
POLARISING FEATURES OF NATIONALISM: THE CASES OF INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA IN THE 1930S, 2008–2009, AND 2015

Audronė Janužytė

Mykolas Romeris University
Institute of Political Science

Ateities st. 20, 08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: audrone_januzyte@mruni.eu

ORCID: 0000-0001-6012-0598

Received: 20 March 2021; accepted for publication: 12 April 2021

DOI: 10.13165/SMS-21-12-1-03

Abstract. *Based on insights into economic nationalism, this article focuses on the forms of nationalism which were manifested in the relations between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees in the independent state of Lithuania. The aim of this article is to highlight features of economic nationalism through an analysis of the relations between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities in two cases of independent Lithuania: 1) ethnic discrimination and ethnic conflicts in the 1930–1940 period; and 2) negative and religious xenophobic attitudes towards immigrants and refugees in the periods of the global financial crisis in 2008–2009 and the refugee crisis in Europe in 2015. This analysis enables us to explain the emergence of economic nationalism as well as its general and specific characteristics in Lithuania, i.e., the reasons triggering the outburst of negative, discriminatory, hostile, or religious xenophobic views of people in Lithuania towards ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees. These views emerged during political, democratic, and refugee crises in Europe and the global financial crisis, and in some cases even resulted in physical violence against minorities –*

especially against Jews in the 1930s.

Keywords: *nationalism, economic nationalism, nationalism in Lithuania, ethnic minorities and groups, ethnic conflicts, immigrants, refugees.*

Introduction

In the process of building the nation-state of Lithuania after declaring independence on 16 February 1918, there was a noticeable growing tendency towards ethnic tensions, hostilities, and conflicts in society in the 1930s. This trend was prompted by global and national economic situations, the political and democratic crisis in Europe, the establishment of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes in other countries, as well as the anti-Semitic and terror-based politics of Nazi Germany against Jews as an ethnic minority and its aggressive foreign policy against neighboring states. All of this affected the domestic policies of Lithuania with respect to its ethnic minorities, specifically in the form of: restrictions of their civil rights and discrimination against them as representatives of ethnic minorities; shaping negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities in the mass media; and even physical violence against them at the local level. After the restoration of the independent state of Lithuania on 11 March 1990, under the conditions of the global financial crisis of 2008–2009, and during the refugee crisis in Europe in 2015, negative or hostile views on ethnic groups, immigrants, and refugees also came into focus. Therefore, the features of economic nationalism can be discerned in independent Lithuania both in the 1930s and in the first two decades of the 21st century. The economic nationalism approach might explain the ways in which national politics affects economics, and what discussions about the relationships between national identities and economic processes were taking place in the different cases of the independent state of Lithuania. According to Andreas Pickel, “Economic nationalism can be understood as a specific ideology and policy doctrine [...] in light of a specific case study [...]”¹ In his opinion, “[...] economic nationalism cannot be examined and assessed as an economic doctrine in an abstract economic framework precisely because it responds to problems situated in a particular historical, political, cultural and social context.”² Insights into economic nationalism presuppose the issues to be discussed in this article, specifically the forms of nationalism which could be identified in the relations of Lithuanians with ethnic minorities and groups as well as immigrants and refugees in cases of independent Lithuania. The aim of this article is to highlight the features of economic nationalism through the analysis of the relations between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities in

1 Pickel, A., “Introduction: False Oppositions. Recontextualizing Economic Nationalism in a Globalizing World”, in *Economic Nationalism in a Globalising World*, edited by E. Helleiner and A. Pickel (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 2005), 2. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctv3s8rx6.5>

2 *Ibid.*, 4.

two cases of independent Lithuania: 1) ethnic discrimination and ethnic conflicts in 1930–1940; and 2) negative and religious xenophobic attitudes towards immigrants and refugees in the periods of the global financial crisis in 2008–2009 and the refugee crisis in Europe in 2015. The relationship of Lithuanians with ethnic minorities and groups is examined based on the research methods of content analysis, document analysis, and the comparative method. The research methods of content and document analysis are applied in revealing Lithuanians' attitudes towards ethnic minorities and groups as well as immigrants and refugees, and also in disclosing the forms of economic nationalism manifested in Lithuanians' relationships with ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees in the independent state of Lithuania. The comparative research method is used to compare the attitudes of Lithuanian society towards ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees in various periods, indicating their similarities and differences as well as identifying the general and specific characteristics of economic nationalism typical of a particular period of independent Lithuania. The sources and literature may be classified into three groups: the first includes publicistic articles of the period discussing ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees. The second group covers research articles and studies of such authors as Liudas Truska, Egidijus Vareikis, Gediminas Vaskela, Vladas Sirutavičius, Darius Staliūnas, and others, examining policies on ethnic minorities and the relationships between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities in the independent Lithuania of the interwar period. The third group comprises sociological research conducted by Diana Janušauskienė³, Vita Petruškaitė, Karolis Žibas, Giedrė Blažytė, and others, as well as opinion polls concerning ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees in Lithuania in the first and second decades of the 21st century.

1. Characteristics of economic nationalism in the 1930s

Many studies have shown that, in the 1930s, conflicts between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities increased in the economic sector. It could be maintained that economic nationalism was emerging as a phenomenon inspired by the protectionist economic policy actively pursued by the Lithuanian Government with respect to Lithuanian business people since the 1930s. This policy was aimed at encouraging (by various means) Lithuanians to engage in business, to incorporate enterprises and banks, and to gradually edge out entrepreneurs of other nationalities from those areas. G. Vaskela, studying national aspects of strengthening the economic positions of

3 The author is grateful to Dr Diana Janušauskienė for permitting the use of data from “Subjective Security in Volatile Geopolitical Context: Traits, Factors and Individual Strategies” (*Subjektyvus saugumas kintančiame geopolitiniame kontekste: ypatumai, formuojantys veiksniai ir individų kuriamos strategijos*, research conducted by the Lithuanian Social Research Centre at Institute of Sociology in 2015–2017, financed by the Research Council of Lithuania. The research head: Dr Diana Janušauskienė. Authors of the research: Diana Janušauskienė, Eglė Vileikienė, Laima Neviskaitė and Ingrida Gečienė-Janulionė).

