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Abstract

The paper stems from dissatisfaction with the present state of research carried out in the domain of development policy elaborated by the new member states (NMSs) of the EU. The present research programme is notably characterized by its normative orientation due to a weak conceptualization of both national and global realities in international development; an ambiguous causality between variables (for example, political will, underdeveloped institutional capacities, lack of interest from civil society); and by the fact that Europeanization seems to be privileged as a conceptual framework, which results in largely mitigated analytical contributions. The conclusion advanced by this research programme is basically that Europeanization was shallow in the sphere of aid policy. The paper will argue for the adoption of a broader reality of development aid, which, notably by its historic evolution and operating manner, is to be conceived of as a global policy. Consequently, the inscription of Lithuanian development policy within international reality (references to the United Nations, the World Bank) allows for emphasizing the dominant role of the EU in the diffusion process of this policy in Lithuania.

I. Introduction

The paper stems from dissatisfaction of the present state of affairs of research on development policy in the new member states of the EU (NMSs). Its objective is therefore to propose, via the case study of Lithuania, a renewed orientation of this research which currently tends to advance a limited scope of reality observation and, consequently, condemns itself to a normative deviation. Although current research can as well be criticized for an ambiguous causality of domestic variables influencing development policy, the paper will draw only on the first weakness. In order to bring more empirical rigour and positivism to research on Lithuania’s aid policy, development strategies in general will be referred to within the global (or international) vs. European context, notably by referring to other international organizations.

Aid policy has been adopted in Lithuania and the other NMSs. It is today part of their public policy landscape. Whereas the logic of a binomial analysis of the NMSs would allow for briefly concluding that diffusion of development policy has taken place, this paper adopts a qualitative approach by drawing on the process of conditional diffusion. As argued in a similar vein by Wade Jacoby, it is important to go beyond research on which piece of legislation was adopted and when; institutional performance of and consequent modifications to the diffusing object are to be analyzed more thoroughly. Moreover, according to Jacoby, research on diffusion tends to focus on changes that intervene within individual laws, which is easy to analyze; yet more complex objects of analysis, such as institutions, which appeal to interactions between the state and society, necessitate more analytical attention to the social and historic context of a country.  

According to the argument advanced in this paper, Lithuanian aid policy is not comprehensively informed by global development issues. Development cooperation of Lithuania is regionally limited both in its multilateral and bilateral aspects. Whereas the first aspect appeals to the European (vs. global) dimension, the second one refers to Lithuania’s partner countries which are its closest neighbours (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine). Such a regional focus is only natural in the sense that development policy is domestically anchored. In other words, it depends on practical knowledge possessed by domestic actors. Regional realities constitute thus a heuristic framework for Lithuanian authorities to proceed with advancing the country’s aid policy.

The analysis of aid policy in Lithuania will notably appeal to the extension of reality observation, instead of an exclusive focus on the EU. There is hardly any solid argument to be found in favour of development policy to be considered as a European policy (the European Commission, EC, and the member states continue to possess shared competency in the domain; the EC has only relatively recently undertaken active efforts in order to achieve greater efficiency of aid policy, for example). Such an extension will not however eliminate the influence of the EU; on the contrary, it will allow for emphasizing a significant degree of Europeanization of Lithuanian development policy.

I will begin by presenting the main points that mitigate academic contributions of current research on development policy in the NMSs. An expanded analytical framework of the research programme in question will then follow. Thirdly, I will try to show a neglected global dimension of development realities in Lithuanian aid policy. Lastly, contrary to the argument of shallow Europeanization advanced by other authors, I will argue for the importance of a regional dimension (including both the EU framework in general and the Eastern Partnership in particular) that facilitates Lithuanian authorities the initiation to development cooperation.

II. A framework for analysis: Europeanization Reconsidered

The current research programme on aid policy in the NMSs prioritizes the Europeanization framework of analysis; yet it presents several weaknesses, which begs for its reconsideration.

A. Weaknesses of Current Research

Development cooperation in the NMSs in general seems to have aroused some interest within the community of researchers. In 2012, for example, an entire special review of Perspectives on European Politics and Society (Vol. 13, No. 1) was dedicated specifically to aid policy in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). The objective of this review was to present the first systemic analysis in the field. Analytical efforts regarding development aid in the CEE countries appeal to the European framework.


