Captive minds: the function and agency of Eastern Europe in International Security Studies

Journal of International Relations and Development

Maria Mälksoo

Brussels School of International Studies, University of Kent, Brussels, Belgium

Email: m.malksoo@kent.ac.uk

Abstract

This article unpacks the ways Eastern Europe (broadly conceived) has featured as a space, trope, and scholarly origin in major International Security Studies (ISS) and International Relations (IR) journals over the past three decades. A framing and authorship analysis in eighteen disciplinary journals between 1991 and 2019 demonstrates how the region has been instrumental for the ISS subfield as an exemplary student of the Western theory and practice of IR. Eastern Europe has served as a symbolic space for exercising the civilising mission of the West and testing the related theories (security community building, democratisation, modernisation, Europeanisation, norm diffusion) in practice. The relative dearth of East European voices in ISS and leading IR theory journals speaks volumes about the politics of knowledge production and the analytical economy of the field. The positionality of East European 'captive minds' complicates 'worlding' IR from the region. The East European subalterns are largely enfolded in the definitive discourses of the field, and their power through disciplinary journals remains marginal.

Keywords: captive minds; Eastern Europe; International Security Studies; knowledge production; 'worlding' IR.

Introduction

Who speaks about and for Eastern Europe (EE)[1] in the post-Cold War academic terrain of international security? In conjunction with the joint effort of this special issue to map the role attributed to EE in International Relations (IR) theory-building and to make sense of the baton taken up (or not) by the scholars of the region, the aim of this article is twofold: empirically, it unpacks the underrepresentation of Eastern European voices in the knowledge production practices of IR; conceptually, it probes the theoretical and normative implications of creating a new IR 'thinking space' out of the region, capable of disorienting dominant paradigms and decentring the field (cf. Hutchings 2011).

Revisiting the issue of the 'Western-centrism' of International Security Studies (ISS) as a key subfield of the allegedly equally Eurocentric IR (Bilgin 2010; cf. Tickner 2013), the article delineates the ways EE has featured as a space, trope, and scholarly origin in major ISS and IR journals over the past three decades. ISS appears as a particularly productive space for illuminating the power relations within the field over the foremost existential subject matter of IR – namely, security. By considering authorships in the eighteen foremost (sub)disciplinary journals between 1991 and 2019, I map the presence or absence of EE scholars in one of the core institutionalised fields of intellectual activity in the study of international relations (cf. Buzan and Hansen 2009). I use a two-dimensional qualification of scholarly origin in this article, distinguishing between the authors' affiliation at the time of publication (their institutional location in EE) and their ethnic/regional background on the basis of publicly available information.[2]

Charting the related themes and default language through frame analysis (Goffman 1974), I conceptualise EE agency in ISS as 'captive minds' – a contradictory position of apparent servility for EE's co-optation to the West-dominated IR while sustaining a sense of distinctiveness and transgressive potential therein. Building on Czesław Miłosz's original metaphor (1953) enables to capture the unorthodox postcolonial positionality of EE in the Western ISS canon: the EE scholars' general alignment with a system that does not acknowledge their distinct voice by shunting the lived

experience of EE subjects by and large to area studies (and thus outside of the IR disciplinary 'core'). In the academic terrain of international security the EE subaltern can undeniably speak (cf. Spivak 1988), whereas its voice is largely enfolded in the definitive discourses of the field, and its power through the gatekeeping functions of the disciplinary journals still marginal.

The exercise unfolds in four parts. The first section presents the many meanings and ways of decentring Western IR, seconding to the postcolonial promise for 'worlding' Security Studies.[3] The next three sections unpack the methodological framework of the study, offer an illustrative breakdown and discussion of the examined empirical material. Three main points emerge from the analysis. Firstly, EE as a space has functioned as an 'identity crutch' for the mainstream ISS since the region's relative backwardness has provided a useful laboratory for testing Western theories with a civilisational zeal, and thus upholding the group identity of ISS as a historically West-centric academic discipline. Secondly, EE as a normatively loaded trope has worked as a warning and a metaphor of Europe's past wrongs, with a more recent foreboding of their looming recurrence, as exemplified by the backsliding of democracy in key CEE countries (Mälksoo 2019). Finally, the prevalent treatment of EE area studies as effectively information boards, or sources of raw data rather than even disciplinary interlocutors serves as an illustration of some of the persistently problematic disciplinary tendencies of IR and ISS. To wit, the inclination to treat history as a 'scripture' or predetermined site for timeless empirical 'lessons' removed from their complex particular contexts (Lawson 2010); the instrumentalisation of local knowledge, and the perpetuating hierarchical organisation of what kind of knowledge and whose perspective matter for IR.

Worlding International Security Studies from Eastern Europe

Where to begin with 'worlding' IR from EE? The criticism of 'Western IR' and the calls for moving beyond it has ontological, epistemological and normative dimensions. Accordingly, three axiological tales of 'post-Western IR' have emerged, all stemming from the basic critique of the West in social sciences and humanities: pluralism, particularism, and postcolonialism (Vasilaki 2012).[4] While these

takes coexist and overlap to various degrees, they have distinct features, premises and ethico-political agendas.

Pluralism essentially assumes that there are multiple worlds and perspectives out there, so for the sake of grasping the whole, it is important to take account of as many as possible for global diversity cannot be reduced to Western experience alone (Acharya and Buzan 2010; Buzan and Little 2001; Tickner and Wæver 2009; Acharya 2011). The pluralist ethos seeks to democratise IR by making space for parallel stories to be told 'without being thought as mutually exclusive and without making absolute normative or ethical claims' (Vasilaki 2012: 6). In its minimalist iterations, the ambit of 'worlding' IR would simply indicate the benign inclusion of 'other points of view' (Vasilaki 2012: 6), whereas more systematically decentring accounts engage the revelation of meanings and practices that make those worlds possible, untangling their underlying foundations and political implications.

Particularism inter alia addresses the ways such untangling should be undertaken. By and large, a particularist approach to 'worlding IR' stems from the premise that 'non-core' theorising has inherent value and hence local or cultural 'schools of thought', 'national IR traditions' and standpoints should be prioritised (Vasilaki 2012: 6–7). A more radical take on the idea of the uniqueness of a particular region's, nation's or culture's role in international relations and world order epistemologically privileges local forms of knowledge (e.g. 'Russia can only be understood from within'-discourse).[5]

A pluralist way to 'tell the story of IR' would thus entail broadening the range of storytellers and demonstrating the intricacies of the local 'plots', for example by reciting the presence of IR in EE, showing how it operates in the region, and the difference therein (cf. Thakur 2015). The research task would accordingly be to trace historically the development of non-hegemonic states in the international system and examine the constitution and operation of their international political subjectivity. A particularist way to narrate IR/ISS would be to tell the story according to the margins ('eccentric locations', as per Bhabha 1994: 6). It is to 'delocalize the [non-hegemonic] worldview, retell it as a world imaginary, and ask how [the non-hegemonic actor] looks at the world', claiming

the universality of the said experience and/or stating that the actor in question is the new general condition of the world (Thakur 2015: 217).

In EE context, a combined pluralist and particularist call to arms is evident in the Forum on the International Relations (IR) in Central and Eastern Europe published in this journal in 2009. Thus far, this forum remains the sole journal publication weighing the pitfalls of intellectual parochialism, provincialism and protectionism in the region specifically against the promise of 'open[ing] national IR disciplines, which would reflect on their unique experiences to develop theoretical concepts applicable beyond the conditions of their origins, as a possible way to breathe a real life into the current "Potemkin villages" of the CEE IR' (Drulák 2009: 173). A particularist slant is evident in Kubálková's contribution to the forum, where she argues that Czech input to knowledge of world politics should be 'anchored in the Czechs' own historic experience of successfully resisting centuries of marginalization by empires and states imposed on them in the name of European or global ideas and policies' (Kubálková 2009: 212).

Yet, both pluralist and particularist ways of making the study of international relations 'post-Western' remain wanting, for the simple opening of the IR intellectual space in order to air more non-Western perspectives nor the elevation of various local IR schools or cultural particularisms into new universalisms does not yet shatter the existing hierarchies in the discipline. The 'national IR projects' and particularism *per se* do not necessarily make for a more democratic and post-Westernised IR as '[t]hese regional IR schools are often the mirror-image of the logic underpinning Western dominance: based on the idea of uniqueness of a "special" civilisation, culture or nation, its "special" place in the world and its "special" mission, they often produce their own versions of hegemony and imperialism' (Vasilaki 2012: 7).

