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Abstract

This paper is a case study of Soviet political influences on Lithuanian archaeology. The work explores the application of central political rules of the Soviet Union to Lithuanian archaeology and analyses the consequences of these applications in the Post-Soviet period. The result of the study reveals that under Soviet policy, Lithuanian archaeologists developed a highly descriptive tradition. In Post-Soviet Lithuania, archaeologists continue to practice the descriptive tradition and rarely engage in theoretical debates. The work suggests possible explanations and solutions to the current problems in Lithuanian archaeology.

Sommaire

Cette thèse porte sur les influences politiques de l’archéologie lithuanienne pendant et après la période Soviétique. Sous le régime Soviétique l’archéologie lithuanienne a développé une tradition très descriptive. Les archéologues lithuaniens continuent de pratiquer cette archéologie descriptive depuis l’indépendance et ne développent que rarement des arguments vraiment théoriques.
Introduction

In the environment created by Soviet policy, Lithuanian archaeology evolved into a highly descriptive discipline. After the declaration of independence in 1990, the descriptive tradition continued to dominate Lithuanian archaeology. Today, Lithuanian archaeology is largely atheoretical, critical analyses of archaeological remains are avoided, and there is only limited scientific dialogue between archaeologists. Relative to Soviet times, post-independence Lithuanian archaeologists live in a permissive environment of relaxed selective pressure. This has not led to any significant changes in the discipline because there is no source of new conceptual variability on which selection can act to generate change. Contemporary Lithuanian archaeologists are largely the intellectual product of the selection regime that existed in Soviet times, hence the lack of new variability.

Some Lithuanian archaeologists working abroad have recently expressed similar concerns about Lithuanian Archaeology (Sidrys 1999). I wish to show the current situation of Lithuanian archaeology and start a discussion about the problems that Lithuanian archaeology is facing today.

Theoretical Framework of the Thesis

Policy and the broader social milieu are very important factors in the development of science (Trigger 1984, 1989, 1995; Kohl 1998). The occupation of Lithuania in the 1940s and the introduction of a new political system, as well as the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s, had a great impact on the development of Lithuanian Archaeology.
Policy and the social milieu are the environment of agents who are the carriers of conceptual systems. Given the abrupt changes in Lithuania's political and social environment in the 1940s and the 1990s, I expected to see corresponding changes in archaeology. However, having been educated in a Post-Soviet department of archaeology at Vilnius University and experiencing four years of archaeological practice in Post-Soviet Lithuania, I am greatly puzzled by the stability of the old conceptual framework in Lithuanian archaeology after the political changes of the 1990s. Lithuanian archaeologists themselves, however, claim that there have been changes in their discipline since the early 1990s. Confronted with these apparent contradictions, I decided to seek a general model of scientific change, which would help me to understand the situation of Lithuanian archaeology and explain the process of major shifts in science.

There are several models of scientific change introduced in the literature of philosophy of science. I draw from a few of them, which together contribute to forming a firm theoretical framework for my thesis.

The model that I apply in my analysis is the synthesis of three scientific change models: the scientific change model of Karl Popper (Popper 1959), Kuhn's "paradigm shift" model (Kuhn 1962) and Robert Richards' "natural selection of ideas" model (Richard 1987). While looking at these three general models, I take an evolutionary perspective and concentrate on the explanation of change and the role of scientists in it.
Popper

Popper refers scientific change to falsifiability. Falsifiability, according to Popper, is the test and rejection of hypothesis against observations of nature (Popper 1959). From an evolutionary perspective, falsifiability is the selection process during which the fittest ideas survive. The fittest ideas in a Popperian context would be the ones that survive falsification attempts.

If nature selects the fittest ideas, according to Popper's model, human agency introduces variability: "it is we who always formulate the questions to be put to nature (...). And in the end, it is again we who give the answer; it is we ourselves, who after severe scrutiny, decide upon the answer to the question which we put to nature – after protracted and earnest attempts to elicit from her an unequivocal 'no'" (Popper 1959: 280). Therefore the scientists have an active role in this model. They need to deliver enough variability to nature to assure rich choice for selection.

The model presented by Popper is interesting for two reasons: for the shape of the model itself and for the falsifiability principle in it. However I see one element missing in this model in order to apply it to the case of Lithuanian archaeology. Popper does not consider the environmental factor. As I stated earlier, the environment of scientific ideas, Soviet policy, was crucial in shaping the trends of Lithuanian archaeology. The falsifiability criterion was not employed during the XXth century in Lithuanian archaeology. Archaeologists who would suggest the falsifiability criterion for the evaluation of high level or middle level range theories would simply not have fit in the social and policy environment.
Newly uncovered archaeological remains were interpreted in the light of political constraints, which proscribed any doubt in the main postulates of Soviet archaeology at the official level. The traditionally employed culture-historical approach, with its concerns for ethnicity and the roots of the Lithuanian nation, encouraged the confirmation of expectations, rather than the challenge of existing assumptions. Statements about ethnic roots and cultural heritage were important for local as well as for the Union’s nationalism.

In Popper’s terms, expectations need to be overthrown because the critical evaluation of ideas does not limit the advance of knowledge. However, in the case of a politically constrained environment, the falsifiability criterion is difficult or impossible to employ.

Kuhn

According to Kuhn, there are few stages of scientific development – emergence of a paradigm, the stage of normal science, crises of normal science, and finally paradigm shift (Kuhn 1962). In Kuhn’s words “Paradigm is an object for further articulation and specification under new or more stringent conditions” (Kuhn 1962: 23). Articulation of a given paradigm is the stage of “normal science”. Kuhn refers scientific change to paradigm shift, when normal science faces a crisis and scientists are not able to solve emerging problems within the framework of the current paradigm.

