

Victor C. de Munck

First, Second and Finally Third Order Understandings of Lithuanian National Identity: an Anthropological Approach*

Abstract. *The term 'national identity' implies homogeneity, but field research shows that the members of a nation are very heterogeneous in their conceptions of their own national identity. How then can we speak of a national identity when there is significant diversity among the members of a nation? I rely on concepts of 'first order' and 'second order' components of identity to resolve this question. First order concepts are constructed from the top down by the cultural elite and second order concepts are precipitates of behavior from the bottom up through personal experiences. I also rely on the importance of situated knowledge as the way identity is understood in social practice. Situated knowledge used by ego in social interactions. Situated knowledge creates a common national (or cultural) identity when ego knows not only that alter knows what ego knows but that ego "knows that alter knows that ego knows that alter knows." It is this third order "Knowing" that creates, expresses, and maintains a national identity that is actually practiced in everyday life. I conclude by noting that a socially just inclusive model of national identity has to be based on this "third order" understanding of national identity.*

Keywords: *anthropology, national identity, situated knowledge, heterogeneity, homogeneity, first order, second order, third order understandings*

Esminiai žodžiai: *antropologija, tautinis identitetas, situacinės žinios, heterogeniškumas, homogeniškumas, pirminis, antrinis ir tretinis suvokimas*

The problem that I grapple with in this paper, is that the term 'national identity' implies homogeneity, but the members of a nation are often very heterogeneous across many of the dimensions (or variables) used to describe a national identity. How then can we

speak of a national identity when there is significant diversity among the members of a nation?

To answer this question I rely on the concepts of 'first order' and 'second order' components of identity. I will show that first or-

* Straipsnis parašytas vykdant Valstybinio mokslo ir studijų fondo remiamą projektą „Lietuvių tautinės tapatybės raiškos būdai: socialinė atmintis, kultūrinis tęstinumas ir kaita globalizacijos sąlygomis“.

der and second order components are constructed through very different processes - the former from the 'top down' the latter from the 'bottom up' (see Frederik Jameson 1999, Eric Wolf 1994, E. P. Thompson 1992, and David Wrong 1979 for excellent discussions of the 'top-down/bottom-up' problem in the construction of identity and power). These two concepts allow me to resolve the 'heterogeneity' problem of national identity by examining unofficial as well as "official" versions of national identity. Second, I will also rely on the importance of situated knowledge as the way identity is understood in social practice, that is in everyday life. Situated knowledge is that knowledge which is used by ego in their interactions within a behavioral environment, either with specific or generalized others.

My theoretical focus, belies and fully rejects essentialist understanding of identity affirming that any such concept is derived from experience, from the senses and not from newspapers as Benedict Anderson (1983) might have it in his (now senescent) notion of nation as an "imagined community," nor from Bourdieu's notions of "habitus" or "doxa," or even "symbolic capital". These are cleverly seductive concepts but their link to everyday life is, to my mind, vague and only serves to obfuscate the relationship between concept and action therefore giving social science a deservedly bad name for those who look to social scientists for answers or at least, insight, into social problems and issues.

The paper is organized as follows: (1) a brief discussion on the use of the term "com-

ponent"; (2) a discussion on first order identities; (3) a discussion on second order identities; (4) an extended case study that displays an expression of a first order component of Lithuanian identity – language; (5) an analysis of interview material to discuss one second order component of identity — generational differences; (6) a comparative analysis of both processes of identity formation; and (7) a synthesis of first order and second order components of identity forms is presented to formulate a situated knowledge theory of national identity.

1. Why Refer to 'Components' of Identities?

It is obvious that even in the most culturally homogeneous of countries there are still many significant differences between the members of the culture in terms of personality, values, beliefs, and practices. The term 'national identity' is used to signify some common salient properties or core features that most, if not all, members of a nation have in common and which distinguish them from members of other nations. Thus, whatever those features may be, and however they are imaginatively constructed, their function is to offer a homogeneous profile of the 'people' of a nation. The term 'national identity,' presumes commonalities and elides differences among the members of a nation. For this reason, discourses of national identity usually involve anthropomorphizing the nation; that is, turning a nation into an entity; national identity becomes an 'id-identity – fixing homogeneity at the subconscious

or essentialist substratum of collective expression.

The transformation of the concept 'nation' into 'id-entity' also entails the transformation of the defining features of the concept 'nation' into qualities (traits) or characteristics of the nation as id-entity. These qualities function as their own referents rather than as symbols that refer and presumably correlate with visible and iterative expressions of collective thought and behavior. Without having to deal with the importance of connecting concept to action, these self-referential qualities render an essential vision of identity. National identity is represented as if it were a unique innate feature of a people. In this way discourses of national identity ascribe essentialist features to the national identity (see Sperber 1996; Kronenfeld 1997). This transformative process is, it seems, inevitable yet both logically and ethically flawed.

As a consequence of the above line of reasoning, I decided on the term 'component' because of its anthropological connection to the idea of componential analysis. This is a rather old notion in cognitive anthropology referring to the idea that meanings are constructed out of the conjunctive intersection of a series of semantic dimensions. Thus, the salient features for distinguishing a bird from any other flying thing are that it has a beak, feathers and wings. You don't need to know anything more than to make a good guess that the thing flying is a bird and not an insect, plane or kite. This unromantic and taxonomic way of thinking about birds, eliminates the tendency to focus on "birdness" as an

inarticulable essentialist distinctive feature of birds relative to (say) dragon flies. It becomes quite a difficult task to investigate the salient components which people use to categorize, reflect on, and distinguish people, social interactions, and cause-effect relations in their behavioral environment. My goal, in this paper, is not quite so difficult, though I advocate such an exhaustive undertaking in the investigation of national or any other identity, since it would set up at least a taxonomy for further, ethnographic studies of identity. The utility of components in this paper is twofold: first to distinguish between first order and second order components and second as a trope rejecting essentialist constructions of identity.

2. First Order Components of Identity

First order components of identity are institutionally construed and validated, they operate from the top down as, for example, actual or 'invented traditions' sponsored by the government or national organizations (for theoretical-historical discussions on invented traditions see Hobsbawm 1971 and Anderson 1987; for an excellent ethnographic example of the application of the theory see Tennekoon 1988). First order components usually do not refer to the marginalized or minority sub-populations of a nation (i.e. 'the people without a history'). First order components are represented in the popular media and signify the identity of the nation as a 'people with a history.' As Hutchinson and Smith (1994) write, citing Geertz:

'In modernizing societies where the tradition of civil politics is weak and where the technical requirements for an effective welfare government are poorly understood, primordial attachments tend, as Nehru discovered, to be repeatedly, in some cases almost continually proposed and widely acclaimed as the preferred bases for the demarcation of autonomous political units' (Hutchinson and Smith 1994: 31).

