

Transatlantic migration vis-à-vis politics of identity: two ways of Lithuanian-ness in the US

VYTIS ČIUBRINSKAS

Center of Social Anthropology, Vytautas Magnus University, Donelaičio 52, LT-44261 Kaunas

E-mail: v.ciubrinskas@smf.vdu.lt

Transnationalism prevailing in current anthropological studies of international migration encourages pointing out the other paradigms such as *politics of identity* and testing their applicability to address the new global flows of human (dis)(re)location. The article includes a short account of analytical categories related to *transnationalism* and *politics of identity* and also provides a case study (based on the US fieldwork) of the application of *identity empowerment* as a research perspective for the analysis of the Lithuanian migration to the US. Two ways – “diasporic” and “recognitionist” – of transatlantic Lithuanian-ness are exemplified. These are enacted and emplaced in politics and practices of: in the first way – *retaining* (homeland) nation-ness, culture as well as politics of *return* to homeland; in the other way – *reclaiming* local “roots”, culture and ethnic heritage as well as the ambition of “re-writing” the local (Texas) histories of multiculturalism of the US.

Key words: migration, (trans)nationalism, politics of identity, identity empowerment, diaspora, home(land), heritage, genealogy, family and local history, Lithuanians, USA

INTRODUCTION

Current anthropological debates on international migration deal with the global flows of human dislocations and translocations and in general with the problems of de-territorialisation and re-territorialization, or the new territorialization (Hannerz 1996; Appadurai 1996; Clifford 1997; Eriksen 1999; Vertovec 1999). The analytical framework for understanding those processes of massive flows of population moving through “locations” and “territoriality” is usually built upon multiple human attachments to the place (places) – both to the new places of settlement and to the places of origin (or departure). Actually, much more attention had been paid to “new places”, and the analysis of the processes of integration and acculturation of immigrants prevailed. Recently, with the employment of the paradigm of *transnationalism*, the focus of research has changed into studying particular social relations migration could produce and questioning the ties and linkages to both, touched by migration places (the “old” from where the migration happened, and the “new” one to where migrants have moved) are taken into account.

Besides the already mentioned entities of “territory” and / or “place”, the processes of migration involve also “culture” and “power” relations and imply questions of empowerment / disempowerment of “culture” and “place”. Symbolic empowerment of culture, in relation to territory in particular, becomes visible when tackling the ‘in-rooted’ (ethnic) and / or

national cultures. It is widely exemplified by the processes of migration and identity politics of migrants, as it is generally the case for migration from the European continent, which played a role in shaping the transatlantic identity politics in North America, just to mention transnational Irish, Jewish and Italian identity politics in the US.

In the perspective of the East European migratory flows to America, the Lithuanian case is conspicuous enough. It has a long and diverse history of waves and generations, with their own politics of identity in the US. Such a complexity could be exemplified by the ways in which the management of the patterns of transatlantic identities went. It is important to stress that East European or / and Lithuanian (which is in the focus of this article) migration to the US is transmigration. It covers emigration, immigration and return migration, and challenges the identity not only of those who move, but also of the subsequent generations of those who do adhere to their transatlantic backgrounds. It certainly does identity empowerment work for those who choose to integrate 'with a difference' as well as it does the opposite to the others and dis-empower the background-ness of those who choose to assimilate into mainstream America.

So, the aim of this article is, first of all, to point out the issue of migrant *identity empowerment* vis-à-vis *transnationalism* and to overview some analytical perspectives in migration studies in relation to those. The point of departure in doing this is the conceptualization of *identity* and *politics of identity* provided by Jonathan Friedman, Nina Glick-Schiller, Steven Vertovec and James Clifford. An overview of these analytical explorations is followed by the application of the *identity empowerment* perspective for the analysis of the Lithuanian migration to the US. Two ways of the transatlantic Lithuanian identity and heritage empowerment are exemplified in this case in order to show the patterns in which the empowerment of cultural descent or ethnic background is perceived, felt and handled. One of the ways is related to the descendants of Second World War refugees, known as DPs (who came from the Displaced Persons' Camps in Germany) and reluctant to integrate into 'American dream' exiles. Another case of migration is focused on the local (American) heritage reclaiming. This one comes from the South East Texas communities of descendants of Lithuanians who in 1850s came to the US as pioneers of Texas prairies and through generations and intermarriage eventually almost merged into German-Americans and mainstream Americans. Nevertheless, they did that by being open to the "difference". So, the descendants of the latter ones took the *heritage reclaiming* politics.