This article sides with a *postcolonial* take on globalising the study of international relations due to its more radical potential to offer alternative ways of seeing. Postcolonialism acknowledges the multiplicity of all beginnings and the consequent borrowings, appropriations and interdependencies between and among different cultures (Said 1993: 217; Bilgin 2016a: 496). Such an ethos of

approaching 'others' is hence quite distinct from the pluralist and particularist agendas as it rejects assumptions of genuine 'geocultural difference': instead, it takes notice of multiple authorship of key concepts and interdependencies between the Global North and Global South (e.g. Bilgin 2016b, 2018a; Grovogui 2011). A mere mechanical adding of other perspectives is accordingly taken but to obfuscate the role of these perspectives as 'constitutive outside' for much of the 'mainstream IR' (Bilgin 2018b: 58). Until 'the understanding of what constitutes knowledge and how it should be presented and consumed remains embedded within the binaries and dualities that reproduce the colonial matrix of power' (Capan 2017: 6–7), boosting the number of articles produced in the periphery, or their citations, does not change the power relations in the field *per se*. Instead, a postcolonial approach to the EE 'voice' in ISS would ask for the constitutive role the historically muted presence of EE insecurities and their seemingly absent agency have played for the subfield and for the more powerful subjects and objects of security in the Western world (cf. Bilgin 2010: 616).

But can EE be categorically considered from a postcolonial perspective, that is, understood as a decolonised subaltern subject in contemporary world politics? Quickly growing multi-disciplinary scholarship on the postcoloniality of post-communist subjects in both East European satellite states and former Soviet republics suggests as much (Kelertas 2006; Chari and Verdery 2009; Lazarus 2010; Hönke and Müller 2012; Owczarzak 2009; Uffelmann 2013; Platt 2013; Etkind 2011; Tlostanova 2012; Morozov 2013). In recent decades, postcolonial studies have significantly extended the legalistic concept of colonisation/colonialism (and consequently postcolonialism) in humanities and social sciences, allowing for the embracing of the experiences of the former 'Second World' inhabitants along with those within the notion's traditional remit of European imperialism overseas (Moore 2001; Korek 2007). While conventionally used in reference to the transfer of sovereignty in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean in the second half of the twentieth-century, the concept and dynamics of 'decolonisation' have likewise encountered calls for 'globalising' in their own right (cf. Ward 2016). Meanwhile, others have warned that the analogy between the postcolonial and postcommunist

conditions threatens to dilute postcolonialism to a 'mobile framework applicable to any and all Self/Other relationships, disconnected from any specific histories of racialization or formal empire' (Mark and Slobodian 2018: 14; see also Buchowski 2006; Snochowska-Gonzalez 2012).

There is certainly some merit in this criticism, yet also a fundamental oversight of the EE role in the global history of colonisation and decolonisation. The very term 'decolonisation' was first used in English in the 1930s to link the independence of the emancipated states which had emerged from the dismantled Habsburg and Russian Empires in EE post-World War I with an argument for the liberation of nations in what we know today as 'the Global South'. Albeit the Mandates system was not applied to inter-war EE states, the supervision of the minority affairs in the region, along with the reconstruction and financial stabilisation of the newly minted EE states by the League of Nations 'resembled the international administration of China or the debt-ridden Ottoman Empire' (Mark and Slobodian 2018: 2). It is in this historic context that EE can be understood as 'the first site of decolonization in the twentieth century' (Mark and Slobodian 2018: 2), and, by implication, a *post*colonial space. Fast forward to the second half of the twentieth century, the Soviet period imprinted another layer of colonial control in the region. As David Chioni Moore (2001: 121) argues, '[b]y most classic measures, lack of sovereign power, restrictions on travel, military occupation, lack of convertible money, a domestic economy ruled by the dominating state, and forced education in the colonizer's language – Central and Baltic Europe's nations were indeed under Russo-Soviet colonial control from roughly 1948 to 1989 or 1991'. Consequently, in the post-Soviet context, the term 'post-colonial' can again be applied to the formerly Russo- and Soviet-controlled regions post-1989 and 1991, regardless of the many obvious caveats (such as the different faces and phases of Russian colonialism; the 'reverse cultural colonization' in the dynamic between the Russo-Soviet colonisers, perceived to be culturally inferior by their CEE colonised subjects, and the publicly professed anti-colonial ideals and actions of the USSR) (Moore 2001: 115). Most recently, the 'doubly postcolonial' experiences of regional states have been highlighted in the scholarly debate due to their historic

objectification to both Soviet imperialism and Western 'peripheralising capitalism' (Kołodziejczyk and Şandru 2012; cf. Snochowska-Gonzales 2012).

While EE postcolonialism is admittedly of a peculiar kind compared to the 'traditional' postcolonial subjects of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, it is fair to regard the region as a political and intellectual 'quasi-colony', a semi-oriental or 'not fully European' Europe dominated and subordinated by the West in various ways throughout history (Wolff 1994; Todorova 1997; Buchowski 2006; Kuus 2007; cf. Said 1978). Mainstream IR scholarship of American vintage has classically proceeded from the Eurocentric assumption of Western priority and Eastern passivity *inter alia* in its engagement of EE (Hobson 2012). For realists, liberals and (conventional) constructivists alike, EE (with the exception of Russia) has generally appeared as an object of projecting power and visions of governance rather than a subject in its own right in the field of making, and making sense of, international relations.

More curiously perhaps, in the contemporary debates over the persisting patterns of domination and subordination in IR knowledge production, EE as a historical stomping ground in-between great powers now falls awkwardly in-between the oft-essentialised trenches of 'the West' and 'non-West'. For both the pluralist 'global IR' (e.g. Acharya and Buzan 2007) and purposefully decolonising agendas for transforming the discipline (e.g. Sabaratnam 2011), EE (except for Russia, yet again) has hitherto remained a relative blind spot. It appears that the EE version of what Naeem Inayatullah and David Blaney (2004) describe as 'the problem of difference' in IR has proved too subtle to be put in the spotlight in the debates on the parameters of a 'post-Western' future for the field. The epistemological reluctance to differentiate EE experiences and sensibilities within the 'European paradigm' (under which they have traditionally been subsumed in IR) has converged here with the scepticism about the normative desirability of any disciplinary imaginaries articulated from the region.

Against this backdrop, the promise of a geo-cultural East European epistemic standpoint does not appear as immediately intuitive for bringing about a stimulating rupture in the current set-up of

the study of international politics as part of the exercise of decentring IR. Going against the grain, I proceed from an EE-sensitised perspective on 'worlding' IR and ISS for such a lens attunes us to the 'instances of mind-colonization', frequently ensuing in self-orientalising and self-stigmatising practices, inferiority complexes, and mimicry in (post)socialist and (post-)Soviet contexts (Tlostanova 2012: 132; cf. Zarakol 2014; Adler-Nissen 2014). EE is of interest for the debates on provincialising Western IR precisely for its complicated subject position as an exemplary student of Western theory and practice of IR, on the one hand; and as a potentially subversive subaltern agent, measuring its moves carefully due to its manifold historical experiences of deception and consequently 'disappointed love' toward the West, on the other (cf. Miłosz 1953: 52).

Eastern Europe in International Security Studies and International Relations journals

Academic journals remain the 'crucial institution of modern sciences' and thus 'the most direct measure of the discipline itself' (Wæver 1998: 697; Kristensen 2012). While intellectual battles are by no means confined to academic journals, taking place in various public fora, such as academic and popular book publishing, and the mushrooming academic blogging scene, the research article still plays a central role in disciplining everyday academic life (Tickner 2013: 635), making or breaking individual academic careers in (Western) IR. Since the emergence and gradual institutionalisation of the subfield, the ISS debates have unfolded in both the specialist journals (e.g. *International Security (IS)* (est. 1976); *Security Studies (SS)* (est. 1991); *Journal of Conflict Resolution (JCR)* (est. 1957); *Journal of Peace Research (JPR)* (est. 1964); *Security Dialogue (SD)* (est. 1970 as *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*; published as SD from September 1992); *Critical Studies on Security (CSS)* (est. 2013); *Journal of Global Security Studies (JGSS)* (est. 2016); *European Journal of International Security (EJIS)* (est. 2016); *European Security (ES)* (est. 1992); *Contemporary Security Policy (CSP)* (est. as *Arms Control: The Journal of Arms Control and Disarmament* 1980; published as CSP from 1993)), and the more general ones (e.g. *International Organization (IO)* (est. 1947); *International Studies Quarterly (ISQ)* (est. 1957); *European Journal of International Relations (EJIR)* (est. 1995); *Journal*

of International Relations and Development (JIRD) (est. 2004); *Review of International Studies (RIS)* (est. 1975); *Millennium: Journal of International Studies (M)* (est. 1971); *Cooperation and Conflict (C&C)* (est. 1965); *International Relations (IR)* (est. 1957)) (Buzan and Hansen 2009).[6]

I ran keyword searches on the electronic platforms of each of the eighteen individual journals (i.e. 'Eastern Europe'; 'Central and Eastern Europe'; 'East Europe') to establish the ways EE is represented as an analytical category in the subfield of ISS, and IR more broadly, in order to provide a basic mapping of the patterns and contexts of discussing the region in the disciplinary debates between 1991 (as the date of the official (re)-emergence of the majority of the states in the region after the collapse of the USSR and the Soviet bloc) and 2019. Out of all the matches to the initial keyword search, only research articles, editorials and book review essays with the substantive thematic engagement were included in the sample. Shorter pieces (such as book reviews, published speeches; translations of EE policy documents) were left aside. The sample extracted from the identified ISS journals included 585 articles (see **Table 1**) and 390 articles from the general IR journals, respectively (see **Table 2**). The accumulation of basic descriptive data was followed by a comparative reading of the identified articles to take stock of the recurrent frames of representation. For Goffman (1974: 21), 'frame' can be defined as a mental script for recognising occurrences and events within one's life space, organising and identifying experiences and guiding perception and action. '[L]ike a picture frame that accentuates certain things, hides others and borders off reality in a certain way', frame analysis enables to unpack how particular ideative patterns are constructed through which the world is understood by audiences (Lindekilde 2014: 6). Since frame analysis is emphatically agentic compared to various strands of discourse analysis (to which it otherwise bears strong family resemblance), it is a preferable method of analysis for exploring the scripting of EE via individually and jointly authored academic articles.

