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Abstract

This paper presents an overview of international migration in the Czech Republic, with a special focus on labour immigration. Currently the Czech Republic is an immigration and transit country. The most important immigration segment - economic immigrants create a colourful mosaic of various ethnicities (80% of them from Europe) each group with their own different economic strategy and niche are the main target of this contribution. After sketching historical patterns and data problems the focus is on the current situation of labour migrants in the country. A number of issues are addressed: e. g., the relationship between immigrant inflows and the economic situation of the country, immigrants’ regional concentration/de-concentration processes, the popularity of the capital city of Prague and western regions vis-a-vis eastern ones and the different structural backgrounds of immigrants coming from the East versus the West. Special attention is placed on discussing undocumented/illegal immigration, mainly in relation to the misuse and evasion of immigration legislation. Finally, the immature Czech migration policies and practices are discussed as needed policy improvements and the need for new immigration legislation. It is clear that the major trend over time leads to more restrictive migratory policies in line with efforts to harmonize Czech migratory policies and practices with those of the European Union (EU).

MAIN GOAL AND STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

This contribution is centred upon international labour migration in the Czech Republic\(^1\). Labour immigration clearly dominates over emigration in Czechia (see below) and that is why the former phenomenon is emphasized here much more intensively than the latter. The main focus of this

\(^1\) The author highly appreciates very useful comments of three anonymous reviewers who contributed to improving the quality of this paper. Also, the author expresses gratitude to Prof. George J. Demko for his valuable remarks and polishing the English language.

The topic, which is dealt with in this contribution is part of a research project being carried out under the umbrella of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic No. 403/99/1006. Some basic facts and ideas in this contribution have been presented at a meeting of experts: “International Migration in Central and Eastern Europe at the Threshold of the XXI Century: New Trends and Emerging Issues”, organized by the UNESCO (MOST program),
paper is to provide an overview of what is going on in the field and to systematize data and pieces of information, which are available from currently imperfect data sources. After placing the larger issue into a broader Central/Eastern European context and a very brief examination of the data, a short description of patterns tied to Czechs working abroad is briefly outlined. Another section discusses the most important patterns/features of the current foreign labour force inflows in Czechia. Special remarks are devoted to undocumented and clandestine immigrants and problems stemming from the misuse and evasion of Czech migratory legislation. Further, a rather condensed description and typology of individual immigrant groups operating in the current Czech labour market is provided. New trends in migration policy (including new legislation) and practices and probable future developments in the field of labour migration in Central and Eastern Europe are also discussed.

**INTRODUCTION**

From the end of the 1980s, like other Central and Eastern European countries (CEEc) the Czech Republic has been going through a process of transition/transformation of its former discredited system. The ultimate aim is to build a developed, democratic, pluralistic and parliamentary society based on a free-market economy. Very simply expressed, the philosophy of Czechia (and of many other CEEc as well) is to open its society\(^2\) and, at the same time, to “re-orientate interests“ from the former closed internal co-operation among the CEEc (and particularly with the Soviet Union) towards the West\(^3\). This process is to be cemented by inclusion of CEEc in

---

\(^2\) 199 million foreigners registered as crossing the Czech state border in both directions (and staying not longer than 180 days) in 1999, demonstrating the country’s openness in terms of population movements (Information, 2000). This openness sharply contrasts with the state of isolation under the communist regime, when, for example, the number of all persons (foreigners and citizens of the state) registered as crossing the border of Czechoslovakia was only slightly above 50 million in the middle of the 1980s (Informace, 1995).

\(^3\) By the” West” in the context of this paper I primarily include the most developed countries in Western Europe (primarily the EU and the European Free Trade Association countries), but also other most developed democracies like the USA, Canada, etc. On the other hand, the East is represented by other Central/Eastern European countries in transition (including countries of the former Soviet Union) as well as some of the typical developing third world countries of Asia.
various Western political, economic and military structures, particularly the EU. The transformation processes are typical of the dramatic changes that have affected all spheres of society - macro as well as micro factors have been and will be involved. Apparently, massive international migration is one of the new phenomena related to the new political and economic organization/structure. Though only Czechia is analysed in this paper, the results have a broader relevance. The combination of such factors as relative political stability, a given geographical position (bordering on the classical Western World which has no history of a communist era), and the strict migration policies of the western developed democracies has led to the creation of a migratory “buffer zone” between the West and the East (see also Wallace, Chmuliar, and Sidorenko, 1995). This migratory „buffer zone“ is composed of Czechia, Poland, Slovakia and Hungary - countries which, despite many problems, are progressing through the transition relatively successfully compared to many other ex-communist countries and which have been able to maintain reasonable living standards (e.g. Garson, Lemaitre, and Redor, 1996). Apparently, the socio-economic climate, including the labour market situation and relatively liberal legislation and liberal practices towards immigrants, in these countries seemed to be a crucial “pull“ factor for migrants from the Eastern world. In general, migratory trends within the above CEEc are more similar than different. However, among the four „buffer zone countries“ Slovakia differs most by having a very limited number of official/documented immigrants as well as a significantly smaller number of clandestine immigrants on its territory. The compact buffer zone creates conditions for intensive transitory movements, East-West cross-border movements as well as massive labour circular (temporary) migration within the region. Migratory trends in these buffer zone countries might, in addition to experiencing huge inflows of labour circular migrants, be characterized in the following way: 1) hosting of a diversity of types of migrants; 2) experiencing a growing inflow of asylum seekers and refugees and a minimal outflow of domestic citizens abroad as asylum seekers and refugees; 3) having a stable or a declining number of permanent emigrants; 4) hosting a huge transit migrant⁴ population; 5) and

⁴ Transit migration in the Czech Republic might be briefly defined as a movement through the country where the migrants’ main intention is not to stay and live there, but only to go through and reach other countries as soon as possible. Migrants usually transit Czechia on their way to Western Europe, but for many reasons their movement is not as easy and rapid as anticipated (see
attracting a particularly large flow of immigrants to the capital cities (see Drbohlav, 1997b). Unlike in buffer zone countries, local push migration factors destabilize population in many other CEEc (namely Bulgaria, Romania and most of the ex-soviet republics) and propel migration streams to the buffer zone or further West. The most important conditions in these countries are political instability and often catastrophic, socio-economic parameters resulting in very low living standards. As far as labour immigration in CEEc is concerned, one important fact should be emphasized. In the buffer states and, despite similarities, Czechia represents an important exception in terms of the quantity of the foreign labour force in its territory. Its contingent, at least regarding documented foreign workers having a work permit, has been and is much greater than in any other buffer zone country (see Wallace and Stola, 2001; Okolski, 1997 vis-a-vis the text below). The differences, however, are diminishing taking into account undocumented workers. The estimated hundreds of thousands of foreigners were in irregular employment not only in Czechia but also in other CEEc (Wallace and Stola, 2001; Salt, 1996 - according to Okolski, 1997).

The import of foreign labourers to Czechoslovakia/Czech Republic has a long tradition. While only very limited numbers of Czechs worked abroad during the communist era, relatively significant numbers of foreigners worked in Czechia mainly during the 1970s and 1980s. These temporary workers came mainly from Poland, Vietnam⁵, Hungary, Cuba, Mongolia, Angola and Korea and gained skill and working experience in Czechia and, at the same time, were filled gaps in the Czech labour market (e. g. in food-processing, textiles, shoe and glass industries, machinery, mining, metallurgy, agriculture). The system of recruiting students, apprentices and workers functioned via intergovernmental agreements and to a much lesser extent also through individual contracts (mainly with workers from Poland and Yugoslavia). After the Velvet Revolution the agreements were terminated relatively quickly and the number of foreign workers legally employed within the old schemes has sharply diminished - as of April 1993, only 1,330 e. g. Transit, 1994); plans of many of them come to nothing and, at least temporarily, they are forced to stay in Czechia or to return eastward.