The research is based on the anthropological fieldwork conducted in 2002 and 2004 in the area of Victoria, De Witt County in Texas as well as in Chicago. The general bulk of the ethnographic data comes from the Lithuanian descendants' families and ethnic networks in villages and towns of South East of Texas, the 'Lithuanian triangle' in Texas: Houston-Victoria-New Brounfels and from Chicago-based Lithuanian diaspora neighborhoods and networks. The archive resources of the Balzekas Museum of the Lithuanian Culture and the Lithuanian Research and Studies Center, both in Chicago, were also used.

1. FRAMEWORK OF *IDENTITY* IN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES OF MIGRATION

Friedman was among the first anthropologists of cultural identity and globalization studies who pointed to the question of cultural identity formation in relation to ethnicity and lifestyle (Friedman 1996). He has built a framework of understanding how *identities are made* as stable entities. He has shown how much of identity stabilization, solidity and singularity is done and how the *identity empowerment* goes through "objectification, reification and

essentialization of culture, 'where culture was an object, whether thing or practice. In this view, culture was contained in its embodiment rather than its generativity; the meaning was in the object, not in the process of its production. This was an identification of peoples in terms of their origins, a project of ethnic mapping analogous to the project of racial mapping that was part of the self-identification of the colonial centers of the world system' (Friedman 1997: 82–5).

Friedman was addressing the relationship of cultural identity being challenged by globalization and taking its shape of being empowered by ethnification. Also, it was clearly assumed by him and others that globalization as well as "migration is one of the factors producing new identity formation – hybrid identities" (Hall 1992) and alternative – diasporic – cultures and identities (Clifford 1994).

Vertovec directly applied the issue of *identity* to migration by providing two points of departure for the understanding of migration from the identity change perspective: as *trans-locality* and as *glocality* (Vertovec, Cohen 1999: XIII–XVI). Locality / place – the major factor of stable identity because of re-location – changes into trans-locality. It is a sort of identity work, which involves reconstruction of "place" and "locality", i. e. transience of one place and one locality into a multi-locality. It is cemented by global-spanning networks which both subvert or extend the national project. The nation-state becomes transient also because the network of people smugglers, travel brokers and families are important means whereby migration flows are able to bypass state entry controls and / or spread the benefits of migration back to homelands.

The anthropological perspectives onto migration studies were precisely summarized by Caroline Brettell and James Hollinger in their book *Migration Theory* (2000) by giving an account that, among other questions, anthropology addresses in studying migration the issues of *identity* and *ethnicity* (Brettell, Hollinger 2000), although the most popular perspective in anthropological studies of migration is *transnationalism* which apparently addresses the other two.

2. TRANSNATIONALISM AND THE EMPOWERMENT OF MIGRANT IDENTITY

Transnationalism as an analytical category to approach migration from anthropological perspective has been introduced into the field by Glick-Schiller, an internationally acclaimed anthropologist-expert of migration studies.

"...transnationalism [is] a process by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement. Immigrants who build such social fields are designated 'transmigrants' [...] Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously" (Glick-Schiller 1999: 26).

Transnationalism differs from nation-state nationalism which is based on citizenship and participation and is expressed as national identity. The nation-state, of course, monopolizes the nation-state narrative of belonging as a forged nationalist narrative (Glick-Schiller 1995). Usually both migrants "sending" and migrants "receiving" nation-states are challenging those who move through their national borders as immigrants but in many cases as emigrants too. For some post-colonial or in particular for post-socialist 'migrant-sending' nation-states like Lithuania, emigration could be understood as a loss and emigrants themselves as just temporal settlers abroad, always ready to answer the question when they will be back.

