

# BOUNDARIES OF EUROPE: TOWARDS A POLITICAL ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE BALTIC STATES

Máiréad Nic Craith

## ABSTRACT

Anthropology as a discipline is largely concerned with understanding human beings on a local and international scale. As the subject has evolved, a number of sub-disciplines have come to the fore, the most prominent being biological, archaeological, linguistic, social and cultural. Political anthropology is generally placed as a sub-specialism within the context of social and cultural anthropology. This essay argues for greater significance for political anthropology as a sub-discipline of anthropology generally and especially within the Baltic States. Following an initial review of political anthropology in and of Europe, the essay outlines some of the key issues to which the Baltic States can make particularly unique contributions. The Baltic States already have a well developed tradition of European Ethnology. This essay emphasises that they are also in a unique position to contribute to the development of political anthropology as an important sub-discipline which has acquired a new relevance in the context of an ever-changing EU. In a Europe that has witnessed many political changes over the past half-century and the emergence of new borders is going, insights into the political process can hardly be acquired through the disciplines of politics or sociology alone. The Eastern enlargement of the EU gives an urgency to our thinking about Europe.

KEY WORDS: socio-cultural anthropology, political anthropology, Baltic States, European ethnology, politology, sociology.

## ANOTACIJA

Antropologijos mokslo disciplina iš esmės siekia suprasti žmogaus elgsenos ypatumus vietiniu ir tarptautiniu lygmenimis. Šios disciplinos vystymosi raidoje atsirado daugiau jos šakų, iš kurių svarbiausios yra biologinė, archeologinė, lingvistinė, socialinė-kultūrinė antropologija. Politinė antropologija paprastai įvardijama kaip socialinės-kultūrinės antropologijos atmaina. Straipsnyje teigiama, kad politinė antropologija yra savarankiška antropologijos šaka ir kad Baltijos valstybių situacija sudaro unikalias sąlygas šios disciplinos plėtrai. Ši socialinės ir kultūrinės antropologijos atšaka analizuoja geopolitines ir istorines problemas, įskaitant šiuolaikinės Europos ypatumus, bendros Europos idėjos istoriją ir Europos integracijos ideologiją. Straipsnyje akcentuojama, kad kartu būtina vystyti kitas giminingas šakas, visų pirma Europos etnologiją. Baltijos šalys turi stiprias europinės etnologijos tradicijas. jos turi unikalią galimybę prisidėti prie politinės antropologijos, kaip svarbios antropologijos atšakos, vystymosi, nes nuolat besikeičiančios Europos kontekste ji tampa ypač aktuali. Europoje, kuri per pastaruosius 50 metų išgyveno nemaža politinių pokyčių, kurioje vis dar atsiranda naujos valstybinės sienos, išvalgos į politinį procesą vargu ar įmanomos vien per politologijos ar sociologijos disciplinas.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: sociokultūrinė antropologija, politinė antropologija, Baltijos šalys, Europos etnologija, politologija, sociologija.

*Prof. Máiréad Nic Craith, University of the Ulster,  
Magee campus, Londonderry, BT48 7JL Northern Ireland, UK  
E-mail: m.niccraith@ulster.ac.uk*

Anthropology as a discipline is largely concerned with understanding human beings on a local and international scale. As the subject has evolved, a number of sub-disciplines have come to the fore, the most prominent being biological, archaeological, linguistic, social and cultural (Lassiter 2002). Political anthropology is generally placed as a sub-specialism within the context of social and cultural anthropology. This essay argues for greater significance for political anthropology as a sub-discipline of anthropology generally and especially within the Baltic States. Following an initial review of political anthropology in and of Europe, the essay outlines some of the key issues to which the Baltic States can make particularly unique contributions.

## Evolution of Political Anthropology

In her reader of anthropology's relationship with politics, Joan Vincent (2002) identifies the Enlightenment period in Europe as the prelude to political anthropology. The Enlightenment was a literary and philosophical movement that emerged among eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century intellectuals in Western Europe. The movement had an immense impact on the relationship between rulers and their subjects and ultimately in the manner in which subjects viewed themselves and their rights within society. It attempted to address inter-related problems of moral philosophy such as the relationship between a state (governance) and its citizens (civil society) and the relationship between individual and society; notions of community (*gemeinschaft*) and society (*gesellschaft*) (Vincent 2002: 17).

Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant could be regarded as representatives of the Scottish and German enlightenment period since their ideas contributed to the shaping of British and American political anthropology respectively. The Enlightenment movement looked at questions of political economy such as the nature of the market and the place of the individual within it and the principle of private property and its relation to 'modernization. Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1766) applied rational enquiry into the question of economy and the workings of the market. Ultimately, the plea for free trade became a feature of the reforms sought by enlightened thinkers.