Though Lithuania is an ethnically homogeneous society with 81% of its population claiming to be ethnic Lithuanian (demographic Yearbook 2001, 2002; 15), primordial attachments remain politically important particularly vis-à-vis neighboring countries (e.g., Russia, Belarus, Poland and Latvia). First order components of a Lithuanian national identity are those features that are presumed to be shared by all Lithuanians and are considered to be core or default features of a 'Lithuanian identity.' Thus, first order components of identity are taken for granted by members of the identity and presumptively uncontested by others who claim membership in that identity. When such components are contested by individuals who claim membership, then their rights to membership will be questioned by those who espouse those (now contested) first order components.

Jonathan Spencer (1990) and F. G. Bailey (1991) have shown that in Sri Lanka and India, respectively, national politics dominates the parameters of local power through public rituals of first order components of national identity and by granting legitimacy only to those who speak in the register of and with reference to national political parties. In

South Asia, the process of national identity formation has been to delegitimize local forms and expressions of identity while at the same time using those local forms to evoke the historical "authenticity" of formulations of national identity. The same process, I believe, can be seen in Lithuania and in the 'newly independent' Baltic states. For Lithuania (as for Sri Lanka where I previously conducted three years of fieldwork), two first order components of national identity are 'language' and 'history.' (See Klumbyte 2003, Rindzeviciute 2002; Gudavicius 1999; Donskis 1999).

Language becomes a more salient first order component of identity in small nations (like Lithuania and Sri Lanka, but not India) where linguistic and cultural boundaries coincide than in large nations. For instance English is not a particularly salient first order marker of American identity simply because there are millions of fluent English speakers who are not in any way members of 'American culture.' Conversely, there are very few fluent Lithuanian speakers who are not also members of Lithuanian culture. First order identities operate to unify and group people together on the basis of expressed and claimed shared features. Those features may be anything — language, common history, shared values, beliefs and customs, wedding ceremonies, child rearing practices, various everyday practices, etc. It is necessary that these features are salient to the people as first order identity markers and that they are shared. Thus, giving odd numbers of flowers as a gift is a shared cultural practice in

Lithuania but it is not a particularly salient first order marker of identity. In Section 3, I will show how language functions as a first order component of Lithuanian national identity through an analysis of an extended case study. I will also suggest that the more salient the homogenizing function of a first order component of identity the more likely it is that it can lead to chronic divisive conflict among the members of a nation (see also Beals and Siegel 1967).

3. Second Order Components of Identity

Second order identities are inchoate and formulated by individuals as personal accounts of identity in which the individual situates him or herself vis-à-vis other formations of national identity. Second order components of identity are seldom, if ever, noted as organizational features of a national identity but cut across the first order components of national identity, fragmenting and calling those first order components into question. Second order identities are constructed through *first order experiences* and cut across the members of a nation. Second order identities are not ‘officially scripted’ and they fragment members of a nation into different subgroups based on a set of shared first order experiences that are distinct to the members of such a group.

Second order identities are built from the ground up and they may be, indeed often are, in symbolic opposition with first order identities. Second order identities are usually distributed across members of a culture, often

according to generational, gender, ethnic, class or religious differences. They are ‘identities’ because they are ‘self-other’ discourses *assumed* to be espoused by people who share similar experiences. That is, as they are built out of the first order experiences of the individual, second order components ‘emplot’ the individual into value assessments of one’s self in relation to specific others. It is important to note that by “assumed” I mean that people who espouse these identities think, *but do not know (or take for granted)* that the components of the identity they espouse are shared by similar types of people. These components are perceived as realistic perceptions of the world because they are derived from first order experiences of the individual and not “handed down” to them.

The notion of “second order components” of identity is analogous to, and very similar to, James Scott’s (1985) concept of ‘weapons of the weak’ and his later concept of ‘hidden transcripts’ (Scott 1991). Second order components, like weapons of the weak, are inchoate and typically symbolize opposition to some features of the first order national identity. Max Gluckman (1955) and later his student Robert Frankenberg (1968) described how cross-cutting ties fragment a community. Second order components of identity, like cross-cutting ties, cut across first order ones, creating heterogeneity in the midst of presumed homogeneity. Second order components are independent of first order components because they are derived from first order experiences while first order components are derived from “official scripts” of identity

and not experiences. Rather, somewhat like Scott's notion of 'hidden transcripts,' second order components of identity are seldom expressed in public settings or as part of any campaign describing key features of that identity. Nevertheless, like the good soldier Schweik, adherence to second order features of identity can wreak havoc on the order of things. If enough people favor second order components of identity over first order components then discourses on national identity will lack force and legitimacy.

Second order components of identity are symbolic "living tools" (Holland, Skinner, Lachicotte and Cain 1998) that people use to orient themselves to their behavioral environment. One can recognize these second order components as they are most often used in a contrast set in which the second order component explicitly contrasts with some other component of identity (e.g., Lithuanian versus Russian, Catholic versus Protestant, men versus women, urban versus rural, hard-working versus lazy, urban versus rural, us versus them etc.). Although second order components of identity are typically expressed ad hoc, motivated by contextual triggers, they nevertheless possess a 'deep structure' that is robust and conservative because they are formulated from a person's *habitus*, or iterated experiences from which certain behavioral, cognitive and affective dispositions are formed. This contrasts with first order components which are usually expressed through culturally official scripts and therefore seldom ad hoc (Bourdieu 1980). First order components even when expressed with fanatic

ardor are seldom rooted in first order experiences as their components diffuse from the top down, and therefore their psychological resting place is the surface structure of consciousness.

A prototypical example of a second order component of identity is the following: I went with a group of Lithuanians to *Gruto Parkas*. The younger Lithuanians (twenty-two and under) saw the statues as 'pop art', the older ones (twenty-eight and over) saw them as historical memories. At the end of the visit, the younger Lithuanians went to the gift shop and bought glasses and shirts with portraits of Lenin inscribed on them. The older ones appeared somber and one, obviously irritated by the carefree behavior of the younger members of the group, wondered aloud how a Lithuanian could walk around with a Lenin T-shirt.

As this example illustrates, second order components of identity are built out of life experiences, those who do not have those experiences do not internalize that particular component (or complex of components) of identity but have second-hand knowledge of them. First order components of identity are discussed and described *as if* all Lithuanians possess them, but any one second order component of identity is probably not shared by all, or even most, Lithuanians. Rather, each salient component cuts across the population, segmenting it into many different parts. Thus, first order components serve as the building blocks for presenting holistic, homogeneous portrayals of a people while second order components imply divisions within a popu-

lation. Of course, both these culturally ‘centripetal and centrifugal’ tendencies work at the same time in all societies. Discourses of national identity usually rely on first order components of identity, while second order components are usually neglected. Even when discourses of national identity refer to minorities those minorities are portrayed as sharing the first order components of the majority. I believe the distinction between first order and second order components of identities is the main theoretical contribution of this paper, as it helps clarify the upward and downward movements and interactions between identity forms within a nation-state.