Actually, it is a nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century nationalist attitude because "national leaders during that period saw their emigrants more as colonists than per-

manent settlers abroad. [...] transmigrants were expected to eventually return home, and long-distance nationalism contained a call to come and rebuild the land. To accept permanent settlement elsewhere was generally defined as national betrayal” (Glick-Schiller, Fouron 2001: 19).

As a sense of identity, transnationalism means a variety of national loyalties and re-located patterns of nationness, and it is extremely important where nationness (as a discourse about and identification with nation) is accommodated, whether it takes place in the homeland, in a neighboring country, or in the diaspora. It is obvious that in our case we have to tackle with transnational and thus displaced nation-ness. Therefore, such ‘re-located’ patterns of identity building appear to be addressed as *ethnic* patterns rather than belonging to the range of nation-ness. Clifford (1994) disagrees with that: “But are diaspora cultures consistently anti-nationalist? What about their own national aspirations? [...] Indeed some of the most violent articulations of purity and racial exclusivism come from diaspora populations. But such discourses are usually weapons of the (relatively) weak. It is important to distinguish *nationalist critical longing and nostalgic or eschatological visions* (emphasis mine), from actual nation building-with the help of armies, schools, police and mass media” (Clifford 1994: 220–1).

Nevertheless, diasporic nationalism is a conspicuous example of migrant identity empowerment and, according to Vertovec, could be understood as *political engagement*, as ‘politics of homeland’ and ‘politics of nostalgia’ (Vertovec, Cohen 1999). It is related to transnationalism because many migrants “gain more social power, in terms of leverage over people, property, and locality, with respect to their homeland than they did before migrating” (Glick-Schiller, Levitt 2004: 1013–4).

Furthermore, long distance nationalism (the term coined by Glick-Schiller as the strongest version of diasporic nationalism) is central to understand how “long-distance nationalist movements have long influenced nation building and national transformation. There are many instances such as the Cuban, Israeli, and Irish communities in which migrants have successfully mobilized host country legislatures to support their homeland projects. Former Iraqi exiles are now playing a critical role in rebuilding the Iraqi state” (ibid.).

Even, according to some authors, Lithuania would not have become Lithuania without immigrants in the US first imagining its emergence and then mobilizing to make it in reality (Glazer 1954; Fainhauz 1991).

Diasporic identity being built upon homeland nationalism employs empowerment of “home” and heritage. From the anthropology of migration perspective, the category of “home” or “homeland” is one of the key elements of the nation’s repository and is extremely important for understanding transnationalism. “Home” (homeland) as a category could be defined in two ways: as a socially homogeneous and physically fixed space or as a dynamic, transnational symbolic space. In the traditional connotation, “home” is a safe, secure, peaceful place linked to “family”, “community” and “homeland” / “nation” (Al-Ali, Koser 2002). Homeland is the space in which “the conduct, expectations, attitudes, feelings and reactions of others are predictable and in which one knows the rules of appropriate behavior” (Holy 1996: 186). From another, transnational and dynamic perspective, the understanding of ‘home’ implies a place which undergoes displacement and uprootedness, and becomes crucial for belonging and identity ‘work’. It applies mainly to political migrants / refugees to whom the idea of ‘home’ becomes elevated to a degree of an ideal place and resource for nostalgic feelings. Expatriates settled in diasporas retain a sense of belonging to the “culture” associated with “home”, and “homeland” becomes an important resource of their politics of identity (Ciubrinskas 2004).

So, after having done an overview of the analytical perspectives of identity empowerment in relation to migration through such resources as *nation*, *home* and *heritage*, we will try to apply them by scrutinizing two examples of the transatlantic Lithuanian-ness. It is the way to understand how migrant identities and / or cultures are constructed in everyday lives of migrants and how identity empowerment can occur through certain manipulations of culture and locality. In this case, we will focus on one-culture and one-territory transcending migratory avenues of social interaction which shapes belonging and / or adherence to *homeland nationalism* and *local ethnic heritage reclaiming*.

The transatlantic, or American, Lithuanian-ness as a model of identity has been coined and re-coined in different periods and in diverse settings of the US and thus has to be understood in a variety of migrant identity strategies of which we will concentrate on two. First and the most conspicuous one is transnational identity or diasporic Lithuanian-ness, and the second one is the identity of descendants or heritage regainist Lithuanian-ness. The first will be approached by the *diaspora nationalism* framework and the other from the *roots identity* perspective.

