

Monika Štrbová

The culture of poverty of the Roma in Slovakia

Górnośląskie Studia Socjologiczne. Seria Nowa 3, 181-185

2012

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Monika Štrbová

Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra

The culture of poverty of the Roma in Slovakia

Abstract: The sociopathological phenomena in the Romany community are often defined as a part of the traditional Roma culture. There are, however, more patterns of behaviour characteristic of the culture of poverty and socially excluded places (perhaps contaminated by various traditions of the Roma). Our contribution does not give clear answers to these questions because we think that at the moment it is already very difficult to distinguish elements of traditional Romany culture from elements that are part of the culture of poverty. Our contribution is rather a consideration of the topic.

Key words: Romany culture, poverty, sociopathological phenomena.

We find Roma in each region of Slovakia but, at the level of municipalities, the minority has actually become a determining element only in Eastern Slovakia (there lives more than 83% of the Roma population who in 2001 signed up to the Roma nationality), where the socio-economic tension was reflected in indicators of unemployment of about 10% higher than the national average; the income gap, which is far above the national average. In this structure of municipalities dominated by small villages with unfavourable conditions, urbanization, the level of the Roma is the lowest among all the nationalities living in the country.

As stated by Bačová (quoted in J. Liba, 2008, p. 124), the Roma family represents a separate demographic type, with the following characteristics:

- young age at the beginning of life in the partner volume and the young age of women at birth,
- significant population growth,
- the smaller proportion of people in the productive age,
- multi-member households,

- higher share of full families with children up to 15 years, housing several generations of spouses,
- common and joint management.

However, as Š. Moravec notes (2006, p. 15), yet no one has formulated a theoretical model of the Roma culture, because the Roma are not clearly identifiable, and bounded by the company and also cultural patterns exhibit great variability both as between different groups, so family relationship in locations where they live too. In this context, M. Jakoubek (2005, p. 227) identifies three cultural complexes of Roma:

Traditional Romany culture

The main characteristics of the traditional Roma culture are: the dominant organizational structure of kinship (the term derives from the family relationship of its identity), the concept of ritual purity (this concept is reminiscent of the situation of Indian caste) and subethnic jurisdiction. The winners of the traditional Roma divided mainly for Walnuts of the Roma (Vlachike Roma) and Rumungros. Vlachike Roma are known, by preserving their traditional way of life and culture, internal laws specific to their Vlachike language. “They are internally divided into many sub-Kalderare, Lovare and Čurare, Bojachs, Machvajs (living in the USA, Canada, and Serbia), Ursars (in Romania — Banat and in Serbia), Rudari Roma (Romanian, living in Eastern Slovakia), Gurbeti, Burbati and others” (E. Davidová, 1995, p. 35). Externally identified by groups such as Gypsies, are not considered ethnicity. Roma is more, as it adds Petrova (bwp.findarticles.com): “include Jevgjits, Ašhlkalijs, and Egyptians in Albania in Kosovo and of Macedonia, of the Travellers in the UK and Ireland, Rudars and Beyashs in Hungary, Romania and other countries.” Sints living mainly in Germany, Austria, Northern Italy, but also for us and in other countries — a group of so-called German Gypsies, also named the Roma.” Even some French groups used a name Manus, which means man. In Spain and southern France, the Roma say Gitanos (E. Davidová, 1995). “These subethnic groups are usually considered impure and are thus once again each other mutually endogamous. [...] in this culture it is laid in the narrow sense of the word of the public sphere. The only reputable and legitimate authority and to the representation of the traditional Roma culture is a representation and authority based on collaterals” (M. Jakoubek, 2005, p. 228). Š. Moravec (2006, p. 14) states about the Roma, which is the bearer of the traditional Roma culture as the man who “has mastered and practiced a comprehensive integrated system of values, standards, principles of social organization, ways of resolving problems, etc...”

The national Roma culture

The main idea of the national Roma culture is the idea that “everyone” Roma “are members of the Roma nation and share one — the Roma identity, as well as the loyalty to [his] nation” (M. Jakoubek, 2005, p. 229). This culture is made by means of a standardized language in schools. M. Jakoubek (2005, p. 229) claims that this culture is getting significant support, but so far the Romany nation does not have a significant number of members and corresponds to the number of persons, all committed to the Roma nationality.

Culture of poverty (culture of peri-urban poor neighbourhoods)

The concept of the culture of poverty was formulated by Oscar Lewis in 1959. Of course, that theory has many critics, but in our contribution we will not deal with them. The concept of the culture of poverty (in the context of the concept of social exclusion or underclass) is based on the premise that “the inhabitants of socially excluded localities are the guardians of specific cultural model that arose in the process of adaptation to long-term poverty” (M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 324). O. Lewis (1966, p. XLV—XLVIII)) has identified 70 types of the culture of poverty, which are described in four dimensions:

- The relationship between a sub-culture and majority of its integration into the company by the company, or majority (if the members of the poor and the absence of participation on the subculture of poorly integrated institutions majority part of the company, there may be deviations, especially according to Merton’s theory of structural tension).
- The nature of the slum community, which is characterized by of organisation.
- Type of family in which children are neglected that results in many early sexual experience, there is no privacy, individual assets, but puts the emphasis on family solidarity and the siblings rivalry over limited resources.
- The attitudes, values and character features of individuals that are characterized by a feeling of distrust, inferiority, despair, apathy, etc.