⁵ Poles and Vietnamese represented the most numerous immigrant communities reaching ten thousands of people depending on what particular period is taken into account (see more Boušková, 1998). During the 1980s a maximum of 60,000 foreign workers (converted to “one migrant and one day unit”) were resident altogether in the country.
were allowed to stay in the country (Boušková, 1998). Most of the former workers returned to their native countries whereas some started using the new economic opportunities and established entrepreneurial ethnic enclaves.

THE INEVITABLE PROBLEM – DATA

It is generally agreed that the data concerning international migration movements are very poor. If available, they are often inaccurate, incomplete, delayed, irregular, incompatible and lacking in detail. This is valid for developed western democracies as well as for buffer zone countries. The latter group suffers from a total lack of experience with regard to the handling of international migration issues. Concerning the Czech Republic, there are shortcomings in terms of monitoring movements. The (macro) migration statistics, records and databases are rather poor and dispersed and not compatible with each other. There are problems regarding data classification, ways in which the data are collected in the field, and are disseminated. Some important pieces of information are not collected while others are not easily available for the public and to academics. Consequently, to this point in time there has been a very limited investigation of the problem of international migration in scientific/research circles (see Drbohlav, 2000). As a result, there is a lack of in-depth analyses of immigration (at macro as well as micro levels). The characterization of immigrants themselves is insufficient. The logic of their behaviour and the consequences of inflows at state, regional and local levels are poorly described and explained. There are very limited attempts to theorize regarding these issues.

New, more reliable mechanisms of collecting, processing, classifying and releasing data are being installed or are in the process of development in Czechia. Furthermore, a lack of financial means, inadequate cooperation among ministries and other institutions, which are responsible for dealing with the migration issues and, at least till 1999, overall fairly illiberal attitudes further complicated the situation.

Apparently, when analysing labour migration flows one has to keep in mind that, in addition to available data on documented (legal) labour migrants, there are also huge numbers of

---

6 Recently, macro migration statistics have been collected in Bulletins published by the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs in time series since 1993 (see e.g. Horáková, 1998, 1999;
undocumented, clandestine foreign workers. These can only be roughly estimated.

The data for this contribution come mostly from the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic. Except for Table 1, exclusively „stock“ data are presented in tables and figures while, of course, the “flow“ data are mentioned and commented upon in the text as well.
FOREIGN LABOUR FORCE

Regarding the new economic environment, Czechia is now trying to regulate the numbers of labour migrants in its territory. At the same time it is also attempting to legally control, through bilateral or multilateral agreements, the possibility for their citizens to work abroad. Such bilateral employment agreements have already been signed, for example, with Germany\(^7\) (1991), Poland (1992), Slovakia (1992), Vietnam (1994), Ukraine (1996), Russia (1998) and Hungary (1999). Generally, EU countries are rather conservative regarding signing agreements about mutual employment with CEEc. Hence, EU countries have few agreements for only a very limited number of specialists/workers/trainees, the preferred activities in this field.

Czechs working abroad

It is very difficult to get any precise overall data on Czechs working abroad. Data on official temporary migration to Germany, by far the most important destination of Czechs, indicated a decreasing number of Czechs working in that country between 1992 and 1998, whereas for 1999 and 2000 the numbers went up slightly\(^8\). According to the best estimates available, about 50,000 Czechs (including illegals and commuters within the border zone) worked in Germany in 1992 (for time periods see Horáková and Drbohlav, 1998; see also Horáková 1993, 1996, 1998). In 1995 the number was estimated at some 30,000 - 35,000. At the present, their number is probably smaller. Germany imposed an important limitation on some of these programs in 1996 and 1997. To summarize, outflow of Czechs abroad to the West because of work peaked between 1991 - 1993 (nevertheless, one can deduce that it mostly concerned temporary stays with possible future returns to the mother country) and since than, it has been decreasing (see also Marešová, Drbohlav, and Lhotská, 1996), and recently, more or less stabilizing. The reason is that Western

---

\(^7\) Regarding Germany, the most important migratory partner of Czechia amongst classical developed western democracies there are five ways to legally work there for Czechs and other CEEc citizens: 1) Project-tied employment (regulated by bilateral agreements), 2) guest-worker contracts (regulated by bilateral agreements), 3) seasonal workers (regulated by law), 4) staff to care for sick and elderly (regulated by law) and 5) cross-border commuters (regulated by law).

\(^8\) Between 1998 and 2000, the given numbers are: 2,397, 2,670 and 3,805, respectively. (Concerning working contracts of Czech citizens in Germany, 18 months is a maximum during...
European countries have introduced more restrictive measures (mainly because of high unemployment rates in their countries and a growing xenophobic atmosphere among their populations\(^9\)). But more importantly, at least between 1993 and 1996, working in Western Europe for Czechs became less attractive than earlier. First of all, those who wanted to leave for the West had already left. Also, the fascination with the West, which was evident in the very beginning of the 1990s has dissipated. Further, the Czechs went relatively successfully through transformation and their living standard was increasing. There were many opportunities to start a business or make a good living at home particularly in light of the indirect revaluation of the Czech crown vis-a-vis western currencies.

Labour migration of Czechs to other regions of Eastern Europe has so far been negligible.

### Foreign workers in the Czech Republic

International migration very quickly gained a foothold in the newly established Czech democratic system and has found its place within society. It is estimated that the current number of foreign immigrants who operate within the Czech Republic is about 460,000 – both: documented and undocumented, permanent and temporary (excluding, however, tourists, asylum seekers and transit migrants\(^10\)). This is about 4.5% of the total population of Czechia (excluding these:

---------------------------------
\(^9\)On the other hand, for example, Hönnekop (1997) points out that: “In agriculture, production would have decreased had Eastern European workers not been available”. Also, due to the lack of labour force mainly in some specific branches, which have been, in part, the consequence of aging process (e. g. Lutz, 1999), some of the Western European countries started implementing recruitment programs of foreigners (e. g. search for computer science experts in Germany).

\(^10\) This estimate is based on interviews made with representatives of the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic and the Institute of Work and Social Affairs in June 2001. Furthermore, studies done by Drbohlav, 1997a; Kroupa et al., 1997; Drbohlav et al., 1999, were also taken into account. The hypothesis is that at the end of 2000, to some 165,000 foreigners who work in Czechia often temporary but usually at least more than several months (those with work permits, trade licenses and Slovaks being registered at job centres) one may add the same number (165,000) of illegal/clandestine foreign labour force with perhaps some 30,000 dependants. If we further add some 33,000 legally staying but not economically active foreigners (those with a visa for more than 90 days but without a work permit or a trade licence), and
immigrants). Nevertheless, transit migrants alone might well represent at least 100,000 people who are on the move in the territory of the country (Transit, 1994).

Economic migrants dominate among the different types of international migrants. In this article economic migrants are considered those who stay both under the umbrella of long-term residence permits (before and including 1999) and those with long-term visas issued for a period exceeding ninety days (in 2000) for, in the broad sense, employment or entrepreneurial activity in Czechia. These economic reasons traditionally dominate over others (86% in 2000) for which the long-term residence permit/long-term visa can be issued, namely: study, short-term attachment, medical treatment etc. Thus, generally speaking and for the purpose of this paper as well as for pragmatic reasons (given that more detailed data are not available) the situation is often simplified and all foreigners having long-term residence permits/long-term visas are labelled as “economic migrants”. Below we will concentrate just on these two categories, because they are the bulk of the economic immigrants. With exception of Slovaks, who fall into a special

67,000 foreigners with a permanent residence permit and some 1,300 refugees (those who have asylum status and stay in the country) then, altogether, about 461,000 persons. Asylum seekers are not included, since their numbers permanently change as many new ones come while many others leave or try to illegally leave the country (before their case is decided upon) in order to reach Germany or Austria above all.