Lithuanians, discerns the origins of economic nationalism which, in his opinion, are characteristic of “any nation that is reborn and on its way to modernity.”⁴ L. Truska refers to the economic policy pursued by the Government as Lithuanization (Lith. synonyms *lituanizacija/lituanizavimas* / “*atlietuvinimas*”).⁵ However, it is difficult to agree fully with the concept of Lithuanization since the protectionist economic policy of the Government and the movement of Lithuanians for the restriction of the rights of ethnic minorities and groups in the economic sector in the 1930s was essentially directed against banking, trade, and other business sectors operated by entrepreneurs of other nationalities. The processes taking place in economic policy and in public may be referred to as economic nationalism, the characteristics of which were as follows:

1. The protectionist economic policy of the Government of Lithuania, with respect to Lithuanian businesspeople, aimed at pushing out entrepreneurs of other nationalities, especially Jewish, and increasing the relative number of Lithuanians in the trade and banking business sectors. According to V. Sirutavičius and Darius Staliūnas: “The peasants who became Lithuanians (E. Weber) and created a nation state also wanted to create ‘national economy’, i.e. to dominate not only in agriculture, but also in trade and in developing industry, etc.”⁶ Active state-wide protectionist economic policy manifested in the regulation of the agricultural sector, the incorporation of state-owned enterprises, the regulation of permits and concessions in the industrial sector, and the management of foreign trade through licenses and permits.⁷ Establishing Lithuanian cooperatives protected by the state was one of the most efficient measures in assisting Lithuanians to gain a stronger position in business. In 1937, for instance, the exports of the “Pieno centras” dairy association accounted for more than 26% of the country’s total. In 1939, the exports of the “Lietūkis” association of agricultural cooperatives covered 15.5% of in the country’s total, and its import of mineral fertilizers constituted 100% of the country’s total. Further, the same company’s import of salt accounted for 93%, and agricultural machineries accounted for 80% of the country’s total. The export of the “Maistas” public company (with the prevailing state capital)

4 Vaskela, G., “Lietuvių ir žydų santykiai visuomenės modernėjimo ir socialinės sferos politinio reguliavimo aspektais (XX a. pirmoji pusė)”, in *Žydai Lietuvos ekonominėje-socialinėje struktūroje. Tarp tarpininko ir konkurento*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2006), 149.

5 For more, see: Truska, L., “A. Smetonos valdžios politika žydų atžvilgiu (1927–1940)”, *Istorija* 59–90 (2004): 67–81; Truska, L., *Lietuviai ir žydai nuo XIX a. pabaigos iki 1941 m. birželio* (Vilnius: VPU leidykla, 2005); Truska, L., “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga ir verslų „atlietuvinimo“ sąjūdis (1930–1940 m.)”, *Istorija* 58 (2003): 39–49.

6 Sirutavičius, V., and Staliūnas, D., “Antižydiškų pogromų prielaidos Lietuvoje (XIX a.–1940 m. (Vietoj įvado)”. In *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005), 21.

7 Truska, “A. Smetonos valdžios politika”, *supra note*, 5: 74.

accounted for one third of the country's exports in 1939.⁸ The protectionist policy supporting and enabling Lithuanian businesses by means of the policy of concessionary credits and investments, state orders, and permits and concessions yielded results: up to 60% of the entire industry, including crafts, was owned by Lithuanians in the 1930s. Lithuanian companies dominated in exports and imports; for example, in the spring of 1939, exports of Lithuanian companies accounted for 81.2% of the country's exports, and the volume of their imports constituted 52.2% of the country's imports. Jewish businesses of that period accounted for 15% of exports and 35.5% of imports in the country, whereas companies owned by entrepreneurs of other nationalities accounted for 3.8% of exports and 10.9% of imports⁹.

2. The discriminatory policy of the authorities against Jewish individuals ensured that the latter could not take civil service positions in state and municipal institutions (which in fact eliminated them from working within the authorities)¹⁰. As shown by the research of L. Truska, individuals of Jewish nationality were in fact not hired to work at the offices of the president and ministers, military schools, or diplomatic establishments, and very few of them were employed in state and municipal institutions. The same can be seen from the statistical data of the period: in 1934, for instance, 477 out of 35,200 civil servants in state and municipal institutions were Jewish, including 290 working as school teachers. The Ministry of National Defence had 1,800 civil servants, and only 9 were Jewish; the Ministry of Interior employed 5 Jews among its 5,600 civil servants (and 2 Jews out of 3,600 police officers); the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had 3 Jews among its 162 employees; and municipalities employed 60 Jews among their 3,000 civil servants, and only 1 Jew worked among 1,300 military officers.¹¹ Another example of discrimination is associated with the restrictions placed on Jewish individuals when acquiring land.¹² It should also be pointed out that although the relative number of Jews in the economy of Lithuania decreased due to their emigration,¹³ business bankruptcies, and protectionism with respect to Lithuanian businesses and

8 *Ibid*; Truska, „Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga“, *supra note*, 5: 39–40.

9 *Ibid*.

10 Sirutavičius and Staliūnas, *supra note*, 6: 18.

11 Truska, „A. Smetonos valdžios politika“, *supra note*, 5: 73.

12 Vareikis, V., „Žydų ir Lietuvių susidūrimai bei konfliktai tarpukario Lietuvoje“, in *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005), 160.

13 Between 1920 and 1940 some 30,000 Lithuanian Jews left the country, most moving to South Africa and Palestine, and the Jewish populations fell to approximately 150,000. See Polonsky, A. (ed.), *Jews in Poland and Russia 3: 1914 to 2008* (Oxford, Portland, Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012), 229.

economic nationalism, Jews still owned 40% of the industry and crafts in the country, and more than 50% of the retail trade in the late 1930s. Many Jews were specialists of free professions, lawyers, educators, or doctors. In 1937, for instance, out of 798 doctors in Lithuania, 341, or 42.73%, were Jewish.¹⁴

3. Public economic organizations that targeted ethnic minorities proliferated. One example of this is the Lithuanian Business Association (*Lietuvių prekybininkų, pramoninkų ir amatininkų sąjunga – Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga*), founded in 1930, which chose the phrase “Lithuania for Lithuanians” as its slogan and was active from 1930 to 1940. The idea of its slogan contradicted an article of the Constitution of Lithuania stipulating that all persons are equal before the law, and their rights may not be restricted, nor may they be granted any privileges on the grounds of nationality or belief. However, this association promoted economic nationalism with discernible features of economic anti-Semitism. Members of this organization demanded economic reforms in the country that would enable businesspeople of other nationalities (especially Jewish) to be pushed out from the industrial, commercial, and business sectors. They even suggested confiscating the assets of Jewish people based on the Law on Land Reform of 1922, which allowed the expropriation of land from Polish landlords for a symbolic fee.¹⁵ The main aim of this organization was to increase the relative number of Lithuanians in the business, banking, trade, and industry sectors. To achieve this aim, they promoted various businesses among the youth, encouraging relocation to urban areas, engaging in business, and abstaining from buying goods from non-Lithuanian shops. In the 1940s, this association had over 100 divisions, with its membership exceeding 5,000.¹⁶ Their ideas were also supported by such parties and organizations as the Lithuanian Nationalist Union, the Lithuanian Christian Labour Party, the “Young Lithuania” association of national Lithuanian youth (*Lietuvių tautinio jaunimo sąjunga* “*Jaunoji Lietuva*”), the “Spring” Lithuanian Catholic youth federation (*Lietuvos katalikų jaunimo federacija* “*Pavasaris*”), as well as paramilitary organizations such as the Union of Creators and Volunteers of Lithuanian Armed Forces (*Lietuvos kariuomenės kūrėjų savanorių sąjunga*), the Lithuanian Riflemen’s Union (*Lietuvos šaulių sąjunga*), and the Iron Wolf organization (“*Geležinis vilkas*” *organizacija*).
4. Articles were published that propagated national discord, discrimination, and anti-Semitism in Lithuanian newspapers and magazines, e.g., the *Verslas* Lithuanian business weekly (with its *Amatininkas* supplement), and such newspapers and magazines as *Tėvynės sargas*, *Trimitas*, *Lietuva*, *Vienybė*,

14 Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 40; Truska, “A. Smetonos valdžios politika”, *supra note*, 5: 74.

