
FIVE APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LITHUANIAN CASE

Anastasija Panasevič*

Abstract

The study aims to indicate the internal motives influencing the shape of the content of Lithuanian development cooperation policy. Five universal theoretical models for analysis of the internal motives of the development cooperation policy were developed: power-political; political stability and democracy; development and performance; strategic-defensive or Cold War; and economic-commercial. The official documents forming the development cooperation policy, qualitative interviews with experts and other data were analysed in order to identify the relevant theoretical model and corresponding motives influencing the content of Lithuanian development cooperation policy.

Introduction

After entering the European Union (EU) in 2004 Lithuania became a donor country, which means it is obliged to implement development cooperation policy towards developing countries. Before that time Lithuania did not have any development cooperation experience. In the last eight years the main partners of Lithuanian development cooperation projects have been post-soviet countries in the East (Eastern Partnership members): Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine; and one country outside this region – Afghanistan.¹

Lithuanian development cooperation policy consists of two parts: the Lithuanian contribution to the European Development Fund (EDF), and a bilateral

* **Anastasija Panasevič** holds a master's degree in Regional Politics of Central and Eastern European Studies from the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University. Email: anastasija.panasevic@gmail.com.

This article is a shortened version of her master's thesis that was defended at the Institute of International Relations and Political Science in 2013.

¹ The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, *The Provisions of the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2011-2012*, Vilnius: The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, 2011, p. 2.

development cooperation and democracy promotion programme. The EDF is the main instrument of the EU for providing development aid to African, Caribbean and Pacific countries and other overseas countries and territories. It is agreed for a multi-annual period (usually 5 years). The 10th EDF was set for 2008–2013 in 2000 and revised in 2005.² It is the first EDF in which new EU members are taking part. Lithuania committed to cover 0.12% (27,218,400 euro) of the total contribution of all EU members to the EDF. As a result of this, Lithuania was allocated one vote (as a proportion of the 1004 votes) in the EDF committee.³ In 2013 Lithuania plans to allocate 14.5 million litas to development cooperation. 12.5 million litas will go to the EDF and 2 million will be reallocated through the bilateral development cooperation and democracy promotion programme, administrated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA).⁴ Thus, about 86% of the total funding for development cooperation goes to the EDF and only 14% is reallocated by Lithuania itself. Only having one vote implies that Lithuania has very little decision-making power on how the EDF funds are spent. Even if all Central and Eastern European EU members voted together, they would have only 26 votes out of 1004⁵, which does not present any substantial voting power either.

Given that Lithuania possesses little decision-making power at the level of the EDF committee, as a unit of analysis only the Lithuanian bilateral aid was chosen because these funds are directly administrated by the Lithuanian government and the motives are clearly reflected through the decisions and policies pursued by the decision-making bodies in Lithuania.

Development cooperation policy is very new in Lithuania and it is still in the process of formation. The issue of development cooperation has barely been analysed. There are many questions and debates among policy implementers and policy makers: for example, should Lithuania change its development cooperation orientation from the east to the south? Which sector of development cooperation

² European Commission, *European Development Fund*, <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/edf_en.htm> [15 12 2012].

³ Council of the European Union, *Internal Agreement between the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the financing of Community aid under the multiannual financial framework for the period 2008 to 2013 in accordance with the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement and on the allocation of financial assistance for the Overseas Countries and Territories to which Part Four of the EC Treaty applies*, in *Official Journal of the European Union*, Brussels: 2006-09-09, Article 8, Part 2.

⁴ Information published during the annual meeting of the implementers of the projects of the Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania. Vilnius, 14-12-2012.

⁵ Council of the European Union, Article 8, Part 2.

policy should be financed more? Which new sectors should be added? How should the efficiency of the developmental projects be increased? Yet the most important issue of aid effectiveness is missing from Lithuanian development cooperation policy discourse – what are Lithuania’s internal purposes (motives) that influence the shape of the content of the development cooperation policy? In other words, what does Lithuania want to achieve through its development cooperation policy? The answer to that question would serve the numerous debates on the improvement and enhancement of the efficiency of Lithuanian development cooperation policy.

The research presented below did not aim to evaluate the efficiency, necessity or results of Lithuanian development cooperation policy. Rather, it aimed to identify the factors (internal purposes and motives) that influence the shape of the content (orientation and priorities) of Lithuanian development cooperation policy. First of all, the theoretical models of development cooperation, enabling us to analyse the internal motives of the country in implementing the development cooperation policy, were developed. Then, empirical research was conducted in order to identify which theoretical model of development cooperation could be applied to the Lithuanian case. The identification of the current model of the development cooperation policy served to identify the internal motives for the implementation of the development cooperation policy corresponding to the relevant model.

The qualitative case study method applied to the research allowed an analysis of multiple types of data (triangulation technique): legal acts; interviews with 15 experts in Lithuanian development cooperation (policy makers, policy implementers and independent experts); and information on the developmental projects conducted. This analysis contributed to the exploration of the broader context of Lithuanian development cooperation policy, which is a very important aspect of this study because there has been very little analysis of the issue of Lithuanian development cooperation in the past. What is more, the applied case study method proved to be the right choice as it contributed to the development of the five theoretical models for the analysis of the motives of the development cooperation policy.