The material was manually coded as either citing EE as a *space* (a descriptive frame) or a *trope* (an evaluative frame), or a combination of the two (a mixed frame). A descriptive frame refers empirically to EE as a geographical/geopolitical space of analysis and projection of power in

international relations (e.g. for CEE, metaphorically speaking, as 'a lawn' where 'two elephants', aka the Great Powers, have either fought or made love on) (Van Ham 1998: 47). An evaluative frame refers to EE as a normatively loaded signifier (e.g. as a manifold security threat or, more generally, a problem to be sorted). A mixed frame entails a combination of the two (e.g. when the space of EE is referred to in the context of international socialisation/Europeanisation debates as a subject 'in progress'). For the admittedly preliminary mapping of the power/knowledge dynamics regarding the East European themes, framings and representations in the journals under scrutiny, I looked further into the issue of who does the writing. I identified the EE authorship of the sampled articles according to the scholars' regional/geographical origins and institutional affiliations at the time of publication (cf. Aydinli and Mathews 2000). **Tables 1 and 2** present the accumulated data in summary form.

Table 1

Table 2

Tables 1 and 2 evidence that EE gets more frequent coverage in ISS journals compared to general IR ones. In absolute numbers, Europe-based journals, particularly with a policy-relevant orientation (e.g. *European Security*; *Contemporary Security Policy*) feature significantly more pieces engaging the EE region (albeit *Security Studies* is a notable outlier here). The predominant framing of the region in ISS journals is descriptive, with a mixed frame figuring between 23% and 33% of the representations extracted from the sample (with *EJIS* as an obvious, yet statistically insignificant, outlier). A purely evaluative frame is notably more recurrent in the pages of *International Security* compared to other ISS journals. Saliently, the journals with the highest coverage of EE also feature the largest number of regionally originated or affiliated authors (25–30%), whereas the flagship journal of the field, *International Security*, features less than 10% of EE authors among the studied sample.

In general IR journals, an evaluative frame of EE, along with a mixed reference to EE as both a space and trope are considerably more prevalent, the latter ranging up to 64% of the sampled articles. The EE authorship numbers speak volumes here: *IO* has not a single EE author within the sample observed, with University of Ljubljana-launched and Central and East European International Studies (CEEISA)-affiliated *JIRD* standing out with about 45% of the authors coming from the region, or affiliated with an EE university.

The editorial boards of generalist IR/ISS journals rarely include any EE scholars, with the top-tier US-based journals hardly having any Europeans on board in all (see **Tables 3 and 4**).

Table 3

Table 4

The overview of the basic framings and EE authorship and editorial board membership proportion sheds light on the relatively marginal position of EE scholars in ISS and IR debates, including on their own home turf. While EE subjects do speak along in the disciplinary debates, the region is more frequently spoken for from the disciplinary mainstream. As a rule of thumb, the more European and critically oriented the journal, the sounder platform it also provides for the more radically alternative EE voices.

A 'troubled region' in the school of democracy

A standard depiction of Eastern Europe in ISS is that of a 'troubled region' of 'conflict-ridden states' (Ripsman 2005), in need of democratisation, Europeanisation, socialisation (Flockhart 2004, 2006; Gheciu 2005), and good norm apprenticeship.

In *International Security*, the pre-eminent journal of the ISS subfield (MIT Press), EE region is mentioned mainly as the target of NATO enlargement (with no or minimal independent agency acknowledged) (Shifrinson and Itzkowitz 2016); an object of democracy promotion (Mendelson

2001) and an instance of democratic breakthrough and consolidation. EE emerges in *International Security* as a realm of dangerous refugee flows (Weiner 1996); a site of ethnic conflict (Lake and Rotchild 1996); a source of negative spill-over effects in need of stabilisation in the post-Cold War era; in all, as an object over which wars are fought. The region is generally portrayed as a target of post-Cold War US grand strategy and Western security policies, lacking an obvious appeal of an autonomously interesting subject of scholarly analysis (cf. McFaul 2007). Russia standardly deserves more attention (e.g. Mendelson 2001), but its portrayal nonetheless generally suffers from IR's 'change problem' – the tendency to treat 'the world's largest country … as an object struggling to adjust to changes rather than a protagonist introducing them into the system' (Krickovic and Weber 2018: 292). The parochialism of the study of security, prominently noted by Gusterson (1999) in the discipline's failure to predict the end of the Cold War, goes uncontested in the subfield's leading publication. Still, a number of ISS scholars of EE origin (but exclusively with North American academic affiliations) have published their work on standard ISS themes in the journal, covering hate narratives and ethnic conflict (**Grigorian** and Kaufman 2007); the recruitment of child soldiers (**Achvarina** and Reich 2006); and deterring terrorism (Trager and **Zagorcheva** 2005/06).

A concurring understanding of Eastern Europe as a foreboding vulnerability for NATO and the West at large is also evident from the pages of *Security Studies* (Taylor and Francis). Accordingly, calls are made to resist the 'temptation' of offering NATO membership 'to all the states of eastern Europe which desire it' and to 'build more restrained security ties with states to the east' instead of a full alliance membership (Mueller 1995: 71). Evoking the gist of the classical Melian dialogue from Thucydides's *The History of the Peloponnesian War* (1910) ('the strong do what they want and the weak suffer what they must'), it is concluded that Eastern European states 'have little choice in the matter, and will presumably settle for what they can get' (i.e. accept arrangements of security guarantees short of their full alignment with the West; Mueller 1995: 72). The irony that such insight and policy advice for the Western actors resonates closely with the conflict management solution of the post-WWII era when 'the Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe was an important element

of the international order … at the expense of the freedom of the East European nations' (Miller 2001: 40) fails to dawn on the neorealist security policy analysts typically dominating the journal.

Throughout the 1990s, EE gets depicted in the pages of *Security Studies* as a liability of turning into 'a zone of concurrent crises, occasional small wars, and constant worry for nearby powers for many years' (Van Evera 1992: 361; see also Driscoll and Maliniak 2016). The expansion of European society is deemed historically difficult due to the specificities of the evolution of 'nationalizing states in eastern and southern Europe' which 'were leading to societies that were inherently unstable and contrary to the principles upon which New Europe was built' (Cronin 2002: 154; cf. Roe 2004a). In a similar vein, constructivist observers note Russia's suffering from the problem of 'untimeliness' which has led to the recurring hysteresis in Russian-Western relations (Neumann and Pouliot 2011). The potential of contagion by 'Eastern violence' is portrayed as strong enough to even harm the US interests (Chopra and Weiss 1995; Cronin 2002). In the standard practice of combining policy analysis and advice in the American tradition of security studies, the West is invited to 'derive leverage from the unformed nature of Eastern political thought' at the collapse of communism which 'has left an intellectual void, leaving the East more than normally receptive to Western notions of appropriate political conduct' (Van Evera 1992: 369).

More detailed EE country cases are displayed in *Contemporary Security Policy* and *European Security* (both Taylor and Francis). Yet, the discussion of NATO enlargement and NATO-Russia relations takes place without focused interest in the CEE states' agency or role in the process (e.g. Cottey 1999; Hyde-Price 2000).

Journal of Peace Research (SAGE) emerged as an outlet bridging traditional ISS/Peace Research and the emerging critical approaches to security in the post-Cold War era. JPR became an early platform of discussing the security-identity nexus (Aalto 2003; Noreen and Sjöstedt 2004), publishing some of today's most noteworthy critical security scholars of EE origin (e.g. Kuus 2002a; Subotić 2011a). Besides the standard backdrop of NATO, EE has deserved more focused attention in

this journal in its own right compared to some other prominent journals in the field (Horowitz 2003; Kostadinova 2000).

Meanwhile, the flagship journal of critical security studies, *Security Dialogue* (SAGE), has covered both considerable ground in discussing concrete security-political solutions for post-Cold War Eastern Europe (e.g. Bitzinger 1991); the growing pains of democratisation (Góralczyk 1992); regional cooperation and security aspects of the stability pact for South Eastern Europe, as well as featured more theoretically targeted interventions on the post-Cold War 'existential politics' of the Baltic states (Mälksoo 2006); regionality and identity politics (Browning and Joenniemi 2003); the effectiveness of the European minority rights protection regime in CEE (Galbreath and McEvoy 2012), and CEE securitisation of minority rights (Roe 2004b, 2006). Notably, some of the original conceptual contributions by EE scholars published in this journal pertain more to Russia than their home turf *per se* (e.g. Kurowska and Reshetnikov 2018; Mälksoo 2015), continuing the tradition of CEE scholars dutifully assuming the role of Russia-interpreters to the West.

