

**WHEN THE NATION IS OPEN. SOME NOTES
ON THE IDEAS OF NATION AND BOUNDARY
IN STASYS ŠALKAUSKIS' THOUGHT**

ANDREA GRIFFANTE

Schio, Vicenza

<griphusrex@yahoo.it>

Since the very appreciate study of Arūnas Sverdiolas on Lithuanian philosophy of culture¹, Stasys Šalkauskis' thought has been understood as an individual response to the needs of cultural selfhood and growth of independent Lithuania. Alvydas Jokubaitis² recently underlined the possibility to analyze Šalkauskis' thought under another perspective, namely the one of philosophy of politics. We think that both Sverdiolas' and Jokubaitis' approaches centred not only the focus of Šalkauskis' philosophical mind, but also his problematic historical question. Combining these two perspectives we come to a couple of points leading us in the analysis of Šalkauskis' thought. First, the problem of the formation of a mature Lithuanian national life and the legitimation of a Lithuanian culture in the national sense of the term is peculiar in all Šalkauskis' work. As L. Donskis noticed, the development of XX century philosophy of culture in Lithuania is a kind of "call for symbolic compensation"³ in a problematical socio-political context. Šalkauskis used the medium of philosophy to build up a coherent theory of culture that should have been used as counterpoise to the political weakness of the Lithuanian national state. On the other hand, Šalkauskis' thought had to challenge the factual political problem that history put in front of him. That is, he elaborated a theory in touch with the historical past of a new nation and with the reality of Lithuanian national state and later problems of

¹ See A. Sverdiolas, *Kultūros filosofija Lietuvoje*, Vilnius, 1983.

² See A. Jokubaitis, *Stasys Šalkauskis ir Antanas Maceina kaip politikos filosofai*, in „Politologija“, 2 (2001), p. 3-25.

³ See L. Donskis, *On the Boundary of Two Worlds: Lithuanian Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*, in "Studies in East European Thought", 54, 2002. See also J. Baranova, *Lithuanian Philosophy: The Search for Authenticity*, in (edited by) J. Baranova, *Lithuanian Philosophy. Persons and Ideas*, Washington D.C. 2000, p. 1-18

governance. In this sense Šalkauskis' thought can participate in the categories of publicity and politics, and his thought can be in some case defined "public" and "political".

In this article, we will illustrate how these two views of Šalkauskis' thought are complementary in the construction of an open approach to the Lithuanian national question and to some of the most important elements to define it: the idea of nation and the idea of boundary.

First level: The components of a part

Since the very beginning of his activity Šalkauskis concentrates his work on the connection between the two poles of his geopolitical speech: the national and the universal one. In the series of articles *Bažnyčia bei kultūra* (1913) for the first time the Philosopher systematically indicates the relationship existing between national culture and the universal elements of religion. In his first book, *Sur les Confins de deux Mondes* (1919), Šalkauskis orderly explains the concepts that will compose the basic matter of his "public" thought and gives a schema of nations' and human world's composition.

In a hypothetical scale, the *elementum minimum* we can find in the natural world is individual ("l'individu", "individas"), that is a neutral "structure" transformed by personal characters into a person ("la personne", "asmuo", "члук"). The whole of the characters forming a person is called personality ("la personnalité"); a nation, actually, is nothing but a togetherness of persons, namely of individuals with their own personalities, connected one to the others by ties of nationality (language, morality,...)⁴.

Thanks to nationality a mass of people becomes a collective individuality: common nationality characters bond different personalities in a homogeneous whole where different persons participate in the nation as organs in a body. The connection between national and personal characters gives the nation the possibility to have an undetermined and free historical life depending on the combination of national and personal elements.

In Šalkauskis' words nationality and individuality share a common task. He writes: «Aucun autre corps social n'est si organiquement et si intimement lié à l'individu que la nation. Aussi, quoi qu'en disent les cosmopolites, la nationalité ne cessera jamais d'être pour l'individu un complément naturel et une condition nécessaire de vie intégrale»⁵. The organicity of national life underlines the quality of this relationship. On the one hand, the unicity of persons is not compromised by collectivity and collective life, that keeps untouched the characters of persons; on the other hand, the nation is the "natural" community of persons, a space for their natural sociability

4 S. Šalkauskis, *Sur les Confins de deux Mondes*, Genève, 1920, p. 13

5 Idem, p. 14

representing the way to elevate to a “higher” level (“à un niveau supérieur”) the cultural work of separated persons, that otherwise would remain incomplete because of separate persons’ lack of integral creativity⁶.

