

A NOTE FROM THE GUEST EDITOR

Barbara A. West, University of the Pacific

The papers I've collected together for this issue speak to each other in a number of very interesting ways. Most obviously, the papers can be approached in terms of the geographic terrain they cover. There are four papers on Russia (Hinterhuber, Lindquist, Rivkin-fish, and Zigon), four papers on a variety of areas that were once part of Yugoslavia (Blumi, Ellis, Pajo, Zivkovic), three papers on Germany (Bickford, Boyer, Wolbert), two on Romania (Bell, et. al, Marrant), one on Poland (Rosenblum), and one comparative paper on Hungary and Finland (Berglund and Harper).

There are also some obvious topical conjunctions amongst some of the papers. Two of the papers explore the work of environmentalists in certain countries of the region. Berglund and Harper look comparatively at Finland and Hungary while Bell, et. al. write about Romania. What is most interesting about this pairing, however, is that while the former compares the legitimating discourses used by environmentalists, the latter explores some of the ways environmentalist discourse and practice is understood, negotiated with, and disputed on the ground.

Two other papers in this collection, Lindquist and Rivkin-Fish, explore legitimating discourses within the health care system(s) in Russia. While the former paper outlines the legitimating strategies of several sectors of the health care system (biomedical, folk, foreign, charismatic), the latter explores this kind of discourse in more depth for the biomedical sector.

Rosenblum and Wolbert's papers can also be read together to provide insight into the production of knowledge in museums. While Rosenblum looks at this production at Auschwitz-Birkenau largely through the lens of history, politics and economics, Wolbert takes a more aesthetic approach to a particular art exhibit in Germany. If you combine these papers with Marrant's review of the film *Diamonds in the Dark*, you get a wide range of insights into both the production and consumption of "Culture" (in its non-anthropological sense) in postsocialist Eastern and Central Europe.

Two other papers explore the important and often ignored intersection of gender and militarized ideologies in Eastern and Central

Europe. Hinterhuber explores this intersection in Russia through the lens of the Soldiers' Mothers of St. Petersburg organization. Bickford reminds us of the all-important fact that men have gender too in his paper on the process of militarization in the GDR. While his work is primarily historical and looks at identity production in the GDR, two other papers follow on from his and address the difficult processes of transition away from these identities. Both Boyer and Wolbert look at the production of a 'discourse of dismissal' with regard to perceived GDR professionalism and aesthetics.

As is the case with much of the work on postsocialist Eastern and Central Europe, several of these papers look at the different kinds of knowledge produced by insiders and outsiders. In Boyer's case, journalists from the East are described as having insider knowledge in the regions of the former GDR, but this kind of knowledge is relatively unimportant when contrasted with the kind of outsider knowledge attributed to journalists from the West: national, global, analytical. In Bell et. al, by contrast, insiders are those who reside in the Danube Delta region of Romania and fully understand its ecology, while outsiders are those environmentalists from Bucharest or elsewhere (both inside and outside of Romania) who are putting people as well as resources at risk because of their lack of insider knowledge. Zigon likewise looks at the mistakes made by outsiders; in this case, the World Bank's efforts to aid in the process of decentralization in Russia. Like in the case of these environmentalists, lack of historical, political, economic, and other insider knowledge in the Russian context has contributed to a disastrous set of conflicting policies.

The next grouping of papers I can logically put together out of these submissions connects Zivkovic's paper with that of Berglund and Harper. In both cases, the authors look at the production of a narrative logic that has guided both the theory and practice of governmental rule (or NGO policy making) in their different countries. Zivkovic looks at the narrative logic of Milosevic's rise to power in Serbia and the way the society's dominant ideology, socialism, was quickly dispelled and dismissed by its challenger. This new logic gained legitimacy through association with local poetry and myth. Berglund

and Harper's paper likewise explores the production of a discourse of legitimacy, but from the perspective of a movement that is outside of the state sector. They found that even though the relationship between environmentalists and the state differs in Finland and Hungary, enviros in both countries use the concept of "independence" to legitimate their beliefs and actions.

The last group of papers in this issue explores different facets in the production, experience, transformation, exploitation, and territorialization of "Albanian" identity. On the one hand, Pajo explores the way that the West rather than Albania itself is becoming the imagined homeland of many members of the Albanian nation who also happen to be citizens of the Albanian state. On the other hand, Blumi and Ellis look at the process of "Albanian-ization" of ethnic Albanians residing in other states. Blumi's paper looks at the creation of Albanians by Serbs in Kosova and the subsequent wholesale adoption of this (in many ways) historically inaccurate categorization by UNMIK. Ellis looks at the process of becoming Albanian as experienced by a community of ethnic Albanian Turkish speakers in Macedonia. Like Pajo, Ellis explores the question of national identity amongst this group of Albanians.

Finally, most of the papers in this issue explore processes of legitimizing identities, policies, and actions in Eastern and Central Europe, both at the micro- and macro- levels. This is most clear in the three papers that explore the production of a narrative logic and in the two papers on legitimacy in the health care system in Russia. However, most of the other papers as well

touch on this theme, if only tangentially. For example, Zigon's paper on decentralization in Russia certainly seems to question the legitimacy of the World Bank in pushing for Russia to take this course of action prior to a period of institution building. Similarly, Bell, et. al.'s paper explores the legitimacy of environmental groups to address problems in the Danube Delta without consulting with the local population that largely lives off of the Delta's resources. West Germans continue to question the legitimacy of their Eastern colleagues when it comes to criticizing the current political, economic, or social system in Germany. Albanians are questioning the legitimacy of their own state to contain and govern their nation. And so on.

What is most clear from these papers is that we all have much work to do in this region. The unique perspective we gain through fieldwork provides us with the conceptual and analytical tools necessary to look at experience and policy making, history and mythology, the past and the present, institutions and individuals, women and men, and states and nations. We continue to be uniquely situated as both insiders and outsiders in this region, with many of the strengths and weaknesses of this perspective. We need to be reminded of the hubris of the outsider, as Zigon, Bell, et. al., and Boyer do, as well as the importance of this position in being able to see the forest for the trees (so to speak), as do Berglund and Harper, Marrant, and Blumi. In the end, we must continue doing what we're doing: collaborating with Eastern and Central Europeans to understand from as many points of view as possible the past and the present in this region.