4. An Extended Case Study of an Encounter with Skinheads: Language as an Example of a First order Component of Identity

At about 6:00 p.m. on a spring day, I went to a bar near Vilnius University with a twenty-five-year-old graduate student named Mindaugas (a pseudonym). Mindaugas also has a full-time job as a low-level civil servant. He speaks-near fluent English, wore a white shirt and tie, a sweater and a pair of pressed slacks. We both ordered beer and began to talk about his possibilities for entering graduate school programs in political science or anthropology in the United States. Four young adult men and two women entered as a group; the males had shaved heads and were wearing leather jackets. The six of them sat behind us and were loud from the start. At one time they clambered over the tables dousing each other with beer.

Mindaugas and I were conversing in English and I sensed that this annoyed them, but then I thought that I was being too paranoid. The group of skinheads left, a half hour later Mindaugas and I also left. As we made our way up the street, we saw the same group of six drinking beer in front of a building entrance. As we passed them, one said to Mindaugas, ‘Ar tau reikia lietuvių kalbos pamokų?’ (‘Do you need Lithuanian lessons?’). Without breaking stride, Mindaugas replied, ‘Ačiū, man nereikia’ (‘No, I don’t, thanks’). I asked Mindaugas what they had said and he replied, ‘nothing, nothing worthwhile.’ Of course, I persisted and he told me.

It seemed an odd statement for (what appeared to be) a drunken skinhead to make; no curse words and the comment was spoken *sotto voce*. It was hard to imagine an American skinhead making a similar statement to an English speaker walking by speaking Spanish with a Hispanic. Second, it seemed odd to me that the skinhead knew Mindaugas was Lithuanian and directed his comment to him. Why bother Mindaugas and not me? And why not say something in Lithuanian to Mindaugas about me rather than making a pointedly sarcastic remark about his language skills when the skinhead already knew Mindaugas was a native Lithuanian?

The above encounter can be interpreted by considering five contemporary conditions that signal a marked rupture between the Lithuanian present and the ‘past’: first, is the demographic issue — Lithuania has been referred to as a ‘cheerfully disappearing nation’ by Aleksa and Žukas (2003; 10). The two

authors report that the population of Lithuania has declined by 300,000 since 1984 due to emigration and, after 1992, to the low birth rate (which at that time began to exceed the death rate). Second, it is reported in the “Executive Summary” on “Youth and Society” that “numerous sociological surveys have revealed that more than half of the young respondents have the intention to emigrate or seek employment abroad” (2001; 13). Third, as a new member of the EU, the borders of Lithuania are open for both in and out migration, thus making both cultural purity and a stable population even more difficult. Fourth, and in the “ethnographic present” perhaps the triggering factor, tourism from the West has increased each year. In particular, Western European and American tourism have risen significantly; in 1998 Western European tourists numbered 284,000 and in 2002 it rose to 3,934,000, undoubtedly it continues to rise at a similar hyperbolic rate (Lithuanian Tourism Statistics).

With tourism (and globalization) comes English, the lingua franca of tourism; one can hear it spoken everywhere in senamiestis (old town). The ‘invasion’ of English is apparent in advertising, billboards, music and other popular cultural outlets. Lithuanian musicians frequently sing in English even if they can’t speak English, and English words and phrases are included with Lithuanian on billboards, radio and television ads. The English terms give legitimacy to the products by indicating their modernity. Within the contexts of modernity, the Lithuanian language seemed (to me) associated with Lithuanian

traditions and home life. While Lithuanian and English, as one reviewer of an earlier submission accurately noted, “coexist,” I suggest that this coexistence is an uneasy one since most Lithuanians are not fluent in English and it is only through English competency that one can fully participate in the new global economy and its attendant cultural projects.

English is the language of globalization and the modern marketplace, while Lithuanian (and Russian also) is the language of the traditional market and the home; hence, Lithuanian is the language of intimate and local spaces. The coexistence between English and Lithuanian works when all citizens are bilingual in both, or when not knowing English does not exclude one from new economic opportunities; but this is not the case. English is a prerequisite for being a full citizen in the European Union. Awareness of the importance of English is manifested in advertisements such as the huge banner draped across a building in downtown Vilnius on which is inscribed the Lithuanian phrase ‘Mes – europiečiai’ along with its English translation ‘We Europeans’ (sic). Lithuanian and English become conflated with generational differences, the past and the future, public and private spaces, tradition and modernity. The Lithuanian language is a first order component of Lithuanian identity because it connects Lithuanians to each other and to their past, but English is what connects them to Western Europe and to their future.

Finally, there is the historical remembering of the nation as it is “revived” ... [from fifty

years of Soviet rule]...through “memories and history” (Klumbytė 2003; 282). Klumbytė surveyed many of the leading Lithuanian newspapers during the three year period prior to and including independence (1988-1991) looking for articles about Lithuanian nationalism; she observed that

Narratives and symbols helped to imagine the new community (the nation, Lithuania) and to construct national identity in opposition to ‘others.’ As mentioned, “Soviets” were shown as “occupiers,” guilty for the suffering and misfortunes of Lithuanians; they were associated with totalitarianism, imperialism, evil, etc. (2003; 286).

Modernity, the influx of foreigners, a history of oppression in which Lithuanian identity is contrasted with a conquering, oppressive Other, and the declining population all cause some level of apprehension among Lithuanians regarding their ‘sustainability’ as Lithuanians. Though most people welcomed accession to the EU and gladly orient themselves to the West they remain, as the collective monograph *Europa ir Mes* (2003) shows, closer to Russia in values. The older Lithuanians and those who do not speak German, French or English but do speak Russian cannot so easily identify with the West. For these people and others, the West comes with a ‘smiley face’ promising as one informant said a “fantasy land of music and dance” an end to economic hardships, freedom and a new way of life. Among these people there is concern that just as Lithuania is being recognized as an independent and successful nation on the world stage, *Lithuanianness* – those

fundamental core features that are believed to be uniquely Lithuanian - will disappear. This concern with the end of a culture and a people - was distilled in the succinct comment by the Skinhead to Mindaugas.

Lithuanians routinely inform foreigners, as a sort of catechism, that Lithuanian is the oldest of the Indo-European languages. Aleksa and Žukas note that ‘... the Lithuanian language ... has preserved the archaic features of the Proto-Indo-European language ... [and] ... Lithuanians are fond of taking pride in the age of their language; but a foreigner who wants to learn to speak it complains about the complexity of its grammar’ (2002; 15). The age and ‘complexity’ of the Lithuanian language are frequently presented in conversations as a synecdoche for the authenticity of Lithuanian culture, history and people. The Lithuanian language is presented as a kind of ethnic/national boundary mechanism *au Frederick Barth* (1969), serving to keep foreigners out and Lithuanians in.