1. Theoretical framework for the research

Development cooperation is a very modern phenomenon, which emerged in the middle of the 20th century.⁶ There is still no systematic methodology for

⁶ Lancaster C., *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007, p. 25.

the analysis of the motives that influence the shape of the content of a state's development cooperation policy. The only attempt to systemise the theoretical findings on the internal motives of foreign aid is the set of approaches developed by Matthew Fielden. He rejected the humanitarian base of foreign aid. According to him, the decisions concerning the provision of aid made by donor countries are influenced by geopolitical interests rather than humanitarian motives. Fielden found four theoretical approaches for analysing motivations for the provision of aid: the power-political hypothesis, the political stability and democracy hypothesis, the development and performance hypothesis, and the strategic-defensive or Cold War hypothesis. The theoretical findings developed by Fielden will be described in more detail in order to develop several separate theoretical models of development cooperation policy. It is important to categorise these models, and identify specific criteria that will allow us to clearly distinguish the models and serve for their identification in real empirical cases.

1.1. Power-political model

The power-political model presumes that foreign aid to developing countries is being given in order to gain their support. The foreign aid is used as a tool of diplomacy, allowing countries to expand their 'soft' power. The concept of soft power is presented by Jr. Joseph S. Nye. According to him, a country may obtain the outcomes it wants without using 'hard' power (military tools; economic sanctions), but by becoming attractive to other countries through its values, culture, examples, its level of prosperity and openness – which is soft power.⁷ According to Nye, foreign aid is one of the sources of soft power (it is not power per se, but only the potential for power) that promotes broadly shared values such as democracy and human rights.⁸

Soft power differs from hard power by the fact that it depends on the willingness of a target (aid recipient country).⁹ Thus, a number of contextual variables affect the deployment of soft power by one state to another and the effect of such efforts, namely, geographic proximity, cultural similarity, historical relations, economic

⁷ Jr. Nye J. S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004, p. 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

ties, etc.¹⁰ Some good examples of increasing soft power by giving aid include the policy of France in its former colonies, and the policy of China towards Africa and Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries.

By providing aid, the donor country increases its soft power not only in the recipient country, but also within the international community. Giving aid means being among the strongest (most developed) of the world's countries. For young donor countries like Lithuania, this aspect is particularly important because at the beginning of a state's development cooperation policy the most important thing is the fact of giving aid itself, rather than the quality or quantity of that aid.

In a political context, aid can also be understood as a political symbol or sign. Increasing amounts of aid could signal increasing closeness in relations between the donor country and the recipient and vice versa: falling aid levels could be understood as cooling relations and alienation. What is more, aid allocations could show to other governments that the government providing assistance would support the recipient government in case of pressures from hostile states. It could also mean that the donor supports particular actions or policies of the recipient government (e.g. democratic reforms).¹¹

The main criteria for the power-political model are: (1) attractiveness for the recipient country (image within partner countries); (2) role within the international community (image within the international community); and (3) cultural/historical ties with recipient countries.

1.2. Political stability and democracy model

The model of political stability and democracy claims that foreign aid is given to developing countries that correspond to particular standards of democracy and human rights.¹² It is based on the constructivism theory, arguing that national interests and cooperation between states are social constructs. Culture, norms and ideas are the most important factors in shaping the way in which states define their own strategic interests. According to constructivists, the mutually comprehensible

¹⁰ Fan Y., "Soft Power: Power of Attraction or Confusion?" in *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 4:2, 2008, p. 6.

¹¹ Lancaster, p. 11-12.

¹² Fielden M. B., "The geopolitics of aid: The provision and termination of aid to Afghan refugees in North West Frontier Province, Pakistan." In *Political Geography*, 17(4) 1998, p. 475, 467.

conduct of international relations is impossible without mutually recognised rules and norms.¹³

In terms of constructivism theory, development cooperation is not just about the provision of foreign aid to developing countries, but also the social reconstruction within these countries. The recipient country should comply with the norms of maintaining a secure and safe environment, democratic political processes, respect for human rights, etc. These are the norms followed by the international community and legitimised by the United Nations (UN).¹⁴ Why is it important to request developing countries to respect these internationally recognised norms? The interests and preferences of states are malleable; they can be formed and changed by the international norms that provide international politics with structure and meaning.¹⁵ Thus, in order to predict the behaviour of other states it is important to make them respect the same norms.

The main criteria for the political stability and democracy model are: (1) the secure, safe and predictable political environment; (2) social reconstruction within partner countries; and (3) mutually recognised norms (democracy, human rights, etc.)

1.3. Development and performance model

The development and performance model claims that aid should be allocated to the countries that have the best development prospects for the future.¹⁶ It is based on the neo-liberal concept of global governance, arguing that foreign aid is a tool of states' tendency to cooperate in addressing problems of interdependence and globalisation.¹⁷ The concept of global governance is based on the existence of the common global interests of all countries and nations and on their interdependency. The main argument is that the environmental (and other global) problems in recent years have become so crucial that the whole global community must join forces and create a common strategy for growth and development based on sustainability.

¹³ Mughanda M., "Inquiry on self interested foreign aid: Insights from the ODA-migrations link in SSA countries." In *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 5(4), 2011, p. 167.

¹⁴ Jemczyk E., "Norms and Their Effect on Humanitarian Aid", <http://atlistmta.org/online-journals/0506-journal-government-and-the-rights-of-individuals/norms-and-their-effect-on-humanitarian-aid/#_ftn48> [24 11 2012].

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Fielden, p. 467.

¹⁷ Lancaster, p. 4.