Enlightenment scholars placed great emphasis on the notion of reason and the problematic political and economic conditions that defied reason such as slavery and slave trade, the wars of religion between European nations and the struggles between them for territorial possessions in the Americas and the Orient. Some post-Enlightenment figures such as Henry Sumner Maine, Lewis Henry Morgan, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels offered further critical explorations of the ideas of Enlightenment moral philosophy.

In the mid-twentieth century, the founding fathers of political anthropology came to the fore and a number of political anthropologists at Cambridge in the 1950s had 'a weak sense of loyalty to the dominant orthodoxy' (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 91). Evans-Pritchard conducted an ethnography of a Southern Sudanese people and his account of the Nuer social order generated various taxonomies of 'primitive' systems in the 1950s and 1960s. Some years later Fredrik Barth described politics in Swat, a small kingdom in North West Pakistan. His *Political Leadership among the Swat Population* (1959) drew on 'the theory of games' which explains life as a series of zero-sum games. One individual's gain is inevitably a loss for another.

A comparison of these books indicates the shift in political anthropology in Britain at this time. Both works focus on stateless societies and the issue of integration. In addition these two anthropologists analyse the political dimensions of segmentary societies. However their conclusions differ substantially. While Evans-Pritchard's work focuses on the social as an overarching structure, Barth's ethnography looks more at the principle of the individual. He endeavoured to analyse the synergies in a social sphere in which there are conflicting interests and relegated the concept of the social to the background regarding such structures as 'incentives and constraints'. 'Evans-Pritchard portrays his people with the aesthetics of a still life, Barth with that of a bustling tableau' (Eriksen and Sivert Nielsen 2001: 91).

One of the most influential approaches to this theme was Edmund Leach's *Political Systems of Highland Burma* which was based on fieldwork conducted among the Kachin and Shan of Northern Burma before and during the Second World War. Although Leach's fieldnotes were lost during his period of military service, the analytical power of the book was such that it became highly in-

fluent in the 1950s. While Leach was not necessarily the first anthropologist to analyse the relationship between myth and political process, he was possibly the first to suggest that both are unstable and could be interpreted differently. His analysis of the Kachin people suggested two models of political order; one egalitarian and the other hierarchical. The political organisation of the Kachin villages invoked and exploited their myths to justify both systems and to oscillate between them as appropriate.

Leach had made a significant distinction between myth and reality. He argued that even in 'traditional' societies, norms are not necessarily 'blueprints for action' (Eriksen and Sivert Nielsen 2001: 92). Instead they were points of ambiguity which were produced by opposing groups and used as appropriate to further their own purposes. In his analysis of the volatility of social life, Leach was contradicting Evan- Pritchard's emphasis on allegiances to social structure. In time, however, Leach's interests moved from politics to symbolism and the atmosphere at Cambridge lost its edge.

At an international level, the break-up of empires after the Second World War shifted anthropology's orientation away from its Enlightenment legacy towards what Joan Vincent call's 'the third phase': the unequal power encounter between the 'West' and the 'Third World'. In 1973, Talal Asad published his *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. This critique of structural functionalist social anthropology became one of 'the most debated books in British anthropology' (Eriksen and Sivert Nielsen 2001: 121). Asad's volume launched colonial studies in anthropology – ironically during the very era when European colonies were being transformed into independent nation states. Asad's agenda was the historical power relationship between the West and the Third World. Most of the contributors argued that the development of anthropology in several regions of the world has been suspiciously parallel with that of colonialism.

This was followed by Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) which shared the anthropological critique of the Euro-centered-ness scholarship of Third World regions. Said argued that representations of 'Orientals' in Western academia were permeated with a fascination and yet a distaste for a mythical East which was regarded as irrational and sensuous. Although this ambivalence could be directly traced to nineteenth-century colonialism, Said located it much further back in time. For Europeans, the Orient was a flexible location across two continents. He maintained that Western studies of Asians had generated a simple, essentialised view of 'the Asian way of life' which served as a catalyst for a dichotomy favouring the West.

Said's criticisms did not exclude anthropological studies. He queried the simplistic representations of discrete cultures which featured strongly in anthropological research generally. He emphasised the concept of knowledge as dependent on the social positions of both the known and the knower and argued that neutral assessments of others were hardly possible from a position of privilege. Richard Fox queried the lengths to which Said's theory of Orientalism could travel and how far anthropology should travel with him? In his ethnography of the Punjabi Sikhs, Fox concluded that anthropology's concept of culture was part of the stereotyping tradition pushing Orientalism along.

Political anthropology in recent decades has focussed on the anthropological study of globalisation. Here anthropologists were entering a new field, regarding it as an 'ethnographic region'. Effectively 'a globalising process has erased the barriers around the region, but anthropologists are busy localising themselves in it, proclaiming its uniqueness developing theory specifically tailored

to it' (Hylland Eriksen and Sivert Nielsen 2001: 171). In this they are justifying the global as a legitimate object of research for a sub-group of anthropologists.