2 Horký and Lightfoot, “From Aid Recipients to Aid Donors...”: 9.

Current research basically concentrates on three elements of analysis: the official development aid (ODA) volume, the geographical and sectorial focus, as well as the institutional structure of aid administration. The conclusion of such an analysis argues as follows: development policy in the NMSs has not succeeded in gaining solid foundation, as it is attested by weak relevant governmental structures, weak political will, and insufficient public awareness as to the challenges in aid policy. Academic literature on development policy in the NMSs appeals to the importance of limited short-term pragmatic national interests, which are at the core of their foreign policy. Consequently, it is argued that Europeanization was shallow as far as the promotion of development cooperation norms is concerned.

Yet this research programme presents several substantial weaknesses which can be distinguished according to their level of analysis, i.e. national, meso (European), and macro (international). The national dimension, as already mentioned above, refers to an underdeveloped analysis of causal processes of endogenous variables. In other words, the fact that development policy has not gained solid foundation in the NMSs, including Lithuania, is attributed altogether to weak political will, insufficient public awareness, as well as inactive civil society in the domain, and low ODA levels. Such a circular reasoning does not make any distinction between causal explanatory power of different variables.

However, the paper draws essentially on the weaknesses of current research on the macro- and meso-levels. As for the macro level, researchers emphasize that the notion of “need” does not have any place in aid policy in the NMSs. Lightfoot notes for instance that neither Estonia nor Latvia targets the ACP countries; although Lithuania maintains relations with Mauritania, such cooperation appears to be less “altruistic” if inspected upon more closely: the Mauritanian coast brings to Lithuanian fishermen the highest percentage of fish caught on the African continent. Similarly, Balázs Szent-Iványi argues that Hungary take advantage of development policy in order to satisfy its economic and foreign policy interests.

Yet these efforts to disqualify development policy in the NMSs on the basis of their pragmatic national interests cannot be substantiated from an empirical point of view. In other words, such pragmatism, conceived of as being closely linked to foreign policy, is as well observed in the case of established donors and the EU itself. The fact that bilateral aid has always been part of short-term national interests of donors has become a banality. For example, the DAC recognizes that “development cooperation occupies a central place in Ireland’s foreign policy”, aid policy being “one of the six high level objectives assigned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.”

---

1 See, for example, Lightfoot, “The Europeanisation of International Development Policies…; Horký and Lightfoot, “From Aid Recipients to Aid Donors…“.
2 Horký and Lightfoot: 1.
Furthermore, Austria and France are known for inflating their ODA volumes by including items non-classifiable as aid.\(^1\) Italy, Greece, and Portugal have never allocated high levels of their ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa,\(^2\) which permits Dominik Kopiński to argue that the lack of Visegrad Four’s interest for Africa makes the corresponding countries part of a whole community.\(^3\) While striving for policy coherence, Sweden recognizes that its multilateral aid policy is supposed to have the most significant effect possible in the domain of goals for development, “while supporting other foreign policy objectives.”\(^4\)

The argument, according to which pragmatic interests of aid policy do not distinguish the NMSs from other members of the international community of donors, can be even more substantiated by references to the communitarian development policy, i.e. implemented by the EC. The EC is simultaneously a bilateral and multilateral donor. This latter dimension is commonly perceived as contributing to a more objective and coherent development assistance, devoid of “commercial and political considerations.”\(^5\) The EC plays an important role in the domain of development policy, in the sense that it coordinates European aid programmes, harmonizes management of aid and hence reduces administrative weight on recipient governments.\(^6\) The overall objective of such activities is a greater efficiency of aid. Some authors argue that the EC’s attention paid to problems of efficacy, efficiency, and quality of aid constitutes its most striking feature as a donor.\(^7\)

Yet European development policy has a highly complex structure, which conceals divergent interests, such as those of the former Directorate General for Development (currently the Directorate General “EuropeAid and Cooperation”, DG DEVCO) or those of the former DG for External Relations (currently integrated within the European External Action Service, EEAS).\(^8\) Numerous arguments are available to put forward the same pragmatism reflected in European development cooperation as the one emphasized by authors interested in aid policy in the NMSs. Gordon Crawford argues for instance that the EU, while presenting itself as a normative actor at the international level, has in reality truly realist objectives, as the author demonstrates via the case of the EU’s promotion of human right and democracy in Central Asia.\(^9\) According to Gorm Rye Olsen, development assistance was the only foreign policy instrument of the EU at the time of the Cold War.\(^10\) For Olsen, the very beginning of the 2000 reform at the EU level in order to activate development policy.\(^11\) Other domains, notably trade and security, reflect as well pragmatic interests of the EU. The Union’s goals in the trade sphere often conflict with other declared priorities, including development cooperation.\(^12\) The existing relation between trade and development is explicitly recognized as being part of the comparative communitarian advantages.\(^13\)