The information about U.S. citizens in Czechoslovakia as of May 1, 1993 (data from a 1993 survey administered by the U.S. Department of State - see Bratsberg and Terrell, 1996) shows us how misleading the information about legal immigrants in Czechia might be. According to the American survey some 10,000 Americans resided in Czechoslovakia at that time, whereas official Czech statistics reported 1,621 Americans in the Czech Republic in 1993. At the same time, the number of Americans in Slovakia was much lower than in Czechia.
migration regime, these categories include also those persons who own work permits and trade licenses. Obtaining a job or a promise of a job as well as meeting demands put on future businessmen is required to get a long-term permit/long-term visa. Logically, as far as job permits and trade licenses are concerned, very often, one can find similar regional and structural patterns to those of economic migration represented by long-term residence permits/long-term visas.

Following the above definition, one can state that some 115,000 foreigners - economic migrants (86% of 134,060), were in Czechia in December 31, 2000\(^{11}\) and this is the group concentrated upon below. (In this context see also footnote 10). The other 66,891 migrants (see Table 1) are those who did not primarily enter the country for economic reasons. They have been granted permanent residence permits mainly for family reunion purposes. Thus, the documented economic migrants represent some 67% of all officially resident immigrants (with long-term visas and permanent residence permits). In fact, the importance of economic immigrants is much higher if undocumented migrants are added.

As mentioned above, the pool of documented foreign labour workers measured in terms of those who stayed with long-term visas for a period exceeding ninety days issued either for employment or entrepreneurial purposes (and closely related activities) - was some 115,000. However, if one applies a more rigorous definition, a more precise figure can be quoted: 164,987 foreigners registered an economic activity at that time (Horáková and Macounová, 2001). From this number, 40,080 were holders of work permits, 61,340 of trade licenses and there were also 63,567 citizens of Slovakia who were „extra“ employed and registered by trade centres in Czechia in December 31, 2000. In fact, the former approach and number must be applied since the latter has no suitable breakdowns and specific figures do not exist and cannot be made.

As far as quantity and related impacts, refugees and asylum seekers represent a marginal community compared to economic immigrants in the Czech Republic at present (see Table 1).

Despite the relatively short time, which has elapsed since the Revolution, four periods typical of different labour immigration patterns in Czechia might be sketched:

\(^{11}\) Those who stayed with long-term visas issued either only for employment or entrepreneurial purposes (or closely related activities).
1) 1990 - 1992 - Political reform was implemented and economic transition/transformation processes started; Migration mechanisms were designed (responsible bodies/institutions, legislation, specific programs etc.; Immigrants were “putting out feelers“ in the country;

2) 1993 - 1996 - The country went relatively successfully through the economic transition and stayed in terms of many economic parameters on the top among all the CEEc in transition; There was a huge inflow of economic migrants;

3) 1997 - 1999 - An economic disequilibrium occurred and, consequently, belated attempts of the Czech government to combat the unfavourable economic situation, to speed up transformation processes via new economic measures, led to deterioration of macro economic characteristics while serious problems at a micro-economic level were apparent as well. Accordingly, the living standard of the Czech population has been following rather negative trends (a decrease of real incomes); The migration policy has become more restrictive and the inflow of foreign labour force (legally resident, documented) has significantly diminished12;

---

12 One of the main problems was seen in the disequilibria between the growth of incomes and productivity of work (see e. g. Roënka, 1998, 1999). Until 1997, real incomes increased more rapidly than labour productivity, while the trend was reversed in 1998 (Roënka, 1999). Growing unemployment is one of the ways to increase productivity and restore lost equilibrium. Unemployment rates for the whole Czech Republic and Prague at the end of 1994, 1997 and for the last quarter of 1998 were 3.2 and 0.3; 5.2 and 0.9; 7.3 and 3.6 respectively. However, there are great differences by individual regions and districts; as of December 1998, in five districts the rate of unemployment officially exceeded 13% (Zamístnanost, 1999). In 1998, inflation rate was 10.7 and economy fell down by -2.2%. Accordingly, under such conditions, accommodation for foreign workers was minimal.

To summarize, the significant decrease in inflow of foreigners who come to the country primarily for economic reasons (documented migrants) was due to: a) damping/depression of some industrial sectors/branches (in relation to migration it concerns mainly construction) which naturally decreases some opportunities of employment otherwise embraced by foreigners (e. g. Ukrainians); b) decreasing purchasing power of the Czech population which, consequently, complicates prosperity of some firms where also foreigners might work and be hit or of self-employed foreigners themselves (e. g. those who to large extent directly rely on customers’ solvency - Chinese, Vietnamese). (On the other hand, just these immigrants offering cheap consumer goods in the Czech labour market might also profit from growing economic differentiation and possible fragmentation of the Czech consumer market as a result of on-going economic and political transformations - see Wang, 1998); c) Also, some direct steps, namely suppressive measurements - the ban on the stay, administrative and judicial expulsions, which
4) 2000 – to date - The turn of the century has brought some more significant indications of improvement - economic revitalization; Competent state institutions/bodies started paying more attention to the international migration issue; The new migratory laws and amendments came into force although immigration policy and practice continue to be more restrictive; Accordingly, the inflow of foreign labor (legally resident) has further been diminished.

In addition to the dominance of economic migrants among migratory types in Czechia, there are also other important migration patterns, which are worth noting:

1) The increase of those foreigners with long-term residence permits was enormous - mainly between 1991 and 1996 from 9,000 up to 153,000. During the last two years in question the numbers increased annually by 68% and 27%. A break occurred in 1996, and from then until 1998 (December) the number has increased by only 3,069 (in absolute terms). Nevertheless, it dropped significantly in 2000 (when also the previous status was transformed into long-term visas and, hence, “administrative recategorization” changes were, to some extent, behind this decrease; the old and new statuses are not compatible). In contrast, family-based immigration grew, albeit very slowly, between 1999 and 2000.

2) The capital city of Prague is very popular among immigrants. For example, 33.5% of the total number of those with long-term visas, were registered there on December 31, 2000. At the same time, Prague concentrated 34.7% of all work permits and 32.3% 13 of all trade licenses which immigrants in the entire country were issued. Prague is the largest city in the Czech Republic and, consequently, the primary gateway for foreigners entering the country. It attracts labour migration from less developed regions because it offers more and better jobs and income opportunities because it benefits from the spill over of internationalisation as it becomes more westernised than any other area in the country. Prague is also the main destination of immigrants are applied more often contribute to the break. As such ‘the ban on the stay’ has a rather deterring role, it increased from 9,525 in 1996 to 14,539 in 1999. Furthermore, altogether 2,985 foreigners were expelled from the country in 1999 (versus 1,065 in 1996).

13 However, mainly in the case of trade licenses it does not mean that immigrants really work in Prague - in the place of their registration. Many of them operate throughout the whole country.
from developed Western Europe, other regions of Czechia and CEEc as well (for more on the concentration of Western immigrants see Drbohlav and Sýkora, 1997). Importantly, it also offers more anonymity for undocumented (clandestine) immigrants than rural settlements. Besides Prague, also other highly urbanized regions attract immigrants more than rural areas\textsuperscript{14}.

