

## **“Gypsy” Fate: Carriers of our collective shadow**

Alexandra Fidyk, Ph.D.

*National-Louis University, Chicago*

If only it were all so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart? (Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*)

### ***Story of the Stranger***



“Strangers, gods and monsters,” writes Richard Kearney (2003) “represent experiences of extremity which bring us to the edge. They subvert our established categories and challenge us to think again” (p. 3). Through this interpretation of “stranger” and “scapegoat,” I consider the

European Roma<sup>1</sup> as a group that challenges our way of thinking. The Roma as named are those who “threaten the known with the unknown” and so are “exiled to hell or heaven; or simply ostracized from the human community into a land of aliens” (Kearney, 2003, p. 3).

Through a Romani narrative, woven of fact and fiction<sup>2</sup>, I consider how a group, which has been deeply identified with the role of the scapegoat, suffers negative inflation, exile and splitting. By fact and fiction I point to the inseparability of living and recounting stories, of Romani biography and cultural myth, and of stories told among the Roma and those told to non-Roma when creating any narrative. This identification of scapegoat by both themselves and others speaks to us of our split between the conscious and unconscious, familiar and unfamiliar, same and other. The Roma remind us that we have a choice, as Kearney (2003) says: “to try to understand and accommodate our experience of

strangeness or to repudiate it by projecting it exclusively onto outsiders” (p. 4). Questions of identity and alterity are addressed as I explore possibilities to respond to the “problem” of the stranger in terms of a Jungian interpretation of a scapegoat complex. In so doing, the hope is to extend not only the discussion of difference in our teaching and research but also as an ethical response toward a people who continually have been denied rights, persecuted and discriminated. Here there arises a warning to the all too common occurrence of dismissing the other as evil or too quickly coming to “make sense” of the stranger, the other, in terms of one’s own sense of self. The great challenge of this century, both for politics and for research, is that of understanding the other which deeply implies understanding self. As Erich Neumann (1969/1990) directs: “The future of the collective lives in the present of the individual” (p. 30).

Narratives, both individual and collective, are a primary embodiment of our understanding of the world, or experience, and ultimately of ourselves. Narrative yields a form of understanding of human experience that is not directly amenable to other forms of exposition or analysis. So what is offered as one interpretation of a Romani narrative is not only descriptive of self but, more importantly, fundamental to the emergence and reality of that subject. Here, a narrative of self is both a receptive and a creative activity. Borrowing language from the literary sphere, narrator, character and spectator are always already caught up in narratives which we enact and continue to construct; in this narrative, the same holds true.

### ***Roma as Stranger and Scapegoat***



This mother’s candor, which could seem brutal to an outsider, was typical of the Dukas, and indeed of all Gypsies I met. Among them it was recognized that truth in itself was not painful only ignorance could bring suffering. (Fonseca, 1996, p. 36)

The European Roma population holds a unique position: there has been no people who at once have been so persistently discriminated against and yet so excessively romanticized (Cooper, 2001-02). “The history of the Romani people can hardly be matched in terms of oppression and injustice,” wrote Ian Hancock<sup>3</sup> (1999, par. 4). They have endured slavery and genocide, sterilization and expulsion, and yet, they have survived. Mostly confined to shantytowns, often denied formal education, without almost any prospect for social mobility, Roma are subjected to extremely demeaning stereotypes. They are viewed as dirty, lazy and criminal. They have

### 3 Fidyk

been called the “near-universal scapegoat for the ills of postcommunist society” (Brearley, 2001, p. 591). And yet, they are admired as musicians, dancers, and free spirits. Hancock (1999) reminds us: Roma are often viewed as “the very *epitome* of freedom” (par. 6, emphasis in original), a popular sentiment expressed in novels, poems, songs, and the public imagination. They are Europe’s untouchables, but also a romantic dark self of the European whites with a “secret allure of the peripheral” (McLaughlin, 1999, p. 38; see Fidyk and Miskovic, 2007; Miskovic, 2006).

Here I apply the term “scapegoat” to individuals and groups who are accused of causing misfortune. This usage serves to relieve others, the scapegoaters, of their own responsibilities, and to strengthen the scapegoaters’ sense of power and righteousness. In this way, a search for the scapegoat relieves us also of our relationship to the other and to the transpersonal dimension of life (Self, gods, God, Spirit). And, thus, ignores the workings of the gods, shifting blame to the scapegoat and the devil for life’s evils – we remain good.



Consistent in all scapegoating activity in both Biblical and political science references is the concept of unity. The scapegoat represents the group’s urge toward its own wholeness by excluding its disparate elements. Thus, scapegoating can exist anywhere there is a transfer of negative attribution from one part of a system to another, or to a part outside of itself to another system in order to meet what is perceived to be a unifying survival function for the system as a whole (Colman, 1995). Within any given society the scapegoat is created by projection identification or by projecting the unacceptable side of group life elsewhere. For the individual, these elements are said to belong to one’s shadow and while not accepted as one’s own become projected onto others. For the group, common negative ground is a collective creation, a “symbolic compromise for many individuals’ negative projections” (Colman, 1995, p. 7). So the scapegoat while not identical to the shadow of the individual is similar in that it is “humanity’s societal vessel for the shadow” (Colman, 1995, p. 7). The scapegoat is an ancient archetype; scapegoating is an ancient activity. Records indicate that animals have been used as scapegoats since the ancient Hittite and Sanskrit texts.