---

\(^{1}\) Lightfoot, “Enlargement and the Challenge of EU Development Policy”: 133-134.
\(^{3}\) Ibid.
\(^{6}\) Ibid.
\(^{8}\) Dearden: 114-115.
\(^{11}\) Ibid.
\(^{13}\) Dearden: 116.
These few examples validate the EU as a bilateral donor, in the sense described by François Pacquement: according to him, bilateral donors are generally contested by multilaterals, which situate themselves “above particular national interests” in order to serve the general interest.\(^1\) Following the same logic, John Degnbol-Martinussen and Poul Engberg-Pedersen conceive of the EU as a regional organ having its political-economic interests, instead of a multilateral agency.\(^2\)

Briefly, European development policy, although having poverty elimination as its prime objective, is far from being detached from the EU’s external policy interests, contrary to the position of NGOs such as the CONCORD. According to the latter, “ODA envelopes [should be] allocated to developing countries on the basis of harmonised and objective criteria relating to the needs and the conditions necessary to realise development policy objectives and the MDGs. Foreign affairs or economic interests of the EU should in no way interfere with these decisions. These criteria should be subject to an interinstitutional agreement between the EC, the EP and the EEAS.”\(^3\)

Such a summarized analysis of existing reality in the domain of aid policy emphasizes the absence of altruism in relevant activities of donors, including the EU. Consequently, current research on development policy in the NMSs appears as entirely delinked from empirical ground and as advancing normative considerations. Besides, the lack of analytical rigour based on reality observation characterizes current research in yet another sense (meso-level): whereas authors writing about aid policy in the NMSs focus on Europeanization apprehended as adoption of the EU’s rules, they do not substantiate this European dimension. Current research in question refers as well to other international organizations, notably the OECD and the UNDP, as well as the Canadian International Development Agency, which have been active in the NMSs; yet no analytical distinction is made between aid policy strategies as vectors of specific norms of the EU and those of other actors. For instance, Horký recognizes that the EU’s principles and rules are established based on an international consensus; the Union and its Member States act within a multi-level environment and form multi-level networks in their turn, hence the difficulty of establishing causal relations.\(^4\) The UN recommendations and the OECD’s principles of aid efficiency have been incorporated within the EU’s rules; at the same time, the EU and its Member States have influenced the multilateral frame.\(^5\) The fact that European rules and/or norms are not analytically distinguished from other external influences makes Europeanization appear merely as a temporal circumstance and devoid it of its conceptual substance.

**B. Development Cooperation as a Diffusing Object**

In order to provide Europeanization with more analytical and conceptual vigour, this paper argues in favour of attributing to development policy a global character. Such a step is anchored in existing international realities as well as the historical perspective of development policy, the EC having been a marginal actor in developing aid policy at the global scale.\(^6\) The spread of aid policy

---

2. Degnbol-Martinussen and Engberg-Pedersen, p. 142.
4. Ibid., p. 8.
5. Ibid.
to Lithuania is thus to be analyzed as a result of diffusion.\textsuperscript{1} As argued by Fabrizio Gilardi, “[d]iffusion pertains directly to disputes over the definition, causes, and consequences of globalization”.\textsuperscript{2} Such a conceptual stance does not contradict the Europeanization framework; on the contrary, it is apt to contribute to the latter’s enhancement: the introduction, along the EU, of other international actors in the process of aid policy formulation in Lithuania provides a comparative perspective allowing for emphasizing the dominant role of the European dimension. This role appears as even more significant, if one considers the lack of targeted action from the EC with regard to the implementation of aid policy.\textsuperscript{3}

The “constitution” and “operational mode” of aid policy in its global dimension is for example advanced by Pacquement.\textsuperscript{4} According to him, development aid, if apprehended “from above”, is peculiar in its economic and historical aspects, having resulted in a “common language”.\textsuperscript{5} As maintained by Pacquement, development aid is characterized by dynamics which does not resemble international transfers of public policy in other domains: whereas the object of aid is commonly shared by different actors, these tend to act according to their specific logic as far as other spheres are concerned.\textsuperscript{6} The international consensus in development cooperation is expressly reflected in the fact that aid policy is “partially multilateralized”, hence its status close to that of “a mechanism of international redistribution”.\textsuperscript{7}

