

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
VILNIUS UNIVERSITY



LIETUVOS POLITOLOGŲ ASOCIACIJA

Published by

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Vokiečių Str.10
LT-01130 Vilnius
LITHUANIA
Tel. (370-5) 251 4130
Fax (370-5) 251 4134
e-mail: tspmi@tspmi.vu.lt
http://www.tspmi.vu.lt

LITHUANIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Vokiečių Str.10
LT-01130 Vilnius
LITHUANIA
Tel. (370-5) 251 4133
Fax (370-5) 251 4134
http://www.lpasoc.vu.lt

LITHUANIAN **POLITICAL SCIENCE** YEARBOOK 2005

VILNIUS 2006

The *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook* aims to provide a wide picture of the main fields of Political Science in Lithuania – Political Theory, Institutional Design, Electoral Process, Public Policy and Public Administration, International Relations and related disciplines. However, it is by no means limited to publications on Lithuania or by Lithuanian authors. Contributions are welcome both from Lithuania and abroad.

Editorial Committee

Jonas Čičinskas (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Leonidas Donskis (Institute of Political Science and Diplomacy, Vytautas Magnus University)
Algimantas Jankauskas (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Alvydas Jokubaitis (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Algis Krupavičius (Kaunas University of Technology)
Antanas Kulakauskas (Department of Political Science, Mykolas Romeris University)
Vaidutis Laurėnas (Klaipėda University)
Raimundas Lopata (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Ainė Ramonaitė (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Aušra Rauličkytė (Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University)
Gediminas Vitkus (Lithuanian Military Academy)

International Advisory Board

Gianni Bonvicini, Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), Roma
Alyson J.K. Bailes, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)
Christoph Bertram, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP), Berlin
Per Carlsen, Danish Institute for International Studies
Atis Lejins, Latvian Institute of International Affairs
Thierry de Montbrial, IFRI, Paris
Martin A. Schain, Center for European Studies, New York University
Joaquin Roy, EU Center, University of Miami

ISSN 1392–9321

© Institute of International Relations and Political Science
Vilnius University, 2006

CONTENTS

PREFACE 7

THE QUALITY OF DEMOCRACY AFTER YEARS OF TRANSFORMATION

Vytautas Radžvilas. Liberal Democracy, Globalization and the Prospects of Democracy in Lithuania 11

Vaidutis Laurėnas. Populism as an Outcome of Post-communist Democratic Primitivism and Pro-capitalism 49

Irmina Matonytė, William E. Crowther. Parliamentary Elites as a Democratic Thermometer: the Lithuanian and Moldovan cases 85

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THEORY

Alvydas Jokubaitis. On the Relationship Between Art and Politics 117

Egdūnas Račius. European Societies *versus* Muslim Minorities: between „Cultural Awareness" and Orientalism 137

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS

Deividas Vijeikis, Jurgis Vilčinskas. European Constitution: towards Changing the Role of the Subnational Level? 155

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND EURO-ATLANTIC INTEGRATION PROCESS

Dovilė Jakniūnaitė. Constructivist Tradition in Lithuanian International Relations Discipline? 183

Tomas Janeliūnas, Arūnas Molis. Energy Security of Lithuania: Challenges and Perspectives 200

Mindaugas Jurkynas. Trajectories of Regional Identities in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia 224

ABOUT THE AUTHORS 257

PREFACE

We are happy to present the seventh volume of the *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook.* The present volume of the *Yearbook* follows the previously employed structure and principles. The main topic of this volume is the Quality of democracy in Lithuania and other post-communist countries after almost two decades of transformation. Francis Fukuyama in 1991 in his seminal study declared "the end of history" and interpreted the sudden collapse of communism as the extinction of any viable alternatives to the worldwide ideologies of liberal democracy and market capitalism. The political processes following the decay of communism have proved that such optimism was unsound. Today the scholars, including the authors of this volume, declare "the end of the transition paradigm". One of the focuses of this topic is the impact of globalization on the prospects of liberal democracy. Dr. Vytautas Radžvilas concludes that the present problematic situation of liberal democracy is a logical and consistent result of the project of modernization and globalization as its new radical stage.

According to Dr. Vaidutis Laurėnas, populism is a result of democratic primitivism and pro-capitalism. Populism is an inescapable aspect of political life. However in the Lithuanian case it can step on a dangerous line, and the ability to govern the state democratically may be lost.

Dr. Irmina Matonytė and William E. Crowther concentrate on analyzing the parliamentary elites in Lithuania and Moldova. In both countries numerous representatives of the *nomenklatura* have survived and managed to adapt to the new political conditions.

In addition, the reader of this *Yearbook* is invited to reflect on the relationships between art and politics, the perception of Muslims minorities in Europe.