3. HOMELAND NATIONALISM OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS: POLITICS OF RETAIN AND RETURN

The Lithuanian pattern of diasporic community in the US refers to the Lithuanian forced migrants. It includes those political refugees and exiles who at the end of World War II fled away from the Communist regime to the West and became concentrated in the Displaced Persons Camps in Germany. In the end of the 1940s they were given a possibility to move to the US, Canada, Britain, Australia and other countries. At least 30,000 of the former Displaced Person Camps Lithuanians (DP) settled in the US, of them about 12,000–15,000 in Chicago (Kucas 1975).

The DP wave of immigration is different from the Lithuanian labour migrants. Inevitably most of the former ones and their offspring undergo ethnic enculturation in their families, ethnic schools, and in the Lithuanian Community. The Lithuanian Community was, and still is, the major Lithuanian organisation in the US. With its sections in each large city, it is also like an umbrella organisation or an overwhelming network of almost all *lietuviskoji veikla* (Lithuanian activities and agency) focused on retaining the Lithuanian-ness.

The homeland nationalism ideology which penetrates *lietuviskoji veikla* in the transatlantic diaspora worked as a kind of prescribed identity enshrined first of all, as mentioned above, in the enculturation of refugees and their offspring. Lithuania to them became a mythical reference, an idea and not a country and a place. *Lietuviskoji veikla* as the Lithuanian activity and agency in the diaspora was, and is, extremely pro-“retaining Lithuanian-ness” and oriented to the Lithuania’s interwar nation-state. It is a kind of idealised version of nationalism:

“Our parents were young when they left Lithuania. They were nurtured in the interwar spirit. In those times in Europe, it was a nationalist and national-socialist spirit. It influenced the organisations of emigrants. It helped to keep Lithuanian culture, nurture the young generation which more or less could speak Lithuanian. This implies that nationalism helped to keep the Lithuanian spirit. Under this influence, an idealised portrait of the interwar period was created” (Lithuanian-Canadian, 35, male).

“We were escaping from [Soviet] occupation, and it was such a sacred thing to retain the Lithuanian-ness[lietuvybe]. Strictly to speak only Lithuanian in families and avoid integration [...] ... it was like a protest against occupation” (Lithuanian-Canadian, 75, female).

The image of the home country was constructed from the typical political refugee's experience, especially the image of a homeland under siege (Kelly 2000). The occupied and suffering country left behind in the end of World War II encouraged them to take a mission of regaining the nation and retaining its culture. A kind of victimization brings together many Lithuanian-Americans in support of their homeland.

This nationalistic feeling of duty was reinforced by moral obligation:

"...because they got away and others did not. Most of DPs have lost relatives and friends through Soviet deportation" (Gustaitis 1956: 27; Budreckis 1982: 198).

Basically, it was a very strong feeling of duty and mission, both moral and civic, to do what was possible to retain the culture as well as to liberate the country. It was clearly assumed that the Lithuanian cultural heritage was challenged by the Soviet regime. One of my informants, who belongs to the second generation of DPs, by acknowledging the importance of "finding roots" emphasized:

"I feel we are a generation that have been robbed of our heritage. I play the national anthem and cry, as we were born here [in the US] and have lost a touch (or were forced to lose the touch) with our roots" (Rita, 36).

POLITICS OF RETURN

This idealistic nationalism was functional in the diaspora and turned into charity and political campaigns to help the occupied Lithuania. Every Lithuanian expatriate was expected to be ready to turn into a repatriate one day.

So, for political immigrants, the home country appears as a destiny where they belong as the nationals of the nation and where they are obliged to return. As a missionary identity "to be of use to your own country" (cf. Ciubrinskas 2006; Ciubrinskas 2009) it was implied, if not imposed, for the second and even third generation Lithuanian-Americans. So even the American-born generations have been supposed to treat Lithuania, but not the United States, the country they were born in, as their "own" country.