From a basic conceptual point of view, diffusion encompasses Europeanization studies.\textsuperscript{8} However, researchers in the domain of diffusion and those in Europeanization have come to concentrate on relatively different methodological agendas. The former give preference to the quantitative perspective, whereas the latter tend towards qualitative research. Such a distinction is far from being rigidly established (for example, Kurt Weyland\textsuperscript{9}); yet diffusion of a given policy, be it on a federative or global level, remains to be largely based on a binomial logic (adoption vs. non-adoption of the policy). In their analysis of democratization, while referring to the quantitative tradition, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch and Michael Ward argue for example that “[e]mpirically, we can only observe the regimes that prevail in a country in a given year, and the specific mechanisms that lead to changes are of course not directly observable.”\textsuperscript{10} A relative negligence of endogenous factors influencing on policy diffusion is noted by Andrea Lenschow, Duncan Liefferink, and Sietske Veenman in the following manner: although literature on diffusion had at some point shown slight interest to domestic factors, it “began to focus on elaborating the nature of the linkage

---

\textsuperscript{1} The paper follows does not aim here at further elaborating on the mechanisms through which diffusion operates; the focus is rather “the soil in which the seed of change is sown”. Andrea Lenschow, Duncan Liefferink, and Sietske Veenman, “When the Birds Sing. A Framework for Analysing Domestic Factors behind Policy Convergence,” \textit{Journal of European Public Policy} Vol. 12, No. 5 (2005): 801.


\textsuperscript{3} This was attested, for instance, by a representative from the MFA of Latvia, who contributed to the elaboration of the first formalized national aid policy document, as well as by a representative from the EC (anonymous interview).

\textsuperscript{4} Pacquement, “Bâtir des politiques globales…”.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Ibid.}: 275.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Ibid.}: 267.

\textsuperscript{8} See, for example, Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin, Geoffrey Garrett, eds., \textit{The Global Diffusion of Markets and Democracy} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Gilardi, “Transnational Diffusion: Norms…”


\textsuperscript{10} “Empirically, we can only observe the regimes that prevail in a country in a given year, and the specific mechanisms that lead to changes are of course not directly observable.” Kristian Skrede Gleditsch and Michael D. Ward, “Diffusion and the Spread of Democratic Institutions”: 281; in: Simmons, Dobbin, and Garrett, eds., \textit{The Global Diffusion of Markets and Democracy}. 
structures facilitating diffusion between states.”

One of the seminal works on diffusion, *The Global Diffusion of Markets and Democracy* edited by Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin, and Geoffrey Garrett, published relatively recently (in 2008), somewhat adheres to the previous consideration in the sense that it concentrates on distinguishing diffusion mechanisms on a largely conceptual level; specificities of a given country or even region remain unanalyzed.

On the one hand, it is obvious that the scope of ambition of researchers interested in such global phenomena as diffusion of democracy would not allow for a detailed qualitative analysis. On the other hand, however, it is to be noted that this research programme is not without weaknesses, and there are alternatives to it. I will appeal to two weaknesses: firstly, it is to be noted that quantitative methodology, as already mentioned above, remains largely static (binomial logic) and, therefore, reduces the dynamism of diffusion as an interactive process; secondly, the quantitative perspective suggests that a given object (for example, a policy) at its starting point remains the same at its end point, hence the consideration of instant homogenization of political or other landscape throughout the world. For Thierry Depleuch, for instance, the homogenization aspect is inseparable from the very transfer of international programmes of development aid and democratic transition, focused on exporting standards of good governance.

Yet reality appears to be more complex than suggested by such conceptual considerations. As the paper will show below, Lithuanian aid policy has not been comprehensively diffused and does not reflect international realities. A qualitative analysis of the targeted case study of Lithuania appears as largely relevant, if one considers the fact that statistical data on ODA of the CEE countries in general remain not 100-percent reliable; furthermore, a relatively short period of the implementation of aid policy (more or less a decade, 2004-2012) is too short to provide substantial information on long-term tendencies in the domain of aid.

III. **Limited Scope of Lithuania’s Aid Policy**

Lithuania’s aid policy results from conditional diffusion, as it is not comprehensively informed by international development issues. However, a limited scope of the country’s development cooperation, both at the multilateral and bilateral levels, appears as logically stemming from the field of action of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). As a constituency interested in aid issues remains to be inexistent, the MFA assumes the dominant role in the domain.