The widespread poverty in developing countries is significantly contributing to the global degradation of the environment, and the large population growth is putting increasing pressure on limited resources. Thus, rich countries should provide developmental aid to developing countries in order to ensure the implementation of their environmental policies.¹⁸ The developmental (or in a broad sense, global) issues came to the attention of the foreign aid sector only in the late 1980s. This was a turning point in the provision of aid, as it started to be understood as a payment for delivered services.¹⁹

Increasing amounts of foreign aid are channelled to expand international control of global threats such as the spread of infectious diseases (smallpox, measles, polio, HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, etc.), environmental degradation (global warming, loss of the ozone layer, pollution of air, water, and land etc.), population growth, global poverty, hunger and so on.²⁰

In 2000 the UN agreed on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)²¹, which aimed to halve the number of people living in absolute poverty. This was a holistic approach to the interconnected national and international challenges in order to create sustainable, gender-sensitive, people-centred development.²²

The main criteria for the development and performance model are: (1) attempts to address global threats; (2) the role of the environmental problems; (3) the role of the health care; and (4) the role of the MDGs in general.

1.4. Strategic-defensive or Cold War model

The strategic-defensive or Cold War model is based on the Cold War political ideology and the competition between the West and the Soviet Union (Russia). This hypothesis claims that aid was given by Western countries to gain influence in less developed countries that were under pressure from external or internal

¹⁸ Degenbol-Martinussen, J., *Aid: Understanding International Development Cooperation*, London: Zed Books, 2003, p. 15.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁰ Lancaster, p. 16.

²¹ MDGs are: 1.Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger; 2.Achieving universal primary education; 3.Promoting gender equality and empowering women; 4.Reducing child mortality rates; 5.Improving maternal health; 6.Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; 7.Ensuring environmental sustainability; 8.Developing a global partnership for development.

²² Lee S., *Neo-Liberalism, State Power and Global Governance*, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007, p. 12-13.

communist threats.²³ It stems from the realism theory of international relations, claiming that states exist in an anarchic environment in which power, security and survival are their priority tasks. Thus, in this anarchic environment states use aid as a tool of hard-headed diplomacy. By giving aid the donor country increases its security, expands its power and influence and manages to survive.²⁴ An example of such purpose of foreign aid is the United States (US) and its foreign aid policy motivated by Cold War concerns.²⁵

The explanation of this model should begin with a short historical excursion, as the Cold War used to be defined as the beginning of development assistance politics. The first development assistance programme was the Marshall Plan, which was initiated in 1948 and aimed to give massive amounts of aid to European countries in order to rebuild them economically after World War II.²⁶ Europe was in ruins and the population's discontent with the economic situation was increasing the chances of communists being elected in Italy and France. The eastern part of Europe had already been absorbed into the Soviet bloc. Thus, the only chance for the US to expand its influence in Europe was through the provision of economic assistance.²⁷

In 1950, the US President Truman presented another development aid programme, which covered the developing countries threatened by communism (for example, South Korea and Taiwan). The official motives of these programmes were based on considerations of national security and commerce. The foreign aid programmes had to support US national interests in strengthening the countries of Western Europe against the expansion of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and the reconstruction of a free Europe for American business. The main idea was that the improvement of the population's living standards in the recipient countries would make people less receptive to communist propaganda.²⁸ Thus, as we can see, aid was "a child of diplomatic realism".²⁹

The main criteria for the strategic-defensive and Cold War model are: (1) competition between the West (EU/NATO) and Russia; (2) Cold War ideology; and (3) military security issues.

²³ Fielden, p. 467.

²⁴ Lancaster, p. 3.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Degnbol-Martinussen, p. 8.

²⁷ Lancaster, p. 28.

²⁸ Degnbol-Martinussen, p. 8.

²⁹ Lancaster, p. 25.

1.5. Economic-commercial model

Matthew Fielden in his work did not indicate the economic approach to development cooperation. However, the economic aspect is very important and cannot be avoided. Thus, the fifth (economic-commercial) model will be added to the models investigated above.

This model is based on commercial liberal theory, which claims that economic interdependence and the realisation of material interests is the main factor that encourages cooperation, close partnership relations and peace among countries.³⁰ It determines foreign aid by the economic and commercial interests of donors.³¹ It presumes that development cooperation with developing countries will be linked to trade enhancement and will increase secure investment opportunities. It means that the donors choose the development cooperation partner countries by their “economic worth” for this state.³²

There are several ways in which foreign aid can contribute to the commercial interests of the donor state. First of all, the donor state can promote special political and economic reforms in the recipient country that would be beneficial for the commercial interests of donor. This mechanism includes the use of conditionality policies. The second method is the introduction of special rules in development cooperation programmes that would require that the grants and loans must be used to buy goods and services from the donor’s country. This means not only an increase in sales of goods and services, but also better and smoother access to markets in the recipient country. The third method is less apparent: the development cooperation projects contribute to smoother cooperation between individuals, building confidence between the societies of the two states and creating a better climate for investments. In this way the foreign aid promotes the better understanding of the market structure in the other country, which also influences closer commercial relationships and promotes trade.³³

The main criteria for the economic-commercial model are: (1) economic interdependence; (2) investment opportunities (better investment climate); and (3) commercial interests.

³⁰ Schneider G., “The Domestic Roots of Commercial Liberalism: A Sector-Specific Approach.” In Gerald Schneider et al. *Globalization and Armed Conflict*, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003, p. 103-104.

³¹ Hopkins R. F., “Political Economy of Foreign Aid.” In Finn Tarp *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future*, London: Routledge, 2000, p. 329-330.

³² Hopkins, p. 339-340.

³³ Degnbol-Martinussen, p. 13-14.

