

Editorial

This issue of *Lithuanian Ethnology* provides a forum for researchers who are starting out on their careers in ethnology and anthropology to share their knowledge and insights. It opens with Kristina Šliavaitė, an experienced colleague, who provides a critical analysis in her article of discussions on the anthropological field of post-socialism, and of the term 'post-socialism' itself. She poses the question 'Has postsocialism ended in Lithuania?' and provides the clear answer 'Yes.' Šliavaitė argues that although first-hand fieldwork-based anthropological research on post-socialism has provided some excellent material to learn about this phenomenon, the term itself, however, due to its ambiguity and its 'orientalising nature', is outdated, and it is time to look for a new approach in exploring current processes in Central Eastern Europe.

The ethnography of post-socialist deindustrialisation is discussed by Aušra Teleišė, who scrutinises the industrialisation-deindustrialisation dichotomy in her article. By using a case study of the former Soviet industrial city of Marijampolė in Lithuania, the author shows how the informal economy, known as the widespread black economy during the Soviet period of industrialisation, became formalised during the post-Soviet deindustrialisation, providing substantial means of livelihood. In her article on the Sami identity in Finland, Ugnė Starkutė also opens up the much-criticised, and similar to postsocialism, problematics of postcolonialism. However, her point of departure is different: it is the power of identity, how the 'proper' Sami come up against 'not proper' Sami. The essentialisation of 'properness', or the ideal of Saminess, is measured today, and it could be compared to how it was during colonial times. It was shameful to be 'proper' Sami then, just as it is shameful *not* to be 'proper' Sami today, the author concludes.

The paradigm of identity is also explored in Vidmantas Vyšniauskas' article on regionalism, in which he tries to understand how the regional or local identity, as a sort of 'nativism', is constructed in multi-ethnic southeast Lithuania. His answer supports the conclusions drawn by Starkutė: identity construction goes hand in hand with power resources. In one way, it is 'prestigious' to identify with 'modernity', in contrast to the 'archaic', belonging to 'old fashioned' regionalism. In another way, 'prestige' is allocated to ethnicity, and the Polish ethnic identity is an example of this.

Živilė Mieliauskaitė also focuses on identity and power relations in her article, by exploring the case of the role of Christian religious practices at an addiction recovery centre in Vilnius, where she carried out her fieldwork. Based on her findings, she shows that the self-identity of people there depends on the formal power of the institution (the recovery centre), and on the symbolic power of religion; and the role of the latter is more significant in the transition from the identity of 'addict' to the identity of 'on the way to recovery'.

Three more papers in this issue tackle international migration, by addressing the uncertainties of migrant life. The paper by the migration researcher Darius Daukšas deals with Lithuanian migrant families in Norway and the Norwegian Child Welfare Services, and shows that the encounter between migrants and the Norwegian authorities results in the uneven integration of Lithuanian immigrants, as well as producing remote families where childcare is taken on by those who are outside the nuclear family, and eventually fosters return migration.

Indra Lukošienė's article focuses on social remittances by highly skilled Lithuanian re-migrants returning from the West. The main problem addressed here is that social remittances, the experience, knowledge, ideas and innovations, etc, obtained in the West are expected to be transferred to the home country by returnees. The answer to this is that all returnees remain transnational, and are open to going back to the West. At the same time, they can be divided into three groups: active 'agents of change', usually entrepreneurs; those influencing only their immediate surroundings; and just passive observers.

The third article on migration is by Anna Maria Cirstea, who also deals with the complicated issue of return migration. In her paper in the section 'Conference Papers', presented at a virtual conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists in 2020, she scrutinises temporary Romanian return migration from the United Kingdom back to the country of origin. The author sees it as a sphere that is governed by transnational social networks, loaded with tensions and contradictions. The imperative of return, and the experience of belonging to 'home' during the temporary return, creates an atmosphere of being 'neither here nor there'.

The 'Reviews' section of this issue contains four book reviews, and a review article by Jonas Mardosa of the book 'Traditional Clothing of Lithuanian Peasant Men' by Vida Kulikauskienė, a prominent researcher into traditional Lithuanian clothing, in which he provides a broad, critical and comparative analysis.

In her review of the book about Karl Polanyi by Chris Hann, who recently became a new member of the Editorial Board of *Lithuanian Ethnology*, Kristina Jonutytė emphasises that this book in particular is good at challenging preconceived notions about post-socialism in Central Eastern Europe.

We hope that this issue of *Lithuanian Ethnology*, offering new material and insights, mostly put forward by our doctoral student colleagues who are setting out on their careers, will be of much interest to readers.

Vytis Čiubrinskas