The role of necessary condition for integral life, and consequently the function of tie with the whole national life conceived as cultural life of the nation, implies for nationality and for its intersubjective processes a central task in the development of persons. Anyway, nationality only represents a “structure”, not the matter of integral national life. It actually cannot explain in itself the functioning of national life. It is first necessary to answer two questions about the meaning of national integrality and the way in which integrality can work.

As we have seen, integrality refers to an over-individual subject, that is to a group of individuals moving from the dominium of nature to the one of social community. Evidently, it implies a tight relation between integrality and culture.

In *Kultūros filosofijos metmens* (1926) Šalkauskis very clearly distinguishes between nature (“*gamta*”) and culture (“*kultūra*”) and states a direct relation between them. Nature is the world of objects given to man and in which, as a material body, man participates⁷; the transformation and the “domestication” of nature forms the dominion of culture⁸. Nature can so exist without culture, but the opposite is not done: «Gamtos apvaldymas ir vadovavimas savaimingai jos kūrybai sudaro būtiną kultūros pagrindą»⁹, nature is transformed into culture as it coincides with a rational (human) aim. For the “structure” of humanity (individual – person – nation) belongs

6 Idem

7 This ‘double statute’ of man and the question of the passage from nature to culture are extensively explained in A. Sverdiolas, *Kultūros filosofija...*, p. 50: «Formuodamas gamtą, žmogus, S. Šalkauskio supratimu, veikia kaip materialią gamtos jėgą. Tačiau tuoj pat iškyla klausimas apie kultūros produkto specifika, palyginti su gamta. Jei žmogus veikia gamtos pasaulyje kaip gamtos jėga, tai tokio veikimo produktai yra daiktiškai realūs, kad ir “apiforminti”, kultivuoti gamtos objektai. Antra vertus, “daiktinė” kultūros produkto egzistencija dar neišreiškia jo kaip *kultūros* produkto specifikos. S. Šalkauskis stengėsi formuluoti fundamentalią kultūros teorijos idėją: kad kultūros produktas nėra tik “daiktas” šalia kitų daiktų. Tam, kad toks produktas egzistuotų kaip kultūros elementas, jis turi būti ne tik pagamintas (“įdaiktintas”), bet ir “išdaiktintas”. Kultūros produkto būties specifika sudaro jo dialektinis pobūdis: kultūros produktas negali egzistuoti *vien tik* objektyviai, jis egzistuoja tiek, kiek kultūriškai suvokiamas, t. y. “išdaiktintas”. Kiek kultūros produktas “neišdaiktinamas” – specifiniu būdu nevertojamas, nesuvokiamas, – tiek jis lieka ne kultūros, bet gamtos objektas».

8 S. Šalkauskis, *Sur les Confins...*, p. 18: «[culture is] *une action intelligente et consciente exercée sur une parcelle de matière*».

9 S. Šalkauskis, *Kultūros filosofijos metmens*, Kaunas, 1926, p. 40.

to a natural order (“*dėsningumas*”) over which people have no power, human culture –that is what Šalkauskis calls “work”– is possible only through the elaboration of nature. In other terms, the formation of culture responds to the human call for a conscious (“*samoningas*”) re-elaboration of nature. In that way, culture appears as the peculiar object of human work and man (individual person) is first of all understood as a creator, similarly, but with less urgent characterization, to A. Jakštas¹⁰.

Within the frame of a national state the problem becomes even more complex. In it, a group of people (the nation) not only differentiates itself from nature, but can goal to build up a culture in the context of its own natural national *humus*. The question is, how a group can rationally conceive his cultural work and direct it to a rational aim in an over-individual context. The answer is given by the double composition of national body, that is by the introduction of two main subjects of historical process: people and intellectuals.

Being parts of the national community their difference is only functional. On the one hand, the people, the mass is described as keeping the mark of the race, that is, according to Šalkauskis’ interpretation of Gustave Le Bon’s theory, of the Indoeuropean origins of the nation¹¹. Witness of the origins and of ethnical tradition, the people embodies the spirit of the nation in its spiritual life as well as in his material works.

