

The background of the cover is a solid dark blue. Overlaid on this is a stylized, lighter blue silhouette of a world map, showing the continents. A dashed line, composed of small blue squares, forms a circular arc that starts from the top left and curves around the right side of the cover, partially enclosing the globe.

1/2017

International and Security Studies

Institute for Security, Energy
and Climate Studies

**INTERNATIONAL
and SECURITY STUDIES**

**INTERNATIONAL
and SECURITY STUDIES**

2017

Warsaw 2017

Redakcja

Redaktor naczelny: prof. dr hab. Ryszard Zięba

Z-ca redaktora naczelnego: dr Krzysztof Księżopolski

Sekretarz redakcji: dr Tomasz Pawłuszko

Z-ca sekretarza redakcji: dr Remigiusz Rosicki

Redakcja statystyczna: Patrycja Bytner

Redakcja językowa:

Maciej Hacaga (język polski), Michael McCabe (język angielski)

Adres redakcji

International and Security Studies

Institute for Security, Energy and Climate Studies – ISECS

ul. Marszałkowska 55/73, lok. 75, 00-676, Warszawa

e-mail: redakcja@isecs.eu

<http://isecs.eu/wordpress/international-and-security-studies/>

Copyright © by Institute for Security, Energy and Climate Studies – ISECS

Wersja pierwotna czasopisma: papierowa

Recenzenci tomu:

prof. dr hab. Mieczysław Stolarczyk, Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach

dr hab. Joanna Modrzejewska-Leśniewska, prof. SGH, Szkoła Główna Handlowa

ISSN: 2543-9804

Skład i łamanie: Studio Grafpa, www.grafpa.pl

Druk i oprawa: Mazowieckie Centrum Poligrafii,

05-270 Marki ul. Duża 1 www.c-p.com.pl

Nakład: 100 egzemplarzy

RADA NAUKOWA:

Prof. Fulvio Attina
(Università degli Studi di Catania, Włochy)
Prof. Esther Barbé
(Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Hiszpania)
Prof. Bojko Bučar
(Univerisytet w Lublanie, Słowenia)
Prof. dr hab. Andrzej Ciupiński
(Akademia im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie)
Prof. dr hab. Erhard Cziomer
(Krakowska Akademia im. A. Frycza Modrzewskiego)
Dr Hans-Georg Ehrhart
(Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitsspolitik, Hamburg)
Prof. Lidija Georgieva
(Univerisytet Św. Cyryla i Metodego, Skopje)
Prof. UAM dr hab. Radosław Fiedler
(Univerisytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań)
Dr hab. Paweł Frankowski
(Univerisytet Jagielloński, Kraków)
Prof. UW dr hab. Tomasz Grosse
(Univerisytet Warszawski)
Prof. dr hab. Dariusz Kozerawski
(Wyższa Szkoła Policji, Szczytno)
Prof. dr hab. Kazimierz Łastawski
(Univerisytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń)
Prof. Radmila Nakarada
(Univerisytet w Belgradzie, Serbia)
Prof. Henry Nau
(George Washington University, USA)
Prof. Josep M^a Reniu
(Universitat de Barcelona, Hiszpania)
Prof. dr hab. Mieczysław Stolarczyk
(Univerisytet Śląski, Katowice)
Prof. dr hab. Ryszard Szpyra
(Akademia Sztuki Wojennej, Warszawa)
Prof. UAM dr hab. Tadeusz Wallas
(Univerisytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań)
Prof. dr hab. Janusz Węc (Univerisytet Jagielloński)
Prof. Jaap de Wilde
(University of Groningen, Holandia)
Prof. UJK dr hab. Agata Włodkowska-Bagan
(Univerisytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach)
Prof. dr hab. Ryszard Skarżyński
(Univerisytet w Białymstoku)
Prof. Tanju Tosun (Ege University, Izmir, Turcja)
Prof. Igor Tsependa (Vasyl Stepanyk Precarpatian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraina)
Prof. UW dr hab. Justyna Zajac
(Univerisytet Warszawski)
Prof. dr hab. Ryszard Zięba (Univerisytet Warszawski)

REDAKTORZY TEMATYCZNI:

Teorie bezpieczeństwa i stosunków międzynarodowych
– prof. dr hab. Ryszard Zięba (UW)
Bezpieczeństwo cybernetyczne
– dr hab. Miron Lakomy (UŚ)
Bezpieczeństwo ekonomiczne, energetyczne i polityka klimatyczna
– dr Krzysztof M. Księżopolski (SGH)
Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe
– Prof. UW dr hab. Justyna Zajac,
Bezpieczeństwo jednostki (człowieka)
– Prof. UW dr Marta Kosmala-Kozłowska (CC)
Instytucje międzynarodowe
– dr Remigiusz Rosicki (UAM)
Geopolityka
– dr Witold Ostant (ASzWoj)
Integracja europejska
– dr Marlena Drygiel-Bielińska (UP-H w Siedlcach)
Polityka zagraniczna i bezpieczeństwa UE
– dr Irma Słomczyńska (UMCS)
Polityka zagraniczna i bezpieczeństwa USA
– dr Ewelina Waśko-Owsiejczuk (UwB)
Polityka zagraniczna i bezpieczeństwa Rosji
– dr Agnieszka Bryc (UMK)
Stosunki międzynarodowe na obszarze b. ZSRR
– prof. UJK dr hab. Agata Włodkowska-Bagan
Europa Środkowa
– dr Małgorzata Bielecka (SGGW)
Europa Wschodnia i Chiny
– dr hab. Marcin Kaczmarek (UW)
Azja Wschodnia
– dr Piotr Kozłowski (SGH)
Bliski Wschód
– dr Katarzyna Czornik (UŚ)
Socjologia stosunków międzynarodowych
– dr hab. Renata Włoch (UW)

Contents

SECURITY POLICY OF POLAND

Andrzej Ciupiński	
<i>Poland and the security and defense policy of the European Union</i>	11
Agnieszka Pawlak	
<i>The effectiveness of the concept of the Polish foreign policy in 1989–2017</i> . .	29
Karolina Korska	
<i>Poland's eastern policy – failure or success?</i>	45
Remigiusz Rosicki	
<i>Характеристика институционально-правовых аспектов энергетической политики Польши</i>	61

SECURITY POLICIES IN EUROPE

Filip Tereszkievicz	
<i>European Union global strategy from the viewpoint of Eurosceptic members of the European Parliament: discursive nodal points</i>	79
Justyna Zając	
<i>Polish-Romanian relations in the 21st century. Back to the future?</i>	95
Ryszard Zięba	
<i>The Ukraine crisis as the rivalry for spheres of influence between the West and Russia</i>	115
Małgorzata Bielecka	
<i>Stabilization missions of the European Union</i>	133

Krzysztof Księżopolski	
<i>Economic security and integration of the energy market in Trimarium</i>	151

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Ewelina Waśko-Owsiejczuk	
<i>Europe's position in U.S. security policy at the beginning of the 21st century</i>	169

Katarzyna Czornik	
<i>New directives in Donald Trump's administration's foreign policy towards the Middle East</i>	191

Miron Lakomy	
<i>The race for Syria: evolution of international rivalry in Levant 2011–2017</i>	211

Radosław Fiedler	
<i>The European Union and the Iranian Islamic Republic – opportunities and challenges</i>	229

SECURITY POLICY OF POLAND

ANDRZEJ CIUPIŃSKI

Prof. dr hab., Jan Długosz University in Częstochowa, Poland

Poland and the security and defense policy of the European Union

The article focuses on the evolution of the Polish approach towards the development of European strategic autonomy in European military integration (European Security and Defense Identity), the European Security and Defense Policy and the Common European Security and Defense Policy. Two stages have been identified: prior to accession to the EU and Poland's participation in the ESDP / CSDP EU since 2003. Special attention was paid to the the lack of interest of the current Polish political authorities in reforming the EU security system.

Key words: Poland, EU, political and military integration

Introduction

After the victory of "Solidarity" in the elections held in June 1989, the pace of change surprised Western European countries who feared conflicts in Central Europe. Initially, the USSR and then Russia were considered to be countries guaranteeing the relative stability of the region, treated as their "historically justified security zone" (Kuźniar, Szczepanik, 2002, 59). However, since the beginning of the new Poland, its leaders have stressed the need to include the Third Republic in the Western European economic system and Euro-Atlantic security structures. It was the dominant orientation, which was expressed in a government document adopted on November 2, 1992, *Assumptions of Polish Security Policy and Security Policy and Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland*. It stated that the North Atlantic Alliance re-

mains an essential factor for political stability and peace in Europe. Poland especially values the Euro-Atlantic character of this alliance and is in favor of the presence of American troops on our continent. Poland's strategic goal in the nineties was the NATO and the Western European Union membership as EU was the European pillar of NATO and an important factor in the European collective security system (Kuźniar, 2001, 631).

The Western European Union was the first organization with which Poland tried to establish cooperation in the field of security and defense. Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski hosted and negotiated in the WEU institutions the conditions of Poland's possible accession to the 1954 Brussels Modified Treaty. The political objectives of France, the main political and military force of Western Europe, were at variance at that time, aimed at building a relatively independent European defense. Central European states President F. Mitterand proposed a loose confederation followed by the Stability Pact, which was the first initiative of the European Union under the Common Foreign and Security Policy, but in fact did little to safeguard the region. France was concerned about the rapid integration of Central Europe into NATO and WEU, believing it would strengthen the role of the United States in the European security system (Parzymies, 2001, 351).

Euro-Atlantic orientation of Polish security policy in the period before accession to the European Union.

In January 1994, at the Brussels summit, it was decided to set up, within the framework of NATO, a political partnership formulation called Partnership for Peace and the development of the European Alliance pillar, called European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI). At this stage, Polish diplomacy did not show any interest in European strategic autonomy. It was focused on accession negotiations with NATO. However, it is worth noting that this was, in a sense, due to the preferences of the European factions giving precedence to the North Atlantic Alliance. The Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary became associate members of the WEU only on March 23, 1999, after NATO accession (Zięba, 2001, 227).

Americans were reconciled to the substratum of European autonomy within ESDI and under their control. They reluctantly referred to plans for the development of independent military capabilities within the European

Union. This was expressed by US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in her historic commentary on the Franco-British Declaration of Saint Malo, December 1998. She warned against three tendencies that could jeopardize the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Alliance and, more broadly, transatlantic relations; the first tendency is decoupling, the cutoff of the European defense system from NATO, the second negative phenomenon is duplication, or the duplication of structures and resources of the alliance, the third word is discrimination, referring to those European members of NATO who are not members of the European Union. This last warning gained support not only in Norway and Turkey, but also in Denmark, which did not want to participate in the EU military activities.

The attitude of American diplomacy was particularly welcomed in the Central European countries, which, after the NATO summit in Madrid, in July 1998, were soon to be adopted in the alliance, and the EU perspective was not yet certain. Candidates fully accepted the doctrine of Albright. It should be noted that the Secretary of State's "3 x non-D" corresponded to the British Security Policy (Albright, 1998; Gradziuk, 2004). This formula has become a software feature of the so- "Atlantists" and many times will be reminded. President Clinton's administration, and especially the American military community, was distrustful of European aspirations in the sphere of security and defense policy (Biegaj, 2001, 80).

On June 4 1999 shortly after the jubilee NATO summit, The European Council at the meeting in Cologne adopted the Declaration on the pursuit of a gradual formulation of the common defense policy of the European Union. The practical implementation of this ambitious target was agreed at the EU summit in Helsinki on 10–11 December 1999 and was called the European Haedline Goal. It was intended, among other things, to form a European Rapid Response Corps with a population of up to 60 000 soldiers (Zięba, 2003, 110–111).

For five years, Poland was a NATO member and candidate for the EU, and at that time its position on the program for the development of European military capabilities could be regarded as at least restrained, and sometimes even reluctant (Zięba, 2010, 126). It was reflected in the official documents, among others in the Security Strategy of the Government of the Republic of Poland, Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek, on January 4, 2000. It was written that the second pillar of Poland's security would be a system developed in the European Union/Western European Union – NATO. Also,

in the speeches of Foreign Minister Władysław Bartoszewski, a number of conditions could be found to be fulfilled by the European Union, so that Poland could support the development of European military capabilities (Osica, 2000, 36–37).

Another coalition government of the SLD – the PSL has not radically changed its attitude towards European projects for the construction of a European security community. It has taken a strong pro-American stance in support of US intervention in Iraq. In addition, the European allies have blamed Polish politicians for choosing the American F-16 multirole aircraft to equip Polish aviation. However, as the process of normalizing transatlantic relations progressed, the Polish side was also more than happy to comment on improving the EU's military capabilities. The Government of the Republic of Poland unreservedly accepted the Security Strategy of the European Union of 2003, and it is noteworthy that many elements of this document were used in the elaboration of the Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland. Poles were eager to join together to build a better world (*Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego*, 2003). In 2003 the first military mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Eupol-BiH) and the military in Macedonia called Concordia was conducted under the European Security and Defense Policy. Although Poland was not yet a member of the EU, we deployed our soldiers and policemen on the Balkan Peninsula (Ciupiński, 2013, 380–382). Since 2004, as a full member, we have participated in major military operations, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the Republic of Chad and Central Africa.

Since autumn 2005, the coalition of three parties has been in power in Poland for two years: Law and Justice – Self Defense – League of Polish Families. The coalition government reluctantly referred to any transnational change and sought to undermine the effects of reforms that tighten integration, defending the attributes of intergovernmental integration. The Polish class mistrusted some of the provisions of the Constitutional Treaty and was not contented with the fact that it was rejected in a referendum held on May 29, 2005 in France and a few days later in the Netherlands. However, there were no radical protests against the concept of common security and defense of the EU.

It is worth noting that many of the leading politicians of the Weimar Triangle countries spoke out in the European strategic debate, which took place in 2005–2007, for the creation of a common European army. In France

the team of President Nicolas Sarkozy, headed by the president himself, in Germany Chancellor Angela Merkel, German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steimeier, Polish President Lech Kaczyński and then Prime Minister Jarosław Kaczyński. These were statements of a general nature, mostly unofficial. In bilateral relations, the improvement of Polish-French relations, sharpened during the Iraqi crisis, should also be noted. Ten years ago, in spite of differences in positions on the ratification of the Treaty of Lisbon, French President Nicolas Sarkozy and Poland – Lech Kaczyński were able to reach an agreement on a Polish-French strategic partnership. It included, among others several specific areas of cooperation in the field of defense (Francusko – Polskie Partnerstwo Strategiczne. Program Współpracy, 2017).

In 2007, President Lech Kaczyński signed the National Security Strategy, which was much more comprehensive than the strategy adopted by his predecessor, Aleksander Kwaśniewski. It dealt with previously unsettled aspects and issues, including energy security. In the context of European integration, emphasis was placed on: *Membership in the European Union determines the basis of Poland's security in a significant way* (p. 44). An extensive fragment is given to ESDP: *Poland is in favor of the development of the European Security and Defense Policy. It will make a significant contribution to the EU's military and civilian crisis response capabilities. It will gradually increase its involvement in the creation of European crisis response forces, also through participation in the formation of combat groups*. The same point expressed strong support for the development of institutionalized security and defense cooperation between NATO and the EU, *in order to ensure the complementarity of the institutions' activities and to maximize the effectiveness of their available means* (Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego, 2007).

According to some authors, the orientation of the Law and Justice led by the Kaczyński brothers tried to implement a neo-realistic security concept, while politicians connected with the Civic Platform pushed the neo-liberal concept (Paruch, 2016, 335–362). In practice, in the field of ESDP, the two parties were pursuing the same pragmatic line. The strategic partnership agreement with France signed by President Lech Kaczyński was concretized two years later by the prime minister of the Republic of Poland. On November 5, 2009, Donald Tusk's official visit to Paris took place and a joint French-Polish statement was published (Deklaracja Francusko-Polskiego Szczytu w sprawie Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony, 2009). Some comments on this document were very optimistic, although exaggerated, since it was thought

that Tusk-Sarkozy's meeting could play the same role as the Saint Malo summit in December 1998, but it is worth noting that it was well received in Brussels (Gros-Verheyde, 2009).

I agree with Jack Czaputowicz's view expressed in 2005: *Poland's position on the dilemmas connected with the shape of EU foreign policy and diplomacy is pragmatic: there is no clear choice between international and transnational solutions* (Czaputowicz, 2005, 2). I believe that the pragmatic approach was characterized on the same level by SLD, PSL, PO and PiS. The last one mentioned until 2010, Smolensk disaster. Differences in programming visions and disputes around the two versions of the treaties did not interfere with actual, wide-ranging military cooperation. Roman Kuźniar considered it "a clear moment of Poland's participation in the European Union" during coalition governments; PiS – Samoobrona – LPR.

At the turn of 2008 and 2009 there was a peak in the Polish involvement in military missions under the European Security and Defense Policy: 400 soldiers participated in the mission in the Republic of Chad, and 170 in Bosnia and Herzegovina (before the 2007 reduction there were over 300). Undoubtedly, a relatively large operational contribution strengthened Poland's position in the European Union, which could be seen particularly during the French Presidency in the second half of 2008. A large group of Polish military observers were included in the mission to Georgia after the Russian invasion – EU MM – Georgia.

The training of Polish soldiers and civil servants led to missions and operations was well appreciated, both in the institutions organizing these ventures and by the participants from other countries. The analysis commissioned by the WEU/EU Parliamentary Assembly assessed that the level of preparation of Polish soldiers for external operations and their procedures were in no way divergent from European standards (Henderson, 2007, 5–6). The good morals of the soldiers sent to the mission and the readiness of the Poles to consider various proposals of involvement within the European Union were highlighted.

An interesting and promising platform for cooperation was the Sixth Group project, if the scope of its activity was extended to the sphere of military security and intervention outside the EU. The founder of the core of six large states was Nicolas Sarkozy (Parzymies, 2009, 201). The group to which Poland has also been invited has dealt with security policy issues related to illegal immigration and counter terrorism. It was originally launched in

2003 initially as a group of five in composition; France, Spain, Germany, United Kingdom and Italy (Posel-Częścik, 2003). Polish Member of the European Parliament Konrad Szymański (PiS) pointed out that Nicolas Sarkozy, even during the presidential election campaign, proposed extending the co-operation of the Sixth Group to other areas, including the preparation of the EU summits. The deputy emphasized that the directorate of six countries would be much more beneficial to Poland than the Triumvirate of France, Germany and Great Britain. From the point of view of strategic potential, Poland was qualified to the top European countries. It was emphasized that the six largest EU Member States contributed to its potential as high as 90% of the total contribution. In the same spirit, former Minister of National Defense Janusz Onyszkiewicz said that the concept of “big country concert” should be revived.

Common Security and Defense Policy as a priority of the Polish Presidency in the European Council

In 2007, the government coalition changed in Poland. Donald Tusk stood at the head of the coalition government of the Civic Platform and the Polish Peasant Party. In the sphere of EU security and defense policy, the policy of the new government can be considered as a continuation of previous governments. Also in bilateral relations there have been no radical changes. It was still important to co-operate the Weimar Triangle. Following the difficult and emotional ratification process, the Treaty of Lisbon came into force on December 1, 2009, which has given the area of external relations far greater importance than before. In the new legal and institutional environment, Poland was preparing to adopt the Council Presidency in the second half of 2011. The preliminary list of priorities of the Presidency was adopted in a resolution of the Council of Ministers of July 21, 2010 (Szpak, 2011, 35). In the economic sphere, the new financial perspective of the European Union and the development of the internal market as a factor in boosting economic growth have been weighed up, as well as the investment in intellectual capital and in relations with the Eastern European countries. Energy security was also sensitized. The EU CSDP entered the fifth place on the priority list.

Both in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland and in the Ministry of Defense recognized that a good platform for preparations

for the presidency would be the cooperation with France and Germany. This was expressed in the joint statement of defense ministers of the Weimar Triangle. On November 13, 2010, the letter was addressed to the High Representative – Catherine Ashton emphasizing that the Commonwealth Security and Defense Policy would be a priority for the Polish Presidency (List ministrów spraw zagranicznych i obrony Polski, Niemiec i Francji do szefowej unijnej dyplomacji Catherine Ashton ws. polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony UE 13 listopada 2010 r., 2010; Jankowski, 2011, 131–138). This was to happen by:

- 1) developing the political dimension of EU-NATO cooperation. It was requested, inter alia, to establish direct contacts between the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and the Common Security Policy with the Secretary-General of NATO;
- 2) coordinating the planning and conduct of EU civil and military activities in CSDP missions;
- 3) modifying the concept of EU Battle Groups from the point of view of operational needs;

Catherine Ashton avoided commenting on the content of a letter called a Weimar initiative. The Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs adopted a conclusions on this issue, stating that the Council supports the ideas expressed in the letter and, in principle, they are already implemented (*Conclusions du Conseil sur la PSDC...*, 2011).

The letter was addressed, although there were discrepancies among the partners as to some points of the initiative. Controversies sparked France's favorite „military command” project, located within the structures of the General Secretariat of the Council of the EU, which is the equivalent of a civilian operational command. Poles and Germans were more in favor of a combined civil-military structure. In turn, the French were reluctant towards the German project of establishing a permanent headquarters on the basis of the National Palace of Germany, based in Ulm. Poles have proposed the construction of a comprehensive civil-military command structure seeing, including the opportunity for greater flexibility and effectiveness of crisis response forces. In the case of the reform of the planning and command structures of operations, the Presidency of Poland advocated the establishment of permanent bodies, but was in a rather awkward position, since it had long contested these trials, just as other states belonging to the so- „Atlantists”, mainly the UK and most of the new EU members.

Poland was restrained and did not support the daring concept of the French establishment of a military Operational Center equal to the CPCC – the Office for Civilian Planning and Conducting. Radosław Sikorski commented on the permanent leadership on the occasion of the EU and NATO involment in Libya and stated that it could be useful for planning a military humanitarian operation in Libya, and in the future it shall be used permanently for further actions (*Polska chce utworzenia...* 2001). Discussions on this subject continued throughout the Presidency. After the July meeting of the Council so-called *the Club of Five* (Weimar + 2) was formed bringing together foreign ministers; Polish Radosław Sikorski, Guido Westerwelle of Germany, Alain Juppe of France, Trinidad Jimenez of Italy and Franco Frattini of Italy, who once again addressed a letter to Catherine Ashton; *After discussing at the last Council of Foreign Ministers, we urge you to examine all possible institutional and legal options, including permanent structured cooperation, necessary for the development of a common security and defense policy, and in particular a solid planning and commanding capabilities* (Five states including Poland appeal to the permanent operational command of the EU, 2011).

The fundamental idea expressed in the Declaration was to transform the Union into a real subject of international relations with the opportunity and the will to shape regional and global security, “in close collaboration with other international organizations (Gros-Verheyde, 2012). The Union must act quickly and effectively” “The Club of Five” also proposed practical steps to achieve this goal; improve the functioning of civil-military structures and ensure synergy in the activities of the External Action Service and the European Commission; use the EU Combat Groups as a deterrent, whose presence, for example, in the Balkans plays a stabilizing role; include more countries and step up cooperation in the European Air Transport Command (EATC) and speed up the air refueling project. One commentator noted that among the signatories of the letter: Spain, Poland and Italy had not yet joined the EATC. The cooperation of The Club of Five was continued after the end of the Presidency by Poland. Foreign affairs and defense ministers of five countries met in Paris on November 15, 2011. They appealed to other EU Member States to join the Weimar Initiative and support the development of the CSDP and improve the effectiveness of the EU defense action.

An important element of the reform was Poland's proposal to make the Battle Groups more functional. It was proposed, among others:

- 1) adjusting the command of groups to the extent so that they can be extended by sea and air capabilities. Initially, efforts were made to permanently integrate air and maritime capabilities into the package. Due to the unwillingness of the Weimar partners, the package was limited to command structures only.
- 2) Inclusion of civilian aspects in the EU Battle Group. Under the assumption, the main task of the civil component would be rescuing in the event of natural or man-made disasters (terrorism).

In the Polish project the civil component could also perform advisory or observation functions. Consequently, Poland has proposed harmonizing the concept of the EU Battle Groups with the CTR (Civilian Response Teams) (Tygodnik BBN, nr 42, 7). In addition, it was recommended to extend GB combat duty from 6 to 12 months. The Swedish proposals from 2009 were reminiscent of the fact that GB could have been used as a strategic retreat for EU operations or as a so-initial Enrty Force, the forces that first enter the crisis area (Zaangażowanie Polski w realizację Wspólnej Polityki Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony, 2013).

The initiatives expressed in the Weimar Group's letter were welcomed both by the High Representative and by the EU Council, which announced on January 31 the adoption of proposals for implementation. The European Parliament in point 40. of the resolution from May 11, 2011, proposed considering a specific EU GB diversification; *specialization of one of the two combat groups in niche capabilities and/or capabilities adapted to mild conflicts requiring mixed civilian-military action* (Rozwój wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony po wejściu w życie Traktatu z Lizbony, 2011). The results of the Polish Presidency also highlighted the fact that the Council adopted a declaration on the financing of strategic transport of EU Combat Groups on both sides. It was noted that the Polish Presidency did not propose new EU-NA-TO relations initiatives, focusing on supporting the High Representative's dialogue with the General Secretary.

On December 14, an European Parliament plenary session was held in Strasbourg, during which the speeches and achievements of the Polish Presidency were highly appreciated. French Minister of Defense Le Drian said that the Polish Presidency in the Council contributed to the strengthening of the EU CSDP and, as the most important achievements, indicated the

launch of the Operation Center in Brussels and a revision of the financing of military operations. In general, it can be stated that the period of one half-year could not have had a breakthrough in the development of the European security and defense system, and no one expected it from Poland. From the standpoint of international authority and the image of Poland, it reinforced its position as a supporter of the development of independent and effective military capabilities of the European Union. It happened despite the fact that the Armed Forces of Poland, unlike some of their allies, did not participate in the most important military actions in Libya during the presidency of Poland. However, the operation against Gaddafi's dictatorship was carried out by NATO forces.

It is worth noting that at the end of 2011, Foreign Minister Radosław Sikorski joined the discussion on the future of the European Union, recommending a federal reform as a remedy for the renationalisation of Member States' policies and their societies. The speech was criticized by the opposition parties, especially Law and Justice (Parzymies, 2015, 419).