Kuhn addresses the role of the scientist at the moment of paradigm shift. He claims that the generation of scientists raised in the old paradigm will not be able to reject it, “they can at best help to create a crisis or, more accurately, to reinforce one
that is already very much in existence" (Kuhn 1962: 78). Kuhn believes, that the
paradigm is a prerequisite to perception: "What a man sees depends both upon what he
looks at and also upon what his previous visual-conceptual experience has thought him
to see" (Kuhn 1962: 112). This belief assumes that scientists are the prisoners of their
mindset to a great extent. According to Kuhn, it is the new generation who is taking
over the new paradigm.

Like Popper, Kuhn does not give great weight to the policy environment in the
process of paradigm shift. He does not look at the paradigm shifts caused by external
events. Kuhn considers the internal crises of the paradigm. However, his model is useful
because it addresses the role of generations of researchers during paradigm shift. His
statement about the difficulty of rejecting the old paradigm could help explain the stable
nature of the approach to archaeology in Post-Soviet Lithuania.

Richards

Richards' model of change in the history of science is based on the natural
selection principle (Richards 1987). According to Richards, individuals carry ideas and
concepts that are related by logic and common evolutionary history. In order to be
expressed, ideas and conceptual systems are going through selection in three different
environments – the minds of individual scientists, the scientific community, and the
general culture (Richards 1987). The transmission of ideas between individuals happens
depending on the context in which information is transmitted (book, lecture, scientific
discussion, etc.) and on the baggage of conceptual systems of the receiver (Richards
1987). This assumption accords with Kuhn's model, which assumes that scientists’
minds are dependent not only on the content of information received but also on the mindset of receiver. Richards’ model emphasizes the environment rather than the content of the message. To use a biological analogy, the phenotypic expression of the ideas is taking different shape not only because of different perspectives of the receiver or because of the content of the ideas, but also because of the environment in which they are transmitted. Richards’ model is largely comparable with Popper’s. For Popper, the process of selection of ideas is falsifiability, while for Richards it is the pressures from different environments – personal, scientific and the general culture. Richards does not specify the selecting pressures; therefore these three environments might include falsifiability as a selective pressure. Both models rely on the introduction of variability for selection by humans.

Synthesis

In Lithuanian archaeology’s case, under Soviet rule, the main selecting factor was not the personal environment, not the scientific environment and not the general public. All these three aggregates were already selected by the political environment and the carriers of ideas survived in the system only because they were fit to the political environment. The rest of the carriers were silent or ruled out of the game. Several archaeologists were sent to prison camps or were executed (A. A. Miller, S. N. Bykovskii, O. V. Kiparisov, P. S. Rykov, B.S. Zhukov, I. M. Grevs, L. S. Klejn, B. A. Latynin, P. Baleniūnas, etc.) or left the country because were not able to function in the political environment (M. Gimbutas, J. Puzinas, P. Tarasenka, V. Nagevičius, etc).
Having reviewed three general models of scientific change it is possible to synthesize them and to apply them to the analysis of Lithuanian archaeology during the second half of the XXth century.

Richards and Popper rely on human agency to introduce variability of ideas for selection. I agree with this statement, because I argue that the scientists who introduce ideas in certain environment are already fit, because they are already selected (selected for university, for example), and their ideas would not be very harmful or distracting for the existing political system. When change is introduced in the political environment, different scientific leaders are selected and their ideas are naturally fit, till the next environmental change.

During the rule of Stalin, Soviet policy was selecting scientists in a very straightforward fashion – keeping them in prisons, executing or exiling them to Siberia. In other words, political environment constrained the variability of ideas introduced for selection. Scientists, who tried practicing the old Pre-Soviet paradigm or were the carriers of ideas of the old paradigm, did not survive the system. Therefore the landscape of ideas became very homogenous during the Soviet period.

In the political change of the 90’s, there was the second big shift in environment: Independence. This was the change from a very constrained to a less constrained environment. In this favorable new environment, archaeologists were not selected out of the system as literally as in the early 40s. During the course of the second change, scientists faced a more diverse landscape of ideas, which they could introduce for selection. However, the old paradigm in Post-Soviet Lithuanian archaeology seems not to change as fast as it would be expected.
I assume archaeologists continue to use the Soviet paradigm because they are comfortable with it. In other words, they are used to the old way things work. Archaeologists claim that they change the old paradigm, because this is what the new environment and system requires, but actually they use the same tools and same approaches to archaeology, because they do not want to leave their comfort zone, their local optimum, in evolutionary terms. They also face much less selective pressure. Therefore the old paradigm continues to be stable.

The generation of the old paradigm reached local optimum and there are no mutations happening in order to push them toward another peak or to establish a new paradigm. The mutation, which still might take place in the old generation, is the space for expression of human agency. Possibly, some scientists of the old paradigm are capable of leaving their comfort zone and becoming carriers of a new paradigm. Following Kuhn’s arguments it is clear that the shift of paradigm is the mission of the new generation, who have a mindset formed already in a different environment. The broader the mindset, the broader the conceptual system, the greater variability of ideas might be introduced for selection by nature.

In this case, Lithuanian archaeologists now have access to a greater diversity of traits, however they are facing relaxed selective pressure. Considering all these conditions, it is possible to conclude that in the long term, a new paradigm will emerge. The velocity of change and the nature of the paradigm will depend on the variability of the concepts introduced by the archaeologists for selection – by the ones, who will leave their comfort zone and the ones who have a new mind set developed under a new political system.
This synthesis of three general models is just one of several possible ways to analyze and explain Lithuanian archaeology in the XXth century. It includes human agency introducing variability of ideas for selection from Popper's and Richards' models, Kuhn's paradigm shifts, which explain why paradigm shift is slow after abrupt change in the policy, and Richards' evolutionary perspective.

Political Shifts And Demands on Archaeology In the Soviet Union (1917-1990)

Soviet archaeology developed on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, interpretations of which underwent changes over time. These changes applied to archaeology and anthropology. It is possible to identify four main periods of change in Soviet policy. In this chapter I will look at the main periods of change in the Soviet policy in order to analyse the application of these global conditions to the local Lithuanian context.