It should be noted that not all communities live in poverty, they represent a model of the culture of poverty. But, as indicated by O. Lewis (2006, p. 409), the “culture of poverty is likely to be the most suitable candidate, people who come from the lowest layers of the fast changing society and are partially excluded from it.”

Culture of peri-urban poor neighbourhoods of course is not the Roma culture, but the “culture of socially excluded places (contaminating many different traditions or trends)” (M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 326). Ferko (quoted in M. Jakoubek, 2006,

p. 398) says about the culture of poverty of the Roma that it was passed on from generation to generation since the time of their living in India. As the author says: "How do from India, were found everywhere on the fringe of society. From the beginning it was a company where you came from, who their denying and building them on the edge of society. Later they were themselves the 'Gypsies' who were separated and withdrew to the edge of society, because they were no longer enough to adapt to life on the edge, that should not be on it, and neither have they could not get out of the booby traps to the culture of poverty" (Ferko, quoted in M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 398) is the difference between poor non-Roma and poor Roma." The problem of Roma poverty in Slovakia is also in fact that it is the only poverty, by concentration. Poverty is reflected differently when it is dispersed and when it is concentrated. The poor non-Roma live between themselves, while the Roma settlements in poor crowd out (Bán, Majchrák, www.tyzden.sk). Follows a socially conditioned to the crime, which has an ethnic element. Granovetter (quoted in M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 333) develops the concept of culture of poverty on the concept of strong and weak ties. The inhabitants of socially excluded localities having specific types of social networks, which are structured on the basis of strong ties and weak ties sit on. Strong ties and weak ties are characteristic for family relationship social network for social network of families with the wider surroundings. In conclusion, "the reliance on family network in an environment of modern market society leads in that environment to the retrospective the leave of exclusion" (M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 334).

We do not know whether the phenomena that are frequent, such as high birth rates are at an early age, distrust of the institutions, the strategy on the presence, absence of private property, the reciprocity within the family relationship networks, tolerance for property crime, etc. are the elements of the traditional Roma culture or the culture of poverty elements (which is not the Romany culture). If these features were the features of the culture of poverty, we think that, then the options for prevention and to address the problem would have been easier. Then (without underestimating universal solutions), the main tool of change should be a social work focused on the individual client in the site. This change, however, should be comprehensive. But if the features of the traditional Roma family, the solutions to the problem can be made more difficult, if not at all be implemented. It is not in our interest to suppress the features of the culture of the Roma. This would lead to assimilation and we do not do it correctly. But these features of the Roma family would have been the least unfavourable for family members, who would like to improve their socio-economic situation. Therefore, we are aware that the success of activities to improve the lives of socially excluded Roma will always be only part-time. In traditional Roma culture then is the number of elements that represent the barriers in relation to the majority of society. For example, one of the fundamental principles of the Roma family is collectivism linked with redistribution. This family solidarity network is very convenient for members on the one hand, but on the other hand, they are most likely in the disadvantaged economic situation of the breaking, which makes it impossible. This specific type of Roma families makes it

also impossible for its members to succeed in majority society. If Roma did not want this success and would be happy with what they have, the problem would be likely to be different. It looks like the situation and the preservation of the culture of the Roma travellers, the success of the Roma in the majority company (M. Jakoubek, 2006, p. 330—332).

Š. Moravec (2006, p. 25) claims that the “Roma issues are a solid demonstration of the mechanism of slapstick in part self fulfilling prophecy.” Someone whom a majority neighborhood considered a Roma, select as “nonconformists” (the lazy), but this man gets into a situation you cannot handle, and actually is, consequently, between the “nonconformists” rank (Š. Moravec, 2006, p. 26).

References

- Davidová E., 1995: *Cesty Romů (Romano drom 1945—1990)*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Jakoubek M., 2005: “Multikulturalismus vs. Kultura (na příkladu tzv. Romů a „jejich” kultury)”. In: Hirt J., Jakoubek M., eds.: *Soudobé spory o multikulturalismus a politiku identit: antropologická perspektiva*. Plzeň: Čeněk, pp. 227—230.
- Jakoubek M., 2006: “Přemýšlení (*rethinking*) “Romů” aneb “Chudoba Romů” má povahu Janusovy tváře. In: Hirt J., Jakoubek M., eds.: *Romové v osidlech sociálního vyloučení*. Plzeň: Aleš Čeněk.
- Lewis O., 2006: “Kultúra chudoby”. In: Hirt J., Jakoubek M., eds.: *Romové v osidlech sociálního vyloučení*. Plzeň: Aleš Čeněk.
- Lewis O., 1966: *La vida. A puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty — San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House.
- Liba J., 2008: “Škola v prevencii sociálno-patologických javov u žiakov zo sociálne znevýhodneného a výchovne menej podnetného prostredia”. Available online at: http://www.ped.muni.cz/z21/2007/konference_2007/sbornik_2007/sb07_praxe_skoly/cze/liba_cz.pdf. 2008 (accessed: 15 March 2012).
- Merton R.K., 2000: *Studie ze sociologické teorie*. Praha: Slon.
- Moravec Š., 2006: “Nástin problému sociálního vyloučení romských populací”. In: Hirt J., Jakoubek M., eds.: *Romové v osidlech sociálního vyloučení*. Plzeň: Aleš Čeněk.

Internet website

www.foruminst.sk/publ/neks2003_sk_6.pdf (accessed: 15 March 2012).