Out of the new ISS journals, International Studies Association's *Journal of Global Security Studies* (Oxford University Press) stands out for its intellectual spearheading of the disciplinary calls to move beyond methodological nationalism (Adamson 2016). Such an ambition is yet to be reflected in the composition of the editorial board of the journal, featuring standard US and UK-heavy representation. On the JGSS pages the EE region emerges as noteworthy for the subfield due to its traditional role as a sphere of superpower interests (e.g. Krickovic 2016), not as a research-worthy subject in its own right.

The generalist IR journals largely provide a recurring image of Eastern Europe as a 'conflict-ridden' (Miller and Kagan 1997: 51) or 'troubled region' (next to the Middle East) (Ripsman 2005: 688). In *International Studies Quarterly*, the flagship journal of the International Studies Association (Oxford University Press), EE appears as the ground from which to theorise the sources of great power regional involvement and the related effects on regional conflicts (Miller and Kagan 1997); the absence of conflict between Romania and Hungary (Linden 2000); as a target of Europeanisation,

in order to measure the effectiveness of the governance quality in the region as a result (Ugur 2013); or as a site for testing the applicability of democratic peace arguments to the Soviet successor states (Braumoeller 1997). The post-communist space is taken to be 'of substantive, theoretical, and methodological interest' for the 'combination of tumultuous geopolitical space, newly emerging states, and transitioning democracies [which] can easily create a combustible mix for interstate conflict' (Fausett and Volgy 2010: 86). EE effectively acts as a perfect bouncing board for 'parsing out' the effects of intergovernmental organisations for interstate conflicts in the region (cf. Grigorescu 2003; Horowitz 2004), in a rather typical IR scholarship's way of viewing the non-Western world as of interest mainly 'for fieldwork and theory-testing, rather than for discovery of new ideas and approaches' (Acharya 2014: 648). The CEE's tireless desire to please the EU is noted in the study on the engagement of the new EU democracies in multilateralism (e.g. Avdeyeva 2007; Milewicz and Elsig 2014; cf. Subotić 2011b).

The signature IR journal in Europe, *European Journal of International Relations* (SAGE), has showcased perhaps the richest and most systematic engagement with social theory in advancing international theory in post-1991 International Studies, not least by reflecting on the role of the Eastern 'other' in its various disguises for the European 'self' (Neumann 1996), along with the historical roots of the alleged Eastern backwardness, the consequent reduction of Eastern identity to a Western concept of civilisation and the ensuing conception of European imperialism as a civilising mission (Hobson and Sharman 2005; Schimmelfennig 2000). EE has received ample coverage in the journal as an object of EU accession politics (read as an instance of the neo-colonial underpinnings in the EU's eastern enlargement process) (Behr 2007; see also Klinke 2015; Nicolaidis et al. 2014); a space of 'Eastern nationalisms', viewed through a demi-Orientalist prism in the West (Jutila 2009: 635); cultural intimacy (Subotić and Zarakol 2012), and a contestant of set-in patterns of a 'common European memory' (Mälksoo 2009). Russia and the European Neighbourhood Policy have further provided opportunities for the advancement of the concepts of soft power (Feklyunina 2016);

epistemic (un)certainty in times of crisis (Natorski 2016), and national ideology in IR theory (Tsygankov and Tsygankov 2010).

A palpably stronger EE representation among the authors and the editorial board is *ex officio* evident in the *Journal of International Relations and Development* as the official journal of the Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA) (Palgrave Macmillan). The journal's engagements with the region-specific developments are too many to account for in here, but in the context of security studies, Xymena Kurowska's (2014) study of the local ownership in the Polish-Ukrainian border reform encounter, and Dorothy Noyes's (2019) unpacking of the phantomic 'Polish plumber'-figure push conceptual boundaries in significant ways.

More systematic connections with EE area studies are also built by *Cooperation and Conflict* (SAGE) stemming partly from the journal's tradition to publish on Nordic and European affairs (e.g. Makarychev 2004; Korosteleva 2016). *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* (SAGE), in its turn, has featured an early constructivist reading of the post-Cold War Estonian security discourse (Kuus 2002b), along with the contributions by authors of EE origin on (post)-communism after the aesthetic turn (Pusca 2017); expanding Europe through memory (Verovšek 2015), and the possibility of resistance for a sovereign-less subject (Zevnik 2009).

As a rule of thumb, the discussions of the EE region-specific security concerns do not make it to the pages of IR/ISS journals, but remain shelved in the area studies or emphatically policy-oriented journals. *Problems of Post-Communism, Europe-Asia Studies, Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society,* and *Nationalities Papers* generally run empirically rich, yet not IR agenda-setting type of articles on the region's security problems and perspectives. The theoretical contributions published in these area-specific journals remain more of the traipsing rather than trail-blazing kind, with a standard article template aimed at filling in the chosen theoretical framework with 'evidence' from an x or y EE country.

The disciplinary function and agency of East European 'captive minds'

'Captive minds' provides a diagnostic caption for the position of EE as a place framed and studied in ISS in a particular way. The allegorical description also helps to make sense of the modest visibility of EE scholars as contributors to international security theorisations. EE 'captive minds' are not just an effect of the ISS/IR disciplinary structure: the torn positionality of EE has a structuring effect in the ISS field in turn. Conceptualising EE as 'captive minds' in ISS/IR enables to regard the EE space as both a subject and object; to probe in depth the complexity of the in-betweenness of EE as 'subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge', bound by power 'which subjugates and makes subject to' (Foucault 1984: 212). Adopting the famous metaphor coined by an émigré Polish writer, academic, and post-Second World War diplomat Czesław Miłosz, EE's 'captive mind'-predicament captures the regional scholarship's wilful self-subordination to the structural pull of West-dominated ISS/IR – for no alternative is deemed to be in place.

Miłosz's *The Captive Mind* (1953) is widely considered to be a central work for understanding the mechanisms of dissent and collaboration in the post-Second World War Soviet bloc and those that allow totalitarian systems to exist and sustain more generally. In this influential philosophical and political essay, Miłosz untangles obvious and more subtle rationales to submit to communist rule (the 'New Faith') on the example of Polish intellectuals in the late 1940s and early 1950s in order to metaphorically capture people's submission to communist indoctrination and conversion, and the appeal of authority and authoritarianism to the intelligentsia more universally (Judt 2010). Besides the intricacies of ideological self-delusion via the images of the 'pill of Murti-Bing' and 'Ketman', the book discusses East Europeans' complex attitude towards the West as 'despair mixed with a residue of hope' (Miłosz 1953: 25), as the countries of CEE ('a semi-colonial terrain') process and respond to the generally patronising Western attitudes toward them (Miłosz 1953: 44). Lamenting how little is known 'about Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary' by '[t]he Frenchman, Belgian or Hollander of average education', Miłosz points at 'the West's disdain of Central and Eastern Europe'

and the consequent sense of ‘a lack of recognition’ and ‘disappointed love’ in the East (ibid.: 44–45, 52). *The Captive Mind* calls for breaking the habit of imitation in Eastern Europe’s relationship with its Western counterpart, ‘so Eastern European cultures must learn to stand by their own strength’ (Miłosz 1953: 46) to overcome the fear of thinking for themselves.

As a script for the EE’s limited agency in the ISS field, ‘captive minds’ appears as an effect of the analytical economy of IR, on the one hand; while entailing a structuring effect vis-à-vis the discipline, on the other. In the first instance, the EE space emerges as an instrumental foil, or a laboratory for the practice and the study of West-led democratisation, modernisation, liberalisation and post-Cold War security community-building attempts in Europe for much of the mainstream IR/ISS. The majority of references to EE in the disciplinary debates of ISS refer to the region’s states as mute objects, utilised simply for testing the validity of theoretical elaborations advanced by scholars in the West – as unquestioned targets of Western post-Cold War civilisational practices, or recipients rather than generators of original concepts and theories in the field. Their own voice is hardly present for it is deemed irrelevant due to their relative size, authority and insignificance from the perspective of the powerful of the IR as an academic terrain (thus reflecting the political undercurrents in its object of study – international politics). The persistently Eurocentric character of security studies ‘regards the weak and the powerless as marginal or derivative elements of world politics, as at best the site of liberal good intentions or at worst a potential source of threats’ (Barkawi and Laffey 2006: 332). As the empirical cut into the important journals of the field demonstrates, EE has generally served as either an unquestioned symbolic space for exercising the civilising mission of the West and testing the related theories in practice or a source of tensions and problems requiring Western strategising to save Europe from the unwanted spill-over effects. Thereby, the ‘margins’ and the ‘centre’ of knowledge production in the ISS field have been assiduously maintained, obfuscating ‘the actual amount and the amazing variety of power that are required to keep the voices on the margins from having the right language and enough volume to be heard at the centre’ (Enloe 1996: 186–88).