The *Yearbook* continues analysis of the public policy and public administration issues. This time, the topic deals with the process of inter-

CONSTRUCTIVIST TRADITION IN LITHUANIAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DISCIPLINE?

Dovilė Jakniūnaitė

Abstract. The article tries to answer the question whether there is a constructivist tradition in Lithuanian International Relations discipline. Noting the short period during which quite a few researches in constructivist tradition were done, it reviews and evaluates current studies and identifies the main influences on the local analyses. There are three main broad areas where constructivist ideas are applied. The first one is analysis of the relationship between security and foreign policy and identity processes, the second studying of securitization processes in Lithuanian decision making and the third dealing with the efforts to apply constructivism as a policy tool. The article concludes that the constructivist tradition in Lithuania is still in its forming years trying to synthesize its own methodology and still has at least two challenges to overcome – to expand the empirical case basis beyond Lithuania or Baltic countries and to improve its analytical apparatus.

Lithuania has a very short tradition of academic research in international relations and political science. Its development started just several years after the restoration of Lithuanian independence and was stimulated by the establishment of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science at Vilnius University in 1992. Now the discipline analyzing international and domestic political life is still in the teenage years, still lacking quite a few years till its twentieth birthday which would maybe mark a grown-up status of Lithuanian political science. So far it is struggling with its own insecurities, concentrating mainly on the problems of Lithuania and trying to prove and justify to the local policy makers the reason for its existence (and, frankly speaking, financing).

The discipline of International Relations is even in the trickier position. In general, it has not only the same title as the reality it analyzes[1], but also tends to be closely connected with the contemporary situation in the international politics and the policy makers of one's own country – the persons

whose decision it analyzes. In a small country these two communities of academia and policy worlds are inevitably very closely connected. Because of that, a lot of academic research in Lithuania tends to be very practical and policy-oriented and mostly atheoretical, usually justifying and motivating the importance of the membership in the EU or NATO or describing the development of bilateral relations[2].

However, in recent years two broad theoretical positions have clearly started to develop in Lithuanian international relations. These two are geopolitical realism and constructivism. Maybe it would be too bold to call them schools because they are still forming and bringing up their followers and still starting to present their empirical and theoretical studies. This situation in Lithuania is unusual compared to the other countries, e.g., in Western Europe. One can hardly find any liberal tradition or pluralistic approach and its variations.[3] Apart from some review articles, there is almost no post-modern international relations research.[4] All these traditions compose a broad picture of international relations, and this is still lacking in Lithuanian International Relations tradition.

This article does not have a goal to complain about the current situation. Besides, it is still too short a time to regret for a slow development of any approach. Instead, the goal is to evaluate the current development of the already existing trend – of the constructivism in Lithuanian International Relations theory. The second bigger trend – geopolitical – is not reviewed here. It is possible to get properly acquainted with it elsewhere.[5]

It is interesting to review and analyze the constructivist tradition in Lithuania for several reasons. First, constructivism is marginal as compared to the dominant realist tradition. This situation is disproportional first of all in terms of quantity: a small group of researchers, and they are mostly ignored by their colleagues working in another paradigm. This article is one of the ways to attract attention and encourage the inter- as well as intra-theoretical discussions. Second, constructivism is critical regarding the dominant position and so creates a potential discussion and dialogue in the otherwise monologous environment of International Relations in Lithuania. Third, it asserts in bringing new insights and ideas into the local discipline, important though overlooked by those holding realist assumptions. So, it is appropriate to evaluate what these ideas are and how

they can contribute to developing a vivid and livelier discipline of International Relations in Lithuania.

The coming of constructivism into this discipline in Lithuania was not quick and did not attract a lot of new researchers immediately. Nevertheless, now it has already formed its group of scolars who have started demonstrating their research results; students started writing bachelor and master theses analysing and applying the constructivist paradigm.[6] The initial difficulties were connected with the absolutely new, unusual, sometimes called "philosophical" way of talking. The new language was introduced which not many wanted to learn, as well as new arguments which were not so easy to accept.

The problems were also partly connected with the overall confusion by constructivists themselves about the possible input of constructivism into the International Relations discipline.[7] Besides, this theoretical framework questioned many events and decisions in Lithuanian foreign policy. Keeping in mind this and also the overall lack of the theoretical self-reflection in Lithuanian International Relations, constructivism potentially creates a challenge for the local discipline and might be one of the reasons why it was accepted quite sceptically and cautiously.

An opponent could ask a very probable question: if some researchers use another approach, does it necessarily mean that some new tradition, or even school, is developing a tradition that can substantially influence the features of the Lithuanian International Relations discipline? Of course, one cannot answer the question with an automatic "yes".