Key thinkers such as the Swedish anthropologist Ulf Hannerz, analyse the relevance of globalisation studies for anthropologists. His *Cultural Complexity* (1992) redefines both the concepts of culture and of globalisation itself. For Hannerz, globalisation was essentially concerned with global aspects of modernity – rather than a homogenous 'global village'. Culture as a concept which signified flow, process and partial integration was perfectly compatible with the process of globalisation and with a world which did not contain discrete, bounded cultures.

Arjun Appadurai has also made a substantial contribution to theoretical explorations of disorder and globalization. His essay on production of locality (1995) suggests that societies have always experienced tensions between the local and the global. For this reason, he proposed a revision of anthropological studies of ritual which was previously regarded as primarily a means of 'producing locality' in a local context. Instead, the process of 'producing locals' was an instrument of ensuring that locals were not swallowed up by the global context.

Several other anthropologists have focused on globalisation studies and de-constructionism. For example, Strathern's *Partial Connections* (1991) suggests that neither societies nor symbolic systems are coherent wholes. Instead there is a plurality of voices in a world inhabited by hybrids, an argument which may ultimately lead to the demise of classical notions of 'culture' and 'society' because it directs our attention to 'an empirical reality, where even the idea type of standard, isolated, 'authentic' society or culture, seems increasingly anachronistic' (Eriksen and Nielsen 2001: 174). This is a view not necessarily supported or shared by other anthropologists who regarded the sudden enthusiasm for globalisation in the discipline as a form of neo-imperialism which ignores the political dimension. However, power is a major issue in Appadurai's work as well as in other works produced by influential anthropologists in the field such as Eric Wolf (1994) and John and Jean Comaroff (1993).

### **Political Anthropology in Eastern Europe**

A brief review of the evolution of political anthropology suggests that anthropologists have moved from the construction of taxonomies of political systems in traditional societies to an analysis of the codes and practice of power at national and international levels. For a long time, the anthropological approach was rooted in exotic societies which challenged researchers to identify roots of political action in a limited region. In such locations it was difficult to separate the political from other dimensions.

While initially anthropologists gave prominence to the notion of difference and became interested primarily in the study of the peripheral and the traditional in exotic societies, with time, a whole new field of anthropological research was linked with an interest in the peripheral in Western societies. Such a transfer was not illogical although it did involve anthropologists in the peripheral rather than the national. 'Political anthropology was confined to micro-universes and images of authentically insular autochthonous in the closed world of the village community' (Abélès 1997: 322). Anthropologists were primarily interested in the traditional forms of power and those in Europe 'seemed to remain on the sidelines of modernity, in an extension of ancestral history' (Abélès 1997: 322).

However the onset of anthropological interest in the process of globalisation was pre-empted by an enthusiasm for the operation of state institutions at national and international levels. 'Anthro-

pologists have succeeded in exploring the symbols and rituals of power in remote societies and it should come as no surprise that the modern world offers ample material for their analyses' (Abélès 1997: 323). Research on the issues of power in African societies is not entirely removed from an examination of the dynamics of power in states with distinct political institutions. In both instances, researchers are dealing with a set of potentialities which may become actualised according to the situations which arise on a practical level.

In recent decades, a whole new field of research has emerged in the area of Western societies and there has been a significant increase in research on Europe which examines contemporary issues of concern (Abélès, Bellier, and McDonald 1993; Bellier and Wilson 2000; and Shore, 2002). The collapse of the Iron Curtain and the Soviet Union, for example, introduced a new potential for anthropological research in a changing geo-political context. Caroline Humphrey, a student of Edmund Leach, first carried out field research in Siberia in 1966-7. Further research on a return visit queried what had actually changed. 'Marx went away but Karl stayed behind' was her enigmatic answer' (Vincent 2002: 258).

While occasional anthropologists in the former Soviet bloc have responded with enthusiasm to the challenges of political anthropology as a sub-discipline, one could hardly suggest that political anthropology has a strong profile here. Other sub-disciplines of anthropology, such as Lithuanian ethnology and biological anthropology acquired recognition and legitimacy (Čiubrinskas 2005). Biological anthropology, in particular, was regarded as an outstanding discipline and an appropriate substitute for anthropology in general throughout the Central/Eastern socialist countries.

Baltic academics in the late twentieth-century promoting socio-cultural anthropology as a separate area of expertise had to establish its disciplinary boundaries from European Ethnology. The latter is a discipline born of the Romantic nation-state ideologies of Central and Eastern Europe and is firmly grounded in *Volkskunde*. European ethnology has survived throughout the twentieth century in Northern and Western Europe as 'one of the central disciplines serving national identity formation, nation-state building and nationalist ideologies' (Čiubrinskas 2005: 6).