We forget that originally the scapegoat was an animal or human victim chosen for sacrifice to the underworld god to appease his anger and to heal the community.

The scapegoat was a healing, curative agent, a *pharmakon*. Such rituals were



dedicated to and identified with the god. They functioned to invite the transpersonal dimension to aid and renew the community which saw itself as embedded in and dependent on transpersonal forces. Scapegoat rituals were used “to enrich meaning or call attention to other levels of existence. . . . [They] incorporate[d] evil and death along with life and goodness into a

single, grand, unifying pattern” (Douglas, 1966, p. 53). As such, one’s identity was personal, communal and transpersonal, belonging to a wider web of relations.

Today many still believe in the efficacy of ritual action, consider sporting rituals during playoffs, celebrations to mark graduation, marriage and death. However, we are too often unconscious of the “grand, unifying pattern,” the transpersonal matrix in which our actions are embedded. We see only the material, secular framework, value highly the technical-rational perspective, serve corporate agendas, and ignore a historical locatedness in an embodied and spiritual dimension of life. Because of this collective forgetting and a desire to avert catastrophe, the scapegoat ritual has become trivialized and its deeper meaning remains unconscious. There is a dangerous tendency to blame certain people or groups, often ethnic and cultural minorities, for the evil in the world, particularly since “God” and those who identify with “his image” (dominant groups, the right, fundamentalists, etc.) have come to be seen as only good; thus, the adverse must be projected. As Kearney’s brief genealogy of scapegoating indicates, certain aspects of biblical culture were/are already exemplifying the maxim – “demonizing monsters keeps God on our side!” (Beal cited in Kearney, 2003, p. 41). Read in this way, Bible narratives sometimes serve/d to stigmatize the stranger, monster or scapegoat as menace to the divine order. As Beal explains:

The monstrous other who threatens ‘us’ and ‘our world’ is represented as an enemy of God and then is exorcised from the right order of things and sent to some sort of hell. ‘Our’ order is identified with the sacred over against a diabolically monstrous chaos. Such is the fate of . . . the sea monster Leviathan in Psalm 74 and Isaiah 27. (cited in Kearney, 2003, p. 42)

We are witness to such thinking and practices today where even in a more secular society politics, law, economics and ethnology rule with that narrative. Such a fate is that of the Roma who have suffered a process of gradual extermination from starvation, hypothermia, and the callous indifference of authorities.

## 5 *Fidyk*

The practice of scapegoating is evidenced in many different cultures: most human cultures have deployed myths of sacrifice to scapegoat strangers. It means holding certain aliens or strangers responsible for the ills of society – finding the one or ones who can be identified with evil or wrong-doing, blamed for it, and isolated or cast out from the community and in extreme cases, waged war against. This action leaves the remaining members with a feeling of guiltlessness, atoned (at-one) with the collective standards of behaviour. Scapegoating both allocates blame and serves to “inoculate against future misery and failure” by evicting or hunting down the presumed cause of misfortune (Kagan cited in Perera, 1986, p. 8). The practice gives the illusion that we can be “perfect” if we do the “right” things; take the proper prophylactic measures (Perera, 1986, p. 9). This sacrificial strategy furnishes communities with a binding identity, that is, with the basic sense of who is included (us) and who is excluded (them). So the price to be paid for the “happy tribe,” the “insiders” is the ostracizing of the “outsider” – the “immolation of the ‘other’ on the altar of the ‘alien’” (Kearney, 2003, p. 26).

### *The Meaning of the Scapegoat Archetype*

What is important here is the bonding that exists between the two groups, a mark of *participation mystique*.<sup>4</sup> Within this field of psychic contagion there is on-



going projective identification, each accepts the given identification of self and other; the two parties coexist in one synchronistic whole – an uroboric, preverbal, pre-ego field. For example, while the European Roma have been scapegoated, within the Romani language the word *Roma* means people in the plural masculine gender, with a connotation of “us” versus “them.”

Outsiders are referred by the general term *Gadje* (*Gaje*), a disparaging term given to one who is not a “Gypsy,” which Dimitrina Petrova (2003) claims is a “strikingly frequent conversational practice when Roma speak with Roma” (p. 112). In other words, within their language, Roma (unconsciously) accept this ostracized position and project it back upon the other. The two groups are caught within dichotomies of the Self-Other relation and unconscious projective identification; both scapegoat and scapegoater feel in control of the mix of goodness and malevolence that belongs to reality itself. Each narrative illustrates that the self (of the group or nation) is never secure in itself. What needs to occur

for the other to be invited back into an ethical response? How is it that Self and Other can come into dialogue with each other?