Nevertheless, a sociological research conducted in 1950s, 1970s and in 2002 among American-born Lithuanian-Americans has shown that 'obligation to return' is far from a constant imperative. It changes depending on age groups and generations, and even certainty about the return, not to talk about the practice of returning, decreases sharply going closer to our days (Cernius 2005: 149).

Still the "obligation to return" was a central imperative to the Lithuanian activities throughout the Lithuanian diasporas after World War II. It was inscribed, as it was mentioned, in the enculturation model used in the families of DPs.

"In my family, parents didn't allow us to watch TV. While at home we had to speak Lithuanian only. Each word pronounced in English was fined with a 10-cent fine. There were always some talks about Lithuania, as it needs to be helped to be liberated and that we will obviously return to it right after it will be free" (American-born, 51, male).

So, the Lithuanian diaspora's identity was based on the strategy of cherishing, perpetuating and retaining nation-ness in terms of culture, language, traditions and heritage. Such an identity became empowered by being juxtaposed to the communist regime which "denied" Lithuanian culture in the homeland. Thus, it was altered by the obligation to retain culture in order to return it back after communism would be defeated.

POLITICS OF IDENTITY OF LITHUANIAN DESCENDANTS IN TEXAS: RECLAIMING LOCAL AND ETHNIC HERITAGE

The Lithuanian connection in Texas is the oldest in the whole of the US. It opens the history of the Lithuanian migration to North America. It started in early 1850s. Despite the fact that it lasted only for about twenty years, was quite small and consisted of no more than two hundred immigrants who eventually assimilated, the contemporary descendants “discovered” the fact itself. Generation after generation the stories, records, letters and pictures about that were passed on and survived. In East Texas, since early 1990s, a group of descendants of early Lithuanian immigrants made a network of ‘searching for the genealogical roots and ancestry’ and heritage, and in 1994 a historical marker “Lithuanians in Texas”, with an inscription on it about the Lithuanian immigration, was erected on the road crossing the main area of the former Lithuanian colony. It says: “Among the many European immigrants arriving to Texas in the mid-19th century was a small group of Lithuanians who settled in the Yorktown vicinity of De Witt County. Due to their eventual assimilation with the numerous German immigrants in the area, the Lithuanians and their contributions to the history of this region were overlooked for generations. [...] They arrived in about 1852, making them among the earliest documented Lithuanian immigrants to America. [...] Leaving their homeland for a variety of religious and political reasons, the Lithuanians arrived in Texas primarily through the ports of Galveston and Indianola. Establishing farms in the area, the Lithuanians became American citizens and contributed to the history and culture of this area. Men from the community fought on both sides of the American Civil War...”

[Location: FM 119 and Alvis Road about 4 miles south (near Royal Oaks), Yorktown]

Most of Lithuanians coming from Lithuania Minor to Texas were native Lithuanian speakers with some command of German. No doubt, some Lithuanians came without knowledge of German, but it was also the case that some of them, even those born in the US, still spoke preferably only Lithuanian. It was the case with George Lundschen. His great-granddaughter Patricia Hand recalls:

“Back in the 1968 when I started my quest for my roots, my grandmother Agnes Lundschen Rabenaldt said that her parents, Robert and Emma Schuenmann Lundschen, could not speak the same language. She said her father spoke Lithuanian though he was born American” (Wolff 2002).

It is an example of intermarriage in a family history, which in our case led to awareness of a particular heritage which was approached as “overlooked” and thus in a need to reclaim. It could be added that Lithuanian language skills, along with the ‘transplanted’ European values of diligence as well as pietism of the Lutheran faith and a few other things perhaps comprised that “culture” and heritage of early immigrants. At least it was fixed and also later evoked in the social memory of my informants and thus became a platform for their identity search.

Even if we totally follow the Daniel Hollinger’s concept of contemporary America being “post-ethnic” (Hollinger 1995), ethnicity still matters a lot. It could be evoked, empowered, even ‘invented’ by the ethnic heritage alone. In our case, material heritage (graveyards, churches, historical sites, also historical objects and artifacts) and collective memory (inscribed in family stories, letters, documents and visual materials) became in the focus of those “searching for the genealogical roots and ancestry”. It resulted in the reclaim of Lithuanian heritage through genealogy.