Governments of Law and Justice. Silence on the EU CSDP

At the end of 2014, the *National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland* was published, as a result of the work of the Council of Ministers based on the results of the Strategic National Security Review of the Republic of Poland (SPBN) (Kupiecki, 2015, 12). As in several earlier governmental and presidential documents, the North Atlantic Alliance was recognized as the primary guarantor of international security. As regards the EU's security and defense issues, the text was more lucid than the 2007 Strategy. One of three policy priorities was: *supporting NATO capacity building for collective defense, developing the EU Common Security and Defense Policy, strengthening strategic partnerships (Including the US) and strategic relationships in the region* (bold in the original document) (Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP..., 2014).

A year later a change of authorities in Poland took place. President Andrzej Duda comes from the formation of the Law and Justice, and the government formed by the party, headed by Prime Minister Beata Szydło, holds a majority of votes in the Sejm of the Republic of Poland. Significant devaluations have occurred due to the actions of the authorities, mainly in the sphere of systemic changes. Many European politicians and institutions,

including the EU Parliament and the European Commission, criticize these changes, accusing the Polish authorities of violating the rule of law and devaluating the democratic values on which the European Union was built. On the other hand, the President, the Government of the Republic of Poland and the parliamentary majority reject the charges and express indignation over the interference in Poland's internal affairs. The dispute over the rule of law overlaps with the problem of Poland's refusal to accept the number of refugees from the Middle East agreed in 2015. On the Polish side, requiring them to accept refugees is considered an unauthorized EU dictation. On the other hand, Brussels treats refusal as a breach of its commitments.

Leader of PiS – ruling party, Jarosław Kaczyński on February 7, 2017 gave an interviewed the “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” in which he called for a thorough reform of the EU, as he considered the EU a success, until the Treaty of Lisbon and the refugee crisis appeared. In the opinion of the President of the PiS “European treaties should be reformed.” We need to strengthen the national states and limit the competences of the EU. We have to defend ourselves against monocentrism, because only Germany benefits from it, and other states do not, he said (Kaczyński, 2017).

Until now, the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland and the Council of Ministers have not announced their intention to publish a strategic document defining the main directions of the Polish security policy. On the other hand, in the Ministry of National Defense, the Defense Concept of the Republic of Poland has been prepared and disseminated, which defined the policy and strategy until 2032. The attitude towards the Union was briefly presented without referring to the Common Security and Defense Policy: *It is almost certain that by 2032 it (EU-AC) will be subject to deep structural transformations resulting from the creation of mechanisms for responding to economic crises, stabilizing the euro area, and resolving dilemmas related to the degree of mutual integration. One of its aspects will remain the security issues. Action on this issue should enrich NATO operations rather than compete for them* (Koncepcja Obronności Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, 2017, 43).

Two months before the publication of the Defense Concept, the European Commission has prepared a document encouraging a pan-European debate on the future of the EU. Suggestions for discussion on security and defense were also presented (Biała księga w sprawie przyszłości Europy, Refleksje i scenariusze dla UE-27 do 2025 r., 2017). There are three variants

within which the defense cooperation of the Member States of the European Union may develop.

The first scenario, "Defense and Security Cooperation," predicts that the EU will continue to complement national efforts and that decisions will always be the responsibility of the Member States. The European Defense Fund would support the development of specific capacities, but most purchases would be left to the Member States. The second scenario, "Defense and Security Sharing," assumes that European states "will combine specific financial and operational resources" to enhance defense cooperation. The role of the EU would be enhanced especially in the areas of fight against terrorism, cyber defense or border protection.

The third and most ambitious scenario is the "Common Defense and Security Policy". In this situation, Europe's protection would be "a joint responsibility of the EU and NATO". The Union would, inter alia, integrate individual Member States, be able to conduct a broad spectrum of military operations, and joint defense would be based on Article 42 of the Treaty on European Union.

The EC emphasizes that these three scenarios are not mutually exclusive. Parallel to the publication of the Communication, Preparatory Action for Defense Research began with the first large-scale EU defense funding program. For the time being, 90 million euros will be spent on the project in 2017–2019.

On June 9 at a conference on European security, J.C. Juncker appealed in Prague for a strong commitment to CSDP cooperation (Defence And Security Conference Prague European Vision. European Responsibility, 2017). He suggested, among other things, to share responsibility and sovereignty. This should be translated as co-responsibility, which does not mean giving up sovereignty.

The EU Common Security and Defense Policy has been operating under the Treaty of Lisbon since December 1, 2009 and many of its provisions and instruments have not been used so far. However, in recent weeks, there have been a number of indications that some Member States will want to revitalize these instruments and use, what the treaty allows and even encourages. One of the most interesting announcements is the fact that the European Commission will become active in this matter. In Poland there are no signals from government, diplomatic and military circles indicating that Poland should take part in the shaping or strengthening of institutions

dealing with external security and in particular the possible defense within the European Union. I want to point out that these are areas of intergovernmental cooperation reserved for the sovereign decision of individual states. Nobody has the right to impose anything on the Member States.

The Polish government will not be required to participate in the reforms of CSDP institutions. The situation in Denmark is known, which in subsequent treaties has written a separatism for this sphere of activity. Some Danish politicians believe that it has weakened and complicated the international position of this state. I will also remind the so-called Irish Protocol attached to the TL, which reserved a number of cases to the competence of the Irish Government. This was due to the failure of the first ratification referendum and the rather intense propaganda of eurosceptics against ratification, also in the context of security and defense. In the case of Poland on the CSDP no revision of treaties or additional protocols is necessary. No one will force us to take military action or crisis response. Approximately a quarter century of treatments for inclusion in the European defense system passes. There has been rather little ambition in this area, although over the last three decades there has been a noticeable interest in European offers for the so-called "Security community".

This year passes a quarter of a century since the publication of official documents declaring the Third Republic's aspirations to include it in European security structures. Integration with Western Europe was seen as a great opportunity, both for further development, guaranteeing independence and security. These were fundamental issues and they still remain. The past twenty-five years have been very successful, many mistakes have been made, but the overall balance remains good. This is a general assessment of the scientific, political and most Polish societies. We participated in the European project for the development of European strategic autonomy, under conditions determined by the constitutional authorities of the Third Republic. Nobody in the European Union did not induce us to do so, nor did we force us to do so. Even the most Eurosceptic experts admitted that in the sphere of security and defense we maintained the full sovereignty.

Recent developments in Brussels and other European capitals have highlighted projects for strengthening cooperation in a number of areas, depending on the interests or capacities of the Member States. Specialized areas are many, but the most important are the euro area, the Schengen area and the EU CSDP. In the perspective of the next few years, Poland is unlike-

ly to accept European currency. In turn, the Schengen area is experiencing a huge crisis due to the migration pressure, and the Polish authorities do not facilitate the overcoming of this crisis by protesting against the reception of refugees. On the other hand, there is a chance to strengthen cooperation in the field of external security, within the framework of the EU CSDP.

In the context of the sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Treaties of Rome celebration, in March 2017 the leaders of France, Germany, Italy and Spain declared their willingness to put in place permanent mechanisms for enhanced structural, security and defense cooperation. These are the four largest EU states (without Great Britain) with the greatest defense potential and can be termed the “strategic four”. So far, London blocked the initiatives of France and Germany to strengthen the EU defense system. After deciding to leave the European Union, Britain lost the opportunity to veto these initiatives. We already see the first results of the new conditions; the launch of the “mini-military command”, the triple increase of the budget of the European Defense Agency and the announcement of the European Commission’s investment in European defense industry, amounting to 100 billion euros. The main investors and beneficiaries will be the states of the mentioned four. It is up to the Polish authorities whether they want to participate in the process of strengthening cooperation in the sphere of security and defense. Not so long ago, it seemed natural to include Poland in this group, and the *Weimar plus* formula would represent about 80% of the EU’s defense potential, and could turn into a real and significant political and military alliance, using the instruments of permanent structured cooperation under the Treaty of Lisbon (Article 42). For the remaining participants of the “strategic five”, Poland could be an attractive partner, because the existing achievements in the ESDP/CSDP missions carried out by the EU are giving a good testimony to the Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland. Also three combat duty missions in the years 2010, 2013 and 2016 have placed Poland among the major military partners. Poland already has its own command, prepared to carry out EU crisis response operations. It operates in Cracow and its first test passed on the occasion of the on-call duty of the Visegrad Group of the EU in the first half of 2016.

Possessing operational and commanding capabilities creates the opportunity for Poland to form a “national combat group”. In 2004, only four Member States declared their willingness to place such units at the disposal of the EU, numbering about 1 500 soldiers. They were: France, Spain, Italy

and the United Kingdom. After leaving the United Kingdom of Great Britain, a Polish combat group can take a seat in the British Army, even in the roster. Forming such an entity would not be too difficult because already three times Poland was a framework state in three GB of EU, providing command and at least 50% of the composition of each of these units. The specialty of "Polish GB EU" should be to protect the eastern flank. This kind of initiative would favor the improvement of relations within the Weimar Triangle and would not jeopardize the Government of the Republic of Poland's potential for limiting sovereignty, which is now a very sensitive issue. The Polish combat group would probably meet the interests of the Scandinavian countries and be able to interact with the "GB GB EU", which is one of the largest and most well-trained and well-equipped combat groups. In addition, in the current decade, within the framework of the "burden-sharing" program, contacts and co-operation have been established in a number of areas conducive to improving the combat capabilities of the European army and gendarmerie. Perhaps because of mutual misunderstanding this co-operation stalled in impasse. But there were periods of tense relations between Warsaw and Brussels, for example in 2003 and 2007. At that time the disputes were overcome.

On 22 – 23 June 2017, the European Council decided to implement the provisions of art. 42 sec. 6, authorizing a group of states to launch permanent mechanisms for enhanced structural, security and defense cooperation (commonly known as PESCO). The Council decided that within three months the parties would negotiate the conditions for the establishment of cooperation mechanisms. Officially, no states have been declared the core of the „avangarde of European defense”, but will probably be created during March summit in Versailles by France, Spain, Germany and Italy. They will join them, probably the Benelux countries: Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg. The question is whether Poland is interested in this cooperation. The first unofficial statement by Prime Minister Beata Szydło, seems to speak for this. „Poland is ready to strengthen European defense policy and to enter into reinforced structural cooperation,” she said at the break of the prime minister's government summit.

Bibliography:

- Albright M.K. *The Right Balance Will Secure NATO's Future*, „Financial Times”, 7.12.1998.
- Biegaj A. *Stanowisko Stanów Zjednoczonych wobec Wspólnej Europejskiej Polityki Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony*, „Sprawy Międzynarodowe” 2001, nr 1, s. 80.
- Biała księga w sprawie przyszłości Europy, *Refleksje i scenariusze dla UE-27 do 2025 r.* Bruksela, dnia 1.3.2017 r. COM(2017).
- Ciupiński A. *Wspólna Polityka Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony Unii Europejskiej*. Gen-eza. Rozwój. Funkcjonowanie. Warszawa 2013.
- Czaputowicz J. *Polityka zagraniczna i dyplomacja Unii Europejskiej a Traktat Konstytucyjny*, Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, „Raporty i Analizy”, Nr 4/2005.
- Defence And Security Conference Prague European Vision. European Responsibility*. Prague, 9 June 2017.
- Gradziuk A. *Stanowisko Wielkiej Brytanii wobec europejskiej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony*, „Biuletyn” PISM 2004, nr 3.
- Jankowski D. *Weimarski trójkąt bezpieczeństwa*, „Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe”, Nr 1/17, 2011, s. 131–138.
- Koncepcja obronności Rzeczypospolitej polskiej*, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, Warszawa, maj 2017r Kupiecki R. (redakcja naukowa) *Strategia bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski. 25 lat*, Warszawa 2015.
- Kupiecki R. *Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP 2014, jako instrument polityki państwa. Uwarunkowania zewnętrzne i aspekty procesowe*, „Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe” 2015/I.
- Kuźniar R. *Polska polityka bezpieczeństwa 1989 – 2000*, Warszawa 2001.
- Kuźniar R. Szczepanik K.(redakcja naukowa), *Polityka zagraniczna RP 1989–2002*, Warszawa 2002.
- List ministrów spraw zagranicznych i obrony Polski, Niemiec i Francji do szefowej unijnej dyplomacji Catherine Ashton ws. polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony UE*, 13 listopada 2010 r. Kancelaria Senatu RP, Sprawozdanie nr 94/2010.
- Parzymies S. *Stan debaty na temat federalnego kształtu Unii Europejskiej*, [w:] *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe. Polska-Europa-Świat*, redakcja naukowa J. Zając, A. Włodkowska-Bagan, M.Kaczmarowski, Warszawa, 2015.
- Parzymies, S. *Stosunki międzynarodowe w Europie 1945 – 2009*. Warszawa 2009.

- Posel-Częścik E. *Powstanie Grupy Pięciu. Implikacje dla Polski*, BIULETYN PISM nr 75 (179), 21 listopada 2003 r.
- Paruch W. *Dwie koncepcje bezpieczeństwa – neorealistyczne refleksje o narodowych strategiach bezpieczeństwa państwa (2007 i 2014)* [w:] *Bezpieczeństwo Europy – bezpieczeństwo Polski*, t.1, red. Naukowa: E.Maj, W. Sokół, K. Mazurek, A. Szwed-Walczak, Wyd. UMCS, Lublin 2016 s.335 – 362
- Szpak K. *Priorytety polskiej Prezydencji* [w:] „Monitor polskiej Prezydencji 2011”. Kraków 2011
- Zięba R. *Główne kierunki polityki zagranicznej Polski po zimnej wojnie*, Warszawa 2010
- Zięba R. *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego. Koncepcje – struktury – funkcjonowanie*. Warszawa 2001
- Zięba R. *Unia Europejska jako aktor stosunków międzynarodowych*, Warszawa 2003.

AGNIESZKA PAWLAK

M.A., University of Warsaw, Poland

The effectiveness of the concept of the Polish foreign policy in 1989-2017

1989 turned out to be a watershed year in the history of post-war Poland. Polish Round Table Talks resulted in the adoption of a program of systemic changes and brought about new challenges for the Polish state to tackle on its way towards democratic reform. Aware of the dynamics of the changes taking place in the early 1990s in Europe (including the end of the cold war and collapse of the USSR), Polish decision-makers took advantage of regained sovereignty when developing Poland's foreign policy. The strategic goals of Poland's foreign policy were subsequently defined. Membership of the North Atlantic Alliance and European Union were among key priorities. Implementation of the concept of 'The Return to Europe' was possible due to the consensus on the Polish political scene before 2004. This cross-party consensus ended together with the fading importance of this foreign policy priority and the emergence of radical groups in the Polish parliament. Since 2005, the focus of the Polish foreign policy has been on its fundamentals i.e. its basic assumptions and goals. The aim of this article is to analyse the effectiveness of Polish foreign policy concept from the start of the systemic transformation. The implementation of the goals of foreign policy by the Republic of Poland from 1989–2017 will be analysed in detail.

Key words: Polish foreign policy, the concept of the Polish foreign policy, rationality of the concept of Poland's foreign policy, the effectiveness of Polish foreign policy.

Tentative assessment of the fulfilment of the assumptions of Polish foreign policy from 1989-2004

The systemic transformation which started in Poland in 1989 contributed to the introduction of fundamental changes in Poland's foreign policy. In this period, Poland regained full sovereignty and was presented with a chance to reform its foreign policy. Earlier, for four decades, Polish foreign policy was not independent in the least. The voice of Warsaw, fully dependent on Moscow, was insignificant in the international arena. All attempts to introduce independent ideas such as Adam Rapacki's plan could not alter the general nature of foreign policy of the Polish People's Republic (Geremek 2004, 14-15).

The end of Poland's subordination as a result of changes enabled the reshaping of Polish foreign policy. The government of Tadeusz Mazowiecki formed in the autumn of 1989 marked a departure from past ways of defining the state's activity in the international arena. The Polish foreign policy which was no longer influenced by the USSR could finally fulfil the authentic interests of the Polish state (Podgórzńska 2006, 15).

Polish foreign policy faced a new international reality as well as serious tasks at the start of 1990. New international conditions had to be taken into account. The collapse of the Soviet Union, the end of communism in Eastern Europe and the dissolution of Czechoslovakia were some of the factors which affected the nature of Polish foreign policy (Kuźniar 2002, 51-52). After the lapse of many years, Poland ceased to be a Soviet satellite state whose activities in the international arena were dependent on its role within the communist bloc. Despite Poland's membership in the Warsaw Pact and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance until mid-1991, Polish political decision-makers tried to bolster Poland's independence in the sphere of foreign policy (Kuźniar 1994, 17).

In order to meaningfully assess the effectiveness of the concept of the Polish foreign policy from 1989-2004, one should start by taking a closer look at a catalogue of key objectives of our state's activity in the international arena. This is quite an easy task since there was a general consensus between all political factions regarding key objectives of Polish foreign policy in the new international reality in the period under discussion.

From 1989-1992, a period of extremely important efforts in the area of foreign policy of a reborn state, Poland's major priorities were delineated (Skubiszewski 1994, 21). One of them focused on the West and Euro-At-

lantic structures in particular (Zięba 2013, 27). The analysis of parliamentary speeches by prime ministers and ministers of foreign affairs post-1989 reveals that the overarching, primary and vital objective of Polish foreign policy in the new international reality was to ensure the security of the Polish state which was to be achieved due to membership in the European structures. According to political elites, integration with the West was desirable for Poland which had been seeking a security guarantee since the early 1990s. This ultimately became possible thanks to the ultimate liquidation of the Warsaw Pact in July 1991, amongst other things.

Poland left the Warsaw Pact although it was not yet clear at the time whether accession to the North Atlantic Alliance would be possible. NATO was suffering an identity crisis at the time. Debates were under way over whether NATO was still necessary in the aftermath of the collapse of its main enemy – the USSR (Zięba 2013, 27). In order to avoid occupying a ‘grey zone’ in terms of security in Central Europe against the backdrop of possible threats, Poland opted for participation in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in line with the tendencies exhibited by Western states (Zięba 2010, 80).

By engaging in the CSCE process, major Polish decision-makers showed a great deal of realism and pragmatism in foreign policy. Under the new conditions, including the end of the bipolar system, the CSCE served as a protective umbrella for Poland (Ćwięk 2011, 267). It played a vital role since global security was still uncertain. Events such as the ethnic conflicts in the states of former Yugoslavia and the former USSR raised concerns that a similar threat could also surface in Poland (Zięba 2001, 365). Although Warsaw faced no ethnic problems, the instability of the post-Soviet space was a natural threat.

Involvement in the CSCE process in the early 1990s showed wisdom of Polish policy-makers. Active participation in the CSCE brought Poland closer to the Western world and the fulfilment of its fundamental goal of becoming a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Seeking security guarantees within the framework of the CSCE was important not only for protection against possible threats and the so-called ‘grey zone’. The CSCE was Poland’s only link to the West in security terms at the time (Nowakowski&Protasowicki&Rajchel&Szafran, 2012, 19).

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was an important stepping stone on the way towards NATO membership. The Atlantic di-

mension was a key priority in Polish foreign policy, which had been stressed in an increasingly decisive way since 1992 when the Warsaw Pact and the USSR ceased to exist. Poland's NATO accession became a strategic goal of Polish foreign policy and was cited in documents signed by subsequent governments of the Republic of Poland. The North Atlantic Alliance as the key organization to ensure security in Poland became an obvious choice in the early 1990s (Zajac, 2014, 192). NATO was then, and still is, the strongest institution to guarantee security in the world. From the Polish perspective, it was even more important that the United States played a key role in this organisation. The US was perceived as the only winner of the cold war and a hegemon whose position remained unchallenged (Zajac, 2014, 192).

The overarching objective of foreign policy of the Third Polish Republic was membership of the European Union, in line with the concept of 'The Return to Europe'. Poland's accession to the EU as a goal of Polish foreign policy was vital for several reasons. To begin with, Polish civilizational choice had to be reinforced (Kuźniar, 2012, 65). By seeking membership in the EU, Poland sought to emphasize its belonging to the Western world as well as its integration with well-developed Western democracies (Zyblikiewicz, 2009, 14). Secondly, EU accession was meant to consolidate the most recent systemic transformation (Kuźniar, 2012, 65). Thirdly, the desire to join the EU was associated with its growing importance, including its ambition to create a 'European defence' in the 1990s (Kuźniar 2012, 65).

Post-1989 Polish policy also focused on sub-regional cooperation. The collapse of the communist bloc provided an opportunity to develop and strengthen relationships with Central European countries. Similarly to Poland, these states wanted to avoid allowing a security vacuum to form in this part of the continent and to attract the West's attention (Łoś-Nowak, 2011, 274–275). Poland's cooperation with the Visegrad Group and Central European Initiative reflected political realism. Polish policy-makers were aware that cooperation with Central European states within the framework of sub-regional groups would become a significant element of Polish efforts aimed at paving the way for EU membership and for Euro-Atlantic structures.

The strategic goal of the foreign policy of the Third Polish Republic was closer relations with the United States. The end of the cold war and collapse of the bipolar system made it possible to revive relations with the US. Polish political elites did realise the importance of foreign policy for our state.

Close ties with the Western super-power were sought by Poland in a bid to ensure its security as part of the North Atlantic Alliance. Since NATO accession was dependent on the decision of the United States which played a key part in it, the priority of Polish-American relations was an exemplification of political realism of subsequent Polish elites of the Third Polish Republic (Zięba, 2013, 108).

The catalogue of post-1989 priorities in Polish foreign policy included friendly neighbourly relations. It is noteworthy that from 1989–1993 all of Poland's neighbours changed. As many as seven new neighbours (Russia, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Germany) succeeded three former neighbouring states (the USSR, East Germany and Czechoslovakia).

Poland's foreign policy priorities were clearly defined and remained unchanged until 2004. Every political faction which came to power continued the policy of Poland's 'Return to Europe', initiated by Krzysztof Skubiszewski in the 1990s. The analysis below will focus not only on the major successes of Polish foreign policy from 1989–2004 as the author will also look at failures that affected the effectiveness of Polish policy abroad.

Poland did not belong to any 'hard' security system in the aftermath of the collapse of the bipolar system. Its geopolitical location meant that the Polish state was situated in between NATO and the USSR (later on Russia). This situation which was prone to the emergence of a security vacuum in the Central European region forced Polish elites to undertake actions to prevent that. The political elites of the Republic of Poland acted in a very considered and reasonable way in the sphere of security policy, the most sensitive issue in foreign policy. Pragmatic efforts were undertaken with full awareness of the existing conditions so as to avoid any radicalisation. The collapse of the communist bloc exposed Poland to various threats which did not make this task easy as the Western states were initially very cautious as regards cooperation in the area of security (Kuźniar 1991, 13–14). Moreover, the dynamics, scope and speed of changes that occurred in Europe created an additional problem. However, orderly and consistent efforts were initiated in order to implement the plan of Poland's 'Return to Europe' against the backdrop of an opportunity to cease being an object of another state's expansion (Kuźniar, 2001, 65). The assumptions behind the plan, namely NATO and the EC (later on the EU) membership, were fulfilled. On March 12, 1999, Poland became a NATO member, following years full of common efforts and

concerns of subsequent political camps in power. This was the most notable success of Polish diplomacy since Poland broke free from Moscow's dictatorship, made possible thanks to the political consensus concerning all political options, arrived at by all those in power in Poland during that period. It was not easy, as evidenced by the fact that power changed hands four times in Poland between 1990–1992. The selection of the North Atlantic Alliance as a guarantor of Poland's security proved to be the right choice.

Another spectacular foreign policy success was Poland's accession to the European Union of May 1, 2004. The achievement of this goal completed the plan of Poland's 'Return to Europe' announced by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, which consolidated Poland's return to the Western world. The approach towards the implementation of this goal was not shaken by numerous barriers which had to be overcome on the way to EU accession. Integration with the European Union was seen as the main foreign policy priority by all political camps in power in Poland prior to 2004. EU membership meant a civilizational choice for Poland and its close ties with the Western democratic states. Polish decision-makers made full use of the opportunities to join the European system. They carried out a professional policy in line with the changes in Europe and global changes (Łoś-Nowak 2011, 268). They decided to pursue the goal of European integration despite the fact that they realised that EU accession brought challenges as well as opportunities. Thanks to the efforts of Polish diplomacy, EU membership finally put an end to divides in Europe and changed the way Poland was perceived by other European states (Parzymies, 2002, 80).

Polish activities as part of sub-regional cooperation can be regarded a success at least in the first half of the period under discussion. In the 1990s, Polish decision-makers demonstrated political realism and contributed to the development of relations with Central European states. The collapse of the bipolar system meant that Poland became part of a new sub-region. 'New regionalism' filled the vacuum in political and economic relations after the demise of the Warsaw Pact and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Zięba, 1992, 25). New regional alliances emerged. The main driving force behind them was the desire to put an end to divides in Europe (Szczepaniak, 1999, 230). In practice, for example, members of the Visegrad Group worked together in the 1990s to unite the Western structures. Despite existing theses that sub-regional cooperation resulted from 'the inefficiency of efforts of individual countries to join the European Community' (Orzelska, 2010,

476), it was a great asset in terms of Polish foreign policy. Polish diplomats did realise that cooperation with the countries of the region would facilitate efforts on the path towards both NATO and EU membership. After all, the West also encouraged such cooperation. However, one should underline that it largely fulfilled instrumental functions in Polish foreign policy on the way towards implementation of the key goals such as EU and NATO accession.

Membership of the North Atlantic Alliance had been associated with the importance of relations with the United States in foreign policy of the Third Polish Republic prior to March 12, 1999. A long-term goal agreed upon by all politicians regardless of their political affiliations was to treat relations with the US as a priority. The strategic nature of this goal is fully understandable given the importance of prospective NATO accession. It would seem that the change of status of the candidate state which later become a full NATO member would bring rationality to Poland's policy towards the US. Meanwhile, pro-American tendencies only became more apparent. They generated a bandwagon effect over time (Zajac, 2009, 178). Polish politicians showed no pragmatism in the aftermath of NATO accession. They were prepared to support American policy unconditionally (intervention in Iraq) even at the expense of good relations with partners from the European Union with whom Poland shared common interests. The asymmetry between the two states was an additional problem. The United States had never perceived Poland as an exceptional partner. Warsaw was ranked as a partner of average importance despite its strong aspirations to become a key partner akin to Israel or the UK (Bieleń, 2007, 25).

Partner relations with Germany could be regarded as a success in the foreign policy of the Third Polish Republic in terms of its pro-Western dimension. Polish diplomacy succeeded in reconciling with Germany as part of its policy of 'openness towards the West'. Thus, a treaty regulating bilateral relations was signed on June 17, 1991. Despite the difficult history in relations between Poland and Germany, political elites of our state managed to overcome contradictions and to shape common interests and values along with Germany (Raabe, 2010, 12).