There exists a critical connection, then, between the growth process of individuals and that of groups. Scapegoats not only hinder group development but also hamper integration of shadow projections, a necessary step in the individuation process – a process of development toward becoming an “individual” personality, to become familiar with one’s personal psychological strengths and weaknesses. As long as there are unintegrated shadow figures for the group – scapegoats – integration of the shadow within the individual is an illusion. That is, the process of individuation for the individual will always be held hostage to the presence of the scapegoat in the larger community. In a very real sense, then, individual and collective development are inextricably intertwined; individuation of the individual cannot proceed without a concomitant developmental process in the collective. The challenge is to acknowledge a difference (on the relative level) between self and other without separating them so schismatically that *no* relation at all is possible, a relation that is ever-present in the transpersonal mix in which our actions are embedded. Individuation requires acceptance of our responsibility for the suffering and scapegoating in the collective and a commitment to help, not just our selves and our kin, but our collective(s) as well. In so doing, we move to a more whole both-and awareness and can proceed more ethically.

In Jungian terms, the scapegoat phenomenon is a particular expression, along with Satan, witch-hunting, minority persecution and war, of the general problem of shadow projection. Scapegoating is a form of denying the shadow of both humans and God. We repress, deny or split off and make unconscious what is seen as unfit to conform with the ego ideal or the perfect goodness of God. It is made devilish. We do not consciously confess our faults and wayward impulses to the scapegoat in order to atone, nor do we often enough see that the faults are part of our psychological make-up. We are acutely aware, however, of their belonging to others, the scapegoats. We see the shadow clearly in projection. And the scapegoater feels lighter, without the burden of carrying what is unacceptable to his or her ego ideal, without shadow. On the other hand, those who are identified with the scapegoat are identified with the unacceptable shadow



## 7 Fidyk

qualities. They feel inferior, rejected and guilty. They feel responsible for more than their personal share of shadow.

The medieval and modern perversion of the archetype has produced a pathology that is widespread. There are many scapegoats among us. Many individuals identify with the archetype and are caught in the distorted pattern in which it now operates. While archetypes manifest both on a personal level, through complexes, and collectively, as characteristics of whole cultures, Jung believed it was the task of each age to understand anew their content and their effects:

If we cannot deny the [scapegoat archetype] or otherwise neutralize [it], we are confronted, at every new stage in the differentiation of consciousness to which civilization attains, with the task of finding a new interpretation appropriate to this stage, in order to connect the life of the past which still exists in us with the life of the present, which threatens to slip away from it. (CW 9i, par. 267)



Since there is no conscious mode of purgation – except scapegoating others – our contemporary secular culture offers little help in dealing with shadow material. Thus, the problem has fallen into unconsciousness.

Arthur Colman (1995) in *Up from Scapegoating* offers the scapegoat as a point of convergence between the individual and the group, a “critical intersection” (p. 2), a “juxtaposition” (p. 5) through which both the person and the collective may individuate. From a psychological point of view, he suggests that individuation separate from the collective is flawed because it leaves the shadow out of the process. The personal shadow once projected onto the collective scapegoat, permits the individual to turn one’s back on the scapegoat and call it a product of mass consciousness, hinting at its lower level. The resistance to exploring the unconscious process of the collective is extremely powerful in academe, governments, corporations and many organizations. Nations and groups do not want to look deeply into their origins, myths, and their complexes – the way the collective unconscious manifests in their structures and processes. While Jung called for the integration of the shadow within the individual, Colman calls for the (re)integration of the scapegoated back into the group or nation. The shadow – individual and collective – must be acknowledged and reclaimed for the self to move toward integration and wholeness.

### ***Scapegoat as Cultural Complex***



The experience of trauma and the formation of complexes occur not only in the psychology of the individual but also in the psyche of the group. Shifting the analysis of scapegoat further from an individual psychology to a group psychology, I use “cultural complex” (Singer, 2002; Kimbles, 2000) to indicate an emotional hook or trigger that can dwell both within the collective psyche of the group and the group level of the psyche embedded within the individual. To clarify, archetypes are the “inborn, innate predispositions of the psyche” (Kirsch, 2004, p. 185); they are the factors which an individual brings to any given situation, internal or external. An archetypal experience typically is embedded in historical and cultural patterns. “While the cultural level of the psyche is still not frequently referred to” (Kirsch, 2004, p. 185), I borrow from Joseph Henderson’s (1964) essay where he proposed the cultural level of the psyche as existing between the personal and the archetypal. This psychic layer, the cultural unconscious, “underpins the archetypal forms or predispositions, and it is as the archetypal moves through the social, cultural and personal filter of the unconscious that it is filed out into an image or an idea that emerges into consciousness” (Morgan, 2002, p. 579). Sam Kimbles (2000) and Tom Singer (2002) extended the concept of cultural unconscious to include the idea of “cultural complexes” which Singer defined as follows:

Like individual complexes, cultural complexes tend to be repetitive, autonomous, resist consciousness, and collect experience that confirms their historical point of view. Cultural complexes also tend to be bipolar, so that when they are activated the group ego becomes identified with one part of the unconscious complex, while the other part is projected out onto the suitable hook of another group. (p. 15)

The emotional charge of the cultural complex in the individual and group psyche can easily take over when the complex is triggered, altering memory, history, meaning and so our narratives. In terrorism or war, the defenses evoked are of both a personal and a cultural complex, experienced not only by the “victims” themselves, but also by others belonging to the “attacked” group. Singer (2002) has identified three components to this particular cultural complex which become activated when the group spirit is threatened:

1. Traumatic injury to a vulnerable person, group of people, place or value that carries or stands for the group spirit – as with the World Trade Center.



