

The International Relations (IR) Scholarship in Central and Eastern European Countries: On Its Way to Cross the Regional Boundaries

Introduction

The presented publication has resulted from the debate on „The IR Scholarship in Central and Eastern European Countries: On Its Way to Cross the Regional Boundaries”, which took place on September 21st 2012 during the 9th Convention of the Central and East European Studies Association (CEEISA) at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow.

The idea of the debate emerged from my conversations on the significance of Polish scholars of International Relations in the global science, which I conducted with Anna Wojciuk. We have decided to invite persons who are, by profession, involved in studying the state of the discipline of International Relations in Central Europe and worldwide for a discussion. The invitation was accepted by Knud-Eric Jørgensen, the chairman of International Relations Standing Group of ECPR, who has been a guest of honour at the first convention of the Polish Association of International Studies in November 2011 in Poznań. Stefano Guzzini had not only expressed the willingness to participate in the seminar, but he also handed over contact details of persons involved in the development of International Relations in the Central Europe- Petr Drulák, Zlatko Šabič and Thomas J. Volgy.

The articles are arranged in the order in which authors presented their speeches. The general questions were:

1. What are CEECs' strengths and weaknesses from the perspective of heritage, organization of the scholarship and discipline, research methods and human capital?
2. What are the boundaries that have to be crossed?
3. What key choices have to be made while learning from others and adapting to international standards? Should we become more “scientific” or move directly from a descriptive style to an anti-positivist one?

Petr Drulák

Uniwersytet Karola w Pradze, Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych

Going Native? The Discipline of IR in Central and Eastern Europe

The discipline of the International Relations has been experiencing a robust growth in the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) during the last decade. After the 1990s, which was the period of either foundation or re-foundation or revival, depending on the country we speak about, the CEE IR has gained sound institutions and it has been producing significant volumes of academic output in terms of teaching and publications. On the other hand, so far the CEE authors have only marginally contributed to the top IR journals and to the top monograph series in IR, and they did not offer any new ideas to the international discipline¹.

This article argues that this marginalization comes from the previous CEE development strategy of the return to the West, which now needs to be changed into a new strategy of the contribution to the West. It starts with a brief review of the key strengths and weaknesses of the IR in the CEE. Following this I argue that the CEE scholars need to go beyond the copying of the Anglo-American IR concepts. Instead, they need to reflect on the political realities of their societies and to tap into the CEE intellectual traditions to develop the concepts of their own. At the same time, they should not give up on the conceptual background of the Anglo-American discipline which can often accommodate the intellectual and political needs of the CEE, nor should they abandon the scholarly rigour which the international discipline has developed.

Strengths and weaknesses

The table 1 summarizes the key strengths and the key weaknesses of the current IR disciplines in the CEE. It uses two perspectives. First, institutions refer to the

¹ J. Bátor, N. Hynek, *On the IR Barbaricum in Slovakia*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 186–193; E. Berg, M. Chillaud, *An IR Community in the Baltic States: Is There a Genuine One?*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 193–199; J. Czaputowicz, *Theory or Practice? The State of International Relations in Poland*. „European Political Science” 2012, No. 11, 196–212; P. Drulák, *Introduction to the International Relations (IR) in Central and Eastern Europe Forum*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 168–173; P. Drulák, R. Druláková, *Czech Republic*, [in:] *International Relations in Europe: Traditions, Perspectives and Destinations*, K.E. Joergensen and T.B. Knudsen (eds.), London 2006; V. Morozov, *Obsessed With Identity: the IR in Post-Soviet Russia*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 200–205; P. Bilgin, O. Tanrisever, *A Story Telling of IR in the Periphery: Telling Turkey About the World, Telling the World About Turkey*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 174–189; P. Roter, *At the Centre and Periphery Simultaneously: the Incomplete Internalization of Slovenian International Relations*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 180–186.

quality of conditions within which the discipline is practiced. Second, the intellectual perspective is about the academic quality of research.

Table 1

Strengths and weaknesses of the current IR disciplines

	strength	weakness
institutional	working research and education institutions	limits of budgets, limits of size
intellectual	ability to passively work within the IR	disability to actively contribute to the IR

Source: own work.

The institutional strength comes from the fact that the national IR communities can count on working research and education institutions such as university departments, research institutes, libraries, journals and publishers. Moreover, at the regional level there are such institutions as the Central and Eastern European International Studies Association, which organizes regular IR conferences inspired by the American ISA model, and “Journal of International Relations and Development” being a high-quality peer-reviewed journal. Intellectually, it is important that scholars have become familiar with the conceptual and methodological tools of the Anglo-American IR as well as with its academic standards. Unlike in the 1990s, they understand the „language“ of IR².

On the other hand, budgetary limitations significantly constrain the opportunities for professional development³. They limit scholarly mobility and access to the literature but they also make teaching hours long and they force young scholars especially to take up additional jobs. Also, a limited size of national disciplines does not allow for a sufficiently deep specialisation nor does it generate enough competition among scholars. These limits also have impact on academic quality of research. Scholars struggle to publish in recognized journals and book series. If they participate in the international division of academic labour, it is usually in the role of regional experts who are expected to provide data rather than make a contribution by sharing ideas⁴.

However, this failure to genuinely contribute to the discipline can be only partially blamed on the unfavourable research conditions. The individual research choices matter, too. By their choices the CEE scholars have so far failed to develop any comparative advantage which would allow them contribution.

² P. Drulák, R. Druláková, *Czech Republic, op.cit.*; P. Drulák, J. Karlas, L. Königová, *Central and Eastern Europe: Between Continuity and Change*, [in:] *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, A.B. Tickner, O. Waever (eds), London 2009, p. 242–260.

³ P. Roter, *At the Centre and Periphery...*, *op.cit.*

⁴ P. Bilgin, O. Tanrisever, *A Story Telling of IR...*, *op.cit.*; J. Czaputowicz, *Theory or Practice?...*, *op.cit.*

What next?

To develop the comparative advantage which would enable the CEE scholars to contribute to the international discipline in a more meaningful manner than it has been the case so far, the scholars need to take into account their own embeddedness. The discipline of IR is always embedded in the community which is defined by traditions, institutions and challenges which the community faces. A good IR scholarship is able to reflect and to develop on these traditions, institutions and challenges. What does it mean in practice?

First, the CEE scholarship needs to rediscover its own intellectual traditions. For example, in the 20th century the Central Europe could boast about a number of exceptional thinkers, who usually turned into politicians and who developed their own thinking about international politics⁵. Today, they are either forgotten or treated as museum pieces which testify about the past without giving anything to the presence. Still, such figures as Roman Dmowski, Tomáš G. Masaryk, Milan Hodža, István Bibó or Edvard Kardelj left over important intellectual legacies. They could be of inspiration to Polish, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian or Slovenian and other scholars who do research on small states, on European integration, on Central Europe, on the international system and on other themes which these intellectual and political leaders addressed in their writings.

Second, the CEE scholarship needs to properly address the key international political challenges which their communities are facing, such as their relationships to the West and to the East, atlanticism, political marginalisation, national minorities, and the politics of history, among others. However, this does not mean production of more case studies which are either purely descriptive or which try to mechanically apply the standard concepts and methods to these issues. There has been no shortage of a such research. What we need is a theoretical research. The concepts and the methods of the Anglo-American IR should not be taken at their face value in the study of the CEE challenges. Instead, they should be revised, enriched or replaced according to the political realities which they are supposed to study and according to the intellectual traditions of the CEE thought. Not only would this move produce a research which is more relevant to the practical needs of the CEE, but it would be also likely to lead to conceptual innovations at the level of the international discipline.