A. **A Neglected Global Dimension of Development Realities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average percentage (%)</th>
<th>(2004-2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilateral aid</strong> (share in % of total aid)</td>
<td>Multilateral aid (share in % of total aid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>66,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>64,10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 To the author’s knowledge, the most comprehensive database on ODA provided by countries is available from [http://stats.oecd.org/qwids/](http://stats.oecd.org/qwids/). Yet some data continue to be inconsistent, as they are presented to the OECD by countries themselves that still have difficulty in reporting their aid flows.
The majority of Lithuania’s ODA transits via the EU budget. This is also the case in the rest of the CEE countries.\(^1\) Also, only a small part of their aid goes to other multilateral organizations. Hence, Lithuania’s stance as a multilateral donor in the sense that it gives more ODA through multilateral (vs. bilateral) channels, as suggested by the table, begs for some consideration. Most importantly, I refer here to the bilateral character of the EU as noted above, as well as the historical evolution of development aid, within which the EC played a marginal role if compared to the World Bank, the UN, and the OECD. The EC’s status at the global level is as well mitigated by the DAC’s methodological stance, as it excludes the EC from the donors of multilateral aid, since not all the DAC’s members are also members of the EU.

Yet, as I will try to show below, Lithuania’s aid policy is EU-oriented and does not grasp the complexity of development realities in its entirety. The paper will focus on the analysis of relevant archives of the MFA of Lithuania,\(^2\) in order to put forth its reaction to international realities in the domain. Then, a conceptual approach of Lithuanian authorities will be advanced, via the analysis of the relevant national strategic documentation of aid policy, such a method being used in

---

1 With the exception of Latvia and Estonia whose statistical data presents inconsistencies with their ODA delivered to the EU budget.

2 Archives were analyzed in December 2011, MFA, J. Tumo-Vaizgant, Vilnius, Lithuania.
diffusion studies. The consideration of Zachary Elkins who maintains that the content of national constitutions impacts on the quality of democracy in a given country attests the importance of official documents.

As for the analysis of MFA archives, it perfectly reflects a temporal coincidence between Lithuania’s entrance into the EU and its debut as an emerging donor country. The first archived dossiers related to Lithuanian development policy date back to 2003, while correspondence from external donors with regard to assistance received by Lithuania continued until 2006. A brief content analysis of the archives corresponding to the initial period of Lithuanian aid policy, i.e. 2003-2006, only enhances the significance of the European frame in the formulation of the policy in question by national authorities.

A more or less systemic approach of the MFA to development cooperation as a coordinator agency started in 2003: it took two initiatives to collect information on (i) the position of the Lithuanian ministries and other national institutions with regard to a series of seminars aimed at introducing civil servants to aid policy, and on (ii) ODA contributions allocated by national institutions. This second initiative was implemented at the request of the OECD. Generally, the responses received by the MFA were favourable to the mentioned series of seminars; furthermore, institutions put forward their contributions to international organizations (the UNEP, CITES, IUCN, IBRD, WHO), as well as bilateral cooperation in the form of consultations.

Two more axes of the MFA correspondence can be distinguished as corresponding to the above-mentioned initial period. There was documentation received with regard to events organized by the EU member states (mostly by those that were at the time presiding the EU Council); this correspondence largely appealed to consequences of the EU’s enlargement on European aid policy. Besides, archives of the time include as well documentation on global issues, in particular debt annihilations, poverty reduction strategies, alimentary needs at the global scale. It is to be noted that, while the first axis seems to have grasped the attention of Lithuanian authorities (as attested by their participation in certain events), the second axis did not succeed in arousing interest within the MFA. Invitations to events appealing to global issues, such as the seminars “Debt Cancellation/HIPS-PRSP/Budget Support” and “Poverty Reduction Strategies and Debt Relief”, were transferred to other institutions (the invitations to the seminars were forwarded to the ministry of finance (MoF), which was not represented therein).

In 2005 the global dimension of the MFA’s aid activities somewhat intensified, as Lithuania contributed the Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs after crises in South-East Asia, Pakistan, Iraq, and Sudan; moreover, the role of the UNDP office in Lithuania became more engaged in the transition of Lithuania from aid receiver to aid donor. Yet the role of the EC was present here again: the EC intervened in order to request that Lithuania’s contributions allocated to