GENEALOGICAL RECLAIMS OF HERITAGE AND RE-WRITING OF LOCAL HISTORY

Genealogical and Historical Societies as well as Commissions in Texas are the most important institutions in documenting the Lithuanian ancestry in the area. They are central in exploring the Lithuanian pioneer history in the area. Local historians and members of those societies are most instrumental in compiling Lithuanian family histories-genealogies. From time to time they initiate new topic-oriented databases, and in the early 1980s *Lithuanian family genealogies & directories* was created.

The Lithuanian descendants undertake genealogical activities of making ancestry lists and genealogical studies by writing family histories also themselves. Especially active are members of the mentioned network of those “searching for the genealogical roots” who are eager to regain the loss of the local history of Texas “overlooked by generations”, with the claim of the Lithuanian fragment to be present among other ‘early pioneers’. It is also a group of interest to regain ‘the past’ via making a documentary proof of it. It is mainly managed by the individual persons who used to become aware of their family ethnic background not in the regular way of enculturation, but “by discovering” it and building their family history and genealogical research interests out of curiosity. So, their own family histories are of particular interest to them, especially after they “discover” themselves having, besides German, also the Lithuanian background. They are instrumental by taking the initiatives in retaining material heritage, for example, in designation of Lithuanian heritage sites to be given the status of a memorial site protected by the Texas State.

So, the genealogical and historical societies and genealogists as well as local historians’ networks (mainly of the Lithuanian ancestry) as well as interest groups (networks) of descendants do enact heritage reclaim in Texas. Those societies and networks are central for all public activities (including, for example, commemoration activities or assistance in maintaining ethnic graveyards) to take place. Also, networks of “regainists” who act to reclaim and “rewrite” the local Texas multicultural past play a role.

Most of activity and also most of interest in the whole endeavour of Lithuanian-ness in Texas are related to family histories and family reunions. Family reunions started in the area of the former Lithuanian colony in late 1970s, and annual meetings are extremely popular among the families of Lithuanian descendants. For example, family reunions of the Lithuanian Kirlicks’ family near Yorktown are held every summer and in 1994 numbered over 1000 members.

Such activities are used for creating new networks of genealogy as well as ethnic and local heritage interest groups.

CONCLUSIONS

In the analytical fields of migration studies, the contemporary focus on the notions of *transnationalism*, *diaspora*, *home(land)* and *heritage* have helped to redirect migration research in anthropology towards new areas of inquiry. The central importance of these notions today signals a concern with attachment to a place of origin, which is quite new within migration research. The overview of analytical perspectives of identity empowerment we have made provides a clear understanding that culture and territory bound as *homeland* or/and as *heritage* can be used as analytical categories to explain the complexity of the identity empowerment patterns, in a particular for a diasporic model of the *retain–return* identity.

The category of *heritage* is a good framework to explain how family heritages could be tightly bound with ethnic and local cultural heritages, could be reclaimed as “roots” and also could work as an important analytical category to address the “roots” identity politics.

To sum up the resources for mobilization of the identity politics and cultural practices of the East European background Americans, it is worth noting that the issue of heritage transplanted from Europe and retained in the US is of focal importance. In particular, it is visible when approached and exemplified in the case of Lithuanian transnationalism.

Transatlantic Lithuanian-ness is manipulated and articulated in diasporic communities and among other groups and individuals of Lithuanian background in so many ways and meanings. We have explored two patterns of it.

The first pattern is *diasporic communities of retain and return*. The generations related to this category of Lithuanian-Americans are used to approach their heritage as Lithuanian-ness in terms of nation-ness. Their ethnic enculturation has been predominantly focused on cherishing the independent Lithuanian nation-state culture and history transplanted from pre-communist Eastern Europe. Idealistic nationalists’ or, in Glick-Schiller terms, “long distance nationalism” nationalists’ politics of identity was that of retainers of homeland culture and of adherents to a missionary imperative of returning it back after the fall of communism. The fall of the Berlin Wall twenty years ago didn’t see much of that “obligation to return”. Only a few did, but still the Baltics is well represented in New Europe by the current Lithuanian President Valdas Adamkus and the former Latvian and Estonian presidents coming from the diasporas.