Until the collapse of Communism, there was a strong emphasis on material culture in Central and Eastern European countries. Following the achievement of independence, the terms social and cultural anthropology gained some currency as a theoretical perspective but with little definite meaning. In general, there was a lack of confidence among academics in socio-cultural anthropology as a discipline.

Čiubrinskas (2005: 7) cites a number of reasons for this. Firstly, 'the uncertain position of anthropology and its location between humanities and social sciences' was problematic. Historians, folklorists and others were not entirely convinced of a methodology that had little regard for the historical context. Social scientists faulted socio-cultural anthropology for its over-focus on qualitative analysis.

Moreover, the nationalist fervour which accompanied the establishment of newly-independent states promoted 'national' disciplines at home. Lithuanian folklore, history and language promoted strong senses of identity and self-respect. Global disciplines such as anthropology were unfocused and added little to the national cause. Instead, Lithuanian ethnology, ethno-musicology and folkloristics were regarded as the key disciplines in 'Lithuanian ethnic cultural studies'.

There was also a general lack of awareness of socio-cultural anthropology in Lithuania. Hardly any anthropological fieldwork had been recorded in the country and there was a lack of trained professionals in the field. Čiubrinskas (2005) notes that anthropology was not taught on a regular basis

in Lithuania until 2001 and it was not until two years later, the first research on ethnographic fieldwork in Lithuania was published (Hohnen 2003).

Following the achievement of independence in the Baltic States, a number of the social science subjects, such as sociology and political science were recognised within academia. In contrast, socio-cultural anthropology has struggled to gain recognition. There are no national traditions of social and/or cultural anthropology in East European post-socialist countries and anthropology is not yet established as a separate discipline. Despite the lack of a contextual framework, this essay argues that the Baltic States are in a unique position to contribute to the development of political anthropology as a specialised sub-discipline and have many advantages to offer.

### **The Potential for Political Anthropology in the Baltic States**

The ‘new Europe’, i.e. the new institutional Europe, is a product of its time, brought into existence by a generation of politicians who are now called ‘the founding fathers of Europe’. This trans-national entity is constantly changing and the Baltic States constitute some of its newest members. Along with recent members, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania can contribute an entirely new perspective on the political anthropology of the ‘new Europe’. Enlargement in 2004 represented a great challenge to the EU and the more that it does to achieve total harmonization and integration among the peoples, cultures and identities of its members states, the more potential there will be for a proliferation of these layers of Europe.

Political boundaries both within and on the borders of Europe will remain central to anthropologists (Kockel 1999, Herzfeld 1987, Donnan and Wilson 1994; Goddard, Llobera and Shore 1994). The frontiers between European identities and national identities have been and will continue to be extremely problematical concerns to the EU and will continue as an ongoing source of tension and challenge. By focusing on the borders between the EU and Russia in particular, and on the impact of membership of the EU on post-Soviet states, the Baltic States can offer tremendously valuable insights for contemporary European political anthropology.

There are particular issues within the EU which should receive more attention from political anthropologists in all regions of the new Europe. Take the notion of citizenship, for example. In the past culture and citizenship have been regarded as concepts on separate trajectories to be researched independently in the disciplines of anthropology and sociology respectively. Anthropologists focused primarily on cultural issues and rarely explored concepts of citizenship. Sociologists were more concerned with issues of civic and political belonging. However some recent anthropological publications have crossed the disciplinary boundaries and have highlighted the significance of citizenship for anthropologists and sociologists have also begun to address the matter of culture.

The development of a concept of citizenship in the Baltic States was contemporaneous with the establishment of a trans-national, EU citizenship. The latter was formally introduced with the revised Treaty on European Union, which was signed in Maastricht in February 1992 and entered into force on 1 November of the following year. Article 8 of the Treaty inserted the notion of ‘Citizenship of the Union’ into the amended Treaty of Rome and conferred obligatory freedoms of goods, persons, services and capital on citizens.

The various articles gave little recognition of the cultural content of citizenship by EU policy makers; placing the focus instead on economic rather than cultural issues. From this and subsequent treaties it would appear that the citizen is primarily perceived as a worker, rather than a cultural being, which ultimately limits the scope of citizenship rights at a European level. This narrow

perspective reflects the emergence of the European Union from an economic context (initially it was known as the European Economic Community) and the primary focus in European integration on the economic sphere. EU citizenship is rooted in market rather than cultural forces.

The emergence of an EU citizenship would appear to herald the development of a post-national form of citizenship, but this is not the case as nationality of an EU member state is a precondition of EU citizenship. Article 8i of the Treaty of Amsterdam affirms that 'every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union'. It also asserts that 'citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship' (Treaty of Amsterdam 1997). This effectively reinforces the traditional construction of citizenship which was centred on principles of nationality and statehood and assumes a dominant, majority culture in a national context which predominates many of Europe's political and social structures. Such a context has enormous implications in the Baltic States, where individuals with Estonian, Latvian or Lithuanian citizenship automatically acquire European citizenship whereas those with Soviet Union citizenship in the Baltic States are excluded.