Intellectuals, that Šalkauskis always considers as an overindividual group (*inteligentija*)¹² without summing them up in any kind of closed class, accomplish a task of nation-ordering in space and in time. We could resume the characteristics denoting intellectuals in a four point schema:

α) The real intellectual «*tu* ir pasižymi, kad jo mąstymo būdas ir gyvenimo linija nepriklauso nuo siaurų, luomo, klasės, profesijos ar partijos interesų»¹³, he is part of the nation, but does not participate in its frag-

10 See A. Jakštas, *Meno kūrybos problemos*, Kaunas, 1930.

11 See S. Šalkauskis, *Sur les Confins...*, p. 15; see also G. Le Bon, *Lois Psychologiques de l’Evolution des Peuples*, Paris, 1922.

12 The term *inteligentija* was used by S. Šalkauskis in a peculiar sense. Because of historical reasons, the word *inteligentija* had been used only as the Lithuanian translation of the Russian *интеллигенция*. About the history of this term see V. Strada, *Eurorussia. Letteratura e cultura da Pietro il Grande alla Rivoluzione*, Roma-Bari, 2005, p. 183-220.

13 See S. Šalkauskis, *Inteligentijos Konceptija*, in “*Židinys*”, 7, 1939.

mentation, and refers to a superior and non-sharable idea of common Good (*bendra gerovė*)¹⁴;

β) As human beings¹⁵ needing commonness, intellectuals orderly 'structure' national society leading to the formation of a national culture – the culture of a national state- summing up people's ethnicity and intellectual universalism;

γ) *Inteligentija* is the 'persona' joining the past and the future of the nation: on the one hand, it is expected to form an 'intellectual class' carrying on his organizational work; on the other hand, as we saw, in order to shape culture, intellectuals constantly have to look 'back' to the national (original) mark of the race of the people.

δ) In order realize their plans intellectuals can use a higher quality and aim-directed rationality: *tikslingumas*¹⁶. On the contrary, people's creativeness is led by simple *protingumas*.

The cultural life of the nation can be explained in terms of cooperation and reciprocal need: Šalkauskis' intellectuals are supposed to join the 'universality' of their 'culture' to the (ethnic) "particularity" of people's 'culture', namely to give a national , even if not particularistic, shape -a *materia*- to universal ideals – the *forma*.

As we can understand, at a 'national level' the integrality of culture –that is the balancing point, *complément naturel* and *condition nécessaire*, of national (integral) life- corresponds to the collaboration of the two parts of the nation, that is the rational coordination of the nation and national life. The integrality of national culture corresponds to the cultural work of an integral nation.

Second level: The parts of a whole

¹⁴ Although the description of intellectuals calls to mind what French philosopher Julien Benda told in the 30's¹⁴, it is not possible to define Šalkauskis' intellectual *tout court* as a liberal. In fact the *inteligentija* is not tied down with a particular class or party, but organically related with the nation. As a higher educated class, *inteligentija* is at least potentially found on the respect of the idea of Good, that is of a universal idea not limited by any kind of particularistic interest.

¹⁵ Talking about the meaning of human social and cultural work Stasys Šalkauskis changed the Tomistic concepts that had constituted the basis of his studies. As A. Sverdiolas underlined "Taigi S. Šalkauskis dvejopai pakeitė tomizmo sąvokas: psychologizavo jas ir teigė žmogaus veikimą esant imanentišką visuomenei. Žmogaus, nukreipto į transcendenciją, priešpriešinimą žmogui visuomenėje S. Šalkauskis pakeitė žmogaus kaip nesąmoningos masės dalelės ir žmogaus kaip kaip sąmoningo visuomenės nario priešpriešinimu" (*Kultūros filosofija...*, p. 57).

¹⁶ See S. Šalkauskis, *Kultūros Filosofija*, in: S. Šalkauskis, *Raštai*, Vilnius, 1990, p. 310-311.