15 Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 42.

16 Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 40.

Pavasaris, Darbininkas, Naujoji Romuva, Židinys, Jaunoji karta, Laisvė, Rytas, Tautos valia, Ūkininkas, etc. Articles in such publications shaped a negative and hostile opinion of ethnic minorities. In the 1930s, the *Verslas* Lithuanian business weekly, with the circulation of 10,000 copies, was, according to Algimantas Kasparavičius, the greatest and loudest mouthpiece of economic anti-Semitism, in the pages of which Jews were blamed for economic hardships, exploiting Lithuanians, taking capital out of the country, granting favorable credit only to their nationals (other Jews), abusing the trading monopoly in rural areas, and undermining Lithuanian entrepreneurs, preventing business growth and the creation of economic prosperity in the country.¹⁷ It should be noted that the pages of the *Verslas* business weekly were in general marked by a negative attitude towards entrepreneurs of various ethnic minorities and groups, and often published discriminatory statements against them, suggesting that the Government should: strive for all public procurement contracts to be awarded only to Lithuanians; prohibit the Lithuanian youth from working for individuals of other nationalities; adopt laws favoring Lithuanians in competition against representatives of other ethnic groups; and enable Lithuanians to gradually take over the businesses of ethnic minorities. For instance, in 1937, Prof. Steponas Kolupaila claimed that “the laws are intended for protecting interests of the master of the country from competitors of other nationalities.”¹⁸ The idea was that “if over 85% of all assets could be accumulated in the hands of Lithuanians [...]”, it would be “the most democratic requirement.”¹⁹ Others argued that it would be quite democratic to require that Lithuanians owned at least 90% of the entire economy of the country.²⁰ On 16 December 1938, one article called for the establishment of quotas in employment and business until such a time as the “majority percentage of Lithuanians is also reflected in commerce.”²¹ The wishes expressed by Emilija Putvinskaitė-Marcinkevičienė, the head of the Riflemen organization, for Lithuanian entrepreneurs to implement the idea of Lithuania being only for Lithuanians are a particularly illustrative claim.²² Other above-mentioned periodicals also reflected a negative attitude towards ethnic minorities and

17 Kasparavičius, A., “Lietuviai ir žydai katastrofos išvakarėse: Iššūkiai ir įvaidžiai”, in *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005), 132.

18 Kolupaila, S., “Dar vienas pralaimėjimas”, *Verslas* 3 (1937), 1; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 42.

19 “Ko mes norime. Lietuvių verslininkų dabartiniai siekiai”, *Verslas* 50 (1938), 1.

20 Kovas, J., “Neabejokim miestų reformos”, *Verslas* 50 (1938), 4.

21 Polonsky, *supra note*, 13: 229.

22 “Kapitalai turi būti lietuvių rankose”, *Verslas* 25 (1939), 1; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 44.

groups. For instances, articles in the *Tėvynės sargas* referred to Russians as those who bring Russification, oppose to and persecute Catholicism, lie, steal, and are lazy exploiters willing to rob Lithuanians of their land; the Jews were accused of swindling, cheating, and stealing, and people were encouraged to boycott Jewish goods, restrict the rights of Jews to lease or acquire land, and even to limit their civil rights. Poles were accused of Polonising Lithuanians, being unwilling to speak Lithuanian, and poaching famous historic figures of Lithuanian origin, and people were invited to abstain from buying goods from Poles.²³ According to V. Sirutavičius: “Minorities were often described as hostile (especially Poles, because of the conflict with Poland) or selfish, conceited, and unconcerned about forming a strong Lithuanian state (this was a more typical description of Jews).²⁴

5. Public meetings inciting national discord, discrimination, and promoting anti-Semitism were held. For instance, Juozas Markulis, one of the lecturers of the Christian Labour Party, made a public promise not to buy goods from people of other nationalities at a lecture on “making the business Lithuanian again” in 1935, which was attended by 200 members of the “Spring”²⁵ Lithuanian Catholic youth federation. The festival of the cities of the Dzūkija region took place in Alytus on 6 June 1937, where General Jonas Jurgis Bulata declared that he did not wish to die until Lithuania became Lithuanian. Bishop Mečislovas Reinys boasted at a party of the members of the Anykščiai branch of the Lithuanian Business Association on 10 July 1938 that he was shopping only at Lithuanian traders.²⁶ On 19 February 1939, a resolution addressed to the Government was adopted and signed by 500 participants at a festival of Lithuanian businesses organized by the Skaudvilė branch of the Lithuanian Business Association. It was demanded in this resolution to impose restrictions on the rights of Jews – i.e., prohibiting trading on Sundays, shifting the market day from Sunday to Saturday, banning ritual slaughtering of cattle, and depriving Jews who illegally settled in Lithuania after 1918 of citizenship.²⁷ The meeting of the Union of Creators and Volunteers of the Lithuanian Armed Forces held in June 1939 in Kaunas accused its long-standing Chairman Petras Gužas of favoring Jews, and he lost his position. The new

23 Vaskela, *supra note*, 4: 151, 154–157.

24 Sirutavičius, V., “‘Close, but very suspicious and dangerous neighbor’: Outbreaks of antisemitism in Inter-War Lithuania”, in *Jews in the Former Grand Duchy of Lithuania since 1772*, edited by Š. Liekis, A. Polonsky, and C. Y. Freeze (Liverpool University Press, 2013), 246.

25 “Pavasarininkai remia mėlynuosius ženklus”, *Verslas* 7 (1935), 3; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 45.

26 “Jūsų, verslininkai, sąjūdis suvaidins...”, *Verslas* 28 (1938), 3–2; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 45.

27 Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 43.