The public use of a foreign language by a Lithuanian symbolically contrasts with one of the first order components of an identity that is perhaps not so “cheerfully disappearing.” As a first order component, Lithuanian becomes a synecdoche for Lithuanian culture. Mindaugas represented a new modern Western European Lithuanian (everywhere in Vilnius there were and there remain signs proclaiming “Būkime europiečiai!” [“We are Europeans!”]), and another in Lithuanian and English: “Mes – europiečiai” [“We Europeans” (sic)]. The skinhead saw, I think accurately, that this model of the new

Lithuanian excludes them (as well as all Lithuanians who do not speak English) and symbolically denigrates their more traditional Lithuanian identity.

5. An Analysis of Second order Components of Identity—Generational Differences

To discover components of second order identities, I interviewed forty ‘ordinary’ Lithuanians. As my Lithuanian was not fluent enough to carry on conversations, I used two college students to act as assistants. Informants were recruited in parks and on the streets of Vilnius. I had a set of twenty basic questions which I asked them. The questions were divided into three categories: basic vital statistics, family and career information, and their ideas about Vilnius and how Lithuania has changed since independence. The interviewees were between twenty-two and seventy-five years of age. Most were relatively poor and around fifty years of age. I use their comments on Vilnius to describe this second order layer of Lithuanian identity.

All forty informants were, at minimum, bilingual; eight were able to speak and write three or more languages. All the older speakers were fluent in Russian. This ability to code switch between Lithuanian and Russian by the majority of older Lithuanians (those who received their second order education before independence) is one communicative capacity that they all share and which reminds them of their shared history and heritage as part of the Soviet Union. It is this common history (a first order component), in fact, that many

of the informants referred to when they responded to the question ‘how Vilnius has changed?’

Few of my informants had anything good to say about the period of Soviet occupation, most remembered the lines they stood in for food, the lack of goods, and the fear of the KGB and threat of deportation. Nevertheless, many voiced nostalgia for a time when they all suffered together and the state looked after them. An editorial in *Lietuvos Rytas* (Lithuania’s main paper, 20 March 2004) also observed that while no one wanted to return to Soviet times, there was a sense of social unity and commonality (all were poor together) that is missing in these modern times of increasing socio-economic differentiation and individualization.

Informants used a discourse of aesthetics to describe how Vilnius has changed: directly referring to the “beauty” of the city; the new modern glass buildings, the shopping and entertainment plazas, and the renovation of the historical buildings in *senamiestis*; the mushrooming of restaurants, coffee shops and night clubs; the availability of all sorts of food-stuffs and commodities that were lacking during Soviet times (there were only one or two kinds of candies and children would break a candy into three pieces to divide among their siblings or friends; bread was frequently thrown into waiting crowds, etc.). Many of the older informants while expressing how beautiful the city had become also expressed ambivalence, often in the form of *‘juodas humoras’* (‘black humor’) over these changes. They did not express discontent with these

changes so much as their complete disconnection with the new Vilnius. Their presentation of self was almost always drawn in the hard pan language of capital and their lack of it. Most of my fifty-plus-year-old interviewees portrayed themselves as outsiders to the present, insiders to the past. Actual names of informants have been changed. I present some of their comments below, to illustrate their 'black humor' and sense of disengagement:

1. 45 year old male: *Vilnius is now a beautiful city and it draws many tourists. There are many rich people, but I manage just barely to get by with less than 500 litas a month.*
2. 50 year old female: *Now Vilnius is beautiful and you don't have to stand in line for goods and come home after two hours. So there is everything in Vilnius ... [a small pause] ... except jobs and money.*
3. 61 year old male: *Of course there is 11% unemployment in Vilnius and that is good, it's worse elsewhere. But I do not complain, we have won our freedom and that is the biggest wealth.*
4. 50 year old female: *Well perhaps Vilnius became nicer, more beautiful but people are still angry, very angry.*
5. 40 year old Plumber: *Mansions are growing because there are rich people, factories are closing up, and schools are also closing up. So, you can see, there is nothing good totally nothing good.*
6. 55 years old unemployed woman (formerly a low level civil servant): *We are becoming more independent and all*

those building projects (statybose) ... it [i.e., Vilnius] becomes more beautiful. ... But the bad thing is that you can't go outside alone when it is dark because there are many bad people. The worst thing is that I can't get a job. This is terrible. I can't find a job even though I have a college education; so what do those people do who do not have such education?' I then asked this last woman what she thought about Lithuania joining the EU and she said, 'When we join the EU, all those foreigners will come to Vilnius.' I then asked, 'Don't you mind that all those foreign people will come to Lithuania?' She replied, 'No they will come and we will go. [She laughed as did we].'

I think the cultural divide between older and younger Lithuanians is expressed in the comments below by a twenty-seven year old undergraduate student who came of age during Soviet times and went to university in Independent Lithuania.

7. 27 year old graduate student – Darius (pseudonym):

Darius. I go to Sweden to pick berries, paint houses and backpack. Lithuanians terrorize all Sweden. Of course, when I hitchhike up there, and stick out my hand, they stop and ask 'where are you from [in English]' ... [I say] 'From Lithon' and they keep driving. Even after they pick me up and find out I am Lithuanian they stop talking. So you know. Everyone knows. And especially in Sweden and in Denmark they say "oh I know

Lithuanians pish pish. Of course I know”.

Victor: *pish pish?*

Darius: *Yeah it's a gun, you know.*

Victor: *Lithuanians don't have guns.*

Darius: *Yeah but this is stereotype. They say 'pish pish.' Gangsters; lots of gangsters are here [in Lithuania]. All the world is talking about it - Lithuanians are gangsters. Hollywood started a movie and another guy wrote a bestseller on Lithuanian gangsters.*

Victor: *Are Lithuanians tough?*

Darius: *I think so. This is my ideology too. They are tougher. But its not a positive thing you know because too much criminal and stuff like that Still I know from my experience. In my childhood. I didn't have lots of food you know. I never throw out food. I mean different things that's why I can live without many things. And I think some people from the West they are more spoiled. They just get cry very fast you know. END*

Darius sees himself as different from the younger generation. Those experiences made him hard, and through his memories of those experiences he can contrast his “hardness” (and that of all those who came of age during Soviet times) with the “softness” of younger Lithuanians, Europeans and Americans. But Darius is also ambivalent about this hardness: it is both a sign of weakness and a sign of strength. He considers himself hard, and he is proud of that and yet feels it is why he can't find a girlfriend or why he feels removed from his younger colleagues at the university, and it is also the reason why Lithuanians have a reputation for being thugs.

Darius represents a transitional figure between the older and younger generations of Lithuanian. He is simultaneously conscious and ambivalent about the differences between them, both valorizing and being ashamed of his “hardness.” We do not find this ambivalence in the interview material of younger Lithuanians who I interviewed in Vilnius. I now present some excerpts from comments made by informants between eighteen and twenty-two years of age. All these informants, like the older ones were recruited at parks and public places. I emphasize that the same recruiting strategies were employed to recruit younger and older informants.