In this article, I would like to answer whether it is possible to speak about the formation of the constructivist tradition in the Lithuanian International Relations discipline. The answer is far from clear, hence the question mark at the end of the title of this article. The article discusses the current situation of constructivism in the Lithuanian International Relations discipline. First, it presents the main ideas of constructivist paradigm in general and the ideas that are mostly used in Lithuania. Second, the main ideas and positions of Lithuanian researchers using this theory are presented, trying to distinguish the most important topics, influences and methodologies applied to the empirical research discussing the problems encountered. At the end of the article, the challenges and perspectives of constructivism in Lithuania are discussed.

1. Constructivism: main influences

It would not be too daring too say that the constructivism to Lithuania came, first of all, with an intention to give new ideas to the discussions on Lithuanian foreign policy. Second, it sought to provide a sounder theoretical framework of talking about international politics and critically reconsider some of the concepts used in Lithuanian political and academic discourse, especially the concepts of security and national interests. The constructivist "movement" in the Western International Relations discipline started in early 1990s, providing a new language and the tools to do exactly that.[8]

The general idea of constructivism – that the social world is not given or natural, it is a kind of artefact, i.e. it is constructed through the actions of the actors that live in that world – is understandable and easy to grasp.[9] Without going into details about the constructivist debates, one can summarize the main propositions of constructivism into five theses:

1. The world of international relations is socially constructed.
2. The knowledge about the world is intersubjective and socially constructed.
3. Action and structure are mutually constitutive.
4. Both the ideal and material factors are important in explaining the world of international politics.
5. Identity politics must be analysed in order to understand the world politics.[10]

As Gražina Miniotaitė has laconically generalized, "constructivists analyse international society as an intersubjectively constructed structure of identities"[11]. All these statements, however, do not help much to say something meaningful about international politics. They serve only as guidelines and also as the initial premises for the criticism of the dominant international relations paradigm in Lithuania as well as anywhere else – realism, sometimes jointly with liberalism, calling them rationalism.

Usually accepting these constructivist assumptions, two theoretical positions were mainly used for the analysis of international politics by Lithuanian researchers. The first one was the securitization theory developed by representatives of the Copenhagen school, the second one beeing Alexander Wendt's theoretical framework of the state identity.

Instead of trying to identify and analyse the objective threats to the national security, the Copenhagen school proposed an elegant and attractive idea – security threats are not given, they do not exist automatically, they are constructed through the speech acts of the actors, actors tell what the security issues are. Therefore, the goal of the researcher is to analyse how it happens. The process through which the problems become security problems was called securitization.[12] The authors of the conception were trying to find the way out of the impasse of the security studies when more and more security threats were found and every problem started to look existential. The solution was to look at the process and the action of the policy actors: how they define the problem, who acts, what the consequences are.

This analytical framework was simple, consistent and allowed looking differently at security problems. In Lithuania, where traditional threats to security were the most relevant after the independence was gained, the idea of securitization gave a fresh look at its own policy and an opportunity to question, e.g., how the relations with Poland, historically the closest neighbour, became a matter of national importance in early 1990s and Poland started to be treated as a threat, or how it happened that economic decisions started to be treated as security issues (the case of privatisation of the Lithuanian oil refinery).[13]

Alexander Wendt's already famous saying that „anarchy is what states make of it" became almost the constructivist manifesto and actually introduced the whole constructivist talking into the mainstream of the International Relations discipline.[14] He gave attention to the attempts to build a bridge between the positivist and the radical approaches. Constructivism seemed to be perfect for that – in Wendt's version it kept the positivist methodology, but spoke about the construction processes of knowledge and the social world. Constructivists emphasize the identity analysis, but there is not much of identity theory to propose. Wendt was the one who did it.[15] Although his four-type state identity structure looks too much artificial and three collective identity types (friend, enemy, rival) are too static descriptions of the behaviour and identity processes of the states, they seem to be a very convenient starting point in presenting constructivist ideas to the new audience.[16]

It might seem simplifying to condense the influences to the two positions. It is not so straightforward, however. Till now, these two not easily compatible positions where mostly visible in the Lithuanian constructivist writings.[17] An analysis of the Lithuanian constructivist writings (and of their critics) will demonstrate it in the next section.

Before proceeding further, there is one point left to explicate – how can we speak about the tradition of some theoretical paradigm in a certain place? The understanding of the school might help there. According to Huysmans, a label of School may warrant "a rich body of work with a sufficient degree of coherence and continuity" that relies on "minimal continuity of people involved", and an explicit development of the "successive pieces of research through a critical engagement with the previous work of the group."[18] So, the most relevant here is the creative and consistent development of the original idea. The school label describes the local and unique development of the theory. However, before any movement in this direction, there must be a proper environment where the ideas could be formulated, discussed, applied and criticised. This is what I call here to have a theoretical tradition at a certain place.