Some sociologists suggest that the development of an EU citizenship points the way for a new form of post-nationalist politics which separates nationality from citizenship rights. Gerard Delanty (1995) argues that since a collective European identity can hardly be constructed on language, nationality and religion without serious conflicts emerging, citizenship may be a possible alternative option. He proposes a form of citizenship that is separated from territory and is based instead on a human rights agenda. Yasemin Soysal (1996) similarly proposes the decoupling of identity and rights and suggests that immigrants in Europe have been incorporated into many rights and privileges of citizenship although they have never been formally incorporated into a formal scheme of citizenship.

Political anthropology in the Baltic States need not necessarily be confined to home territories. Europeans have migrated to all regions of the globe and some valuable research has already been conducted on European heritages in the United States (Byron 1999; Čiubrinskas 2004). The proportion of Eastern Europeans in Western Europe has increased dramatically in recent years. In 2003, almost 8,500 work permits were issued to Lithuanians, Latvians, Poles, Ukrainians and Russians in Ireland. (This figure includes some 3,000 renewals). Most of these positions are located in agriculture, catering and meat plants. 'Many, such as doctors or engineers, are overqualified for the work; they leave their high-status jobs to take lower-ranking positions here' [in Ireland] which often pay more'. Russian and Eastern European food markets have opened in many parts of Ireland. The first celebration of a Russian Orthodox Easter Liturgy took place in Dublin in 2004 (O'Brien 2004: 15).

Such patterns of migration have immense ramifications for cultural politics at regional, national and international levels. Every anthropologist is aware that culture is a process rather than a product and is fluid rather than static. Culture/s in Europe are shaped by migrant as well as indigenous elements (if one can tell the difference!) and they are influenced for example, by Asian and Indian foods, Eastern spirituality, Chinese herbal medicine and Afro-Caribbean music. Such patterns of migration have immense ramifications for cultural politics at regional, national and international levels. Yet, the EU has not yet adequately dealt with the issue of migration, preferring the largely homogenous nation-state model as a category.

The dominance of nation-state structures is reflected in the attention given to matters of culture in various European Treaties. Article 8ii of the Amsterdam Treaty reflects the EU's commitment to official, nation-state languages and establishes that citizens have the right to petition the European

parliament, to apply to the European Ombudsman, and to write to the institutions and advisory bodies of the Union in any of the Constitution's languages and to obtain a reply in the same language (Treaty of Amsterdam 1997).

The whole question of language in Europe which has hardly been fully addressed by anthropologists (Grillo 1989; McDonald 1989; Bourdieu 1991; O'Reilly 1999; 2001; Nic Craith 2006). In the context, anthropologists in the Baltic States can offer a 'home perspective'. Some of the newly established republics in the Baltic region have explicitly acknowledged a link between state culture and citizenship and have actually used the process of citizenship as a tool of cultural inclusion/exclusion. In the case of Lithuania, the issue appears hardly as extreme as it is in Estonia or Latvia. Lithuania had not experienced the migration of Russians on the same scale as the other Baltic States. As the proportion of ethnic Russians was relatively low, it appears to have opted for a largely inclusive citizenship policies but the link between language and citizenship is one of immense significance in Europe and one to which the Baltic States can make a particularly powerful contribution.

Promotion of indigenous languages at the expense of Russian in the Baltic States symbolises the new geo-political orientation of these independent Republics and their rejection of former Russian domination. Yet, there is another dimension that needs to be considered here. Anthropologists in the Baltic States have knowledge of languages such as Russian which places them in a premium position not only to look in a westward direction towards Europe but in an easterly direction 'beyond' Europe.

The Baltic States are in a unique position to develop an anthropology of economy as they have experienced the economic transition from communism to democracy. Anthropologists here have unique insights into the successes and failures of the communist regime as well as of the opportunities and challenges offered by the transition.

Accession to the EU could be perceived as evidence of the Balts 'turning their backs' on Russia and the curtailment and suppression of the Russian languages is evidence of Baltic attempts to eradicate any traces of former Russia's domination. Modern Baltic citizens wish to be associated with progressiveness in Europe and are seeking to re-claim a Western identity which was concealed under communist rule.

## **Conclusion**

All of my suggestions until now refer specifically to dimensions of political anthropology of Europe at a trans-national or national level. This sub-specialism of social and cultural anthropology addresses geo-political and historical issues including European modernity, the history of the idea of Europe and the ideology of European integration. However, such a proposal is not to suggest that case studies of traditional cultures and identities as well as European ethnographic and folklife studies ought to be neglected.