3) Nevertheless, an overall trend of migrant dispersion and diffusion, and homogenisation within the country, is evident over time, as other regions become more attractive. While the Prague’s share of all the long-term residence permits issued was 44.9% in 1992, it was only 33.5% in 2000 (Table 2). (The respective figures for working permits are 37% for the end of 1994 and 34.7% for the end of 2000). This has to do with the demand for foreign labor, which has been, in part, saturated in Prague in the course of time as well as with growing economic opportunities in other regions of the country. In sum, since 1999, the tendency for concentration in Prague has lessened to a considerable extent.

4) Prague and the Central Bohemia region concentrate 48.7% of all foreigners with long-term visas. In contrast to Prague, which is losing importance in relative terms (the decrease of

\textsuperscript{14} The step-wise regression juxtaposing work permits by districts of Czechia in 1993 as dependent variable to potential predictors - selected economic, socio-demographic and geographical characteristics quite clearly showed that “... it is quite evident that the numbers of aliens with work permit in the districts of the Czech Republic are clearly related to urban environment and the atmosphere”, whilst realized investment plays the most important role. Thus, the higher the concentration of legally working aliens (with their work permits), the more a district is typical of an urban/suburban climate, with its favourable economic development (for example, high investments, a low rate of unemployment) and with its “challenging environment” that copies areas where highly educated and skilled domestic inhabitants are as well as visitors from abroad attracted. On the other hand, this environment is also characteristic of socio-pathological phenomena (represented, for instance, by the divorce rate) (Drbohlav, 1994).
immigrants over time is apparent in absolute terms - for example, there has been a drop from 49,309 in 1997 to 44,873 in 2000 – in migrant “stock”) whereas the surrounding region is gaining. Also, South and, in part, North Moravia are of growing importance in the process. On the other hand, heavily rural South Bohemia has the lowest share of immigrants. Examining trends over time (1993 versus 2000), whereas the shares of Prague, North Bohemia and North Moravia have been decreasing, other regions have been increasing (1993 versus 2000).

In relative terms (per 1,000 population), the importance of both the Moravian region and East Bohemia, and South Bohemia is lower in comparison to other areas.

5) As far as immigrants’ country of origin is concerned, by December 31, 2000, 80.0% of migrants of the entire economic immigrant group (represented by those who had a long-term visas) were from European countries, 17.5% from Asia and less than 1.4% from North America (Horáková and Macounová, 2001). The most numerous current foreign labour force (measured in terms of long-term visas) officially registered in Czechia is represented by Ukrainians (41,438) and Slovaks (33,136)\textsuperscript{15}, followed by Vietnamese (15,318) and Poles (5,281) (December 31, 2000)\textsuperscript{16}. Other groups are less important and include citizens of Russia, China, Germany, Belarus, Yugoslavia, Moldavia, Bulgaria, and the USA. Americans, Chinese, and citizens of Great Britain are highly concentrated in Prague (Ministry of Interior, internal materials). Economic immigrants from Ukraine prevail in four out of six Bohemian regions (including Prague). Logically, Slovaks make full use of geographical proximity and formerly developed economic ties in both Moravian regions (e.g. mining in the Ostrava region). Vietnamese, mostly as small businessmen (buying and selling goods), have newly established their businesses in West Bohemia taking advantage of the main transport corridors connecting Prague with Western Europe. Examining changes over time, two different periods can be identified. Between 1993 and

\textsuperscript{15} In fact, the number of Slovak economic immigrants is much higher since some of them, though registering at job centres (see also footnote 10 and 17), did not ask for and do not have a long-term visa.

\textsuperscript{16} It is important to note the existence of a deviation of trade licenses from the mainstream. In contrast with the composition of immigrants who had long-term visas, Ukrainians (21,402) and Vietnamese (19,307) small-businessmen are by far the largest communities - data as of December 31, 2000 (Horáková and Macounová, 2001).
1997, there was an influx of Slovaks\textsuperscript{17}, a huge increase of Ukrainians and steady growth of Vietnamese and Poles. Also, although at a lower level numerous immigrant communities of other Eastern immigrants have started increasing importantly, while some western groups rose slightly. However, according to the official data, the latest development (1998 - 2000) has been marked by stagnation and, recently, a rather significant decline in the numbers of individual ethnic groups of economic immigrants (measured via long-term residence permit/long-term visas). On the other hand, representatives of individual ethnic groups among holders of permanent residence permits (for family reunions) have increased, albeit slightly. As far as the most important immigrants’ ethnicities are concerned, Poles decline in all migration statuses/categories, whereas the Ukrainian decline in long-term residence permits/long-term visas was offset by gains in the category of job licenses.

6) One has to distinguish two very different immigrant groups in Czechia. The first an Eastern category is mainly composed of young males who, in contrast to their usually high education/skill level, are hired for manual, underpaid and unskilled jobs (however, when dealing with officials at job centres, they, on purpose, often undervalue their skills - see Table 5 and Drbohlav, 1997a). The second one is a more heterogeneous immigration from the West that is characterised by more females, children and older persons in comparison to those from the East. This second group also typically contains people with a high level of education who are mostly engaged in professional and managerial areas of work (managers, advisers, language teachers etc.). While data in Table 5 prove this situation with the example of work permits, in Table 6 the same is done with long-term residence permits when two different immigrant communities - Ukrainians and Americans - are juxtaposed one to the other. It is also worth mentioning that

\textsuperscript{17} Because of the common history within Czechoslovakia, Slovaks are a specific migrant category in Czechia. Their migration to the Czech Republic has a long tradition and even now, after the split into two independent states, the Slovak migration in Czechia has been regulated by a special “freer regime”. For example, Slovaks, unlike any other foreigner, are not supposed to ask for a work permit (in fact, a Slovak can compete on the Czech labour market without “being discriminated” vis-a-vis Czechs; Generally, an alien can take a vacant job provided no other citizen of Czechia is willing to accept it). What they are supposed to do is to only register themselves. As of December 31, 2000, 63,567 Slovaks were registered at job centres and 6,670 Slovaks stayed in Czechia with job licenses (Horáková and Macounová, 2001).
only for Poles is employment through group contracts more important than individual job search. Refugees do not participate in the Czech labour market at all.

7) Mainly due to the great share of “circulators“ among immigrants and because only a short time has elapsed some migratory features, otherwise expected, have not developed yet: For example, ethnic minorities have not so far created any significant areas of concentration within cities or regions (with the exception of the Russian community in Karlovy Vary) and no important ethnic social or political structures have evolved which would “unite, unify and organize“ new immigrants in the country.

**Illegal labour immigration and the evasion of migratory legislation**

Undocumented (illegal) migration of aliens relates to a situation when ones’ entry or stay does not, or has ceased, to fulfil conditions for entry or long-term residence stipulated by relevant intrastate law or international agreement, to which the Czech Republic is tied. No doubt, clandestine labour immigrants change the whole picture, which is drawn by legally residing economic migrants. The estimate of undocumented/illegal immigrants is for many reasons a very complicated matter (e. g. there are many different migratory types; there exist rather poor statistics even regarding legal immigrants; ,,shifts“ over time – both within illegal and legal statuses and from legal to illegal status occur and, vice versa; there are not many ,,case study objective data“ on illegals from which ,,totals“ might be derived etc.). As already mentioned above, one might estimate the current number of illegal immigrants in Czechia (as of the very end of 2000) at somewhere between 295,000 – 335,000. (From this figure - 165,000 might be illegals active on the Czech labour market, 30,000 their dependants and 100,000 – 140,000 transit migrants – see also footnote 10).