Interviews with three young males, aged 22, 21, 20 (met at Lukiškių park, all live in Vilnius):

Victor: *How did Vilnius change during those 10 years of independence?*

20 year old: *It changed for the better. It used to be old, the paint peeling and the walls crumbling. I like Zuokas (the Mayor) very much; he has worked hard to make the city like a little Paris. The young people are also much better than they used to be, less argumentative. People have become freer and more liberal and more open.*

Victor: *How would you describe Lithuanian character?*

21 year old: *There is a song that describes the Lithuanian mentality: “I feel good when my neighbour feels bad (man gerai, kai kaimynui blogai)” (all of us laugh and he sang it to mock that mentality). Lithuanian is a thief (vagis). He is jealous of many things. Some Lithuanians have a 'black envy.' They*

will always complain whatever their life is. Many people can't see any light in the future. These are mostly the older people who lived comfortably during Soviet times and now that those times are gone, they feel bad. But we (meaning the three of them and the younger generation) think that our future will be better.

Victor: *How important is education to you?*

22 year old (he has a good job): *Good work experience is more important than higher education. After graduation (he means from University) one usually starts from the lowest job and the lowest wages. Then slowly you climb up, until you can make a decent living. But if one is smart he can get at the top of those stairs at once without any higher education, just having good work practices and starting before college... And of course you need a little luck to be in the right place at the right time.*

All three of the above males had a high school education and spoke some English. They were dressed much like American youths, in baggy longish shorts and looking sort of "punkish." They were optimistic about their own futures and very expressive and open in their interviews with me, as opposed to the older informants who either were very closed or treated it as a kind of job to get through (I paid each informant 10 litas - about three dollars). Below are some more excerpts from interviews with younger informants:

21 year old male student:

Victor: *How has Vilnius changed?*

21 year-old: *You know before there were only clubs with techno music but now you go*

to clubs and there are jazz and I think blues. More self-expression (išraiškos). And I like this tendency even if I don't like the way it is expressed. Old people are just the same as they were during Soviet times; they didn't change.

A distinction is made between old people and the young generation and the distinction is, once again, framed in terms of Soviet times. In particular, younger people are seen as "self-expressive", whereas older Lithuanians are not; in fact, they are seen as just the opposite - jealous and deceptive. Below is another, longer excerpt from an interview with a twenty year old female. I include it to provide a few more of the informants' reflections on differences between "Soviet times" and the present. The excerpt is taken from the middle of an extended conversation about the respondent's future and about the relation between career, personal goals and civic responsibilities.

Interview with Rasa 20 year old female student, Vilnius University. The interview was conducted by the author, mostly in English and a little in Lithuanian.

Victor: *Can you tell me how people talk about what they can do for society?*

Rasa: *They are mostly speaking about their profession and about their occupation and their studies they are speaking about their future because now it is really harder When you have to find your job yourself. . .you know. I don't know if it is really the case but lots of people say. Earlier when we were part of the Soviet Union everyone knew what they will do after their studies because everybody had a job and they really knew because just they had*

an appointment not an appointment but somehow the places were reserved. For you and so on and you really knew what you will do. Now we don't have and we have to find ourselves. There's some competition between people and between students.

Victor: *for what? For grades? For jobs?*

Rasa: *Uhmhm for acquaintances (pazistamus). But you know those people [who you meet through school] so you can ask them if you want to look for a job or something if you will...*

Victor: *How does that competition work. How do you play that game.*

Rasa: *How do you play that "game?" [she was confused about my use of "game"].*

Victor: *I mean what's the goal? To know a lot of professors? To know a lot of people? Colleagues? to know a lot of...*

Rasa: *Hummm... To know a lot of people who are successful.*

Victor: *successful in all fields or in your specific field?*

Rasa: *uhh... In your chosen field ... anywhere but ... that we uhmhm get... "kad mus pazintu."*

Victor: *[translating her Lithuanian into English] "That we get recognized?" You mean recognized by important people?*

Rasa: *Recognition ya recognition by other people so it is important for them.*

Victor: *Do students in general. Are you. Are you generally optimistic about your future?*

Rasa: *Jo... Yah I am.*

Victor: *how come?*

Rasa: *Because I think we have lots of possibilities.*

Victor: *Who? You have lots of possibilities?*

Rasa: *We can do what we want actually. ... We are free to express ourselves....or so something like that... (She giggles, but not nervously).*

Victor: *are you free to get the kind of job you want?*

Rasa: *Ya I think I will.*

Victor: *What kind of job do you want.*

Rasa: *(this was all said in English, except for the Lithuanian excerpt) I want a kind of job where I could express that is where I could use the knowledge that I get here in the university...that I could use this skills that I get and uhm. I'm not very sure about my future actually. I am not even sure what I will do next year (laughs) because I am thinking of going to Germany and making a break of my studies soooo. But I think this is great here living in Vilnius and studying in university you can meet people you can know about what you can do. There is not to structuralize your life...uhh...you do not live in a structure. I am speaking about one thing then just about another thing. I don't know. END*

The interview with Rasa, seemed to me very similar to one I would have with an American student except for a few parts. It is similar in her optimism and her sense that she can get any kind of job she wants through hard work and a little bit of luck. She is also planning on taking a break and traveling; but as she is talking about her future she catches herself switching between sounding very affirmative and confident and not really knowing. Her ambiguity about the future is not

leavened by fear and resignation, as it might have been had I interviewed a Lithuanian student during “Soviet times.” Her optimism, her sense of individuality and the importance of self-expression reflect a “modern” attitude that is distinct from the attitude of the older informants. Of course part of this has to do with age. But still, as she points out, she does not feel caught in a structure in which her future is predetermined by the state; she is free to be confused and she values this freedom. Like the other young informants, she speaks with a sense of agency and optimism, and, most importantly acknowledging that she is living in a free nation - where she is free to express herself and to get the kind of job she wants. She is free of the censor’s ears and eyes.

She also uses freedom as a trope to differentiate the present from Soviet times, noting that during Soviet times jobs were supplied by the state, therefore it is “harder” to get a job now; you are “on your own.” As a trope, freedom is equated with individuality and the absence of state control over one’s life. Rasa referred to “competition” in a way that I, the interviewer, had not anticipated; for her competition meant “networking.” Her description of the competition for recognition marks a structural transitional period between a Soviet-style socialist and free-market economy, because this sort of competition individualizes and socializes simultaneously. Competition implies a competition between individuals so that your talents are recognized by important others as unique and valued; at the same time, one is competing for membership into a social network through which you

have privileged access to jobs and other valued resources.