The current CEE scholarship fails in both respects. Three groups of scholars can be distinguished here – modernisers, traditionalists and sherpas. Modernisers are socialised into the Anglo-American IR but they ignore or deny their CEE embeddedness. They do work and write in English but due to the above weaknesses they do not have much to offer to the outside world and, what is more, the work could be done by someone in the West and by higher standards. Modernisers usually represent the CEE at the international conferences and in international publications. On the

⁵ P. Drulák, *Central Europe and IR Thinking: Traditions and Disciplines*, in: *Regional and International Relations of Central Europe*, [in:] Z. Šabič, P. Drulák (eds), Basingstoke 2012, p. 18-39.

other hand, traditionalists do not produce in English. They are immersed in the CEE context, some of them develop idiosyncratic conceptual tools but most of them are not much aware of concepts and methods, therefore, they produce either a descriptive research or an advocacy research defending particular political positions. They usually occupy important institutional positions in their respective national academic fields. Finally, sherpas are to a limited extent aware of the international IR as well as of the local context. However, they do not develop research of their own, instead, they use their local knowledge to deliver data to research projects led by established international scholars. PhD students and young researchers can benefit from starting as sherpas and thus learning important research skills, however, there are quite a few senior scholars in the CEE who remain in this role for the rest of their career.

Table 2.

The groups of IR scholars

Reflecting the CEE embeddedness?	Reflecting the Anglo-American IR?		
		No	Yes
	No	Sherpas	Modernisers
Yes	Traditionalists	<i>Reformers?</i>	

Source: own work.

To further advance the discipline, reformers are needed, namely, the scholars who are aware of the tools and standards of the Anglo-American IR while they also reflect on the CEE traditions and political realities.

Learning without aping should be the reformist motto. Learning the tools and the standards without aping the features that are not relevant. For example, it does not make much sense to try to refer to the dichotomy between positivism and post-positivism to structure the IR fields in the CEE. The choice between the two may be important at the level of an individual research strategy but it is irrelevant for the discussion about the shape of the disciplines. These have been shaped by the dichotomy between modernisers and traditionalists. It is by learning without aping that the CEE disciplines of IR can produce original research contributions and overcome their major weakness so far.

Stefano Guzzini

Uniwersytet w Uppsali

The Periphery Starts In Our Heads

This Panel discusses institutional and intellectual strengths and weaknesses of the IR discipline in Central and Eastern Europe. After diagnosis, it asks for ideas to move forward. I have little to add to the general assessment by the other contributors with which I agree. For all the financial bottlenecks and precarious disciplinary autonomy, for all the disregard for expert knowledge and the ambivalent status of the academic profession (at least in the social sciences), and the limited international research output, I agree with Zlatko Šabič that the discipline has made giant steps forward since the time I started teaching IR in CEE⁶. There are many new degrees with or in IR, as well as a general institutional setup with the CEEISA and some new national organisations. There is the quite successful *JIRD*, although, having been its editor (2004-2008), I may not be impartial in my judgment. Last but not least, there is quality research in IR in CEE, and colleagues from whom anyone could learn.

Having not that much to add to the diagnosis, let me therefore dwell on the understandable anxiety which speaks out of the Panel's concern: the anxiety of being at the periphery in both money and knowledge. It is a widely shared concern and to a large extent a healthy one, because it keeps us moving and curious for learning. But it can also be a debilitating one if one ends up like the proverbial rabbit paralysed by the lights of an approaching car. I was once invited to a convention organised by the *Korean Association of International Studies*, which has more than thousand members and is awash of money – and which was still concerned that there was no „Asian (Korean) theory of IR”⁷. At the risk of making a cheap pun, my intervention argues that „the periphery is what we make of it”.

When German IR scholars finally got together to make their own journal in the early 1990s, the first issue of the „*Zeitschrift für International Beziehungen*” from 1994 reflected the state of IR in Germany, as much as it made reflections on it. IR was a nascent disciplinary field or sub-field, just as Political Science had been in which IR department is usually located (or locked in, as some would say). As for many other post-45 social sciences in the West, this implied that the disciplinary development tended to follow, albeit with some delay, the fads and fashions, concepts and theories which have been invented elsewhere. Sticking out their necks, German scholars had to think about their place in the academic periphery. The aim was to establish some autonomy both towards Political Science and within the

⁶ I first taught at the ‘College for New Europe’ Summer Schools in Cracow in 1991-93, and then as permanent faculty at the CEU in Budapest from 1994-2000.

⁷ S. Guzzini, *Theorising International Relations: Lessons from Europe's Periphery*. Danish Institute for International Studies, „DIIS Working Papers” 30/2007, Copenhagen.

international discipline of IR. As so nicely captured by his title line „We can do much better: *aber muß es gleich auf amerikanisch sein?*“ [...but must it be in American?], Michael Zürn's article in the original issue argued that IR was now ready to go alone, yet without blindly mimicking the US disciplinary experience⁸. In a perfect match to this line, the opening article of the first issue, was Harald Müller's plea for harnessing Habermas' theory of „communicative action” for IR⁹. This turned out to be the start of a quite vivid debate which had all the envisaged advantages. It focused German scholars on discussing theory, i.e. a fundamental contribution to the software of the discipline, not just some application of programs written elsewhere. Moreover, it proposed an autonomous, not just copied or imported approach, and it did so by explicitly not neglecting the state of the (international) art. In fact, this debate directly engaged the state of art, informing a reference article that one of its protagonists published in *International Organization*¹⁰.

To think of Germany as the discipline's periphery may strike scholars from Central and Eastern Europe as odd. But in some obvious sense it is, just as is the Korean example above. Although German scholars can be seen almost everywhere and although they publish in all the best journals and presses, their „cachet” as successful scholars still depends on exactly those rites of passage defined by a US-dominated discipline. From here stems the central ambiguity of our field. On the one hand, any field needs selection and standards for assessing the quality of research so as to allow competent communication and mutual learning. Without some common language(s), the core (and fun!) of science is lost. For all their problems, peer-review processes at different levels are classical institutions through and with which learned societies move forward in their on-going dialogue. But then: which dialogue? All this must sound far too nice to those who have encountered the ever so tacitly mobilised biases and explicit barriers to our scientific communication: their mother tongue is not English, and then their conceptual vocabulary is not aware of findings elsewhere (for lacking resources), or even if it were: their approach and methodologies may not be *en vogue* with the on-going „debates”, and finally even if their research would talk to those debates, carefully picking its audience, the communication is not taking place where people would need to listen. The vocation of our sciences may well be a form of knowledge that is fundamentally universal in its origins and reach; its reality is not. Very few people in Europe, West, East, North or South, can elude the periphery.

In fact, with every step out of the periphery, a new rung seems to appear on the top of the ladder. No adaptation seems ever enough. Consequently, the temptation is

⁸ M. Zürn, *We can do much better! Aber muß es gleich auf amerikanisch sein? Zum Vergleich der Disziplin »Internationale Beziehungen« in den USA und in Deutschland*, „Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen” 1994, 1 (1), p. 91-114.

⁹ H. Müller, *Internationale Beziehungen als kommunikatives Handeln. Zur Kritik der utilitaristischen Handlungstheorien*, „Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen” 1994, No. 1 (1), p. 15-44.

¹⁰ T. Risse, *«Let's Argue!» Communicative Action in World Politics*, „International Organization” 2000, No. 54 (1), p. 1-39.

great not to embark on this laborious journey at all. There is always need for some policy advice, some will say, also on foreign policy and surely in security. Hence, why desperately trying to live up to some foreign and fastidious academic standards when more success can be gained in the research grey zone of think tanks, parties and other public or private actors with quite different research standards (and they are different!)? IR in CEE, and not only, is still greatly suffering from its original struggle to establish itself as a respected and authoritative realm of knowledge independent of, and usually competing with, the world of policy makers, when the latter is often financially better endowed (e.g. military or business funds for research) and occupied by people surely no less convinced of their qualities.