The first period starts with the creation of the Soviet state in the 1917. Klejn notes that archaeology was late to follow ideological changes in comparison with other domains (Клеiн 1993: 86). Shnirelman confirms this fact and says that ethnogenetic studies, including archaeology, till the end of 1920s, did not feel any serious pressure from the state (Shnirelman 1996: 230). In the dawn of the Soviet Union, the Soviet government supported the archaeological school of Pokrovskii, who referred to Imperial Russia as the "prison of the peoples" (Shnirelman 1995: 120). Pokrovskii reinforced non-Russian nationalism, which at the given moment met well with the needs of Soviet policy. The Soviet regime was coming to "liberate" all the nations imprisoned under the Tsar's rule. In the light of those ideas, the revolution period in Russia was the first
opportunity, after decades of suppression, for the nations in the Russian empire to claim their rights and to take the future in their own hands. Lithuanians did not miss this opportunity and declared independence in 1918. Therefore, Lithuania was not a part of the Union at the moment of the formation of Soviet theory and methods in archaeology.

The situation in the Soviet Union had greatly changed by the end of 1920's and the mid-1930s. This was the period when Marxism was introduced into archaeology. Belief in global revolution inspired a new generation of the Soviet archaeologists to be interested in universal archaeological phenomena. Therefore the school of Pokrovskii, which was still popular during the first Soviet decade, became unwelcome on the part of the Soviet government. Local nationalism became the greatest enemy of the state. Marr, soviet linguist, made the greatest impact in this situation. He formulated a new theoretical framework for Soviet archaeology. Marr was the first to fit communist-socialist ideas to linguistics and later, these were adopted by archaeology. His main statement was that "there are no ethnic cultures in genesis as such... but there is a uniform human culture at particular stages of development..." (Shnirelman 1995: 122).

Pokrovskii and Marr can be viewed as both being internationalists.

However, Pokrovskii's internationalism encouraged local nationalisms, which in context of the Soviet policy became bothersome, because all the different nations of the Union had to be under control. Therefore, Marr's slogans, discouraging local nationalisms and claiming local development through different stages, were very convenient for the Soviet government. As a consequence, archaeologists at this period had to reject the notion of archaeological culture used earlier, which indicated separate
cultural development, and to concentrate on socio-economic formations (Shnirelman 1996: 231).

The First generation of Marxist archaeologists believed that the mode of production and the level of its development were the key in understanding and reconstructing prehistoric societies. Similar ideas could be recognized in the 1960s New Archaeology movement in North America (Trigger 1989).

Archaeology in the Soviet Union became "history armed with the spade" (Клейн 1993: 344). Klejn notes some misinterpretations of Marx's ideas about 'historicism' in Soviet thought. He says that "Initially 'historicism' was understood in the sense of methodological demand to consider all things in terms of development and interconnection. But unwittingly its meaning was changed into something different: bringing up all these disciplines to history and, as much as possible, including them into it." (Klejn 1993: 347).

The third period indicates transition from internationalism to "Soviet nationalism". In 1936, the Soviet Constitution legitimized ethnic identities comprised in the Union. The Soviets needed a historical justification and legitimation for the Union. Consequently, the study of the different nations forming the Soviet Union was included in schoolbooks. Even though ethnic histories became important again, it was necessary to emphasize the positive impacts of Slavs on the development of the non-Russian nations of the Union. The real manifestations of local nationalisms were severely persecuted (Shnirelman 1995: 130-137). In this situation, several aspects of Marr's autochthonous development theory were strongly criticized (Shnirelman 1996: 233). It became dangerous to be an academic archaeologist. The followers of Pokrovskii as well
as Marr started to be persecuted. Finally in 1950, Stalin condemned Marrism completely and declared it to be a "vulgarization of Marxism" (Thompson 1961: 30; Tolstoy 1952: 10). Pokrovskii’s school promoting interest in local histories was viewed as a "mockery of Russian patriotism" (Shnirelman 1996: 130). Slavic ethnogenetic expansion in Soviet thought started to be used to promote Slavic superiority over Germans, Vikings, Goths and the non-slavic nations forming the Soviet Union. As a result of these political circumstances, Soviet archaeologists returned to the concept of "archaeological culture" in the middle of the 1930s.

This was the period during which Lithuanian archaeology entered the Soviet system. The Red Army occupied Lithuania in 1944. Lithuanian archaeologists had to forget archaeological literature published during the Independence period and to reject "bourgeois" terminology. They needed to adopt the Marxist-Leninist framework, adjust the periodization system on the development of economic stages in society and to "find" progressive influences of Slavs on the Baltic tribes.

The concept of ethnogenesis and the notion of archaeological culture, both promoted by Soviet archaeology, were already used by Lithuanian archaeologists. Ethnogenesis and the distinction of different peoples in prehistoric times was one of the most important issues for Jonas Puzinas (Čivelytė 2005: 48), who is considered to be the founder of scientific archaeology in Lithuania. These ideas Puzinas brought from Germany in 1934, where he defended his doctoral dissertation at Heidelberg University, titled "Vorgeschichtsforschung und Nationalbewusstsein in Litauen" [Studies of Prehistory and National Consciousness in Lithuania] (my translation). Puzinas "was sure that the archaeological culture is a synonym for a nation and an ethnos" (Čivelytė
When Puzinas came back in 1934 he was the first to educate professional archaeologists in Lithuania. He taught in Kaunas and Vilnius universities from 1934 till 1944. Puzinas was a professor of the four Lithuanian archaeologists who graduated before the Soviet occupation in 1944 and continued their work in archaeology later. Marija Gimbutas, one of his students, together with Puzinas emigrated to the West, while Pranas Kulikauskas, Rimutė Rimantienė and Regina Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė continued archaeological practice in Soviet Lithuania. The three archaeologists who stayed in Lithuania had a firm background of culture-historical archaeology brought by Puzinas from Germany in the early 30s.