Eastern policy became another key area of the concept of foreign policy of the Third Polish republic. Relations with Eastern European neighbours were not key objectives of the international activity of our state in practice, although they were defined as such in post-1989 foreign policy in theory. After all, the main efforts of Polish diplomacy focused on the idea of Po-

land's 'Return to Europe' and integration with the West. Every post-1989 power elite regarded Eastern policy as secondary which, in a sense, resulted in numerous failures in its implementation.

The UBL concept (the 'Giedroyc doctrine') turned out to be unsuccessful. In the light of this concept, Ukraine, Belarus and Lithuania were to be treated as a single entity. The idea of Poland becoming a liaison between Western Europe and Russia also failed (Kuźniar, 2009, 180–181). In the case of the former concept, Poland failed to understand differences in the stages of development and problems typical of our neighbours. In the latter case, Poland failed to understand that neither Russia nor Western Europe needed intermediaries in order to conduct dialogue.

The assumption that 'what is bad for Russia, is good for Poland' was typical in Polish Eastern policy at the time (Kuźniar, 2009, 183). However, one must bear in mind that not all ideas detrimental to Russian interests were beneficial to Poland. It would have been better to define common interests and pursue mutually beneficial goals instead of promoting ideas which were damaging to one of the parties. Poland perceived Russia as its main adversary from the moment it broke away from Moscow's patronage which led to a crisis in mutual relations in the 1990s.

Bilateral treaties on mutual relations with all Poland's neighbours should be regarded as major successes of Polish Eastern policy during post-systemic transformation. Not only did these treaties confirm the inviolability of the borders, they also laid down foundations for future relations (Czarnocki, Kondrakiewicz, 2007, 625). The process of concluding the treaties followed the so-called double-track policy developed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Apart from the focus on Euro-Atlantic integration, Polish policy-makers did not postpone the decision on the conclusion of these treaties. Poland negotiated and signed treaties on good neighbourly relations without waiting for the reaction of the Western states. Although the 'double-track policy' has been criticised by many authors mainly because of its excessive cautiousness and defensiveness, the extraordinary determination of the then incumbent Polish authorities should be underlined. Despite an uneasy situation, Polish decision-makers managed to regulate relations with new neighbours based on bilateral treaties (Orłowski, 2004, 12–14).

Tentative assessment of the fulfilment of the assumptions of Polish foreign policy 2004–2017

Poland's EU accession of May 1, 2004, was the final leg of the journey towards the fulfilment of priorities of Polish foreign policy, defined at the beginning of systemic transformation. The accomplishment of the idea of 'The Return to Europe' constituted an historical landmark for Poland. All major political parties joined efforts over 15 years to implement this idea which contributed to the effectiveness of Polish foreign policy. However, later on, cross-party agreements were undermined and consensus in the area of foreign policy came to an end after past assumptions were met.

The parliamentary election held in the autumn of 2005 in Poland was accompanied by a debate on the future of foreign policy of our state. Since then, disputes about key priorities and strategic goals in foreign policy have dominated Polish political discourse. The end of the consensus in this area was caused not only by the implementation of the goals set at the beginning of the transformation. The access of radical parties to the political arena in the country was a significant reason underlying the departure from the consensus (Kaczyński, 2008, 8). Self-Defence of the Republic of Poland (*Samoobrona RP*) and the League of Polish Families (*Liga Polskich Rodzin – LPR*) gained support due to the undermining of all contemporary achievements in Polish foreign policy. While in the parliament, these parties contested all aspects of Polish aspirations concerning EU membership. They also criticised Poland's accession to NATO (Chojan, 2015, 170).

The concept of Polish foreign policy underwent a full revision after the right-wing party Law and Justice (*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość – PiS*) came to power in 2005, forming a coalition along with two populist parties: Self-Defence of the Republic of Poland and the League of Polish Families. The rhetoric of PiS focused on a complete departure from what had been going on from 1989–2004. Poland's foreign policy in that period was criticised and radical changes were announced. A new approach to foreign policy of our state was introduced, putting an end to previous activities regarded as unfavourable for Poland by PiS.

The government formed by the Law and Justice party declared 'the defence of national interests' as the fundamental goal of its foreign policy (Kaczyński, 2008, 12). A national, sovereign, strong and safe Poland was

defined as the main priority by this party (Kaczyński, 2008, 12). However, contrary to expectations, the policy implemented by PiS did not enhance Poland's reputation or gravitas in the international arena. This party's activities mainly oscillated around Euro scepticism, nationalistic policy, bandwagoning in relations with the United States and anti-Russian sentiments in Eastern policy.

The policy of the government run by PiS did not favour further integration with the EU (Zięba&Pawłuszko, 2016, 5). Criticism of the European Union was largely associated with the fear of losing Polish sovereignty and failing to fulfil Polish national interests at the expense of stronger member states. This approach resulted in the fact that Poland's further European integration in the years under the rule of PiS was hampered (Zięba, 2010, 66–67).

We could be searching in vain for significant successes in Eastern policy of this government too. The activities of this party mainly focused on undermining Russia's imperial ambitions which even resulted in the freezing of Polish-Russian relations (Zięba, 2010, 65). Moreover, Poland was labelled a 'Russo phobic' state in the days of PiS while historical policy was one of the fundamentals of the rhetoric of the politicians from this party. In terms of Polish foreign policy, steps were taken to deprive Russia of geopolitical benefits stemming from its once dominant position (Chojan, 2016, 304).

On the other hand, Law and Justice employed a strategy of bandwagoning in relations with the United States. Instead of using the opportunity stemming from the accession to the European Union (by shifting the vector towards closer ties with EU member states), Poland was labelled 'the US Trojan horse of Europe' (Zięba, 2013, 118). This was due not only to the unconditional support for activities of the American partner in the international arena but also constant 'begging' for a US military presence in Poland.

The coalition of Civic Platform (*Platforma Obywatelska* – PO) and the Polish People's Party (*Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe* – PSL) which came to power following the 2007 parliamentary election had a different concept of foreign policy. Unlike their predecessors, this coalition adopted a pro-European and pro-Atlantic approach as well as a pragmatic Eastern policy (Zięba, 2013, 30).

Civic Platform's concept of foreign policy was far more pragmatic than that implemented by the politicians of the Law and Justice party. Sober realism was particularly apparent in their attitude towards the European Union. PO politicians realized that effective membership in EU structures could generate benefits rather than threats. Therefore, European policy

was the main foreign policy vector of the PO-PSL coalition. References to national interests, employed excessively by PiS, were replaced by defining common opportunities and threats, common interests and benefits. Under the rule of PO, Poland acted in favour of enhanced European integration and was especially active in the second half of 2011 when it held presidency in the Council of the European Union (Bajczuk, 2011, 3–5). Not only did it enhance the prestige of the Polish state in the international arena but also contributed to the perception of Poland as a pragmatic participant of European integration by other actors (Zięba, 2011b, 76).

In cooperation with the Polish People's Party, Civic Platform conducted rationalisation of foreign policy towards the United States i.e. a more pragmatic emphasis was placed on relations within the European Union. Donald Tusk's government abandoned the wishful thinking of its predecessors and started to pursue Poland's true interests. This was evidenced, for example, in the decision made in October 2008 to discontinue participation in the war in Iraq and withdraw Polish troops from the country (Kuźniar, 2012, 367).

The PO-PSL coalition also proposed a new approach in terms of Eastern policy. What was new, compared to the policy implemented by PiS, was the departure from hard demands, sharp polemics and attempts to cause damage to Russian interests whenever possible (Zięba, 2011c, 38). The new policy was much more pragmatic. Therefore, Polish-Russian relations could finally be normalised. The policy of spreading democratic reforms on the territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was still negatively perceived by the Russian Federation (Stolarczyk, 2016, 265). In practice, declarations about playing the role of 'the exporter of democracy' led to a weakening of the imperial ambitions of the Russian state. Poland's lobbying for the adoption of the NATO Membership Action Plan with Georgia and Ukraine during the 2008 Bucharest Summit and participation in Eastern Partnership programs were perceived as anti-Russian initiatives which had a detrimental effect on Polish-Russian relations.

Rationality of the concept of Poland's foreign policy

A concept of foreign policy defined by Ryszard Zięba as 'a certain thought-over, imagined state of affairs which should be realised, according to its authors' plans' is a set of programs developed by the government and other authorised bodies (Zięba, 2013, 25). The concept is not fully disclosed to the

public although it takes into account the values and interests of the nation. What is made public is only the doctrine of foreign policy which contains a system of prioritised objectives (Zięba, 2007, 27).

All major political forces acted in unison in terms of Polish foreign policy prior to Poland's EU accession on May 1, 2004. One could speak of a single policy regarding our state's activity in the international arena during the period. That concept was implemented by all subsequent governments. However, this continuity was disrupted after the completion of strategic goals (memberships in the North Atlantic Alliance and European Union). Since 2005, parties having divergent views of foreign policy had started competing on the Polish political scene. Thus, the fundamentals i.e. goals, priorities and dimensions of Polish foreign policy were being contested (Zięba, 2011a, 20–21).

The lack of a comprehensive document which would describe Polish foreign policy in an exhaustive way is also a problem. Currently, no document describes the aims of Polish foreign policy for a period of longer than a year. Truth be told, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland developed 'Priorities of Polish foreign policy 2012–2016' in 2012. However, this was only a superficial document which did not resemble a strategy (Zięba, 2013, 31).

The existence of a written concept of foreign policy is extremely important for every state. It covers long-term priorities. Hence, any shifts in power prompt no shocks nor revolutionary changes. Perhaps the lack of such a written document represents a shortfall in Polish foreign policy. The development of a detailed action plan would undoubtedly make a consensus in Polish foreign policy more attainable.

Conclusions

To conclude, the post-2005 political scene was divided into two major post-Solidarity camps. The former was built around the Law and Justice party and implemented foreign policy in opposition to the discredited approach of the previous government. The latter was built around the coalition between Civic Platform and the Polish People's Party and opted for a continuity of Polish foreign policy despite some changes (Kaczyński, 2008, 15).

So-called 'assertive' foreign policy under the rule of PiS which was supposed to fulfil national interests was ineffective. Not only did the government

fail to enhance Poland's gravitas in the international arena and implement set goals, but new problems also emerged. Earlier conflicts (such as the ones with Russia) aggravated and fresh conflicts (such as the ones with EU institutions) sparked (Bieńczyk-Missala, 103–107). Zbigniew Brzeziński's assessment of the activities of the right-wing option is noteworthy. According to him, this policy brought about Poland's self-isolation in the international space.

The latter political camp under discussion i.e. the one built around the coalition between Civic Platform and the Polish People's Party developed a more pragmatic approach. This government succeeded in normalising relations with the European Union and rationalising relations with the United States. However, the concept of Eastern policy raises certain concerns. Despite initial signs of a 'reset' in relations with the Russian Federation, no significant progress was made. The investigation into the Smolensk plane crash was a problem which could not be overcome. Another problem which did not facilitate a reconciliation emerged on the way towards closer Polish-Russian relations. The Smolensk tragedy had replaced the Katyn massacre as one of Poland's most tragic historical events. In addition, politicians from the PO-PSL coalition failed to fulfil an ambitious role of the EU exporter of democratic values to the territory of the CIS.

Although both governments assumed that they would manage to fulfil their assumptions, none of them fully succeeded. In addition, Polish foreign policy was disrupted. This policy became the subject of a political game in the aftermath of 15 years of general consensus. Although differences in opinion did occur between frequently changing power elites from 1989–2004 (e.g. on the issue of negotiations with the EU), this consensus which brought Poland closer to the tendencies outlined by the Western states was of utmost importance. Fundamental goals set out at the beginning of the transformation remained unchanged which certainly contributed to the image of Poland as a credible state that was determined to achieve its goals in a considered manner.

From today's perspective, the return to the consensus seems difficult if not impossible to achieve mainly because of the lack of a well-defined priority which all political parties could aspire to. Besides, Poland's EU membership is so advanced that reaching agreements in every aspect is wishful thinking. Possible consensus around Polish-Russian relations also seems unrealistic. The nationalistic right-wing policy overwhelmed with history used to shape current relations is an obstacle to it.

Bibliography

- Bajczuk, R. (2011). Poland – a rising engine of European integration. Polish foreign policy and the EU membership. *Working Paper*, No 04, pp. 3–18.
- Bieleń, S. (2007). Pozycja geopolityczna Polski. In: S. Bieleń (Ed.), *Polska w stosunkach międzynarodowych* (pp. 15–32). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza ASPRA-JR.
- Bieńczyk-Missala, A., Poland's foreign policy: main directions, *Revista UNISCI / UNISCI Journal*, No. 40, pp. 101–117.
- Chojan, A. (2015). Sytuacja międzynarodowa Polski oraz jej polityka zagraniczna w latach 2002–2005. *Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna*, No. 2, pp. 168–197.
- Chojan, A. (2016). Polityka wschodnia Polski w myśli politycznej partii Prawo i Sprawiedliwość (lata 2005–2007). In B. Józwiak & T. Stępniewski (Eds.), *Transformacja, integracja i kryzysy w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej* (pp. 168–197), No 5. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Czarnocki, A. & Kondrakiewicz D. (2007). Uwarunkowania, koncepcje i realizacja polityki zagranicznej Polski. In: M. Pietraś (Eds.), *Międzynarodowe stosunki polityczne* (pp. 601–627). Lublin: Uniwersytet Marii Skłodowskiej-Curie.
- Ćwięk, H. (2011). Bezpieczeństwo w polskiej polityce zagranicznej po 1989 roku. In A. Jarosz & K. Olszewski (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna III RP. 20 lat po przełomie. Koncepcje, bezpieczeństwo, kwestie prawne i polonijne* (pp. 265–276). Toruń: Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Geremek, B. (2004). O polskiej polityce zagranicznej po 1989 roku. *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 13–30.
- Kaczyński, M. P. (2008). Polska polityka zagraniczna w latach 2005–2007: co po konsensusie?, Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.
- Kuźniar, R. (1991). Nowa polska polityka zagraniczna. *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, No. 10, pp. 7–16.
- Kuźniar, R. (1994). Polityka zagraniczna RP-próba oceny, *Rocznik Polskiej Polityki Zagranicznej*, pp. 9–20.
- Kuźniar, R. (2001). Polityka bezpieczeństwa w polskiej polityce zagranicznej. In: R. Kuźniar (Ed.), *Polska polityka bezpieczeństwa 1989–2000* (pp. 45–126), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Kuźniar, R. (2002). Ewolucja międzynarodowych uwarunkowań polskiej polityki zagranicznej po 1989 roku. In: R. Kuźniar & K. Szczepan-

- ik (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna RP 1989–2002* (pp. 50–66). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo AKSON.
- Kuźniar, R. (2009). Polityka wschodnia III RP – sukcesy pragmatyzmu, porażki prometeizmu. In A. Gil & T. Kapuśniak (Eds.), *Polityka wschodnia Polski. Uwarunkowania, koncepcje, realizacja* (pp. 179–186). Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Kuźniar, R. (2012). *Polityka zagraniczna III Rzeczypospolitej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Łoś-Nowak, T. (2011). Polska – cele, aspiracje, kierunki. In: T. Łoś-Nowak (Ed.), *Polityka zagraniczna. Aktorzy-potencjały-startegie* (pp. 261–287). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Poltext.
- Nowakowski, Z. & Protasowicki I. & Rajchel J. & Szafran H (2012). *Rola premierów RP w polityce bezpieczeństwa po 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Naukowe Powszechne.
- Orłowski, T. (2004). Polska myśl polityczna i polityka lat 1989–1993 wobec wschodnich sąsiadów, *Rocznik Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*, No. 2, pp. 10–15.
- Orzelska, A. (2010). Współpraca regionalna w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej (1990–2000). In W. Materski & R. Żelichowski (Eds.), *Polska transformacja. Spojrzenie po dwudziestu latach* (pp. 473–490). Warszawa: Instytut Studiów Politycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Parzymies, S. (2002). Integracja europejska w polityce zagranicznej III RP. In R. Kuźniar & K. Szczepaniak (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna RP 1989–2002* (pp. 67–98). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa AKSON.
- Podgórzeńska, R. (2006). Priorytety polskiej polityki zagranicznej w pracach rządów po 1989 roku. In R. Podgórzeńska & Ł. Tomczak (Eds.), *Wybrane zagadnienia polityki zagranicznej Polski po 1989 roku* (pp. 15–34). Szczecin: Uniwersytet Szczeciński.
- Raabe, S. (2010). Polska – sąsiad, partner, przyjaciel na wschodzie. Zmienne losy stosunków polsko-niemieckich po 1989 roku, *Raporty Fundacji Konrada Adenauera*, No. 17, pp. 1–40.
- Skubiszewski, K. (1994). Perspektywy polityki zagranicznej RP w Europie, *Rocznik Polskiej Polityki Zagranicznej*, pp. 21–30.
- Stolarczyk, M. (2016). *Rosja w polityce zagranicznej Polski w latach 1992–2015*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Szczepaniak, M. (1999). Aktywność Polski w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej. In A. Żukowski (Ed.), *Polska polityka zagraniczna w procesie przemian po*

- 1989 roku (pp. 230–242). Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego.
- Zajac, J. (2009). Bandwagoning w polskiej polityce zagranicznej. *Przegląd Zachodni*, No. 3, pp. 168–178.
- Zajac, J. (2014). NATO w polityce bezpieczeństwa Polski. In K. Czornik & M. Lakomy (Eds.), *Dylematy polityki bezpieczeństwa Polski na początku drugiej dekady XXI wieku* (pp. 191–204). Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Zięba R. (2010). *Główne kierunki polityki zagranicznej Polski po zimnej wojnie*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Zięba, R. (1992). „Nowy regionalizm” w Europie a Polska. *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, No. 1–2, pp. 25–44.
- Zięba, R. (2001). KBWE/OBWE w polskiej polityce bezpieczeństwa. In R. Kuźniar (Ed.), *Polska polityka bezpieczeństwa 1989–2000* (pp. 363–388). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Zięba, R. (2007). Uwarunkowania polityki zagranicznej państwa. In R. Zięba (Ed.), *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa* (pp. 17–35). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Zięba, R. (2010). Poszukiwanie międzynarodowej roli dla Polski – konceptualizacja roli państwa „średniej rangi”. In S. Bieleń (Ed.), *Polityka zagraniczna Polski po wstąpieniu do NATO i do Unii Europejskiej. Problemy tożsamości i adaptacji* (pp. 52–70). Warszawa – Wydawnictwo Difin.
- Zięba, R. (2011a) Uwarunkowania polityki zagranicznej Polski na początku drugiej dekady XXI wieku. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, Vol. 43, No. 1–2, pp. 9–37.
- Zięba, R. (2011b). The search for an international role for Poland: conceptualizing the role of a „middle-ranking state”. In S. Bieleń (Ed.), *Poland's foreign policy in the 21st century* (pp. 61–79). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Difin.
- Zięba, R. (2011c). Współczesne stosunki polsko-rosyjskie: uwarunkowania, problemy, implikacje. *Przegląd Politologiczny*, No. 3, pp. 35–61.
- Zięba, R. (2013). *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w strefie euroatlantyckiej*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Zięba, R., Pawłuszko T. (2016). Wstęp. In R. Zięba, T. Pawłuszko (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna w zmieniającym się łańdźie międzynarodowym: wybrane problemy* (pp. 5–12). Kielce: Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego.
- Zybkiewicz, W. L. (2009). Reorientacja polityki zagranicznej Polski w latach 1989–2008. In: J. J. Piątek & R. Podgórskańska (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna. Decyzje, procedury, instytucje* (pp. 9–29). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

KAROLINA KORSKA*M.A., University of Warsaw, Poland*

Poland's eastern policy - failure or success?

Full membership of the North Atlantic Alliance in 1999 and accession to the European Union in 2004 marked the completion of the first stage of what is called 'The Return to Europe' according to literature on the subject and as anticipated by the Polish political class. The goals were achieved due to cooperation and the perseverance of all Polish political factions which perceived integration with the West as the best opportunity for Poland's development and the strengthening of its position in the international arena. Judging by the actions of policy-makers in those days, many scholars rightly pointed out that joining the West should not and cannot imply turning away from the East. Indeed, Western European countries expected Poland to bridge the gap in their relations with former Soviet republics whereas Poland itself declared that it would assume the role of liaison in this unstable region full of uncertainties (Zięba, 2011, 10). Successes and failures throughout the integration process with the West are more comprehensible to researchers and political scientists than analysis of the Eastern dimension of Polish policy. According to the author, the Eastern dimension of Polish foreign policy is worthy of in-depth analysis. Thus, this article focuses on analysis of successes and failures in Eastern policy as well as unresolved issues which give rise to disputes that continue to hamper bilateral relations to this day.

Key words: Polish Eastern policy, Polish Foreign policy, Eastern European neighbours, bilateral relations, Eastern European region, failures in Eastern dimension, successes in Eastern dimension

Introduction

A plethora of views on Poland's Eastern policy are postulated in the political-scientific debate. However, one can systematise these views and outline two major approaches which are most commonly encountered in literature on the subject. One of the approaches can be defined as a romantic one which calls for the promotion of democracy, rule of law and the protection of human rights in former Soviet republics. This should be done in the name of solidarity with the countries Poland shares a common legacy with as well as for strategic purposes. In other words, the latter presupposes prevention of the development of revisionist sentiments as well as attempts by the Russian Federation to reinstate its superpower status (Szczepanik, 2011, 46). Some scholars believe that such an approach can be referred to as a 'mission'. Adherents to the alternative, so-called minimalistic vision, assume that neither the Western European system, nor values and ideas will become entrenched in the states of the former Soviet bloc whereas Polish activity in this region may bring about opposing results by eliciting Russia's elevated activity (Szczepanik, 2011, 46).

The doctrine of Giedroyc, a Polish politician and journalist associated with *Kultura* monthly has been the pillar of foreign policy in relations with Eastern European neighbours since the watershed in 1989 (Zajac, 2016, 48). In his opinion, Poland should not exhibit revisionist tendencies towards Ukraine, Lithuania nor Belarus (hence the doctrine is interchangeably referred to as the 'ULB doctrine') and should support the sovereignty of these states and encourage their integration with the West, in line with the political vision of Josef Pilsudski in relation to the ULB triangle, as cited by many researchers (Najder, 2013, 8). One can therefore tentatively assert that this concept is related to the romantic approach to Eastern Europe as described above. Nevertheless, it should be added that Polish politicians, unable to banish the anti-Russian sentiments, 'enriched' the concept with stereotypes and prejudices. Obviously, the scale of extreme emotions stemming from Polish-Russian relations as well as the importance of relations with individual Eastern European countries has differed depending on which coalition was in power in Poland post 1989. Politicians refuted the validity of the division of Polish foreign policy into Eastern and Western policies since they both make up foreign policy. This approach was expressed by Władysław Bartoszewski for the first time in May 1995 (Fedorowicz, 2011,

67). According to researchers, this was caused by a lack of comprehensive policy towards the region as a whole since the countries faced a number of political, economic and social problems, prompting both a differentiated approach and political actions on the part of Poland. In general, scholars claim that Poland's Eastern Policy after 1989 was determined by: Polish domestic conditions, changes in the post-Soviet area and the evolution of politics in the United States and Western European countries towards this area after the collapsing of the USSR (Stolarczyk, 2016, 8). Moreover, it should be noted that Polish relations with Eastern European Countries are largely determined by the relations with Russian Federation.

Successes of Poland's eastern policy

When analysing the successes of the Polish Eastern policy, one cannot overlook the importance of bilateral relations with individual neighbours, based on treaties which regulate interstate relations. The establishment of good relations was not in the least obvious, especially in the area of diplomacy, mainly because of high instability of the Eastern European region and a number of problems stemming from the collapse of the Soviet Union. The perseverance of the ruling elite was necessary since the international community had grown weary of the East and feared unfavourable developments. According to many authors, Western European countries and the United States were not well prepared for the emergence of new entities in the international system. Hostile attitudes were sometimes exhibited towards them (Jędraszczyk, 2010, 111). Although it would be unfair to state that Poland subordinated its political decisions to the stance of the Western states, Polish politicians postponed their decisions on the signing of treaties, given their strenuous efforts to integrate with Euro-Atlantic political and security-related structures. From 1989–1993, Poland no longer bordered three, but seven states and established sound neighbourly relations with each one despite some obvious (mainly historically-related) factors which may have affected the level of willingness to sign treaties and delay the process of reconciliation (Orłowski, 2004, 12). Therefore, in order to provide relations with the countries in the neighbourhood with a legal basis, Polish decision-makers were pragmatic which should be seen as an important factor.

Since the beginning of Polish sovereignty in the late 1980s, Polish-Russian relations have been accompanied by an altogether difficult dialogue stemming from divergent interpretations of watershed and tragic historical events which led to prejudices among the peoples. Truth be told, Polish historiography is full of events related to mutual grudges and harms, highlighted by many on numerous occasions. Despite breaking free from the USSR and receiving assistance with political transformation from the West, Poland has reoriented its policy with reservation whilst bracing itself for a backlash from the former USSR (Zięba, 2004b, 4). Among other things, Polish scientists have underlined the fact that the cold war was not brought to end following an amicable settlement between the two rival blocs but due to the collapse of the USSR which brought about increased levels of uncertainty in terms of Russia's future intentions. Russia's discontent with NATO expansion to the East stemming from the 1992 announcement of prospective membership of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary is also noteworthy. In view of the above, aspirations of achieving full autonomy and freedom marked by the withdrawal of the troops of the former USSR from the territory of Poland can be regarded as a success of Polish Eastern policy. The troops were withdrawn on the anniversary of the aggression against Poland in 1939 i.e. on September 17, 1993 as stipulated in the document of May 1992.

Bartłomiej Sienkiewicz, the author of the widely discussed *Pochwała minimalizmu* (*The Praise of Minimalism*), published in 2002, who engaged in a debate on the relevance of the 'Giedroyc doctrine', believed that the abandonment of revisionist sentiments by the Polish political elites was an important achievement in the context of the Eastern dimension (Sienkiewicz, 2013, 34). According to him, even the slightest manifestation of such sentiments would equate to failure in the context of declarations previously made by Poland espousing its desire for reconciliation and the fiasco of Polish policy towards the East. In his later arguments, Bartłomiej Sienkiewicz emphasized that Poland treated its partners equivocally i.e. showing equal respect for their sovereignty and subjectivity on the international arena. This approach was entirely different from that adopted by Western countries who represented the so-called typical Western 'postcolonial discourse' as defined by Bartłomiej Sienkiewicz (Sienkiewicz, 2013, 34). In other words, this fact can be regarded as a success of Polish decision-makers in terms of Poland's Eastern policy.