Second order components of identity are implicitly invoked that distinguish the relationship of older and younger Lithuanians with Vilnius. All of the informants, regardless of age, described Vilnius in aesthetic rather than in utilitarian terms. The city, like an impressionist painting of Paris, is viewed as a social landscape consisting of cafes, cinemas, beautiful buildings and young ‘beautiful’ people promenading on cobblestone streets. No one portrayed the city as a place where people live and where goods are produced and sold. None of my informants, in fact, lived in ‘old town’ (*senamiestyje*), yet all of them reflexively referred to *senamiestis* rather than the apartment blocks, or ‘sleeping districts,’ where the majority live and where the neighborhoods are still primarily functional (i.e., Soviet) in design.

During Soviet times, it was precisely *senamiestis* that was ignored and most of the funds were put into the surrounding areas for building multi-storied flats and developing industry. *Senamiestis* was, I was told, neglected and ugly. Since independence however, funds have been redirected into developing *senamiestis* and its neighboring districts and *senamiestis* is now a UNESCO heritage site.

Though my informants use *senamiestis* as a synecdoche for Vilnius (and also for a modern Lithuania), the older informants clearly do not identify themselves with the ‘new’ *senamiestis* while the younger one’s, just as clearly, do seem to; they are “at home” in

senamiestis. The presentation of self by the older informants recalled their Soviet past and contrasts starkly with their representation of Vilnius as 'new,' 'modern' and 'beautiful.' Even while the older informants expressed admiration for the changes that are occurring in Vilnius, they added some *juodas humoras* (black humor) to indicate their own alienation from senamiestis as a synecdoche for modernity.

These older informants, mostly pensioners living on 350 to 600 litas (2.8 litas to a U.S. dollar), share a world view that gives them a means of talking with each other and constructing a shared cultural identity, however unorganized and inchoate that identity might be. The experiences of these pensioners are perhaps too ordinary, too lackluster, to coalesce into some sort of first order identity. Yet, like Scott's (1985) weapon's of the weak and like his later notion of 'hidden transcripts' (Scott 1990), these older informants with their mordant sense of humor recall the Good Soldier Schweik who through all his buffoonery can also wreak havoc on the social order.

The older informants I interviewed share a concern with the economics of everyday life. Money is needed, there isn't enough, and it is always uppermost in their minds, both for themselves and for their children. The informants' concern with money tends to be expressed in a language of modesty rather than materialism. These informants did not express a desire to buy cars or even houses, they simply wanted to be able to buy food and pay their rent.

A few observed that present day Lithuanians consumed in excess. As one said, 'I don't need more than two coats or two pairs of shoes, what for to hang on a nail? Then I will have to buy nails.' They represent themselves as pragmatic and resourceful in contrast to modern Lithuanians who by default are represented as young and who were described as soft, self-centered, and 'whiny.' One male informant, compared himself to contemporary Lithuanian youth with the following example,

When I get on a trolleybus and someone steps on my foot by accident, I don't complain, much worse has happened to me; but if this happens to a student; he will whine loudly. Always he complains, If he goes to a restaurant he will complain if has too wait too long for his food, or if his coffee is cold. He is like an American, too soft. He should be glad that he can afford to go to a restaurant.

This seems to be the key difference: the old Lithuanian is hard and stoic but poor; the new Lithuanian is soft, easily upset, self-centered, but rich.

One final case study I think starkly emphasize the difference between those older lower-middle class Lithuanians and the new Lithuanians as represented by Mindaugas and the youths I interviewed. I had interviewed a sixty-five-year-old man who said that he had been retired and lived as a pensioner (*pensininkas*) for the last ten years. I asked him how he received enough money to live during those years. The question, appeared innocent to me, but he retorted as if I had insulted him and said with evident irritation, 'how come you say that I was all the time

without a job? How can I not work! All those years I worked.' My assistant (a representative of the modern Lithuanian) tried to placate him by saying 'nowadays' (*šiais laikais*), 'many people don't have [jobs].' To which he quickly replied, using her word, 'nowadays,' 'You see nowadays. I'm not from nowadays, I am from olden times (*Šiais laikais. Aš ne iš šių laikų. Aš iš senų laikų*).

For this man "olden times" is Soviet times. A period, as Rasa mentioned, when the government found a job for everybody. Thus, "olden times" is one where the self is embedded in and shaped by social forces. For the new Lithuanian, the self is valued as an egocentric construct, separate and distinct from social institutions or even family. For the 'old' Lithuanian the self is incorporated into family, the work force, and support networks based on regional, ethnic or school connections. The older informants conceptualized themselves 'sociocentrically' – in relationship with social others (Shweder and Bourne 1984). The egocentric and sociocentric self constructs are part of second order identities because they reflect patterns of emplotting the self-in-the-world and identity forms are derived, ad hoc, from a sense of how one is emplotted, through one's own agency or through social agents.

6. A Comparative Analysis of First Order and Second Order Components of Identity

I discussed interviewee responses with a Lithuanian professor who had studied in North America. In English he said that the

responses of the older informants stemmed from the years of "terror" during the Soviet "occupation" of Lithuania. Below is an excerpt of his analysis of the "Lithuanian personality of the older generation":

Professor X: [speaking of the Lithuanian personality] You present yourself to the occupier, you agree with him, you uhm you please him, you are in compliance with him, that's because you have to you have no choice he has all the cards in his hand. In that sense the Lithuanians have a certain kinship with the Jews. Maybe that's why they hated them and why they exterminated them, because over the years ,over the centuries, in Europe the Jews developed a personality of accommodation, they had to in order to survive ... certainly we Lithuanians were manipulators of the Russian occupied. We got our roads built, we were the best in the USSR; we had Ignalina [a Chernobyl style nuclear power plant] built ... our industry was developed the way we wanted to; we managed to stave off the Russian migration which happened in Latvia and Estonia. And we had a way of going to Moscow impressing the oppressors with our vodka and our sausages and our cheese and our drinking abilities to get our way. But in the process you have to demean yourself; you realize that you are being schizophrenic and you are developing a schizophrenic mentality so that's where the duplicity lies.

His analysis fits with the commonplace analysis of Lithuanian personality as presented by both experts and informants. For instance, a main theme of many panels at the Nineteenth Conference on Baltic Studies in Toronto (June 3–5, 2004) was the "trauma" that was incurred by the populations of the Baltic states during the Russian occupation. Thus one panel was entitled "the Fateful

Years: Holocaust, Deportation and Repression” and the “plenary session” was titled “1944 and its Aftermath: commemoration and Survival.” In these sessions the focus is on the past and the effects of the past on the people who suffered through those times. Ignored, for the most part, was the cultural gap between those who grew up in Soviet times, who experienced the trauma of those times, and those who grew up after independence. Though beyond the scope of this paper, this cultural gap is condensed in historiography and representations of the past in museums. Klumbyte makes this point well when she wrote

The history of Lithuania in popular narratives usually begins at the time of Mindaugas, the only king of Lithuania, who ruled in the 13th century. Then it celebrates the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which was, according to the official history, one of the greatest states in East Europe. Lithuanian and Polish Commonwealth (1569, Liublinas union) and the history of the 18th century when Lithuania became a part of Austria-Prussia-Russia empire are not evoked very often. Those years are skipped or remembered as ones of resistance and revolts. (2003; 282).