But even if one embarks on this journey, out of ambition or sheer intellectual curiosity, the underlying dilemma of the periphery will not go away. As succinctly summarised by Petr Drulák in his contribution, it opposes two main characters. There are the „modernisers” who erase the potential specificity and richness of local ways to knowledge by adopting the appropriate identity in the allegedly universal field of science. By contrast, there are the „traditionalists” who, in the attempt to protect autonomy, may end up defending intellectual autism, if not self-righteousness. To make things worse, this opposition has a clear ring of a generational power struggle, too. Hence, it can be caught up with dynamics which have little to do with scientific content. Those generational frontlines can moreover get muddled. In the earlier days in some Western European countries, and now often in CEE (and the European South!), the modernisers are often to be found in the younger generation which use the meritocracy of international peer review as its most potent weapon – as little as that may actually be – to circumvent encrusted hierarchies and powerful old-boy networks at home. But we know from Western European countries that also modernisers can become „traditionalists” of sorts by narrowly defending the disciplinary norms that brought themselves to their positions and keep on legitimating them. Also in CEE, modernisers can turn into nationalists and protectionists, resisting different (international) approaches and contacts outside their control, now conveniently justified by some (selective) kind of intellectual anti-imperialism.

Hence, if almost no one can elude the periphery, wherever in Europe they may be, if the opposition between modernisers and traditionalists are of a structural kind and not easy to change, the short-term question becomes how best to live with it and perhaps change it. As others mentioned in this Panel, the starting point is to develop one’s own skills, and by this I mean both the analytical skills and the necessary self-confidence to go about it. When Tom Volgy notices an increase in such self-confidence in the region, this is truly important. We all boil just with water, as the German saying has it. Good brains are to be found everywhere. With the necessary humility in front of the realm of knowledge, one needs to have the confidence to „start one’s own thing”. Obviously, research projects are informed by what other people are doing, concepts others have used, established theories with which ranges of problems are constituted and sometimes also resolved. But the important part is to have an active approach towards it, to take the initiative to engage different ideas and new people.

This concerns both the education of future academics and the collaboration of already established ones. With regard to the first, we need to teach less and learn more, not to stuff our curricula with endless courses and syllabi with huge literature lists, but concentrate on fewer courses that dig deeper and develop „thinking”. In Hedley Bull’s memorable phrase: „thinking is also research”. When I arrived at the CEU in Budapest, fresh from graduate school, I made all the mistakes there could be. I provided a fully imported reading list, and heaped incredible amounts of readings on my hapless students. It testified to their remarkable abilities, not mine, what many were still able to do with it. Only over time did I come to realise that the readings were mostly an excuse for helping them to develop their analytical skills, their sense of argumentation and critique, in short, to develop their intellectual autonomy; and only then could I start learning from my students. Not an easy, but an immensely grateful task. The access to a thousand databases and article collections are not a substitute for that. Money is not all. What is needed are a few fundamental texts that are also sufficiently diverse to stimulate different questions and logical paths. For this theory is crucial. Besides, it is also relatively cheap: one needs only a few books and brains¹¹.

Furthermore, groups of like-minded people are needed. The reason some „colleges” work so well is not (only) because they are in some deservedly prestigious or self-anointed university, but that they bring people together in an on-going exchange. When I wrote my dissertation, the support of my peers was crucial. Also, electronic messaging being just made available, I could send drafts via ftp (file transfer protocol) to doctoral friends who returned the favour. It is hard to overestimate how important that was – and also how much fun the night-long discussions were. Just as Anna Wojciuk writes, my sense is that such intellectual group dynamics is still not sufficiently used in CEE. There are still not enough research meetings of doctoral students within the respective countries, working groups which would come together within or across universities, to discuss ideas, readings, and later – their papers. One needs a community, a critical mass, or a support group, if you wish. Knowledge is inter-subjective, learning is social. Research is not an exercise in self-inflicted boredom; it is the communication of ideas and knowledge. Sure, this requires some money and the most precious good of all: time. And besides the institutional support, it requires skilful facilitators as in any such setting. Here, senior scholars have to play their most important role (at a minimum by not blocking initiatives). All that is feasible, though, if one starts changing priorities and reverses the vicious cycle of partly self-imposed solitude. In fact, people will be surprised when they find out how many others long for the same. I would bet that those places in CEE where some form of group dialogue has developed are the ones where IR research does best.

The aim is to develop and be able to use own standards for intellectual recognition that are highly demanding, ambitious and informed by the international state of

¹¹ For a general defense of the crucial role of theory for intellectual autonomy see: S. Guzzini, *The Significance and Roles of Teaching Theory in International Relations*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2001, No. 4 (2), p. 98-117.

the art, and hence making oneself independent from the desperate quest for an international recognition that will not be forthcoming for the periphery any time soon. The periphery will stay with us, but it does not have to mean that we cannot do good science – of whatever methodological family.

Knud Erik Jørgensen

Uniwersytet Aarhus, Wydział Politologii

Choosing Directions at Central and Eastern European Crossroads

Professor Jacek Czaputowicz's most welcome invitation to make reflections on the state of the art in Central and Eastern Europe prompts me to address a range of key issues for the discipline in the region. While it is well-known that the region has experienced more than twenty years of political transformation, it is less well-known how political, economic and disciplinary developments are intertwined. The cultural-institutional approach suggests that political culture, bureaucratic culture and academic culture should be taken into account¹². Moreover, some of the issues are highly relevant also in a wider context, no matter whether that context is defined as European or the world-wide discipline¹³. Finally, when future directions are considered, it should be taken into account that the discipline currently is more divided than perhaps it has been ever before.

What are CEECs' strengths and weaknesses from the point of view of heritage, organization of the scholarship and discipline, research methods and human capital?

Central and Eastern Europe is a region where only during the last 20 years it has been possible to develop a proper discipline of International Relations. It is against this background that achievements and missed opportunities have to be assessed. When assessing achievements, it is clear that the choice of a comparator is crucial for the outcome. In other words, choose one comparator and the result will be bleak, chose another comparator and there might be hope.

In my view, the strengths include the following. The region has been capable of creating:

- A professional association, Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA). While the association is not big, it has done a tremendous job in introducing the discipline to a region that around 1989/1990 decided to „come back to Europe”. As one of the few associations in Europe, CEEISA operates in English and welcomes an international membership.

¹² K.E. Jørgensen, T.B.Knudsen, *International Relations in Europe: traditions, schools, destinations*, London 2006.

¹³ K.E. Jørgensen, *The Best kept Secret: Continental IR Theory*, „European Journal of International Relations” 2000, No. 18(3), p. 9-42; K.E. Jørgensen, *Towards a Six-Continents Discipline*, „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2004, No. 6, p. 330-343.

- A tradition of biennial IR conferences, even if a relatively short tradition. In this respect, CEEISA is ahead of other regions in Europe, e.g. the Nordic region.
- A relatively successful journal, the „Journal of International Relations and Development” (JIRD). The journal is now one of the respectable IR journals in Europe, fully indexed and supported by a professional publishing house. Among the journal’s challenges is further consolidation and improvements in terms of attracting more submissions from the region as well as a wider readership.
- CEE is characterized by a scholarly tradition that in some respects is deeper than elsewhere. At least some scholars have actually read the work of Vienna Circle positivists, for which reason they do not have to rely on remote echoes of original positivism. Such knowledge enables not only a proper understanding of this branch of philosophy of science, but also a different spin on the post-positivist tradition.
- CEE has not (yet?) been infected by the contemporary research technique fetish, according to which method is a ruling king while all other aspects of scientific inquiry – substantive knowledge, theory and meta-theory – are reduced to ornamental servants of the method.