## 9 Fidyk

2. Fear of annihilation of both the personal and group spirit by a ‘foreign other’.
3. Emergence of avenging protector/persecutor defenses of the group spirit. (Singer cited in Weisstub and Galili-Weisstub, 2004, p. 153)

### *Identity through Negative Inflation*

In what follows, I briefly draw out three characteristics from a Romani narrative which illustrate their identification with the role of the scapegoat: negative inflation, exile and splitting. As positioned, the Roma as scapegoat are unconsciously cut off from an adequate relation to the outer world and to their own inner depths. Even if they were to disidentify from the burden of the complex, their relation to the archetype continues because their identity was constructed within its pattern. Thus, “[t]he complex becomes a focus of life” (Jung, CW 10, par. 456).

Hancock’s (2005) *We are the Romani people*, allocates the dark side of



Romani history in centuries of slavery and enforced labour in Europe and elsewhere, their attempted genocide under the Nazis, and causes of antigypsyism, in particular the role of stereotypical images of “The Gypsies” – conditions that continue to affect the lives of Romanies today.

Romani identification with negative inflation, an unconscious identification with the negative side of the shadow creating an unrealistically low view of oneself in the eyes of the scapegoater, begins with a long history of slavery. The Ottoman court in 1818 incorporated new edicts into the penal code, among them: “Gypsies are born slaves”; and “Any Gypsy without an owner is the property of the Prince” (Hancock, 2005, p. 21). In England, during the sixteenth century, King Edward VI passed a law stating that Romanies be “branded with a V on their breast, and then enslaved for two years,” if they escaped and were recaptured, they were then to be branded with an S and made slaves for life (Hancock, 2005, p. 27). Spain shipped Romanies to the Americas; others were transported by Columbus to the Caribbean; Portugal shipped Romanies as an unwilling labour force to its colonies in Maranhao (now part of Brazil), Angola, and even India – the Romanies country of origin. Russia, Scotland, England, Virginia followed suit; one English visitor to Jamaica in the 1790s described seeing “many Gypsies subject from the age of eleven to thirty to the prostitution and lust of overseers, book-keepers, negroes, and

taken into keeping by gentlemen who paid exorbitant hire for their use” (cited in Hancock, 2005, p. 28).



When the Nazis came to power in 1933, German laws against Romanies had already been in effect for hundreds of years. Their persecution began nearly as soon as they arrived in German-speaking land hundreds of years earlier because as “outsiders” they were, without knowing it, breaking the Hanseatic laws which made it a punishable offence not to

have a permanent home or job. By the nineteenth century, scholars in Germany and elsewhere in Europe were writing about Romanies and Jews as being inferior beings – the “excrement of humanity” (Hancock, 2005, p. 35). The Roma came to be identified with “unworthy of life” and “incurably mentally ill”; and in just four months after Hitler became Chancellor to the Third Reich, a law to enact the phrase “lives undeserving of life” was put into effect (Hancock, 2005, p. 36).

In general, a person with one Jewish grandparent was not affected in the Nazi anti-Jewish legislation, whereas one-eighth ‘gypsy blood’ was considered strong enough to outweigh seven-eighths of German blood – so dangerous were the Gypsies considered. (Kenrick and Puxon, 1972, p. 74-75)

In September, 2001, the Council of Europe “issued a blistering condemnation of Europe’s treatment of the Roman Gypsy community, saying that they are subject to racism, discrimination and violence . . . the UN says they pose Europe’s most serious human rights problem” (BBC, 2001). Evidence can be seen as recently as May 24, 2008 in the *Los Angeles’ Times* article: “Italy’s right targets Gypsies, migrants” where Umberto Bossi, who once suggested shooting at boats carrying immigrants, continues to support measures against foreigners and violence toward the Roma. The numerous reports about employment agencies or airlines, which indicate a Romani client’s ethnicity on their own paperwork to ensure unequal treatment, qualify as institutionalized antigypsyism – the use of official power as a weapon. Antigypsyism is personal too, since the decision to discriminate rests with those same individuals. Such discrimination was and continues to be wide spread (see Miskovic, 2006).

Judith Okley (1983) has pointed out, “outsiders have projected onto Gypsies their own repressed fantasies and longings for disorder,” (p. 232) and they have further used those imagined characteristics of a small –g “gypsy” as a means to measure the boundaries of their own identities. Thus, an individual’s occasional urge to challenge the establishment, or to engage in some anti-social act, or even an

## 11 Fidyk



unconscious fascination with anarchy are, unlikely to be ever realized by that individual, though they can be experienced vicariously or unconsciously by being projected onto the “outlaw” Romani population. This phenomenon is reflected again and again in the media as well as in works of fiction.

Indeed, a literary “gypsy” has emerged which represents the epitome of freedom: freedom from responsibility, freedom from moral constraints, freedom from the requirements of hygiene, freedom from a nine-to-five routine. This narrative remained unchallenged by the Roma community because while it was becoming established as part of the western worldview, Romanies were unaware of its emergence (Hancock, 2005). And by the time the Roma community began to react and object, it was too late.