2. Constructivism in Lithuania

Gražina Miniotaitė was the first to introduce a constructivist framework for the International Relations discipline in Lithuania. Her first attempt to apply the constructivist methodology was made in 1998, and she continues to write in this tradition now.[19] She was also the one who introduced the concept of securitization and analysed a relationship between the identity politics and security and foreign policies of the Baltic countries and presented the initial research directions.

There are three broad topics on which constructivist researchers are concentrating: identity issues and Lithuanian foreign policy, security policy and its securitization process and implications of constructivism for policy making. All these problems are connected and emerge more or less in most studies. For the clarity purposes they are analysed separately.

In one of the first articles there was stated that "[f]oreign and security policy of Lithuania, like that of other Baltic states, is closely related to the development of her political identity"[20]. This thesis was repeated through

many articles and was proved by various case studies. In one of her later articles Miniotaitė focuses on how the idea of Europe is integrated into the discourses on national identity in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and shows how their ideas of the nation-state depend on the East–West opposition:

"The Baltic States [...] have been creating narratives of belonging to the West, with the East as their threatening 'other'. The West is being associated with prosperity, security and democracy, whereas the East is linked with poverty, unpredictability and insecurity. Positive identification with Europe is accompanied by dissociation from non-Europe, with the emphasis on Russia's threats."[21]

She attempts to prove that integration into the EU and NATO reconstructs the identities of these countries and shows how they are reflected in their domestic and foreign policies. The idea and presence of Europe is an inevitable factor here. All identity processes since Lithuania has gained independence in 1990 are connected to thoughts and discussions of Lithuanians about the country's relation to Europe and to Russia as its permanent Other. This discourse of being between the West and the East dominated public thinking, and only after the two enlargements in 2004 the official argumentations shifted to a new discourse – Lithuania as a regional centre trying to dissociate from the long developed narrative of Lithuania as a wanna-to-be a true European (this goal is "accomplished") and to a create new one – Lithuania as a leader and pathfinder for the Eastern European countries to the democracy and better well-being. [22]

Miniotaitė notices the artificiality of this process: there are no viable narratives to support this policy. Instead, a more logical and "natural" way is to associate with the Nordic dimension. So, the main line of the argument stays the same – it is impossible to change the foreign policy of the country without changing the identity discourse.[23]

Thus, analysis of the identity politics and foreign policy mainly note the Lithuania being between East and West and trying to make its own identity construction from two categories. The first one is mostly used negatively – as something "we are not", the second one – absolutely positive – is what "we" want to be or already are. Another aspect, which is always noted, is about tension between the discourses of the identity and sovereignty. This tension moves the identity politics as it forces to redefine,

review existing concepts. So, on one side, foreign policy creates challenges to the existing identity structures of Lithuania; on a second side, identity politics forces to be more responsible about the foreign policy strategies.

The securitization idea attracted even more attention. After the initial presentation of the idea and its application analysing the Lithuanian–Polish relations and conceptions of national security[24], it was applied to the analysis of the information security (Lithuanian–Russian relations)[25], public discussions regarding the President's visit to Moscow to celebrate the anniversary of the Victory Day in 2005.[26]

One of the indications that the alternative theoretical position is getting to be regarded more seriously is when the criticism begins. One could even say that when something is ignored or disregarded, it does not exist. Tomas Janeliūnas was the one who tried to evaluate critically the securitization theory.[27] He did it by analyzing the same case from two different positions – securitization and the position called by him "communicative security". The case was the discussions in late 2004 and early 2005 whether Lithuanian President Valdas Adamkus should go to Moscow to celebrate the anniversary of the victory in the Second World War against Germany.

Janeliūnas has concluded that the securitization theory is useful, because it helps to reveal how a problem becomes a security problem, what arguments are used, what actors are acting, but it does not help to find the best ways to solve the existing problems, so the best is to combine two methodologies – constructivist and positivist.[28] It was something what Wendt tried to propagate, although he didn't use his ideas or made very elaborate methodological discussions. He also formulated the alternative "objectivist model for security analysis" trying to show the possibility to have a model which allows evaluating and calculating the threats.[29] His conclusion was also that constructivist analysis couldn't contribute to the policy prescriptions. The question of the practical use of constructivism is the main counter-argument of realists.The need to justify the use of a new theory is frequently grounded on the possibility to extract a practical use from it.