2. Analysis

2.1. Power-political model

Lithuanian image within the international community of donors

Answering the question of why Lithuania implements a development cooperation policy, all respondents said that this is the obligation undertaken during the process of joining the EU. Such an answer confirms the prior findings of Ondřej Horký³⁴, stating that at least the initial stage of the Lithuanian development cooperation policy was totally compulsory and imposed by the EU. However, such imposition of a development cooperation policy is understood by the majority of experts as a matter of honour: a sign that Lithuania was recognised by the international community of donors as a developed country. Thus, noblesse oblige, Lithuania is using this policy in order to prove to be the right choice. Creating an image of Lithuania within the international community of donors is the one of the key points and goals of Lithuanian development cooperation. Lithuania is trying to create an image of a small country exceeding its capabilities, acting side by side with great countries, old donors.

Another important point regarding the Lithuanian image among international donors is the importance of Lithuania's expert knowledge. Lithuania is trying to introduce itself as an expert on Eastern Europe (especially Belarus) to become a bridge between the EU and Eastern Partnership countries.

So, it is evident that one of the main internal purposes of Lithuanian development cooperation policy is the attempt to create a positive image of Lithuania within the international community of donors, in the EU and NATO.

Lithuanian image within the partner countries

The power-political approach to development cooperation focuses on the expansion of the donor's soft power and gaining the support from the recipients.

The documents forming the development cooperation policy do not contain any specific information about the Lithuanian interests within the partner countries. The only general statement that the goal of the Lithuanian development

³⁴ Horký, O., Development policy in new EU member states: Re-emerging donors on the way from compulsory altruism to global responsibility, Prague: Institute of International Relations, 2006, p. 1.

cooperation policy is to enhance political, economic, social and cultural relations in the countries, appointed by the Government³⁵, can be found in the provisions of the development cooperation policy.

The majority of respondents agreed that Lithuanian development cooperation policy contributes to the promotion of the Lithuanian image within the partner countries. However, the only positive example mentioned by respondents was Georgia.

Why was Georgia a success story? The answer could be that **Georgia** was the most favourable place for Lithuanian development cooperation. It is a quite small country, willing to reform, with pro-democratic and pro-Western authorities. Lithuania, with its experience of democratisation and European and transatlantic integration, was perceived as a strategic partner, a big brother in the EU, and a bridge to the West. However, other priority countries were less receptive to Lithuanian support.

Ukraine is too big. Lithuania has conducted development cooperation projects in Ukraine since 2002. In general these are technical administrative capacity-building projects, implemented by Lithuanian state institutions. Since 2006 Lithuanian NGOs have also been involved in the development cooperation projects. Between 2006 and 2012 Lithuania allocated about 2 million litas³⁶ to developmental projects in Ukraine (~330,000 litas per year), which is a very small amount of money bearing in mind the scale of Ukraine. In comparison, for developmental projects in Moldova (which has only a twelfth of the population of Ukraine) 1.8 million litas were allocated during the same period (~300,000 litas per year), and 1.6 million litas were allocated to Afghanistan in 2012.³⁷

According to policy maker 6, there is an interest on the part of Ukraine to work with Lithuania. Ukrainians are most interested in the European integration experience of Poland and Lithuania, because these two countries are historically and culturally very close to them.

Belarus is a country unwilling to make any reforms and unwilling to receive any support from Western countries; support can be provided only for democratic oppositional movements, which are not able to influence any governmental

³⁵ The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, *The Provisions of the Development cooperation policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2011-2012*, Vilnius: The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, Chapter 3, Article 11.3.

³⁶ Information published during the annual meeting of the implementers of the projects of the Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania. Vilnius, 14-12-2012.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

decisions or reforms, thus we cannot speak about real expansion of Lithuanian soft power in Belarus until the regime changes.

There are two sides to the effect of Lithuanian development cooperation in Belarus. On the one hand, there is an opinion that Lithuanian support for democratic movements in Belarus hampers the strategic (economic) neighbourhood relations between Lithuania and Belarus. The representatives of Lithuanian business express their protests against Lithuania's foreign policy seeking to promote the democracy in Belarus because, as they claim, Belarus is a very important strategic partner for Lithuanian business and such Lithuanian policy is harmful for business interests.³⁸ On the other hand, Lithuanian projects that promote democracy in Belarus are an investment in the future of Belarus as a politically independent, economically stable, and reliable neighbour and close partner. The current oppositional forces appreciate the support received from Lithuania; however, they do not currently have any power: thus, this support is only an investment in the future. In the case of Belarus, presently data from the interviews allow us to conclude that Lithuanian development cooperation projects in Belarus do not enhance Lithuania's soft power in the country. Therefore, the power-political model is not the case for Lithuanian development cooperation policy in Belarus.

Moldova has other partner countries that are implementing development cooperation and democracy promotion projects there, and Lithuania cannot "enter the market" because "Moldova has other close neighbouring countries, EU members, which are quite influential there, so we just do not withstand the competition".

In **Afghanistan** Lithuania does not have any goals or interests to expand its soft power. The main goal of Lithuanian presence in Afghanistan was to ensure respect from the international community (NATO) and create a positive image of a small but promising country. According to policy maker 1, the projects in Afghanistan are a tool of Lithuania's public diplomacy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) officially states that Lithuania's participation in the NATO mission to Afghanistan is to ensure the status of a reliable and active member of the alliance.³⁹ The positive image of Lithuania within NATO structures contributes to the state's security, as "Lithuania seems to be the responsible actors of international politics, contributing to the international security attempts. What is more, the Afghanistan project is the

³⁸ Lithuanian Confederation of Industrialists, *Economic Sanctions*, <<http://www.lpk.lt/lt/naujienos/ekonomines-sankcijos>> [2012 12 02].

³⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *Lithuania in NATO*, <<http://www.urm.lt/index.php?1134003413>> [01 05 2013].

military exercises for Lithuanian soldiers. In these missions they get the knowledge, which they bring back to Lithuania. That contributes to Lithuanian security.”

What is more, the resources that Lithuania allocates to Afghanistan are too small to bring about any changes or progress.

Cultural/historical ties with partner countries

According to Ying Fan, cultural similarity and historical relations are effective tools of the expansion of the soft power.⁴⁰ Policy makers highlighted the importance of the cultural heritage of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the policy of development cooperation.

The protection of the cultural heritage of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) in Belarus and Ukraine, the promotion of the idea that these nations have a common past, and the reminder about the glorious past and wealth of all nations in the GDL under Lithuanian rule fosters respect for Lithuania and forms the image of the country as a unifier of all these nations; the former leader of the region; the bridge between East and West. It also shows the proximity of Lithuania to these countries and promotes the idea that Lithuania is an EU country that understands the problems of these states. This contributes to the main goal of Lithuanian foreign policy – to achieve a favourable external environment for the country’s safe existence.⁴¹

Lithuania implemented several cultural projects that were not related to the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Such projects took place in Georgia and Afghanistan. For example, the National M.K. Čiurlionis School of Art implemented the project ‘The Legend of Vilnius for Georgian Children’ in Georgia in 2010. This project aimed to promote the interest of Georgians in Lithuanian culture. The book *The Legend of Vilnius* was translated into the Georgian language in order to acquaint Georgian children with the history and culture of Lithuania.⁴²

A very similar project was implemented in Afghanistan. It included the translation and publication of eight books of Lithuanian fairy tales into the Dari language. The project was implemented by Vilnius University in 2008–2009 and

⁴⁰ Fan, p. 6.

⁴¹ Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, *Resolution No XI-52, Key objectives and principles of foreign affairs and of the European policy in the global environment*, <http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?nr=1&item_id=256&c_m_e_id=4&c_menu_i_id=162;164&cno_cache=1> [10 12 2012].

⁴² Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Lithuania. Culture of Development. Vilnius: Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department, 2011, p. 15.

aimed to promote Lithuania's culture in Ghor Province in order to develop good relations between local people and the Lithuanian Provincial Reconstruction Team.⁴³

Although these two projects were not related to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, they aimed to promote Lithuanian culture abroad and in this way establish closer relations with the recipient country and earn the respect of the population. However, the real added value for the development of these recipient countries remains unknown and doubtful.

All in all, it should be concluded that Lithuanian development cooperation cultural projects have very clear political and strategic motivations – they promote the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (reminding recipients of the former powerfulness of the state), show the cultural closeness of Lithuania to strategically important neighbouring countries (Belarus and Ukraine), promote Lithuanian culture abroad, build closer relations with strategically important recipient countries (Georgia and Afghanistan), and make Lithuanian development cooperation policy more visible in the international arena.

2.2. Political stability and democracy model

The political stability and democracy approach to development cooperation seems to be very relevant to the Lithuanian case as in public the most emphasised point seems to be the importance of the Lithuanian post-communist transition, democratisation and European integration experience. Officially, the goal of Lithuanian development cooperation policy is to contribute to the development of the democracy, security and stability in the neighbouring and post-conflict regions.⁴⁴

In the provisions of the development cooperation policy, prepared by the government of Lithuania, it is also stated that Lithuania seeks to share its experience in the enhancement of the rule of law, democracy, human rights, gender equality, transformation to the market economy and European integration with developing countries willing to reform.⁴⁵ The sharing of the democratisation experience and values contributes to the security of Lithuania.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴⁴ The Provisions of the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2011-2012, Chapter 3, Article 11.2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, Chapter 2, Article 5.

Although a lot of the respondents mentioned that the development cooperation in Belarus is not effective enough – it was called “monologue, rather than dialogue”; “talks with ourselves” – they concluded that “still we should do something there”. The importance of Belarus as a development cooperation partner country was considered quite high, with respondents giving it 4.3 points out of 5. In addition, Belarus was ranked second (after Georgia) among priority countries. This fact shows that a peaceful and stable neighbourhood (foreign policy goal) is a more important factor influencing the choice of priority countries for development cooperation programmes than the real levels of poverty, hunger and disease in these countries (theoretic goals of development cooperation).

Capacity building, good governance projects, support for regional development, and support for European integration aspirations form a major part of Lithuanian development cooperation.⁴⁶ In the framework of such projects Lithuanian public institutions and services share their experience with colleagues from partner countries. Such projects have twofold results. First of all, they contribute to closer, smoother and more efficient international cooperation between these institutions (a good example is Twinning projects). Secondly, Lithuanian institutions can learn from teaching others.

The political stability and democracy model of development cooperation is relevant to the Lithuanian case, as the normative aspect of the development cooperation policy is highly visible in the official documents forming the development cooperation policy, in the content of the projects implemented in the framework of development cooperation and in the democracy promotion programme.

Lithuania’s attempts to share the democratisation experience with neighbouring countries contribute to the security of Lithuania. Furthermore, this matches the theoretical criterion of the secure, safe and predictable political environment. What is more, the technical capacity-building projects implemented by Lithuania contribute to social reconstruction within the partner countries (the second theoretical criterion).