The capital city of Prague, and its surroundings, provides a good example of the “impact of illegals“. While there should be some 58,000 international migrants staying or registering themselves officially in Prague at the end of 2000 (the ,,stock“ by the given year), the estimate tells us that as many as 80,000 more might be added to this figure in order to have more realistic illustration what is going on in the migration field. In the middle of the 1990s, the number of foreigners in Prague (excluding tourists) was estimated to have been more than 10% of the total
population (see also Êermák et al., 1995). Table 7 provides a rough quantitative assessment regarding important communities of foreign undocumented immigrants by their country or region in Prague. Based on existing statistics and the authors’ own experience, it can be deduced that while North Americans, Chinese and Western Europeans are concentrated in Prague or in its near surroundings, Ukrainians and transit migrants operate throughout the entire republic (see below).

It is not difficult to believe that also in the case of Ukrainian workers the overall number of undocumented migrants in Czechia reaches the number of legally registered immigrants (Drbohlav, 1997a; see also footnote 10).

As it has been clearly shown in the example of the Ukrainians (e. g. Lupták and Drbohlav, 1999), there has recently been an important shift from “work permits“ to “trade licenses“ or to the black market. The strict and bureaucratically functioning Czech-Ukrainian agreement on the mutual employment of citizens reduces the opportunity for Ukrainians to operate in the country. Also, economic problems and, indeed, generally more restrictive measures applied towards migrants lead Ukrainians in Czechia to either switch from “work permits“ to “trade licenses“, which are much easier for foreigners to obtain, or to simply enter the black market and operate illegally in the country. Ukrainian independent quasi-businessmen are those workers who were provided with trade licenses but whose working regimes in fact resemble what is typically considered that of classical employees (these are really „hidden employees“). They are active in the same kind of occupation (“unqualified employees“ in various sectors of the economy) as “normal employees“. The whole system of issuing trade licenses to foreigners is a very liberal model, which is frequently misused by many foreigners (e. g. establishing public trading and limited liability companies within which foreign business persons now legally operate and function only as employees). It has been proven that this is the most advantageous way to legally penetrate the country and then legally or quasi-legally work or operate there.

A new and pragmatic situation has developed in which Ukrainians are now entering an asylum regime within which working activities in Czechia are allowed by a new law for asylum seekers whose applications are being investigated. (Currently, however, asylum seekers´ possible working activities have been somewhat limited by new legislation - Act No. 2/2002).

Apparently, the restrictive measures applied in the Czech-Ukrainian agreement did not
contribute to a factual decrease in the number of Ukrainians and other immigrants in the Czech Republic. It is more likely the other way around; in contrast to official statistical data, the number of illegal/undocumented immigrants has probably increased. Indeed, this situation is also reflected by the perception of the Czech public, which confirms a quantitative growth in the foreign labour force in the country over time - 1997 versus 1999 and 1999 versus 2001 (see the results of the opinion poll - Všejejné, 1999; O vztahu, 2001).

**Individual segments of the immigrant labour force**

It is worthwhile to very briefly sketch main behavioural patterns, which are typical of the important labour immigrant groups in the current legal and illegal Czech labour market. Although simplifying reality to some degree, Table 8 summarizes some immigration trends (see also, e. g. Cizinci, 1995; Drbohlav, 1997a, b; Kroupa et al., 1997; Chan, 1998; Wang, 1998; Drbohlav and Ėermák, 1998). The emphasis here is on demonstrating what forms of residence/work, types of work, social and socio-demographic parameters and regional patterns are linked with some important foreign labour force communities. Three rather different migratory inflows are found in Czechia now. The first group represents flows from the East (CEEc in transition - Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine), the second flow come from the West (developed countries of North America and Western Europe) and the third - a migration stream of Vietnamese and Chinese from the far East. Apparently, no homogeneous, compact pattern is visible. There exists rather a colourful mosaic of groups, activities, strategies and mechanisms.

**MIGRATION POLICY AND PRACTICE**

Some measures have been taken to control immigration to Czechia. First, at the beginning of the 1990s, laws regulating the entry and presence of foreigners were passed (the philosophy: “being quick rather than thoroughgoing and thus slow” was applied)\(^\text{18}\). Further, a number of re-

---

\(^{18}\) The entry and stay of foreigners in the territory of the Czech Republic was originally regulated by the Aliens Act No. 123/1992 and the Amendments to the Law No. 190/1994, 150/1996 and, consequently, by other regulations.

There were two basic legislative pillars for managing foreigners’ employment: the Law No. 1/1991 and the Law No. 9/1991 of the Czech National Council, and also two pillars for
admission agreements (concerning asylum-seekers) as well as some multilateral and bilateral agreements for the employment of foreigners were signed (see above). Cooperation with international institutions dealing with migration was established (over time, at least in some specific migratory sectors, this cooperation has successfully intensified). Also, the introduction of a state "integration program" for refugees, reemigrants and some other specific migratory categories was relatively effectively and successfully implemented in the Czech Republic.

Nevertheless, Czech migration policy and practice suffers from some weaknesses. First, the national immigration policy has no clear objectives, except: 1) to join western democratic structures (especially the EU) and thereby harmonize international migration policies and practices with those in the West; 2) to combat illegal immigration (which, however, also lacks a general conception and particularly the willingness, ability and means to do so). International migration in the Czech Republic has been seen mainly in the light of defensive reasoning, while, of course, trying to join western democratic structures also predetermines geopolitical interests. At least until 1999, the policy was mainly concerned with ad hoc measures within a more or less static model. Unambiguously, passive attitudes prevailed over active ones. No general goals were defined, let alone specific preferences made regarding economic, demographic, cultural or social diversity. For example, many economic and, in fact, all demographic, cultural and geographic aspects were ignored. In so doing, a rather negative perception of the international migration issue is obvious, its positive effects

regulating foreigners’ business activities: the Law No. 455/1991 and the Trade Code No. 513/1991. Nevertheless, regarding both areas, there was also a number of other complementary Amendments, rules and instructions.

The asylum procedure was governed by the Refugees Act No. 498/1990, which has also been partly changed and supplemented over time.
are more or less ignored or not recognized. Discussing and publicizing the migration issue in
general, and that of a foreign labour force in particular, was rare, reflecting an absence of any
systematic activity in this field. The Government and the Parliament - in many respects the
key bodies to create and implement policy, had other priorities on the agenda. As a corollary,
the existing migration legislation was not pliant. The whole process of change in this field
(new laws, amendments) stagnated. Further, there was insufficient cooperation between the
institutions/ministries mainly responsible for dealing with international migrants (refer to
paragraph “Inevitable problem - data”). No coherent and mutually complementary policies
with regard to immigration were practised.

Nevertheless, since 1999, some positive developments regarding international migration and
immigrants’ integration have occurred. First, new migratory legislation has been adopted.
This, to some extent, enabled “migratory theory and practice” to be harmonized within a
domestic institutional, administrative bureaucratic network and towards the EU. In short, the
main goal was to strengthen migration control according to the EU standards and
requirements. The twin new Acts, the 326/1999 Act on the Stay of Aliens on the Territory of
the Czech Republic (Aliens Act) and Act No. 325/1999 on Asylum (Asylum Act) entered into
force in January 2000. They have in common that they represent a very detailed set of rules
aimed at regulating all aspects of asylum and migration procedures and the stay of foreigners,
asylum seekers and recognized refugees on the territory of the state, leaving only a limited
space for its implementation by secondary legislation. It is noteworthy that the Aliens Act
gives precedence to international treaties regulating the stay of third country nationals on the
Czech territory over its own provisions. Further, certain issues closely related to migration
itself, are governed by specific laws, including, most importantly, access by third country
nationals to employment and independent gainful activities. Recently, the relevant laws (on
Employment - No. 167/1999 and on Small Business - No. 356/1999) were amended (on
October 1, 1999; March 1, 2000, respectively) with respect to harmonising them with the EU
regulations.
Other major changes and, to a large extent, improvements\textsuperscript{19} compared to former laws includes a new complex visa regime that contains provisions for the issuing, validity and types of visas. Those third country nationals who intend to come to the Czech Republic for a specific purpose, such as employment, must first obtain a corresponding visa in their country of origin through Czech embassies or consular offices. Accordingly, new formal statuses for a stay in the country has been created and it is mandatory for anyone who is to operate in the country under the umbrella of a long-term visa to simultaneously also get a work permit or a trade license. In sum, just as in the EU countries, external controls have been strengthened.

