonn: Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung, ZEF, 2006.
17. Fleck, G. and Rughiniș C. *Come Closer: Inclusion and Exclusion of Roma in Present-Day Romanian Society*, București: Human Dynamics, 2008.
18. Glasze, G., 'The Spread of Private Guarded Neighbourhoods in Lebanon and the Significance of a Historically and Geographically Specific Governmentality', in Glasze, G., Webster, C. and Frantz, K. (eds.), *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, New York: Routledge, 2005, pp. 123-138.
19. Gültekin, N.T. and Güzey, Ö., *Divided Cities: Social and Residential Segregation: A Gipsy Neighborhood in Menzilahir, Edirne, Turkey*, Paper presented at the 47th Congress of the European Regional Science Association, Paris, 2007.
20. Guy, W., 'The Czech Lands and Slovakia: Another False Dawn?', in Guy, W. (ed.), *Between Past and Future: the Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*, Hertfordshire: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001, pp. 285-332.
21. Imre, A. 'Global Entertainment and the European Roma Problem', 2006, *Third Text*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 659-670.
22. Kain, J., 'Racial and Economic Segregation in US Metropolitan Areas', in Clark G.L., Gertler M.S. and Feldman M.P. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*, Oxford University Press, 2003.
23. Kessler, H.L. and Nirenberg, D., *Judaism and Christian Art: Aesthetic Anxieties from the Catacombs to Colonialism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
24. Knox, H.M., 'Religious Segregation in the Schools of Northern Ireland', 1973, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 307-312.
25. Kovacs, A., 'Ghetou la Sfântu Gheorghe. Țigani cer dărâmarea zidului care separă orașul de cartierul rromilor', *Gardianul*, 26 February 2009, [Online] available at <http://www.newz.ro/stire/80686/ghetou-la-sfantu-gheorghe-tigani-cer-daramarea-zidului-care-separa-orasul-de-cartierul-rromilor.html>, accessed on May 20, 2014.
26. Latham, A. McCormack, D., McNamara, K. and McNeill, D., *Key Concepts in Urban Geography*, London: Sage, 2008.
27. Lie, J., *Multi-Ethnic Japan*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.
28. Maly, M., *Beyond Segregation: Multiracial and Multiethnic Neighborhoods*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008.
29. Marcińczak, S., Gentile, M., Rufat, S. and Chelcea, L., 'Urban Geographies of Hesitant Transition: Tracing Socioeconomic Segregation in Post-Ceaușescu Bucharest', 2014, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1399-1417.
30. Massey, D.S. and Denton, N.A., *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993.

31. Mateescu, I. 'Romii Nu Mai Vor «Zidul Berlinez»', *Adevărul*, 26 January 2010, [Online] available at http://adevarul.ro/locale/brasov/romii-nu-mai-vor-zidul-berlinez-1_50ad61e57c42d5a6639417a4/index.html, accessed on July 20, 2014.
32. Mionel, V., *Segregarea urbană. Separați dar împreună*, București: Editura Universitară, 2012a.
33. Mionel, V., 'Ghetourile urbane și alegerile electorale. De ce sunt importante ghetourile pentru oamenii politici?', 2012b, *Sfera Politicii*, vol. XX, no. 171, pp. 50-58.
34. Mionel, V., *România ghetourilor urbane. Spațiul vicios al marginalizării, sărăciei și stigmatului*, București: Pro Universitaria, 2013.
35. Mionel, V. and Neguț S., 'The Socio-Spatial Dimension of the Bucharest Ghettos', 2011, *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, no. 33E, pp. 197-217.
36. Musterd, S. and Ostendorf, W., *Urban Segregation and the Welfare State: Inequality and Exclusion in Western Cities*, New York; London: Routledge, 2013.
37. Niculae, L.C., *Arhipera. Arhitectură socială participativă* (PhD thesis), 2013, Universitatea de Arhitectură și Urbanism "Ion Mincu", București.
38. Oblet, T., *Gouverner la ville: Les voies urbaines de la démocratie moderne*, Paris: PUF, 2005.
39. Omenya, A., *Theoretical Conceptualisations of Urban Segregation and Their Relevance to Housing in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, Paper presented at the Conference on Gated Communities: Building Social Division or Safer Communities?, Glasgow, UK, 2003.