- chairman, Colonel Antanas Mačiuka, said that if Lithuanians wanted to be independent, they should have economic along with political independence: “[...] the minorities [...] will have to adapt to us.”²⁸ In his speech at the 7th anniversary of the Kalvarijos branch of the Lithuanian Business Association in the spring of 1939, Dr. Eliziejus Draugelis, a figure in the Catholic community, wished for Lithuanian business people to have more rights than citizens of other nationalities “as the Lithuanian is a master and he must always have priority.”²⁹ On 15 August 1939, proclamation leaflets of the *Verslas* editorial board containing the slogan “Lithuania for Lithuanians” were distributed at a cooperation festival held in Jurbarkas, which was attended by 4,500 people.³⁰
6. National conflicts and anti-Semitic acts of violence occurred. Examples of anti-Semitic campaigns include the dissemination of leaflets against Jews, defacing non-Lithuanian signs, breaking the windows of Jewish houses, companies, and shops, as well as acts of brutality and collective violence. Most of the violence against Jews was carried out by lower-middle-class Lithuanians in small towns, and by gymnasium pupils and university students in Kaunas. Members of the Lithuanian Riflemen’s Union and the “Young Lithuania” association of national Lithuanian youth were often involved in anti-Semitic campaigns in various provinces of Lithuania.³¹ One of the more serious conflicts took place on 1 August 1929 in Kaunas, Vilijampolė, in a scuffle between leftist (mostly Jewish) and Lithuanian workers. Several police officers were also involved in the conflict. In 1932, one police officer and 7 other individuals were sentenced to imprisonment for between 3 and 9 months.³² One example of collective violence (a pogrom) is the incident in Leipalingis on 18 June 1939, where local Jews were assaulted and the windows of their homes were smashed (the window panes of 22 Jewish houses and the synagogue were broken). The Jews were protected from physical attack only by police intervention. The most active participants in the pogrom and the main instigators of the crowd were three members of the Lithuanian Riflemen’s Union and one member of the “Spring” Lithuanian Catholic youth federation. Five individuals were sentenced to one month of imprisonment or a fine of 1,000 Lithuanian litas each, and 13 individuals were sentenced to 1 week in custody or a fine of 200 Lithuanian litas.³³ Another example of collective violence can be seen in the

28 “Savanorių sąjunga steigia ekonominę komisiją”, *Verslas* 25 (1939), 3; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 44.

29 “Didelės verslininkų iškilmės Alytuje”, *Verslas* 22 (1939), 3; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 45.

30 Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 43–45.

31 Vareikis, *supra note*, 12: 165.

32 *Ibid.*, 170–171.

33 For more, see: Mačiulis, D., “Žvilgsnis į vieno pogromo anatomiją tarpukario Lietuvoje”. In *Kai kse-*

pogrom of 30 October–1 November 1939 in Vilnius, during which 22 Jews were seriously injured and 13 were left with minor injuries at the hands of Polish aggressors. The Jews accused the Lithuanian Government of failing to prevent the violence, and blamed the Lithuanian police for supporting the aggressive crowd. The passivity of the authorities can be explained by their attempts to reduce ethnic tensions and to stabilize the situation in the recently regained Vilnius Region.³⁴ It should be pointed out, however, that no deaths occurred in anti-Jewish riots or pogroms in the inter-war period in Lithuania.³⁵

There were a number of reasons which prompted the rise of economic nationalism. On the one hand, this rise is related to the economic, social, and cultural gap between ethnic minorities and Lithuanians. On the other hand, the merely formal levelling of constitutional rights accompanied by discriminatory politics limiting the employment of individuals of other nationalities at state institutions did not bridge the widening social and cultural gap, particularly in the conditions of the global economic recession in 1929–1932. Although the Government of Lithuania attempted to curb the incitement of national conflicts and manifestations of anti-Semitism,³⁶ the same Government essentially locked up and failed to resolve the causes of national discord. Furthermore, the protectionist economic policy pursued by the Government with respect to Lithuanian businesspeople did not consolidate the society of Lithuania in overcoming the consequences of the global recession in the country. On the contrary, it deepened the economic gap between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities, and prompted economic nationalism. Another important factor for the development of economic nationalism was the building of a nation state, where ethnic minorities and groups were perceived as an obstacle to an ethnocentric state, to economic modernization, and to Lithuanians competing with representatives of other nationalities. According to V. Sirutavičius, “various Lithuanian social organizations were formed that not only actively tried to strengthen ‘national consciousness’ or to nationalize

nofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005), 181–212; Truska, “A. Smetonos valdžios politika”, *supra note*, 5: 72.

34 Vareikis, *supra note*, 12: 179.

35 *Ibid.*, 162; Sirutavičius and Staliūnas, *supra note*, 6: 11.

36 Incitement to national hatred entailed financial penalties of up to LTL 1,500, and criminal prosecution with possible imprisonment for 2 months or expulsion from the territory of residence. In addition, it should be noted that there were no legal acts restricting the rights of Jewish people. In fact, some periodicals which promoted anti-Semitism were banned. For instance, the *Tautos žodis* weekly, the articles of which created an image of a Jew as an exploiter of Lithuanians undermining the state of Lithuania, was banned in 1927, and its most active publishers were imprisoned in the Varniai Concentration Camp for a few months. The editor of *Tautos žodis* was imprisoned for 1 month in 1933 for incitement to national hatred. For more, see: Vareikis, *supra note*, 12: 172, 174; Kasparavičius, *supra note*, 17: 125–126; Truska, “Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga”, *supra note*, 5: 40; Truska, “A. Smetonos valdžios politika”, *supra note*, 5: 71–72.

the state, but also aimed to combat ‘foreigners’, opposing the ‘negative’ influences of ethnic minorities.³⁷

2. Features of economic nationalism in 2008–2009 and 2015

A comparison of the relations between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities and groups in the 1930s and in 2008–2015 reveals several similarities. First, during the periods of the global economic recession and financial crisis and the refugee crisis in Europe, Lithuanians’ hostility towards representatives of other nationalities and races heightened, and acquired the features of economic nationalism. Such slogans as “Lithuania for Lithuanians” returned to radical media and extremist movements in Lithuania. For instance, a Turkish respondent in an interview on 27 July 2011 said that his fellow countrymen and he had encountered flare-ups of national hatred from Lithuanians: “[...] one of them called us Arabs and shouted that we should get out of Lithuania [...], and it was not pleasant to hear ‘Lithuania for Lithuanians’ when celebrating the Day of Independence of Lithuania on March 11th together with Lithuanians in the common march on Gediminas Avenue” (author’s note – the main street of Vilnius).³⁸ In the view of Patrick Taran, given the conditions of economic recession and high unemployment rates in the country, labor migrants are often accused of taking the jobs of local residents, which increases negative attitudes towards them. Based on opinion polls conducted in 2009, public attitudes towards labor migrants were more negative rather than positive in Lithuania.³⁹ The reasons for such negative views were threats associated with immigrants, namely the loss of jobs and potential social disturbances in the country. For instance, according to data from 2010–2014 opinion polls, more than half of the respondents thought that the migrants residing in the country were supported by Lithuanian taxpayers’ money,⁴⁰ and that the arrival of migrants could cause social disturbances.⁴¹ Other risks were associated with the

37 Sirutavičius, *supra note*, 24: 246.

38 Interview on 27 July 2011, from Žibas, K., *Kinų ir turkų imigrantai Lietuvoje* (Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, 2014), 147.