Efforts aimed at bringing Ukraine closer to the Western structures belong to the category of 'partial successes' in Polish Eastern policy. It is assumed that despite Ukraine's clear dualistic tendencies since obtaining independence in 1991, i.e. its balancing between the West and Russia, Poland was a clear promoter of Ukrainian integration with the Western European world. This thesis was confirmed by the involvement of Polish politicians including Alexander Kwaśniewski during the 2004–2005 Orange revolution which resulted in the reorientation of Ukrainian foreign policy and Ukrainian declarations in favour of EU membership (Pieniążek, 2014, 207). In the opinion of experts, the diplomatic efforts of Polish politicians directed the attention of the international community towards Ukraine's domestic affairs. As a result, Ukrainian issues became part of discourse in political science (Lelonek, 2014, 16).

Although most researchers and historians perceive the Orange revolution as a success of Polish politicians, there appear slightly more balanced opinions such as that of Krzysztof Fedorowicz who opines that the 2004 events do not represent the long-term success of Polish efforts (Fedorowicz, 2011, 224). In his view, Ukraine has still not made a clear geopolitical choice regarding its key partner in foreign policy. Polish and other foreign political elites have failed to take into account the insufficient determination of Ukrainian decision-makers when it comes to integration with the West which has led them to the erroneous assumption that Ukraine is determined to bring about such an integration.

Poland has been an advocate for Ukraine's accession to the Transatlantic structures in the years since. The need to complete the process of Ukraine's association with the European Union was among the priorities of the 2011 Polish Presidency of the Council of the European Union (Leszczenko, 2013, 250). Still, this should not be regarded as a failure of Polish efforts. It is Ukraine which has failed to take its chance to return to the West although one has to acknowledge that the stance of the European Union regarding Ukraine's accession has been far from unambiguous.

According to some researchers, the approach of Polish decision-makers to the 2013–2014 Ukrainian crisis is noteworthy. They demanded decisive action to counteract Russia's imperialistic inclinations and a reaction to the annexation of Crimea in the form of the imposition of sanctions and international isolation (Fiszer, 2016, 190). Not all the countries have presented such an unambiguous stance against the backdrop of Vladimir Putin's viola-

tion of the international law. The Mediterranean states have failed to condemn the policy of the Russian Federation. Surprisingly for Polish politicians, even the Central European countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia) were unable to speak univocally this time.

Obviously, some undermine the above-mentioned successes; bilateral treaties have not solved many of the currently disputable issues between Poland and its neighbours. Besides, Poland does not play the role of a stabilizing force in the region nor of a liaison between the East and the West since the West is not necessarily interested in the domestic affairs of Belarus or Ukraine. Russia, on the other hand, has no need for an agent in its Euro-Atlantic relations. Moreover, the efforts of Polish diplomacy haven't ultimately produced the anticipated results as expected by the Ukrainians and have not paved the way for Ukrainian integration with the European Union. In addition, Polish politicians who actively supported Maidan are accused of pursuing their own interests. Poland was not among the signatories of the Minsk accords concluded in 2015 amidst the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. The Minsk accords were signed by the presidents of Ukraine, France and Russia along with Germany's Chancellor. The aim of these agreements was to halt bloody hostilities. Moreover, Ryszard Zięba draws attention to the fact that Polish efforts have not alleviated tension over the situation in Ukraine. On the contrary, they have been based on propaganda and designed to foment hatred against Russia, which has resulted in Poland's exclusion from crisis settlement talks (Zięba, 2004a, 22). It must be emphasised that decision-makers in neighbouring Eastern European states have not used the opportunities available to them whereas Poland lacks both sufficient resources and ambition to affect the policy of these governments. Poland cannot be held liable for their ill-fated decisions. To conclude, one should not rush to conclusions regarding the fiasco of Polish policy but one should emphasize its achievements.

Failures of Poland's eastern policy

Failures of the Eastern policy can be attributed to the so-called historical policy and constant commemoration of injustices perceived as disastrous in creating the vision of Poland's future in the international arena by the majority of historians and other scholars. It is noteworthy that substantive

issues are often blurred by politically motivated arguments. The notion of 'historical policy' is part of the Polish debate in political science although its use is challenged by scholars, since history is science and not politics (Szubartowicz, 2006). Although the analysis of the available materials allows to conclude that right-wing factions have used historical controversies with far greater frequency, it is noteworthy that every political elite in power has taken advantage of historical policy, since it is easy to affect citizens' emotions and attitudes by taking advantage of historical feuds (Kącka, 2015, 61). However, a certain distinction has to be made. The rational and emotional attitudes towards historical policy can be delineated. The representatives of the rational approach perceive historical policy to be on a par with other policies implemented by the ruling elite i.e. foreign, social, monetary or economic policies. The emotional approach is characterized by a perception of historical relations with other states through a prism of conflicts, wrongdoings and guilt (Kącka, 2015, 62). Another division into martyrological and heroic tendencies that coexist in the Polish discourse of political science can also be drawn (Bieleń, 2012, 18). The former generates a feeling of resentment against harm caused by the neighbouring countries and fears of a possible revival of hostile actions. The latter approach aims to encourage solidarity with Poland, sharing Polish historical visions and judgments (Bieleń, 2012, 19). However, it seems that none of the divisions are beneficial, since they hamper the development of healthy relations between Poland and neighbouring countries. Instrumental use of history by the Polish political elite undermines the image and international position of the country, since leaders of other countries can assume that, guided by historical trauma, the Polish party might hinder the achievement of rational compromises or the fulfilment of rational interests. It is noteworthy that 'grudge bearing' negatively affects willingness to elaborate political concepts of relations with neighbours, especially Russia. Many experts point out that relations with the Russian Federation resemble a sinusoid, since they are still governed by historical issues, usually brought up by the Polish party.

The development of Polish-Lithuanian relations has definitely not been in line with Polish national interests. As early as in the early 1990s, the Lithuanians emphasised the importance of the recognition of their independence of March 11, 1990, by the Republic of Poland whereas, in reality, Polish policy-makers formally recognized it as the 23rd subsequent state as

late as August 26, 1991 (Najder, 2008, 48). As few as 15% of Poles participating in the referendum on the independence of Lithuania voted in favour of its sovereignty. Moreover, as few as three out of nine Polish Members of the Lithuanian Parliament supported the decision to leave the USSR. As a result, Lithuanian foreign policy reoriented in the Scandinavian rather than the Polish direction.

The main factor that resulted in the cooling of relations was the situation of the Polish minority in Lithuania. The Polish diaspora is the most numerous minority on the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. Some authors claim that Poland has expended no sufficient effort to defend the interests of compatriots in the Vilnius region. For instance, Zdzisław Najder draws attention to the fact that the Polish authorities remained passive as regards the 1991 Lithuanian initiative to recognize the so-called Copenhagen Document for the Protection of National Minorities (Najder, 2008, 48). As stressed by Michał Wołłejko, the Lithuanian authorities disregard provisions of the Treaty on Friendly Relations and Good Neighbourly Cooperation concluded between Poland and Lithuania in 1994. In particular, they ignore the majority of provisions which regulate the rights of the Polish minority in Lithuania (Wołłejko, 2001, 99). Besides, Lithuania should comply with provisions of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe signed by it in 2000 (Szczurowski, 2012, 183).

Political issues still attract the attention of Polish and Lithuanian politicians and societies. In the opinion of the world community, 2004, the year of both countries' accession to the EU, should have become the watershed event in relations between Warsaw and Vilnius. Unfortunately, the thesis formulated by Jan Nowak-Jeziorański that friendly relations will not be established merely based on the Treaty on Friendly Relations and Good Neighbourly Cooperation, has proven to be valid. Indeed, the tenth anniversary of the Treaty marked rather antagonistic relations between the countries while the Polish party reported problems with, *inter alia*, the spelling of Polish surnames of citizens of Lithuania of Polish descent (Komoda, 2013, 212). According to the decision of the Constitutional Court of Lithuania in 2009, Poles can only spell their surnames according to Lithuanian spelling conventions. The list of problems also includes a ban on using Polish names of places and streets in areas inhabited by members of the Polish community. It is noteworthy that the Electoral Action of Poles in Lithuania, a party

representing the interests of the Polish minority, is treated as an opponent on the Lithuanian political scene (Arlotti, 2012, 111). The main obstacle to the normalization of Polish-Lithuanian relations lies in a different perception of the problem; Lithuanians believe that the Polish diaspora is not discriminated against and is constantly fighting for rights (which, according to public opinion in Lithuania, are respected). This results in the perception of Poles as 'prone to conflict'. It is difficult to open a new chapter in Polish-Lithuanian relations since the issue of the Polish minority is a recurrent problem which crops up during elections in Lithuania and is exploited during election campaigns by figures belonging to nationalist circles. The most recent governmental election in Lithuania, held in December 2016, provided hope that the situation of the Polish minority would improve. Unfortunately, from today's perspective, as was the case following past elections, this issue has remained only declarative (Raś, 2016, 2).

Both states should cooperate both on a regional and international basis since both are members of NATO and the European Union. The fact that such an important issue has not been settled for several decades despite the existing convention and treaty seems to be a failure of Polish Eastern policy.

Another example of a failure of the political elites concerning Polish Eastern policy exists in the example of Poland's relations with Belarus. This case is not often described in literature as a failure since Belarus is regarded as *raraavis*, a special case, among European countries. In the opinion of many leaders, as the last dictatorship in Europe, this country is not worthy of close ties with democratic countries given its undemocratic political system, violations of human rights and the orientation of its foreign policy towards Russia or outright dependence on the Russian Federation in many areas. Nevertheless, Poland, as a neighbouring country, should not necessarily speak with one voice along with the Western states which are not really interested in the domestic situations of Eastern European states.

During the first years of the period of transformation, relations between Poland and Belarus appeared satisfactory. One may even go as far as to say that the lack of tragic twists in the shared history was one of the key factors to influence such a *status quo*. The main goals of Polish diplomacy in relations with Belarus were the democratization of the latter, establishment of the rule of law and the implementation of free market reforms. In other words, the objective was to gradually shift the West closer to the East. Poland perceived Belarus' stronger sovereignty as a guarantee for both re-

gional and global security. The visions of cooperation started to diverge over time since Belarusian policy-makers have shown more interest in closer economic ties than political ties (which have been perceived as more important by the Polish elite). Despite divergent aspirations, Poland emphasised the importance of political reforms which brought about deterioration of the relations exemplified, among others, by the situation of the Union of Poles in Belarus which represents the minority of Polish nationals. The reaction of the Polish authorities or rather the lack thereof as well as the lack of actions aimed at the improvement of the situation of the Polish community in Belarus warrant criticism. In 2005, the year of a diplomatic crisis in Polish-Belarusian relations, the then incumbent authorities limited their actions to dismissing Belarusian diplomats and expressing solidarity with the Polish minority whose rights were being violated. They also emphasised the obligation to observe the provisions of the treaty concluded between Poland and Belarus including provisions concerning the rights of minorities (Fedorowicz, 2009, 249).

To conclude, Krzysztof Fedorowicz described Poland's policy between 1996–2010 as a 'democratic crusade' (Fedorowicz, 2011, 291). Assumptions about the policy towards Belarus (or Eastern Europe in general) were erroneous since politicians were convinced that the path of reform undertaken by Poland would be adopted in every state of the former Soviet bloc and that Western standards and the Western model of governance was the only choice (Fedorowicz, 2011, 291). Therefore, the approach, according to which dynamism of bilateral relations depends on the fulfilment of Polish postulates, should be assessed as misleading and bound to result in a number of setbacks in terms of bilateral relations. Unfortunately, one must admit that no alternative concept was developed in the case the Polish vision was to fail. It is also noteworthy that Polish policy-makers have not taken social sentiments in Belarus into account; the Belarusians have not shown the slightest inclination towards Western integration; on the contrary, they have opted to remain under the Kremlin's watchful eye (Fedorowicz, 2011, 255).

Many political scientists and researchers agree that there is no agenda for cooperation with Belarus today, whereas it is precisely the improvement of relations with the buffer state in between Poland and Russia which should be a priority of foreign policy (Sokołowski, 2014, 97). Truth be told, the current Minister of Foreign Affairs Witold Waszczykowski did pay a vis-

it to Belarus in 2016 – the first official visit in 6 years – and assured Poland would assist Belarus on its path towards modernization, promising assistance in the area of security. The talks also focused on the situation of the Polish minority in Belarus. Taking into account the current initiatives of the government and the international situation, it is safe to assume that these slogans will remain mere declarations (which are no different than declarations of previous governments) and that Poland is only looking for allies willing to support its current policy. Undoubtedly, violations of human rights, repression of the opposition and torture are just some of the activities of the Belarusian authorities which should be met with outright condemnation. Nevertheless, Poland should maintain a concept of bilateral relations with its neighbour. The absence of which would indicate a failure in Eastern policy.

The failure to use the potential of a transit country situated between the East and the West is one of the shortfalls of the Eastern policy. Polish policy-makers have not developed a policy of a transit state apart from other numerous tasks Polish diplomacy was facing in the days of the transformation as well as more recently (Ciosek, 2002, 23). According to Stanisław Ciosek, Poland should learn how to enjoy benefits derived from its geographic location. He emphasises that none of the governments formed after 1989 have sought monetary compensation for gas transit. Poland has also failed in its role as a liaison between the East and the West due to its insufficient potential and capacity to act as an intermediary between Russia, Eastern European countries and the West. Political scientists often state that politicians 'stumble over their own feet' when formulating the goals of Polish Eastern policy. These goals are often too ambitious. The international situation and Poland's real potential to influence the developments is often inaccurately assessed.

Unresolved/ disputed issues in Poland's eastern policy

Contentious and unresolved issues which are part of the policy towards Eastern Europe are very often historically entrenched, which is indicated above. The developments across the Polish eastern border i.e. the conflict in Ukraine and Russian aggression pose a number of challenges for the international community. Still, historical issues absorb the attention of Polish and Ukrainian politicians and society.

Differences in naming the tragic events which took place from February 1943 until early 1944 when the Ukrainians from the Ukrainian Insurgent Army committed an act of genocide against Poles residing in the Eastern Borderlands can be observed in Polish and Ukrainian historiography. 'The massacre of Poles in Volhynia' (literally 'the Volhynian slaughter') also known as the 'Volhynia genocide' in Poland is referred to as the 'Volhynia tragedy' in Ukraine (Kabaczij, 2013, 81). It is important in terms of Polish public opinion, historians and politicians that the Ukrainian party recognizes these acts of murder committed during World War II as genocide. However, the majority of Ukrainian scientific texts do not describe the said events even in terms of ethnic cleansing (Portnov, 2012, 30). None of the most important, comprehensive Polish works on the subject have been translated into Ukrainian. Moreover, most of the Ukrainian researchers believe that Poles exaggerate the extent of their loss and underestimate the number of Ukrainian casualties. The year of 2003 was a watershed year in that the 60th anniversary of the event was commemorated. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted a joint Polish-Ukrainian statement which condemned all anti-Polish activities instigated during the war (Motyka, Zaszkilniak, 2012, 13). It should be stressed, however, that a single vote decided the issue of whether the declaration was to be approved. Taking into account the results of opinion polls conducted at the time, one may conclude that nearly 50% of the Ukrainians have never heard of the massacre of Poles in Volhynia while history textbooks published in 2011 do not even broach this topic (Portnov, 2012, 29). These events are still acute, which is exemplified by the film 'Volhynia' directed by Wojciech Smarzowski which stirred extreme emotions both in Poland and Ukraine.

Yet another unsettled, important issue in the context of policy towards Eastern Europe is the issue of damage caused to Polish cultural heritage during World War II. There are difficulties quantifying the losses which have been described as 'immense'. Vilnius and Lvov, for example, are regarded as the most valuable urban sites within the boundaries of the Second Polish Republic (Konończuk, 2017, 35). Still, no government has compiled a comprehensive list of lost property. It can be stated again that obligations stemming from the signed treaties between Poland and its neighbouring states which regulate mutual relations, including preservation of cultural heritage, exist only on paper. Unambiguous conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the existing materials: an overwhelming majority of Polish

historical sites on the territory of today's Belarus and Ukraine are unfit for renovation. Wojciech Konończuk indicates that one of the reasons behind this state of affairs is that cultural goods are not seen as a common asset whose preservation is in the interest of both parties, and not solely Polish, Belarusian or Ukrainian interests. Talks about the return of Polish works of art plundered by the USSR have been going on for years. These negotiations have a legal basis since these issues are regulated according to bilateral agreements. New applications and documents have been submitted since the early 1990s. However, the Russian party refuses to return Polish works of art. The situation concerning Ukraine is seemingly likewise. Subsequent Ukrainian governments have refused to conclude an agreement with Poland on this issue. Talks on the issue have lost their dynamics given the current domestic situation in Ukraine.

Conclusions

Based on literature pertaining to Poland's foreign policy, one can point out the first fundamental error when formulating Polish policy in the Eastern dimension in the early 1990s which was the desire to create the same concept applicable to all the states of Eastern Europe. Erroneous definitions of the needs and potential of individual countries as well as divergent determinants of bilateral relations both in the historical and economic or social area have resulted in ineffective actions in Polish diplomacy. It seems that this inefficiency can also be observed today. The priorities and postulates put forward by Polish decision-makers have not changed for years. Democratisation and integration with the West are most popular intentions in relations with the countries of the former Soviet bloc no matter whether the Euro-Atlantic model is likely to become rooted in a less favourable environment or not.

Eastern policy can be looked at in terms of successes and failures. Its successes pertain to efforts aimed at stabilization of the situation in the region and individual Eastern European states. Dialogue with these states is often difficult. At the EU level, Poland is an advocate of initiatives such as the Eastern Partnership. In order to assess bilateral relations with neighbouring states, shortfalls of Eastern policy should also be pointed out. Apart from the lack of a concept in relations with neighbours, one should emphasise the

importance of the grudge held relating to mischiefs committed in the past. Historical policy will not contribute to lasting foundations for bilateral cooperation aimed at mutual benefits. Zdzisław Najder's opinion can be cited here. Zdzisław Najder believes that there is no such thing as Polish Eastern policy at the moment. The author proves his point by outlining 3 determinants of every 'policy': 1) delineation of goals; 2) prediction of the course of events; 3) an impact on the course of events in order to accomplish specific intentions (Najder, 2008, 33). He highlights the lack of clear-cut objectives (the same declarations recur over and over again), erroneous forecasts for the development of the situation and the consequent failure to meet vital interests. These assumptions might seem too bold, and yet the efforts of Polish policy-makers are far from being satisfactory in the area of Eastern policy. Moreover, Poland cannot be labelled a leader as far as this policy is concerned.

Bibliography

- Bieleń, S. (2012). O polskiej polityce wschodniej - aspekty poznawcze i praktyczne. *Polityka wschodnia*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 11–34.
- Ciosek, S. (2002). Polska i Rosja w obliczu rozszerzenia Unii Europejskiej. In P. Kowal Kowal (Ed.) *Wymiar wschodni UE – realna szansa czy idee fixe* (pp. 22–24). Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych.
- Fedorowicz, K. (2009). Polityka Polski wobec Białorusi. In A. Gil & T. Kapuśniak (Eds.) *Polityka wschodnia Polski. Uwarunkowania, koncepcje, realizacja* (pp. 233–250). Lublin - Warszawa: Instytut Europy Środkowo- Wschodniej.
- Fedorowicz, K. (2011). *Polityka Polski wobec Rosji, Ukrainy i Białorusi w latach 1989–2010*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Fiszer, M. J. (2016). Wady i zalety członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej oraz nowe wyzwania dla polityki integracyjnej Polski. *Politeja*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 181–215. DOI: 10.12797/Politeja.13/2016.43.08.
- Giovanni, A. (2012). Stosunki polsko-litewskie między przeszłością a przyszłością. *Studia Europejskie*, Vol. 4, pp. 107–122.
- Jędraszczyk, K. (2010). *Strategiczne partnerstwo ukraińsko-polskie. Polska w polityce niepodległej Ukrainy*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.
- Kabaczij, R. (2013). Nie bojąc się Wołynia. *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*, No. 1, pp. 81–86.

- Kącka, K. (2015). *Polityka historyczna: kreatorzy, narzędzia, mechanizmy działania- przykład Polski*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Komoda, A. (2013). Stosunki polsko-litewskie. In M. S. Wolański (Ed.). *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w latach 2004–2011. Struktury-koncepcje-sąsiedzi-Izrael* (pp. 207–224). Polkowice: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskiej Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Techniki.
- Konończuk, W. (2017). Wspólne dobro, polska bolączka. *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*, No. 1, pp. 101–109.
- Lelonek, A. (2014). Geopolityka Ukrainy – między buforowością, finlandyzacją a Zachodem. In P. Kowal (Ed.), *Młoda myśl wschodnia* (pp. 16–45). Wrocław: Kolegium Europy Wschodniej im. Jana Nowaka-Jeziorańskiego.
- Motyka, G., Zaskilniak, L. (2012). Dwugłós historyków. Rozliczenie własnej przeszłości jako element drogi do Europy”. In A. Zińczuk (Ed.) *Pojednanie przez trudną pamięć. Wołyń 1943* (pp. 12–22). Lublin: Stowarzyszenie „Panorama Kultur”.
- Leszczenko, L. (2013). Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie. In M. S. Wolański (Ed.) *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w latach 2004–2011. Struktury-koncepcje-sąsiedzi-Izrael* (pp. 249–262). Polkowice: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskiej Wyższej Szkoły Przedsiębiorczości i Techniki.
- Najder, Z. (2008). *Patrząc na Wschód. Eseje 1975–2008*. Wrocław: Kolegium Europy Wschodniej im. Jana Nowaka Jeziorańskiego.
- Najder, Z. (2013). Pojednanie, współpraca, życie obok siebie? *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*, No. 2, pp. 7–13.
- Orłowski, T. (2004). Polska myśl polityczna i polityka lat 1989–1993 wobec wschodnich sąsiadów. In A. Gil & J. Kłoczowski (Eds.), *Rocznik Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej 2004* (pp. 11–15). No. 2. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Pieniążek, P. (2014). Czy przemyśleliśmy Wschód? In P. Kowal (Ed.), *Młoda myśl wschodnia* (pp. 202–215). Wrocław: Kolegium Europy Wschodniej im. Jana Nowaka-Jeziorańskiego.
- Portnov, A. (2012). Ukraińska (nie)pamięć o Wołyniu 1943. In A. Zińczuk (Ed.) *Pojednanie przez trudną pamięć. Wołyń 1943* (pp. 29–31). Lublin: Stowarzyszenie „Panorama Kultur”.
- Raś, K. (2016). Nowy rząd na Litwie: perspektywy i wyzwania. *Biuletyn PISM*, No. 87, pp. 1–2.

Sokołowski, I. (2014). Relacje Polski z Białorusią. In P. Kowal (Ed.), *Młoda myśl wschodnia* (pp. 99–109). Wrocław: Kolegium Europy Wschodniej im. Jana Nowaka-Jeziorańskiego.

Stolarczyk, M. (2016). *Rosja w Polityce zagranicznej Polski w latach 1992–2015*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Szczepanik, M. (2011). Between a Romantic 'Mission in the East' and Minimalism: Polish Policy Towards the Eastern Neighbourhood. *Perspectives: Review of Central European Affairs*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 45–66.

Szczurowski, M. (2012). Trudna integracja w Unii Europejskiej. Polacy na Litwie. In S. J. Włodowski (Ed.). *U podstaw polskiej polityki wschodniej* (pp. 183–202). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Toruńskiej Szkoły Wyższej.

Szubartowicz, P. (2006) *Demagogiczne chwytaki Kaczyńskich*. Rozmowa z prof. Barbarą Skargą. Tygodnik Przegląd, 22. Retrived from <https://www.tygodnikprzeglad.pl/demagogiczne-chwyty-kaczynskich>

Wołłejko, M. (2001). Sytuacja mniejszości polskiej na Litwie a relacje polsko-litewskie. *Bezpieczeństwo Międzynarodowe*, Vol. 1, No. 17, pp. 99–114.

Zajac, J. (2016). *Poland's Security Policy: The West, Russia, and the Changing International Order*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zięba, R. (2004a). Międzynarodowe implikacje kryzysu ukraińskiego. *Stosunki międzynarodowe-International Relations*, Vol.50, No. 2, pp. 13–40.

Zięba, R. (2004b). Transformation of Polish Foreign Policy. *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest*, No. 4, pp. 13–45.

Zięba, R. (2011). Uwarunkowania polityki zagranicznej Polski na początku drugiej dekady XXI wieku. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, Vol.43, No. 1–2, pp. 9–37.

REMIGIUSZ ROSICKI

Ph.D., Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland

Характеристика институционально-правовых аспектов энергетической политики Польши

Объем анализа в тексте охватывает избранные проблемы энергетической политики Польши. Анализ энергетической политики Польши охватил только узловые институционально-правовые проблемы, которые включили в себя следующие вопросы: (1) правовые основы и предусмотренная законом область энергетической политики, (2) субъективная сфера энергетической политики, (3) сфера прогнозирования энергетической политики.

Для более подробного исследования проблемы, рассмотренной в тексте, представлены следующие исследовательские вопросы: *(1) В каком объеме юридические решения влияют на эффективность проведения энергетической политики в Польше? (2) Какой из принятых сценариев развития энергетики в планировочных документах проекта энергетической политики Польши следует считать наиболее вероятным?*

Подход к проблеме имеет наглядный характер, отсюда представленный анализ базируется в основном на разработке и синтетическом представлении избранных институционально-правовых вопросов, которые были дополнены собственными выводами. Кроме того, в тексте был проведен сравнительный анализ трех сценариев развития польской энергетики, содержащихся в «*Проекте энергетической политики до 2050 г.*» с 2015 года.

Ключевые слова: энергетическая политика, энергетическое право, сценарии энергетической политики, экономическая политика, государственная политика, энергетическая безопасность.

Введение

Предметом анализа данного текста является энергетическая политика Польши в институционально-правовом измерении. Главные аспекты содержащегося в тексте анализа касаются понимания энергетической политики, субъектов, ответственных за проведение энергетической политики, сущности документации по вопросу энергетической политики и прогностических элементов, которые связаны с планировочной документацией энергетической политики.