40. Puckett, L.M., 'Barriers to Access Social Services and the Roma of Poland', 2005, *International Social Work*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 621-631.
41. Rughiniș, C., *Integration Every Other Day. Public Reasoning on Roma/Gypsy Segregation in Romania*, 2007, Center for Policy Studies, Open Society Institute, [Online] available at http://www.policy.hu/rughinis/rughinis_integration.pdf, accessed on May 24, 2015.
42. Ruzicka, M., 'Continuity or Rupture? Roma/Gypsy Communities in Rural and Urban Environments under Post-Socialism', 2012, *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 81-88.
43. Santos, M., *The Shared Space: The Two Circuits of the Urban Economy in Underdeveloped Countries*, London: Methuen, 1979.
44. Sauciu, R., 'Ghetourile din Parcul Tineretului ar putea fi dărâmate', *Evenimentul de Botoșani*, 8 August 2008, [Online] available at <http://www.evenimentuldebotosani.ro/cgi-sys/suspendedpage.cgi>, accessed on April 16, 2014.
45. Scheffel, D., 'Ethnic Micropolitics in Eastern Europe: A Case Study from Slovakia's Gypsy Archipelago', 2008, *Anthropology Today*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 23-25.
46. Shirasawa, M., 'Living Conditions of the Elderly in Buraku Ghettos in Osaka-City', 1985, *Journal of Minority Aging*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 57-76.
47. Sinha, R. and Sinha U.P., *Ecology and Quality of Life in Urban Slums: an Empirical Study*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 2007.
48. Sobotka, E., 'Human Rights and Policy Formulation toward Roma in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland', in Marsh, A. and Strand, E. (eds.), *Gypsies and the Problem of Identities: Contextual, Constructed and Contested*, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2006, pp. 141-156.
49. Stanciu, G., 'Primarul a făcut ședință publică cu locatarii din Turturica', *City News*, 15 July 2010, [Online] available at <http://alba.citynews.ro/eveniment-15/primarul-fa-cut-sedinta-publica-cu-locatarii-din-turturica-87912>, accessed on April 28, 2014.

50. Stănculescu, M. and Berevoescu I., *Sărac lipit, caut altă viață*, București: Nemira, 2004.
51. Sugrue, T.J., *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005.
52. Székely, E., 'Nu Mă Bate, Au, Mă Doare!', *Covasnamedia*, 27 May 2012, [Online] available at <http://covasnamedia.ro/beta/?p=30051>, accessed on April 28, 2014.
53. Tátrai, P., 'Ethnic Residential Segregation in Three Cities of Northwest Romania', 2011, *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 189-216.
54. Toušek, L., 'Purification of Space: Spatial Segregation of Roma in the Czech Republic', 2011, [Online] available at http://www.academia.edu/428790/Purification_of_Space_Spatial_Segregation_of_the_Roma_in_the_Czech_Republic, accessed on January 10, 2014.
55. Vašečka, I., 'The Roma Issue in Local Social Policy', in Vašečka, M., Jurásková, M. and Nicholson, T. (eds.), *Čačipen pal o Roma (A Global Report on Roma in Slovakia)*, Institute for Public Affairs, 2003, pp. 249-266.
56. Vassilev, R., 'The Roma of Bulgaria: A Pariah Minority', 2004, *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 40-51.
57. Wacquant, L., 'Les deux visages du ghetto. Construire un concept sociologique', 2005, *Actes de La Recherche En Sciences Sociales*, vol. 160, no. 4, p. 21.
58. Wacquant, L., 'A Janus-Faced Institution of Ethnoracial Closure: A Sociological Specification of the Ghetto', in Hutchison, R. and Haynes, B. (eds.), *The Ghetto: Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2011, pp. 1-31.
59. Wacquant, L., 'Urban Outcasts: Stigma and Division in the Black American Ghetto and the French Urban Periphery', 1993, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 366-383.
60. Ward, D., *Poverty, Ethnicity and the American City, 1840-1925: Changing Conceptions of the Slum and Ghetto*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
61. White, M.J., 'The Measurement of Spatial Segregation', 1983, *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 88, no. 5, pp. 1008-1018.
62. Wirth, L., *The Ghetto*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1928 (reprint 1998).
63. Zoon, I., *On the Margins*, New York: Open Society Institute, 2001.