---

1 Tom Ginsburg, Svitlana Chernykh, and Zachary Elkins, “Commitment and Diffusion: How and Why National Constitutions Incorporate International Law,” (2007): 11 // http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&amp;context=tom_ginsburg&amp;sei-redir=1&amp;referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.fr%2Furl%3Fsa%3Dt%26rct%3Dj%26q%3Dcommitmet%2520and%2520diffusion%3A%2520how%2520and%2520why%2520national%2520constitutions%2520incorporate%2520international%2520law%22&usg=AFQjCNF63kE5X9F5r3x9d3FjA%26ei%3DDkpnT-3DDkpT-rAFY9QXlomTCA%26ug%3DAFQfCNgFecrT92516fB buffering%3A%2520how%2520why%2520national%2520constitutions%2520incorporate%2520international%2520law%22 (accessed March 19, 2012).
2 Zachary Elkins, “Diffusion and Constitutionalization of Europe,” Comparative Political Studies Vol. 43, No. 8/9: 995; also, see, for example, Lenschow, Liefferink, and Veenman: 802.
3 We use “generally”, since only three responses were received, as suggested by the archives of the MFA.
countries in crises were communicated to the European pole. As for the UNDP Office, it emphasized the comparative advantages of Lithuania as having successfully become a democracy and joined the EU; it supported Lithuanian authorities in their efforts to deal with candidate countries to the Union (vs., for instance, African countries). Although the UNDP was probably the first agency having undertaken to systematize Lithuania’s transition experience, its role as an expert in development aid was neglected by the MFA during the elaboration of the first key policy document at the national level: The Development Co-operation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2006-2010. The UNDP was consulted when drafting the guidelines and had several substantial remarks: the Office recommended for instance that the MFA include references to other international organizations as aid partners (notably because of their vast intervention scope and experience in monitoring/evaluation practices). Yet none of the UNDP’s remarks was taken into consideration.

Other inconsistencies relative to Lithuanian aid policy can be added to the exclusion of international organizations from the scope of partners in development cooperation. During the same drafting process, the Ministry of Social Security and Labour (MSCL) noted that poverty reduction was not reflected among priority spheres of Lithuanian aid policy, although it appeared in the Millennium Declaration and the Consensus of Lithuanian Political Parties on Foreign Policy Goals and Tasks for 2004-2008. Besides, as noticed by the MSCL, support to European integration, one of the priority sectors mentioned in the draft, did not apply to any of the chosen partner countries; according to the MSCL, Lithuania should have chosen the Balkan countries as partner countries. Yet the MFA did not rectify the draft of the guidelines according to these remarks.

A conceptual limitation of Lithuanian authorities in the domain of development aid can also be invoked with regard to an incoherent classification of international organizations: for example, in 2006 was formed a dossier of archived documents “Documents of the development programme of the United Nations Organizations”; yet the content of the dossier relates not to the UNDP, but to relevant development international activities within the UN in general; also, some OSCE documents were included therein. Although the dossier is in principle characterized by a global aspect of aid policy (MDGs, UNCTAD, World Bank, WTO, CERF, WFP, UNFPA, Monterrey Summit, Doha Round, high level meetings on migration, reform of the ECOSOC, balanced economic growth, etc.), it is to be noted that the Lithuanian MFA did not take the initiative to dialogue with relevant international instances on global subjects related to development. Although one can try to explain such a passivity of the MFA by the fact that it did not possess sufficient institutional capacity, at the end of 2006 a whole separate department, Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department (DCDPD), was established. Yet the global dimension of aid

---

1 The EC then added together the contributions of the member states and declared them as European contributions (“The total humanitarian response of the EU currently amounts to…”). Letter of the EC concerning aid provided to Pakistan, Brussels, December 16, 2005.

2 In 2004 the UNDP Office, together with the MFA, started the project “Strengthening National Capacity of Lithuania as an Emerging Donor”, as a result of which appeared the publication “Experience of the Republic of Lithuania: A Path from an Assistance Recipient to a Donor Country”. (UNDP and MFA of Lithuania, Experience of the Republic of Lithuania: A Path from an Assistance Recipient to a Donor Country, Vilnius, Gironda, 2006 (?).


4 These international activities were generally reported to the MFA by the Lithuanian missions to the UN in NY and Geneva.

5 Until the end of 2006, the MFA had only a division (Division of Development and Assistance) that was in charge of the administration of received and provided aid.
policy did not gain in importance, as attested by the Guidelines for 2011-2012, which remained almost identical to those adopted in 2006.2

The second version of the Guidelines rectified however some inconsistencies that characterized the first version for 2006-2010: for example, in the definition of ODA, it includes Lithuanian “contributions to the international development cooperation organizations or structural units for development cooperation of the international organizations”, whereas the 2006-2010 refers only to bilateral aid; besides, whereas the Guidelines for 2006-2010 stipulates that “development co-operation policy of the Republic of Lithuania is in line with the principles and objectives of the European Development Co-operation Policy”, the version for 2011-2012 extends the scope of Lithuania’s principles, objectives, and obligations in the domain to include the UN Millennium Declaration, and “consideration of challenges posed by the global developments and crises.” Moreover, the Guidelines for 2006-2010 include a separate part “Relation of the Development Co-operation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania with the European Union Development Co-operation Policy”, it does not appear in the version for 2011-2012. These few remarks can be associated with a certain multilateralization of Lithuanian aid policy; yet it is to be noted that international organizations remain without detailed reference, as it is for instance done in strategic documentation of well-established donors, or even some NMSs such as the Czech Republic or the Slovak Republic.