Основной целью текста является желание сделать презентацию ключевых проблем, связанных с: (1) «правовыми инструментами» ведения энергетической политики и изложенными в законе *«Об энергетике»*, (2) изменениями в законах, касающихся субъективных аспектов ведения энергетической политики, (3) прогнозами и сценариями, содержащимися в *«Проекте энергетической политики Польши до 2050 года»*. С целью детализации исследовательской проблемы, в тексте представлены следующие исследовательские вопросы: *(1) В какой степени правовые решения влияют на эффективность ведения энергетической политики в Польше? (2) Какой из принятых сценариев развития энергетики, в планировочной документации проекта энергетической политики Польши, следует считать наиболее вероятным?*

Содержащийся в тексте анализ имеет наглядный характер, отсюда проводимые исследования будут основываться на разработке и синтетической демонстрации избранных институционально-правовых вопросов, дополненных собственными выводами (сравн. Smolak, 2012, 81-110; Pieniążek, Stefaniuk, 2014, 246-256; Nowacki, Tabor, 2016, 353-356). В случае характеристики понятия политики и ее субъективной сферы использован догматическо-доктринальный подход (сравн. Wronkowska, 2005, 76-91). В случае же характеристики прогностических аспектов энергетической политики Польши, будет проведен сравнительный анализ трех исследовательских сценариев, содержащихся в *«Проекте энергетической политики до 2050 г.»* с 2015 года.

Избранные институционально-правовые аспекты энергетической политики

Понятие энергетической политики

Существенной проблемой является – несмотря на существование множества «политик» и «стратегий», которые относятся к вопросам энергетики – отсутствие значимых долгосрочных стратегических планов в секторе энергии. Отсутствие реальной ответственности за невыполнение принципов, содержащихся хотя бы в документе, предусмотренном в законе «Об энергетике» (гл. III, 13-15 *Ustawa Prawo energetyczne*), что несет за собой отсутствие рациональности в инвестиционном процессе и планировании.

Очередная проблема, связанная с правовыми аспектами энергетической политики, касается ее характера в структуре административного и конституционного права. Документ энергетической политики подготавливается *министром энергетики*, однако резолюция принимается *Советом министров*. Следует подчеркнуть, что постановления *Совета министров* имеют внутренний характер и обязывают только организационные единицы, подчиненные органу выдающему эти акты (ст. 93 *Конституции РП*). Эффектом этой резолюции является принятие документа «планировочного» характера, который не имеет никакой связывающей силы, в том смысле, что отсутствие его реализации не приводит к каким-либо правовым последствиям, например, ответственности *Совета министров* или *министра энергетики* (сравн. Czarnecka, Oglódek, 2007, 331-334; Elżanowski, 2008, 77-80; Waligórski, 2008, 69-74). Следствием такого, а не иного решения является документ, который имеет «бланковый» характер, что в свою очередь порождает вопрос о достоверности и стабильности энергетической политики, проводимой исполнительной властью в Польше.

Основные инструменты энергетической политики изложены в третьей главе закона «Об энергетике». Анализируя отдельные статьи в упоминаемом разделе закона, можно выделить разное понимание термина и понятия «энергетическая политика»: (1) определение целей энергетической политики (ст. 13 *UPE*), (2) определение задач и модели предпринимаемых действий (ст. 12 *UPE*) (3) характеристика элементов документа «энергетической политики» (ст. 14-15 *UPE*), (4) указание органов, от-

ветственных за «энергетическую политику» (ст. 12 и 12а *UPE*), (сравн. Czarnecka, Ogiódek, 2007, 325-363; Pawełczyk, Pikiewicz, 2012, 430-482).

С другой стороны, когда мы попытаемся разделить содержание статей, находящихся в третьей главе этого закона, можно выделить следующие вопросы, связанные с «энергетической политикой»: (1) стратегия энергетической политики (ст. 12 *UPE*), (2) конкретный документ энергетической политики (ст. 13-15а *UPE*), (3) мониторинг энергетической безопасности (ст. 15b *UPE*), (4) конкурентный рынок энергии (ст. 15с и 15f *UPE*), (5) требования к энергетическим компаниям (ст. 16-16b *UPE*), (6) местная энергетическая политика (ст. 17-20 *UPE*).

Обязательный субъективный объем планировочного документа, именуемого «энергетической политикой государства», охватывает следующие вопросы: (1) топливно-энергетический баланс страны; (2) производственные мощности отечественных источников топлива и энергии; (3) пропускные способности, в том числе связей между различными государствами; (4) энергетическая эффективность экономики; (5) действия в сфере защиты окружающей среды; (6) развитие использования установок возобновляемых источников энергии; (7) объем и виды запасов топлива; (8) направления реструктуризации и собственнических видоизменений топливно-энергетического сектора; (9) направления научно-исследовательских работ; (10) международное сотрудничество (ст. 14 *UPE*). Несмотря на детальные указания основных моментов планировочного документа, в литературе появляются упреки в отношении качества подготовленных вопросов, например, обращается внимание на недостаточную разработку топливно-энергетического баланса Польши, что может возникать в результате отсутствия законодательного регулирования его содержания (сравн. Zawiska, 2016, 58-64).

СУБЪЕКТИВНАЯ СФЕРА ЭНЕРГЕТИЧЕСКОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

Долгое время высказывалось пожелание, чтобы энергетическую политику специально для этой цели формировало отдельное министерство (сравн. Rewizorski, Rosicki, Ostant, 2013, 311-314; Rosicki, 2015a, 51-62). *Министерство энергетики* было создано законом от 19 ноября 2015 об изменении закона о кабинетах правительственной администрации и некоторых других законов (с последующими изменениями от 11 фев-

раля 2016 года) (Законодательный вестник 2015 п. 1960). До сих пор задачи и полномочия, возложенные на *Министерство энергетики*, исполнялись *министром экономики*, поэтому энергетика была приписана отделу экономики. Кажется, что новое решение следует оценить, в принципе, положительно, потому что польская энергетика потребует более эффективных действий, также в институциональном измерении. Кроме того, процесс специализации является естественным процессом развития современной администрации, также и на центральном уровне (сравн. Swora, 2012, 105). Несмотря на это, выдвигаются аргументы, указывающие на то, что такая институциональная фрагментация в некоторых сферах будет менее рациональна. Например, М. Свора и М. Стефанюк утверждают, что предыдущее решение давало более широкие возможности в согласовании различных интересов в одном ведомстве (Swora, Stefaniuk, 2016, 39-40). При анализе изменений также можно выдвинуть очередной постулат, в котором говорится о необходимости консолидации, по крайней мере, избранных отделов охраны окружающей среды с энергетикой, следовательно, расширения формулы действия *Минэнерго*.

Задачи *министра энергетики* определяет ст. 12 п. 2 закона «Об энергетике», в котором указывается: (1) подготовка проекта энергетической политики государства и координация его осуществления; (2) определение конкретных условий планирования и функционирования систем запаса топлива и энергии в режиме и диапазоне, установленных в законе; (3) контроль над безопасностью поставок горючего газа и электроэнергии, а также контроль над функционированием отечественных энергетических систем в установленных законом пределах; (4) сотрудничество с воеводами и органами местного самоуправления в вопросах планирования и реализации систем снабжения топливом и энергией; (5) координация сотрудничества с международными правительственными организациями в установленных законом пределах.

Несмотря на изменения, связанных с созданием *Министерства энергетики*, по-прежнему актуальными остаются решения в сфере его роли в качестве органа, контролирующего энергетическую политику. Его позиция возникает из разделения функции создания энергетической политики в стратегическом и системном измерении от функции регулирования энергии на рынке. Таким образом, на основе этого примера можно сказать, что контроль над энергетической политикой про-

исходит на политическом уровне (министерский уровень) и на уровне центральных органов власти. Результатом этого является необходимость выявления других субъектов, связанных со сферой энергетической политики, например, *Председателя Управления по регулированию энергетики* или *Уполномоченного Совета по делам стратегической энергетической инфраструктуры*.

Председатель Управления по регулированию энергетики обладает компетенцией в области регулирования топлива и энергии, действует также в сфере продвижения конкуренции на энергетических рынках и предотвращает ограничивающую ее практику. В сферу полномочий *Председателя Управления по регулированию энергетики* среди прочего следует включить: предоставление и отмену концессий, утверждение и контроль тарифов на топливо и энергию, определение периода действия тарифов на топливо и энергию, согласование планов развития в области удовлетворения текущих и будущих потребностей в топливе и энергии (сравн. Rosicki, 2010, 113-137).

Прогностические аспекты энергетической политики

Сценарии энергетической политики

В планах польской энергетической политики, представленной в качестве проекта в 2015 году, было принято три основных сценария: (1) *сбалансированный сценарий*, (2) *ядерный сценарий* и (3) *сценарий на основе развития сектора возобновляемых источников энергии и газового сектора (газ + ВИЭ)*. Выделение отдельных сценариев следовало из принятых целей, которые должны послужить польской энергетической политике, в том числе: (1) необходимость ограничения негативного воздействия энергетического сектора на окружающую среду, (2) необходимость осуществления принципов энергетической политики Европейского Союза, (3) необходимость проверки расходов на эксплуатацию запасов каменного и бурого угля, (4) необходимость рассмотрения обоснованности развития ядерной энергетики, (5) необходимость более тесно определить потенциал традиционного и нетрадиционного газа, (6) необходимость более точного определения потенциала нетрадиционных источников энергии («*Проект энергетической политики Польши до 2050 года*», 2015).

В случае первого из сценариев, т.е. *сбалансированного сценария*, предполагается отсутствие особенно революционных изменений в энергетической структуре Польши. Этот сценарий указывает на необходимость продолжения существующих тенденций и концепций в национальной энергетической политике. Прогностические предположения в этом варианте влекут за собой наименьший риск возможных затрат в случае принятия ошибочных решений, касающихся энергетического сектора. Стоит обратить внимание, что период 2035-2050 гг. будет характеризоваться своего рода стабильностью, а это означает, что в этот период польский энергетический баланс не подвергся бы существенным изменениям. Тем не менее, следует отметить, что в то же время все большее значение в энергетической структуре имели бы возобновляемые источники энергии и газ, при одновременном сохранении немалой, хотя и ограниченной по отношению к состоянию текущей, роли угля и нефти (Ciechanowska, 2014, 839–842; «Проект энергетической политики Польши 2050 года», 2015).

В случае *сбалансированного сценария* предполагается увеличение доли энергии из возобновляемых источников в энергетическом балансе (в результате реализаций, вытекающих из правил европейских обязательств обеспечения как минимум 10% доли ВИЭ в транспортном топливе и 15% в балансе первичной энергии, и целевых показателей сокращения выбросов). Кроме того, в связи с необходимостью создания единого энергетического рынка в Европейском Союзе и укреплением старой инфраструктуры передачи, необходимым становится увеличение инвестиционных затрат на развитие (умных) сетей передачи и дистрибуции, в том числе и на расширение межсистемных соединений с целью увеличения пропускной способности. В свою очередь удержание постоянного увеличения доли газа в структуре производства электроэнергии (в 3,5 раза больше по сравнению с 2015 годом), потребует обеспечения надлежащей инженерно-технической кадровой базой (*Выводы из прогнозируемых анализов...*, 2014, «Проект энергетической политики Польши до 2050 года», 2015).

Вторым из предложенных сценариев является *ядерный сценарий*, который не кажется самым правдоподобным. Следует заметить, что расходы на реализацию этого проекта были бы самыми большими, что связывается как со значительными инвестиционными затратами, так и расходами, связанными с развитием людских ресурсов. Тем не менее,

следует отметить, что инвестиционные затраты могли бы быть компенсированы в будущем относительно низкой стоимостью получения топлива (сравн. Badyda, Kuźniewski, 2015, 695-700; Bartnik, Hnydiuk-Stefan, 2016, 257-263).

Следует подчеркнуть, что развитие атомной отрасли могло бы принести положительный эффект в области: (1) энергетической безопасности (понимаемой как безопасность энергоснабжения и диверсификация в рамках энергетической структуры), (2) уменьшения эмиссии энергетического сектора, (3) энергетической эффективности (понимаемой как потери при процессах преобразования энергии) (сравн. Kubowski, 2016). Таким образом, укрепление энергетической безопасности основывалось бы на снижении уровня опасности в области перебоев в энергоснабжении, укреплении стабильности производства электроэнергии, при одновременной дифференциации структуры производства электроэнергии. В качестве риска в цепочке поставок можно принять опасность, возникающую из механизмов обеспечения себе доступа к ядерному топливу.

Третьим из предложенных сценариев является *сценарий газ + ВИЭ*, который представляется возможным для осуществления, особенно, если примем во внимание развитие сетей передачи и планы создания в Польше газового хаба. В этом сценарии участие двух основных носителей, т.е. газа и ВИЭ, в энергетическом балансе формировалось бы на уровне 50-55%. Реализация принципов этого сценария приведет к: (1) значительному нивелированию эмиссии польского энергетического сектора, (2) значительной неоднородности энергетической структуры. Сохранение источников с высокой установленной мощностью позволяет эффективно использовать рассеянные и менее стабильные возобновляемые источники в ситуации, когда появляются проблемы с балансировкой электроэнергетических сетей (Bukowski, Śniegoński, 2011; «*Проект энергетической политики Польши до 2050 года*», 2015).

Сценарий газ + ВИЭ потребует постоянных инвестиций в инфраструктуру передачи и дистрибуции газа, и прежде всего в газовые электростанции. Реализация этого сценария также потребует развития инфраструктуры хранилищ газа, чтобы нивелировать опасность поставок этого сырья. Более того, кажется, что заявленная широкая эксплуатация нетрадиционного газа в Польше не будет иметь места по причине геологических условий, а прежде всего – экономических. Следовательно, необходимо активизировать усилия по разработке транснациональной

газотранспортной инфраструктуры (Szurlej, 2013, стр. 925-939; Rosicki, 2015, стр. 133–148).

Оценка и сравнение сценариев энергетической политики

Сравнивая сценарии развития энергетики, следует учесть, что все долгосрочные прогнозы или методы сценариев с длинной временной перспективой обременены большой вероятностью появления ошибок. Это вовсе не означает, что нельзя указать основных преимуществ отдельных сценариев энергетической политики.

В случае сбалансированного сценария, который можно считать наиболее вероятным, хотя бы политические факторы могли это изменить, следует заявить, что он является наименее проблематичным для нынешней экономической структуры страны. В то время как его недостатком было бы удерживание в течение длительного времени значительной доли твердого топлива в энергетической структуре страны. Кроме того, осуществление этого сценария, по сравнению с другими, будет связываться с наименьшей редукцией парниковых газов.

В случае сценария газ-ВИЭ, по сравнению с другими, мы бы имели дело со значительной редукцией эмиссии парниковых газов, как следствие и улучшением качества воздуха в Польше. При осуществлении этого сценария необходимо было бы активизировать усилия в области развития сетей передачи и дистрибуции, как с точки зрения газа, так и электроэнергии. Кроме того, были бы необходимы меры, которые приближались бы к либерализации энергетических рынков с целью упрощения экономического развития и создания наиболее выгодных условий для потребителей, в том числе благоприятного рынка для потребителей, участвующих в совместном создании энергии.

В случае ядерного сценария следует отметить, что осуществление программы строительства ядерной электростанции в ближайшем будущем маловероятно. Содержание проекта *«Энергетической политики Польши до 2050 года»* заключало этапы реализации проекта, который уже с момента объявления был маловероятен. Ожидалось, что смена правительства в Польше в 2015 году повлечет за собой более активное участие в развитии ядерной энергетики, основой которой могло быть экспонирование новыми властями проблематики диверсификации и без-

опасности энергоснабжения. Эти предположения на то время не нашли подтверждения в ином качестве решений и политических действий, поскольку не было представлено целостного видения оперативных планов в этой области, более того, экономические планы, представленные после 2015 г., показывают различные пути развития энергетического сектора. С одной стороны сохраняются заявления относительно развития ядерной энергетики с заранее установленной мощностью (6000 МВт), с другой стороны представлены проекты, носящие инновационный характер в области ядерных реакторов IV поколения, т.е. в сфере развития технологии HTR (*High Temperature Reactor*) и SMR (*Small Modular Reactor*) (сравн. Малые модульные реакторы SMR, 2013; Программа польской ядерной энергетики, 2014; План ответственного развития..., 2016; Заявление министра энергетики, 2017).

Принимая во внимание все вышесказанное, следует учесть, что до 2035 г. не следует ожидать запуска в профессиональную эксплуатацию ядерных реакторов с объявленной установленной мощностью. Более вероятным следует считать развитие инновационных программ в области технологий HTR и SMR, но в первом ряду экспериментальных реакторов этого типа (сравн. Малые модульные реакторы SMR, 2013; Стратегия ответственного развития ..., 2017). Впрочем, эти предположения должны быть перепроверены из-за политических факторов, которые включают в себя: политические подразделения (межпартийные, межпарламентские и межправительственные), а также деятельность групп интересов (в том числе групп интересов энергетического сектора).

Проводя анализ отдельных сценариев, следует также подчеркнуть важность твердого топлива для польской экономики (сравн. Szczerbowski, 2013, 35-46). На удержание их роли будут влиять структурно-экономические факторы и факторы политического риска. В первом случае необходимо принять во внимание, что Польша имеет самые большие запасы угля в Европейском Союзе, к тому же ее энергетика в значительной степени зависит от этого сырья. Результатом этого является широкая экономическая зависимость государства на центральном и местном уровне (напр., налоги, сборы, прямые и косвенные рабочие места). Во втором случае следует принять во внимание отсутствие воли принятия рискованных политических решений, которые повлияли бы на уменьшение избирательной поддержки. Лица прямо или косвенно связанные с угольной отраслью составляют значительную группу по-

тенциальных избирателей. Результатом этого является легкость в поддержании мифов о дешевой угольной энергии и широкой временной перспективе в добыче угольных ресурсов (сравн. Bukowski, Śniegocki, 2014; *Осушение неактивных горнодобывающих предприятий...*, 2015).

Стоит подчеркнуть, что политические факторы являются причиной того, что какие-либо радикальные решения, основанные на смелых постановлениях, изменяющих польскую энергетику, могут быть поняты как менее вероятные. Из анализа политических и законодательных действий с 2004 до 2017 года, можно сделать вывод, что решающим фактором, влияющим на польскую энергетическую политику, являются международные обязательства Польши, например, в региональном аспекте. Самое большое значение в региональном аспекте имеет членство Польши в Европейском Союзе, что означает обязательное выполнение требований по охране окружающей среды и энергетике, которые были разработаны в группе этих стран (сравн. Frączek, Kaliski, & Siemek, 2013, 301-315). Разработанные в Европейском Союзе решения конкурируют с внутренней политикой и экономической ситуацией Польши.

Учитывая все вышесказанное о влиянии отдельных факторов, следует принять, что на направления энергетической политики большое влияние будут иметь партийные коалиции, удерживающие власть в настоящее время. Можно предположить, что либеральные партии, левые и «про-европейские» будут более склонны к принятию решений, изменяющих основные направлений энергетической политики. Хотя более консервативные и «евроскептические» партии предпочтут решения, способствующие традиционной энергетической политике, которая поддерживала бы значение каменного и бурого угля, при одновременном негативном отношении к радикальным решениям и минимальном осуществлении принципов энергетической политики, разработанной на уровне Европейского Союза (сравн. Polniak, 2012, 89-103; Carter, Ladrech, Little, 2014; Kijewska, 2014, 1215-1227; Ancygier, Szulecki, 2015; *Энергетическая безопасность...*, 2015; Książkowski, 2015; Ancygier, Szulecki, 2016, 2–11).

ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ

Основной целью текста был анализ избранных вопросов, связанных с польской энергетической политикой в институционально-правовом аспекте. Анализ был сосредоточен главным образом на: (1) правовой ос-

нове энергетической политики, (2) основных субъектах энергетической политики, (3) прогнозах и сценариях энергетической политики. Представленный анализ не охватил всех вопросов, связанных с нормативными актами, касающимися польской энергетической политики, поэтому, для уточнения проблемы исследований в тексте представлены следующие исследовательские вопросы, которые связаны с выводам: *(1) В какой степени правовые решения влияют на эффективность проведения энергетической политики в Польше? (2) Какой из принятых сценариев развития энергетики, в планировочной документации энергетической политики Польши, следует считать наиболее вероятным?*

ВЫВОДЫ

Следует отметить, что необходима бóльшая специализация министра энергетики в области подготавливаемых целей и направлений, содержащихся в документах по планированию, т.е. в отдельных проектах энергетической политики. Кроме того, целесообразным представляется активизация усилий, которые будут воздействовать на бóльшую согласованность в политических и институциональных действиях, а также на согласованность между отдельными документами, которые прямо или косвенно связаны с энергетической политикой.

Следует отметить, что необходимо изменение правовой основы ведения энергетической политики министром энергетики, поскольку текущие законодательные нормы кажутся недостаточными и малоэффективными с точки зрения определения стратегических целей и их осуществления в энергетической сфере. Например, одной из проблем при проведении энергетической политики является связывающая сила документации, утверждаемой Советом министров. Следствием вышесказанного является отсутствие согласованного видения и скоординированных действий в области энергетической политики.

Следует положительно оценить изменения в области консолидации вопросов, касающихся энергетики в отдельно взятом министерстве, т.е. Министерстве энергетики. В связи с необходимостью повышения эффективности работы *Министерства энергетики* следует произвести дальнейшую консолидацию отделов, которые связаны с энергетикой, например, связанных с возобновляемыми источниками энергии, будучи в компетенции Министерства Охраны окружающей среды.

ВЫВОДЫ

Стоит обратить внимание, что на осуществление определенных сценариев развития энергетики в Польше будет влиять много факторов. К основным факторам, детерминирующим изменения, следует причислить структурно-экономические факторы и факторы политического риска. Достаточно большое значение будут иметь факторы, принадлежащие ко второй группе, т.е. факторы политического риска, что следует из факта инструментального отношения к энергетической политике и энергетической экономке с целью внутренней политики, т.е. партийного и парламентарного соперничества. Из этого возникает предположение, что политические факторы будут устранять какие-либо радикальные решения в отношении направлений и целей энергетической политики. При анализе долгосрочных прогнозов, следует также учитывать изменения в действиях властей в Польше и динамику изменений в области энергетической политики в Европейском Союзе.

Проводя сравнительный анализ трех сценариев развития энергетики (*сбалансированный сценарий, ядерный сценарий, сценарий на основе развития сектора ВИЭ и газового сектора «газ+ ВИЭ»*), представленных в проекте «*Энергетическая политика Польши до 2050 года*», следует отметить, что наиболее радикальные решения будут наименее реалистичными в осуществлении. Следовательно, в первую очередь, следует исключить более широкое участие Польши в развитии ядерной энергетики, хотя с этими допущениями следует учитывать значение факторов, представленных в тексте. Следует принять, что наиболее реальным является сбалансированный сценарий с медленным темпом изменений в секторе возобновляемых источников энергии, газовом и ядерном секторах. Следует подчеркнуть, что эти предположения могут измениться в связи с возможностью принятия политического риска со стороны власть имущих.

Следует признать, что наибольшее влияние на замедление развития, например, возобновляемых источников энергии в Польше, имеют политические действия или партийное и парламентское соперничество, отсутствие мышления политиков в категориях национальных интересов и отсутствие мышления политиков в категориях долгосрочной стратегии, которая превышала бы период парламентского срока полномочий.

Библиография

- Ancygier A., Szulecki K. (2015). *The new Polish government's energy policy: expect more State, less market*, [B:] <http://energypost.eu/new-polish-governments-energy-policy-expect-state-less-market/>, 19.02.2017.
- Ancygier A., Szulecki K. (2016). Die polnische Energie – und Klimapolitik in der Verantwortung von PiS. *Polen-Analysen*, 175.
- Badyda K., Kuźniewski M. (2015). Analiza opłacalności budowy elektrowni jądrowej w Polsce. *Energetyka*, 11.
- Bartnik R., Hnydiuk-Stefan A. (2016). Analiza ekonomiczna jednostkowych kosztów produkcji elektryczności w różnych technologiach jej wytwarzania. *Energetyka*, 5.
- Bukowski M., Śniegocki A. (2011). *Mix energetyczny 2050. Analiza scenariuszy dla Polski*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Strukturalnych, Ministerstwo Gospodarki.
- Bukowski M., Śniegocki A. (2014). *Ukryty rachunek za węgiel. Analiza wsparcia gospodarczego dla elektroenergetyki węglowej oraz górnictwa w Polsce*. Warszawa: Warszawski Instytut Studiów Ekonomicznych.
- Carter N., Ladrech R., Little C. (2014). *Political parties' climate policies in the UK, Italy and Denmark*, [B:] <https://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/f51e32ac-9212-4623-813f-2fc6a4040668.pdf>, 19.02.2017.
- Ciechanowska M. (2014). Polityka energetyczna Polski do 2050 roku. *Nafta-Gaz*, 11.
- Czarnecka M., Ogłódek T. (2007). *Prawo energetyczne. Komentarz*. Bydgoszcz-Katowice: Branta.
- Elżanowski F. (2008). *Polityka energetyczna. Prawne instrumenty realizacji*. Warszawa: LexisNexis.
- Frączek P., Kaliski M., Siemek P. (2013). The Modernization of the Energy Sector in Poland vs. Poland's Energy Security. *Archives of Mining Sciences*, 2.
- Kijewska B. (2014). Problematyka energetyczna w ujęciu politycznym: kwestie energetyczne w programach politycznych. *Przegląd Naukowo-Metodyczny. Edukacja dla Bezpieczeństwa*, 3.
- Książkowski K. (2015). *Polityka energetyczna w kampanii wyborczej 2015*, [B:] http://www.cire.pl/pliki/2/polityka_energetyczna_w_kampanii_wyborczej_2015.pdf, 06.04.2017.