There are other activities, which are worth mentioning. The Ministry of the Interior, through its Department for Asylum and Migration Policy (former Department for Refugees and Integration of Foreigners) took the initiative to conceptualise and systematize the whole migratory issue. For example, a new ministerial advisory commission (composed of migration experts - representatives of other relevant ministries, other selected state bodies, regional or local policy makers, NGOs and independent research/scientific circles) has been established. In collaboration with this Commission the Department worked out a “Concept of immigration integration policy.” This document has become a basic policy pillar defining the policy, and means through which activities in the field of international migration/immigrants’ integration will be realized. For instance, regarding the research in the migration field, the concept assumes that significantly more financial support (coming from the state budget) will be devoted to migration research. Furthermore, the communication/information channels between, on the one hand, the Ministry of the Interior and other Ministries, and, on the other, the public and state administration at a local level, have in part been improved. Also, the NGOs have been invited to further cooperate in the given field.

An important initiative has also come from the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs. In line with demographic parameters and the whole situation on the Czech labor market and,

\textsuperscript{19} The new legislation also suffers from some evident shortcomings: For example, no preferential treatment for those who stay for a very short time and from whom the state benefits indeed (stays tied to trade, sport, culture etc.); not taking into account family reunion processes properly;
indeed, with what is going on in Western Europe (e. g. German activities) they have brought in a “Proposal for Active Selection of Skilled Foreign Workers”. This point system, based on a Quebecian model, may have, if applied, an important impact upon the whole migratory arena of the country.

Despite some progress in the field of migration policy and practice there are at least three basic problematic issues still to be addressed. These issues have been problematic for some time and “successfully survived” the new legislative changes as well:

1) Employment of foreigners, namely issuing a trade license that allows foreigners to start a business in the country is very liberal. Yet, regulations are very easily and frequently evaded both within and outside the law (see e. g. Kroupa et al., 1997, Lupták and Drbohlav, 1999). This situation in many ways places Czech entrepreneurs who adhere to the laws at a disadvantage vis-a-vis foreigners.

2) As far as employment of foreigners through work permits is concerned, two points attract attention above all: a) The current, very free regime for Slovak workers and 2) the administratively rather complicated and demanding process of organizing employment for Ukrainians (given the bilateral agreement) – the latter agreement does not solve the problem inasmuch tens of thousands of Ukrainians work in Czechia illegally or misuse/evade the migratory legislation as far as the small businessmen or asylum seekers are concerned (see above).

4) There is no effective control mechanism for illegal labour activities. For example, while in theory some employer sanctions are possible according to regulations, in practice it is very difficult to prove foreigners’ guilt - that his/her work activity is illegal (the overall legislative setting is not effective).

**PROBABLE FUTURE TRENDS**

Though more reliable predictions of future international migration trends are for well-known reasons almost impossible, some basic ideas on future labour migration of foreigners to Czechia will be sketched below. The remarks will be devoted to a time horizon of the next 5 years when one can expect that the Czech Republic will crown its endeavour to become a developed western-type democracy and will join the EU. The ideas are based on the basic assumption that

sometimes not adequate requirements which must be met by an applicant, somewhere not flexible mechanisms installed and the like (see e. g. Drbohlav at al., 2000).
the European integration process will go ahead according to plan relatively smoothly and no catastrophic events like a socio-economic or political collapse in some of CEEc will erode or stop it.

The existing trends might be extrapolated into the future. Labour immigration will continue chiefly in relation to the political, social and economic development in Czechia itself and other CEEc. Indeed, the character of economic development in Western democracies might, to some limited extent, play some role as well. CEEc polarizing into several different subgroups should, despite many problems, approach the levels of the most developed democracies. One can expect that Czechia might be one of those countries that will be at the head of the pack, hence, attracting important numbers of immigrants. Despite an attempt to regulate and limit the inflow of immigrants - circular labour migrants will probably dominate the immigration mosaic. The entire process may well follow an “S-shaped curve“ characterizing the settlement of immigrants in the destination country over time (see Martin and Taylor, 1995). In other words, intensive circular labour movements become the first stage of permanent (settlement) immigration. Simply stated, some of those migrants (not a negligible share) who started as pendular migrants will, after some time, probably settle permanently in the Czech Republic. The absorption of immigrants into Czech society will be strengthened by:

1) Considerable manifestation of globalisation and internationalisation of the economy;
2) Specific demands of the Czech market to meet labour deficits. This will be differentiated by individual regions and professions with a greater demand for highly skilled professionals as well as, those who will be willing to do the most demanding and, at the same time, unattractive, dirty work;
3) Employers’ never-ending, strong desire for a cheap labour force;
4) Relatively very low mobility of the Czech labour force (the collapse of housing construction, the non-existence of a real market with flats/houses etc.) which, at least for some time, might support (together with point 2 above) immigrants’ complementary rather than competitive function.

Against these inflows of immigrants coming mainly from the East, the voice of the Czech public will function with little success. Any resistance to immigrants will directly grow with a possible increasing in economic and social problems within society. Intensifying contacts with the western developed world and harmonizing economic, juridical, social and other conditions will bring about permanent, not large, but important contingent of Western immigrants. In the
course of time more and more transparent and compatible rules for doing business might function as a “pull“ migratory factor mainly for Western Europeans. On the other hand, by accepting western models with their protection of access to their own markets (placing tariffs and quota restrictions), the Czech Republic could lose some of the current and potential important immigrants-investors from the East (e. g. see the example of the Chinese in Wang, 1998).

In the meantime, further harmonization of migration policies and practices with those in the EU will continue - e. g. visa policy, arranging or rearranging bilateral agreements, further creating conditions for application of the Schengen agreement (including the protection of the state borders and the harmonizing of information systems). Logically, these changes will have important implications in relation to foreign labour migration patterns as well.

It may be expected that joining the EU might provoke a short but strong immigration wave from the East (probably mainly from ex-soviet republics) to Czechia in anticipation of even more systematic and restrictive migration policies. A huge social-economic polarization between westernised, rich and fortified countries like Czechia, Poland, Hungary and other CEEc will permanently stimulate illegal migration flows.

CONCLUSIONS

The Czech Republic has very quickly become an immigration and transit country and, the capital, Prague, a very important immigration and transit city. The current number of foreign immigrants who operate within the Czech Republic is about 460,000 – both: documented and undocumented, permanent and temporary (excluding, however, tourists, asylum seekers and transit migrants). In addition, the number of transit migrants might well reach levels between 100,000 and 140,000 (see footnote 10 and table 1).