Recently two Lithuanian academicians, Nortautas Statkus and Kęstutis Paulauskas, have noticed quite an obvious fact that there is a lot of discussion on both sides of the camps (constructivists and realists), but these two

do not talk to each other. Without just stating that and moving in one's own direction they decided to make an experiment and to discuss Lithuanian foreign policy in one article from two theoretical points of view – realism and constructivism – trying to show the value of both approaches.[30] Besides, they wanted to prove that both theories have a practical aspect and can be used as foreign policy tools, which is not a surprising conclusion for realism but not much expected from a constructivist researcher. So, it was a step in a new direction – to deliberate openly the possibility of using constructivism as a practical instrument for Lithuanian foreign policy. Keeping in mind all the initial assumptions of the constructivist paradigm, it is a very unusual though not unimaginable step.

One of the surprising conclusions of their article is the acknowledgement that "realist theory does not give answers to many practical problems."[31] Not putting it so radically – at least it cannot give as much as it supposedly promises. In their view, the realist position has become too static and does not react quickly enough to the changing realities of the external environment of Lithuania. Critically evaluating the current pro-US and harsh anti-Russian foreign policy of Lithuania, they try to find arguments for a change of the foreign policy strategy using the constructivist framework.

Constructivism as a tool presents itself in recommendations to foreign policy makers. These recommendations are quite radical if to keep in mind the current position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which concentrates almost exclusively on building and influencing the Eastern neighbourhood and promoting its interests to the main international players – the EU, US and, sometimes, Russia. On the other hand, they are not so unexpected if to review how the alternatives are discussed in a public discourse.

They recommend that, first of all, Lithuania needs to reassess its European policy. This means paying more attention to what is going on in the EU and trying to participate actively in the community's decision-making process. Their second recommendation sounds very ambitious – to integrate the EU into Lithuanian identity descriptions, i.e. Lithuania has finally to begin living "in the EU", not "with the EU". Statkus and Paulauskas urge the political elite to regard Europe not as an object. They advise to consider Europe and Lithuania as the subjects that are interacting and reaching goals inside the European system. Europe is not a stable structure

which has to be conquered or considered as a constant coffer from where you get money. Finally, they propose a more active participation of Lithuania in the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy and advocate the desecuritization of the relations with Russia. This all will allow finally becoming a "normal European country" without being a "bridge" or a "buffer zone" – the descriptions that imply a constant insecurity of the country.[32]

The recommendations are trying to change the course of Lithuanian foreign policy and in essence are very interesting to discuss. For the purpose of this article, they are interesting from a different angle: how they are connected to and derived from the constructivist propositions. Presenting constructivist analysis of international relations, they use the same two inspirations – the securitization school and Wendt's ideas about identity. They mix them interchangeably – without considering their different roots and assumptions as well as different conclusions. Theoretical inconsistency is quite obvious, but it is not the methodological and argumentative problems that are most interesting. The most surprising are the recommendation points that authors derive from the constructivist framework. They make an assumption that there is such a foreign policy strategy which may be called constructivist: "It is rather impossible to rapidly turn Lithuania's foreign policy from a realist, geopolitical path towards a constructivist one".[33] That "construtctivism implies transnational integration, the end of the national policy, and the beginning of the supranational one."[34]

However, apart form the statement about the necessity to desecuritize foreign relations with Russia, it is impossible to regard the other proposed changes of Lithuanian foreign policy as constructivist. They might be called pro-European or liberal institutionalist. Constructivism is a position which does not give concrete policy recommendations. Its goal is to understand how the international political processes work, how foreign policies of the states function. Although the securitization school sometimes states that the goal is to desecuritize as many questions as possible, it does not recommend to do this automatically. First of all it concerns analysis: it is necessary to demonstrate how the foreign policy works, how it depends on the words used or on the identity discourses in the country; the second part – recommendations – becomes a totally different endeavour. You cannot automatically say that constructivism

deals with transnational integration. You have to show how contemporary processes tend to a certain direction.

So, why all the proposals were called constructivist? Constructivism became the means to justify the new foreign policy strategy. And the proposed strategy is quite a huge alternative to the current one, so, what but the theoretical alternative to the dominant theoretical position, realism, can validate it? This in itself is neither good nor bad; just methodologically incorrect. But it induces more reflexivity and creation of alternative scenarios. So, constructivism becomes a policy tool not only because it offers a different approach to policy, but also because being an alternative thinking itself it allows an easier presentation and justification of different ideas.

The explicit or implicit idea to justify constructivism by showing its practical use is constant in constructivist writings in Lithuania. The uncertainty rises from here also because mainly according to this criterion the theories are valued. This environment does not create proper conditions for appreciating theoretical thinking.