CEE is obviously not a region without weaknesses. However, there is no particularly good reason to indulge in comparing own weaknesses to the successes of others. This is to say, the following weaknesses come to mind:

- Language of publication. Most CEE scholars write in the language of the country of residence. It seems they have a clear preference for addressing the (limited) audience that happen to know the language, whether it is Polish, Czech, Bulgarian or any other of the languages spoken in the region. This predominant preference for the mother tongue implies that fellow colleagues around the world are generally cut off from knowledge produced in CEE.
- Publication habits. Unfortunately, a lot of papers never make it to publication or end up in research paper series characterized by a very limited circulation.
- Limited socialization of students to read original English language books and articles. Syllabi typically includes translations and while such translations might be excellent they do not encourage or rather force students to confidently use English as their working language.
- Attendance at international conferences. CEE scholars tend to stay at home and though limited funds for travel is an important factor, it might not be the only one. After all, it seems to me that more Turkish than CEE scholars participate in ISA conventions, WISC conferences and SGIR/EISA conferences. But these events are where networks are being created and cultivated, this is where CEE scholars should become pro-active members of the international community of IR scholars.
- Tradition can be considered as both strength and weakness. The latter happens when reproduction and repetition wins over progress. This applies to a range of phenomena: norms of publishing, structures of hierarchy and theoretical traditions turned into dogma. Progress is possible when traditions are acknowledged yet given an innovative twist.

What are the boundaries that have to be crossed?

It is very tempting to resist crossing boundaries, not only because crossings take time, but they are high risk engagements and they disturb well established knowledge and habits. Being built on existing knowledge and cherishing own norms and rules, universities are notoriously conservative institutions. However, given the highly uneven balance between strengths and weaknesses, described above, it seems to me that seven boundaries should be crossed as soon as possible.

- Stop writing in your own language (except for the occasional article). None of the languages in Central and Eastern Europe appear on the radar of major indexing companies. Consider which audience you are writing for and which research agenda or debates you aim at intervening.
- Revise syllabi so that students have to read original articles and book chapters. It will take time to get used to read in English, yet such time is an excellent long term investment. Why not expose your students to English speaking guest lecturers or speeches on YouTube¹⁴.
- Attend at least one of the major conferences in Europe each of the following years: 2013 (EISA www.8thpaneuropean.org), 2014 (CEEISA and WISC) and 2015 (EISA). Five years plans are back in mode so formulate objectives you aim at achieving within the next five years and consider the appropriate tools to reach them. This can be done at both individual and institutional levels.
- Get in touch with international publishers who publish in English and consider publishing your next article in one of the top-25 journals.
- Accept that (also) Central and Eastern Europe is characterized by significant generational differences. In this context, how should new members of the community of IR scholars, PhD candidates, train their analytic skills?
- Get together in joint ventures, for instance organizing the next CEEISA conference together with e.g. British, Nordic, German or Italian IR scholars.
- Take initiatives! The upcoming EISA has frequently open calls for workshop directors, section chairs and similar leadership positions.

What key choices have to be made while learning from others and adapting to international standards? Should we become more „scientific” or move directly from a descriptive style to an anti-positivist one?

Given that „international standards” are defined very differently around the world, their function as a lighthouse, suitable for scholarly navigation, is limited. The TRIP Around the World 2012 Survey¹⁵ demonstrates in great detail the pronounced variation. Hence, the challenge is not to adapt to some unambiguous international standards but to thoroughly discuss and then decide which standards to adapt to. It could even be that the one-way street of adaptation becomes a two-way street. If so, which standards would scholars in CEE contribute to? Would it be best-practice to be able to draw on literature in two or three languages?

¹⁴ Example: John Ruggie <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Th88pvZYa-4>, (retrieved: 25.11.2012).

¹⁵ <http://irtheoryandpractice.wm.edu/projects/trip/publications.php>, (retrieved: 14.02.2013).

- Do you value the idea of a pluralist community of scholars, characterized by contending perspectives? If so, it will be necessary to discuss how such a community can be preserved, not least given the endless examples of suggestions to homogenize the discipline, in terms of both methodological and theoretical orientation. While a pluralist community is not necessarily an end in itself, it seems that the discipline remains a bundle of contending perspectives, characterized by enduring debates.
- According to rumours, latecomers have certain advantages, for instance the option of not repeating the mistakes of the avant-garde. If you find this claim persuasive, then it becomes almost obligatory to identify the avant-garde and then produce a catalogue of mistakes that the (changing?) avant-garde has made over time. Hint: comparative foreign policy analysis vintage early 1970s; the present fashion of making method a fetish; positivism of different vintage years.
- Is it necessary, as a community, to master all levels of abstraction: descriptive, analytical, methodological, theoretical, meta-theoretical and philosophical one? For a mature community, it probably is. But this does not imply that each individual member of the community should feel obliged to master all levels, three might be sufficient.
- If there should be a prudent balance between strategies of specialization and general knowledge, then three challenges present themselves: i) which specializations and where? Which specialization do you want e.g. Prague, Brasov, Krakow or Budapest to be known for? ii) Should specialization be thematically defined, e.g. security studies, multilateral institutions, European foreign policy? iii) How would you want to define a „prudent balance”?
- It has always been tempting to monopolize the notion of „scientific” IR. The behaviourists of the 1960s engaged energetically in this game, labelling their opponents „traditionalists”; there are still ISA sections that find it necessary to flag „scientific” and, according to some game theorists, only game theory qualifies as science. Rationalists of various sorts perhaps do not aim at monopolizing „science, but find it convenient to talk about „normal science”. Such games are, most of the time, quite amusing to observe. However, if the point of departure is a „descriptive style”, then it might be high time to move on, for instance discussing the scientific nature of post-positivism, taking into account advances within philosophy of science during the last 50 years. Hint: positivism is not quite characterized by being at high tide.

Given the dividing discipline, CEE scholars (and others) face difficult dilemmas rather than easy choices. On the one hand, Pierre Lizée, Ole Wæver/Arlene Tickner and Pami Aalto (et al.), among others, have outlined fairly radical or diverse conceptions of International Relations¹⁶. On the other hand, there are frequent calls to

¹⁶ P.P. Lizée, *A Whole New World: Reinventing International Studies for the Post-Western World*, Basingstoke: Palgrave 2011; A.B. Tickner, O. Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, New York 2009; *International Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, P. Aalto, V. Harle, S. Moisiso (eds), Basingstoke 2011.

simply do what economists are doing, with this difference that we should apply to politics. I think that it is a good time for Europeans to think about possible consequences for them of such transformations of the discipline. Moreover, politicians cannot get enough of world class universities, yet without defining what they might be, let alone knowing what world class is or what it would cost. The administrative system takes over, defines that top-notch journals is world class and issues a ban on writing books. So, we will then be heading towards so-called professionalization, i.e., knowing more and more about less and less. Media folks might come across what's published, conclude that it is incomprehensible and that IR is irrelevant and begin to interview other journalists about what is happening in the world. Finally, we might want to address a key issue: who is our audience? Not because we do not know but because it matters whether we are addressing audience x, z or y.

Zlatko Šabič

Uniwersytet w Ljubljanie, Wydział Nauk Społecznych

Four Questions

1. What are CEECs' strengths and weaknesses from the point of view of heritage, organization of the scholarship and discipline, research?

The ideological division in the Cold War period and the lack of academic freedom in then communist countries had given little if any incentive for studying and discussing international relations in or beyond CEE. IR research was confined to a very narrow circle of scholars who had very often belonged to the then political elites and had therefore been able to travel to international conferences. Consequently, there was very little connection between the „Eastern” and the „Western” production scholarship dealing with international affairs, the only exception being the „cultural” debate about the „special place” of Central Europe, initiated in the 1980s, which is symbolised by well-known Kundera's *Tragedy of Central Europe*. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the „East” had initially been dormant – in most part because of the lack of resources. In the „formative years” of CEE's intellectual space discussing international relations, scholars that used to belong to Communist elites more or less dominated the discourse. Gradually, their ranks diminished (with only few left, but those have become active participants in the changing IR environment in the region) and younger scholars, many of them educated abroad, took their place. In this respect, the history of the CEEISA (Central and East European International Studies Association), the core network of international relations scholars and professionals in the region is an excellent example for illustrating the change of generations. It all began with the initiative of the International Affairs Network (IAN). The IAN was

launched in 1994. It was coordinated by the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs from the University of Pittsburgh, and supported financially mostly by the Pew Charitable Trusts. Given its early entrance into the CEE region, the IAN had a very limited choice as to whom it would (could) co-operate. But it did have money to create a network, which took place in 1996, when the CEEISA was inaugurated. Yet, little happened beyond that.