- Kubowski J. (2016). Elektrownie jądrowe a globalne ocieplenie. O przyczynach i skutkach globalnego ocieplenia. *Energetyka*, 1, [B:] <http://www.cire.pl/pliki/2/elektrowniejadroweaglobalneocieplenie.pdf>, 06.04.2017.
- Małe Reaktory Modułowe SMR* (2013). Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Badań Jądrowych.
- Nowacki J., Tabor Z. (2016). *Wstęp do prawoznawstwa*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Obwieszczenie Ministra Energii z dnia 18 stycznia 2017 r. w sprawie ogłoszenia sprawozdania z realizacji „Programu polskiej energetyki jądrowej” za lata 2014–15 (2017).
- Odwadnianie nieczynnych zakładów górniczych prowadzone w związku z likwidacjami kopalń* (2015). Warszawa: Najwyższa Izba Kontroli.
- Pawelczyk M., Pikiewicz B. (2012). Polityka energetyczna. [B:] Pawelczyk M. (ред.), *Prawo energetyczne. Komentarz*. Poznań: Iuris.
- Pieniążek A., & Stefaniuk M. (2014). *Socjologia prawa. Zarys wykładu*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Plan na rzecz Odpowiedzialnego Rozwoju. Informacja prasowa z 16 lutego 2016 r.* (2016). Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rozwoju.
- Polniak Ł. (2012). Bezpieczeństwo energetyczne państwa w programach polskich partii politycznych. *Nauki Społeczne*, 2.
- Program polskiej energetyki jądrowej* (2014). Warszawa: Ministerstwo Gospodarki, Pełnomocnik Rządu do spraw Polskiej Energetyki Jądrowej.
- Projekt Polityki energetycznej Polski do 2050 roku* (2015). Warszawa: Ministerstwo Gospodarki.
- Rewizorski M., Rosicki R., Ostant W. (2013). *Wybrane aspekty bezpieczeństwa energetycznego Unii Europejskiej*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Rosicki R. (2010). Reglamentacja działalności gospodarczej w energetyce. Analiza prawno-instytucjonalna. *Przegląd Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego*, 3.
- Rosicki R. (2015a). The Energy Policy of Poland up to 2050 – a Critical Analysis. *Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne*, 1.
- Rosicki R. (2015b). A New Prospect of Poland’s Gas Security. *Zeszyty Naukowe WSB w Poznaniu*, 8 (65).
- Smolak M. (2012). *Wykładnia celowościowa z perspektywy pragmatycznej*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Strategia na rzecz odpowiedzialnego rozwoju do roku 2020 (z perspektywą do 2030 roku)* (2017). Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rozwoju.

- Swora M. (2012). *Niezależne organy administracji. Aspekty prawne, organizacyjne i polityczne*. Warszawa: PWE.
- Swora M., Stefaniuk M. (2016). Minister Energii (art. 12). [w:] Swora M., & Muras Z. (red.), *Prawo energetyczne. Tom II*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.
- Szczerbowski R. (2013). Bezpieczeństwo energetyczne Polski – mix energetyczny i efektywność energetyczna. *Polityka Energetyczna*, 4.
- Szurlej A. (2013), The State Policy for Natural Gas Sector. *Archives of Mining Sciences*, 3.
- Ustawa o zmianie ustawy o działach administracji rządowej oraz niektórych innych ustaw (Dz.U. 2015 poz. 1960).
- закон „Об энергетике” от 10 апреля 1997 г. (Вестник законов 1997, № 54, п. 348 с изменениями) [сокращение: UPE].
- Waligórski M. A. (2008). Polityka energetyczna państwa jako sektorowa polityka administracyjna. *Biuletyn Urzędu Regulacji Energetyki*, 4.
- Wnioski z analiz prognostycznych na potrzeby Polityki energetycznej Polski do 2050 roku* (2014). Warszawa: Ministerstwo Gospodarki.
- Wronkowska S. (2005). *Podstawowe pojęcia prawa i prawoznawstwa*. Poznań: Ars boni et aequi.
- Zawiska M. (2016). Elementy polityki energetycznej (art. 14). [w:] Swora M., & Muras Z. (red.), *Prawo energetyczne. Tom II*. Warszawa: Wolters Kluwer.

SECURITY POLICIES IN EUROPE

FILIP TERESZKIEWICZ

Ph.D., Opole University of Technology, Opole, Poland

European Union global strategy from the viewpoint of Eurosceptic members of the European Parliament: discursive nodal points

The purpose of this paper is to identify discursive nodal points (DNP) within Eurosceptic discourse about the EU Global Strategy (EUGS) that was presented by Federica Mogherini at the end of June 2016. These DNPs have been identified by examining Eurosceptic discourse both in parliamentary debate about this document, as well as in media such as newspaper articles and web materials. This allows the author to define five Eurosceptic narratives about the EUGS. The first underlines that the document does not take into consideration the consequences of Brexit. The second highlights that the EUGS is a step towards a European federal state. The third is a conviction that the EUGS would create unnecessarily strong links between the EU and NATO. The fourth underlines that giving Turkey the possibility of accession to the EU is a mistake. And the fifth is a belief that the security strategy (but not the EUGS) could be useful for Europe, however only if it will concentrate on common threats for all European member states. Through identifying Eurosceptic narratives, this paper defines two Eurosceptic DNPs about the EUGS. The first DNP is the belief that this document is an example that European elites are disconnected from societies and their problems, while the second is a belief that the EUGS is an instrument that increases the United States' influence on Europe.

Keywords: European Union, Eurosceptic, Constructivism, Discursive Nodal Points, EU Global Strategy,

Introduction

Recent years have shown increasing societal support for populists, including those that are against integration, particularly with regard to the European Union (EU). The 2014 elections for the European Parliament, recent elections in some EU member states (Austria, Netherlands, France), and the referendum in the UK about leaving the EU have made political analysts realise that Euroscepticism is not a marginal political outlook, but is in fact going mainstream. Therefore, a fundamental issue in the debate about the future of EU integration is to increase knowledge about Eurosceptic attitudes towards particular areas of cooperation within an integrated Europe. This paper researches one issue from that debate: Eurosceptic discourse surrounding a new Global Strategy for the EU that was presented by Federica Mogherini on 28 June 2016. A constructivist approach is used to achieve that goal, highlighting the concept of Discursive Nodal Points (DNP) created by Thomas Diez. DNPs are extracted from the Eurosceptic discourse that was conducted not only within the European Parliament framework, but also from newspaper articles and web materials. A coherent viewpoint shared by anti-EU politicians of the European security strategy is described based on these DNPs, which gives us insight into the future of European cooperation within the field of security when Eurosceptic politicians and parties have influence on member states' governments.

The notion of Euroscepticism

The notion of Euroscepticism exists in the debate about European integration for many years¹. However, as Krzysztof Zuba noted, there did not exist one coherent term that describes attitudes against European integration until the 1990s. The debate about the Maastricht Treaty promoted the notion of "Euroscepticism", but it did not create one coherent understanding what that term meant (Zuba, 2006, 7). The first holistic description of Euroscepticism was published in 1997 (Benoit), and the first conceptualisation of that notion was created by Taggart (1998, 366). "Euroscepticism" has become

¹ The notion of Discursive Nodal Points, albeit authored by T. Diez., is founded on other authors' analysis. The roots of DNP are traced to the works of Laclau & Mouffe (1985) or Hejl (1987, 303–339).

a scientific term encompassing any political ideology that contest the process of some or all of the elements of European integration (Zuba, 2006, 10).

Nevertheless, in spite of the number of publications about Euroscepticism (Abts, Heerwegh Swyngedouw, 2009, pp. 1–26; Brack Costa, 2012; Crespy Verschuere, 2009, 377–393; Kaniok, 2012, 29–52; Leconte, 2010; Usherwood, Startin, Guerra, 2013; FitzGibbon, Leruth & Startin, 2017), there is a dispute between academics about what exactly that term means, and which attitudes and ideas exist within its framework (Leconte, 2015, 254–255; Leruth, Startin & Usherwood, 2018, 1–9). That dispute could be simply described as a question of whether Euroscepticism would destroy the EU, or if it would merely reform it in a desirable direction. Taggart & Szczerbiak distinguished between “hard” Euroscepticism (having as a goal the collapse of the EU) and “soft” Euroscepticism (having the limiting of the EU’s integration as a goal) (2001, 10; 2002, 27). We can find another distinction based on similar criteria in the publication of K. Zuba, who contrasts between Euroscepticism (opposition to European integration) and Eurorealism (ambivalence about European integration) (2006, 55–59). These aforementioned distinctions are important for this paper because they focus only on politicians and parties that represent Taggart & Szczerbiak’s concept of “hard” Euroscepticism and Zuba’s idea of Euroscepticism. Therefore, the whole spectrum of attitudes and orientations that express ambivalence about European integration are excluded.

For the sake of this paper, the choice of relevant parties is made on a simple premise: only parties whose members are deputies in the eight-term European Parliament play an important role on a national scene. This premise is based on the fact that elections to the European Parliament were conducted within the same timeframe (22–25 May 2014). Further, it is assumed that parties whose members are deputies in the European Parliament have significant societal support. This paper focuses on those parties whose deputies are members of two Eurosceptic EP factions: Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, and Europe of Nations and Freedom, as well as independent deputies who have Eurosceptic orientations. The first group is a specific hybrid of politicians from the ecological populist Italian 5 Star Movement (*Movimento 5 Stelle* – M5S) and far-right parties. Beside the above-mentioned Italians, Great Britain’s United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) has the biggest representation in the group. Deputies from the Sweden Democrats (*Sverigedemokraterna* – SD), Lithuania’s Order

and Justice Party (*Partija Tvarka ir teisingumas* – PTT), Czech Party of Free Citizens (*Strana svobodných občanů* – SSO), are also accounted for, as well as a Polish deputy from KORWIN and independent French deputy Joëlle Bergeron (Members, 2016). The Europe of Nations and Freedom's group consists of politicians who represent parties from the right-wing pan-European group European Alliance for Freedom, such as France's National Front (*Front National* – FN), Italy's Northern League (*Lega Nord* – LN), the Freedom Party of Austria (*Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs* – FPÖ), The Netherlands' Party of Freedom (*Partij voor de Vrijheid* – PVV), Poland's Congress of the New Right (Kongres Nowej Prawicy – KNP), Belgium's Flemish Interest (*Vlaams Belang* – VB), independent Brit Janice Atkinson and independent Romanian Laurențiu Rebegea (ENF Members, 2016). Among independent deputies Euroscepticism is represented by members of Greece Golden Dawn (*Λαϊκός Σύνδεσμος – Χρυσή Αυγή*), Hungary's Jobbik (*Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom*), Poland's KORWiN party, and the National Democratic Party of Germany (*Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands* – NPD) (Non-attached, 2017).

The main idea of EU global strategy

A new strategic document for the EU, entitled "A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe, was officially presented on 28 June 2016 by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Federica Mogherini to the Head of State or Government in a European Council meeting (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016). It has replaced the outdated European Security Strategy from 2003 (European, 2003). Andrea Frontini noted that the need for analytically solid and meaningful prescriptive analysis of the regional and global strategic landscape surrounding Europe had been overdue. Over the course of a decade, the geopolitical environment in the European neighbourhood had deteriorated due to threats such as "politico-security" turbulence in Sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia and the Far East, the rise of increasingly transnational challenges like terrorism, climate change and cyberattacks (Frontini, 2016). All of these developments showed that the EU needed a new strategic document for its external actions, as well as for its security policy.

The new strategy was prepared in a very short period of time, mainly because F. Mogherini had announced the preparation of a new EU strategic document as her main goal in her initial months on the post (Tocci, 2016, 461–472). Although the work took almost 18 months to complete, it still was not fully complete. Another problem had been related to Brexit, because the presence of UK in the EU had been in the balance during work on the global strategy. This issue had been crucial for the debate about the EU's new strategy, because without the British military capacities and political potential, the Community would be weakest on the global scene. Eventually, the British voted for Brexit, and the new Global Strategy was presented a few days later in an atmosphere of crisis of European integration.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the new global strategy has been criticised almost from the beginning (Tereszkiewicz, 2016b, 107–110). However, the document accurately describes the new situation of the EU as the world becomes a “more connected, contested and complex” (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 7). That complexity pushed the High Representative to prepare the strategy, which is “double global” geographically and thematically speaking (Zandee, 2016, 26). It establishes goals and priorities for the EU's external actions across the planet. What is more, it tries link together internal and external security issues. Furthermore, the document defines “principled pragmatism” as a fundament of the EU's external action and security policy, based on the principles of unity, engagement, responsibility and partnership.

The new strategy has five established priorities. The first ensures the security of the European Union, which names the most important threats for an integrated Europe. Among them are terrorism, hybrid threats, economic volatility, climate change and energy insecurity. The ability to promote peace and security within and beyond EU borders is a main goal for the Community according to that priority. To achieve the goal, intensification of activity in the fields of defence, counter-terrorism, cyber-security, energy security and strategic communications is needed. Furthermore, close cooperation with NATO would increase the EU's own input to security for an integrated Europe (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 16–20).

The second priority is the state and societal resilience of Eastern and Southern neighbours of the Union. The main instrument for that priority is an enlargement policy that would be concentrated on the Western Balkan states and Turkey, which have a clearly defined perspective of ac-

cession to the EU. The global strategy also emphasises the necessity of establishing close links between itself and the European Neighbourhood Policy. That would help increase of the resilience of European neighbours and thereby increase the security of the EU. Furthermore, the Union will support different paths of stability, targeting the most adjusted cases of governmental, economic, societal and climate instabilities, as well as develop more effective migration policies focusing on origin and transit countries of migrants and refugees (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 20–25).

The third priority is an integrated approach to conflicts. Within the framework of this approach the EU should establish, according to the global strategy, a more cohesive attitude toward conflicts and crises in regions surrounded the Community. That means not only a coherent use of EU politics and instruments, but also activity at all stages of the conflict cycle, acting promptly on prevention, responding responsibly to crises, and avoiding premature disengagement. The EU will also engage in peacebuilding processes in a practical and principled way to encourage human security (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 25–29).

The fourth priority is cooperative regional orders. Within this goal, the EU will support cooperative regional orders worldwide, but with respect for diversity of the different parts of the globe. That priority is important for the EU because regional governance offers states and peoples the opportunity to better manage security concerns, harvest the economic gains of globalisation, and express more fully cultures and identities, which is a fundamental for the EU's own peace and development. That priority creates an opposition to the Kremlin's actions in Ukraine because Russian violation of international law has challenged European security order (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 30–36).

The final priority is global governance. A global order based in international law is fundamental for the EU, because it ensures human rights, sustainable development and lasting access to the global commons. Therefore, the EU will endeavour for a strong UN as the bedrock for the multilateral rules-based order. The EU will strive also to closely cooperate with states, international and regional organisations, and non-state actors. The global strategy says that the Community has an aspiration to transform rather to simply preserve the existing global governance system that reflects the aspirations of Brussels (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016, 36–41).

In order to translate that vision into reality, the Global Strategy calls for a collective investment in the EU's credibility through increased defence and security capabilities, and more reactive diplomatic, security, and development tools. What is more, the Strategy also calls for a joint approach based on institutional and policy innovations, including the role of the European External Action Service, and better links between the EU's internal and external policies and EU's institutions (Frontini, 2016). Thusly, the essence of the Global Strategy is to bring soft and hard power instruments together in a joint approach and to recognise that the EU has a particular role to play as a security provider in the near abroad, as well as further afield (Zandee, 2016, 27).

The concept of Discursive Nodal Points

The father of the concept of Discursive Nodal Points (DNPs) is Thomas Diez². DNPs operate by filling a subject of discussion (in this case, the Global Strategy of the European Union) with meaning through the tying together of several discourses on other, more general concepts. Thus, DNPs help frame the given subject of discussion (Diez, 2001, 16). Per that theory, streams that exist within a discourse are interwoven, combining to form a new discourse. Diez argues that by the using of analysis of discursive nodal points from disparate but linked political articulations, it is a chance to reconstruct one discourse that dominates in one political environment or group (Diez, 1998, 3–7). DNPs exist to define a meta-narrative; with time, that meta-narrative becomes unquestioned and presented as obvious and natural (Diez, 2001, 16), thereby becoming a fundamental part of that discourse.

The aim for analysis of DNPs is a reconstruction of a conceptualisation of a specific subject of discussion within diversified discourses, which are conducted within political debates and then meta-narratives on which they are based. European Union security policy is a specific subject on which The EU Global Strategy is focused. Each articulation of the EU Global Strategy is therefore part of the discourse on that strategic document, but this paper is only concerned with a capture of discursive nodal points in Eurosceptic

² The notion of Discursive Nodal Points, albeit authored by T. Diez., is founded on other authors' analysis. The roots of DNP are traced to the works of Laclau & Mouffe (1985) or Hejl (1987, 303–339).

discourse within the European Parliament about the titular document. In short, the paper defines a Eurosceptic meta-narrative about the EU Global Strategy. The reconstruction of discursive nodal points within the discourse about that document is important because actors (namely Eurosceptic politicians) are not completely autonomous. They are constrained by conventional understanding and agreed-upon rules of the game, and also by mutual positioning, existing institutionalised routines, and changing contexts (Hajer, 1995, 275–276). Discursive nodal points help us to understand what influences Eurosceptic attitudes, not only towards The EU Global Strategy, but also towards EU foreign and security policy as a whole. DNPs help us understand the nature of that policy not as outcomes of politics, but as an integral part of politics in constituting powerful discursive practices that are not only shaped by their discursive contexts, but also reproducing and reasserting them (Diez, 2001, 17).

Discursive Nodal Points within Eurosceptic discourse about the EU global strategy

The EU global strategy is not an important issue for Eurosceptic politicians to pursue. Rarely have they taken part in the discussion about that strategic document, especially in contrast to politicians from mainstream factions. The main area where a reconstruction of Eurosceptic discourse about the EUGS is possible is the European Parliament, where a debate was held about the Strategy on 6 July 2016 (A Global Strategy for the EU's, 2016). A conducted analysis helps define five types of narrative within a Eurosceptic discourse about that document, and two DNPs.

The first narrative is an opinion that the EU Global Strategy does not take into consideration the consequences of Brexit. Almost all Eurosceptic politicians think that the omission of Brexit is a huge weakness of the document because the Community without the United Kingdom would have reduced political and military potential, which would have an influence on the EU's positions in the global scene, as well as its possibility to play as an influential actor or to preserve European interests. The EU with Britain has a completely different weight in international relations than without it, and for that reason the strategy prepared before Brexit is now out-of-date

(A Global Strategy for the EU's, 2016). Another argument within that narrative underlines that ignoring consequences of Brexit means a disregard for European societies that are increasingly Eurosceptic and distrusting of the EU, meaning that the pro-European Global Strategy, which prioritises a necessity to increase European integration especially in the military and security fields, goes against public opinion and sociological trends. This makes it appear as though pro-European elites are disconnected from the member states' societies (A Global Strategy for the EU's, 2016; Borghezio 2016; The Democratic, 2016).

The second narrative is a belief that the EU Global Strategy is a step toward a European federal state. That opinion is very strong among politicians from SD, UKIP and PVV. They think that the main, albeit hidden, goal for that strategy is to limit a member state's sovereignty in the foreign and security policy area (A Global Strategy for the EU's, 2016). Creating a common European army is criticised by Eurosceptics as a step towards federal state (A Global Strategy for the EU's, 2016; Une armée, 2016). However, the document does not mention that goal literally (A Global Strategy for the European, 2016). Especially among UKIP members, the idea that Britain would be forced to join the EU army if it were to stay is very popular. They think that the EU global strategy was kept secret during the campaign on the Brexit referendum because of fears that it could affect the outcome by boosting the "leave" campaign's popularity (Jankowski, 2016).

The third narrative is a conviction that the Strategy would create unnecessarily strong links between the EU and NATO, especially within the security and defence area³. That opinion is not far from the truth mainly because of the results of NATO's Warsaw Summit, where these two organisations established an agreement on cooperation in the defence field (Joint Declaration, 2016). Eurosceptic politicians, especially from FPÖ, Golden Dawn, PVV, and LN emphasise that the EU would realise NATO's goals and preserve their interests, which often are against European interests (A global strategy for the EU's, 2016; Sinadinos, 2016). Another objection regarding the global strategy relates to the presumption that close links between NATO and the EU would hurt relations with Russia, which is against member states' interests. Moreover, the strong links between NATO and the EU,

³ However, a completely different opinion is popular among UKIP members, who think that the EU global strategy shows that Brussels is "positioning its self as a rival to NATO" (EU wants, 2016).

which the strategy could create, reposition Russia as a challenge to European security. That, in the Eurosceptic's opinion (mainly from Golden Dawn and LN), would deepen distrust between Moscow and other capitals on the continent (A global strategy for the EU's, 2016; Borghezio 2016). Certain Eurosceptic politicians, especially those from Austria's FPÖ, indicate additionally that close cooperation with NATO would be against the neutrality of some of the member states (A global strategy for the EU's, 2016; Hübner, 2016; Neue Werte, 2013).

The fourth narrative is the belief that creating an illusion of the possibility of EU accession for Turkey – as this document is doing – is a huge mistake and must be rejected. They underline that an agreement with Ankara about the refugee crisis shows the weakness of the EU at the negotiating table. In the Eurosceptic's opinion, Brussels' concession to Turkey of open access to the Community through the visa liberalisation and the perspective of accession is against public opinion in EU member states. This shows that the EU global strategy creates an opposite point of view for future relations with Turkey compared to dominant attitudes of European societies (A global strategy for the EU's, 2016).

The last narrative is unusual for the Eurosceptic's type of thinking, because it is a belief that the security strategy could be useful for Europe. Politicians from SD and Golden Dawn do not completely reject the idea of a such a strategy, but think that it should concentrate on security threats that are real and common for all Europeans. Many of them think that the most important security issues for now are illegal immigration and the refugee crisis (A global strategy for the EU's, 2016). Therefore, the EU should focus on the securing of the external border (Riksdagen, 2016). And that is a reason why this narrative is not typical for Eurosceptics. Usually these politicians are against any role of the EU in any capacity, but this narrative shows that some of them see a place for the Brussels as a provider of security in these fields where cooperation is needed.

The above-described narratives allow us to define the Eurosceptic's Discursive Nodal Points about the EU Global Strategy. The first DNP, dominant among Eurosceptics, is a conviction that the new strategic document is another example that European elites are disconnected from European societies and their real problems. They denounce politicians from mainstream parties, as well as EU bureaucrats, for not focusing on high unemployment, inefficiency of health services and security threats, and attempting to build

a European federal state (or at least a pan-European common army) using the EUGS. In their view, mainstream politicians giving Turkey the possibility of accession to the Community, while not taking a strong enough stance against Islamic terrorism arising within member states, is inappropriate. For these reasons, the Strategy is perceived by Eurosceptics as a new toy for pro-European elites that is unnecessary for European societies.

The second DNP is a belief that the EU global strategy is an instrument that increases the United States' influence on Europe, which can be against member states' interest. The new strategic document, in their opinion, creates needlessly strong links between the EU and NATO, which thereby gives Washington a chance to preserve American interests using European "hands". This impact is observed in relations between the EU and Russia because the main burdens of anti-Kremlin sanctions are suffered by European states, while the United States handles lighter consequences of said sanctions (Tereszkiewicz, 2015, 254–256.).

Conclusions

The above-conducted analysis shows that the EU global strategy is not a very important issue for Eurosceptic politicians. The Eurosceptic discourse about that document took place mainly within the European Parliament, and rarely had a place within member states' legislatures and media. The crucial observation is that politicians, who are in theory against the EU and European integration, do not always dispute the idea of the security strategy that is common for European states. This concept is popular especially within politicians from SD or Golden Dawn. However, strategic documents should, in the opinion of those Eurosceptics, focus only on common pan-European problems like illegal immigration or terrorism, and must assure sovereignty of European states. This point shows that some Eurosceptic politicians are open for strong cooperation between member states in the security area, meaning that they are not completely against European integration, but they want it limited only to issues or threats that are common among member states. This open attitude towards the common European security strategy does not mean that Eurosceptics find value in the EU Global Strategy. Mainly, their opinion is negative because of two reasons (DNPs). First, they underline that this document is part of the federal type

of thinking and it shows that pro-European elites are disconnected from increasingly Eurosceptic societies. Second, the EU global strategy will create strong links between the EU and NATO, which – in their opinion – increase European subordination to the United States especially within the security and defence area. These two reasons procure that the viewpoint of Eurosceptic members of the European Parliament on the EU global strategy is very negative. Therefore, if Eurosceptic politicians or parties had influence on government in some EU member states, the EU global strategy would lose influence on the EU's foreign and security policy.

Bibliography

- Abts, K., Heerwegh, D. & Swyngedouw M. (2009). Sources of Euroscepticism: Utilitarian, Interest, Social Distrust, National Identity and Institutional Distrust, *World Political Science Review* 5(1), DOI: 10.2202/1935-6226.1057
- A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign And Security Policy "Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe"* (2016). 28 June. Retrieved from http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf.
- A Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy (debate)* (2016). 6 July. Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20160706+ITEM-010+DOC+XML+V0//EN>.
- Benoit, B. (1997). *Social-Nationalism: An Anatomy of French Euroscepticism*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Borghesio, M. (2016), Altri errori della Mogherini nella "Nuova strategia globale" della UE. Retrieved from <http://www.imolaoggi.it/2016/07/07/borghesio-altri-errori-della-mogherini-nella-nuova-strategia-globale-della-ue/>.
- Brack, N., & Costa, O. (2012). *Euroscepticism within EU Institutions. Diverging Views on Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Crespy, A. & Verschueren, N. (2009). From Euroscepticism to resistance to European integration: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 10(3), pp. 377–393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15705850903105793>.