The fourth period commences after Stalin's death in 1953. It is a period during which archaeologists started to feel less pressure and threat from the state. Western scientific ideas started to be discussed in the literature, though the attitude towards westerners remained hostile. Anthropologists became especially interested in questions of human evolution: the origin of the human mind, language or culture in general (Клейн 1993: 24-26), though this interest is not represented in the Lithuanian archaeological literature. Lithuanian archaeologists continued to successfully adapt a descriptive archaeological tradition. During the years of Brezhnev, archaeology got into stagnation and, according to Klejn, it was not ready for the democratization process in the 80’s (Клейн 1993: 27-29).
Dealing with Soviet Policy:

Application of Soviet Central Rules in Peripheral Lithuanian Context

The goal of this chapter is to understand the application of Soviet central rules in Lithuanian archaeology and to see how these rules and other factors were influencing Lithuanian archaeological tradition during the Soviet years, up until Lithuanian independence in 1990.

The main strategy of Lithuanian archaeologists during the Soviet period was to comply with official policy requirements, while practicing activities that were more or less compatible with their own convictions. Even in expressing the officially required surface message in their literature, Lithuanian archaeologists had a tendency to stay as neutral as possible.

Archaeologists had to have good knowledge of central policy requirements in order to publish, work, and ‘survive’ in the Soviet system. Their main concern, then, was to try to express their ideas as best as they could while minimizing risks. Archaeologists had to comply with Soviet rules about the content of their work, its format, terminology, and text structure.

Archaeologists started looking for the best compromise between the need to express their own ideas, the need to observe political rules, as well as ways to circumvent these rules while minimizing risk. They gradually developed methods for reducing the distortion of their ideas in their published work. Readers, in the meantime, became well trained in recognizing these methods and strategies, and were able to discern ideas that belonged to the author and ideas that were imposed by the Soviet political system. This implicit comprehension between authors and readers increased
the possibilities of expression, while reducing the risk of being selected out by the political environment.

One of the most adaptive methods in Soviet era Lithuanian archaeological literature was to avoid the topics that were politically sensitive or unacceptable (Luchtanas, lecture notes). Such topics included the interpretation of archaeological data and theory building. Silence was used as a statement of disagreement (Клейн 1993: 82). Lithuanian archaeologists who survived the change of political environment in 1944, consciously and later unconsciously observed this silence. In the long term, this interpretive and theoretical silence contributed greatly to the development of a strongly descriptive archaeological tradition in Lithuania. This tradition did not require or encourage the expression of opinion and dealt mostly with low-level theory.

To illustrate the applications of central Soviet rules to peripheral Lithuanian archaeology, I will examine two significant works: “Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai” [The Traits Of Lithuanian Archaeology] (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius Kulikauskiene 1961) published in 1961 and “Senasis Geležies Amžius” [The Old Iron Age] (Michelbertas 1986) published in 1986. The first work, “Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai”, represented the new Soviet paradigm in archaeology and became a model for later archaeological publications. The second work shows the well-developed descriptive archaeological tradition in Lithuania that was fostered by the Soviet system. Both works were used as main teaching materials for archaeology students at university.
"Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai" is divided into four main parts: Foreword, Introduction, chapters on the Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age and an Appendix. The sequence of topics covered in each chapter on an archaeological period is dictated by political requirements: the topics of greater concern are discussed at the beginning; the topics of lesser concern are discussed at the end. In the description of archaeological sites, priority is given to settlements and hill-forts. The description of burial sites comes later. In the description of artefacts, priority is given to working tools and weapons. Those are followed by descriptions of ceramics and jewellery.

According to Marxist archaeology, domestic context and working tools reveal the modes of production and are the key to understanding the economic and social development of societies. Burials, ceramics and jewellery are a secondary concerns - they help to resolve questions of archaeological cultures and ethnogenesis. An important place is given to the discussion of contacts and trade routes, because they can reveal foreign influences on local populations. The Soviet state had a strong interest in controlling statements about foreign influences on local populations. The aspect of beliefs in prehistory was not of much concern, because religion according to Engels, is "nothing else but fantastic reflection in the heads of humans... reflection in which, natural phenomena is taken for supernatural." (my translation) (quoted in Румянцев 1981: 129; Окладников 1952: 177). Descriptions of prehistoric belief systems were accordingly often kept for last.

In the later "Senasis Geležies Amžius" (Michelbertas 1986), the structure described above has undergone some change. Description of burials takes more space than the description of settlements. Jewelry is discussed prior to working tools.
(Michelbertas 1986). Toward the end of the Soviet period, Lithuanian archaeologists found themselves with a great deal of archaeological data from burial grounds and very little data from domestic sites. Between 1948 and 1960, 58 burial grounds and only 17 dwelling settlements were excavated (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961). The relative proportion of excavation remained the same throughout the Soviet period (Sidrys 1999: 211).

Sidrys (1999) argues that Soviet era Lithuanian archaeologists avoided the excavation of domestic sites because it would have involved them in the politically difficult subject of social reconstruction and interpretation. Burials were also easier to find and cheaper to excavate. Because of land amelioration, many burials had to be excavated in order to save archaeological sites. Most of the dwelling settlements in Lithuania are hill-forts, and were therefore not threatened by the amelioration process (Sidrys 1999: 212). As a result, Lithuanians directed their archaeological tradition towards excavation of burials, the description of the artifacts from burial sites, the affiliation of the artifacts with local ethnic groups, and determination of their territorial and chronological boundaries based on data from burials. Significantly, most of these concerns were peripheral to the interests of Soviet archaeology. Specializing in topics of lesser theoretical interest was apparently a successful adaptive strategy.