Most scholars at the time were willing to participate in IAN-sponsored meetings, but showed less enthusiasm in investing their own time and human capital to sustain at least co-operation in the region. The IAN had ceased its operations in late 1990s, which led to the disintegration of the „network”. Most likely, the CEEISA itself would have been discontinued, had it not been for a joint effort of various academic institutions from the region and beyond to keep it alive. Most of the effort to build the network was done in Prague and Ljubljana. The enthusiasm and help of individuals from various CEE countries (including Poland, which hosted no less than three CEEISA conventions) was crucial. Equally important was the intellectual and financial support from outside the region. The International Studies Association (ISA), the largest international network of IR scholars in the world, organised a joint CEEISA-ISA conference in Budapest, which was attended by over 700 participants. Given that this conference took place in 2003, it could arguably be understood as one of the most important events that put the CEEISA on the map. Generally speaking, as far as the IR is concerned, the intellectual arena of the CEE was becoming richer. The people involved in the IAN network more or less parted their ways, but the number of young scholars from CEE, with interest in international relations in general and CEEISA activities in particular was continuously growing.

Since the turn of the century, the CEEISA has played a pivotal role in strengthening the IR scholarship in the region. It has its own conferences, which are organised in various parts of the CEE. In Central Europe, the CEEISA organised its conferences in all countries except Slovakia. It had a conference in the Baltics (Estonia), the Russian Federation, as well as Turkey (owing to the fact that Turkish IR scholars take CEEISA as a particularly important venue to present their research and have therefore been among the most active members of the Association). In 2014, the CEEISA will go to Romania. Further, the CEEISA has its own, official journal called, the „Journal of International Relations and Development” (JIRD) which is indexed by all important databases, including the Web of Science (WoS). The potential to publish in the JIRD is still being explored by CEE scholars, since all the editors so far hoped to receive more manuscripts from the CEE region than they actually did.

This brings us to the strengths and weaknesses of the region. There seems to be little wrong with the institutional support to the discipline. Besides their domestic outlets, CEE scholars can attend CEEISA conferences and publish in a widely indexed journal. In terms of the language, CEE scholars are comfortable in presenting in English – this was not a case only a decade ago. On the issue of human capital, the region is full of young, aspiring scholars, and those who have great careers in the region or elsewhere in the world. The real problem, however, is that

these trends are not reflected in the actual output which is presented in CEE, be it at CEEISA conferences or the JIRD. Especially with respect to the former, as already mentioned, editors of the JIRD complain that they do not receive manuscripts, in particular good manuscripts from CEE scholars. One has yet to find out why this is the case. One might speculate about the lack of confidence of (particularly younger) CEE scholars, but such speculation would be immediately cast off just by looking at, for example, how many prominent CEE scholars make their careers abroad. It is to be hoped that this trend changes and that there will be more quality manuscripts in the future. It is also true that a lot of research in CEE is being published in a book form. For this reason, one might think of introducing CEEISA's own book series, which would provide yet another opportunity for a high quality material to be published and properly disseminated.

2. What are the boundaries that have to be crossed?

In my view, there are five kinds of factors („boundaries”) that the discipline faces in its development since 1989: a) geography; b) institutional development; c) language; d) quality; and d) financial resources.

Among the five factors, the institutional development has been the least problematic. As already mentioned, the region has its own professional organisation – CEEISA, which has a journal that is globally recognised. Worth mentioning are also domestic developments as some countries create their own ISAs or develop IR sections in their political science associations; most recently, Poland has also created its own international studies association. On the other hand, geography continues to be an issue; we still do not know each other very well. The co-operation among professionals from some of the countries is excellent; these individuals are mostly from the Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia. As already said, Turkey is also very active. Two of CEEISA's conferences have taken place in Russia. This is it – there is still a lot of ground to cover. The Western Balkans, in spite of several attempts to change the situation, is still not involved in CEEISA activities. Austria, geographically and historically very much part of CEE, practically does not exist in CEEISA; the same goes for Hungary. The CEE should also reach out to the Eastern Neighbourhood, to countries such as Ukraine and Moldova; and to Central Asia and Caucasus where minor successes have already been accomplished (scholars from these two regions participated in the 2008 CEEISA/WISC conference in Ljubljana). All in all, crossing these geographic boundaries remains a major task – it should be the role of the CEEISA as well as domestic international studies associations to bridge that gap the best way they can.

Language can be both an impediment and an advantage for the development of IR in CEE. Arguably, there is a considerable gap between domestic publications and those published abroad. For all sorts of reasons, many scholars from the region still prefer publishing at home in their mother tongue. In part, this is due to the national evaluation system where „care for the national language” plays an important role.

This is not surprising, especially if the market for such works is huge (Germany is one example; in CEE, Poland is another). Yet, for scholars from smaller CEE countries, publishing abroad is (or should be) a must, and it is to be expected that there will be more pressures towards publishing abroad, also from national research agencies in these countries. That, in turn, should lead toward stronger integration of the CEE IR Community.

In terms of academic output, there is still a lot to be done. Today, not many scholars from CEE are recognised globally for their research. Very few of them have published in leading IR journals. This list includes JIRD, as well. Only a handful of CEE scholars have published there. All too often I hear from younger scholars that they are afraid of submitting manuscripts to the JIRD because they fear a (devastating) critique. Particularly in the past i.e. before the JIRD entered the WoS, this attitude was terribly wrong and misplaced. An enormous effort had been put by editors in „coaching” younger scholars toward publishing quality articles. After the journal has made it to the WoS the inflow of articles has been enormous, and most of submissions are from the West. It seems that this is making the JIRD yet another Western IR journal, but that is not the case. In spite of a huge number of manuscripts they need to deal with, and all the fight against backlogs notwithstanding, the editors of the JIRD have continuously encouraged scholars from CEE to submit their work to the JIRD and they work with authors to improve their manuscripts. Of course, in the end, the quality matters, but if editors do not receive manuscripts in the first place they are not going to be able to judge whether these manuscripts are worth publishing.

That said, it must be pointed out that the JIRD is published only four times per year, which means that one cannot judge the quality of the output simply on those criteria. Even publishing in top journals is not sufficient. Good articles may appear in „less prominent” journals. It should be reiterated that a lot of good research is published in a book form. In the past, there have been efforts to scan through the output in IR communities in CEE. The second issue of the JIRD in 2009 was devoted to this topic. One hopes that these efforts will be repeated periodically, say every ten years, simply to follow the progress made, i.e. how competitive scholars from CEE are vis-à-vis more established IR communities around the world. Currently, given the existing findings, the situation does not seem to be bad at all, but it is not satisfactory either.

Finally, one cannot avoid the issue of financial resources. While certain trends and tensions that I am about to mention may also be applicable to more developed IR communities, it can be argued that they are much more visible in CEE. The first issue relates to research priorities. In (inter)national schemes for financing research the bias toward natural sciences is enormous, in good part also because natural scientists are embedded in decision-making bodies that determine such priorities. Here we encounter a paradox – the contemporary world is laden with various social conflicts that are being unresolved. The current economic and political crisis has intensified those tensions, dormant prejudices and animosities tend to reopen, the intolerance towards „the Other” is increasing. Yet the bigger the social crisis, the higher the

probability of conflicts emerging from it, the lesser funds are available for research in social sciences and, in our case, international relations, a discipline which can actually address these problems and discuss ideas how to resolve them. The other issue, which is particularly present in CEE countries, is the dependence of research on public money. Besides the bias against social sciences, the allegiance to ruling political parties tend to influence preferences of individual governments, hence there is a chance that the funds will be distributed according to the criteria that will make it difficult for those scholars who do not speak the same language as the government to compete for these funds. This „approach” becomes even more problematic with younger, less established scholars. The result of such state of affairs is potentially devastating as it impacts opportunities for, and human resources with the ability of, doing quality research.