### *Identity through Exile*

Scapegoated or exiled groups such as the Roma, which appear to devalue space and transgress or disturb the meaning of place, are, yet again, reviled and rejected. Because of laws forbidding Roma to settle, which began to be passed soon after their arrival in Europe, their means of livelihood had to be portable – that is, easily and quickly gathered up. One such means was fortune telling, a highly regarded profession in India, but not in Europe; begging is similarly viewed very differently in Hindu and Islamic societies, where giving alms to beggars is a religious obligation yet has no such status in the West. Fortune telling only helped reinforce the image and narrative of mystery and exoticism that was growing in the European mind. Roma, in turn, have exploited this image as a means of protection since one is less likely to show hostility towards a person whom one believes to have some measure of control over, or knowledge of, one’s destiny (Hancock, 2005).



“Travelling,” writes Hancock, (2005) “is part of our history. Our ancestors trekked for thousands of miles from India to Europe and out into the world, so there is certainly some truth to the stereotype of the “travelling gypsy” (p. 101). A distinction, however, must be made between travelling on a journey, with a purpose, and travelling because local laws in an area forbid one to stop and therefore leave no choice.

The Roma’s status as not being part of nationalistic aspirations may be a more difficult one, since they are more vulnerable to the loss of rights, persecution and discrimination. Claiming membership in an ethnic group ensures certain rights and entitlements that social membership does not (Steiger-Kruczek & Simmons, 2001). However, the absence of such attachment to the land could be seen as contributing to a more fluid sense of identity. As John McLaughlin (1999) added:

[T]heir sense of survival and their sense of superiority, coupled with a high self-esteem enabled Gypsies to endure, curiously without bitterness, human persecution and deprivation throughout much of modern European history. Indeed they seemed to have survived in spite, and perhaps even because of persecution by “settled Europe”. (p. 43)



So the Roma are not only without a nation state, but also they do not lay claim to one, thereby, challenging the notion of European nation-states with their boundaries and rights that accompany groups’ identity or ethnicity. Ironically, nostalgia, an ever present theme in Roma songs across Europe, is not understood, then, as nostalgia for home; it is, instead, a “yearning for a past that Gypsies never had” (McLaughlin, 1999, p. 41). When we remember that the word “nostalgia” comes from the Greek, *nostos*, meaning “pain for home” and “a return home,” we can understand both its appeal and its danger. History suggests that the Roma have no home even though “nostalgia is the essence of Gypsy song, and seems always to have been” (Fonseca, 1996, p. 5). Perhaps uniquely among peoples, they have no dream of a homeland. Utopia – *ou topos* – means “no place.” It is “nostalgia for utopia: a return home to no place”: *O lungo drom*; the long road (Fonseca, 1996, p. 5). The yearning itself, which is celebrated, is a yearning for a past that never was. Such yearning, Fonseca suggests, is the impetus to travel. Note that this nostalgia of the “Gypsy song is weighted with fatalism:” “the crack of Doom/ is coming soon. / Let it come, / It doesn’t matter,” goes the refrain of a Serbian Gypsy song (Fonseca, 1996, p. 5).

Exile is an archetypal image of the painful stimulus that forces individuals or groups to seek for return and atonement with the transpersonal. It marks the rupture of the initial bond and harmony which is analogous to a loss of paradise and birth

### 13 *Fidyk*

into life's difficult separations and struggles, as is basic to the myth of Western thought since the Fall.

The exiled are cast out to wander in the wilderness, a place beyond accepted cultural forms, filled with “the potency of disorder . . . in contact with danger . . . at the source of power” (Douglas, 1966, p. 117). In the wilderness, the scapegoated confronts the transpersonal, the unknown. The wilderness is an image



expressing their existential experience of profound alienation and exile. It is the world of their own perceived reality that encompasses them, for they feel anomalous, outside the collective borders, beyond acceptance. In addition, through their alienation from the collective, the scapegoat serves the group in a medial capacity, helping to connect the world of consciousness to that of the objective psyche. Psychologically, the wilderness “mirrors the pain of never-belonging, of homelessness, or living in hiding” (Perera, 1986, p. 26). Paradoxically, it is also the place of their eventual reunion with the hidden individual Self.

#### ***Identity through Splitting***

Her real name was Bronislawa Wajs, but she is known by her Gypsy name, Papusza: ‘Doll.’ Papusza was one of the greatest Gypsy singers and poets ever and, for a while, one of the most celebrated. She lived all her life in Poland, and when she died in 1987 nobody noticed. (Fonseca, 1996, p. 3)

An editorial by Matthew Braham that appeared in the British newspaper *The Guardian* on April 8, 2000, stated that:

The Roma are perhaps the most singularly disliked ethnic group in the world . . . the Roma too are part of the problem, through the persistence of a culture that is as much a source of their marginalization as is the majority prejudice against them.