Potentially, Šalkauskis' world is a whole of nations. As the cooperation of intellectuals and people to the search for national culture coordinates the nation, so the whole of nations is led by national missions to be realized in the context of the national cultural lives. Missions ("pašaukimai", "vocations") are not to be understood as in relation to XIX century Slavonic messianism¹⁷, but as non-exclusivist actions leading the lives of nations¹⁸.

In *Sur les Confins de deux Mondes* Šalkauskis explains his views on Lithuanian history and Lithuanian national mission¹⁹. The three-part structure of the book puts in evidence the development of Lithuania along its historical path and the characteristics of the mission. Šalkauskis divides Lithuanian history into three parts: *Thèse: Prépondérance de l'Orient en Lituanie* (XI - XVI century), *Antithèse: Prépondérance de l'Occident en Lituanie* (XVI - XVIII century) and the third phase embracing Lithuanian history since the birth of Lithuanian national movement. The origins and the meaning of Šalkauskis' *Orient/Rytai* and *Occident/Vakarai* and their genesis from French XIX century thought have already been widely analysed²⁰. Here it is enough to say that West and East are geographical and 'cultural' indicators, and play a role of both theoretical and historical ground in the definition of Lithuania. Actually in Šalkauskis' opinion Lithuanian national culture can exist *de facto* thanks to the challenge of these two opposite

17 The dominion of freedom is to be understood as the engine of history and the directory of a non-deterministic development of historical flux. In Šalkauskis uni-total world individual freedom preserves the unitotal world's conformation from any possible pre-determined finalism. Because of that, we can not speak of the Lithuanian mission –the conjunction of Eastern and Western cultures and their synthesis in the Lithuanian "civilisation nationale"- as a particular declination of messianism. If messianism is «idea 'pośrednika' między ludźmi a Bogiem, odradzającego ludzkość (tj. mówiąc ściślej, daną grupę wyznaniową) i otwierającego tej drogę do zbawienia, pojmowanego z reguły jako zbawienie ziemskie» (A. Walicki, *Filozofia a Mesjanizm*, Warszawa, 1970, p. 11), so it is not the case of Šalkauskis's position. His national mission is part of a unitotal world of missions.

18 See S. Šalkauskis, *Sur les Confins...*, p. 23.

19 It is interesting to note that also the before mentioned Slavonic and particularly Polish messianism has been seen as an open way to the national state: «Mesjanizm wieku XIX-ego był doktryną patriotyczną nie nacjonalistyczną ani szowinistyczną. Tworzył się w kręgu rozpowszechnionych wówczas ideologii narodowo-wyzwoleńczych» (T. Chrobak, Z. Stachowski, *Idea narodu I państwa w kulturze narodów słowiańskich*, Warszawa, 1997, p. 156).

20 The role of E. Hello and J. De Maistre in the formation of this geo-cultural categories is well known although specific studies have not been done yet. See Kriščiūnas E., „Rytų ir Vakarų pasaulių sintezė Stasio Šalkauskio filosofijoje“, in: *Lietuva ir Pasaulis: konfliktas ir bendradarbiavimas*, Vilnius, 2000, and A. Sverdiolas, „Rytų ir Vakarų Sintezės Idėja“, in: S. Šalkauskis, *Raštai*, IV, Vilnius, 1995, p. 5-18.

cultural units. On the one hand Lithuania represents the boundary between these two civilisations, the open field where Western and Eastern culture fight either advancing or being pulled back. On the other hand Lithuania is the border where these civilisations meet and can be synthesized in an original culture.

The mission of Lithuanian national civilisation²¹ is the formation of a Lithuanian culture, a point of fusion of Eastern and Western civilisations: an integral culture –surpassing the two cultural units and synthesizing them in another national culture- is possible thanks to peculiar Lithuanian national characters and historical experience.

Šalkauskis' use of these geo-cultural units in a historical perspective is not simply linked to historical (factual) events, but underlines the reciprocal dependence of the two components in representing the nation and its role in the world's history. The existence of Lithuania actually depends on the balance, namely on the synthesis, of Western and Eastern civilisations. The precondition is a well functioning interaction of *intelligentija* and people, that is the formation of a collective (integral) individuality.