Interpretations of Politically Sensitive Topics

There were several politically sensitive topics in Soviet archaeology. These topics were seen by the government as playing a role in the education of society and in the creation of Soviet identities that conformed to the system. The goals of archaeology,
archaeological periodization, the history of Lithuanian archaeology, foreign influences on local population (trade, contacts), cultural heritage, ethnogenesis and religious beliefs, were all sensitive topics.

In the Introduction to “Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai”, Kulikauskas presents a definition of archaeology and its goals: “Archeology is a sub-field of historical science, which studies the oldest history of human societies through material culture” (my translation) (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 5). In Soviet terms, this means that the archaeological artifact is only a source of data but not, as in antiquarianism an end in itself. Artifacts need to be analyzed and interpreted in order to reconstruct processes within historical societies: “It became necessary to enlighten the Lithuanian past correctly, historically; based on Marxist-Leninist science, which studies society and its development” (my translation) (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 3).

Tautavičius in the same volume criticizes “bourgeois archaeologists” for wasting their time on the description of artifacts, which leads to formalism in archaeology (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 20). These goals set for archaeology in the Soviet system seem to be useful and promising. However, the Soviet political context very much narrowed the ways in which these goals could be achieved. The requirement of interpreting data and reconstructing historical societies was largely disregarded in Lithuanian archaeology, even though the authors of the volume claim the opposite. As mentioned earlier, Lithuanian archaeologists largely kept silent on any high-level interpretations and mostly dealt with the description of local material culture, the classification of artifacts and their affiliation with local ethnic groups.
This situation can be easily illustrated through the later work "Senasis Gelezies Amžius" [The Old Iron Age] (Michelbertas 1986), in which the description of sites and artifacts in the 270 page monograph takes more than half of the space. The part on reconstruction of society's subsistence strategies and social relations takes only 37 pages and does not reveal original interpretations of the data. The tendency to keep away from data interpretation is seen in all archaeological monographs of the Soviet period in Lithuania.

A similar situation can be recognized in archaeological periodization. Marxist-Leninist archaeology divided human history into several stages, based on Engels' (1884) "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State". The Marxist-Leninist stage system, adopted in Lithuanian archaeology, implied that the Mesolithic represents matriarchal clan society, the Neolithic sees a change to patriarchal clan society and paints the Bronze Age as a patriarchal clan society. The Iron Age was regarded as a period of break up of Tribal societies and a period of class formation. All this prehistoric time-span, beginning with the Stone Age and finishing with the Iron Age, was seen as the primitive barbarian stage. The stages could be moved back and forth in time in different archaeological contexts, but their sequence and the social processes within the stages could not be modified. Archaeologists kept repeating the same stages in development of economy and social relationships all through the Soviet period.

The case of Lithuanian archaeology shows that the outcome of the Soviet political climate is stagnation of archaeological thought. Through several generations, descriptive practices became a tradition in Lithuanian archaeology and many archaeologists even today are not willing or able to engage in deeper analyses of the
data. The same descriptive archaeological tradition is transferred to new generations in most of the archaeology courses offered by Vilnius University.

Discussion of the history of Lithuanian archaeology faced tight political restrictions during the Soviet period. The main goal of the policy in this regard was to convince the public that the Soviet system encouraged archaeological research and only through Soviet style archaeology would the Lithuanian past be correctly revealed. In such circumstances several historical facts and important personalities of Lithuanian archaeology, who had been selected out of the system, could not be mentioned. One of them was Puzinas – the first professional archaeologist in Lithuania. Another was Gimbutas, who emigrated from the country and continued her research in the United States.

The names of these archaeologists started to appear in the literature in the late periods of the Soviet Union under the guise of criticism. Criticism became a covert way to discuss existing archaeological research, which earlier could not be discussed in any context. In the early “Lietuvos Archeologijos Bruožai” (1961) these selected personalities are dismissed or mentioned only very briefly (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 22-33). Michelbertas’ 1986 “Senasis Gelezies Amžius”, by contrast presents the works of Puzinas, but at the same time criticizes him for overestimating the influence of the Roman Empire and the Goths on Baltic culture (Michelbertas 1986: 9).

The Soviet paradigm tended to divide influences into positive and negative ones. It clearly identified who should be the object of sympathy and who shouldn’t. Negative characters during the Soviet period were “Western Imperialists”, “local Lithuanian
bourgeois", "Polish landlordish-bourgeois", "German occupants" (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 28-30). All of them, according to the Soviet government, were destroying the cultural heritage of Lithuania and not producing any valuable data (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961, 28-30). Negative attitudes were also linked to influences from the West: the Roman Empire, Vikings, Goths or Germans (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961; Michelbertas, 1986). This affected how archaeology treated prehistoric trade and contact.

Positive attitude were expressed towards activities and influences from Russian archaeologists in Lithuania during the XIXth century. Special attention was paid to the Soviet period, proudly listing the achievements of archaeologists in data production and in formulation of new questions, such as the formation of the Baltic tribes, social classes and finally the Lithuanian nation (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 32). It was concluded that all progress that took place in Lithuanian archaeology was due to the Soviet Marxist-Leninist methodology (Kulikauskas, Tautavičius, Kulikauskienė 1961: 28-32).

Lithuanian ethnogenesis and the protection of archaeological heritage were widely discussed in the Soviet literature. Those topics, for different reasons concerned both parties to the game — Soviets, as well as Lithuanians. The preservation of the archaeological heritage and the study of ethnogenesis had one goal — the construction of cultural identity based on past events and material remains. The Soviet Union was eager to construct Soviet identities by interpreting the material heritage from a Marxist-Leninist perspective, while Lithuanians wanted to preserve and to discover their
Lithuanian identity without the influence of Soviet ideology. As a result, archaeologists often discussed both of these topics in the literature.