39 Petrušauskaitė, V., and Žibas, K., “Darbo migrantai Europoje ir Lietuvoje: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų problematika”, in *Etniškumo studijos = Ethnicity Studies I: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų Lietuvoje* (Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015), 14–15.

40 In 2010, 57.5% of respondents believed that immigrants living in Lithuania were supported financially by Lithuanian taxpayers; in 2011, this opinion was shared by 54.4%; in 2012 and 2013, this attitude was maintained by as many as 61% of respondents; and in 2014, this number dropped to 57%. See: Žibas, *supra note*, 38: 78, 190; Blažytė, G., “Visuomenės nuostatos imigracijos atžvilgiu ir jų atsiradimo prielaidos”, in *Etniškumo studijos = Ethnicity Studies I: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų Lietuvoje* (Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015), 120.

41 In 2010, this opinion was shared by 51.4% of respondents; in 2011, this number was 51.1%; in 2012, this position was supported by 52.9%; and in 2014, this attitude was maintained by 54% of respondents. See: Žibas, *supra note*, 38: 78, 118, 192; Petrušauskaitė et al., “Darbo migrantų Lietuvoje gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų rodiklių sąvadas”, in *Etniškumo studijos = Ethnicity Studies I: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo*

rising unemployment rates in the country, and potential threats which could stem from the cultural and ethnic differences of immigrants. Based on the data of the European Commission of 2009, nearly two thirds of the respondents in Lithuania agreed that unemployment in Lithuania was related to the coming of people of other ethnic groups into the country.⁴² In 2014–2015, almost two thirds of respondents in Lithuania expressed their approval of strict measures regulating of the arrival of labor.⁴³ According to the 2010–2014 opinion polls, attitudes about schoolchildren being in the same class as the children of immigrants remained unchanged, with half of the respondents being unwilling for their children to learn in the same class as the children of immigrants.⁴⁴

It should be pointed out that most surveys seem to indicate a certain contradiction between the opinions of the public about national security and those on the arrival of immigrants and refugees. On the one hand, Eurobarometer polls in 2015 and 2017 showed that Lithuania was a secure country. However, when Lithuanian respondents were asked: “*To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of following statements about security? Your country is a secure place to live*”, in 2015, 27% (EU28 – 35%) totally agreed and 49% (EU28 – 47%) tended to agree.⁴⁵ In 2017, 42% (EU28 – 37%) totally agreed, and 46% (EU28 – 45%) tended to agree.⁴⁶ To sum up the Eurobarometer polls, 76% (EU28 – 82%) of Lithuanian respondents agreed that their country was a secure place to live in 2015, and 88% (EU28 – 82%) shared this opinion in 2017. In general, it should be emphasized that based on the security indicators (Global Peace Index), Lithuania is ranked highly as a state of peace. In 2010, it was ranked 42nd globally; in 2011–2013, it came 43rd globally; in 2014, it was listed 46th globally; in 2015–2017, it was ranked 37th globally; in 2018, it came 36th globally; and in 2019, it was ranked 39th globally.⁴⁷

ir darbo sąlygos Lietuvoje (Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015), 63–64.

42 Blažytė, *supra note*, 40: 108–109, 115.

43 Petrušauskaitė et al., *supra note*, 41: 67.

44 Blažytė, *supra note*, 40: 119.

45 *Europeans' Attitudes Towards Security: Special Eurobarometer 432 report* (European Commission, March 2015), 10. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c3c03fb3-4ff3-4cee-9b29-b31228a339f9/language-en>

46 *Europeans' Attitudes Towards Security: Special Eurobarometer 464b* (European Commission, June 2017), 9. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/SPECIAL/surveyKy/15692020>

47 Institute for Economics & Peace, *Global Peace Index 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019*. Accessed 20 August 2020, from https://www.peacewomen.org/sites/default/files/wps.iep_gpi2010_methodologyresultsfindings.2010_0.pdf; <http://gtmarket.ru/files/news/2011/global-peace-index-report-2011.pdf>; <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2012-Global-Peace-Index-Report.pdf>; <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Global%20Peace%20Index%202013.pdf>; <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2014%20Global%20Peace%20Index%20REPORT.pdf>; <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-peace-index-2015>; https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI%202016%20Report_2.pdf; <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/>

On the other hand, although Lithuania has remained untouched by the wave of refugee migration, in 2016 the majority of the population still had very hostile attitudes regarding refugees. The entry and settlement of refugees into Lithuania was associated with growing threats to the national security of Lithuania and its citizens. On 19 May 2016, a study entitled “Subjective Security in the Changing Geopolitical Context: Peculiarities, Shaping Factors, and Strategies Created by Individuals” was presented, and its quantitative and qualitative data showed that that 26.1% of respondents considered refugees a great threat to Lithuania (despite the fact that only 11 refugees were actually present in Lithuania in 2016 when the survey was carried out).⁴⁸ According to the data of this study, the perceived threats related to the issue of refugees can be divided into several areas as follows.

1. *Threats to national security*: 80% of respondents thought that refugees would bring a risk of terrorism; 74% thought that refugees from Asia and Africa would bring problems of national security to Lithuania and the EU⁴⁹; and 39.4% thought that national security would be subjected to a higher risk of terrorism as refugees might resort to acts of terror.
2. *Threats to individual physical security*: 36.5% of respondents thought that individual physical security would be threatened, as crime rates in the country would rise; and 42% thought that residents would not feel safe in public places in general.
3. *Threats to social-cultural security*: 27.4% of respondents thought that the national composition of Lithuania would change, and Lithuania would lose its culture and identity; and 18.4% thought that Christian values would be harmed.
4. *Threats to economic security*: 20.9% of respondents believed that refugees would take jobs from locals; and 36.9% thought that the state would suffer financially as it would have to pay welfare benefits for refugees.⁵⁰

The perception of a huge economic, social, and cultural disjuncture among different nationalities was also signaled by the fact that 6 out of 10 residents thought that refugees should be denied entry into Lithuania; 7 out of 10 were against the possibility for refugees to take Lithuanian citizenship; 6 out of 10 did not want to work with refugees; 7 out of 10 would not want refugees as neighbors; 7 out of 10 would not

GPI-2017-Report-1.pdf; <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Global-Peace-Index-2018-2.pdf>; <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI-2019-web003.pdf>

48 Janušauskienė et al., “Subjektyvus saugumas kintančiame geopolitiniame kontekste: ypatumai, formuojantys veiksniai ir individų kuriamos strategijos”, Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro (LSTC) Sociologijos instituto 2015–2017 m. vykdomo LMT finansuojamo projekto tyrimo duomenų pristatymas (Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Sociologijos institutas, 2016 m. gegužės 19 d.).