2.3. Development and performance model

The development and performance approach allows us to look at development cooperation through the prism of addressing global threats, i.e. the spread of

⁴⁶ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *Lithuanian Development Cooperation 2011*. Vilnius: Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department, 2011, p. 3.

diseases, environmental problems, population growth, global poverty, hunger, and so on. These threats are mentioned by the UN in the MDGs. The UN Millennium Declaration is among the documents on which Lithuania bases its development cooperation policy.⁴⁷ However, directly only several goals could be found among the priority sectors of Lithuanian development cooperation policy, which were listed in the Lithuanian development cooperation provisions adopted by the Lithuanian government. These goals are support for health care, support for the rights of women, addressing environmental problems and the fight against climate change.⁴⁸

Environmental issues

The reports of the MFA show that in 2011 four projects addressing environmental problems were implemented (one in Belarus, two in Georgia and one in Moldova). These projects addressed the issue of harm from nuclear power plants in Belarus (seminars), the issues of alternative energy resources (installation of bio-gas lines) and environmentally-friendly ways of life (competition for journalists on environmental issues) in Georgia, and the issue of environmental problems in Moldova (conference for NGOs).⁴⁹

The relatively low number of projects implemented in this field shows that the environment is not the main priority of Lithuanian development cooperation. Interview respondents gave it 2.7 points out of 5 and it was ranked in 11th place among all priority fields. According to them, the role of the environmental issues in Lithuanian development cooperation is just a formality. According to policy implementer 1, environmental issues play only a minor role in the entire development cooperation policy; they were even called “cross-sectoral elements” rather than being a priority sector.

There are two reasons why this field is just a formality. Firstly, although Lithuania declared that it would contribute to the MDGs (thus, the environmental issues should be among the priorities) Lithuania lacks expertise in this field, there are still a lot of environmental problems within Lithuania, and this is quite a new field for Lithuania, so it would be difficult to teach others. Secondly, environmental

⁴⁷ The Provisions of the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2011-2012, Chapter 1, Article 3.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter 6, Articles 15.2-15.7.

⁴⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *Lithuanian Development Cooperation 2011*, Vilnius: Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department, 2011, p. 7-11.

projects require a lot of resources and the Lithuanian development cooperation programme is very limited.

Health care

Health care seems to have a more important role in Lithuanian development cooperation policy than the environmental issues. The main health-care projects were implemented in Afghanistan. In 2008 Lithuania began implementing health-care projects in the Ghor province of Afghanistan. There was an urgent need to rebuild the hospital. In 2009 Lithuanian architects and engineers accomplished the technical design of several departments of the hospital, and in 2011 the reconstruction began. The project is very expensive and Lithuania has already allocated 1.85 million litas to the reconstruction. However, Lithuania succeeded in finding several partners: Greece, Japan and the USA also contributed.⁵⁰

According to policy maker 1, attracting other partners to health-care projects is the most efficient way for Lithuania to implement them. This could be a Lithuanian function: to evaluate need, develop the project and then make the advocacy campaign within the international community in order to find potential partners.

In 2010–2011 there were several capacity-building projects for Afghan medics, especially in the spheres of children's and women's health. Lithuanian medics went to Ghor province in order to provide consultations for medics and patients.⁵¹

The health-care projects in Afghanistan seem to be needed. However, in the context of the whole of the Lithuanian development cooperation the projects appear to be single initiatives without any systematic nature.

Regarding the MDGs that are among the priorities of Lithuanian development cooperation, it is important to point out that after 2011 the environment and the fight against climate change, and the empowerment of women's social activism were excluded from the priority sectors listed in the guidelines of the Lithuanian development cooperation programme. These issues remained only in the project application forms in the shape of a question: "How does the project contribute to the MDGs?" According to policy makers 6 and 7, gender equality and environmental issues are not independent sectors of development cooperation but

⁵⁰ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *Lithuanian Development Cooperation in Afghanistan*, Vilnius: Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department, 2009, p. 13, 21.

⁵¹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *Lithuanian Development Cooperation 2011*, Vilnius: Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Department, 2011, p. 4.

are just principles that cut across all sectors. The implementers should ensure that their projects will be environmentally-friendly and gender-sensitive. However, as mentioned previously, implementers consider such a requirement to be an absurd formality. Thus, it could be concluded that MDGs have only a second-rate, cross-sectoral role in Lithuanian development cooperation and that the development and performance model is not relevant to the Lithuanian case.

2.4. Strategic-defensive or Cold War model

This approach presumes that the Lithuanian development cooperation policy towards Eastern Europe is implemented in order to accelerate their integration into the EU and NATO, and in this way to diminish Russia's influence within the region.

In the goals of its foreign policy, Lithuania officially announced its support for the development of democracy in the Eastern neighbourhood states and their integration into the EU and NATO; for the efforts of Georgia and Moldova to maintain the integrity of their territories and become free from Russian troops; for the promotion of the development of democracy in Russia's neighbourhood; and its intention to contribute to the stability and security of the whole region.⁵² This permits presuming the presence of the geopolitical aspect of the competition between the West and Russia in the official documents forming Lithuanian development cooperation policy. However, in the rhetoric of the experts interviewed for this research this aspect was not clearly observed.

In order to find evidence for or against the strategic-defensive model, the respondents were asked about the influence of the development cooperation policy on the national security of Lithuania. However, the majority of them referred only to the non-military security issues – health care, the environment, economic issues, a secure neighbourhood, etc. Another security aspect of Lithuanian development cooperation policy is the image of Lithuania within NATO, which has already been discussed in the context of the power-political model.