Yet, 'captive minds' as a metaphorical description of EE's position in the hierarchies of IR/ISS knowledge production also potently captures how EE subjects (i.e. states, populations, and IR/ISS scholars of EE origin) have been captivated and spellbound by the Western framings, representation and study of their regional 'selves', ways of being and EE security concerns (cf. 'captive nations' of the Soviet empire). This captivation, which is oftentimes tied to the instrumental role of EE ISS scholars in their respective national security apparatuses, standardly pays lip-service to 'the power' while concealing secret opposition to the region's treatment as 'poor relations' by the theoretical trend-setters in the field, typically located in the West (cf. Miłosz 1953: 44). The upshot for the IR/ISS is that appearances can be deceptive: a seemingly total immersion might still entertain a possibility of subversion from within. For the EE agency in the academic field of IR/ISS in turn, the 'experience [which] has taught the Eastern intellectual to measure his moves carefully' (Miłosz 1953: 52) has often been accompanied with self-orientalising practices, consequently hampering the ability of EE security scholars to come up with a more radically autonomous voice in the field. While a handful of EE ISS scholars have been able to 'break through' by various disciplinary standards either in the mainstream or in the critical camp of ISS, they remain structurally bound to 'Western IR' to the extent of their distinct decentring positionality going generally unacknowledged in the field.

The question is not merely *whether* the EE subalterns can speak security in the academic field of ISS, but also *how* the EE subjects are being listened to, heard and understood in the field (or, alternatively, continuously securitised and spoken *for*) (cf. Bertrand 2018: 295). While the promise of EE subaltern subjects to deliver a radically 'fresh voice' might indeed remain rather restricted against the backdrop outlined above, a 'captive minds'-perspective enables to unfold a telling and persisting feature of ISS: the function of the EE 'margins' for the ISS subfield itself. More generally, it exposes the IR's disciplinary identity which remains entangled in the understanding that 'a general theory of international politics is necessarily based on great powers' and hence it is deemed 'ridiculous to construct a theory of international politics based on Malaysia or Costa Rica' (Waltz 1979: 73). The humble presence of EE agency in ISS drives home the acerbic remark by R. B. J.

Walker (1992: 6), namely that 'theories of international relations are more interesting as aspects of world politics that need to be explained than as explanations of contemporary world politics'. The EE positionality as 'captive minds' in ISS hence also serves as a parable of *how* a subaltern can/not speak.

Conclusion

This article has mapped the presence of EE as an 'object of knowledge' and EE scholarship as 'subjects that know' in the field of ISS and broader IR via thematic coverage and authorship analysis of EE in twenty field-defining journals between 1991 and 2019 (cf. Foucault (1970/2004). The authorship of the articles published in these journals (which are generally Anglophone, based in and controlled by Americans and Western Europeans) tends to be tilted toward the authors affiliated with the United States and Western European institutions (Tickner 2013: 632; see further Lohaus and Wemheuer-Vogelaar 2020).[7] The 'Matthew Effect' of success breeding success (i.e. a highly published author or institution is more likely to publish again compared to the less prolific ones, similarly to the highly cited papers being cited again and again) can generate an unwelcoming opportunity structure for scholars coming from elsewhere (Kristensen 2015: 252). The trends in publication patterns are matched by the composition of editorial boards of the leading journals in the field and the citation patterns therein. The periphery's capacity to become an autonomous 'ideas maker' (Guzzini 2007) is thus structurally disadvantaged from the start, and only further restricted by the delay of EE IR/ISS scholars' entrance to the subfield due to their political separation during the Cold War years and the considerably smaller size of the local IR communities.

EE has functioned as an 'identity crutch' of sorts for the mainstream ISS and worked as a forewarning of recurrent conflicts allegedly with broader European repercussions. Proceeding from a peculiarly postcolonial condition of EE, and highlighting the importance of studying the international as a social space co-constituted by 'others', this contribution joins the multi-register chorus inviting to pay a closer attention to the ideas about the international of these very 'others' and

their manifold participation in collaborative meaning-making of the world (cf. Bilgin 2016a, 2016b; Grovogui 2006; Jabri 2014; Turton and Freire 2016; Valbjørn 2017).

The exercise conducted here is naturally of a limited kind without amounting to a systematic discourse analysis: while addressing some interplay between the 'discursive units' (the texts) and the 'discursive practices' (their production and dissemination), it leaves the reception and the 'social practices' (the wider order of discourses in society) for future empirical studies (Fairclough 1992). At least three possible ways to expand the enquiry and increase the validity of the proposed argument can be envisioned: (i) including ISS textbooks, monographs and curricula besides the journals in the current sample; (ii) systematically historicising the links between 'knowledge production, circulation, certification, and re-appropriation' of and about the EE and security (studies)-nexus, engaging the pertinent political economy, the historical and institutional contexts, interests and social forces at play (cf. Raj 2007: 233; Kamola 2020); and (iii) providing intellectual biographies of the key EE security scholars and contributions to the subfield in order to canvass the breakthrough pathways from a European periphery in the ISS academic field alongside their citation patterns and possible implications for the division of labour and the disciplinary politics between ISS and EE area studies. Yet another exploratory option could include looking closely into the relatively recent foreign and security policy journals published in the region (e.g. *Baltic Security and Defence Review, New Eastern Europe, Journal of Regional Security, New Perspectives: Interdisciplinary Journal of Central and East European Politics and International Relations*), in addition to the well-established area studies journals covering the region (e.g. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures, Communist and Post-Communist Studies, Problems of Post-Communism, Europe-Asia Studies, Nationalities Papers, Nations and Nationalism, Demokratizatsija, Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Societies*).

Inspired by Miłosz's original script, I have proposed the metaphor of 'captive minds' to shed light on the EE subject position in the field of ISS. Quite akin to IR in general, the material inequality in the international system is reflected in the ways knowledge is manufactured and reproduced in the

ISS (cf. Ayoob 2002: 27). Yet, much is lost by disregarding the knowledge and experiences of those subjects historically often depicted as belonging to an interzone, measuring the distance between 'Europe' and 'non-Europe' and, hence, relegated into the subject position of meek converts. The ontological significance and yet-to-be-tapped-into potential of EE in the study of world security lies precisely in embracing the region's inhabitants' experiences of nested liminalities and consequent mimetic patterns of engaging with the international as specific modes of articulating and practising subaltern subjectivities. Empirically, the powerful would benefit from taking seriously the security concerns and dilemmas confronting the traditional 'objects' of their power (and their analysis) to better grasp the security practices of the 'weak' – their ways of resistance, stigma-management and mimicry. In ethical terms, the contribution of EE 'Melians' for the West-dominated International Security Studies is to offer the latter a mirror in order to help with the introspection and reflection – if only to serve as a reminder that 'the high could not be high unless the low existed' (cf. Turner 1969: 83). 'Worlding' IR from EE begins by fine-tuning ourselves to barely discernible differences in the institutionalised ways of speaking and writing about the region, on behalf of as well as for it.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers and editors of JIRD for their expert eye and engagement with this piece. Xymena Kurowska and Akos Kopper have been generous and patient interlocutors throughout the development of the argument. I am sincerely thankful to their editorial guidance and support. Thanks are also due to the panel participants at ISA 2019 Toronto where this paper was first presented and our discussant Stefano Guzzini.

Notes

[1] I refer to 'Eastern Europe' as broadly post-communist space, entailing the countries of the former 'Eastern bloc' along with the states that emerged from the dissolution of the Soviet Union and that of the former Yugoslavia. Such a terminological choice is not ignorant of the contested semantics and history of the term, but a pragmatic embracing of a standard broad reference to the region in IR (e.g. Fausett and Volgy 2010). Occasionally, I emphasise the 'Central European' subcomponent in 'Eastern Europe' to highlight finer layers therein (see Twardzisz 2018; Marinković and Ristić 2018).

[2] To satisfy the criterion of 'scholarly East Europeanness' in the absence of EE institutional affiliation either a publicly traceable confirmation of the author's birthplace/ethnicity or of the regionally situated university having afforded a doctorate to the author in question had to be present.

[3] The concept of 'worlding' entails 'intersecting practices of colonizing, resisting and reshaping' with all IR scholars in 'imagining and creating *worlds*' (Tickner and Wæver 2009: 9; emphasis in original).

[4] Meera Sabaratnam (2011) develops a more nuanced typology of decolonising strategies in the study of world politics, including: identifying discursive Orientalisms, deconstructing historical myths of European development, daring Eurocentric historiographies, rearticulating subaltern subjectivities, varying political subjecthoods and re-envisioning the social-psychological subject of world politics.

[5] For a sharp critique of this relativist position, see Makarychev and Morozov (2013).

[6] Since not all journals were in existence in 1991, the total number of journals covered for the full 1991–2019 timeframe was 10.