49 Janušauskienė et al., *Ar Lietuvos gyventojai jaučiasi saugūs? Subjektyvus saugumas kintančiame geopolitiniame kontekste* (Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, 2017), 29–30, 107.

50 Janušauskienė et al., 2016, *supra note*, 48.

want refugees as friends; and 8 out of 10 would not consent to their son or daughter marrying a refugee.⁵¹

Present-day Lithuanian society is characterized by a prevailing negative attitude towards receiving refugees in the country, and most respondents would ignore or would be hostile with respect to refugees: 44.2% claimed they would pretend not to notice refugees; 28.3% would shun them, e.g., they would not enter a cafe if they saw refugees inside; 12% would take civic actions against refugees, e.g., they would participate in protest meetings and campaigns; and 1.7% would take physical actions against refugees whenever an opportunity presented itself.⁵² However, some positive views towards refugees should also be acknowledged: younger people tended to be more compassionate towards refugees, as 30% of respondents aged 18–25 years sympathized with refugees, whereas only 17% of respondents older than 66 years did so.⁵³ Additionally, 17.1% would try to meet refugees; and 13% would try to assist them, e.g., by donating to charities, teaching Lithuanian, etc.⁵⁴

Sociological studies and public surveys indicate that modern Lithuanian society is still not open to cultural and religious diversity. A xenophobic view of people professing different religions prevails. Citizens of Lithuania are suspicious about refugees who come from countries where the dominant religion is Islam, and the majority are highly intolerant of, and indeed hostile towards, these individuals (resorting to violent acts against such refugees cannot be ruled out either). Refugees are associated both with threats to national security and threats to physical, social-cultural, and economic individual security. They are associated with acts of terror and crime; causing harm to culture, identity, and Christian values; the loss of jobs; and decreases in welfare benefits payments.

Nevertheless, certain changes in the attitudes of modern society in dealing with manifestations of national intolerance and religious xenophobia should also be acknowledged. Based on research data, a third of respondents expressed positive attitudes towards refugees, and would help them to integrate in Lithuania.

Conclusion

In summarizing, it could be claimed that the emergence of economic nationalism in independent Lithuania was influenced by the processes taking place in the country, in Europe, and around the world. This allows us to explain the rise of economic nationalism as well as its general and specific characteristics in Lithuania, i.e., given the context of political, democratic, or refugee crises in Europe and the global financial

51 Janušauskienė et al., 2017, *supra note*, 49: 27.

52 Janušauskienė et al., 2016, *supra note*, 48.

53 Janušauskienė et al., 2017, *supra note*, 49: 27.

54 Janušauskienė et al., 2016, *supra note*, 48.

crisis. It is also possible to identify the reasons which prompted the negative, discriminatory, hostile, or religious xenophobic views of Lithuanian residents towards ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees, in some cases escalating to physical violence against them – especially against Jews in the 1930s.

In terms of the relationships between Lithuanians and ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees, this analysis has revealed that general and specific features of economic nationalism characteristic of certain periods of independent Lithuania can be discerned both in the 1930s and in the first two decades of the 21st century.

The general characteristics typical of economic nationalism are seen in the following range of forms through which it targeted ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, and refugees of various nationalities.

1. The dissemination of ethnic discord in the media and social networks, shaping a negative and hostile opinion about ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, or refugees – e.g., by accusing Russians of Russification and calling them invaders; by accusing Jews of stealing businesses from Lithuanians and calling them exploiters of Lithuanians; by accusing Poles of Polonisation or creating ethnic tensions in South-Eastern Lithuania, etc.
2. The activities of political and social organizations or movements aimed at ethnic minorities, immigrants, and refugees, and demands to restrict their businesses, boycott their goods and services, and refuse those seeking work or political asylum entry into the country.
3. Public rallies and demonstrations instigating nationalist sentiment; e.g., the typical slogan of nationalist demonstrations – “Lithuania for Lithuanians” – is insulting both to the feelings and the dignity of people of various nationalities and also violates the Constitution of Lithuania, which states that all persons are equal before the law and their rights may not be restricted, nor may they be granted any privileges on the ground of nationality or belief.
4. Provoking ethnic conflicts or acts of violence against minorities, groups, immigrants, or refugees (including damaging monuments and property by arson or otherwise and physical violence).

The specific characteristics of economic nationalism are as follows.

1. The economic nationalism of the 1930s was also promoted by protectionist economic policy exhibiting certain aspects of ethnic discrimination, with the aim of ousting entrepreneurs of several nationalities from industrial, financial, and trade sectors. To that end, Lithuanians were given preferential treatment by the Government of Lithuania, which provided exclusive and beneficial conditions for Lithuanians to start new businesses, protected their existing businesses by means of awarding public contracts and granting concessional loans, established state-owned companies, regulated prices, and applied both concessions in industry and licenses in foreign trade.
2. At the local level, ethnic conflicts would sometimes escalate into physical violence, essentially against one ethnic minority (Jews). This was, to some extent,

affected by the anti-Semitic sentiment instigated in the press, the anti-Semitic activities of some organizations, and, partly, the protectionist economic policy pursued by the Government that aimed to restrict or oust Jews from industrial, banking, and trade businesses.

Looking prospectively, one cannot state definitely that the growth of nationalist sentiment with respect to ethnic minorities and groups might be foreseen in Lithuania. On the one hand, Lithuania is an independent and democratic state, warranting rights to language, traditions, culture, and freedom of beliefs and consciousness to its citizens. Acts instigating national hatred are not tolerated and entail criminal prosecution; thus, nationalist sentiment should not spread in society. On the other hand, certain nationalist moods or social tensions may build up in the event of, for instance, re-opened conflicts between Lithuanians and Poles over the writing of personal and place names in Polish (which is not the official state language) in South-Eastern Lithuania; immigrants being discriminated against in employment relations; or the worsening economic situation in Lithuania in general as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Nonetheless, it is encouraging that the majority of Lithuanian citizens associate the flaws of the state and economic hardships with the national or regional politics pursued by the Government rather than with ethnic minorities, groups, immigrants, or refugees.