This elision of about 400 years of history – the time between the Liublinas union and independence in 1991 – also elides those people who grew up and whose ‘cultural experiences’ (Hallowell 1955) were shaped by Soviet times. Many of the older generation are from two distinct historical times: one, the fifty year period between World War I and II when Lithuania (except for Vilnius) was an inde-

pendent state, and second the period of “soviet times which began just after the end of World War II. These older informants symbolize the “authentic Lithuanian” and also the bitter period of Soviet rule. They possess a double socio-cultural status, both of which contrast with contemporary culture: the one as Lithuanian peasant, the other as Soviet worker, neither of these appear to have a significant role to play in the present period of internationalism.

Klumbyte continues that, “in Lithuania... nation” was produced by essentializing “the East” and “the West - with “The East” represented as “backward and uncivilized” and “The West” as “modern and civilized (2003; 286).” If we apply Klumbyte’s analysis to my own data of generational cultures, then the young are identified with “The West” and the older generation with “The East. The dichotomies of “West and East,” older and younger generations, and “first order and component” identities simplify the complex and dynamic processes that are at play in Lithuania and the other newly independent states. Everything is in flux and “in between” at least two pasts (a glorious Independent past of the grand duchy of Lithuanian, and the Lithuania that was part of Russia), two presents, and two futures. Lithuania is in between West and East. In this “blooming buzzing” confusion it is useful to simplify through the construction and analysis of dichotomies while keeping in mind that the dichotomies are schematic (hence, simplifying) rather than thick representations of the processes that act on Lithuanian identity forms.

The second order components of identity for the older generation of Lithuanians, those based on first order experiences, are, in terms of the above dichotomies, rooted in “The East;” and for the younger generation, in “The West.” The older generation is in an ambiguous and paradoxical situation, for they represent traditional values and are supposed to represent an “authentic” Lithuanian identity while at the same time they are also conflated and identified with “Soviet times.” Because their accumulated historical experiences are not congruent with present conditions and future hopes, but instead remind younger generations of the drudgery both of “life on the farm” and of Soviet times, the older generation and what they represent are rejected by the younger generation, the intelligentsia and other cultural elite who formulate first order components of identity.

In a recent ethnographic study (2003–4) of village life outside of Kaunas, Ida Knudsen discovered that almost all if not all of the “farmers” rejected their status as “farmers”: too much work, the work was not satisfying, and not enough money to be made, particularly with EU foodstuffs flooding the market. The younger people are mostly leaving rural areas for higher education and jobs in the cities. Many of the urban young, cut off from those traumatic Soviet times, have enthusiastically embraced modernity (and post-modernity) and thus further delegitimized identity constructs associated with Soviet and pre Soviet Lithuanian times. Lithuanian traditions need to be invented, but which traditions? Recent historical traditions do not have

the legitimacy or the appeal to be embraced as identity markers. Nobody wants to be a peasant anymore nor does anyone want to return to Soviet times. From what then do you invent features of a national identity that don’t seem so obviously contrived?

7. A Situated Knowledge Approach to National Identity

Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) have posited that learning is a social practice through which participants “equipped with locally-situated understandings of the way the world is organized” invent and reinvent knowledge (particularly shared or cultural knowledge).⁶ Lave and Wenger conceptualize knowledge itself as learned through “participation in changing ways in a changing world” (ibid: 5). Learning occurs within systems of social relations and involves relations of power, areas of conflict, and various degrees of participation. Learning entails the construction and maintenance of identities within social relations. Identities are “situated” in the local contexts of relational identities, where individuals use identities both to establish a “footing” in relationship to the other, and also to understand the goals, motives, tropes, and other linguistic and paralinguistic communicative devices the other uses.

Lave and Wenger define “Community” as “...participation in an activity system about which participants share understandings concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and for their communities” (1991; 98).

It is thus crucial to ask members themselves how they understand the identity of others as well as their own in particular social interactions (that is in ethnographic contexts). In an effective apprenticeship, for instance, learning takes place not through formal instructions but because the apprentice acquires knowledge through imitating his teacher. The point is that identity is learned and found in social interactions. Kemper (1993; 377–378) makes this point as well when he notes that in 1864 none of the inhabitants of the town of Lozere apparently identified themselves as Frenchmen and women in a census. It was not the newspaper or other media that led French people to identify with France, but through their experiencing themselves as citizens of France (as in World Wars I and II).

Identities are transformed through the learning that is derived from primary experiences of the other, or what Lave refers to as “changing understanding in practice” (Lave 1993; 6). This idea of identity as situated knowledge, and the sense of identity as gained through experience, gives us a perspective for understanding how the young and old in Vilnius (at least those we interviewed) can be said to share the same identity. While the younger and older interviewees appear to inhabit different behavioral environments, relying on different modes of self-expression and articulation to society, they both understand and acknowledge each other’s conceptions of self and positioning of self vis-à-vis contemporary Lithuanian society. Modern young Lithuanian adults know that the values

of aestheticism and self-expression which connect them to Vilnius are precisely the values that exclude and alienate elder Lithuanians (and those younger adults like the skinheads who are marginalized by the various processes of modernity).

Though young adults do not share my elder informants’ Soviet experiences, they know of them and understand the importance of that period to older Lithuanians. But at an even more mundane level, the skinheads, older and younger adults know much about each other that they take for granted (D’Andrade 1987). Thus, all know that *Cepelinai* are a “traditional Lithuanian food” and that the colloquial for policemen is “*agurkai*” (“cucumber”) because of their green uniforms; that Arvydas Sabonis is Lithuania’s most famous basketball player; that foreigners and rich Lithuanians go to Nida for the summer and that middle and lower-middle class families go to Šventoji. There are countless ordinary behaviors, gestures, styles of clothes, bits of knowledge, cultural factoids, practices, that constitute the “nuts-and-bolts” of everyday life and that Lithuanians just know and know that other Lithuanians know these nuts and bolts. This cultural infrastructure constituted out of a shambles or bricolage of situated knowledges that are unarticulated as culture is, I believe, what knits Lithuanians together into a common identity that is, at the same time not expressed as identity and, indeed, cannot be expressed as such. It can best be referred to as “situated knowledge.”