[7] Tickner (2013) cites Keim (2008: 28), according to whom '58% of the total literature covered by the Social Sciences Citation index is authored or co-authored by scholars affiliated with the United States, while all of Western Europe accounts for 25%, Latin America for 1%, and the entire African continent for less than 1%'. EE does not make it to this bibliometric overview at all, nor is it generally part of the search for IR theory openings beyond the West (e.g. Acharya 2011).

References

Aalto, Pami (2003) 'Revisiting the Security/Identity in Russo-Estonian Relations', *Journal of Peace Research* **40**(5): 573–91.

Acharya, Amitav (2014) 'Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies', *International Studies Quarterly* **58**(4): 647–59.

Acharya, Amitav (2011) 'Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **39**(3): 619-37.

Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan, eds (2010) *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*, Oxford and New York: Routledge.

Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan (2007) 'Preface: Why is There No Non-Western IR Theory: Reflections on and from Asia', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* **7**(3): 285–86.

Achvarina, Vera and Simon Reich (2006) 'No Place to Hide: Refugees, Displaced Persons, and the Recruitment of Child Soldiers', *International Security* **31**(1): 127–64.

Adamson, Fiona B. (2016) 'Spaces of Global Security: Beyond Methodological Nationalism', *Journal of Global Security Studies* **1**(1): 19–35.

Adler-Nissen, Rebecca (2014) 'Stigma Management in International Relations: Transgressive Identities, Norms, and Order in International Society', *International Organization* **68**(1): 143–76.

Avdeyeva, Olga (2007) 'When Do States Comply with International Treaties? Policies on Violence against Women in Post-Communist Countries', *International Studies Quarterly* **51**(4): 877–900.

Aydinli, Ersel and Julie Mathews (2000) 'Are the Core and Periphery Irreconcilable? The Curious World of Publishing in Contemporary International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives* **1**(3): 289–303.

Ayoob, Mohammed (2002) 'Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case of Subaltern Realism', *International Studies Review* **4**(3): 27–48.

Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey (2006) 'The postcolonial moment in security studies', *Review of International Studies* **32**: 329–52.

Behr, Hartmut (2007) 'The European Union in the Legacies of Imperial Rule? EU Accession Politics Viewed from a Historical Comparative Perspective', *European Journal of International Relations* **13**(2): 239–62.

Bertrand, Sarah (2018) 'Can the subaltern securitize? Postcolonial Perspectives on securitization theory and its critics', *European Journal of International Security* **3**(3): 281–99.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge.

Bilgin, Pinar (2018a) 'How to Globalise IR?', *E-IR*, 22 April.

Bilgin, Pinar (2018b) 'Thinking about the World Order, Inquiring into Others' Conceptions of the International', in Gunther Hellmann, ed., *Theorizing Global Order: The International, Culture and Governance*, 37–65, Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Bilgin, Pinar (2016a) 'How to remedy Eurocentrism in IR? A complement and a challenge for The Global Transformation', *International Theory* **8**(3): 492–501.

Bilgin, Pinar (2016b) 'Edward Said's "Contrapuntal Reading" as a Method, an Ethos and a Metaphor for Global IR', *International Studies Review* **18**(1): 134–46.

Bilgin, Pinar (2010) 'The "Western-Centrism" of Security Studies: "Blind Spot" or Constitutive Practice?', *Security Dialogue* **41**(6): 615–22.

Bitzinger, Richard A. (1991) 'Neutrality for Eastern Europe: Problems and Prospects', *Bulletin for Peace Proposals* **22**(3): 281–89.

Braumoeller, Bear F. (1997) 'Deadly Doves: Liberal Nationalism and the Democratic Peace in the Soviet Successor States', *International Studies Quaterly* **41**(3): 372–402.

Browning, Christopher S. and Pertti Joenniemi (2003) 'The European Union's Two Dimensions: The Eastern and the Northern', *Security Dialogue* **34**(4): 463–78.

Buchowski, Michał (2006) 'The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother', *Anthropological Quarterly* **79**(3): 463–82.

Buzan, Barry and Richard Little (2001) 'Why International Relations Has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to Do about It?', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **30**(1): 19–39.

Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Capan, Zeynep Gülsah (2017) 'Writing International Relations from the invisible side of the abyssal line', *Review of International Studies* **43**(4): 602–11.

Chari, Sharad and Katherine Verdery (2009) 'Thinking between the Posts: Postcolonialism, Postsocialism, and Ethnography after the Cold War', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* **51**(1): 6–34.

Chopra, Jarat and Thomas G. Weiss (1995) 'Prospects for Containing Conflict in the Former Second World', *Security Studies* **4**(3): 552–83.

Cottey, Andrew (1999) 'Central Europe Transformed: Security and co-operation on NATO's new frontier', *Contemporary Security Policy* **20**(2): 1–30.

Cronin, Bruce (2002) 'Creating Stability in the New Europe: The OSCE High Commissioner on national minorities and the socialization of risky states', *Security Studies* **12**(1): 132–63.

Driscoll, Jesse and Daniel Maliniak (2016) 'With Friends Like These: Brinkmanship and Chain-Ganging in Russia's Near Abroad', *Security Studies* **25**(4): 585–607.

Drulák, Petr (2009) 'Introduction to the International Relations (IR) in Central and Eastern Europe Forum', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **12**(2): 168–73.

Enloe, Cynthia (1996) 'Margins, silences and bottom rungs: how to overcome the underestimation of power in the study of international relations', in Steve Smith, Ken Booth, Marysia Zalewski, eds, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, 186–202, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Etkind, Alexander (2011) *Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*, Cambridge: Polity.

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fausett, Elizabeth and Thomas J. Volgy (2010) 'Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) and Interstate Conflict: Parsing Out IGO Effects for Alternative Dimensions of Conflict in Postcommunist Space', *International Studies Quarterly* **54**(1): 79–101.

Feklyunina, Valentina (2016) 'Soft power and identity: Russia, Ukraine and the "Russian world(s)", *European Journal of International Relations* **22**(4): 773–96.

Flockhart, Trine (2006) '"Complex Socialization": A Framework for the Study of State Socialization', *European Journal of International Relations* **12**(1): 89–118.

Flockhart, Trine (2004) '"Masters and Novices": Socialization and Social Learning through the NATO Parliamentary Assembly', *International Relations* **18**(3): 361–80.

Foucault, Michel (1984) *The History of Sexuality*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, Michel (1970/2004) *The Order of Things*, New York: Routledge.

Galbreath, David and Joanne McEvoy (2012) 'European organizations and minority rights in Europe: On transforming the securitization dynamic', *Security Dialogue* **43**(3): 267–84.

Gheciu, Alexandra (2005) 'Security Institutions as Agens of Socialization? NATO and the "New Europe"', *International Organization* **59**(4): 973–1012.

Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Góralczyk, Bogdan (1992) 'Central and Eastern Europe in Transition: Democracy Half Done', *Bulletin for Peace Proposals* **23**(2): 197–203.

Grigorescu, Alexandru (2003) 'International Organizations and Government Transparency: Linking the International and Domestic Realms', *International Studies Quarterly* **47**(4): 643–67.

Grigorian, Arman and Stuart J. Kaufman (2007) 'Hate narratives and ethnic conflict', *International Security* **31**(4): 180–91.

Grovogui, Siba (2011) 'To the Orphaned, Dispossessed, and Illegitimate Children: Human Rights Beyond Republican and Liberal Traditions', *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* **18**(1): 41–63.

Grovogui, Siba (2006) *Beyond Eurocentrism and Anarchy: Memories of International Order and Institutions*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gusterson, Hugh (1999) 'Missing the End of the Cold War in International Security', in Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall, eds, *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*, 319–45, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Guzzini, Stefano (2007) 'Theorising International Relations: Lessons from Europe's periphery', DIIS Working Paper, No. 2007/30.

Hobson, John M. (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–2010*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobson, John M. and Jason C. Sharman (2005) 'The Enduring Place of Hierarchy in World Politics: Tracing the Social Logics of Hierarchy and Political Change', *European Journal of International Relations* **11**(1): 63–98.

Hoffmann, Stanley (1977) 'An American Social Science: International Relations', *Daedalus* **106**(3): 41–60.

Horowitz, Shale (2003) 'War after Communism: Effects on Political and Economic Reform in the Former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia', *Journal of Peace Research* **40**(1): 25–48.

Horowitz, Shale (2004) 'Structural Sources of Post-Communist Market Reform: Economic Structure, Political Culture, and War', *International Studies Quarterly* **48**(4): 755–78.

Hönke, Jana and Markus-Michael Müller (2012) 'Governing (in)security in a postcolonial world: Transnational entanglements and the wordliness of "local" practice', *Security Dialogue* **43**(5): 383–401.

Hutchings, Kimberley (2011) 'Dialogue between Whom? The Role of the West/Non-West Distinction in Promoting Global Dialogue in IR', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **39**(3): 639–47.

Hyde-Price, Adrian (2000) 'The antinomies of European security: Dual enlargement and the reshaping of European order', *Contemporary Security Policy* **21**(3): 139–67.