It will also be important to maintain other related branches such as European ethnology. A new book series from Ashgate entitled *Progress in European Ethnology* features specially commissioned 'regional' monographs providing a critical overview in English of the different national/regional traditions in European Ethnology and their development (Kockel 2002). One of the early volumes in the series gives insight into the development of a discipline in a former communist state. Rihtman-Augustin and Caspo-Zmegac (2004) analyse the development of ethnology in Croatia during and after socialism and examine the link between ethnicity and nationhood. The political relationship between ethnology and politics is explored in great depth.



The series is not confined to socialism and an Austrian volume examines the social, cultural and political implications of European ethnology in a state where study of ethnology of 'Volkskunde' had a somewhat murky reputation in last century when prominent scholars carried out dubious research on behalf of the National Socialist government

Further projected volumes include a study of French ethnology as an academic discipline and as a practice, in relation to the politics of heritage and the fostering of cultural identities at both a national and regional level (Diemossier forthcoming). This volume argues that in recent decades, the French state has sought to define a notion of ethnological heritage which has encouraged (although not always successfully) the proliferation of cultural identities based on values such as commodity and collectivity. In consequence, new cultural expressions of identity have emerged which combine traditional and contemporary definitions of what it means to be French. These volumes challenge the concept of identity in different locations in Europe and set the development of ethnology in the context of differing political regimes. An Irish volume is projected at a future date and a proposal for a Baltic volume is now overdue.

The Baltic States already have a well developed tradition of European Ethnology. This essay emphasises that they are also in a unique position to contribute to the development of political anthropology as an important sub-discipline which has acquired a new relevance in the context of an ever-changing EU. In a Europe that has witnessed many political changes over the past half-century and the emergence of new borders is going, insights into the political process can hardly be acquired through the disciplines of politics or sociology alone. The Eastern enlargement of the EU gives an urgency to our thinking about Europe.

Other issues that need to be addressed include the relationship between a culturally kaleidoscope and a politically unified EU. What are the relationships between Europeans and those who beyond European borders, either in Russia, the USA and Australia? And what, if anything, can we learn about 'Europe' through focusing on what happens at these borders? How are we – and how is the rest of the world – conceptualising and articulating the meaning of Europe? This is directly related to the question of how far further EU expansion can go? Baltic anthropologists have many meaningful things to say – not only on the point of territorial delineation, but also on matters of identity politics and the experiences of immigration and asylum in Europe.

#### **Bibliography**

- Abélès, Marc., Bellier, Irene and McDonald, Maryon 1993. An Anthropological Approach to the European Commission. Unpublished report for the European Commission Forward Studies Unit.
- Abélès, Marc 1997. Political Anthropology: New Challenges, New Aims. *International Social Science Journal*, 153, pp. 319-31.
- Anderson, Benedict 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun 2000. Grassroots Globalisation and the Research Imagination. *Public Culture*, 12(1): 1-19.
- Appadurai, Arjun 1995. The Production of Locality. Richard Fardon (ed.) *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, p. 204-223.
- Asad, Tala 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca.
- Barth, Fredrik 1959. *Political Leadership among the Swat Population*. London: Athlone Press.
- Bellier, Irene & Wilson, Thomas 2000. *An Anthropology of the European Union*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Byron, Reginald 1999. *Irish America*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Čiubrinskas, Vytis 2004. Transnational Lithuanian Identity and Heritage: Imagined, Constructed and Contested. Ullrich Kockel and Máiréad Nic Craith (eds.) *Communicating Cultures*, Berlin, Hamburg, London: LIT Verlag, 42-66.
- Čiubrinskas, Vytis 2005. The First Program in Anthropology in the Baltic States. *EASA Newsletter*, 39, 6-10.

