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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.
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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 Kackin 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-
fluential 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 calls ‘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-
Anthropologists 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.
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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 member 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.
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Europos Sąjungos esama problemų, kuriomis visų naujosios Europos regionų politinio antropologui turi skirti daugiau dėmesio. Vienas iš tokių problemų pavyzdžiui būtų pilietybės sąvoka. Pilietybės sąvokos raída Baltijos valstybėse sutapo su transnacionalinės Europos Sąjungos pilietybės atsiradimu. ES pilietybės atsiradimas lyg ir tėvynė paskelbti post-nacionalinės pilietybės formos gimtą, tačiau taip neatsitiko, nes valstybės ES narės tautybė tapo būtina sąlyga ES pilietybės bei. Šis faktas veiksmingai sustiprina tradicinę pilietybės sampratą, besiremiančią tautybės ir valstybiškumo principu, ir implikuoją dominuojančios daugumos kultūrų nacionaliniame kontekste, būdinga daugumai Europos politinių ir socialinių struktūrų. Toks kontekstas turėjo ypatų reikšmę Baltijos valstybėse, kuriose asmenys su esu, latvio ar lietuviu pilietybė automatiškai įgijo Europos pilietybę, o Tarybų Sąjungos piliečiai Baltijos valstybėse patyrė atskirti.


Nacionalinės valstybės struktūrų dominavimas iš esmės atsispindi požiūryje į kultūrą, iškilo išvairuojantiesiose ES dokumentuose. Amsterdamo sutarties 8ii punktas atspindi ES įsipareigojimus oficialiuose nacionalinių valstybių kalbų atžvilgiu ir dėmesį Europos kalbų klausimui apskritai, tačiau antro-
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pologai vargu ar rimtai domėjosi šiais klausimais. Kai kurios naujai susikūrusios respublikos Baltijos regione nedviprasmiskai 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 nepatyre tokio masto rusakalbių migracijos kaip kitos Baltijos valstybės.


Baltijos šalys turi unikalų galimybę vystyti ekonomikos antropologiją, nes jos išgyveno ekonominį 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 lygmenyje. Ši socialinės ir kultūrinės antropologijos atšaka analizuojà geopolitinės ir istorinės problemas, įskaitant šiuolaikinės Europos ypatumus, bendros Europos ideologiją ir Europos integracijos ideologiją. Tačiau tai nereikia, 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 šalyje užtikrintų stiprius europinės etnologijos tradicijas. Straipsnyje akcentuojama, kad jos turi unikalią galimybę prisidėti prie politinės antropologijos, kaip svarbios antropologijos atsakos, vystymosi, nes nuolat besikeičianti Europos kontekste ji tampa ypač aktualū. Europoje, kuri per pastaruosius 50 metų išgyveno nemaža politinių pokyčių, kurioje vis dar atsiranda naujos valstybinės sienos, įžvalgos į politinių procesų vargu ar įmanomos vien per politologijos ar sociologijos disciplinas. ES rytų krypties plėtra skatina Europos dėmesį tiek Lietuvai, tiek kitoms Baltijos valstybėms.
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