There is a huge pool of documented foreign labour workers in Czechia, by far the most important migratory type in the country. The entire immigrant group is composed of various ethnic communities (coming mostly from other CEEc in transition, Western Europe, North America, Vietnam and China) that symbolize in some respects fairly different behavioural patterns (activities, strategies, mechanisms - see table 8). The economic immigrants were quite easily absorbed into society between 1990 and 1996. Since then, exactly as the “experience
dictates“, and manifesting more serious social and economic problems (1997 – 1999) and tighter, more restrictive migration policy, the level of documented migrants has significantly decreased (measured by “stock“ data). Nevertheless, one can deduce that because of immigrants’ very pragmatic and flexible behaviour, strong inflows of illegal immigrants continue (see for example, Lupták and Drbohlav, 1999). The analysis of the foreign labour force in Czechia demonstrates that migratory features in this country are in many respects similar to those characteristic of western developed democracies (see also e. g. Drbohlav, 1997a, b, c): For example, the popularity of the capital city of Prague is significant albeit decreasing over time especially for economic migrants. There are also two very different immigrant groups in Czechia - the first an Eastern category is mainly composed of young males who, in contrast to their usually high education/skill level, are hired for manual, underpaid and unskilled jobs. The second group is a more heterogeneous group from the West characterised by more females, children and older persons (vis-a-vis the Eastern group) with high level of education, mostly engaged in professional and managerial areas of work (note the correspondence to dual labour market theory).

On the other hand, given that such a short time has elapsed since the emergence of a democratic state, some typical migratory features, otherwise expected, have not yet developed (namely, ethnic spatial concentrations/enclaves and strong ethnic organizational structures).

Unlike in the western developed world, the migration policies and practices are in an immature stage in the Czech Republic. Objective and inevitable shortcomings go hand in hand with delay and inattention to migration issues by the Government and the Parliament and, consequently and logically, some other bodies and institutions. Nevertheless, since 1999, the situation in the migration field has, in part, been developing in rather a positive direction (better legislation, more active, systematic, comprehensive and coherent approaches).

The future development of international labour migration in Czechia will, to a large extent, be influenced by an anxiety to join the EU and to harmonize policies and practices with those in Western Europe. Accordingly, this will significantly influence the structure of the entire Czech migration picture.
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Moreover, internal materials of the Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Work and Social Affairs and Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Czech Republic were used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration type; Time</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Foreigners with long-term visas issued for a period exceeding ninety days(^1) (at December 31, 2000), (“stock”)</td>
<td>134,060</td>
<td>Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Foreigners with permanent residence permits (at December 31, 2000), (“stock”)</td>
<td>66,891</td>
<td>Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Foreigners with work permits (at December 31, 2000), (“stock”)</td>
<td>40,080</td>
<td>Ministry of Work and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Foreigners with trade licenses (at December 31, 2000), (“stock”)</td>
<td>61,340</td>
<td>Ministry of Industry and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Foreigners with registered economic activity (on December 31, 2000), (“stock“) – a) 40,080 holders of work permits, b) 61,340 holders of trade licenses and c) 63,567 citizens of Slovakia „extra“ employed and registered by trade centres(^2)</td>
<td>164,987</td>
<td>Institute of Work and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Asylum applications in 2000, (“flow”)</td>
<td>8,788</td>
<td>Department for Refugees and Integration of Foreigners, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Asylum applications (between January 1, 1993 and December 31, 2000)</td>
<td>29,184</td>
<td>Department for Refugees and Integration of Foreigners, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Foreigners granted refugee status (between January 1, 1993 and December 31, 2000)</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Department for Refugees and Integration of Foreigners, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Foreigners who have gained asylum seeker status and reside in the Czech Republic (as of December 31, 2000), (“stock“)</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11) Estimate of undocumented foreign workers in 2000, (“stock”)\(^3\)

| Authors’ estimate | 165,000 |

12) Estimate of transit migrants, the beginning of the 1990s, (“stock”)

| UN ECE | 100,000 – 140,000 |


Note:

Some 460,000 is estimated to be the current number of foreign immigrants who operate within the Czech Republic - both documented and undocumented, permanent and temporary (excluding, however, tourists, asylum seekers and transit migrants).

\[460,786 = 6 + 11 + \text{note No. 3} + [2 – (4+5)] + 3 +10\]


2 Within these 165,000, foreigners active on the Czech labour market having permanent residence permit are not included. They represent a different - much more integrated migratory segment, being accepted primarily for family reunion reasons and having more or less the same position as citizens of the Czech Republic.

3 Plus perhaps 30,000 dependants.

The short-term not exceeding 180 days, permits foreigners’ free movement as tourists under the compliance with the conditions for granting a visa or agreed upon in so-called visa-free agreements.

The long-term residence permit – new since 2000 is a visa issued for a period exceeding ninety days. It is more or less economically based immigration subject to proving the purpose of the stay (mainly employment and business, and, to a much lesser extent, study, therapy etc.).

The permanent residence permit in the territory of the Czech Republic is granted to an alien particularly for the purpose of reunification of a family, in cases where the spouse, a person of direct kin or a sibling of an alien had been granted permanent residence in the territory of the Czech Republic. It can further be granted on humanitarian grounds or if it is in a interest of the foreign policy of the country. This status is issued for five years.

Work permit enables immigrants to be employed. Trade license enables immigrants to make their own business in the Czech Republic (see more on these categories in e. g. Kroupa et al., 1997).


Very simply, the transit migrants are those whose main goal is not to stay in the Czech Republic but to enter other country/ies (mainly illegally Germany) as soon as possible.
### TABLE 2
Foreigners with long-term residence permits and permanent residence permits in the Czech Republic and Prague; 1990-2000 (as of December 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Long-term stay</th>
<th>Permanent Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>9,204</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>20,428</td>
<td>9,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>46,070</td>
<td>17,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>71,230</td>
<td>28,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>120,060</td>
<td>46,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>152,767</td>
<td>52,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>153,516</td>
<td>49,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>155,836</td>
<td>46,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>162,108</td>
<td>52,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>134,060</td>
<td>44,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note:
Stateless persons are not taken into account.

1 In 1990 and 1991 it was not possible to separate data for Prague from these for Central Bohemia.
2 The newly passed Act on the Stay of Aliens on the Territory of the Czech Republic (Aliens Act) No. 326/1999 (came into force on January 1, 2000) substituted the status of the long-term residence permit for a new one - long-term visas issued for a period exceeding ninety days.

See also note in Table 1.
### TABLE 3
Foreigners with long-term residence permits (1993) and long-term visas issued for a period exceeding ninety days in the Czech Republic and Prague by country of origin (for selected countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>In December 31, 1993</th>
<th>%, Prague</th>
<th>Number, CR</th>
<th>%, Prague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,136</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5,281</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>15,318</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4,809</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>41,438</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>15,318</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9,158</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,070</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>134,060</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior (internal materials).

**Note:**

1. Except for Ukraine, Russia and 309 other foreigners with passports of individual republics of the former Soviet Union.
2. Except for 718 other foreigners with passports of individual republics of the former Yugoslavia.
3. For 2000 data concerns newly established Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).
4. See the footnote 15 and 17.
Citizens of France, Romania, Italy and Croatia did not reach a threshold of 1,000 immigrants in 2000.

The newly passed Act on the Stay of Aliens on the Territory of the Czech Republic (Aliens Act) No. 326/1999 (came into force on January 1, 2000) substituted the status of the long-term residence permit for a new one - long-term visas issued for a period exceeding ninety days.

Country of origin is defined according to a citizenship of immigrants (which is found in their passport). It concerns also other tables (see below).

Not included are newly arising source migrant countries which, in 2000, had under the given status in the Czech Republic the following numbers of immigrants: Belarus (2,134), Yugoslavia (SFRY)(1,989), and Moldavia (1,909).