3. So what? Challenges and perspectives

Is it possible to make any conclusions about the state of the constructivist theoretical tradition of International Relations in Lithuania? The time span of six or seven years, of course, does not allow any final statements. Clearly, the quantitative development is already visible: younger researchers start to get into this framework of analysis and apply theoretical knowledge for the case studies and more bachelor and master theses are written in this tradition. It means that people are looking for some new insights and new ideas that can be developed and applied more creatively. And the domination of one research tradition is not even useful for the hegemony itself, at least for one simple reason – it starts to get boring and rigid.

However, it is very difficult to speak about the tradition yet. And this is not only the problem of the small academic community. The question is about the existence, or more exactly non-existence, of internal discussions and the absence of almost any visible Lithuanian constructivism at the international level. Almost all related works are published inside the country. This way not only the reactions and criticism are confined, but also the authority of some of the statements loses its worth. We may like or not the

fact, but academic community has its own hierarchical system which researchers have to take into account. This system makes its own requirements, and if you are not seen you do not exist.

Clearly, there are a few challenges for the academics who are doing constructivist research in Lithuania. First, the main and almost only topic where constructivist insights are applied is exclusively foreign and security policy of one country – Lithuania. On the one hand, there should be no surprises here. For a very long time since its independence all Lithuanian domestic and foreign policy has been concentrated along two goals – the EU and NATO memberships. And who but not Lithuanian academics themselves should have known the situation better? But the expertise in one field is not enough.

The relevance of the topic and the easily accessible and comprehensible empirical material allowed making great use of the new theoretical insights. Specializing in one topic can help to get some expert niche in the epistemic community; the development, however, cannot stop there. So, the challenge is to introduce new research objects and questions into the analysis trying to demonstrate not only the local knowledge of a local topic. This only can help to integrate into the wider, first of all, European, academic community. It is not too daring to say that the Lithuanian International Relations research community has this goal.

The second challenge consists in a still small amount of tools used in constructivist analysis. The weakest link in all constructivist enterprise is the understanding of methodology and the methods used. There is no consistency in what methodology is exercised and why a certain methodological approach is used. From there stems the tendency to mix many constructivist theoretical writings into one quintessence using arguments from one or another theoretician, without considering different roots and assumptions of their statements. This problem, of course, is connected with the general lack of methodological training in the Lithuanian political science discipline. Nevertheless, this challenge must be overcome if we want to talk about building any tradition of International Relations theory in Lithuania.

Although being sceptical and cautious about the current status of constructivism in Lithuania and finding no arguments enough to put a full stop instead of the question mark at the end of the title of this article, we

cannot deny quite a fast development from a zero point during the last seven years. The community of scholars has hardly been formed, and it is the basis for the tradition to develop. We can hope that in Lithuania not only the tradition of constructivism, but also the constructivist school might emerge one day.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 Traditionally, to distinguish between the discipline and the object it analyzes, the discipline is written International Relations and the reality the discipline tries to understand and analyze is written in small letters – international relations. This tradition is used in this article.

2 E.g., Lithuanian–Polish, Lithuanian–Russian, Lithuanian–German, etc. The best example is the first issues of the journal *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review.*

3 A more liberal view is represented in European studies and not surprisingly so – the nature of the EU does not allow to use strict realist approaches.

4 E.g., Grikienis, A., Kritinės geopolitikos ir tarptautinės politikos praktikos santykis, *Geopolitikos akiračiai,* Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2004, pp. 65–78; Jakniūnaitė, D., Naujausios tendencijos tarptautinių santykių teorijoje: konstruktyvizmas, postmodernizmas ir virtualizmas, *Politologija*, 2000 (4), pp. 52–88.

5 E.g., Laurinavičius, Č., Motieka, E., Statkus, N., *Baltijos valstybių geopolitikos bruožai. XX amžius*, 2005, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas; Motieka, E., Statkus, N., Globalios ir Baltijos valstybių geopolitinės situacijos pokyčiai, *Lietuvos metinė strateginė apžvalga* 2003, Vilnius: Generolo Juozo Žemaičio Lietuvos karo akademija, 2004, 9–52; Motieka, E., Statkus, N., Geopolitinių kodų struktūra ir dinamika, *Politologija*, 2003 (1), pp. 60–110.; Statkus, N., Motieka, E., Laurinavičius, Č., *Geopolitiniai kodai: tyrimo metodologija,* Vilnius; Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2003.

6 This fact is based on the theses of students of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University.

7 Adler, E., Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1997, 3(3), pp. 319–363; Walt, S., International relations: one world, many theories, *Foreign Policy*, 1998 (110), 29–46.

8 Checkel, J. T., Constructivist turn in international relations theory, *World Politics*, 1998, 50 (2), pp. 324–348.

9 See Kratochwil, F., Constructivism as an approach to interdisciplinary study, in *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*, K. M. Fierke, K. Erik Jorgensen (eds.), Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2001, pp.16–17.