In the first, as well as in the second phase of Lithuanian history, the word “*preponderance*” marks a lack of *equilibrium* between the intellectuals and the people; it underlines the lack of fulfilment of the synthetic work of the nation (*tauta*). During the first part of Lithuanian history the predominance of the East –namely of Eastern culture- is first of all the result of popular culture predominance. Although the first ‘outline’ of *intelligentija* appeared at the same time as the foundation of the Lithuanian state, the cooperation between people and intellectuals briefly comes to an end and sacrifices Lithuania and the call for a synthetic culture to the Polish-Lithuanian *Rzeczpospolita*.

It is so understandable why in the second point of Šalkauskis' periodization, the “*prépondérance de l'Occident*”, the union of Lithuania and Poland into a common state represents the biggest obstacle to the formation of a national synthetic Lithuanian culture. In fact, whereas the Lithuanian people can keep their traditions and popular ‘culture’ (*liaudies kultūra*), Lithuanian intellectuals become a part of the common Polish-Lithuanian leading class and get polonized. The Western (mainly Polish) cultural preponderance is the result of an ‘unnatural’ separation between intellectuals and people in the body of the nation.

The third period, that is the one starting with the *Atgimimas* and continuing till Šalkauskis' contemporaneity, is told to be leading to the real foundation of synthetic Lithuanian national culture. It is not a case that the philosopher calls this third phase “*synthèse*”: even if the triadic movement is only apparently Hegelian, the third phase shows that the synthesis of

²¹ Namely a national mission in a world potentially well-structured by national missions.

civilizations and the accomplishment of Lithuanian national mission is possible only when intellectuals and people carry on a common cultural work²².

The renewed cooperation between the *intelligentija* and the people also represents the way to reaffirm the centrality of the geographical question. On the one hand, the collaboration and finally the birth of a synthetic culture in Lithuania is the way to chase away the Russians and preserve the new culture from any possible Eastern predominance; on the other hand, it is the way not to be overcome by Polish culture, nor to give up with calls for Lithuania as a part of the Polish state. The possibility of a Lithuanian national and synthetic culture, is linked to the existence of a territorial state²³ situated on the *limen* of two cultural 'worlds' that remain essential to Lithuania.

Third Level: Borders and reciprocity

Šalkauskis' idea of boundary has very deep Kantian roots. Kant writes in his *Prolegomena*: «Grenzen (bei ausgedehnten Wesen) setzen immer einen Raum voraus, der außerhalb einem gewissen bestimmten Platze angetroffen wird und ihn einschließt; Schranken bedürfen dergleichen nicht, sondern sind bloße Verneinungen, die eine Größe affizieren, sofern sie nicht absolute Vollständigkeit hat»²⁴. Limits are closed spaces, absolute spaces. On the contrary, boundaries do not define the space within its borders as an absolute unit, but circumscribe and bow it with the totality of space: a boundary cannot be exclusive, it only represents a segmentation of the space to which it is in constant and biunique relation. The Kantian concept of boundary is then a category of relation.

22 Although not strictly connected to Hegelian philosophy of history, the dialectic relationship between parts of a whole and the whole itself in Hegel's thought can clarify Šalkauskis; approach to the synthesis: «Das unmittelbare Verhältnis ist das des Ganzen und der Teile: der Inhalt ist das Ganze und besthet aus den Teilen (der Form), dem Gegenteile seiner. Die Teile sind voneinander verschieden, und sind das Selbständige. Sie sind aber nur Teile in ihrer identischen Beziehung aufeinander, oder insofern sie zusammengenommen das Ganze ausmachen. Aber *das Zusammen* ist das Gegenteil und Negation des Teiles» (G. Hegel, *Enciclopedia delle Scienze Filosofiche, Rusconi*, Milano, 1996, §135, p.294).

23 In accordance to many other Lithuanian thinkers of his times Šalkauskis gives the Lithuanian state an essential role in the balancement of European political powers and calls for the formation of an „*Etat tampon indépendant qui, grâce à sa neutralisation, conciliera à la fois ses intérêts et les nécessités des relations internationales*” (S. Šalkauskis, *Sur les Confins...*, p. 230).

24 I. Kant, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen metaphysik*, Felix Meiner Verlag, Hamburg, 1993, § 57, p. 118.