The attitudes of Lithuanian policy makers towards Russia in the context of development cooperation policy are not militant. On the contrary, several policy makers and independent experts stressed the willingness and necessity to resume

⁵² Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, *Programme of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania*. Resolution No XI-52 of 9 December 2008, Articles 191-199. <http://www.urm.lt/popup2.php?item_id=256> [29 12 2012].

its development cooperation programme in the Kaliningrad region and even other regions of the Russian Federation (for example, Pskov, St Petersburg).

The Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation was included in the list of priority regions in the provision of Lithuanian development cooperation policy in 2003.⁵³ In the provisions for 2006–2010 Kaliningrad disappeared from the list. It was stated that Lithuania would implement development cooperation policy within Eastern Europe (Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine), South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia), and the post-conflict countries (Afghanistan and Iraq). If there is the financial ability, Lithuania will also support the countries of other regions, particularly the poorest African countries.⁵⁴ However, the Kaliningrad region remained in the guidelines of the development cooperation programme, and the projects (cultural, youth exchanges, economic relations, energy security) were implemented there until 2010.⁵⁵ The policy makers from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs explained such change by saying that the Kaliningrad region was taken out of the priority regions because the Russian Federation is not an ODA recipient country (i.e. it is not included in the list of ODA recipients prepared by the OECD); this means that the funds allocated for development cooperation projects in the Kaliningrad region do not count towards the Lithuanian ODA. Given the fact that Lithuania has an obligation to increase its ODA to 0.33% of GNI by 2015, it could be easily concluded that this change is of a rational nature, i.e. not allocating any developmental funds to non-ODA recipient countries. This fact once again proves that the main driver of Lithuanian development cooperation policy is obligation.

The criterion of the competition between the West and Russia was not proven to exist, as there is no evidence for such a statement in the legal acts or among the projects implemented. Only a few hints, expressed by a few experts, were observed. Moreover, the lack of a militant attitude towards Russia and the willingness to implement development cooperation policy in the Kaliningrad region expressed by the experts allows for an argument against the existence of this criterion. This is also proven by the examples of projects implemented in the Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation until 2010.

⁵³ The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, *The Provisions of the Development and Aid Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2003-2005*, Article 5, Part 13.

⁵⁴ The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, *The Provisions of the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2006-2010*, Article 7, Part 18.

⁵⁵ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *The Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Projects in 2010*, <<http://www.orangeprojects.lt/site/?page=11&sub=537>> [05 01 2013].

The criterion of the military security issues is not relevant to the Lithuanian case: no evidence was found in the legal acts and only the non-military security issues were listed by the respondents.

2.5. Economic-commercial model

The economic-commercial model of development cooperation looks at development cooperation policy through the prism of economic and commercial interests of the donor.

Before 2010 the guidelines of the development cooperation programme placed emphasis on the economic and trade relations between Lithuania and its partner countries. In the guidelines for 2009, the following priority sectors of Lithuanian development cooperation were listed: enhancement of bilateral economic and trade relations between Lithuania and Belarus; establishing partnerships between Lithuanian and Georgian business structures; the promotion of business initiatives among Lithuania and the Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation; and even the promotion of business initiatives with business structures from the partner countries in general as a separate chapter of the guidelines.⁵⁶ However, after 2009 these priorities relating to economic relations disappeared. Although the promotion of economic and trade relations is listed among the sectors of the Lithuanian development cooperation programme (in multi-year provisions, prepared by the government)⁵⁷, they are not included in the programme guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA).

Since 2012 the MFA has financed only 13 projects aiming to contribute to the promotion of business initiatives. In 2007 one project was implemented in Moldova, which aimed to present the opportunities to invest in the economy of the Gagauzia region of Moldova.⁵⁸ In 2008 there were two projects in Ukraine; they both aimed to support the cooperation between the Sumy and Telšiai regions, in order to promote the development of small and medium businesses and establish

⁵⁶ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *The guidelines for the Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Programme 2009*, Vilnius: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, 2008.

⁵⁷ The Government of the Republic of Lithuania, *The Provisions of the Development Cooperation Policy of the Republic of Lithuania for 2011-2012*, Chapter 6, Article 15.4.

⁵⁸ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *The Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Projects in 2007*, <http://www.orangeprojects.lt/site/newfiles/files/pdf/2007_metu_VB_projektu_suvestine.pdf> [02 01 2013].

business partnerships.⁵⁹ In 2009 the largest number of projects in the sector of the promotion of business initiatives was financed: three projects in Belarus⁶⁰, three projects in Georgia⁶¹, two projects in Ukraine⁶², and one project in Azerbaijan.⁶³ All of these projects aimed to promote cooperation and partnership relations between entrepreneurs from Lithuania and these partner states. The total amount of funds allocated for the implementation of these projects in 2009 was nearly 450,000 litas or 7% of the total funds allocated to the development cooperation programme that year.⁶⁴ However, since 2010 the projects promoting business relations have disappeared. Only a few projects, addressing the entrepreneurial skills of women and youths, were implemented; however, they did not directly promote business cooperation.

Such change could be explained by the financial crisis of 2009 and the financial cuts to the development cooperation programme. While the resources were available, the enhancement of economic and trade relations and the promotion of business initiatives were financed through the mechanisms of the development cooperation programme. However, when the resources were cut, only the most important sectors of that programme remained – the promotion of democracy, the support for European integration aspirations, administrative capacity-building projects, etc. Since Soviet times, Lithuanian business structures have had close relations with partners from Eastern Europe; thus, Lithuanians have their own ways of doing business, developing contacts, etc. The economic crisis of 2009 was the turning point when the development cooperation programme showed that business is not its goal, and business decided that the development cooperation programme is not its method. Since that time, although they are both issues of foreign policy, they do not overlap.