- Comaroff, John & Comaroff, Jean 1993. *Modernity and its Malcontents: Ritual and Power in Post-colonial Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Demossier, Marion 2006. *Anthropology at Home: Developments in French*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Donnan, Hastings & Wilson, Thomas (eds.) 1994. *Border Approaches: Anthropological Perspectives on Frontiers*, University Press of America.
- Dow, James & Bockhorn, Olaf 2004. *The Study of European Ethnology in Austria*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fox, Richard 1985. *Lions of the Punjab: Culture in the Making*. Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press.
- Friedman, Jonathan 1994. *Cultural Identity and the Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Gluckman, Max 1940. *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Goddard, Victoria A., Llobera, Joseph R. & Shore, Cris (eds.) 1994. *The Anthropology of Europe. Identity and Boundaries in Conflict*, Oxford Berg.
- Grillo, Ralph 1989. *Dominant Languages: Language and Hierarchy in Britain and France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hannerz, Ulf 1992. *Cultural Complexity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Herzfeld, M. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking Glass: Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*, Cambridge University Press.
- Hohnen, Pernille 2003. *A Market out of Place? Remaking Economic, Social and Symbolic Boundaries in Post-communist Lithuania*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Humphrey, Caroline 1998. *Marx Went Away – but Karl Stayed Behind*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas & Sivert Nielsen, Finn 2001. *A History of Anthropology*, London, Stirling, Virginia: Pluto Press.
- Kant, Immanuel 1795. *Political Writings*, edited by H. Reiss (1970). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kockel, Ullrich 1999. *Borderline Cases: Ethnic Frontiers of European Integration*. Liverpool: University Press.
- Kockel, Ullrich 2002. *Explorations in European Ethnology*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Lassiter, Luke Eric 2002. *Invitation to Anthropology*. New York, Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Leach, Edmund 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. London: Athlone Press.
- Leach, Edmund 1961. *Pul Eliya: a Study of Land Tenure and Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maine, Henry, Sumner 1887. The Effects of Observation of India on Modern European Thought (Read Lecture), *Village Communities in the East and West*. London: John Murray.
- Marx, Karl & Engels, Friedrich 1847. *The Communist Manifesto*, edited by Samuel Beer (1955). Arlington Heights: AHM Publishing Corporation.
- McDonald, Maryon 1989. *We are not French! Language, Culture and Identity in Brittany*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, Lewis, Henry 1887. *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*, edited by Eleanor Leacock (1974) New York: World Publishing.
- Nic Craith, Máiréad 2006. *Europe and the Politics of Language: Citizens, Migrants, Outsiders*. Basingstoke, New York. Palgrave/Macmillan.
- O'Brien, Carl 2004. Terrible food but Good Money, *The Irish Times*, 12 May, p. 15.
- O'Reilly, Camille 1999. *The Irish Language in Northern Ireland: the Politics of Culture and Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- O'Reilly, Camille 2001 (ed.) *Language, Ethnicity and the State: Vol 1: Minority Languages in the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 1-19.
- Rihtman-Augustin, Dunja & Capo-Zmegac, Jasna 2004. *Ethnology, Myth and Politics: Anthropologizing Croatian Ethnology*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Said, Edward 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Shore, Cris 2002. *Building Europe: the Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Adam 1776. *An Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, edited by E. Cannan (1976). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn 1991. *Partial Connections*. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wolf, Eric 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wolf, Eric 1994. 'Facing Power: Old Insights, New Questions' in Robert Borofsky ed. *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Schocken, pp. 218-28.
- Vincent, Joan 2002. *The Anthropology of Politics: a Reader in Ethnography. Theory and Critique*. Oxford and Mass. USA: Blackwell.

## NAUJOSIOS RIBOS EUROPOJE: POLITINĖS ANTROPOLOGIJOS PERSPEKTYVOS BALTIJOS VALSTYBĖSE

Máiréad Nic Craith

Olsterio universitetas, Jungtinė Karalystė

Santrauka

Antropologijos mokslo disciplina iš esmės siekia suprasti žmogaus elgsenos ypatumus vietiniu ir tarptautiniu lygmenimis. Šios disciplinos vystymosi raidoje atsirado daugiau jos šakų, iš kurių svarbiausios yra biologinė, archeologinė, lingvistinė, socialinė-kultūrinė antropologija. Politinė antropologija paprastai įvardijama kaip socialinės-kultūrinės antropologijos atmaina. Straipsnyje teigiama, kad politinė antropologija yra savarankiška antropologijos šaka ir kad Baltijos valstybių situacija sudaro unikalias sąlygas šios disciplinos plėtrai.

**Politinės antropologijos potencialas Baltijos valstybėse.** „Naujoji Europa“, t. y. naujoji institucinė Europa, yra savo epochos produktas, sukurtas politikų, dabar vadinamų „Europos kūrimo tėvais“ kartos. Šis transnacionalinis vienetas nuolat kinta, o Baltijos valstybės yra vienos iš naujausių jos narių. Drauge su kitomis naujomis valstybėmis Estija, Latvija, ir Lietuva gali suteikti „naujosios Europos“ politinei antropologijai visiškai naują perspektyvą.

Politinės Europos sienos (tiek vidinės, tiek išorinės) lieka antropologų dėmesio centru. Europinio ir nacionalinio identiteto skirtybės yra ir toliau bus ypač problemiškas Europos Sąjungos rūpestis, nuolatinis socialinės įtampos šaltinis. Sprendžiant ES ir Rusijos sienų bei ES narystės poveikio posovietinėms valstybėms klausimus Baltijos šalys gali įnešti vertingą indėlį į šiuolaikinę Europos politinę antropologiją.