Inayatullah, Naeem and David L. Blaney (2004) *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, London and New York: Routledge.

Jabri, Vivienne (2014) 'Disarming norms: postcolonial agency and the constitution of the international', *International Theory* **6**(2): 372–90.

Judt, Tony (2010) '*Captive Minds*, Then and Now', *The New York Review of Books*, 13 July.

Jutila, Matti (2009) 'Taming Eastern Nationalism: Tracing the Ideational Background of Double Standards of Post-Cold War Minority Protection', *European Journal of International Relations* **15**(4): 627–51.

Kamola, Isaac (2020) 'IR, the Critic, and the World: From Reifying the Discipline to Decolonising the University', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **48**(3): 245–70.

Keim, Wiebke (2008) 'Social sciences internationally: The problem of marginalisation and its consequences for the discipline of sociology', *African Sociological Review* **12**(2): 22–48.

Kelertas, Violeta, ed. (2006) *Baltic Postcolonialism*, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Klinke, Ian (2015) 'European Integration Studies and the European Union's Eastern Gaze', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **43**(2): 567–83.

Kostadinova, Tatiana (2000) 'East European Public Support for NATO Membership: Fears and Aspirations', *Journal of Peace Research* **37**(2): 235–49.

Kołodziejczyk, Dorota and Cristina Şandru (2012) 'Introduction: On colonialism, communism and east-central Europe – some reflections', *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* **48**(2): 113–16.

Korek, Janusz, ed. (2007) *From Sovietology to post-coloniality: Poland and Ukraine from a postcolonial perspective*, Stockholm: Södertörn Academic Studies 32.

Korosteleva, Elena A. (2016) 'The European Union, Russia and the Eastern Region: The analytics of government for sustainable cohabitation', *Cooperation and Conflict* **51**(3): 365–83.

Krickovic, Andrej (2016) 'Catalyzing Conflict: The Internal Dimension of the Security Dilemma', *Journal of Global Security Studies* **1**(2): 111–26.

Krickovic, Andrej and Yuval Weber (2018) 'What Can Russia Teach Us about Change? Status-Seeking as a Catalyst for Transformation in International Politics', *International Studies Review* **20**(2): 292–300.

Kristensen, Peter Marcus (2015) 'Revisiting the "American Social Science": Mapping the Geography of International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives* **16**(3): 246–69.

Kristensen, Peter Marcus (2012) 'Dividing Discipline: Structures of Communication in International Relations', *International Studies Review* **14**(1): 32–50.

Kubálková, Vendulka (2009) 'The 'take off' of the Czech IR discipline', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **12**(2): 205–20.

Kurowska, Xymena (2014) 'Practicality by judgement: transnational interpreters of local ownership in the Polish-Ukrainian border reform encounter', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **17**(4): 545–65.

Kurowska, Xymena and Anatoly Reshetnikov (2018) 'Neutrollization: Industrialized trolling as a pro-Kremlin strategy of desecuritization', *Security Dialogue* **49**(5): 345–63.

Kuus, Merje (2002a) 'European Integration in Identity Narratives in Estonia: A Quest for Security', *Journal of Peace Research* **39**(1): 91–108.

Kuus, Merje (2002b) 'Toward Cooperative Security? International Integration and the Construction of Security in Estonia', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **31**(2): 297–317.

Kuus, Merje (2007) 'Something old, something new: Eastness in European Union enlargement', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **10**: 150–67.

Lake, David A. and Donald Rothchild (1996) 'Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict', *International Security* **21**(2): 41–75.

Lawson, George (2010) 'The eternal divide? History and International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* **18**(2): 203–26.

Lazarus, Neil (2012) 'Spectres haunting: Postcommunism and postcolonialism', *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* **48**(2): 117–29.

Lindekilde, Lasse (2014) 'Discourse and Frame Analysis: In-depth Analysis of Qualitative Data in Social Movement Research', in Donatella della Porta, ed., *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, 1–35, Oxford Scholarship Online, DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198719571.001.0001.

Linden, Ronald H. (2000) 'Putting on Their Sunday Best: Romania, Hungary, and the Puzzle of Peace', *International Studies Quarterly* **44**(1): 121–45.

Lohaus, Mathis and Wiebke Wemheuer-Vogelaar (2020) 'Who Publishes Where? Exploring the Geographic Diversity in Global IR Journals', *International Studies Review*, doi: 10.1093/isr/viaa062: 1–25.

McFaul, Michael (2007) 'Ukraine Imports Democracy: External Influences of the Orange Revolution', *International Security* **32**(2): 45–83.

Makarychev, Andrey S. (2004) 'Where the North Meets the East: Europe's 'Dimensionalism' and Poland's "Marginality Strategy"', *Cooperation and Conflict* **39**(3): 299–315.

Makarychev, Andrey and Viatcheslav Morozov (2013) 'Is "Non-Western Theory" Possible? The Idea of Multipolarity and the Trap of Epistemological Relativism in Russian IR', *International Studies Review* **15**(3): 328–50.

Mälksoo, Maria (2019) 'The Normative Threat of Subtle Subversion: the Return of "Eastern Europe" as an Ontological Insecurity Trope', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* **32**(3): 365–83.

Mälksoo, Maria (2015) '"Memory Must Be Defended": Beyond the Politics of Mnemonical Security', *Security Dialogue* **46**(3): 221–37.

Mälksoo, Maria (2009) 'The Memory Politics of Becoming European: The East European Subalterns and the Collective Memory of Europe', *European Journal of International Relations* **15**(4): 653–80.

Mälksoo, Maria (2006) 'From Existential Politics towards Normal Politics? The Baltic States in the Enlarged Europe', *Security Dialogue* **37**(3): 275–97.

Marinković, Dušan and Dušan Ristić (2018) 'Regional heterotopia of Central Europe: 'lost' identity in the process of deterritorialisation of Europe', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **21**: 146–71.

Mark, James and Quinn Slobodian (2018) 'Eastern Europe in the Global History of Decolonization', in Martin Thomas and Andrew Thompson, eds, *Oxford Handbooks Online: The Oxford Handbook of the Ends of Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mendelson, Sarah E. (2001) 'Democracy Assistance and Political Transition in Russia: Between Success and Failure', *International Security* **25**(4): 68–106.

Milewicz, Karolina and Manfred Elsig (2014) 'The Hidden World of Multilateralism: Treaty Commitments of Newly Democratized States in Europe', *International Studies Quarterly* **58**(2): 322–35.

Miłosz, Czesław (1953) *The Captive Mind*, translated by Jane Zielonko, London: Secker & Warburg.

Miller, Benjamin (2001) 'Between War and Peace: Systemic Effects and Regional Transitions from The Cold War to Post-Cold War', *Security Studies* **11**(1): 1–52.

Miller, Benjamin and Korina Kagan (1997) 'The Great Powers and Regional Conflicts: Eastern Europe and the Balkans from the Post-Napoleonic Era to the Post-Cold War Era', *International Studies Quarterly* **41**(1): 51–85.

Moore, David Chioni (2001) 'Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique', *PMLA* **116**(1): 111–28.

Morozov, Viacheslav (2013) 'Subaltern Empire? Toward a Postcolonial Approach to Russian Foreign Policy', *Problems of Post-Communism* **60**(6): 16–28.

Mueller, Karl (1995) ‘Alignment balancing and stability in Eastern Europe’, *Security Studies* **5**(1): 38–76.

Natorski, Michal (2016) ‘Epistemic (un)certainty in times of crisis: The role of coherence as a social convention in the European Neighbourhood Policy after the Arab Spring’, *European Journal of International Relations* **22**(3): 646–70.

Neumann, Iver B. (1996) ‘Self and Other in International Relations’, *European Journal of International Relations* **2**(2): 139–74.

Neumann, Iver B. and Vincent Pouliot (2011) ‘Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium’, *Security Studies* **20**(1): 105–37.

Nicolaidis, Kalypso, Claire Vergerio, Nora Fisher Onar, Juri Viehoff (2014) ‘From Metropolis to Microcosmos: The EU’s New Standards of Civilisation’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **42**(3): 718–45.

Noreen, Erik and Roxanna Sjöstedt (2004) ‘Estonian Identity Formations and Threat Framing in the Post-Cold War Era’, *Journal of Peace Research* **41**(6): 733–50.

Noyes, Dorothy (2019) ‘Blaming the Polish plumber: phantom agents, invisible workers, and the liberal arena’, *Journal of International Relations and Development* **22**(4): 853–81.

Owczarzak, Jill (2009) ‘Introduction: Postcolonial studies and postsocialism in Eastern Europe’, *Focaal* **53**: 3–19.

Platt, Kevin M.F. (2013) ‘Occupation versus Colonization: Post-Soviet Latvia and the Provincialization of Europe’, in Uilleam Blacker, Alexander Etkind, and Julie Fedor, eds, *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe*, 125–45, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pusca, Anca (2017) ‘Re-Thinking (Post)Communism after the Aesthetic Turn: Art and Politics in the Romanian Context’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **45**(2): 233–40.