The experts involved in this research evaluated the importance of the sector of economic development and trade relations in the development cooperation policy as 2.6 points out of 5 and it was ranked last out of the 12 priority sectors listed in

⁵⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *The Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Projects in 2008*, p. 23-24. <http://www.orangeprojects.lt/site/newfiles/files/pdf/Internetas_2008_metu_VB_projektu_suvestine.pdf> [02 01 2013].

⁶⁰ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, *The Development Cooperation and Democracy Promotion Projects in 2009*, p. 10. <http://www.orangeprojects.lt/site/newfiles/files/pdf/2009_metu_VB_projektu_suvestine.pdf> [02 01 2013].

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

the provisions of development cooperation policy prepared by the government of Lithuania.

Policy makers were quite sceptical about the real impact of development cooperation on the economy. Only an indirect relationship between the Lithuanian development cooperation policy and its economic interests could be found. The main aspect of the interdependence of development cooperation and economic interests was the development of people-to-people contacts.

The Lithuanian development cooperation programme is too small and the funds operating in this field are very limited. This means that the policy cannot have any significant influence on the volume of sales of goods and services in Lithuania. The only field in which Lithuanian development cooperation policy could have influence is the development of closer relations with partners, enhancing confidence among partners which stimulates the climate for investments. Thus, the development cooperation policy could only have an indirect influence on the economic and commercial interests of Lithuania, and it is obvious that the economic-commercial model of development cooperation is not relevant to the Lithuanian case.

Conclusions

Although Lithuanian development cooperation could be called “compulsory altruism” and came to Lithuania with the EU accession process, the content of the policy was created by the Lithuanian government. This research aimed to identify the internal purposes – motives – that influenced the shape of the content of the Lithuanian development cooperation policy.

In this work, five theoretical models for the analysis of the motives of the development cooperation policy were developed. These were the power-political model, related to the concept of soft power; the political stability and democracy model, based on constructivism; the development and performance model, based on the neo-liberal concept of global governance; the strategic-defensive model, based on Cold War ideology; and the economic-commercial model, based on the commercial liberal theory. Specific criteria for each model were developed in order to conduct the research and identify the models in a real empirical case.

It is also important to highlight that these models clearly define (group) the motives of foreign aid only theoretically; in real life those purposes overlap and are often hidden, thus it is not easy to assign the goals of Lithuanian development cooperation policy to one or another model, as it might seem.

The conducted research showed that the power-political model of the development cooperation policy is the most relevant for the Lithuanian case. All three theoretical criteria developed for the identification of this model (attractiveness for the partner countries; role within the international community; cultural/historical ties with partner countries) matched the empirical patterns.

The relevance of the power-political model permits us to state that the main internal motives of Lithuanian development cooperation policy are the aspirations to create a positive image of Lithuania within the international community. The main means to this end are the implementation of developmental projects in Afghanistan, and creating the image of Lithuania as an expert on the Eastern European countries.

The second motive is the aspiration to become attractive for partner countries. The main projects aiming to create an attractive image of Lithuania within partner countries (Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia and Afghanistan) are the cultural projects and technical capacity-building projects. Cultural projects are twofold: in part they aim to promote the cultural heritage of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in order to remind partner countries of the former powerfulness of the state and show the cultural closeness of Lithuania to the strategically important neighbouring countries (Belarus and Ukraine); and partly they promote Lithuanian culture abroad, in this way contributing to the closer relations with strategically important recipient countries (Georgia, Afghanistan). The administrative capacity-building projects contribute to the attractiveness of Lithuania for the partner countries with aspirations of European integration (Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine). Such projects serve for the development of the administrative capacities of the recipient country to prepare for the implementation of EU standards. Lithuanian transitional experience makes the country attractive for the partner countries.

The analysis of the theoretical models also proved the relevance of the political stability and democracy model to Lithuanian development cooperation policy. All three theoretical criteria (secure, safe and predictable political environment; social reconstruction within the partner countries; and mutually recognised norms (democracy, human rights, etc.)) proved to be relevant to the empirical patterns of the Lithuanian case. It permits us to affirm that the third internal motive influencing the content of Lithuanian development cooperation policy is the aspirations to create a secure, predictable and stable Lithuanian neighbourhood. The main means to achieving this goal is sharing the Lithuanian democratisation, European and Atlantic integration experience with the country's neighbours.

The third development and performance model, which argues that development cooperation policy is a tool for states to cooperate in addressing

common global threats, was not confirmed in the Lithuanian case. Its criteria (global threats, environmental problems, health care, gender equality and MDGs in general) appeared to be only “cross-sectoral” elements in Lithuanian development cooperation policy, rather than the real priorities.

The strategic-defensive or Cold War model was also not proven. No evidence for the confirmation of the four criteria (competition between the West (EU/NATO) and Russia; Cold War; hard power; and military security) were found neither in the legal acts, nor among the projects implemented. However, such factors as the lack of militant attitudes of experts towards Russia and the non-military security issues served as arguments against this model.

The final model discussed in this study was the economic-commercial model. Only one of the criteria of this model (economic interdependence; trade enhancement; investment opportunities; economic worth of the partner country; commercial interests) proved to be valid – the investment opportunities. This issue was a priority for Lithuanian development cooperation policy until the financial crisis in 2009. However, more recently economic-commercial interests have not been the issue of development cooperation. Although the experts stressed the possible effect of the people-to people contacts developed through the development cooperation projects on the investment climate for Lithuanian business, there is no evidence to prove this model.