The second pattern – *descendents’ community of recognition and regain* – consists of Lithuanian background Texans focused on the local Lithuanian-Texan heritage reclaim securing the right to “get back the ancestors’ past”. It serves for the representation of the “overlooked for generations” heritage of the Lithuanian pioneers (“heroes of the past”) to be seen back on the local parade of immigrant cultures dominated by German-American Texas culture. Actually, it is the reclaiming of certain Lithuanian roots, culture and history and an ambition of re-writing the already “invented” and standardized history of Texas.

So, the politics of the Lithuanian-ness in the United States is shaped by the politics and practices of *retaining*, *reclaiming* (getting recognized), *regaining* and *returning* back to homeland of such moral economy resources and values as “our own nation and culture”, or “our own roots and past”.

Received 15 October 2008

Accepted 4 May 2009

References

1. Al-Ali, N.; Koser, K. (eds.) 2002. *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London and New York: Routledge.
2. Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minnesota University Press.
3. Brettell, C.; Hollifield, J. (eds.) 2000. *Migration Theory. Talking across Disciplines*. New York: Routledge.
4. Budreckis, A. 1982. “Reluctant Immigrants: The Lithuanian Displaced Persons”, in *Contemporary American Immigration*, ed. D. L. Cuddy. Twayne Publishes, 173–205.
5. Cernius, V. 2005. “Acculturation of Lithuanian Immigrants Who Arrived in the United States after World War II”, in *Beginnings and Ends of Emigration*, ed. D. Kuiziniene. Vilnius: Lithuanian Emigration Institute, Versus Aureus, 123–156.
6. Ciubrinskas, V. 2004. “Transnational Identity and Heritage: Lithuania Imagined, Constructed and Contested”, in *Communicating Cultures*, eds. U. Kockel, M. Nick Craith. Munster: LIT Verlag, 42–66.

7. Ciubrinskas, V. 2006. "To Be of Use to Your Own Country": Missionary Identity of the Lithuanian Transmigrants, *Socialiniai mokslai / Social Sciences* 3(53): 25–32.
8. Ciubrinskas, V. 2009. "Diasporas coming home. Identity and uncertainty of transnational returnees in postcommunist Lithuania", in *Postsocialist Europe. Perspective from Home*, eds. L. Kurti, P. Skalnik. London: Berhahn, 95–117.
9. Clifford, J. 1994. "Diaspora", *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3): 302–338.
10. Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes, Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA, London: Harvard University Press.
11. Eriksen, T. H. 1999. "Globalization and Politics of Identity", *UN Chronicle* 36 (Autumn).
12. Friedman, J. 1996. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
13. Friedman, J. 1997. "Global crises, the struggle for cultural identity and intellectual porkbarrelling: cosmopolitans versus locals, ethnics and nationals in an era of de-hegemonisation", in *Debating Cultural Hybridity. Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, eds. P. Werbner, T. Modood. London & New Jersey: ZED Books, 70–89.
14. Fainhauz, D. 1991. *Lithuanians in the USA. Aspects of Ethnic Identity*. Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, Inc.
15. Glazer, N. 1954. "Ethnic groups in America: from national culture to ideology", in *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*, eds. M. Berger; T. Abel; Ch. H. Page. Toronto.
16. Glick-Schiller, N.; Basch, L.; Blanc-Szanton, C. 1995. "From immigrant to transmigrant: theorizing transnational migration", *Anthropological Quarterly* 68(1): 48–63.
17. Glick-Schiller, N.; Fouron, G. E. 2001. *Georges Woke up Laughing. Long Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home*. Durham / London: Duke University Press.
18. Glick-Schiller, N., Levitt 2004. "Transnational perspectives on migration: conceptualizing similarity", *International Migration Review* 37 (Fall).
19. Glick-Schiller, N.; Basch, L.; Blanc-Szanton, C. 1999. "Transnationalism: A New Analytical Framework for Understanding Migration", in *Migration, Diaspora and Transnationalism*, eds. S. Vertovec, R. Cohen. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Pub., 26–49.
20. Gustaitis, R. 1956. "The Lithuanian Displaced Persons in America", *Lituanus* 1.
21. Hall, S. 1992. "New Ethnicities", in 'Race', *Culture and Difference*, eds. J. Donald; A. Rattansi. London: Sage.
22. Hannerz, U. 1996. *Transnational Connections. Culture, People, Places*. New York: Routledge.
23. Hollinger, D. A. 1995. *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. Basic Books.
24. Holy, V. 1996. *The Little Czech and the Great Czech Nation: National Identity and the Post-Communist Social Transformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Kelly, M. E. 2000. "Ethnic Pilgrimages: People of Lithuanian Descent in Lithuania", *Sociological Spectrum* 20: 65–91.
26. Kucas, A. 1975. *Lithuanians in America*. Boston: Encyclopedia Lituanica Press.
27. Vertovec, S.; Cohen, R. 1999. "Introduction", in *Migration, Diaspora and Transnationalism*, eds. S. Vertovec, R. Cohen. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Pub., XIII–XXVIII.
28. Wolff, H. 2002. "Many in DeWitt have Lithuanian roots", *Victoria Advocate*, May 29.