10 See, e.g., Hopf, T., The promise of constructivism in international relations theory", *International Security*, 1998, 23(1), pp. 171–200, Adler, E. Seizing the Middle

Ground; Checkel, J. T., „Social Constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay, *Review of International Studies*, 2004 (30), pp. 229–244, Wendt, A., *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, also Miniotaitė, G., Jakniūnaitė, D., Lietuvos saugomo politika ir identitetas šiuolaikinių saugumo studijų požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2001, 3(23), pp. 21–43; for a very basic introduction: Jakniūnaitė, D., Naujausios tendencijos tarptautinių santykių teorijoje: konstruktyvizmas, postmodernizmas ir virtualizmas, *Politologija*, 2000 (4), pp. 52–88.

[11] Miniotaitė, G., Convergent geography and divergent identities: a decade of Transformation in the Baltic States, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 2003, 16 (2), p. 210.

[12] Buzan, B., Waever, O., de Wilde, J., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.

[13] More on that see Miniotaitė, G., Jakniūnaitė, D., Lietuvos saugomo politika ir identitetas šiuolaikinių saugumo studijų požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2001 (3), pp. 21–43.

[14] Wendt, A., Anarchy is what states make of it: social construction of power politics, *International Organization*, 1992, 46(2), pp. 391–425.

[15] Wendt, A., *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[16] E.g., Jakniūnaitė, D., Konstruktyvistinė saugumo samprata, *Seminarai: Atviros Visuomenės Kolegija*, sud. A. Kulakauskas ir A. Sverdiolas, Vilnius: Strofa, 2001, pp. 157–168.

[17] Wendt's influence might even more increase because of the translation of his book *Social Theory of International Politics* to Lithuanian (in 2005).

[18] Huysmans, J., Revisiting Copenhagen: or, on the creative development of a security, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1998, 4(4), p. 479–480.

[19] Miniotaitė, G., Lithuania's security: dynamics of perceptions and policy, in *Hard and soft Security in the Baltic Sea Region*, Jansson, R., ed., Stockholm: Olof Palme International Centre, 1998, pp. 89–100. Miniotaitė, G., The security policy of Lithuania and the 'Integration Dilemma', *COPRI Working Papers*, 2000 (5), Copenhagen.; Miniotaitė, G., Baltic States: in search of security and identity, *COPRI Working Paper*, 2001 (14), Copenhagen; Miniotaitė, G., Convergent geography and divergent identities: a decade of transformation in the Baltic States", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 2003, 16(2), pp. 209–222; Miniotaitė, G., The Baltic States: in search of security and identity, in *Almost NATO: Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security*, Ch. Krupnick (ed.), Lanham Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

[20] Miniotaitė, G., The security policy of Lithuania and the 'Integration Dilemma', p. 2.

[21] Miniotaitė, G., Convergent Geography, p. 214.

[22] See also, Neumann, I. B., *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

[23] This kind of research was mostly done by Miniotaite (above), other examples include: Statkus, N., Paulauskas, K., Lietuvos užsienio politika tarptautinių santykių teorijų ir praktikos kryžkelėje, *Politologija*, 2006 (2), pp. 12–61; Jurkynas, M., Brotherhood reconsidered: region-building in the Baltics, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 2004, 35(1), pp. 1–31. Partly also Nekrašas, E., Is Lithuania a Northern or Central European country?, *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 1998 (1), pp. 19–46.

[24] Miniotaitė, G., Jakniūnaitė, D., Lietuvos saugomo politika ir identitetas šiuolaikinių saugumo studijų požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2001 (3), pp. 21–43.

[25] Jurgelevičiūtė, D., Information security in Lithuania: the problem of May 9th and the clash of Russian fighter, Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review, 2006, forthcoming.

[26] Janeliūnas, T., Gegužes 9-osios problema saugumizavimo teorijos ir komunikacinio saugumo požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2005, 2(38), pp. 3–30.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Janeliūnas, T., Gegužes 9-osios problema, P. 27.

[29] Janeliūnas, T, Saugumo studijos – grįžimas prie objektyvistinio analizės modelio, *Politologija*, 2004, 2, 40–71.

[30] Statkus, N., Paulauskas, K., Between geopolitics and postmodernity: quo vadis Lithuanian foreign policy?, *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 2006, forthcoming, in Lithuanian: Statkus, N., Paulauskas, Kęstutis, 2006, Lietuvos užsienio politika tarptautinių santykių teorijų ir praktikos kryžkelėje, *Politologija*, 2006 (2), pp. 12–61.

[31] Statkus and Paulauskas, forthcoming.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

LITERATŪRE

Adler, E., Seizing the middle ground: constructivism in world politics, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1997, 3(3), pp. 319–363.