3. What key choices have to be made while learning from others and adapting to international standards? Should we become more „scientific” or move directly from a descriptive style to an anti-positivist one?

While one needs to be critical about the state of IR teaching and research in CEE, one should also be quite clear on the following: compared to the 1990s, IR in CEE has made huge steps forward. There is, in fact, very little that we can learn from „international standards”. Scholars in CEE are aware, for example, of the importance of a peer review. We realise that doing IR only within our own borders, i.e. producing case studies of our own countries, will not get us far. This is important for the future, because some fundamental changes still need to be made in this respect. Here, two paths need to be followed. In terms of research, interdisciplinarity is the key – for example, one should not shy away from working with natural scientists and vice versa. Besides the fact that interdisciplinarity enriches national and international research output, the co-operation between various sciences may well lead to less dismissive views about the values of one science or the other. In CEE, many steps are yet to be made in this direction. In terms of education, it all starts at universities. My sense is that IR students in CEE are all too often subjected to descriptiveness; methodology in general and theory in particular tend to be neglected. The state of the discipline is also indicated by the fact that in most universities in CEE students still rely on western literature. The latter is not in itself bad – quite the contrary, provided that students are systematically encouraged to read original texts. But to have some quality textbook in a local language seems almost a must, for two reasons: first, because of the need to develop an own terminology and in this way enrich the local language. Second, because a textbook written in a local language brings the discipline closer not only to those who wish to pursue their careers as scholars, but particularly to a wider audience, which often times yet needs to be convinced about the impact that developments abroad can have on their own lives (in Slovenia, for example, the austerity measures threaten to discontinue the only TV program that focuses on foreign affairs, allegedly because it does not have many viewers).

4. Final advice

The times are challenging, especially for the young people, interested in IR and aspiring to make careers in either academia or in an environment in which the knowledge and skills learned from their IR studies' programs is required. The competition is immense at all levels – whether one wants to pursue his or her career in academia, a public or private sector there is not really much difference as to the difficulty to get a job. As I have indicated above, there are still issues that need attention if one discusses that state of the IR discipline in CEE. However, I have also made it clear that we see an immense progress in scholarship, quality of research and graduates coming from CEE. That makes scholars from the region more competitive. With a successful resolution of some critical issues such as funding, research priorities and mentality, and with less fear to do networking and publishing abroad, IR studies and scholarship from CEE will become more visible both regionally and globally.

Thomas J. Volgy

Uniwersytet Arizony, Departament Politologii i Polityki Publicznej

A Couple of Quick Reflections On Changes in the CEE Academic IR Community Over the Last Decade

Thank you for organizing this panel, for inviting me, and for the diversity of views that are represented here.

I come to this panel as an outsider by nationality and training. While I was born in Hungary, as a naturalized citizen who grew up in the United States and was trained in the US as a political scientist, I have strong emotional attachments to both Hungary and Central Europe, although the professional, academic linkage is relatively recent.

It was only a bit more than a decade ago that I was invited to a meeting in Warsaw to have a group of us look at the state of international relations scholarship in Central Europe, and to talk about strategies for strengthening academic practices and institutions. From those deliberations came a strategy for restructuring the Central and Eastern European International Studies Association (CEEISA), a strategy that was initially carried on the shoulders primarily of Czech and Slovenian colleagues.

I must admit that I had left that Warsaw meeting a bit pessimistic...more pessimistic than Americans normally, and less pessimistic than Hungarians generally. The model I advocated for the CEEISA was a modified version of our own ISA structure, based heavily around a secretariat, a routinized conference allowing for regular interaction between scholars in the region, a journal of value produced by the association, and reliance on a large corps of volunteers who believed in collaboration and

mutual, voluntary assistance as dimensions fundamentally important to the growth of the CEE academic community.

While these thoughts were met with support at the meeting, I also heard an enormous amount of scepticism and defeatism, centring around the idea that the academic community in inside CEEISA was too poor and too busy trying to survive to engage in volunteerism, which was an option available only to rich scholars.

I am so happy that those voices of pessimism were proven wrong. CEEISA, since that meeting, has grown and flourished. Its journal (JIRD) is widely read and respected. Its conferences draw very respectable numbers and increasing represent scholarship from the four corners of the region. Here in Cracow, I learned from and engaged with at least half the panels I attended...a strong score for any conference. And contrary to the early pessimists, there is a strong feeling of collaboration and volunteerism, with dozens of colleagues giving their time and energy to the cause of academic development as a public good rather than just an individual's private benefit.

To me the ultimate test of success is confidence in one's work and the finding of value by others in it. This test is now clearly met at the CEEISA conference. On one hand, I find the scholars from inside the region substantially more confident about their work and their contributions to the global academic community. And on the other hand, I find more and more scholars from outside the CEEISA boundaries reading the work being produced here. Thus, to me both tests are being passed admirably.

Of course not all is perfect and I would offer three suggestions about future directions to pursue. First, in perusing the research papers presented at the CEEISA conferences and those submitted to JIRD (a journal that I read regularly and for which I referee), I find that there is some hesitation by scholars in the region to dive into new issues and theoretical/methodological constructs being raised elsewhere that challenge our conventional understandings. Yet, I'm not sure about the reason for such hesitation. One example surrounds network analysis. It is both a methodology for observing data, but more importantly, it offers a theoretical approach that moves away from monadic and dyadic explanations for foreign policy activity. In its strongest forms¹⁷, it is challenging both our theoretical approaches to scholarship and some of our strongest empirical findings (for example, the salience of the Kantian peace). I see not a glimmer of any of this in recent work in the region. Yet, network analysis was pioneered in the region, and its footprints leading out of, for instance, the University of Ljubljana are seen all over the work of scholars operating west of Slovenia.

Second, there needs to be a stronger recognition that the empirical, historical realities of the region form a tremendous laboratory with which to address key questions of IR scholarship outside of the region. For instance, we know that most conflicts

¹⁷ Z. Maoz, *Networks of Nations: The Evolution, Structure, and Impact of International Networks, 1816-2001*. Cambridge 2011; M.D. Ward, R.M. Siverson, X. Cao X, *Disputes, Democracies, and Dependencies: A Reexamination of the Kantian Peace*, „American Journal of Political Science” 2007, No. 51, p. 583-601.

in international politics stem from territorial, ethnic, and „enduring rivalry” issues. Historically, the region has been steeped in all of these. In fact one enumeration of rivalries in international politics identifies more of these cases in the CEE region than virtually anywhere else. A conscious, comparative treatment of these cases, comparing the dynamics in the region with those of other regions would greatly assist us in testing the utility of our theories. Yet, too much of the work I see being done on the region remains as a single case, rather than this comparative focus. I am convinced though that a more rigorous comparative focus will allow for a better understanding of these processes not only globally, but also about the region itself.

Third, and finally, I want to challenge CEE scholars to do better at something that is done badly outside of the region by IR scholars: to wit, we need to talk with each other more. I think it is imperative that positivists talk more with post-structuralists, constructivists more with realists, post-colonial scholars more with liberal theorists. There are substantial areas of intersection...theoretically speaking...between us. Too many of us have given up and have settled for talking among ourselves, or even worse, simply laughing at the „other”. Yet, there are great commonalities, and if not so great, then substantial intersections where we can communicate, and collaborate. The results should be better theory, better science, and better understanding of the phenomena we seek to study. I sense that some of us are too old—not chronologically, but in terms of our practices—to do this in a sincere way. I find CEE scholars still young, in terms of their practices, and able to perhaps create and cross these bridges better. All of us would benefit greatly as a result.

Thanks again for your time and interest in my thoughts.