Ripsman, Norrin M. (2005) ‘Two Stages of Transition from a Region of War to a Region of Peace: Realist Transition and Liberal Endurance’, *International Studies Quarterly* **49**(4): 669–93.

Roe, Paul (2006) 'Reconstructing Identities or Managing Minorities? Desecuritizing Minority Rights: A Response to Jutila', *Security Dialogue* **37**(3): 425–38.

Roe, Paul (2004a) 'Which Security Dilemma? Mitigating Ethnic Conflict: The Case of Croatia', *Security Studies* **13**(4): 280–313.

Roe, Paul (2004b) 'Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization', *Security Dialogue* **35**(3): 279–94.

Sabaratnam, Meera (2011) 'IR in Dialogue … but Can We Change the Subjects? A Typology of Decolonising Strategies for the Study of World Politics', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **39**(3): 781–803.

Said, Edward (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward (1978) *Orientalism*, New York: Pantheon Books.

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2000) 'International Socialization in the New Europe: Rational Action in an Institutional Environment', *European Journal of International Relations* **6**(1): 109–39.

Shifrinson, Joshua R. Itzkowitz (2016) 'Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion', *International Security* **40**(4): 7–44.

Snochowska-Gonzalez, Claudia (2012) 'Post-colonial Poland – On an Unavoidable Misuse', *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* **26**(4): 708–23.

Snyder, Timothy (2009) 'The Historical Reality of Eastern Europe', *East European Politics and Societies* **23**(1): 7–12.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, 271–313, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Subotić, Jelena (2011a) 'Expanding the scope of post-conflict justice: Individual, state and societal responsibility for mass atrocity', *Journal of Peace Research* **48**(2): 157–69.

Subotić, Jelena (2011b) 'Europe is a State of Mind: Identity and Europeanization in the Balkans', *International Studies Quarterly* **55**(2): 309–30.

Subotić, Jelena and Ayse Zarakol (2012) 'Cultural intimacy in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* **19**(4): 915–38.

Thakur, Vineet (2015) 'Africa and the Theoretical Peace in IR', *International Political Sociology* **9**(3): 213–29.

Tickner, Arlene B. and Ole Wæver, eds (2009) *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, London and New York: Routledge.

Tickner, Arlene B. (2013) 'Core, periphery and (neo)imperialist International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* **19**(3): 627–46.

Tlostanova, Madina (2012) 'Postsocialist ≠ postcolonial? On post-Soviet imaginary and global coloniality', *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* **48**(2): 130–42.

Todorova, Maria (1997) *Imagining the Balkans*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trager, Robert F. and Dessislava P. Zagorcheva (2005/06) 'Deterring Terrorism: It Can Be Done', *International Security* **30**(3): 87–123.

Tsygankov, Andrei P. and Pavel A. Tsygankov (2010) 'National ideology and IR Theory: Three incarnations of the "Russian idea"', *European Journal of International Relations* **16**(4): 663–86.

Turner, Victor W. (1969) *The Ritual Process. Structure and Anti-Structure*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Turton, Helen Louise and Lucas G. Freire (2016) 'Peripheral possibilities: revealing originality and encouraging dialogue through a reconsideration of "marginal" IR scholarship', *Journal of International Relations and Development* **19**(4): 534–57.

Twardzisz, Piotr (2018) *Defining 'Eastern Europe': a semantic inquiry into political terminology*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Uffelmann, Dirk (2013) 'Theory as Memory Practice: The Divided Discourse on Poland's Postcoloniality', in Uilleam Blacker, Alexander Etkind, and Julie Fedor, eds, *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe*, 103–24, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ugur, Mehmet (2013) 'Europeanization, EU Conditionality, and Governance Quality: Empirical Evidence on Central and Eastern European Countries', *International Studies Quarterly* **57**(1): 41–51.

Valbjørn, Morten (2017) 'Dialoguing about Dialogues: On the Purpose, Procedure and Product of Dialogues in Inter-National Relations Theory', *International Studies Review* **19**(2): 291–96.

Van Evera, Stephen (1992) 'Managing the Eastern Crisis: Preventing War in the Former Soviet Empire', *Security Studies* **1**(3): 361–81.

Van Ham, Peter (1998) 'The Baltic States and Zwicheneuropa: "Geography is Destiny"?', *International Relations* **XIV**(2): 47–59.

Vasilaki, Rosa (2012) 'Provincialising IR? Deadlocks and Prospects in Post-Western IR Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **41**(1): 3–22.

Verovšek, Peter J. (2015) 'Expanding Europe through Memory: The Shifting Content of the Ever-Salient Past', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **43**(2): 531–50.

Walker, R. B. J. (1992) *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weiner, Myron (1996) 'Bad Neighbors, Bad Neighborhoods: An Inquiry into the Cause of Refugee Flows', *International Security* **21**(1): 5–42.

Wæver, Ole (1998) 'The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations', *International Organization* **52**(4): 687–727.

Ward, Stuart (2016) 'The European Provenance of Decolonization', *Past and Present* **230**(1): 227–60.

Wolff, Larry (1994) *Inventing Eastern Europe*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zarakol, Ayse (2014) 'What made the modern world hang together: socialisation or stigmatisation?', *International Theory* **6**(2): 311–32.

Zevnik, Andreja (2009) 'Sovereign-less Subject and the Possibility of Resistance', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* **38**(1): 83–106.

About the Author

Maria Mälksoo is Senior Lecturer in International Security at the University of Kent, Brussels School of International Studies. She is the author of *The Politics of Becoming European: A Study of Polish and Baltic Post-Cold War Security Imaginaries* (Routledge, 2010), a co-author of *Remembering Katyn* (Polity, 2012), and the editor of *Handbook on the Politics of Memory* (Edward Elgar, forthcoming). Her work on European security politics, transitional justice, liminality, memory wars and memory laws has appeared in various IR journals and edited volumes. Her current research focuses on rituals in world politics, particularly in relation to extended deterrence, and memory laws in Eastern Europe.

Tables

Table 1: Eastern Europe in International Security Studies journals

	Sample/Total no of articles meeting the search criteria	Frame of reference			EE authorship
		EE as space	EE as trope	EE as both space and trope	
IS	55/279	44% (24)	31% (17)	25% (14)	~5
SS	79/373	68% (54)	9% (7)	23% (18)	<10
JCR	8/114	63% (5)	12% (1)	25% (2)	~5
JPR	17/140	76% (13)	0	24% (4)	~5
SD	31/164	55% (17)	10% (3)	35% (11)	10
CSS	0/0	0	0	0	<5
JGSS	3/42	67% (2)	0	33% (1)	>5
EJIS	1/10	0	0	100% (1)	0
ES	308/562	68% (208)	8% (25)	24% (75)	~90
CSP	83/357	66% (55)	5% (4)	29% (24)	~20

Table 2: Eastern Europe in International Relations journals

	Sample/Total no of articles meeting the search criteria	Frame of Reference			EE authorship
		EE as space	EE as trope	EE as both space and trope	
IO	13/152	8% (1)	46% (6)	46% (6)	0
ISQ	38/350	63% (24)	16% (6)	21% (8)	>5
EJIR	81/164	46% (37)	25% (20)	30% (24)	5
JIRD	88/175	34% (30)	14% (12)	52% (46)	>40
RIS	39/224	28% (11)	10% (4)	62% (24)	5
M	27/158	22% (6)	44% (12)	33% (9)	>5
C&C	44/150	18% (8)	18% (8)	64% (28)	<10
IR	60/224	43% (26)	13% (8)	43% (26)	<20

Table 3: Composition of editorial boards/committees in International Security Studies journals[1]

	Total number of editorial board members	EE institutional affiliation	EE origin, but not affiliation[2]
IS	45	0	0
SS	44	0	0
JCR	30	0	0
JPR	23	0	0
SD	40	0	1
CSS	30	0	0
JGSS	42	0	0
EJIS	25	0	0
ES	26	1	1
CSP	37	1	1

Table 4: Composition of editorial boards/committees/international advisory boards in general International Relations journals

	Total number of editorial board members	EE institutional affiliation	EE origin, but not affiliation
IO[3]	48	0	0
ISQ	73	0	0
EJIR[4]	62	**3**	0
JIRD	61	13	3
RIS	33	0	0
M[5]	32	0	0
C&C	19	1	0
IR	39	0	0

[1] The information has been extracted from the official websites of the journals as of September 2020. The editorial board/committee membership is exclusive of the editorial teams of the journals (i.e. editors-in-chief/coordinating editors, associate/co-editors, managing editors), but inclusive of the editorial board chair (in case in place).

[2] Scholarly origin is qualified here as (i) institutional affiliation (i.e. the academic 'home' of a board member at the time of their service in the respective editorial board) and (ii) EE locational origin, drawing on the publicly available background information on the person's place of birth upon the indication of the author's name and/or place where their doctorate was obtained.

[3] Editorial Board (37) plus Senior Advisors (11).

[4] Editorial Committee (27) plus International Advisory Board (35).

[5] Editorial committee (21) plus International Advisory Board (11).