**Working Around the System**

While dealing with all sensitive topics in archaeology, Lithuanians employed two main strategies in their publications to circumvent political rules and to survive in the system. Klejn titled these strategies "payment of tribute" and "pose of silence" (Клейн 1993: 82). According to Klejn, "payment of tribute" allowed scientists to separate the main text from politically enforced statements. The Soviet system and the classic ideas of Marxism were discussed apart from the main text in a separate chapter, usually the introduction, the foreword or the conclusion. Klejn’s "Pose of silence" was a statement of disagreement on issues that were sensitive (Клейн 1993: 82). The only safe way of disagreeing with an official position was to keep out of the discourse entirely.

These two methods in Lithuanian archaeological publications complemented each other. Dealing with politically sensitive topics, Lithuanian archaeologists could not avoid the presentation of central Soviet positions, and this is where they paid their tribute to the system. Most of the time they tried to separate politically enforced statements from the rest of the information. On the other hand, Lithuanian archaeologists did not engage in the research and analysis of politically sensitive topics (except Lithuanian ethnogenesis) and this is where they employed the "pose of silence". In the Lithuanian case, "pose of silence" resulted in the emergence of a descriptive archaeological tradition.
Early archaeological publications of the Soviet period seem to satisfy the central political requirements. However, the surface message did not represent archaeological practices in reality. This controversy showed up in later archaeological publications, for instance, in earlier discussed work “Senasis Geležies Amžius” (Michelbertas 1986). Later publications still preserved a politically appropriate tone, kept the same Soviet vocabulary and the same Marxist-Leninist framework, but they were not able to provide any new interpretations on the growing archaeological databases gathered since the beginning of the Soviet system. Lithuanian archaeologists became specialists in collecting archaeological data and placing it into a stagnated Marxist-Leninist framework. Descriptive work became the main part of the archaeological literature. The political environment and the continous efforts of Lithuanian archaeologists to avoid political debates let to the descriptive tradition, which was not in the intention of the Union, nor the intentions of Lithuanian archaeologists themselves.

The emergence and formation of a descriptive archaeological tradition in Lithuania during the Soviet period was thus the unintended consequence of the existence of an active archaeological community in a totalitarian but theoretically sophisticated political framework. Since the declaration of independence in 1990 and the abandonment of the Marxist-Leninist framework, Lithuanian archaeologists have found themselves with huge databases and no obvious successor framework in which to interpret them.
Lithuanian Archaeology Since Independence: The Descriptive Tradition Continues

In 1990, Lithuania declared its independence from the Soviet Union. The new political environment did not impose strong selection on the carriers of ideas in the way that the 1944 Soviet re-occupation had. In this less restricted political environment, Lithuanian archaeologists found themselves with a broader choice of ideas and the possibility of moving Lithuanian archaeological research in new directions. However, the pressure of the Soviet political environment over 50 years had affected local archaeological tradition significantly and homogenized the landscape of ideas.

Now, because of this homogeneity, Lithuanian archaeologists were having difficulty coming up with innovative questions, employing archaeological theory and engaging in critical analyses of their data. Lithuanian archaeologists rejected the Marxist-Leninist framework, imposed by the Soviet policy but never deeply espoused in Lithuania, and continued practicing the same descriptive tradition that had emerged during the Soviet years as a consequence of political restrictions. Lithuanian archaeologists had a hard time leaving their comfort zone: they claimed to reject the Soviet paradigm while continuing to use the old tools to approach archaeological data. These problems are noticeable in the literature published since independence, as well as in post-secondary education in archaeology.

The concept of ethnogenesis played a significant role in Lithuanian archaeology during the Soviet period, and continued to do so after independence (Girininkas et al. 2005: 112, 250). After the collapse of the Soviet Union, ethnogenesis became important in Lithuanian scholarship and society. It served to recover and create Lithuanian
identity, its roots, and its independence. It is not a coincidence that one of the first archaeological monographs published in independent Lithuania was concerned with the roots of Baltic culture (Girininkas, Baltų Kultūros Ištakos [The Origin of the Baltic Culture], 1994).

This work conforms to aspects of the old paradigm in that it is basically descriptive. However, it provided possible starting points for discussion about Archaeology and Lithuanian prehistory. While it has led to a diversification of ideas in the Lithuanian archaeological literature, it has not yet led to extensive critical discussion.

The old paradigm is represented by the culture-historical approach and the description of the archaeological material of the Neolithic Narva culture, which Girininkas associates with the roots of the Balts. The description of the Neolithic Narva culture occupies 200 pages out of the book’s 250 (Girininkas 1994). On the other hand, in his analysis, Girininkas challenges traditionally accepted theory, which says that Baltic culture was brought by Indo-European invasions in the late Neolithic. Girininkas argues for local development of the Baltic culture. He traces the origin of the Balts to the very beginning of the Neolithic period and associates it with local Narva culture. Girininkas believes that the earlier Eastern Baltic populations were not assimilated by Indo-Europeans, but rather experienced slight cultural external influences that gave impulse for the development of the local populations (Girininkas 1994).

This statement is not as important in its content as it is important in its very presence and in its potential, largely unfulfilled up to now, to evoke debates on the issues of the Neolithic in the Baltic region. For example, in his work, Girininkas rejects
the demic-diffusion model (Ammerman and Cavalli-Sforza 1973) as being the only appropriate model for the spread of Indo-Europeans into the Baltic. This idea encourages the introduction and examination other possible socio-cultural transition models. So far, alternative models have been introduced as a result of this work, but they have not been extensively discussed and compared.

Even though Girininkas is mostly concerned about the ethnogenesis of the Balts, his ideas give guidelines for further discussion on a wide range of other issues, such as the transition to farming in the Baltic region, reconsideration of the concept of archaeological culture in general, discussion on different models of socio-cultural change, consideration of Neolithisation processes in the Eastern Baltic, etc. Therefore, even though, based on the old paradigm, this monograph starts a new epoch in independent Lithuania by bringing out an opinion and giving a hint for further problematic research topics and discussions.