VYTIS ČIUBRINSKAS

Transatlantinė migracija identiteto politikos atžvilgiu: dvi lietuviškumo laikysenos JAV

Santrauka

Šiuolaikiniuose tarptautinę migraciją nagrinėjančiuose antropologiniuose tyrinėjimuose vyraujanti *transnacionalizmo* paradigma iškelia kitus tiriamuosius požiūrius, pavyzdžiui, *identiteto politiką*, pritaikytinus naujausiems globaliems žmonių iš(si)vietinimo bei į(si)vietinimo srautams tyrinėti.

Straipsnyje apžvelgiamos *transnacionalizmo*, *identiteto politikos* ir kai kurios gretutinės analitinės kategorijos, išplėtos J. Cliffordo, J. Friedmano, N. Glick-Schillerio, S. Vertoveco ir kt. teoretikų.

Siekiant *identiteto politiką* (tapatybės sureikšminimą) kaip tiriamąją perspektyvą konkrečiai taikyti tarptautinei migracijai pažinti, atvejo analizei pasirinkta transatlantinė lietuvių migracija į JAV. Remiantis minėtąja perspektyva bei empiriniais autoriaus 2002 ir 2004 m. JAV (Čikagoje ir Teksase) atliktų antropologinių lauko tyrimų duomenimis, straipsnyje išskiriamos dvi transatlantinio lietuviškumo, kaip migracijos nulemtos identiteto, strategijos. Tai – nukreiptoji į išorę, į emigracijos („namų“) šalį – „diasporinė“ identiteto konfigūracija ir nukreiptoji į vidų – Jungtinėse Amerikos Valstijose vietinio (etninio, istorinio-kultūrinio) „pripažinimo siekianti“ laikysena. Pavyzdžiais straipsnyje parodoma, kaip yra įkūnijami šie abu transatlantinė migracija paremti identiteto kontūrai. Lietuviškumas, kaip identiteto politika, išreiškiamas tokiomis viešosiomis pozicijomis bei praktikomis: pirmuoju atveju – tautiškumo ir tautinės kultūros išlaikymas (per institucijas ir organizacijas) bei imperatyvinis grįžimo į tėvynę kursas; antru atveju – vietinių (lietuviškų) šaknų (išišaknijimo) etninio-kultūrinio paveldo pripažinimo reikalavimas.

Straipsnis baigiamas išvada, kad transatlantinės migracijos įpavidalintam lietuviškajam identitetui, remiantis pasirinktųjų dviejų jo atvejų analize, pirmuoju atveju galia suteikiama praktikuojant diasporinį bei „ilgo nuotolio nacionalizmą“ (Glick-Schiller terminas), antruoju – reikalaujant istorijos perrašymo, t. y. siekiant „perrašyti“ vietinį (Teksaso) JAV multikultūralizmo istorijos fragmentą įterpiančią lietuvišką sandą.

Raktažodžiai: migracija, transnacionalizmas, identiteto politika, diaspora, namai, namų šalis, paveldas, genealogija, šeimos ir krašto istorija, lietuviai, JAV