Buzan, B., Waever, O., de Wilde, J., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.

Checkel, J. T., Constructivist turn in international relations theory, *World Politics*, 1998, 50 (2), pp. 324–348.

Checkel, J. T., Social constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay, *Review of International Studies*, 2004, 30, pp. 229–244.

Grikienis, A., Kritinės geopolitikos ir tarptautinės politikos praktikos santykis, *Geopolitikos akiračiai*, Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2004, pp. 65–78.

Hopf, T., The promise of constructivism in international relations theory, *International Security*, 1998, 23(1), pp. 171–200.

Huysmans, J., Revisiting Copenhagen: or, on the creative development of a security, *European Journal of International Relations*, 1999, 4(4), pp. 479–505.

Jakniūnaitė, D., Konstruktyvistinė saugumo samprata, *Seminarai: Atviros Visuomenės Kolegija*, sud. A. Kulakauskas ir A. Sverdiolas, Vilnius: Strofa, 2001, pp. 157–168.

Jakniūnaitė, D., Naujausios tendencijos tarptautinių santykių teorijoje: konstruktyvizmas, postmodernizmas ir virtualizmas, *Politologija*, 2000 (4), pp. 52–88.

Janeliūnas, T., Gegužes 9-osios problema saugumizavimo teorijos ir komunikacinio saugumo požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2005 (2), 3–30.

Janeliūnas, T., Saugumo studijos – grįžimas prie objektyvistinio analizės modelio, *Politologija,* 2004 (2) 40–71.

Jurgelevičiūtė, D., Information security in Lithuania: the problem of May 9th and the clash of Russian fighter, Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review, 2006, forthcoming.

Jurkynas, M., Brotherhood reconsidered: region-building in the Baltics, *Journal of Baltic Studies,* 2004 (35), 1, pp. 1–31.

Kratochwil, F., Constructivism as an approach to interdisciplinary study, in *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*, K. M. Fierke, K. E. Jorgensen (eds.), Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 2001, pp.13–35.

Laurinavičius, Č., Motieka, E., Statkus, N., *Baltijos valstybių geopolitikos bruožai. XX amžius*, Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2005.

Miniotaitė, G., Baltic states: in search of security and identity, *COPRI Working Paper*, 2001, p. 14.

Miniotaitė, G., Convergent geography and divergent identities: a decade of transformation in the Baltic States *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 2003, 16 (2), pp. 209–222.

Miniotaitė, G., Lithuania's security: dynamics of perceptions and policy, in *Hard and Soft Security in the Baltic Sea Region*, Robert Jansson, ed., Stockholm: Olof Palme International Centre, 1998, pp. 89–100.

Miniotaitė, G., The Baltic States: in search of security and identity, in *Almost NATO: Partners and Players in Central and Eastern European Security*, Ch. Krupnick (ed.), Lanham Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

Miniotaitė, G., The security policy of Lithuania and the 'Integration Dilemma', *COPRI Working Papers*, 2000, (5).

Miniotaitė, G., Jakniūnaitė, D., Lietuvos saugumo politika ir identitetas šiuolaikinių saugumo studijų požiūriu, *Politologija*, 2001, 3, pp. 21–43.

Motieka, E., Statkus, N., Geopolitinių kodų struktūra ir dinamika, *Politologija*, 2003, 1, pp. 60–110.

Motieka, E., Statkus, N., Globalios ir Baltijos valstybių geopolitinės situacijos pokyčiai, *Lietuvos metinė strateginė apžvalga* 2003, Vilnius: Generolo Juozo Žemaičio Lietuvos karo akademija, 2004, pp. 9–52.

Nekrašas, E., Is Lithuanian a Northern or Central European Country?, *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 1998 (1), pp. 19–46.

Neumann, I. B. and Waever, Ole (eds.), *The Future of International Relations: masters in the Making?*, London, New York: Routledge, 1997.

Neumann, I. B., *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Statkus, N., Motieka, E., Laurinavičius, Č., *Geopolitiniai kodai: tyrimo metodologija,* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2003.

Statkus, N., Paulauskas, K., Lietuvos užsienio politika tarptautinių santykių teorijų ir praktikos kryžkelėje, *Politologija,* 2006 (2), pp. 12–61.

Statkus, N., Paulauskas, K., Between geopolitics and postmodernity: quo vadis Lithuanian foreign policy?, *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review,* 2006, forthcoming.

Walt, S., International relations: one world, many theories, *Foreign Policy*, 1998, 110, 29–46.

Wendt, A., Anarchy is what states make of it: social construction of power politics, *International Organization*, 1992, 46(2), pp. 391–425.

Wendt, A., *Social Theory of International Politics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Vilnius, 2006.