Anna Wojciuk

Uniwersytet Warszawski, Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych, WDiNP

The State of IR Discipline in Poland. A Junior Scholar's Perspective

I am flattered to be invited to take part in this round-table gathering with eminent scholars who combine on the one hand excellent research output and on the other substantial involvement in the development of IR discipline in CEE. In the last decade CEEISA and JIRD were fora within which discussions about the state of the discipline in CEE were held, yet Poland was largely absent in those exchanges. That is why I would like to focus particularly on my country and try to draw a picture of the discipline from the point of view of a young scholar and of a newcomer to the debate.

1. As for the heritage, our strength is being a part of extremely rich European tradition, therefore outstanding achievements of European humanities are easily accessible here and are a part of our culture. Until late nineties of 20th century an ideal of an intellectualist, well-rounded, familiar with classics and contemporary developments

in research, literature and art was cultivated here. Recently, with modernization and Europeanization, it seems to be less in high tide but it still may be an inspiring reference while searching for our own, distinct language to describe international reality. What is more, in twenties and thirties of the 20th century there were Polish attempts to grasp the specificity of international relations from the CEE perspective. On the one hand, there was a strategic tradition developed by Józef Piłsudski, Roman Dmowski and Władysław Sikorski, and on the other the international law stream, represented by an acknowledged scholar Ludwik Ehrlich. The Piłsudski's geopolitical concept of *Intermarum* encompassed the whole CEE, its purpose was to build a federation of countries including Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Belarus, Ukraine, Hungary, Yugoslavia under the aegis of Poland. During the cold war Paris-based, Polish emigrant „Kultura” monthly was a centre of reflection about international relations. Systematic, theoretical approaches to IR were absent here but at least since twenties there was an intellectual tradition of conceptualizing international issues. Now those achievements rarely resonate in the research output produced in Poland but in the future rediscovering them may be a fruitful task.

As far as weaknesses are concerned, during the cold war the field was largely ideological and controlled by the government. Many talented students who wanted to make independent research had to go to other, „safer” fields, for example Bronisław Geremek, a famous intellectual and Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, was working on medieval history. One can guess that during that time we have lost many high-achievers who otherwise would be interested in working on IR but who had to go to other disciplines for political reasons.

Discussing organization of the IR discipline in Poland one has to mention the broader context of policies concerning higher education and research. Until 2011 academia was the only part of social reality in Poland which has not faced any major reform since 1989. The recent changes are widely criticized in the public debate, yet anecdotal evidence shows that many young scholars support them. The reform is build according to the Western standards of public management and consequently it weakens academic hierarchy. Establishing a system of distribution of funding and scholarships centred in government agencies, it limits the power of faculties in managing public expenditures on research. On the other hand, the reform is an appreciating research published in English, it is pushing scholars to go international, to develop networks and to make efforts to publish their research in renowned peer-reviewed journals.

In that respect it is an indispensable advantage (although coming so late!) that finally Polish universities got access to most of international scholarly databases. Before, taking into account relatively modest libraries and lack of access to major international journals, a lot of scholars who did not have opportunities to work abroad, were in fact cut of most of up to date developments in the discipline. One should mention here that very little IR theory classics are translated into Polish and in original versions they are absent in the libraries. Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations* and Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* were translated just in 2010.

Now we have an easy access to the databases but we have to build habits to regularly follow the selected journals and identify where the learning frontier of the discipline is. Therefore, if we consider making Polish IR more international and internationally accessible, those reforms may be considered as an opportunity rather than a threat.

On the positive side one must also mention the EU accession with remarkable opportunities of exchanges and learning from the diversity of approaches present in the continent. Europeanization has certainly contributed to building conscience of the new generation of IR scholars in Poland. There are relatively few attempts to question modernization model as proposed by the EU.

Discussing positive developments on the organizational aspect one cannot forget that just recently The Polish Association of International Studies was established and that it is a promising attempt to build a network, foster international scholarly cooperation and create a real community of researchers. Similarly, 2013 European Studies Association Convention in Warsaw is a great organizational opportunity to become an intellectual co-host, pro-active in building a program of the event and not only venue provider.

From the organizational side, the weaknesses reflect mainly modest funding if compared with Western countries. Polish scholars are still teaching a lot (although with demographic crisis less and less), typically they devote more of their time and energy to pedagogy than to research. Low basic salaries are combined with a high demand for higher education. In last twenty years scholarization on the academic level has risen from less than 10% to more than 50% in given cohorts. The minimal burden for a junior assistant professor is 210 hours a year, some are teaching 400 and more, (record holders in their „best years” were teaching even 800 hours). Many Polish scholars hold two positions simultaneously. This education boom was sometimes detrimental to the quality and provoked inflation of M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The demographic crisis which can already be observed at the universities will certainly concern IR institutes and it will further put the discipline out from its comfort zone. It is a huge challenge for the discipline to adapt to the new situation (less money from teaching) and at the same time foster the quality of both teaching and research.

As far as research methods are concerned, the picture is quite gloomy in Poland. Even during this conference there were numerous voices coming from Polish scholars diagnosing difficulties in professionally designing research, admitting lack of skills to correctly apply theory and methods. The preliminary results from the study we have conducted together with Jacek Czaputowicz and which were presented in another panel during this conference show that most of the journal publications in Poland lack both theoretical underpinning and clear methodological approach. Many articles and books are literature reviews. I think that still relatively good orientation in history and a substantial knowledge about Eastern Europe, reflecting our strategic interests, are our main comparative advantages in the field.

2. In my view first boundaries that have to be crossed are mental ones. Therefore it is a difficult process of leaving the comfort-zone and going through an adaptive challenge. The reforms we are experiencing and demographic changes we are going

to face soon will most likely be uneasy for the community. Therefore, we will have to learn new skills, those of applying for grants and scholarships, building international teams of scholars, designing meaningful research grounded in theory and methods, confronting our findings in international conferences and finally writing and submitting papers and books in English. And what is the worst: we will have to learn how to have them published. Many scholars express anxiety and uncertainty how to achieve it. It indeed seems a huge challenge since very few Polish papers have been published internationally and strikingly, there has not been a single one published in JIRD. Crossing the mental borders would also mean being more active in the international fora, sometimes we are present but often silent observers. This is my personal experience how hard it is to take the floor in an international, important event for the first time. The fact that Poland is the largest country in the region and that consequently the community of scholars is also large may be one of the reasons why we are less internationally connected. It is possible that Polish community of IR scholars was large enough to sustain itself and it did not have incentives to establish international cooperation and exchange.

On the other hand, my experience from the United States showed me how hard it is in Poland to work in teams. We need to cross the boundary of individualism, to learn how to cooperate, how to give each other feedback on a regular basis in a constructive way and how to accept criticism. As Knud-Erik Jorgensen has suggested during the workshop „How to build an IR theory” held prior to the conference at the University of Warsaw, it would be ideal if our cooperation could lead at some point to establishing Poland as a small centre on the international map of the discipline. Establishing it as a country having some specialty, where scholars from other countries come to learn and share knowledge.

Those difficult challenges will most likely touch our modes of behaviour, processes and possibly also values and norms. To successfully get through the transition and become a self-conscious, creative, highly professional and internationally renowned community will require a lot of cooperation and leadership from scholars originating from different centres in Poland. Leadership which do not necessarily need authority, which is acting as a multiplier in empowering more and more scholars from the community.

3. From the Polish perspective it is a difficult question on how to modernize the discipline and not to become imitators. I personally support the idea of an intense training in research design, theories and methods as without those tools it is incredibly hard, if possible, to produce research fulfilling international quality criteria. Therefore, there could be a variety of theories and methods being thought if only they lead to the quality of output. I really liked what Stefano Guzzini said during this round-table: „being qualitative is not an excuse for bad research”. I think our key choice should be then to develop capacities in research design, theories and methods, then scholars should make independently their theoretical and methodological choices. Quality research should be the major objective to achieve in the process of development of the discipline.

While learning international standards and modernizing it is important not to

become imitators, as imitators we will never be as interesting as those who we do try to imitate. Therefore it would be fascinating to rediscover our traditions and re-establish links with those parts of it, which may be inspiring for our research. A discussion about where do we come from as Polish IR scholars, where we are and where we are going to would be an interesting beginning for the community.