B. Bilateral Aid as Lithuania’s Foreign and Security Policy Instrument

A limited orientation of Lithuania’s aid policy appears not only through the above analysis of the EU’s relatively dominant role in comparison to other international actors, but also via bilateral aid of this Baltic state. Lithuania, while advancing its experience with its Eastern neighbours, cooperates with “the European Union’s Eastern Partnership countries”: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.3 These countries are in Lithuania’s neighbourhood zone bordering Russia and hence are of interest to Vilnius within the frame of its security policy. Vilnius is indeed interested in the regional stability based on widely recognized liberal-democratic and free-market principles. Such Lithuania’s combination of its security policy with development cooperation attests to the importance of practical anchoring of diffusing aid policy.

It is worth noting that, since the end of 2006, for aid policy in Lithuania has been responsible the DCDPD. Until that date development cooperation was part of the competence of the Development and Assistance Division within the Multilateral Relations Department.4 Among other things, such as administration of development cooperation projects, the DCDPD is in charge of managing all the information related to aid policy, including those coming from international organizations. The DCDPD consists of three divisions: Development Cooperation Policy and Planning Division, Democracy Promotion Division, and Programmes and Projects Division.5 As informed by a representative of the Department, the first division is in charge of questions related to the EU; the 2nd one concentrates on Belorussia, Moldova, and Ukraine; while the 3rd one focuses on Central Asia, South Caucasus, and Afghanistan. Consequently, the question arises as to a competent

---

3 Afghanistan is also explicitly mentioned among the Lithuanian partner countries. Guidelines for 2011-2012
4 This Department no longer exists; it was split in separate departments, including the DCDPD, the UN, International Organizations and Human Rights Department, and other departments that have not yet been identified by the author.
instance within the MFA that would follow activities related to the UN and other international organizations.

If we briefly refer to development policy organization in established donor countries, basic-levels substantial divergences are to be noted. For example, the MFA of Finland possesses a department for development policy, which has 7 units, including the Unit for UN Development Issues and Unit for Development Financing Institutions.¹

A growing bilateral logic of Lithuania’s aid policy as its dominant axis of action is also corroborated by the analysis of archives. In 2006, for example, only one dossier accounted for documentation related to Lithuania’s partner countries, specifically Afghanistan, Georgia, and Moldova (as well as Mauritania, which was in 2006 an ad hoc partner country). In 2009 more than 50 dossiers were mentioned Lithuania’s partner countries; almost all of them were dedicated to separate development cooperation projects implemented during 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Armenia</th>
<th>Azerbaijan</th>
<th>Belarus</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Iraq</th>
<th>Liban</th>
<th>Mauritania</th>
<th>Moldova</th>
<th>Palestine</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Tadjikistan</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the specific regional focus of the partner countries of Lithuania, the activities of the DCDPD appear as entirely strategic, which implies that Lithuanian authorities would neglect everything that does not fit the country’s security vision. Consequently, the DCDPD, in existence for almost 6 years, would appear as having been incapable to develop its own institutional logic, its security-based line of reasoning being already maintained and defended by other structures of the MFA, especially the Eastern Neighbourhood Policy Department. The DCDPD could furthermore be described as a mere executive branch of Lithuania’s foreign and security policy.

Yet, even if Lithuanian aid policy seems to be strongly anchored within the country’s security dimension, such a strategic orientation cannot automatically explain Lithuania’s limited vision of development policy. At this point, it might be relevant to refer, for example, to development policy of Denmark and the Netherlands.² Researchers having analyzed Danish and Dutch development cooperation put emphasis on the significant role of the economic variable in the elaboration of aid policy, especially with regard to its bilateral aspect. For instance, Jan Pedersen recognizes that, although the multilateral dimension of Danish aid policy was always supported by the most unwavering defenders of development, the reaction of the administration stayed