Lithuania as it was described and conceptualized by Stasys Šalkauskis is a boundary in the Kantian sense of the word, namely a territory necessarily relating itself to the 'external' space and playing a role of both division and inclusion (synthesis). Actually, Lithuania needs the contribution coming from the 'domestic abroad' of Eastern and Western civilizations to accomplish its national mission and carry on an osmotic function from its boundary-position. It means that Lithuania participates in the life of a space that is much wider than a national state. At the same time, Lithuania is supposed to be an independent territorial state, living in a proper separate space. It is possible to define Šalkauskis' Lithuanian boundary as a space of free synthesis, born from the meeting of a particular national mission, different cultural traditions and the variety of personal characters (*asmenys*).

If we considered the division between East and West as the only moment in which the idea of boundary is implied we would fail in our analysis. That one is just a 'geographical' application of this idea.

We can actually find out two more applications, the one connected to the idea of time, the other referring to the internal composition of the nation.

As we have seen, West and East represent the two poles around which the whole existence of the Lithuanian nation develops. The realization of the national mission takes place at a "turning point" of national history. In fact, the mission gets fulfilled when the national body has already experienced the burden of a "foreign" culture predominance, namely when the nation is supposed to be conscious of its historical task. Šalkauskis' idea of border as a synthetic focus is indeed the engine moving the nation to the analysis and synthesis of national history: the analysis helps to understand why the national civilisation has not been completed or in some cases it has even failed; the synthesis of history, on the contrary, forms the active part of national culture building-up process and represents the reach of national mission consciousness.

Talking about national culture and history we have implicitly made an allusion to the functional division of the nation allowing the synthetic progress of Lithuanian culture. It is not difficult to see that the same idea of boundary is also actively influencing the *corpus* of the nation: *intelligentija* and people are the protagonists of an osmotic process proceeding from a divided series of persons towards synthetic nation and culture. The two parts of the nation do not only live on the borderland between two worlds and two historical non-synthetic epochs, but embody the idea of boundary itself. If the intellectuals and the people does not collaborate, then only a geometrical border without land –namely, according to Kant's terminology, a *Schrank-* exists. On the contrary, if the work of these two collectivities is the result of a conscious process of historical understanding and of mutual comprehension, then the nation, united in the nation building-up and existing only in relation to the fulfilment of its synthetic mission, becomes a real human boundary (*Grenze*).

From this point of view only collective individualities are concerned by the Šalkauskian idea of boundary. A single person would have no cultural significance, if one did not connect with an 'ethnic' over-individual context: only describing the most basic collective individualities –intellectuals and people- does speak Šalkauskis about 'cultures'. The idea of boundary can in fact interact when cultural units still exist and live in a condition of constant potential challenge.

The very accurate distinctions that Šalkauskis' uses in his philosophical terminology²⁵ implies the existence of the idea of boundary. The distinction between *tauta* and *nacija*²⁶ is, for instance, based on the existence of both a geographical and an internal boundary. As a *tauta*, a nation is not "*nariu pasaulio tautų šeimoje*"²⁷. Although the nation-*tauta* corresponds to the phase of national culture development in which people and intellectuals already have reciprocal relations, the so formed integral collective individuality does not interact with similar 'foreign' collective individualities yet. *Tautos* are limited, cut off from the life of nations living outside its national borders.

Nacijos stand on a morally higher place. A *tauta* becomes a *nacija* when the relation existing between intellectuals and people is open, namely when it is related to the space beyond the boundary. *Nacijos* participate in world's life and join the uni-total world of integral nations as a natural member .

In the case of Lithuania, Lithuanian *tauta* becomes a *nacija* when embracing the national historical mission²⁸. The concept of *nacija* in this way is strictly related to the introduction of the idea of boundary in the national life. We can look at *nacija* and especially at *lietuvių nacija* as the application of the general idea of boundary to a particular case, in the geographical, historical and internal sense of the word we have illustrated before. The distinction between *nacionalizmas* and *patriotizmas* reflects the same distinction we have seen between *tauta* and *nacija*²⁹ in relation to people and their behaviour towards nation and national life³⁰.

25 See *Bendrojo filosofijos terminija*, now in S. Šalkauskis, *Raštai II*, Vilnius, 1990, p. 126-276.

26 See L. Mulevičius, *Tauta ir nacija*, in *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis-1990 metai*, Vilnius, 1992.