To reiterate: The European Roma population holds a unique position. No people have been at once so persistently discriminated against and yet so excessively romanticized (Cooper, 2001-02). Sevasti Trubeta (2003) explains:

The common denominator of the diverse (historical) forms of the collective Gypsy imaginary is their alleged ‘strangeness,’ which seemed to be

expressed mainly in that ‘deviant way of life’ taken up by those *incapable* of social conformity. Furthermore, this assertion joins diachronic stereotypes of primitivism, presenting Gypsies as ‘parasites’ or as ‘noble savages’ and additionally as ‘born wanderers’. (p. 503, emphasis in original)

Here, we see continued evidence of the alienated persona-ego or the victim-ego where the accuser denies its own shadow and projects evil or wrong-doing upon the accused, leaving the remaining members of the community with a feeling of guiltlessness, atoned with the collective standards of behaviour. In other words, the unconsciously targeted scapegoats – Roma – tend to represent denied polarities within the scapegoaters – settled people of Western Europe for example – that are being split and projected. The Roma who have been covertly assigned the role simply tend to be more transparent in revealing this denied polarity, thereby creating a “bipolar projection”. As an “othered” group, they represent the intrapsychic conflicts of group/nation members and are unconsciously used to act out a shared collective problem. Repressed urges of other people, such as anger projected onto the scapegoat, disassociates these urges from their own anger and enables vicarious satisfaction as some of the repressed urges are acted out by the scapegoat. In a sense, the scapegoat expresses and contains the denied group emotions and attributes underlying a particular group concern. This, then, becomes the target for the projections of other groups/members with respect to that concern. The scapegoat serves as an example of denied and repressed feelings and a container for other member’s emotions. So scapegoating both allocates blame and serves to “inoculate against future misery and failure” by evicting the presumed cause of misfortune (Kagan cited in Perera, 1986, p. 8). Subsequently, the scapegoat not only has to confront their own emotions but also the repressed emotions of the other group/members.



The Roma have been portrayed as carefree, whimsical “Gypsies” so it should come as little surprise that among the Roma there is much suppressed anger and frustration. Such emotion manifests in different ways such as family violence, alcoholism and outwardly with non-Roma. Billy Cribb, a

Romani boxer from England tells how he was drawn to the profession, common among Romanies, because as a child when he was made to feel different from the other children, his response was to hit them: “I couldn’t answer in any other way” (cited in Hancock, 2002, p. 99). Other Romanies express anger at the indignities

## 15 Fidyk

that racism brings, at the advantages that *Gadje* children have in schooling, and at the *gadžo* academics who have obtained degrees and professional reputations by studying them and their language (Hancock, 2002). Typically, Roma are non-confrontational; Hancock writes: “[We] will go along with suggestions either for the sake of peace, or from a fear of challenging [non-Romani authorities]. If involvement of any kind becomes uncomfortable, the Romani response is to leave” (pp. 98-99).

The psychology of individuals or groups identified with the scapegoat complex is understood as a manifestation of a distortion of the archetypal structure as signified by the scapegoat ritual which was used “to enrich meaning or call attention to other levels of existence” (Douglas, 1966, p. 53). The scapegoat ritual is no longer dedicated to and identified with the god. This change accounts for the split between the originally united parts (of good and evil) of the archetypal pattern. In groups identified with the scapegoat complex this accuser is constellated by the rejecting behaviours of the dominant group. It derives from the moralistic judgements of the mother or father, or in the case of a nation, its leaders, media, and institutions, which relate, in terms of how things should be rather than things as they are.

### ***Ethical Responsibility to an Examined Life***

What is the importance of “reading” the narratives of different groups of people? Socrates warned that the unexamined life is not worth living. While few might argue, I believe that there is a deeper and more compelling reason to live an examined life. It is this: the unexamined life is fundamentally unethical. Jung explains:



I took great care to try to understand every single image, every item of my psychic inventory . . . and, above all, to realize them in actual life . . . . Insight into them must be converted into an ethical obligation. Not to do so is to fall prey to the power principle, and this produces dangerous effects which are destructive not only to others but even to the knower. The images of the unconscious place a great responsibility upon a man [*sic*]. Failure to understand them, or a shirking of ethical responsibility, deprives him of his wholeness and imposes a painful fragmentariness on his life. (1973, p. 192-193)

While I have addressed the notion of cultural complex, namely the scapegoat, as interpreted through a Romani narrative, the collective of both the scapegoat and the scapegoater, is made up of individuals – us. And while this analysis focuses on group dynamics, one must not lose sight of the individual’s life. The “dangerous effects” Jung refers to are “all too present when the political life of a country becomes polarized, as it is [today] in the United States” (Lindley, 2006, iii) and increasingly around the world. Both the right and the left, because they confuse worldly power with “truth,” neglect the inner life.



In the case of the Roma, and other ethnic and “racial” minorities, using a Jungian perspective to distinguish cultural complexes and to recognize their effects on individuals and groups enables a deeper understanding of group psychic life. Doing so provides a key to dealing with destructive aspects of the

collective psyche. The analysis of cultural complexes, if applied seriously, could contribute significantly to the resolution of conflict in warring groups. Neumann aptly wrote: the “fight against heretics, [minorities], political opponents and national enemies is actually the fight against our own religious doubts, the insecurity of our own political position, and the one-sidedness of our own national viewpoint” (1969/1990, p. 52). The collective will continue to attempt to liberate itself by exploiting the psychology of the scapegoat as long as there are unconscious feelings of guilt which arise through the splitting phenomenon in the formation of the shadow. The same applies to our communities, academic institutions and classrooms. One place to begin is with personal (unconscious) feelings of guilt and inner insecurity because the shadow confutes the ego’s illusion that it is identical with the ideal values of the group. Confronting and reintegrating the shadow is, from the perspective of Jungian psychology, the *sine qua non* of individuation. So, too, with groups and organizations “whose excluded parts hold the creative and change-producing elements without which stagnation is all but inevitable” (Colman, 1995, p. 101). Potential is to be found in groups for consciousness of self and other when the group or nation becomes unified by task and by difference in a truly democratic fashion. Jung knew this well:

Self-knowledge is not an isolated process; it is possible only if the reality of the world around us is recognized at the same time. Nobody can know himself and differentiate himself from his neighbor if he has a distorted picture of him, just as no one can understand his neighbor if he had no



## 17 Fidyk

relationship to himself. The one conditions the other and the two processes go hand in hand. (CW 14, par. 520)



What seems an exception is cultures where conscious connection to the transpersonal source has not been lost. Herein the one or ones identified with the scapegoat serves the community by returning evil to its archetypal source through sacrifice, carrying back to the gods a burden too great for the human collective to bear (Perera, 1986). While our separateness is derived from the circumstances and happenings of our particular lives, our common space is the archetypal ground.

Here I turn to Neumann (1969/1990) who distinguished between an old ethic, the Western religious and psychological tradition that holds perfection as its standard and goal, and a new ethic, in which, when “freed from futile ambition and its requirement of perfection,” we can own and attend all of our nature (p. 4). In this orientation, the greatest value is no longer perfection, but wholeness and reality. This “new ethic” requires that we recognize and address our unwelcome humanness rather than project it onto a stranger or enemy who, as carrier of our rejected shadow, becomes a psychological necessity for us even while we seek to destroy him or her. The acceptance of the shadow involves growth in depth into the ground of one’s own being, and with the loss of the illusion of an ego-ideal, a new depth in rootedness and stability is born. This living relationship with the shadow brings to the ego its solidarity with the whole human species and its history as known in subjective experience. This solidarity with “evil” includes the “ugliest man,” – the primitive and undeveloped portions of shadow that have never been conscious, as well as that which has been experienced and rejected by the ego – “the predatory man and the ape man in terror in the jungle,” who according to Neumann, keep us in relation with nature and the earth (p. 97). And in the projected case of the Roma, it keeps us in solidarity with what has been named the “dirty, lazy, and criminal,” even the “excrement of humanity.”

Neumann advised us to make friends with ourselves for the principle of growth through wholeness “necessarily involves a creative relationship between the dark instinctual side of [one’s] nature and the light side represented by the conscious mind” (p. 146-7). However, while the collective depends on the creative achievement of the individual, “it can better afford to dispense with creativity[,]”

than allow itself to become exposed to the unconscious contagious influence of unintegrated, or in this sense, psychologically unhealthy persons” (p. 103). The paradoxical secret of growth or transformation is that in and through the shadow, the base or strange becomes gold or familiar.



Looking to Neumann’s new ethic in our teaching and research as well as in our consulting asks that we become conscious of both the “positive” and “negative” forces within us and to relate these forces consciously to the life of the individual and community. Indeed, where in our separate lives does a “fluid sense of identity” exist – one

that is not bound to place– and where do our inferiorities and guilt dwell? Neumann reminds: “The shadow who demands acceptance is the outcast of life” (p. 94-5). As told in this narrative, the scapegoat or stranger – the “Gypsy” – is the individual form which the dark side of humanity takes on in us and for us, as a part of our own personalities.

### **Works Cited**

- Brearley, M. (2001). The persecution of Gypsies in Europe. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 45, 588-599.
- Colman, A. (1995). *Up from scapegoating: Awakening consciousness in groups*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.
- Cooper, B. (Winter 2001/2002) “We Have no Martin Luther King”: Eastern Europe’s Roma minority, *World Policy Journal*, 69-78.
- den Heyer, K., & Fidyk, A. (2007). Con-figuring historical facts through historical fiction: Agency, Art-in-fact, and imagination as stepping stones between then and now. *Educational Theory*, 57(2), 141-157.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fidyk, A., & Miskovic, M. (2007). *Strangers & scapegoats: Addressing difference through a Roma narrative*. A paper presented at The Third International Congress of Qualitative Research at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Fonseca, I. (1996). *Bury me standing: The Gypsies and their journey*. New York: Vintage.
- Hancock, I. (2005). *We are the Romani people*. Hertfordshire, UK: University of Hertfordshire Press.