My older informants, the skinheads and the ‘modern’ young adults share these situ-

ated knowledges of themselves and of their relationship to each other (and to other Lithuanians and “nationalities living in Lithuania). This situated national identity does not consist of shared values and practices, but of the tacit recognition of differences and an understanding of the roots, reasons for and trajectories of those differences. By understanding that the differences in conceptions of self and of world view stem from different second order life experiences, both young and old see the position of the other as valid and reasonable given these differences. But, and this is a key point, they don't necessarily have to agree with or value the perspectives of the other group, they merely have to recognize “where they are coming from”. The possibility of understanding the second order experiences that lead to differences in conceptions of self and world view is most likely to occur when there is an underlying foundation of shared life experiences and knowledge (that is, first order components of identity—language, ethnicity, common history). This field of common experiences and the construction of a situated national identity is constructed through practices that are so ordinary and part of the fabric of everyday life that they are taken for granted. Being a Lithuanian means being able to situate one's own experientially gained knowledge vis-à-vis another and for both parties to recognize each other's perspective in a field of situated common knowledge.

8. Conclusion

I have argued that second order components of identity are precipitates of experi-

ence and are devices by which the individual frames his or her relationship to their behavioral environment. Second order components of identity serve to set up contrast sets between members of a culture and cut across first order components, creating heterogeneity in the face of the homogenizing force of first order components of identity. But the heterogenizing process of second order identity can be framed within a larger common homogenizing identity that truly respects differences. This can only be done by adopting the anthropological perspective of understanding the experiences which shape the other's world view. Though young and old generations have sharply different life experiences, they share first order experiences and knowledge of Lithuanian identity. Despite such differences in life experiences, they have had enough social encounters to understand not only each other's difference but also how each views the other.

Situated knowledge creates a common national (or cultural) identity when ego knows not only that alter knows what ego knows but that ego “knows that alter knows that ego knows that alter knows.” It is this third order “Knowing” that creates, expresses, and maintains a national identity that is practiced in everyday life. An expressive, experiential model of national identity has to be based on “third order” knowledge because it is not enough that I know (first order knowing), or “I know that you know” (second order knowing), but also that “I know you know that I know.” This article has come to this conclusion through an anthropological analy-

sis of first and second order framings of “national identity.” The conclusion was inferred and came somewhat as a surprise to the author, but it is entailed by the empirical data. Our next step would be to further explore the dynamics and relationship between first order, second order, and third order ways of knowing identities (in his case Lithuanian

national identity). Without the circle of knowing being completed through the process of situated knowing between people with different life experiences, we have only essentialized versions of national identity that inevitably lead to stereotyping, prejudicial constructions of the other, and social intolerance.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. 1987 (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Bailey, F. G. 1991. *The Prevalence of Deceit*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and boundaries: the social Organization of Culture Difference*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1958 (1936). *Naven* (2nd edition). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Beals, Alan R. and Siegel, B. 1967. *Divisiveness and Social Conflict*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1980. *The Logic of Practice*. (Translated by Richard Nice). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frankenberg, Robert. 1968. *Village on the Border: Prospect Heights (Ill)*: Waveland Press.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from Prison Notebooks* (transl. Q. Hoare & G. Smith). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, Stuart. 1990. “Cultural Identity and Diaspora” in J. Rutherford (ed.) *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. 1955. *Culture and Experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1971. “From Social History to the History of Society”, *Daedalus* 100: 20–45.
- Hofstadter, Douglas R. 1985. *Metamagical Themas*. New York: Random House.
- Hutchison, Robert and Adam Smith (eds). 1994. *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jameson, Frederic 1990. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham (NC): Duke University Press.
- Kemper, Steve. 1993. *The Nation Consumed: Buying and Believing in Sri Lanka*. *Public Culture*. 5: 377–393.
- Kronenfeld, David B. 1997. *Plastic Glasses and Church Fathers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klumbyte, Neringa. 2003. “Ethnographic Note on Nation: Narratives and Symbols of the Early Post-socialist Nationalism in Lithuania”, *Dialectical Anthropology* 27: 279–295.
- Lave, Jean. 1988. *Cognition and Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, Jean. 1993. *The Practice of Learning*. In Seth Chaiklin and Jean Lave (eds). *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on Activity and Context*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 3–32.
- Lave, Jean. 1996. “Teaching as Learning in Practice”, *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 3(3): 149–164.

Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lewellen, Ted C. 2002. *The Anthropology of Globalization: Cultural Anthropology Enters the 21st Century*. Westport (CT): Bergin & Garvey.

Lietuvos Rytas. 2004. "Editorial" [Author unknown], March 20.

Spencer, Jonathan. 1990. *A Sinhala Village in a Time of Trouble Delhi*: Oxford University Press.

Sperber, Dan. 1996. *Explaining Culture: A Naturalistic Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shweder, Richard A. and E. J. Bourne. 1984. "Does the Concept of the Person Vary Cross-Culturally?" in R.A. Shweder and R.A.

LeVine (eds.) *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge University Press.

Tennekoon, N. Serena. 1988. "Rituals of Development: the Accelerated Mahavali Development Program of Sri Lanka", *American Ethnologist* 15: 294–310.

Thompson, E. P. 1992. *Customs in Common*. London. Harmondsworth.

Wolf, Eric R. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolf, Eric R. 1994. "Perilous Ideas: Race, Culture, People", *Current Anthropology* 35 (1): 1–12.

Wrong, David. 1979. *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

SANTRAUKA

PIRMINIS, ANTRINIS IR ESAMAS TRETINIS LIETUVIŲ TAUTINIO IDENTITETO SUVOKIMAS: ANTROPOLOGINĖ PERSPEKTYVA

Lauko tyrimai rodo, kad lietuvių tautos nariai tautinį identitetą supranta heterogeniškai, nors pats terminas „tautinis identitetas“ reiškia homogenišką jo suvokimą. Tad kaip galime kalbėti apie tautinį identitetą, jei jo suvokimas tarp tautos narių ryškiai skiriasi? Tai paaiškina „pirminio“ ir „antrinio“ identiteto komponentų konceptai. Kultūrinio elito pirminio suvokimo konceptai yra konstruojami ir nuleidžiami iš viršaus į apačią, o antrinio suvokimo konceptai yra skubotas ir neapgalvotas elgesys, pasireiškiantis per asmenines patirtis. Ne mažiau svarbios yra situacinės identiteto suvokimo socialinėse praktikose žinios, individų naudojamos socialinėse sąveikose. Situacinės žinios sukuria bendrą tautinį (ar kultūrinį) identitetą, kai individas žino ne tik tai, kad jo artimas žino, ką jis žino, bet ir kai individas „žino, kad jo artimas žino, jog jis žino apie savo artimo žinojimą“. Tai ir yra tretinis „žinojimo“ identiteto suvokimas, kuris sukuria, išreiškia ir palaiko kiekvieną dieną praktikuojamą tautinį identitetą. Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad socialiai priimtinas tautinio identiteto modelis turėtų būti pagrįstas pastaruoju, „tretiniu“, tautinio identiteto suvokimu.

Įteikta 2007 01 10

Pateikta spaudai 2007 06 29

Sociologijos katedra,

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas,

Donelaičio g. 52-311, 44244

Kaunas

El. paštas: Victor@bestweb.net