Lithuanian experience regulating conflict of interest: balancing on private and public edge

Jolanta Palidauskaitė

This article describes the problem of conflict of interest and its regulation in Lithuania. After a short introduction of conflict of interest and related notions, types, and forms of conflict of interest the Lithuanian case study is followed. After a short historical review of such conflict regulation in interwar Lithuanian Republic period the analyses turns to contemporary legislation concerning this ethical problem. Lithuanian Law on the Compatibility of Public and Private Interests in the Public Service was edited three times what allows the author to distinguish tendencies and evaluate them in the broader context. The author provides a snapshot of the conflict of interest in codes of ethics of Lithuanian public institutions. The analyses of legislation regulating conflict of interest in politicians and civil servants activity allows concluding that behavior of civil servants is more regulated due to their role.

Three historical ways of making sense of political: non-power view on relation between history and politics

Justinas Dementavičius

The article introduces three historical and linguistic approaches to political thought: Anglophonic history of ideas, German conceptual history and French history of political. It is claimed, that these schools could offer new tools for Lithuanian political sciences and help for better understanding of

Lithuanian political thought and tradition. The article identifies main simi-
larities and differences between all three approaches, and also shows what
kind of questions could be raised and answers given while using different
approaches in studies of political. The last part of article presents context of
current studies of political thought in Lithuania and indicates possible trends
for future studies while using more historical approaches to political.

Positivism-postpositivism debate in social sciences

Evaldas Nekrašas

The article explores positivism-postpositivism debate in social sciences that
has been lasting already for many years. The author does not suppose this
debate will end soon since it raises fundamental questions concerning the
aims, tasks and methods of social sciences. Though representatives of these
sciences differ significantly in views on these questions, the most of them
and, in particular, evident majority of representatives of political science
virtually holds positivist views. Such questions, which may be called con-
ceptual, are essentially disputable, so they can not be resolved by any em-
pirical research.

When examining positivism-postpositivism debate the author singles
out, paying tribute to tradition, three aspects of debate: (1) ontological, (2)
epistemological, and (3) methodological. Yet he presents the arguments to
support his claim that because of its antimetaphysical character positivism
can have no ontology at all. Therefore an ontological dispute between posi-
tivists and postpositivists is simply impossible.

Postpositivists, in discussing epistemological questions, would be inc-
lined to reject positivist viewpoint that our statements and theories about
social life can be true (though according to modern positivists, we can never
know it for sure). They also would reject the positivist distinction between
facts and values, which likewise can be considered as epistemological. But
the most serious dispute that is taking place in social sciences concerns me-
thodological questions. The author, in analyzing it, pays most attention to
two most influential forms of postpositivism, namely to critical theory and

postmodernism. Having discussed genealogy and deconstruction which, though with serious reservations, may be considered as postpositivist methods, the author claims that postpositivism lacks the main part of methodology, i.e. rules of accepting scientific statements and theories. And that is why postpositivism can not win the methodological debate over positivism which has such rules.

Terrorism and guerrilla warfare as two forms of insurgency

Egidijus Gailiūnas

This article deals with terrorism and guerrilla warfare as two different forms of insurgency. It is argued that terrorism and guerrilla warfare can and should be understood as two different strategies or different strategic approaches used by insurgent groups. Five criteria are used to distinguish terrorism from guerrilla warfare. These five criteria: targets, size of operational units, control of territory, area of operations, identification signs. The article states that distinction between terrorism and guerrilla warfare is not only possible, but needed.