- Diez, T. (1998). The Economic Community Reading of Europe: Its Discursive Nodal Points and Ambiguities towards "Westphalia". *COPRI-Working Paper* 6, pp. 1–27.
- Diez T. (2001), Europe as a Discursive Battleground. *Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies. Cooperation and Conflict* 36(1), pp. 5–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00108360121962245>
- ENF Members (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.enfgroup-ep.eu/members/>.
- European Security Strategy "A Secure Europe in a Better World" (2003). Retrieved from <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/file/10/download?token=ubYn8qBQ>.
- EU wants an Empire' Brussels hope to expand its influence as far as Asia and Africa (2016). *Express*. Retrieved from <http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/685005/EU-superstate-army-plans-Brussels-expand-reach-China-Africa-Brexit-Ukip>.
- FitzGibbon, J., Leruth B., & Startin, N. (Eds.) (2017), *Euroscepticism as a Transnational and Pan-European Phenomenon. The emergence of a new sphere of opposition*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Frontini, A. (2016) The EU Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy: A Short Guide for the Perplexed. Retrieved from <http://www.ispionline.it/it/pubblicazione/eu-global-strategy-foreign-and-security-policy-short-guide-perplexed-15441>.
- Hajer, M. (1995). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Harmesen, R. & Spiering, M. (2004). Introduction: Euroscepticism and the Evolution of European Political Debate. *European Studies. A Journal of European Culture, History, and Politics* 1(20), pp. 13–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/9789401201087_002.
- Hejl, P. (1987). Konstruktion der sozialen Konstruktion. In S. J. Schmidt (Ed.) *Der Diskurs des radikalen Konstruktivismus* (pp. 303–339). Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.
- Hübner, J. (2016), EU-Pakt mit Nato beendet Neutralität von Österreich und Schweden. Retrieved from https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXV/J/J_09946/imfname_547172.pdf.
- Jankowski, J. (2016). Brussels Looks to Expand Into Middle East and Africa – UKIP MP: 'EU Wants an Empire', *Planer Free Will*. Retrieved from

- <http://planetfreewill.com/2016/07/01/brussels-looks-to-expand-into-middle-east-and-africa-ukip-mp-eu-wants-an-empire/>.
- Joint Declaration by the President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, and the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2016). Retrieved from http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2016/07/NATO-EU-Declaration-8-July-EN-final_pdf/, (dostęp: 28.12.2016).
- Kaniok, P. (2012) Eurosceptics – Enemies or a Necessary Part of European Integration? *Romanian Journal of Political Science* 12(2), pp 29–52.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, Ch. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy” Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London: Verso.
- Leconte, C. (2010). *Understanding Euroscepticism*. London: Palgrave.
- Leconte, C. (2015). From Pathology to mainstream phenomenon: Reviewing the Euroscepticism debate in research and theory. *International Political Science Review* 36(3), pp. 250–263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192512115576236>.
- Members (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.efddgroup.eu/members>.
- Neue Werte für Österreich. Grundsatzprogramm (2013). Retrieved from <http://www.teamstronach.at/de/programm?file=files/team-stronach/content/downloads/grundsatzprogramm/Grundsatzprogramm.pdf>.
- Non-attached Members (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/search.html?politicalGroup=4907>.
- Leruth, B., Startin N. & Usherwood, S. (2018). Defining Euroscepticism. From a broad concept to a field of study. In B. Leruth, N. Startin & S. Usherwood (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism* (pp. 1–9). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Riksdagen. Utrikesutskottet, Protokoll, Utskottssammanträde 2015/16:28 Överläggning med regering om EU:s globala strategi (EGS) (2016). Retrieved from <http://data.riksdagen.se/dokument/H3A1UU28p>.
- Sinadinos, E. (2016). [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Li9Kx7wpokI>.
- Taggart, P. (1998). A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party System. *European Journal of Political Research* 3(33), pp. 363–388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.00387>.
- Taggart, P. & Szczerbiak, A. (2001). Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe. *SEI*

- Working Paper* 46. Retrieved from <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=sei-working-paper-no-46.pdf&site=266>.
- Taggart, P. & Szczerbiak, A. (2002). Europeanisation, Euroscepticism and Party System: Party-Based Euroscepticism in the Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe. *Perspectives on European Politics & Society* 1(3), pp. 23–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15705850208438827>.
- Tereszkiewicz, F. (2016a). Konstruktywizm jako perspektywa badawcza w wyjaśnianiu zachowań eurosceptyków w Parlamencie Europejskim w obszarze działań zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej. *Przegląd Europejski* 3(41), pp.10–28.
- Tereszkiewicz, F. (2016b). Rewizja europejskiej strategii bezpieczeństwa – kolejna zmarnowana szansa? In I. Oleksiewicz & K. Stępień (Eds.), *Zagrożenia i wyzwania bezpieczeństwa współczesnego świata. Wymiar ekonomiczno-społeczny* (pp. 101–113). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Rambler.
- Tereszkiewicz, F. (2015). Partie antyunijne wobec konfliktu na Ukrainie: implikacje dla działań zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations* 3(51), pp. 245–265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7366/020909613201513>
- The Democratic Revolution has just begun (2016). Retrieved from http://www.ukip.org/the_democratic_revolution_has_just_begun.
- Tocci, N. (2016). The making of the EU Global Strategy. *Contemporary Security Policy* 37(3), pp. 461–472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1232559>.
- Une armée européenne à la place de l’Otan? (2016). Retrieved from <https://fr.sputniknews.com/international/201606301026286215-otan-armee-europeenne/>.
- Usherwood, S.; Startin, N. & Guerra, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Journal of Common Market Studies* 51(1). Special issue *Confronting Euroscepticism*.
- Zandee, D. (2016). EU Global Strategy: from design to implementation, pp. 25–29. Retrieved from <https://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/EU%20Global%20Strategy%20-%20AP%20-%20August%202016.pdf>.
- Zuba, K. (2006). *Polski eurosceptycyzm i eurorealizm*, Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

JUSTYNA ZAJĄC*Prof. UW dr hab., University of Warsaw, Poland*

Polish-Romanian relations in the 21st century. Back to the future?

In the early 21st century, Poland and Romania declared a strategic partnership. What prompted both states to seek a close political-military cooperation was Russia's apparent return to its imperial policy, which both countries regarded as a threat to their national security. The Georgian-Russian war of 2008 and the intervention of Russia in Ukraine in 2014 contributed to the establishment of a Polish-Romanian strategic partnership which, as an aside, was announced on the 90th anniversary of establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries. Such cooperation could also be viewed as a throwback to the Romanian-Polish relations of the interwar period – but with a twist: whereas in the 1920s the fulcrum of the Polish-Romanian partnership was France, in the 21st century this role was assumed by the United States.

Key words: Poland, Romania, security, NATO, USA

*The distinction between the past, present and future
is only a stubbornly persistent illusion.*

Albert Einstein

In the 21st century Poland and Romania returned to special political and military cooperation that had characterized their relations in the interwar period of the 20th century. These relations have even been called a strategic partnership. What factors contributed to the strengthening of relations between Poland and Romania? How does the Polish-Romanian declared

strategic partnership manifest itself, and what does it involve? Are there any parallels between the Polish-Romanian relations in the interwar period of the 20th century and more recent times? These questions are the focal points of this article. I argue, that in the 21st century, Poland and Romania are seeking close political-military cooperation due to Russia's apparent return to its imperial policy, which both countries regard as a threat to their national security. Military and political issues form the core of the analysis. There are parallels between Polish-Romanian relations in the interwar period of the 20th century and those in 21st century – the role of the third country. While the fulcrum of the Polish-Romanian partnership in the interwar period was France, the United States has fulfilled this role in the 21st century.

Polish-Romanian relations: a historical overview

When one reflects on close Polish-Romanian relations, the interwar period – the time when Poland and Romania were joined by a political-military alliance – immediately comes to mind. On March 3, 1921, both states, fearing the threat of their eastern neighbor, the Soviet Russia, signed the *Convention on Defensive Alliance* that included, as its integral part, a secret military agreement. At the heart of both documents laid a provision of mutual assistance under the conditions of *casus foederis*, i.e., in case of unprovoked attack on one of the two states along their eastern frontiers, the other state was obliged to help to defend its attacked ally. In addition, the two parties agreed not to “negotiate nor to conclude an armistice or a peace without the participation of the other State”. Both states also pledged to communicate with each other in all matters concerning their relations with their eastern neighbours.

It is worth noting that Romania and Poland forged their alliance exclusively for political and security reasons and their cooperation had no deeper roots in either economic or cultural relations (Bułhak, 1977, 311, 313; Walczak, 2008). From Bucharest point of view, the agreement helped Romania increase its security, especially after Romania had taken advantage of a post-revolutionary chaos in Russia and annexed Bessarabia. Following the annexation, the Romanian-Russian relations did and would remain tense. Moreover, in addition to Russia's challenge, Romania felt threatened by Hun-

gary with which it had an ongoing border dispute over Transylvania. Speaking of Poland, recognizing the danger posed by its two powerful neighbors, Germany and Russia, while also in conflict with Lithuania and the Ukrainians and not on amicable terms with Czechoslovakia, Poland regarded the alliance with Romania as a way to stabilize, at least in part, the situation on its southern border¹ (more on Polish strategic culture: Włodkowska-Bagan, 2016). The alliance with Romania provided Poland with a guarantee that its connection with Western Europe would be maintained in the event of Germany's blockade of the Polish sea coast and, above all, it strengthened Poland's hand against the Soviet Russia.

An important role in the rapprochement between Poland and Romania was played by France, which viewed the cooperation between both states as a means to strengthen its own position with regard to Soviet Russia. For France, regarded as a superpower at that time, the Polish-Romanian rapprochement also promised to beef up its position in Central Europe (more: Wandycz, 1962). Nonetheless, despite the efforts of the Polish government and the support of France and Romania, Poland failed to become a member of the Little Entente (more: Essen, 1992). Czechoslovakia, a member of said alliance, opposed such a solution, fearing the growth of Poland's influence in the region. The Polish authorities also failed to form a tripartite Polish-French-Romanian alliance intended to strengthen Poland's security vis-à-vis Germany and the Soviet Union² (Bułhak, 1973, 520, 525–526).

Given the circumstances, Romania's role in Poland's security policy increased. On March 26, 1926, both countries renewed a bilateral accord, known as the treaty of alliance. Unlike the political convention from five years before, the 1926 treaty included a general statement on mutual assistance in the event of any attack. It was only in the new military convention attached to the treaty that the obligation of close cooperation in the event of an attack from the east was specified. This requirement made the accession to war under the conditions of *casus foederis* automatic, and it mandated both parties to participate in conflict in "real and active" terms (Leczyk,

¹ After WWI, Poland's borders with Romania was only 347 km long. Only Poland's border with Latvia was shorter (109 km).

² Poland's alliance with France, signed on February 19, 1921, was anti-German in its essence whereas with Romania – anti-Soviet. The creation of a Polish-French-Romanian trilateral alliance would have guaranteed Poland's help from both allies in the event of an attack by Germany or the Soviet Russia (the USSR since 1922).

1997, 176–177). Then on January 15, 1931 the agreement was replaced by a new Guarantee Treaty (Osmańczyk, 2002, 1815).

Even though problems in the Polish-Romanian relations began to arise in the 1930s, the Romanian government allowed its territory to be used to transfer military equipment to Poland after Germany attacked Poland on September 1, 1939. Nevertheless, the policy of Romania – which, by then, was drifting toward the Axis powers – took a new turn in the subsequent weeks. Under the German pressure, the Romanian authorities detained Polish soldiers fleeing to Romania after the USSR invaded Poland on September 17, 1939. The Polish POWs were subsequently placed in internment camps located in the central parts of Romania. Among the thousands of detainees, soldiers and officials, there were President Ignacy Mościcki and the Commander-in-Chief of Poland's armed forces, Marshal Edward Rydz-Śmigły (Guz, 2007). Not long after General Ion Antonescu was declared *Conducător* and assumed power (September 6, 1940), Romania offered the Third Reich its full cooperation and broke off diplomatic relations with Poland on November 4, 1940.

In the aftermath of WWII, Poland and Romania remained within the Soviet sphere of influence. In spite of the officially friendly relations between the two countries, the Polish-Romanian alliance signed in 1949, or the two countries' membership in the same structures of Eastern Europe (e.g., the Warsaw Pact and the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance), a true rapport between Poland and Romania was lacking. A star-shaped network of relations in the Eastern bloc, with the Soviet Union in its center and the remaining countries orbiting it as its satellites, limited the possibility of multilateral cooperation, including the prospects of developing meaningful Polish-Romanian relations. Moreover, both countries did not share similar interests, which was clearly visible in their respective approaches to, say, the Federal Republic of Germany (more: Zajac, Zięba, 2005). Strained relations between the Soviet Union and Romania under the rule of Nicolae Ceausescu (1965–1989) also had a chilling effect on the prospects of closer Polish-Romanian ties.

The collapse of the Cold War divisions and transformations in Central and Eastern Europe after 1989 did not have an immediate impact on strengthening relations between Warsaw and Bucharest. Poland and Romania did not sign the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, which defined the nature of Polish-Romanian relations in the post-Cold War realities, un-

til relatively late on January 26, 1993. Even though, in the 1990s, Romanian Foreign Minister, Adrian Severin, conjured up a strategic vision in which Romania and Poland would flank NATO's Southern and Northern fronts from the Black Sea to the North Sea (Ruxanda, 2009, 127–128; Angelescu, 2011, 123–142), Poland would not play a significant role in Romania's foreign policy within the next two decades – and neither would Romania in Poland's.

This all was about to change at the turn of the 21st century when more consequential discussions on the Polish-Romanian strategic partnership, the common interests of both countries and the measures required to serve these interests began to emerge.

Polish-Romanian strategic partnership in the 21st Century

“Romania is, absolutely, Poland's strategic partner as far as the region [of Central Europe – J.Z.] is concerned” said President Andrzej Duda during his visit to Bucharest on November 3, 2015. At the joint talks, Presidents Andrzej Duda and Klaus Iohannis emphasized the importance of Polish-Romanian cooperation in several areas: 1) ensuring military security and cooperation within the North Atlantic Alliance, 2) addressing the issue of energy security and the European Union's pursuit of energy sovereignty through the efficient use of existing resources and the adequate energy mix and diversification of the sources of supply, 3) ensuring stability in Ukraine, Moldova and the Black Sea basin; 4) addressing the problem of illegal immigration, 5) promoting economic cooperation, including investments in the infrastructure (highways and railroads), all while pointing to the prospects of cooperation among the states of the so-called *Intermarium*.

A month later, on December 21, 2015, Foreign Ministers, Witold Waszczykowski and Lazar Comanescu, signed the Action Plan for 2016–20, thus spelling out the details of the Polish-Romanian cooperation. In its current form, the plan includes provisions regarding security cooperation, European policies and economic partnership. Much attention is being paid to cooperation between Poland and Romania in strengthening NATO (including its eastern flank) and cooperation with the post-Soviet states (i.e., members of the Eastern Partnership – with Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus, in particular) as well as cooperation between Romania and Poland in the Euro-

pean Union. In its essence, the 2015 plan was a continuation of the earlier Action Plan approved during a visit to Bucharest by President Bronisław Komorowski in October 2010; the aforementioned 2010 plan was a follow-up to the guidelines adopted in the declaration on the Polish-Romanian strategic partnership and signed a year earlier on October 7, 2009 by Presidents Lech Kaczyński and Traian Băsescu. The 2009 declaration on strategic partnership, signed on the ninetieth anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two states, contains provisions for consolidating Polish-Romanian relations in four areas: 1) political and security cooperation, 2) energy and sustainable development; 3) economic partnership; 4) European Area of Freedom, Security and Justice.

Alas, although Poland and Romania signed the declaration on strategic partnership (2009), the agreement on the bilateral cooperation in the area of defense (June 5, 2013), and two Actions Plans (2010, 2015), cooperation between the two countries has left a lot to be desired. Even though lower-level diplomatic meetings were held regularly, collaboration at the highest level (i.e., that of the presidency) was not the most fruitful (which was often explained by bringing up uneasy personal relations between Presidents Komorowski and Băsescu) (Pacula, 2015, 17).

It all changed when Klaus Iohannis was elected Romania's President in November 2014. A few months later, in March 2015, Komorowski and Iohannis met in Warsaw where they announced the renewal of the Polish-Romanian strategic partnership. In the joint declaration signed by Komorowski and his Romanian counterpart, Poland and Romania declared their active support for strengthening NATO's eastern flank and synchronizing as well as intensifying their collaboration to ensure NATO's lasting presence on their territories and in the region. Both countries avowed to make efforts to develop strategic partnerships with the United States and ensure the proper presence of the American armed forces on their respective territories. Both made commitment to the optimum level of engagement in developing the missile defense system in Europe, participating in joint missions and military exercises, and countering terrorism. Both presidents declared that their countries would continue working toward providing a European perspective to the member states of the Eastern Partnership that had signed association agreements with the European Union (Moldova, Ukraine, and Georgia). To this effect, Poland and Romania pledged to promote specific projects to support the process of institution building and

reforms in said countries. Poland and Romania agreed to cooperate in the field of energy security, including their support for the energy union, developing the North-South transmission corridors and a greater diversification of supply. Lastly, both promised to work closely within the institutions of the European Union.

The aforementioned documents and declarations reaffirm the top importance of security issues in the Polish-Romanian cooperation. Both countries take the view that Russia poses a threat to European security, and both share similar views on the future and functioning of NATO and the need for a strong U.S. presence in Central and Eastern Europe.³

Common interests of Poland and Romania

Deterring Russia

It is in the interests of both countries to deter Russia and keep Russia from rebuilding its traditional sphere of influence.

Poland and Romania are located in Russia's immediate neighborhood,⁴ and their borders form the external boundaries of the European Union and NATO. Over the centuries, Poland and Romania had been engaged in numerous border disputes with Russia. In the case of Poland, the disputed border regions included the present-day Ukraine and Belarus while, in the case of Romania, the areas of today's Moldova and parts of Ukraine. Poland and Romania were also victims of the German-Soviet Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 23, 1939 by virtue of which the Soviet Union annexed Poland's eastern territories and Romania's Bessarabia and northern

³ That the newly-elected Romanian President Klaus Iohannis happened to support a strong Euro-Atlantic line in Romanian foreign policy and close relations with the United States proved significant in revitalizing this partnership: both views have been in line with the concept of Poland's foreign and security policy advocated by the PO-PSL government in 2007–2015 and the Law and Justice (PiS) party since fall 2015. The issues surrounding Polish-Romanian economic cooperation and the development of common policy views in the European Union have also been increasingly discussed.

⁴ Poland borders on Russia along Kaliningrad Oblast. The border is 210 km long. Romania does not border on Russia. Nonetheless both countries, separated by the Black Sea, are located in close proximity to each other.

Bucovina. These unlawful actions were legitimized during the course of WWII and its aftermath. The annexation of Poland's eastern territories by the Soviet Union that followed the Soviet invasion of Poland on September 17, 1939, was officially legitimized by the "Big Three" Allied leaders at the conferences in Teheran (December 1943) and Yalta (February 1945). In Romania's case, the Soviet annexation of Bessarabia and the northern part of Bukovina in June 1940 was formally legitimized by the Treaty of Paris, which Romania, as a satellite country of the Third Reich, signed with the Allies in February 1947.

As the 20th century went by, Poland and Romania have grown apprehensive about Russia's return to its imperial policy which both regard as a serious threat to their security and to the stability of the whole region of Central and Eastern Europe, in general. In the case of Poland, these fears are tellingly illustrated by President Lech Kaczyński's speech delivered during the Georgian-Russian war at the rally in Tbilisi, on August 12, 2008. Kaczynski said at that time: "For the first time in a long while, our neighbors from the north, in our case also from the north and from the east, have shown a face we have known for centuries. Those neighbors think that the nations around them should be subordinated to them. (...) That country is Russia. (...) That country thinks that the old times of an empire that collapsed 20 years ago are returning; that domination will once again be the chief trait of this region. It won't!. (...) We also know very well that today it's Georgia, tomorrow Ukraine, the day after tomorrow the Baltic States, and after that it will perhaps be time for my country, Poland!. (...) But we are able to stand up against it". As far as Poland was concerned, the subsequent events, especially the crisis in Ukraine in 2014, exacerbated this fear. President Bronisław Komorowski's captured this sentiment in the address he gave on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of Poland's accession to NATO on March 14, 2014: "Poland is safe today... but historical experience and observation of what is taking place beyond our borders to the East forces us to be quick thinking and vigilant. It is making us aware that we live in the vicinity of an area of instability."⁵

⁵ President Andrzej Duda shares this opinion. During a meeting with NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg on January 18, 2016, President Duda said: "It is obvious that, over the last few years, Russia has engaged in a number of actions that can't be called anything but aggressive... Russia is building up its military potential and has been demonstrating this in an unusually evident manner, through various types of

Romania's anxieties intensified after the Georgian-Russian War of 2008 and the annexation of Crimea by Russia in March 2014. As Romania's ambassador to Poland, Ovidiu Dranga, remarked in June 2015, Russia's actions posed a considerable threat to security, especially considering the consequences of Russia's annexation of Crimea and the increase in Russia's military presence in the Black Sea region (Dranga, 2015). Romanian authorities have feared that the Crimean scenario might be repeated in Transnistria, which has been a disputed territory in Russian-Moldovan relations since the early 1990s.⁶ (more: Zdaniuk, 2006, 143–158).

Poland's and Romania's strategic documents also reflect this growing concern about Russia's threat. The National Security Strategy of Poland of November 2014 states, among other things, that "the reassertion of Russia's position as a major power at the expense of its neighborhood, as well as the escalation of its confrontational policy, an example of which is the conflict with Ukraine, including the annexation of Crimea, has a negative impact on security in the region." (# 41). By the same token, the *Concept of Defense of Poland* of May 2017 states that Russia's policy "poses a threat mainly for Poland and other countries in the region, but also for all other nations desirous of a stable international order (...) Russia is ready to destabilize the internal order of other states and to question their territorial integrity by openly violating international law."

National Defense Strategy of Romania adopted in 2015 accounts for similar areas of uncertainty. The *Strategy* underscores that "Romania lies in a region that was defined for a long time by the presence of frozen conflicts. Today, the region is marked by active conflicts and the deterioration of the relations between NATO and the Russian Federation. The presence of conflict areas within the region raise the issue of the Romanian citizens' security. Russian Federation's actions in the Black Sea Region, infringing upon international law, questioning international order, preserving frozen conflicts and the annexation of Crimea have raised again the NATO awareness upon fulfilling its fundamental mission that is collective defense, as well as the

exercises, and by actions that are described in some members of the Alliance as activities of a provocative nature that seek to test the political and psychological resistance of those NATO countries' decision-makers".

⁶ Romania has consistently supported the Chișinău authorities in their efforts to reduce Russian influence in Moldova as well as international initiatives aimed at withdrawing Russian troops from Transnistria. See more.

validity of the security arrangements agreed upon with Russia at the end of the 20th century” (# 5 and 35). Such concerns are not unsubstantiated. Russia has, indeed, expanded its offensive potential in the Black Sea region (Lorenz, 2017) and Kaliningrad Oblast since the annexation of Crimea.⁷

Even though Polish and Romanian policymakers maintain that Russia's direct incursion into their territories is not likely, they are afraid of expanding Russia's sphere of influence and Moscow's meddling in the domestic affairs of their countries. Therefore, in an attempt to prevent Russia from expanding its influence, Warsaw and Bucharest vehemently condemned Russia's actions in Ukraine, arguing for preserving the territorial integrity of that country and, thus, for returning Crimea to Ukraine. Poland and Romania have been among a group of the countries demanding a decisive reaction from NATO and the EU toward Russia. A reference to NATO matters in this context. The North Atlantic Alliance occupies a prominent place in the security policy of both countries and provides a strong link in the development of their collaborative relationship.

Strengthening NATO

The efforts to contain Russia and curb its sphere of influence are doubtless a motivating factor behind Poland and Romania's drive to strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance. Poland and Romania share similar views on – and have very similar approaches to – key issues pertaining to NATO. They view NATO as a cornerstone of their security, and they see the main purpose of the Alliance in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, i.e., the one containing the clause of *casus foederis*. Poland's *National Security Strategy* of 2014 explicitly asserts that “NATO will remain the most important political and military Alliance and a guarantor of Poland's security. It is crucial for the North Atlantic Alliance to maintain a full spectrum of military and political capabilities, as well as solidarity between Allies, which guarantee the

⁷ In October 2016, Russia's Minister of Defence, Sergei Shoigu, confirmed that Iskander-M ballistic missile launchers had been permanently deployed in Kaliningrad Oblast. News about the deployment of these missiles first appeared in 2013. Russia's military expenditures have also been on the rise. According to SIPRI database, between 2015 and 2016, Russia increased its expenses on military by 5.9% to 69.2 billion USD, making it the third largest spender in the world (after US and China).

fulfilment of its core mission – collective defence – and make it possible to undertake other tasks resulting from the evolution of its environment.” Similar statements can be found in Romania’s *National Defense Strategy* of 2015: “the main warranty provider when it comes to Romania’s security is the North Atlantic Alliance, the transatlantic relationship representing the strategic binder which awards coherence and consistency to NATO actions”.

When Russia annexed Crimea in March 2014, Poland and Romania intensified their cooperation to boost NATO’s eastern flank. Both states (just as the Baltic states) overtly engaged in advocacy in favor of strengthening the Alliance’s infrastructure in the Central-European region (Kacprzyk, 2014)⁸. Before the NATO summit in Newport in September 2014 – where the decision to reinforce the eastern flank of NATO was to take place – President Bronisław Komorowski met with the Presidents of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria in Warsaw on July 22, 2014. The purpose of the meeting was to work out a common approach to the Alliance Summit. In the end, all participants supported the idea of focusing NATO on the “collective defense mission under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty” and the “strategic reinforcement of the Eastern Alliance flank”.

Nonetheless, the Newport summit failed to achieve the objective of permanently deploying the Allied troops on NATO’s eastern flank. Because of a lack of consensus on this issue, NATO’s member states agreed to create the so-called *Spearhead* (*Very High Readiness Joint Task Force – or VJTF*), i.e., a high-readiness force within the NATO Response Force (NRF) that could be deployed at short notice (usually within 2–3 days) from its rotating location to the eastern flank of NATO should conflict with Russia arise. The Romanian delegation, seeking to strengthen NATO’s southern flank, succeeded in persuading the Allies to create a Multinational Division Southeast command structure headquartered in Bucharest (in Romania, to be sure) analogous to its Multinational Corps Northeast counterpart headquartered in Szczecin (in Poland, ditto). It was also decided in Newport that the next NATO summit would be held in Warsaw in July 2016.

Poland and Romania used the ensuing months to tighten their cooperation in further boosting the eastern flank of NATO. On November 3, 2015,

⁸ The Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia had assumed a more moderate position but, eventually, they endorsed the demands of their regional partners.

invited by the presidents Klaus Iohannis of Romania and Andrzej Duda of Poland, the presidents of Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and the President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Republic met in Bucharest to work out and adopt an integrated approach to challenges to regional security. The meeting would subsequently be known as a NATO mini-summit. Its participants, in addition to reaffirming their commitment to NATO's renewed emphasis on the Alliance's collective defense, agreed, among other things, to strengthen the eastern flank of NATO and fully implement the Readiness Action Plan (RAP). In a similar vein, they restated their belief that the long term strategic adaptation of the Alliance would be crucial to strengthening Central European defense. The participating delegations also expressed their concern that Russia's military activities in the region were undermining European security architecture. They urged Russia to abide by international law and meet its international obligations, responsibilities and commitments as a pre-condition for any future NATO-Russia relationship based on trust and confidence.