See also note in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number in December 31, 1993</th>
<th>Number in December 31, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>17,754 - China 2,301, Yugoslavia 1,881, Vietnam 1,752, CIS 1,469, Poland 1,352, Ukraine 1,021, USA 850</td>
<td>44,873 - Ukraine 15,990, Russia 5,458, Slovakia 4,782, Vietnam 2,600, China 2,406, Yugoslavia 1,426, USA 1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bohemia</td>
<td>4,851 - Poland 1,725, Vietnam 1,107, Ukraine 710</td>
<td>20,362 - Ukraine 6,434, Slovakia 4,586, Poland 2,183, Vietnam 2,155, Russia 1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bohemia</td>
<td>1,726 - Ukraine 317, Vietnam 317, Germany 183, Austria 179, CIS 117</td>
<td>6,177 - Ukraine 2,657, Slovakia 1,222, Vietnam 561, Russia 304, Austria 247, Germany 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bohemia</td>
<td>3,792 - Ukraine 1,035, Vietnam 795, Poland 626, Germany 373</td>
<td>11,804 - Vietnam 4,241, Ukraine 3,058, Slovakia 2,238, Russia 566, Germany 453, Belarus 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bohemia</td>
<td>5,136 - Poland 1,551, Vietnam 1,130, CIS 760, Ukraine 389, Yugoslavia 252, Germany 223</td>
<td>11,383 - Ukraine 3,642, Vietnam 2,711, Slovakia 2,351, Russia 620, Bulgaria 266, Moldavia 244, Poland 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bohemia</td>
<td>2,398 - Poland 755, Vietnam 502, Ukraine 362</td>
<td>9,437 - Slovakia 3,172, Ukraine 3,106, Poland 872, Vietnam 678, Russia 237, Belarus 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Moravia</td>
<td>4,624 - Ukraine 844, Vietnam 424, Slovakia 342, Poland 288, Austria 288, Yugoslavia 254, CIS 232</td>
<td>17,277 - Slovakia 7,107, Ukraine 5,228, Vietnam 1,242, Mongolia 474, Belarus 364, Moldavia 320, Russia 315, Austria 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Moravia</td>
<td>5,789 - Poland 2,324, Slovakia 1,059, Vietnam 758</td>
<td>12,747 - Slovakia 7,678, Ukraine 1,323, Vietnam 1,129, Poland 1,089,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior (internal materials).

Note:
1. The Commonwealth of Independent States.
2. Regarding Slovaks - see footnotes 15 and 17.

See also note in Table 1
## TABLE 5
Foreigners with work permits in the Czech Republic (stock) by the most important countries of origin - structure by selected characteristics; as of December 31, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Individ.(^1)</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>SS(^2)</th>
<th>Univ.(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>15,753</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>7,679</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Britain</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,080</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Work and Social Affairs (internal materials).

Note:
\(^1\) “Individual” form of employment (in comparison with “contracts” which represent the rest up to 100%).
\(^2\) Graduates at secondary school; \(^3\) Graduates at university.
Slovaks do not need work permits when working as employees in the Czech Republic (see footnotes 15 and 17).

See also note in Table 1.
**TABLE 6**
Citizens of Ukraine and the USA who were granted long-term residence permits in the Czech Republic in 1996 by selected socio-demographic characteristics (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex: Males</strong></td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 0 – 14</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 44</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 59</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for stay:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial activity</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social structure:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical college</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligentsia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Alien and Border Police, Ministry of Interior (internal materials).

Note:
1 The author is well aware of problems within the social structure categories when a mixture of them (type of employment, education and status) is applied (see also table 5). Anyways, this respects the official current Czech statistical practice at least within the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Work and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic.

More recent breakdown of the given data was not available. Now, the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic has not registered the social structure data since they have been found to be not too authentic records.

See also note in Table 1.
TABLE 7
Estimate of selected most important communities of foreign undocumented migrants in Prague and nearby surroundings at the turn of the century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/region of origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>10,000 - 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>some 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10,000 - 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>5,000 – 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit migrants</td>
<td>some 10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ assessment – based on own experience and research (e. g. Drbohlav, 1997a; Drbohlav et al., 1999; Lupták and Drbohlav, 1999), many secondary sources of information and various data from the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic. Also, estimates are derived from the character of the spatial and functional setting/organization of ethnic groups - see also footnote 10 and tables 3, 4, 8 and 1 (including a „philosophy“ regarding the creation of immigrant estimates).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group/Region of origin</th>
<th>Form of stay, type of work</th>
<th>Social and demographic structure, social relations</th>
<th>Range/Regional pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovaks</td>
<td>1Permanent jobs, to a lesser extent seasonal ones, commuting within the border zone; heavy industry (mining and metallurgy), agriculture and forestry, construction, light industry and services - within the border zone, mainly construction - within the interior; manual auxiliary workers and qualified workers as well</td>
<td>Workers, a wide mosaic of patterns and strategies</td>
<td>Ostrava, Karviná and the whole zone bordering on Slovakia, Prague and Central Bohemia but also some other districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainians</td>
<td>Work permits – individual, trade licenses, illegally; manual work, auxiliary work; mainly construction but also industry (e.g. food-processing, textile), agriculture</td>
<td>Poor; workers, (relatively high educational level purposely undervalued), young, males; frequent trips to mother country</td>
<td>Throughout the whole country, Especially Prague, Central Bohemia, large cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Trade licenses, illegally; small-scale market entrepreneurs/sellers; buying and selling clothes and electronics</td>
<td>Quasi-Middle class</td>
<td>Throughout the whole country, especially western border zone - near Germany and Austria, large cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>Work permits – contracts; manual work, auxiliary work; construction, heavy industry (metallurgy, mining), textile industry, agriculture, forestry</td>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>Central Bohemia, the whole zone of Bohemia and Moravia bordering with Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Illegally, via trade or entrepreneurial companies; representatives of firms in China and small-businessmen; import, distribution (wholesale) and retail of apparel, shoes and light industrial goods</td>
<td>Strong kinship ties and regional social networks, relatively frequent trips to mother country</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Americans</td>
<td>1) Work permits, short-term stays; top managers, advisers, employees of multinational and international companies;  2) Illegally, trade licenses; lecturers, teachers of English, small-scale businessmen</td>
<td>1) Relatively affluent; university-educated, highly skilled, intellectual background; 2) a “mixture of structures”</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europeans</td>
<td>1) Work permits, short-term stays; top managers, advisers, employees of multinational and international companies  2) Illegally, trade licenses; lecturers, teachers of “western” languages, small-scale businessmen</td>
<td>1) Relatively affluent; University-educated, highly skilled, intellectual background; 2) a mixture of structures</td>
<td>Prague, a zone bordering on Germany and Austria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1 In fact, Slovaks are an integral part of the Czech labour market even after the split of Czechoslovakia - with no social, cultural and very limited geographical barriers. See footnotes 15 and 17.
Especially in a case of Western immigrants, frequent undocumented stays seem to be caused, to some extent, by rejection of the immigrants to cooperate with the Czech administration. A huge bureaucracy, a demanding and time-consuming process of registration when communicating with the Czech administrative bodies (mainly within the Ministry of the Interior) and reluctance of Czech employers to register their foreign employees as soon as possible are behind these facts.

By far, not as many undocumented immigrants (in absolute terms) in this category in the Czech Republic as compared to the Northern Americans.

See also footnote 10 and note in Table 1.

This characterization is not based on any representative survey research. It follows from the authors’ personal experience, through consulting on the issue with selected experts and through some original, primordial views on migratory and residence patterns of some immigrant communities in Prague/Czech Republic (see e. g. Wang, 1998; Chan, 1998; Drbohlav, 1997a). The indicated facts stress only the most significant trends; omitting information does not necessarily mean that, in fact, there are no clearer trends in relation to selected aspects and given ethnic immigration groups. Rather, so far, they have not been tackled or simply detected and widely publicized.