27 See the article *Tautinis auklėjimas*, in S. Šalkauskis, *Lietuvių tauta ir jos ugdymas*, Kaunas, 1933.

28 The transformation of the Lithuanian *tauta* into *nacija* is understood as the moment of national destiny revelation: "Iš čia aiškėja tautinis lietuvių idealas, tautos pašaukimo nustatomas: tai yra pilnutinė dviejų civilizacijų, Rytų ir Vakarų, sintezė tautinės lietuvių individualybės lytyse" (idem).

29 In Šalkauskis' words patriotism is the morally right way –equally distant from both nationalism and cosmopolitanism- to love the nation as a *nacija* and

Šalkauskis' biography evidently puts light on the philosopher's engagement, especially as an ideologue of *Ateitininkai*, the Christian-democratic movement, in Lithuania's socio-political life in the '20ies and '30ies. Looking at Šalkauskian philosophical thought as at a discursive practice, the idea of boundary is much more than a simple element in the *spectrum* of his thought: it is above all a space of cultural and political elaboration.

Šalkauskis' interest in philosophy of culture only indicates the approach that led the philosopher's work towards a proposal for Lithuania as a national state in the second and third decade of XX Century. Part of Šalkauskis' works, namely the one in which the philosophical categories are a useful support to the definition of a Lithuanian national culture, has an implicit political sense linked to Šalkauskis' 'social' activity. The idea of boundary that we have tried to explain in these pages is in fact an ideal centre, an ideal principle for the building up of an independent Lithuanian culture (also for a new Lithuanian political culture), constantly in touch with world's politics and cultural life and not fossilize in an idealistic paradise.

Polemics spread out with Vytautas Alanta and other political activists of these times prove the participation of Šalkauskis in the socio-political discourse and in the definition of its basis. In other words, thanks to the elaboration of an idea of open boundary Šalkauskis can be considered a real counterpart both to *tautininkai* and to more open-minded nationalist tendencies. His contribution as an ideologue of Christian-democrat *ateitininkai*³¹ leaves no doubt about the critical force of his thought, potentially corrosive for the leading political class.

Conclusion

In this article we have seen how Šalkauskis' idea of boundary is the crowning point of his idea of nation. Historical background and culture are the points of legitimation of the nation: the first one is a moment of self-

represents a moment of moral improvement: "Turint galvoje tikrą patriotizmo supratimą, pigu išpėti, jog tikras patriotizmas tiek pačiam patriotui, tiek patriotiškai mylimai tautai privalo būti tobulėjimo bei kultūrinės pažangos veiksnys" (S.Šalkauskis, *Tikras patriotizmas ir jo reiškimosi lytis*, in S. Šalkauskis, *Lietuvių tauta ir jos ugdymas,...*)' See also S.Šalkauskis, *Tautybė, Patriotizmas ir Lietuvių Tautos Pašaukimas*, in "Židinys", 5-6, 1928.

³⁰ The distinction between nationalism and patriotism is here philosophically grounded. In Western political speech the distinction between these two concepts has quite often been understood as the expression of an "unessential" difference. See Z. Bauman, *Liquid modernity*, Oxford, 2000.

³¹ Šalkauskis' thought has been considered very influent to Lithuanian *emigrés* in America. See A. J. Van Reenan, *Lithuanian Diaspora. Königsberg to Chicago*, Boston, 1992

consciousness, the second one forms the voluntaristic ground³² for the building up of a conscious and integral nation in the future. The nation can freely realize itself by the expression of the will to become an integral nation on three levels. Persons, people/intellectuals and the nation as a not yet organic co-action of its parts are the three levels by which the nation searches for and finally realizes the participation in the totality of the world throughout its individual life on the boundary.

The core of Šalkauskian definition of boundary and consequently of the Lithuanian nation can be resumed, as we have told before, in three points.

Lithuania can definitely be an integral nation by the fulfilment of its national mission of cultural synthesis of Western and eastern civilizations. In order to do it, Lithuania has to further work of synthesis based on three levels of development (*pažanga*). Each level focuses on the ideas of boundary.