The pace of change in archaeological thought and the development of archaeological trends in Lithuania since the 1994 volume can be evaluated by looking at the recent first volume of the massive series “Lietuvos Istorija: Akmens Amžius ir Ankstyvasis Metalų Laikotarpis Lietuvoje. T. I” [History of Lithuania: Stone Age and Early Metal Period in Lithuania Vol 1], 2005 written by Lithuanian Stone Age specialists Ostrauskas, Juodagalvis, Girininkas and Brazaitis. The part on the Neolithic period includes discussion of Indo-Europeans, which again brings out the question of ethnogenesis of the Balts. Brazaitis notes that scientists in Lithuania have not lost their interest in ethnogenesis. However, the author recognizes that all current publications, with the exception of Girininkas’ “Baltų Kultūros Ištakos” (1994), unconditionally
accept one theory on the formation of Baltic culture. The traditional view holds that Baltic culture, together with agriculture and Corded-Ware culture, were brought by Indo-Europeans during the late Neolithic. According to Brazaitis, apart from the traditionally accepted theory, other possible theories are not mentioned in the literature and not discussed (Girininkas et al. 2005: 249). He concludes with an uncharacteristically activist sentence: “Apparently it is time to consider this issue in a wider perspective, not limiting oneself with the view that was formulated more than half a century ago” (my translation) (Girininkas et al. 2005: 250).

This observation shows that ethnogenesis is still a significant concern in Lithuania, but at the same time, there are no firm arguments forwarded in support of any theory of the Baltic ethnogenesis. Stagnation of the ethnogenesis debate could be resolved by either changing the tools to approach the issue, reformulating the questions, or re-evaluating the importance of ethnogenesis to archaeology.

Even though the activist call for change is present in the work, the work itself makes few moves towards a change of paradigm. The new work pays more attention to the socio-cultural processes and reconstruction of prehistoric social structures than earlier publications. They also consider subsistence strategies of the societies and discuss the Neolithisation process in the Baltic. The authors present some theories on different topics and reference a wider range of sources, including western sources, compared to earlier publications. For example, while discussing the issue of transition to farming in the Baltic, they consider the models proposed by Zvelebil and Rowley-Conwy (1984) and Gimbutas (Girininkas et al. 2005: 170). While discussing the Indo-European issue, they consider the theories of Colin-Renfrew (1988), Gimbutas and
some others, for which, unfortunately, the co-authors do not give a reference (Girininkas et al. 2005: 249). However, the presentation of the models and theories is descriptive and lacks critical analysis.

In summary, the whole of “Lietuvos Istorija: Akmens Amžius ir Ankstyvasis Metalų Laikotarpis Lietuvoje. T. I” is an attempt to view the Lithuanian Stone Age in the European context and reconstruct the historical and cultural genesis of societies that existed within the political borders of present-day Lithuania. Sometimes the reconstruction of the Stone Age societies and their economy is done through the application of straight ethnographic analogies referring to “primitive cultures” (Girininkas et al. 2005: 40, 100). This approach has become problematic and an object of intense debate in anthropology and archaeology (Kuper 1988; Wobst 1978). Unfortunately this debate is not reflected in the book’s discussion or in Lithuanian Archaeology in general. There may be several reasons for this. During the Soviet period there was little access to works on the history of non-Soviet archaeological theory, and there are currently no formal courses in archaeological theory in Lithuania. There was only one publication on archaeological theory that appeared during the years of independence in Lithuania. It is the translation of Hodder’s “Reading the Past” (Hodder, 2000). The book is not employed nor discussed at university in archaeology programs; therefore the content is hardly understandable for archaeology students, who do not have the required theoretical background. At university, archaeological data is only approached descriptively. Another problem is limited contact with colleagues from abroad, which restricts access to current trends of archaeology in the world. Finally, access to foreign archaeological literature is limited for both financial and linguistic
reasons. If you do not see the need to engage archaeological theory in analysis of archaeological data and you have only small bits of information on the theory instead of a whole picture, you might end up using concepts without really knowing their current meaning.

The authors avoid description of separate archaeological artefacts, however they end up with rigorous descriptions of the Stone Age archaeological cultures and archaeological sites. They use the culture-historical approach in their work and emphasize the need to study the genesis of separate archaeological cultures in the Lithuanian Stone Age (Girininkas et al. 2005: 112). The latter goals seem to bring Lithuanian archaeology back to the descriptive tradition that evolved under the Soviet regime.

Overall the interest in the Stone Age in Lithuania has increased during the years of independence and this can be seen in the number of excavations of Stone Age sites as reflected in the Annual reports on excavations (Archeologiniai Tyrinėjimai Lietuvoje [Archaeological Research in Lithuania], several publications (Barzdžiuvienė et al. 2001; Daugnora and Girininkas 2004; Girininkas et al. 2005, Rimanitenė 2005) as well as ongoing research projects (Akmens Amžius Pietų Lietuvoje 2001; Akmens ir Žalvario Amžiai Lietuvoje 1999 - 2008). The main tendency remains to publish and to describe the database collected during excavation. There are few critical views expressed in the literature. It is difficult to develop productive discussions under these circumstances. Archaeologists remain concerned about ethnogenesis in the Baltic region, where they intensively employ culture-historical approaches and engage themselves in the typology of archaeological artefacts. The situation could be illustrated by the goals set for the
ongoing flagship project of the Lithuanian Institute of History, “Akmens ir Žalvario Amžiai Lietuvoje” [The Stone and Bronze Ages in Lithuania]:

1. to establish the time when what is now Lithuania was inhabited by humans and the conditions of life at that time;
2. to establish the outlines of farming, craft development in the stone and bronze ages;
3. to examine the development of ethno-cultural processes in the stone and bronze ages;
4. to examine and reconstruct the development of people's material and spiritual culture;
5. to establish and research a series of essential landmark sites from separate periods and cultures to supplement our knowledge and help us achieve the aims stated above;

In the light of this project, contemporary Lithuanian Archaeology seems to be looking for a package of the Baltic culture, which would contain prototypical finds. This approach limits the number of insights that could help reveal the complex socio-cultural processes in the past. Especially when researchers consider development of culture within the present political borders of Lithuania.