Jacek Czaputowicz

Uniwersytet Warszawski, Instytut Europeistyki, WDiNP

Intricacies of Interdisciplinarity

In order to evaluate the strong and weak aspects of International Relations (IR) as a social science, we should pay attention to its historical conditionings. In Poland IR developed initially, outside universities, namely in the Polish Institute of International Relations in Warsaw and the Western Institute in Poznań. Since the mid-1970s the chairs of IR have been created as a part of university structure. Social science of International Relations is nowadays well-rooted in the Polish academic environment. A network of International Relations Institutes is dense, university specialization – popular, and the number of scholars and students – significant. In comparison to others, IR students are distinguished by their openness to the world and knowledge of foreign languages.

IR in Poland is set within the framework of Faculties of Political Science. IR constitute a research field which combines history, political science, international law and economy. The dominating descriptive approach relies on the description of a certain aspect of international reality and drawing practical conclusions for foreign policy. Scholars are classified according to regional and thematic specializations, in contrast to classification based on theory applied or research standpoints. It is difficult to determine paradigms or attitudes which are in the foundations of the studies.

Created in 2008, the Polish Institute of International Studies aims at integrating the academic environment and improving its academic standards. The two conventions organised so far have been dedicated to IR interdisciplinarity and to levels of analyses. The Association undertakes activities to create a self-contained discipline of International Relations. The situation generates tensions in relations with political science academics, who perceive it as danger to their position. A recent transformation of ECPR-Standing Group in International Relations to European International Studies Association is interestingly inspiring, while organisation of CEEISA Conference at Jagiellonian University in 2012 and the 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations in 2013 at Warsaw University contributes to opening of the Polish environment to the realm of Western International Relations.

Polish scholars have developed their own approach which could best be compared to the British School of International Relations. Polish universities missed the quantitative turn in social sciences, which took place at the beginning of 1990. At that time Poland was busy with transformation processes and working out new foreign policy directions to NATO and EU membership.

Poland has relatively large demand for expertise relating to foreign policy, particularly to such concepts as EU Eastern Policy, climate change, securing supply of energy resources, human rights or developmental aid. Polish think-tanks such as the Polish Institute of International Affairs and the Centre for Eastern Studies are active, represent high standards and have good reputation. Main Polish journals on International Relations – „International Affairs”, „Polish Diplomatic Review”, „Western Review” and the only publication in English – „The Polish Quarterly of International Relations” are published by think-tanks.

However, the scholars aim at searching for truth and proclaiming truth, and understanding, exposing and finding the intellectual solution of the problem which is different from the political solution. Meanwhile, many Polish International Relations scholars give up their academic role and take on the role of experts. They identify problems, warn against dangers, invent methods of prevention and legitimize certain foreign policy.

In order to develop the science of International Relations there are boundaries to be crossed, indeed. After 1989 the transition from real socialism to common sense realism has taken place. By common sense realism I understand a practical attitude which is oriented on the recognition of Government's interest and the analysis of its foreign policy, nevertheless the attitude which lacks methodological and theoretical awareness. Today we have to cross a second boundary and go beyond the common sense realism. We have to make a transition from description to scientific analysis and explanation.

Some scholars claim that in the CEECs there are as many post-positivists as there are positivists and it is a good tendency because one may expect synergy¹⁸. I think that in Poland, we need to first and foremost develop a positivist methodology. The real alternative should not be more scientific or post-positivist. Both ways out of common sense realism are legitimate, either by adopting a scientific approach or a more critical, normative and – why not – post-positivist stance.

During the discussion at the first convention of the Polish Association of International Studies in November 2011 the concept that International Studies (IS) cannot be restricted to political science because its research field is significantly wider was brought up many times. The IS interdisciplinary character constitutes a basis to extract them from political sciences. However, in Poland IS are rather a multidisciplinary research field. Interdisciplinarity requires a synthesis of research approaches; it is something more than a sum of partial arrangements made by separate disciplines.

¹⁸ P. Drulák, *Introduction to the International Relations (IR)*, 'Central and Eastern Europe Forum', „Journal of International Relations and Development” 2009, No. 12(2), p. 168–173.

It needs the thorough knowledge of disciplines or creation of the research team which possess such knowledge. However nowadays, as understood in Poland, interdisciplinarity is a synonym of surface knowledge, knowledge not thoroughly examined by any discipline.

In the relations to interdisciplinarity there are three phases of IS development. In the period between the First World War and the 1950s International Studies constituted a research field used by many disciplines bound by common problems, such as war and conditions which guaranteed peace. It was then believed that extracting a separate discipline would exclude economy, law and other disciplines from the discipline of International Relations. Being a result of behavioural revolution in the 1950s, political science has developed its own methodology owing to which it has become more coherent, while IR were placed within this realm. On the other hand, in 1970s there was a return to interdisciplinarity by taking into consideration international political economy, inspirations coming from philosophy and sociology (Frankfurt School) and subsequently the postmodern and feminist notions, as well as post-colonial and ecologic studies (inspirations with biology).

Being separated from the West by the Iron Curtain, the Central and Eastern Europe has not experienced the above mentioned sequence of development. The Marxist approach, which was in force during the Cold War, appeared to be a road to nowhere. Today, International Studies are still at the level of multidisciplinary research field. It is characterized by multidisciplinary, not by interdisciplinarity, because there is no synthesis of cognitive structures of given disciplines. Establishing a separate discipline requires developing the aspects which are specific to it, its own theories and methodologies. Multidisciplinarity is not enough; crucial here is what distinguishes IS from other disciplines. Therefore, IS shall at first formulate their own theories and methodologies, and only then can they start a dialogue with other disciplines. The fact that IS are created by people representing various disciplines is not enough; it is separate scholars that should be interdisciplinary in nature.

IS vary from history. A historian exposes what is unique, and is interested in an event, while a political studies academic is interested in the class of events, he/she uses historic data to test theory. History is much acclaimed in Poland (Polish School of History) and that is why it strongly influences IS. On the other hand, International Law is differentiated from IS by the type of research questions centred around rules and principles which govern International Relations. IS concentrate on understanding and explaining why parties in international relations behave in a certain way, i.e. why and when countries tend to break international law. The level of Polish sociology is relatively high, but the quantitative and qualitative methods developed by this science should be more widely used in IS.

For the sake of the development of International Relations, it is necessary to equip young academic scholars with essential analytic tools. However, university studies seldom teach students the skills necessary for the development of the discipline. In countries of Central and Eastern Europe the coming of the delayed positivistic revolution and the introduction of teaching programs for statistics, quantities and qualita-

tive methods are necessary. We should not aim at searching a specific specialization field for the scholars of the region, but at improving the general academic level of the discipline. Then, the specialization will appear as a natural consequence.

Nauka o stosunkach międzynarodowych w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej: w kierunku przekraczania granic regionalnych

Abstract

The discussion gathered acknowledged researchers from the region and countries of the West who for years have been engaged in the development of International Relations in the Central and Eastern Europe. The academics analyse strong and weak points of the discipline regarding heritage, organization, research methods and human resources. They deliberate what epistemological and methodological choices should be made in order to implement Western standards of learning.

Keywords: *Sociology of International Relations, discipline, methodology, Central and Eastern Europe*

Streszczenie

W debacie uczestniczą uznani badacze, wywodzący się zarówno z regionu, jaki i z państw zachodnich, od lat zaangażowani w rozwój nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej. Analizują silne i słabe strony dyscypliny pod względem dziedzictwa, organizacji, metod badawczych i zasobów ludzkich. Zastanawiają się, jakich wyborów epistemologicznych i metodologicznych należy dokonać w celu wprowadzenia zachodnich standardów nauki.

Słowa kluczowe: *socjologia stosunków międzynarodowych, dyscyplina, metodologia, Europa Środkowa i Wschodnia*