On the first level, the persons –that is the individuals shaped by Lithuanian national characters- have to be synthesised into the two main protagonists of the national body: the intellectuals and the people. The process of synthesis takes place on the ‘internal’ boundary existing between ‘cultural subjects’ of the national *corpus*, that is between the (cultural) individuals that will compose the nation by their work as people or intellectuals.

On the second level, the intellectuals and the people synthesise their ‘semi-cultures’ into an integral national culture. The synthesis aims here to melt these two ‘semi-cultures’ divided by another ‘internal’ boundary fundamental for the individualization of the nation sub-subjects.

On the third level, Western and Eastern civilisations are the two poles that Lithuania has to synthesise because of its national mission. In this case, the boundary is Lithuania itself thanks to its geo-political position and historical background.

The Kantian ground makes the Šalkauskian idea of boundary an inclusive and dialogical category able to link plurality, respect difference and save cultural individualities in the historical flux. The persons, the over-individuality of the nation as well as the “individuality” of national collectiveness represent only the different parts forming the totality of the integral nation-based world.

32 There are no complete studies about the specific problem of Mazzinianism in Lithuania. It is possible that Mazzini’s thought penetrated in Lithuania throughout Poland since the second half of XIX century.

When the nation is open. Some notes on the ideas of nation and boundary in Stasys Šalkauskis' thought

Andrea Griffante, Schio (Vicenza)

During the first Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian philosopher Stasys Šalkauskis elaborated an idea of Lithuania linked to the peculiar geo-political and historical situation of the “Lithuanian nation”. The idea of boundary can be considered the focus of this elaboration linking the different parts of the nation–people and ‘cultural classes’- to the world’s unity. The inclusiveness of the idea of border gives a possibility to preserve national characters and to relate the nation with diversity. In a context of political conflicts, as it was in the interwar period, this model represents a challenge of nationalism and a proposal for an open nation.

*Il Presidente del Consiglio regionale della Toscana On. Riccardo Nencini
è lieto di invitarLa all'inaugurazione della mostra fotografica*

**in occasione del 15° Anniversario
dei rapporti Diplomatici fra Italia e Lituania**

Lituania 1990 - 2006
Gli anni dell'indipendenza

Interverranno:
Franco Cardini - Direttore dell'Istituto di Scienze Umanistiche
Alessandro Parenti - Docente di Linguistica all'Università di Firenze
Laura Tilunaitė - Console presso l'Ambasciata di Lituania a Roma
Angelo Perugini - Console On. di Lituania a Firenze

Venerdì 19 gennaio 2007 ore 17.30
Palazzo Carretani - Piazza dell'Unità d'Italia, 1 - Firenze



LIETUVOS AIDAS.

LIETUVOS TARYBA
skelbia
Lietuvos nepriklausomybę

Lietuvos Taryba šiuo pasiūlyje numato m. 20 d. d. 1990 m. vasarą buvo sukurta Lietuvos Respublika. Taryba šiuo pasiūlymu išreiškia Lietuvos Respublikos nepriklausomybę ir šia sudėtyje išreiškia šios paraišką.

Lietuvos Taryba, šiuo pasiūlymu Lietuvos Respublikos nepriklausomybę, remdamasi pripažinti, kad Lietuvos Respublika buvo laisva ir savarakiška valstybe nuo 1918 m. rugpjūtį m. 23-25 d. 1918 m. ir, skelbia atnaujinti nepriklausomybę, demokratinius pa-
statius sutarusių Lietuvos valstybę
su sostine VILNIUJE ir laisvąjį atskaitomi
suo šiuo pasiūlymu išreiškia, kad šis buvo su Lietuvos
laikraščiu.

Šiuo pasiūlymu Taryba, su Lietuvos valstybę pa-
eidė ir jai suteiktas su kitomis valstyboms prabė-
gusiai nestatyti bei gėdinti gėdinti sostinės šiuo
sostis. Šiuo, numatoma šiuo su jai gėdinti šiuo.

LIETUVOS TARYBA
1918 m. rugpjūtį m. 23-25 d. 1918 m. ir, skelbia atnaujinti nepriklausomybę, demokratinius pa-
statius sutarusių Lietuvos valstybę
su sostine VILNIUJE ir laisvąjį atskaitomi
suo šiuo pasiūlymu išreiškia, kad šis buvo su Lietuvos
laikraščiu.