Between 1994 and 2005, several monographs were released on different time periods (Grigalavičienė 1995; Rimantienė 1995, 1996; Tautavičius 1996; Volkaitė-Kulikauskienė 2001; Butrimas et al. 2003; Kuncevičius 2005), on archaeological sites (Michelbertas 1997; Vaitkunskienė 1999; Rimantienė 1999, 2005; Zabiela et al. 2001; Žulkus 2002), bibliographies of archaeological literature (Tautavičius 1999), memoirs of Lithuanian archaeologists (Kulikauskas 1999; Ikamaitė, 2002) and a volume of the
history of archaeology in Lithuania until 1945 (Kulikauskas, Zabiela 1999). The monographs concerning different time periods in archaeology are all employed as teaching material at university. These publications in their format and their approach to archaeological data are very much similar to the Soviet period publications discussed in the earlier chapters. The descriptive tradition is continued. Reconstruction of prehistoric social organization is not a central concern. There is a strong culture-historical approach and typology of the artefacts seems to be the main concern. Local Lithuanian material is not analyzed in the global context.

Understanding the Past and Forming the Future

In its new, less restrictive environment, Lithuanian Archaeology has diverged to some extent from its Soviet era ancestor: Soviet terminology was largely abandoned, Western and Nordic influences are more obviously present and acknowledged, more space is dedicated to reconstruction of the belief systems of Baltic tribes (Vaitkevičius 2003, Alkai: Baltų Šventviečių Studija) [The Alkai: Research into Baltic Sacred Places]. The latter topic became significant after the collapse of the Union when Lithuanians became free to practice religion. Ancient belief systems of the Baltic tribes are a part of the ethnogenesis debate, which has to do with creation of Lithuanian cultural identity.

Some of the archaeologists who worked in the Soviet period believe that there is no need to change the old paradigm. They claim that Soviet policy did not significantly influence archaeological research. Rimantienė, who specialized in the Lithuanian Stone Age, claims that she did not face any political constraints and served neither Marx nor
Engels during the Soviet years. Today, she continues to write books in the same tradition (Zemlickas 1998). She is one of the most respected archaeologists in Lithuania in the XXth century.

The Soviet political system selected archaeologists who were either pre-adapted or able to adapt to the Soviet political environment, and some of those archaeologists did not even notice the impacts of the policy on research. They were simply doing what they would have done, regardless of the political context. They fit, and were thus allowed to do their work as they wanted. The descriptive archaeological tradition was the most adaptive in the Soviet context in Lithuania. It naturally became the essential approach to archaeological data, first through the selection of archaeologists, and later through their education.

The Soviet period in Lithuanian archaeology is still not analyzed and not discussed to any great extent. For example, Kulikauskas and Zabiela (1999) explicitly adopt a Pre-Soviet definition of Archaeology that rejects social reconstruction, merely because of its Soviet era association (Kulikauskas and Zabiela 1999: 8). Some archaeologists say that the Soviet period is still too sensitive to touch and therefore it remains a task for future generations (Luchtanas, lecture notes).

Lithuanian archaeology is in stagnation. Lithuanian archaeologists have a huge database of archaeologically valuable material. However they need to review the work that has been done in the Soviet period, evaluate its advantages and disadvantages, to name openly the problems that need to be solved and decide about the ways they could be solved. In other words, Lithuanian archaeologists need to create a theoretical framework for their further research. This would help to get into discussion with foreign
archaeologists, broaden their knowledge and share their own experience. Developing a clear picture of the history of Lithuanian archaeology, including the Soviet period, can significantly contribute to establishing a new paradigm and continue conscious development of Lithuanian archaeological thought.

Conclusions

One of the essential aspects that influence the slow pace of the paradigm shift in Lithuanian archaeology in the Post-Soviet period is the mindset that evolved in the Soviet environment. Russian philosopher Alexander Zinoviev recognizes the phenomenon of "Homo sovieticus" in the Post-Soviet countries (Zinoviev, 1985). This phenomenon could be easily traced in many spheres of social life in Lithuania, including the archaeological milieu. Judging by several archaeological publications and my own experience, I can tell that critique aimed at traditionally accepted views in Lithuanian archaeology is not well received and generates hostile responses (Sidrys 1999; Michelbertas 2001). There is no tradition of debate or discussion in the Lithuanian archaeological literature.

It is important to be curious and open minded in science in order to broaden knowledge, hear different views and to form positions with well-based arguments. There is also a strong hierarchy between the older and younger generations of researchers, faculty, and students, which sometimes result in disrespectful behaviour from both sides and constrains the flow of innovative ideas and productive scientific discussions. There still exists indifference towards the work carried on and a lack of initiative, especially in teaching. Often, students' efforts are discouraged and
constructive feedback is very rare. Most courses in the undergraduate archaeology program have not changed in approach since Soviet times – students are merely required to learn local typologies of archaeological artefacts and archaeological sites by heart. No tools are provided for questioning the material. There is simply no encouragement to discuss or interpret the data. The University curriculum is designed to prepare “collectors” of archaeological remains, and does not provide the tools for analysis.

Debates on political influences and biases in archaeology have not gained much attention in Lithuania. The theory of archaeology is still a very new subject and is not discussed enough to significantly contribute to the further formation of Lithuanian archaeological tradition. The upcoming paradigm of archaeology in Lithuania has to evaluate the achievements and flaws of Lithuanian archaeology from the Soviet period and to keep the useful elements and ideas instead of rejecting them completely. Working at the period of paradigm shift, in a favorable environment, Lithuanian archaeologists finally have the opportunity to introduce great variability of ideas for selection and to shape the future traditions of Lithuanian archaeology.
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