## 19 Fidyk

- Hancock, I. (1999). *The Roma: Myth and reality*. The Patrin Web Journal. Retrieved from [www.geocities.com/Paris/5121/mythandreality.htm](http://www.geocities.com/Paris/5121/mythandreality.htm)
- Helleiner, J. (1995). Gypsies, Celts and tinkers: Colonial antecedents of anti-traveller racism in Ireland. *Ethnic & Racial Studies*, 18, 532-554.
- Henderson, J. (1964). The archetype of culture. In A. Guggenbühl-Craig (Ed.), *Der Archetyp, Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Congress for Analytical Psychology, 1962*. Basel and New York: S. Karger.
- Jung, C. G. (1953-1979). *Collected works* (Trans. R. F. C. Hull). In H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire, (Eds.). Bollingen Series 17. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kearney, R. (2003). *Strangers, gods and monsters: Interpreting otherness*. London: Routledge.
- Kenrick, D., & Puxon, G. (1972). *The destiny of Europe's Gypsies*. London: Heinemann.
- Kimbles, S. (2000). The myth of invisibility. In T. Singer (Ed.) *The Vision Thing: Myth Politics and the Psyche in the World*. London: Routledge.
- Kirsch, T. (2004). Cultural complexes in the history of Jung, Freud and their followers. In T. Singer & S. Kimbles (Eds.), *The Cultural Complex: Contemporary Jungian Perspectives on Psyche and Society* (pp. 185-195). Hove, England: Brunner-Routledge.
- Lindley, D. (2006). *On life's journey: Always becoming*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications.
- McLaughlin, J. (1999). The Gypsy as "other" in European society: Towards a political geography of hate. *The European Legacy*, 4, 35-49.
- Miles, R., & Brown, M. (2003). *Racism: Key ideas*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Miskovic, M. (2006). *Roma education in Europe: In support of the discourse of race*. Unpublished manuscript. National-Louis University, Chicago, IL.
- Morgan, H. (2002). Exploring racism. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 47(4), 567-581.
- Neumann, E. (1969/1990). *Depth psychology and a new ethic* (Trans. E. Rolfe). Boston: Shambhala.
- Okley, J. (1983). *The traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Perera, S. B. (1986). *The scapegoat complex: Toward a mythology of shadow and guilt*. Toronto: Inner City Books.
- Petrova, D. (2003). The Roma: Between the myth and future. *Social Research*, 70, 111-161.
- Ringold, D., Orenstein, M. A., & Wilkens, E. (2003). *Roma in an expanding Europe: Breaking the poverty cycle*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Singer, T. (2002). The cultural complex and archetypal defenses of the collective spirit: Baby Zeus, Elian Gonzales, Constantine's sword, and other holy wars. *San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal*, 20(4), 4-28.
- Steiger-Kruczek, E., & Simmons, C. (2001). The Roma: Their history and education in Poland and the UK. *Educational Studies*, 27, 281-290.

- Tanner, A. (2005). The Roma of Eastern Europe: Still searching for inclusion. *Migration Information Source*. Retrieved February 17, 2006 from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=308>
- Trubeta, S. (2003). "Gypsiness," racial discourse and persecution: Balkan Roma during the Second World War. *Nationalities Papers*, 31(4), 495-514.
- Weisstub, E., & Galili-Weisstub, E. (2005). Collective trauma and cultural complexes. In T. Singer & S. Kimbles (Eds.), *The Cultural Complex: Contemporary Jungian Perspectives on Psyche and Society* (pp. 147-170). Hove, UK: Brunner-Routledge.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> *Romani* and *Romanes*, sometimes written *Romany*, are the general names for the language of the Roma, the Sinti, and the Calé. *Romani* is the only Indo-Aryan language that has been spoken exclusively in Europe since the middle ages. It is part of the phenomenon of Indic diaspora languages spoken by travelling communities of Indian origin outside of India (retrieved April 10, 2007 from <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/whatisromani.xml>). The term *Roma* has gained increasing currency as a cover term for all populations which speak (or at some time spoke), the Romani language, and while its use in this way is sanctioned by different Romani organizations (Nordic Roma Council, Sa-Roma, Inc. and the Roma National Congress), not all groups accept it by any means (Hancock, 2002, p. xix). The name *Rom* or *Rrom*, which is the self-designation of the speakers, also surfaces in other travelling (peripatetic) communities that speak Indian languages or use an Indic-derived special vocabulary: *Lom* (Caucasus and Anatolia) and *Dom* (Near East). In India itself, groups known as Dom are castes of commercial nomads: service-providers such as metalworkers and entertainers.

*Roma* means all groups residing in central and eastern Europe, or respectively, those who in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century emigrated from central and eastern Europe to western Europe and overseas. The name *Romani* is derived from an adjective: *romani čhib* "Roma-tongue, Roma-language." This definition is used in the English-speaking world as *Romany* and in the international linguistic context as *Romani*. The international name *Romani* thus simultaneously implies its belonging to the language family (retrieved April 10, 2007 from <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/whatisromani.xml>).

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion about the role imagination plays in historical work and qualitative scholarship see section on "art-in-fact" (pp. 142-147) in den Heyer & Fidyk (2007).

<sup>3</sup> Hancock's work is used extensively for he is both a Romani and a professor of linguistics and director of the Romani Archives and Documentation Center of UT Austin, Texas.

<sup>4</sup> Participation mystique is a term derived from the anthropologist Lucian Lévy-Bruhl. Jung writes: "It denotes a peculiar kind of psychological connection . . . [in which] the subject cannot clearly distinguish himself from the object but is bound to it by a direct relationship which amounts to partial *identity*" ("Definitions," *Psychological Types*, CW 6, par. 781).

The images used herein are photographs submitted to *Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 Photo Contest* (retrieved on September 18, 2008 from: [http://demo.itent.hu/romaphoto/index.php?content=3&category\\_id=&page=25](http://demo.itent.hu/romaphoto/index.php?content=3&category_id=&page=25)). The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015 is an unprecedented political commitment by governments in Central and Southeastern Europe to improve the socio-economic status and social inclusion of Roma within a regional framework. The Decade focuses on the

## **21 Fidyk**

---

priority areas of education, employment, health, and housing, and commits governments to take into account the other core issues of poverty, discrimination, and gender mainstreaming.