References

- Blažytė, G. “Visuomenės nuostatos imigracijos atžvilgiu ir jų atsiradimo prielaidos”. In *Etniškumo studijos = Ethnicity Studies 1: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygos Lietuvoje*, 107–134. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015.
- “Didelės verslininkų išskilmės Alytuje”. *Verslas* 22 (1939), 3.
- Europeans’ Attitudes Towards Security: Special Eurobarometer 432 report*. European Commission, March 2015. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c3c03fb3-4ff3-4cee-9b29-b31228a339f9/language-en>
- Europeans’ Attitudes Towards Security: Special Eurobarometer 464b*. European Commission, June 2017. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/SPECIAL/surveyKy/15692020>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2010: 2010 Methodology, Results & Findings*. Sydney, 2010. Accessed 20 August 2020, from https://www.peacewomen.org/sites/default/files/wps.iep_gpi2010_methodologyresultsfindings.2010_0.pdf
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2011: 2011 Methodology, Results & Findings*. Sydney, 2011. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <http://gtmarket.ru/files/news/2011/global-peace-index-report-2011.pdf>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2012: Quantifying Peace and Its Benefits*. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2012-Global-Peace-Index-Report.pdf>

- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2013: Measuring the State of Global Peace*. Sydney, 2013. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Global%20Peace%20Index%202013.pdf>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2014: Measuring Peace and Assessing Country Risk*. Sydney, 2014. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2014%20Global%20Peace%20Index%20REPORT.pdf>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2015: Measuring Peace, Its Causes and Its Economic Value*. Sydney, 2015. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-peace-index-2015>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2016: Ten Years of Measuring Peace*. Sydney, June 2016. Accessed 20 August 2020, from https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI%202016%20Report_2.pdf
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2017: Measuring Peace in a Complex World*. Sydney, June 2017. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI-2017-Report-1.pdf>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2018: Measuring Peace in a Complex World*. Sydney, June 2018. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Global-Peace-Index-2018-2.pdf>
- Institute for Economics & Peace. *Global Peace Index 2019: Measuring Peace in a Complex World*. Sydney, June 2019. Accessed 20 August 2020, from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/GPI-2019-web003.pdf>
- Janušauskienė, D., Vileikienė, E., Nevinskaitė, L., and Gečienė-Janulionė, I. *Ar Lietuvos gyventojai jaučiasi saugūs? Subjektyvus saugumas kintančiame geopolitiniame kontekste*. Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, 2017.
- Janušauskienė, D., et al. “Subjektyvus saugumas kintančiame geopolitiniame kontekste: ypatumai, formuojantys veiksniai ir individų kuriamos strategijos”. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro (LSTC) Sociologijos instituto 2015–2017 m. vykdomo LMT finansuojamo projekto tyrimo duomenų pristatymas. Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Sociologijos institutas, 2016 m. gegužės 19 d.
- “Jūsų, verslininkai, sąjūdis suvaidins...”. *Verslas* 28 (1938), 3–2.
- “Kapitalai turi būti lietuvių rankose”. *Verslas* 25 (1939), 1.
- Kasparavičius, A. “Lietuviai ir žydai katastrofos išvakarėse: Iššūkių ir įvaizdžių”. In *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas, 117–156. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005.
- “Ko mes norime. Lietuvių verslininkų dabartiniai siekiai”. *Verslas* 50 (1938), 1.
- Kolupaila, S. “Dar vienas pralaimėjimas”. *Verslas* 3 (1937), 1.
- Kovas, J. “Neabejokim miestų reformos”. *Verslas* 50 (1938), 4.
- Mačiulis, D. “Žvilgsnis į vieno pogromo anantomiją tarpukario Lietuvoje”. In *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas, 181–212. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005.
- “Pavasarininkai remia mėlynuosius ženklus”. *Verslas* 7 (1935), 3.

- Petrušauskaitė, V., and Žibas, K. "Darbo migrantai Europoje ir Lietuvoje: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų problematika". In *Etniško studijos = Ethnicity Studies 1: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygos Lietuvoje*, 11–27. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015.
- Petrušauskaitė, V., and Žibas, K., and Batuchina, A. "Darbo migrantų Lietuvoje gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų rodiklių sąvadas". In: *Etniško studijos = Ethnicity Studies 1: Darbo migrantai: gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygos Lietuvoje*, 48–78. Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centro Etninių tyrimų institutas, 2015.
- Pickel, A. "Introduction: False Oppositions. Recontextualizing Economic Nationalism in a Globalizing World". In *Economic Nationalism in a Globalising World*, edited by E. Helleiner and A. Pickel, 1–18. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 2005. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctv3s8rx6.5>
- Polonsky, A. (ed.). *Jews in Poland and Russia 3: 1914 to 2008*. Oxford, Portland, Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012.
- "Savanorių sąjunga steigia ekonominę komisiją". *Verslas* 25 (1939), 3.
- Sirutavičius, V. "Close, but very suspicious and dangerous neighbour: outbreaks of antisemitism in Inter-War Lithuania". In *Jews in the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania since 1772*, edited by Š. Liekis, A. Polonsky, and C. Y. Freeze, 245–262. Liverpool University Press, 2013.
- Sirutavičius, V., and Staliūnas, D. "Anti-žydiškų pogromų prielaidos Lietuvoje (XIX a.–1940 m. (Vietoj įvado)". In *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas, 7–24. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005.
- Truska, L. "A. Smetonos valdžios politika žydų atžvilgiu (1927–1940)". *Istorija* 59–60 (2004): 67–81.
- Truska, L. *Lietuviai ir žydai nuo XIX a. pabaigos iki 1941 m. birželio*. Vilnius: VPU leidykla, 2005.
- Truska, L. "Lietuvių verslininkų sąjunga ir verslų „atlietuvinimo“ sąjūdis (1930–1940 m.)". *Istorija* 58 (2003): 39–49.
- Vareikis, V. "Žydų ir Lietuvių susidūrimai bei konfliktai tarpukario Lietuvoje". In *Kai ksenofobija virsta prievarta. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių dinamika XIX a.–XX a. pirmoje pusėje*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas, 157–180. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2005.
- Vaskela, G. "Lietuvių ir žydų santykiai visuomenės modernėjimo ir socialinės sferos politinio reguliavimo aspektais (XX a. pirmoji pusė)". In *Žydai Lietuvos ekonominėje-socialinėje struktūroje. Tarp tarpininko ir konkurento*, compiled by V. Sirutavičius and D. Staliūnas, 133–175. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2006.
- Žibas, K. *Kinų ir turkų imigrantai Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: Lietuvos socialinių tyrimų centras, 2014.

SUPRIEŠINANTYS NACIONALIZMO BRUOŽAI: NEPRIKLAUSOMOS LIETUVOS ATVEJAI 1930–1940, 2008– 2009 IR 2015 M.