Europos Sąjungoje esama problemų, kurioms visų naujosios Europos regionų politiniai antropologai turėtų skirti daugiau dėmesio. Vienas iš tokių problemų pavyzdžių galėtų būti pilietybės sąvoka. Pilietybės sąvokos raida Baltijos valstybėse sutapo su transnacionalinės Europos Sąjungos pilietybės atsiradimu. ES pilietybės atsiradimas lyg ir turėjo paskelbti post-nacionalinės pilietybės formos gimimą, tačiau taip neatsitiko, nes valstybės ES narės tautybė tapo būtina sąlyga ES pilietybei. Šis faktas veiksmingai sustiprina tradicinę pilietybės sampratą, besiremiančią tautybės ir valstybiškumo principu, ir implikuoja dominuojančios daugumos kultūrą nacionaliniame kontekste, būdingą daugumai Europos politinių ir socialinių struktūrų. Toks kontekstas turėjo ypatingą reikšmę Baltijos valstybėse, kuriose asmenys su esto, latvio ar lietuvio pilietybe automatiškai įgijo Europos pilietybę, o Tarybų Sąjungos piliečiai Baltijos valstybėse patyrė atskirtį.

Politinė antropologija Baltijos šalyse nebūtinai turi apsiriboti savosiomis teritorijomis. Europiečiai migruoja į įvairius pasaulio regionus; jau vykdomas reikšmingas europinio paveldo Jungtinėse Amerikos Valstijose tyrimas. Rytų Europos gyventojų skaičius Vakarų Europos valstybėse pastaraisiais metais išpūdingai išaugo. 2003 metais buvo išduota beveik 8500 darbo Airijoje leidimų lietuviams, latviams, lenkams, ukrainiečiams ir rusams. Tokie migracijos modeliai reiškia kultūrinių politikų išsišakojimą regioniniu, nacionaliniu ir tarptautiniu lygmenimis. Tačiau ES kol kas nesugebėjo deramai išspręsti migracijos problemos, teikdama pirmenybę iš esmės homogeninės nacionalinės valstybės modeliui kaip kategorijai.

Nacionalinės valstybės struktūrų dominavimas iš esmės atsispindi požiūryje į kultūrą, fiksuojama įvairiuose ES dokumentuose. Amsterdamo sutarties 8ii punktą atspindi ES išipareigojimus oficialių nacionalinių valstybių kalbų atžvilgiu ir dėmesį Europos kalbų klausimui apskritai, tačiau antro-

pologai vargu ar rimtai domėjosi šiais klausimais. Kai kurios naujai susikūrusios respublikos Baltijos regione nedviprasmiškai pripažino ryšį tarp valstybės kultūros bei pilietybės ir praktiškai panaudojo pilietybės suteikimo procesą kaip kultūrinės integracijos ar atskirties įrankį. Lietuva išvengė tokių kraštutinumų, kurie pasireiškė Estijoje ar Latvijoje; ji nepatyrė tokio masto rusakalbių migracijos kaip kitos Baltijos valstybės.

Vietinių kalbų puoselėjimas Baltijos šalyse, priešpriešinant jas rusų kalbai, simbolizuoja naują geopolitinę šių suverenių respublikų orientaciją ir atsisakymą nuo ankstesnio rusų kalbos dominavimo. Tačiau čia reikėtų atkreipti dėmesį į vieną svarbų aspektą. Baltijos šalių antropologai moka rusų kalbą ir todėl atsiduria privilegijuotoje padėtyje: jie gali ne tik žvelgti į vakarus Europos link, bet ir į rytus, „už“ Europos sienų.

Baltijos šalys turi unikalią galimybę vystyti ekonomikos antropologiją, nes jos išgyveno ekonomikos perėjimą nuo komunizmo link demokratijos. Šių šalių antropologai yra puikiai susipažinę tiek su komunistinio režimo privalumais ir trūkumais, tiek su pereinamojo laikotarpio teikiamomis galimybėmis ir iššūkiais.

**Išvados.** Iki šiol visos mano pastabos buvo pateiktos apie Europos politinės antropologijos aspektus transnacionaliniame ir nacionaliniame lygmenyse. Ši socialinės ir kultūrinės antropologijos atšaka analizuoja geopolitines ir istorines problemas, įskaitant šiuolaikinės Europos ypatumus, bendros Europos idėjos istoriją ir Europos integracijos ideologiją. Tačiau tai nereiškia, kad reikėtų atsisakyti tradicinių kultūrų ir identiteto socialinių tyrimų ar Europos etnografinių ir tautų gyvenimo studijų.

Kartu būtina vystyti kitas giminingas šakas, tokias kaip Europos etnologija. Baltijos šalys turi stiprias europinės etnologijos tradicijas. Straipsnyje akcentuojama, kad jos turi unikalią galimybę prisidėti prie politinės antropologijos, kaip svarbios antropologijos atšakos, vystymosi, nes nuolat besikeičiančios Europos kontekste ji tampa ypač aktuali. Europoje, kuri per pastaruosius 50 metų išgyveno nemaža politinių pokyčių, kurioje vis dar atsiranda naujos valstybinės sienos, išvalgos į politinį procesą vargu ar įmanomos vien per politologijos ar sociologijos disciplinas. ES rytų krypties plėtra skatina Europos dėmesį tiek Lietuvai, tiek kitoms Baltijos valstybėms.

*Received in September 2005*