---

² Thorough documentary research on aid policy of these countries has only recently appeared in the collection “The Aid Rush. Aid Regimes in Northern Europe during the Cold War”: Jan Pedersen, “Denmark’s Bilateral Aid, 1962-1991” and Marc Dierikx, “Developing Policy on Development. The Hague, 1945-1977”; in: Helge Ø. Pharo and Monika Pohle Fraser, eds., The Aid Rush...
pragmatically prudent as to allocating more aid to multilateral organizations.\(^1\) According to Pedersen, the administration had doubts concerning organized interest groups in the domain of trade and labour, which remained unrevealed to the public, however; these interest groups perceived bilateral aid (contrary to other forms of aid) as generating domestic demand. Multilateral aid was forced to cede to bilateral assistance, and it gradually lost its share of 50% in Danish ODA; the same trend characterized ODA of the other Nordic countries.\(^2\)

In the Dutch case, Marc Dierikx maintains that in the formulation of aid policy of the Netherlands (1950-60) were actively engaged the MFA and the Ministry of Economic Affairs.\(^3\) According to the author, the ministries disagreed as to the role to play by the Dutch economic interests in aid policy. As further reading of Dierikx’s documentary research on Dutch development policy reveals, none of the institutions managed to dominate the other, the Netherlands having continued to be preoccupied by its potential as an exporter and an important actor in defining development issues within international institutions, such as the UN.\(^4\)

It is also to be briefly noted that the analyses of Pedersen and Dierikx both include the role of civil society.

These analyses are important reference points in research on Lithuanian aid policy as closely linked to security and foreign policy in the sense that they highlight the proximity of development cooperation to domestic actors. By explicating interactions between different actors (administration, interest groups, civil society), the Danish and Dutch cases emphasize the importance of divergent interests to the comprehensive character of development policy. As noted again by Pedersen, at the time when the 1962 law on development cooperation was being elaborated, different agents in Danish politics perceived differently the value and pertinence of divergent operating modes of aid policy.\(^5\) In this respect, the author distinguishes notably three types of modes: concentration of resources on participation in the UN activities; bilateral efforts in the name of economic and political interests of Denmark; and civil orientation characterized by the Administration’s trust placed on civil society’s capacity to practically implement development policy. Pedersen concludes that none of these orientations managed to dominate, which led to the establishment of “a relatively stable autonomous model” of aid policy.\(^6\) Resources in the domain were allocated according to multiple preferences, since the ultimate goal was to incorporate active groups of domestic actors within aid policy, considered as common “national project”.\(^7\)

If applied to the case of Lithuania, this conclusion would appeal to the MFA’s participation in aid policy activities as conforming to its practical field of action. Limits of Lithuania’s aid policy would result not from short-sided interests of the MFA, but from the lack of interactions of diversified actors in the domain.

\textbf{IV. Conclusion}

The analysis presented in the paper was basically three-fold. It proceeded with highlighting the weaknesses of the current research programme of development policy in the NMSs. In this regard, the emphasis was notably put on its limited observation of reality. By neglecting pragmatism of other donors and especially of the EC, authors conclude to short-sidedness of aid policy in the NMSs in the sense that they do not live up to relevant European norms. Consequently, their analysis becomes normatively oriented. Furthermore, at the analytical level, European norms

---

\(^1\) Pedersen: 186.
\(^2\) Ibid.: 187.
\(^3\) Dierikx: 229; in: Pharo and Fraser.
\(^4\) Ibid.: 231.
\(^5\) Pedersen: 188.
\(^6\) Pedersen: 219.
\(^7\) Ibid.
are not distinguished from those of other international actors, which reduces Europeanization merely to a temporal circumstance (vs., for example, a process with specific conceptual implications). The present paper thus tried to expand the framework for the analysis of aid policy in the NMSs and referred, in this regard, to the concept of diffusion as well as to the global character of development issues. Last but not least, through the Lithuanian case, the paper aimed to show that the country’s aid policy has difficulty in interacting with international influences (the UN, World Bank, OECD) in a comprehensive manner and reflects a limited vision of global realities in the domain. In this context, the EU’s role appears to be dominant, as attested by the fact that Lithuania proceeded with the implementation of aid policy, including the elaboration of strategic documentation or the establishment of a separate department within the MFA. Furthermore, in the case of Lithuania, aid policy is closely associated to the EU’s Eastern Partnership, in the sense that Lithuania’s partner countries participate as well in this European Neighbourhood programme. According to the paper, the association of Lithuania’s bilateral aid to the country’s foreign and security policy emphasizes the relevance of practical anchoring of the diffusing new policy in question. Domestic environment hence appears as indispensable to comprehending the process of diffusion, whatever the significance of exogenous influences.
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