Audronė Janužytė

Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Vilnius, Lietuva

Santrauka. Straipsnyje, remiantis ekonominio nacionalizmo įžvalgomis, nagrinėjamos nacionalizmo formos, pasireiškusios lietuvių santykiuose su etninėmis mažumomis, grupėmis, imigrantais ir pabėgėliais nepriklausomoje Lietuvos valstybėje. Straipsnio tikslas – nagrinėjant lietuvių ir etninių mažumų santykius išryškinti ekonominio nacionalizmo bruožus dviem nepriklausomos Lietuvos atvejais: 1) etninė diskriminacija ir etniniai konfliktai 1930–1940 m.; 2) neigiamas ir religinis ksenofobinis požiūris į imigrantus ir pabėgėlius 2008–2009 m. pasaulinės finansinės krizės ir 2015 m. pabėgėlių krizės Europoje laikotarpiams. Tai leidžia paaiškinti ekonominio nacionalizmo atsiradimą ir jo bendrus bei specifinius bruožus Lietuvoje, t. y. kodėl politinių, demokratijos ar pabėgėlių krizių Europoje, taip pat pasaulinės finansinės krizės sąlygomis prasiveržia negatyvus, diskriminacinis, priešiškas ar religinis ksenofobinis Lietuvos piliečių požiūris į etnines mažumas, grupes, imigrantus ir pabėgėlius, o kai kuriais atvejais – ir fizinis smurtas prieš juos, ypač prieš žydus XX a. 4-ajame dešimtmetyje. Straipsnyje prieita prie šių išvadų: 1. Ekonominio nacionalizmo atsiradimą nepriklausomoje Lietuvoje veikė procesai šalyje, Europoje ir pasaulyje. 2. Lietuvių santykių su etninėmis mažumomis, grupėmis, imigrantais ir pabėgėliais analizė atskleidė, kad tiek XX a. 4-ajame dešimtmetyje, tiek XXI a. 1-ajame ir 2-ajame dešimtmečiuose galima įžvelgti bendrų ir specifinių ekonominio nacionalizmo bruožų, būdingų konkrečiam nepriklausomos Lietuvos laikotarpio atvejui. 3. Bendriems ekonominio nacionalizmo bruožams būdinga tai, kad ekonominis nacionalizmas nukreiptas prieš etnines mažumas, grupes, įvairių tautybių imigrantus ir pabėgėlius gali atsiskleisti įvairiomis raiškos formomis: 1) etninės nesantaikos sklaida žiniasklaidoje ir socialiniuose tinkluose, kai formuojama negatyvi ir priešiška nuomonė apie etnines mažumas, grupes, imigrantus ar pabėgėlius, pavyzdžiui, kaltinant rusus rusifikacija ar vadinant juos okupantais, kaltinant žydus, kad jie atėmė iš lietuvių verslus, ar vadinant juos lietuvių išnaudotojais, kaltinant lenkus dėl polonizacijos ar etninių įtampų kūrimo Pietryčių Lietuvoje ir pan.; 2) politinių ir visuomeninių organizacijų veikla ar visuomeniniais judėjimais, nukreiptais prieš etnines mažumas, imigrantus ir pabėgėlius, kai reikalaujama riboti jų verslus ar boikotuoti jų prekes ir paslaugas, taip pat neleisti atvykti dirbti ar ieškoti politinio prieglobsčio Lietuvoje; 3) viešais susirinkimais ir demonstracijomis, kai kurstomos nacionalistinės nuotaikos, pavyzdžiui, tipinis nacionalistinis demonstracijų šūkis „Lietuva lietuviams“ net tik žeidžia įvairių tautybių piliečių jausmus ir orumą, bet taip pat prieštarauja Lietuvos Konstitucijai, kad visi

Lietuvos piliečiai yra lygūs prieš įstatymus, nesuteikiant jiems privilegijų ir ribojant jų teises dėl tikėjimo ir tautybės; ir 4) provokuojant tautinius konfliktus ar naudojant smurto veiksmus prieš etnines mažumas, grupes, imigrantus ar pabėgėlius (paminklų, turto niokojimas (padegimai ir etc.) ir fizinis smurtas). 4. Specifiniai ekonominio nacionalizmo bruožai yra: 1) XX a. 4-ojo deš. ekonominį nacionalizmą skatino ir protekcionistinė ekonominė politika, kurioje galima išvelgti etninės diskriminacijos bruožų, siekiant iš pramonės, finansų ir prekybos sektorių išstumti įvairių tautybių verslininkus. Dėl to Lietuvos vyriausybė sudarė išimtinių ir palankių sąlygų lietuviams imtis naujų verslų, protegavo jų verslus per valstybinius užsakymus ir lengvatinius kreditus, steigė valstybines įmones, reguliavo kainas, taikė koncesijas pramonėje ir licencijas užsienio prekyboje; ir 2) lokaliu lygmeniu etniniai konfliktai peraugdavo į fizinį smurtą, iš esmės prieš vieną etninę mažumą – žydus. Tam tikros įtakos turėjo kurstomos antisemitinės nuotaikos žiniasklaidoje, kai kurių organizacijų antižydiška veikla ir iš dalies vyriausybės vykdoma protekcionistinė ekonominė politika, kurios tikslas buvo riboti ar išstumti žydus iš pramonės, bankų ir prekybos verslų. Žvelgiant į ateitį negalima vienareikšmiškai atsakyti, ar galima prognozuoti, kad Lietuvoje nacionalistinės nuotaikos dėl etninių mažumų, grupių ir imigrantų gali išaugti. Viena vertus, Lietuva yra nepriklausoma, demokratinė valstybė, kurioje garantuojamos kalbos, tradicijų, kultūros, tikėjimo ir sąžinės laisvė visiems jos piliečiams. Nacionalinės neapykantos kurstymo veika nėra toleruojama ir už tai numatoma baudžiamoji atsakomybė, todėl nacionalistinės nuotaikos neturėtų plėstis visuomenėje. Kita vertus, tam tikra nacionalistinė ar socialinė įtampa gali sustiprėti visuomenėje, pavyzdžiui, jei tarp lietuvių ir lenkų atsinaujintų konfliktai dėl vietovardžių rašymo ne valstybine lenkų kalba Pietryčių Lietuvoje, arba jei imigrantai dėl darbo santykių patirtų diskriminaciją, ir jei apskritai Lietuvoje pablogėtų ekonominė situacija dėl COVID-19 pandemijos. Tačiau vilties teikia tai, kad dauguma Lietuvos piliečių valstybės ydas ir ekonominius sunkumus sieja ne su etninėmis mažumomis, grupėmis ar imigrantais ir pabėgėliais, o su valdžios vykdoma politika nacionaliniu ir regioniniu lygmenimis.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *nacionalizmas, ekonominis nacionalizmas, nacionalizmas Lietuvoje, etninės mažumos ir grupės, etniniai konfliktai, imigrantai, pabėgėliai.*

Audronė Janužytė – Mykolo Romerio universiteto Viešojo administravimo ir verslo fakulteto Politikos mokslų instituto docentė. Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: nacionalizmo teorijos ir koncepcijos, nacionalizmo problemos Europoje, etninės mažumos, aukštojo mokslo politika Europoje.

Audronė Janužytė – associate professor at the Institute of Political Science at the Faculty of Public Governance and Business at Mykolas Romeris University. Research interests: theories of nationalism, nationalism issues in Europe, ethnic minorities, politics of higher education in Europe.