Romania and Poland (and the Baltic states) *de facto* sought to create a deterrence mechanism based on a continuous, rotational presence of NATO forces on the eastern flank. At the NATO Warsaw summit in July 2016, the Allies agreed to deploy four multinational combat battalions to Poland and the Baltic States to reassure the region against Russian intrusion. President Barack Obama announced that an armored brigade would be sent to Poland while Romania declared to send an infantry logistic company. The NATO Allies also agreed to enhance the air force presence in Bulgaria and Romania to help monitor airspace and facilitate a joint threat assessment. Poland, the United Kingdom, and Italy offered to contribute aircraft, and NATO pledged to set up a multinational land brigade based on a Romanian unit to which Bulgaria offered to contribute 400 soldiers and Poland promised approximately 250 (Lorenz, 2017). The aforementioned decisions are presently at the stage of implementation.

With Russia's alleged menace looming large, Poland and Romania have also increased their defense spending. Romania decided to gradually increase its defense expenditures in April 2014, expecting that they would reach 2% of GDP in 2017. Poland followed suit a few months later. In July 2015, the Polish parliament passed a law that, from 2016 onwards, would increase Poland's defense needs to no less than 2% of GDP of a preceding year.

Both states have also sought to limit Russian influence in the post-Soviet areas. Their support for the pro-Western aspirations of Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia exemplifies this effort (Bir, 2015). In the 2009 declaration of strategic partnership, Presidents Kaczyński and Băsescu stated that the objective of Poland and Romania would be to take coordinated action to carry out NATO's "open door policy", including guaranteeing the permanent place of Georgia and Ukraine in the Euro-Atlantic area of security and stability. At the Alliance Summit in Bucharest in April 2008, Poland and Romania – both NATO border states – also favored the adoption of the Membership Action Plan (MAP) for Ukraine and Georgia, promoted by the United States. Ultimately, this solution was not adopted due to a lack of unanimity among NATO member states. The issue of NATO enlargement to the post-Soviet states was put on the back burner following the outbreak of the crisis in Ukraine at the turn of 2013-14, but Poland and Romania have continued to support the "open door" policy of the Alliance (more: Dąbrowski, Iwański, 2016)⁹.

Strategic Partnership with the United States

Unquestionably, the tie that binds Poland and Romania is their close cooperation with the United States. Both regard the United States as indispensable to ensuring the security of Europe. As stated in Poland's *National Security Strategy* of 2014, "among strategic partnerships of Poland, the priority significance is attributed to the cooperation with the United States of America. Poland will strive for the possibly broadest military presence of the US in Europe, including Poland, and it will support activities for the preservation of the US security guarantee for Europe (...) It is important to preserve a significant and lasting commitment of the United States in European security matters, within the framework of NATO and bilateral relations." This approach was reiterated in 2017 in Poland's *Concept of Defence*.

⁹ While in the Polish-Ukrainian relations since 1993 there has been, at least declaratively, a strategic partnership, the Romanian-Ukrainian relations have remained brittle for more than two decades after Ukraine's independence (1991) due to, predominantly, violations of Ukrainian minority rights in Romania and Romanian minority rights in Ukraine. Russia's intervention in Ukraine in 2014 became a catalyst for a revision of the Ukrainian-Romanian relationship and overcoming their mutual mistrust.

The document states, among other things, that the continuous military and political engagement with the United States would remain an important element of European security. Similarly, Romania's *National Defense Strategy* of 2015 notes that "the solidarity of the transatlantic relationship depends on the United States' maintaining their commitment in Europe." The document also refers to "deepening the security dimension of the strategic partnership with the U.S., by consolidating military operation, including the national territory and the Black Sea Region."

Both Poland and Romania view the United States as their strategic partner in the military and political sphere, recognizing that the U.S. is their main ally and external guarantor of their security. Warsaw and Bucharest also recognize that the U.S. military presence in Europe is essential to ensuring European security. The tightening of relations with the United States is extremely important for both countries, especially in the context of a growing sense of the Russian military threat felt in Poland and Romania.

From the point of view of the U.S. security interests, Poland and Romania are desirable partners. Both are the largest Central European states located in key geopolitical areas: Poland in the Baltic Sea region while Romania in the Black Sea region and in the immediate neighborhood of Russia. All things considered, from a geostrategic point of view, the political and military engagement of the United States in Poland and Romania has reinforced the Central-European corridor vis-à-vis Russia (Bugajski, 1999, 47–64).

Poland's and Romania's cooperation with the United States gradually increased from the 1990s on, i.e., when joining NATO became Poland's and Romania's priority (more: Zajac, 2016; Zięba, 2013, Kuźniar, 2008, Solak, 2008; Treptow, Ionescu 1999). Poland joined the Alliance in March 1999; Romania did so five years later in March 2004; the United States played a decisive role throughout the process of enlarging NATO.

Following the terrorist attack on the USA on September 11, 2001, Poland and Romania were active participants in the Global War on Terrorism led by the administration of George W. Bush. Both countries significantly contributed to the international coalition led by the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq in the global fight against terrorism. In the case of Iraq, Poland's engagement went further than that of Romania: Poland was one of four states that invaded Iraq in March 2003 and later became a member of the Multi-National Force, at one point, contributing 2,500 troops to the MNF. The Pol-

ish troops withdrew from Iraq in October 2008. Romania, on the other hand, did not participate in the first phase of the conflict – i.e., the invasion of Iraq – but it joined the coalition forces in July 2003 and remained part of it until September 2009, sending 730 troops at the peak of its involvement. Poland and Romania were also among the countries that hosted CIA secret prisons between 2003 and 2005, in which Americans interrogated and tortured individuals suspected of terrorist activities (Marty, 2006 and 2007).

In the 21st century, with the deterioration of relations between Russia and the West, the Polish-American and Romanian-American relations became closer. Both countries signed declarations of strategic cooperation with the United States: Poland in 2008 and Romania in 2011. Poland and Romania have participated in the European component of the NATO missile defense program (*European Phased Adaptive Approach, EPAA*), announced in 2009. Two ground-based SM-3 missile launchers will be located in Romania and Poland. Under the terms of agreement signed by Romania and the United States in September 2011, the base at Deveselu, in southern Romania, was declared operational in May 2016. The Polish base in Redzikow, according to the agreement signed in July 2010, is expected to be operational in 2018. After launching both bases, participation in the EPAA project will be a natural catalyst of closer Polish-Romanian relations that may include participating in joint military exercises, sharing experience on maintaining military bases, and creating legal grounds for the presence of American troops in both countries (Pacufa, 2015; Kulesa et. al, 2013).

Conclusions

It is fair to say that Polish-Romanian relations have not been exceptionally strong since the end of the Cold War. Nonetheless, the accession of both countries to NATO (Poland in 1999 and Romania in 2004) and the European Union (Poland in 2004 and Romania in 2007) as well as the changing international order have fostered this relationship. In particular, a diminished role of the West in the world system and Russia's revisionist policy have contributed to the Polish-Romanian rapprochement. Poland's and Romania's geopolitical locations and historical experiences color the perception of Russia's threat in both countries, making it appear ever more real. The Georgian-Russian war and the intervention of Russia in Ukraine con-

tributed to the establishment of a Polish-Romanian strategic partnership which, as an aside, was announced on the 90th anniversary of establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Once the 21st century has begun, Poland and Romania returned to the special political and military cooperation that had characterized their relations in the interwar period of the 20th century. Just as it was then, so it is now that Poland and Romania are concerned about Russia's expansionist policy. In the interwar period, Bucharest and Warsaw were bound by a bilateral agreement obligating them to assist each other in the event of Russian aggression. Today, Poland and Romania are bound by NATO's multilateral alliance that, according to Article 5 of the Treaty of Washington, obligates all member states to offer each other mutual assistance in the event of an external assault. Whereas the fulcrum of the Polish-Romanian partnership in the interwar period was France, the United States has fulfilled this role in the 21st century. Indeed, Poland and Romania continue to view the United States as their strategic partner and a vital external guarantor of their as well as European security. Polish-Romanian relations are called by both countries as a strategic partnership. It needs to be stressed, however, that this strategic partnership is limited to military cooperation, in particular participation of both countries in European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) – a part of the NATO missile defense in Europe.

In the face of new pressures and growing challenges such as climate change, cyberattacks, terrorism, illegal immigration etc., Poland and Romania are uncomfortably stuck in the century-old divisions as they grapple with conventional and oft-archaic perceptions of spheres of influence, military threats, and troop deployments that fuel their geopolitical anxieties. The more things change, the more they seem to stay the same.

Bibliography

Agreement between the government of the Republic of Poland and the government of Romania on bilateral defense cooperation, 5 June 2013. Retrived from: <http://archiwalny.mon.gov.pl/en/arttykul/14394>.

Angelescu I. (2011). New Eastern Perspectives? A Critical Analysis of Romania's Relations with Moldova, Ukraine and the Black Sea Region. *Perspectives*. 19 (2), pp. 123–142.

- Bir M. (2015). A union between Moldova and Romania: On the cards?. *EU Observer*. (March 5). Retrived from: <https://euobserver.com/beyond-brussels/127824>.
- Bugajski J. (1999). Key elements of Romania's Security Strategy. In K. W. Treptow, M.E. Ionescu (Eds.). *Romania and Euro-Atlantic Integration* (pp. 47–64). Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies.
- Bułhak H. (1973). Próby przekształcenia sojuszu wojskowego z Rumunią w trójstronne przymierze polsko-francusko-rumuńskie w latach 1923–1924. *Przegląd Historyczny*, 3, pp. 519–528.
- Bułhak H. (1977). Polska a Rumunia 1918–1939. In J. Żarnowski (Ed.), *Przyjaźnie i antagonizmy. Stosunki Polski z państwami sąsiednimi w latach 1918–1989*. Warszawa: Polska Akademia Nauk, Instytut Historii Zakład Dziejów Europy XIX i XX wieku.
- Czornik K., Lakomy M. & Stolarczyk M. (Eds.) (2014). *Dylematy polityki zagranicznej na początku XXI wieku*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Czornik K., Lakomy M. & Stolarczyk M. (Eds.). (2015). *Implikacje konfliktu ukraińskiego dla polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa polski. Aspekty polityczne, wojskowe, gospodarcze i społeczne*. Katowice: Regionalny Ośrodek Debaty Międzynarodowej w Katowicach.
- Dąbrowski T. & Iwański T. (2016). Przełamywania nieufności w stosunkach Rumunii i Ukrainy. *Analizy OSW*. Retrived from: <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/analizy/2016-04-27/przelamywanie-nieufnosci-w-stosunkach-rumunii-i-ukrainy>.
- Defence Ministers agree to strengthen NATO's defences, establish Spearhead Force, February 5, 2015. Retrived from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_117188.htm.
- Dziewięciu prezydentów za wzmocnieniem wschodniej flanki NATO, 22 lipca 2014 r. Retrived from: <http://www.polskieradio.pl/5/3/Artykul/1183986,Dziewieciu-prezydentow-za-wzmocnieniem-wschodniej-flanki-NATO>.
- Essen A. (1992). *Polska a Mała Ententa: 1920–1934*. Kraków: PWN.
- Guz E. (2007). Polacy między Rumunią a Rzeszą, *Tygodnik Przegląd*, No. 39. (September 30).
- Joint Declaration on "Allied Solidarity and Shared Responsibility", Bucharest, November 2015. Retrived from: <https://www.lrp.lt/data/public/uploads/2015/11/joint-declaration.pdf>, 10.01. 2016

- Kacprzyk A. (2014). Deterring Russia after Ukraine: CEE Divided on the Future of NATO Policy. *Policy Paper*. Warsaw: Polish Institute of International Affairs, 13 (96).
- Konwencja o przymierzu odpornym między Rzeczypospolitą Polską a Królestwem Rumunii, 3 marzec 1921 and Tajna konwencja wojskowa, 3 marzec 1921.* (1989) In T. Jędruszczak & M. Nowak-Kiełbkiowa (Eds.). *Dokumenty z dziejów polskiej polityki zagranicznej 1918-1939, t. I, 1918-1932.* (pp. 146-150). Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax.
- Kulesa Ł., Nicolescu A., Secieru S., Sobják A. (2013). Pushing the Turbo Button: What Next for the Polish Romanian Strategic Partnership?. *Policy Paper*, 30 (78). The Polish Institute of International Affairs, European Institute of Romania.
- Kuźniar R. (2008). *Droga do wolności. Polityka zagraniczna III RP*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Lech Kaczyński w Gruzji – przemówienie na wiecu w sierpniu 2008.* Retrived from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ojcme45iykc>.
- Leczyk M. (1997). *Polska i sąsiedzi. Stosunki wojskowe 1921-1926*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Filii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Lorenz W. (2017). Strengthening Deterrence in the Black Sea Region. *PISM Bulletin*, 22 (March 3).
- Marcin Wilczek, the Ambassador of the Republic of Poland to Romania: Polish-Romanian bilateral relations are very good and intense, 11 November 2015.* Retrived from: <http://www.nineoclock.ro/marcin-wilczek-the-ambassador-of-the-republic-of-poland-to-romania-polish-romanian-bilateral-relations-are-very-good-and-intense>.
- Marczuk K.P. (2009). Rumuńska strategia bezpieczeństwa. In K. P. Marczuk (Ed.). *Dwie dekady zmian: Rumunia 1989-2009* (pp. 113-126). Warszawa: Difin.
- Marty D. (2006). *Alleged secret detentions and unlawful inter-state transfers of detainees involving Council of Europe member states: Report*, Doc. 10957, Strasbourg: Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe – PACE, (June 12).
- Marty D. (2007). *Secret detentions and illegal transfers of detainees involving Council of Europe member states: Second report*, Strasbourg: Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe – PACE (June 7).
- NATO musi reagować na zmieniającą się sytuację i patrzeć w przyszłość, 18 stycznia 2016.* Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/aktualnosci/wizyty>

- zagraniczne/art,45,nato-musi-reagowac-na-zmieniajaca-sie-sytuacje-i-patrzec-w-przyszlosc.html.
- Orędzie Prezydenta RP z okazji 15-lecia przystąpienia do NATO, March 12, 2014. Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/archiwum-bronislawa-komorowskiego/aktualnosci/wypowiedzi-prezydenta/inne/art,605,oredzie-prezydenta-rp-z-okazji-15-lecia-przystapienia-do-na-to.html>.
- Osmańczyk E. J. (2002). *Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements*. London: Routledge.
- Ovidiu Dranga: Polsko-rumuńska współpraca to geostrategiczna rzeczywistość, 15 czerwca 2015. Retrived from: <http://www.euractiv.pl/section/polityka-zagraniczna/interview/ovidiu-dranga-polsko-rumunska-wspolprac-to-geostrategiczna-rzeczywistosc>.
- Pacula P. (2015). Polsko-rumuńska współpraca obronna. Stan obecny i perspektywy. *Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe*, 3, pp. 11–21.
- Prezydent w Bukareszcie: Pokazaliśmy jedność i decyzyjność, 4 listopada 2015. Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/aktualnosci/wizyty-zagraniczne/art,26,spotkanie-szefow-panstw-wschodniej-flanki-nato.html>.
- Romania, Polish Foreign Ministers sign the 2016–2020 Action Plan of the Strategic Partnership, 21 December 2015. Retrived from <http://www.nineoclock.ro/romania-polish-foreign-ministers-sign-the-2016-2020-action-plan-of-the-strategic-partnership>.
- Rumunia jest dla Polski partnerem strategicznym, 3 listopada 2015. Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/aktualnosci/wizyty-zagraniczne/art,25,oficjalna-wizyta-prezydenta-andrzeja-dudy-w-rumunii.html>.
- Ruxandra I. (2009). *La politique étrangère roumaine (1990–2006)*. Brussels: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Solak J. (2004). *Rumunia. Narodowe i ponadnarodowe aspekty integracji ze strukturami euroatlantyckimi*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek: Toruń.
- Szczepanik K., Herman-Łukasik A. & Janicka B. (Eds.). (2007). *Stosunki dyplomatyczne Polski. Informator, Tom I: Europa 1918–2006*. Warszawa: Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych.
- Treptow K.W. & Ionescu M.E. (Eds.) (1999). *Romania and Euro-Atlantic Integration*, Iași: The Center for Romanian Studies.
- Walczak H. (2008). *Sojusz z Rumunią w polskiej polityce zagranicznej w latach 1918–1931*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

- Wandycz P.S. (1962). *France and Her Eastern Allies 1919–1925*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Włodkowska-Bagan A. (2016). Kultura strategiczna Polski. In R. Zięba & T. Pawłuszko (Eds.), *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w zmieniającym się ładzie międzynarodowym: wybrane problemy* (pp. 53–76). Kielce, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach.
- Wspólna deklaracja J.E. Lecha Kaczyńskiego, Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej oraz J.E. pana Traiana Băsescu, Prezydenta Rumunii dotycząca polsko-rumuńskiego partnerstwa strategicznego, 7 października 2009. Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/archiwum-lecha-kaczynskiego/aktualnosci/rok-2009/art,12,695,wspolna-deklaracja-o-partnerstwie-strategicznym.html>.
- Wspólna Deklaracja prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej pana Bronisława Komorowskiego oraz prezydenta Rumunii, pana Klausa Wernera Iohannisa, Warszawa, 12 marca 2015 roku. Retrived from: <http://www.prezydent.pl/archiwum-bronislawa-komorowskiego/aktualnosci/wydarzenia/art,3189,wizyta-prezydenta-rumunii-szansa-na-zaciesnienie-wspolpracy.html>.
- Zajac J. & Zięba R. (2005). *Polska w stosunkach międzynarodowych 1945–1989*, Toruń: Wyd. Adam Marszałek.
- Zajac J. (2016). *Poland's security policy. The West, Russia, and the Changing International Order*, Palgrave London: Macmillan.
- Zdaniuk B. (2006). Nadniestrze – ostatni konflikt zimnej wojny. *Spółeczeństwo i polityka*, 3 (8), pp. 143–158.
- Zięba R. (2013). *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w strefie euroatlantyckiej*, WUW: Warszawa.

RYSZARD ZIĘBA*Prof. dr hab., University of Warsaw, Poland*

The Ukraine crisis as the rivalry for spheres of influence between the West and Russia

The Ukraine crisis is a manifestation of acute geopolitical rivalry between the West and Russia for influence in Ukraine. The author used for analysis, the theory of realism. This perspective allowed him to highlight the rivalry for spheres of influence between both sides, as a geopolitical rivalry, military confrontation in Europe, and as a consequence the weakening of Euro-Atlantic security. The last part of the paper reflects on the key question – how to emerge from the crisis? The author presents proposals that suggest more restraint in the position of all parties involved in the crisis, and concludes that the situation has shown that without cooperation with Russia, it is not possible to create an extension of Western influence and to realize the dream of Ukrainians of joining the European Union. He argues, the Ukrainian crisis should make all the external entities involved in it aware that an understanding between the West and Russia in the matter of Ukraine could prove to be a breakthrough with a very positive impact not only on European security but on the global international order. Freezing the conflict at the present lower intensity level only postponed addressing a problem that will need to be resolved by means of an understanding between all the interested parties.

Key words: Ukraine, the Ukraine crisis, rivalry, spheres of influence, the West, Russia, NATO, the European Union, theory of realism

Introduction

In autumn of 2013 the Ukraine crisis began. Initially, it has an internal character, expressed in mass demonstrations in Kyiv and other Ukrainian

cities, against the decisions of the president and the government refusing to sign the new association agreement on the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA). In February 2014, when the legal authorities were overthrown, the crisis gained an international dimension. The West recognized the new Ukrainian authorities, and Russia led in March to the annexation of the Crimea and began to support the militarily secessionist in Donbas (Zięba, 2014, 15–19). The Ukraine crisis has become the most important long-term disruption of international cooperation in Europe. The consequences of this crisis are manifold and as it turns out to be serious for the whole Euro-Atlantic security system. The very serious consequence of this crisis is the weakening of Ukraine as a state.

The Ukrainian crisis demonstrated the old truism voiced by realists that there is no equivalence between moral principles and state interests. Although the two main entities competing over Ukraine – the West and Russia – seek to justify the legitimacy of their actions, their explanations clearly indicate that they have specific political, strategic and economic interests there. One should, therefore, judge their actions as if they were our own. This leads to the conclusion that one should avoid moralizing judgments, and propaganda seeking to pillory the adversary or rival. Experts should show restraint in their assessments and politicians in their actions.

The world is so made that weak states generate problems and powerful ones seek to take advantage of them in their own interest. The Ukrainian crisis was brought about above all by the Ukrainians themselves who for over 20 years of independent existence proved unable to build a democratic and efficient state and an efficient market economy. Ukraine thus became a victim of its own will, a protectorate as it were of Russia, which has there its political interests and its cultural and economic influence. It is worth recalling that the Orange Revolution of 2004–2005 ended unsuccessfully. Ukraine's then pro-western reformers continued the oligarchic politics and caused great disappointment, especially among the younger segment of Ukrainian society. Ukraine remained a buffer state between Russia and the West.

But by 2013 the situation around Ukraine had become less favorable to the realization of a program of democratic and market reforms, especially as Russia, which had its own interests in Ukraine, had become significantly more powerful, and the West much weaker. Generally speaking, the West came out of the 2008 financial crisis much weakened and it now had more

competitors in the form of the newly emerging powers. The reputation of the United States and NATO had been marred by the lost wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, by their support of the Arab Spring, and by the intervention in Libya. The European Union in turn only managed to overcome the crisis in the Euro zone, and had to face the prospect of disintegration as a result of the nationalisms that were tearing at it. It is in this situation that the USA and the EU decided to draw Ukraine into its sphere of influence, by supporting the entirely justified European aspirations of a large segment of Ukrainian society. In order to change Ukraine's political course, what was missing was consensus among its very citizens. The pro-European option was supported mainly in the western and central part of the country, while the Ukrainians of the eastern and southern parts feared the nationalism of their western compatriots. These fears were stoked by Russia, which didn't recognize Ukraine's new authorities which had been chosen in an unconstitutional manner in February 2014. In addition, Russia cleverly took advantage of the opportunity to secure its strategic interests, by annexing Crimea along with the naval base in Sebastopol and, in some measure, managed to delay economically the entry into force of the commercial part of Ukraine's new association agreement with the European Union. Of course, this assessment does not touch upon the question of the legitimacy of Ukraine's European aspirations, but concentrates only on the matter of rivalry over this country by external entities in keeping with the directives of the theory of political realism.

Geopolitical Rivalry

Security in the Euro-Atlantic area after the Cold War was based on the principle of recognition for the territorial status quo and on cooperation between states and international organizations. The guiding idea behind its shaping was the theory of liberalism entailing the concordant cooperation to maintain the peace and to simultaneously promote democratic transformation. It was called cooperative security and gave an illusory and idealistic conviction that the differing interests of states making up this system could be reconciled through cooperation. But the system as it took shape in the 1990s didn't fully take into consideration the interests of all its participants. The western part of the continent reinforced its security through the

enlargement of NATO and the European Union, while in the East a sense of uncertainty, and in Russia a sense of being “encircled” by the West persisted. The Russian leaders – Boris Yeltsin, Vladimir Putin or Dmitri Medvedev – made attempts to bring about cooperation between equals with the West and always considered that Russia was a part of Europe. But the West failed to see this orientation in Russian politics, seeing only the shortage of democracy in Russia’s political system and in its policies and continues in its efforts to “Europeanize” that large country. This is not conducive to deeper cooperation with Moscow, least in the sphere of international security.

The West did not treat Russia as an equal in the resolution of arising problems, such as the ending of the war in former Yugoslavia, already disregarded in 1991 during the first military invasion against Iraq, in 2003 during the second one, and between them during the war in Kosovo in 1999. During the 1990s, the first post-Cold War decade, the West and especially the United States attempted to cooperate with Russia, but treated it as a weak junior partner which was not in a position to stand up to the USA and to look after its own interests. And to, the first NATO enlargement took place despite Russia’s opposition in 1999 when three former Soviet allies – Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary – were admitted to the Alliance; five years later seven other countries were admitted, including three that had once been a part of the Soviet Union – Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. It is worthwhile to note that this “encroachment” on post-Soviet area was taking place while Russia found itself under the efficient and initially definitively pro-European leadership of President Vladimir Putin. The West not only failed to take up Russia’s offer of closer cooperation, but it is precisely then that it supported the “color revolutions” in various non-Russian independent CIS states – in Georgia, in Ukraine, in Kirgizstan and also attempted to trigger a similar “revolution” in Belarus (Bandeira, 2015, p. 42–52). Moscow saw these actions as the West’s expansion toward its boundaries (Wilson, 2010, 21, Becker et al., 2016, 120).

The Ukraine crisis provided evidences to public opinion that the West and Russia had different and incompatible interests. This incompatibility manifested itself on the plane of military and strategic relations. The European Union’s offer to Ukraine of a new association agreement was supposed to strengthen the pro-western course in that country’s policy (Sakwa, 2015, 26). Yet, it was a neutral country that remained under the “shadow” of Russian influence. The leasing by Russia of the naval base in Sebastopol

was a visible sign of Ukraine's submissiveness to its powerful neighbor. The acceleration of democratic and market reforms in Ukraine as a result of the association agreement with the EU would have in an obvious manner led to a change in Kyiv's foreign policy from one that balances between Russia and the West to one that clearly opts for a pro-western course. It is for this reason that the leaders of western countries accepted the rejection by Kyiv's demonstrating opposition of the agreement signed with President Victor Yanukovych on 21 February 2014 and accepted the participation in the newly formed temporary government of Arseniy Yatseniuk of nationalist or semi-fascist politicians.

In the spring of 2014 we saw the violation of the post-Cold War international order in Europe. The annexation of Crimea by Russia, followed by Russian military support for the separatists of Ukraine's eastern provinces made plain that when threats to its interests arose, Russia decided to break international law and OSCE principles. Interestingly, this was done by a state which calls itself a defender of international law and condemns sharply all of its violations. During the fighting in the Donbas in the spring of 2014, the West supported the dirty war conducted by government forces against the separatists (the "anti-terrorist operation" in the Kyiv's terminology), Ukrainian citizens. The West also failed to react to the reports of humanitarian organizations pointing to the humanitarian disaster taking place in eastern Ukraine; it didn't send convoys with aid for the suffering civilian population in the Donbas. This means, in terms of the premises of Morgenthau's political realism, that states that speak of universal moral norms nevertheless choose effective political action that brings them advantages.

The competing interests of the West and Russia on the military and strategic plane is also shown by the calculations of certain western politicians who are counting on bringing Ukraine into NATO on the one hand, and Russia's fear that yet another, decisive, NATO "approach" to its southwestern boundaries may be about to take place and seriously block the Russian fleet's ability to operate on the Black Sea on the other. Should such a scenario materialize, Russian security would be seriously compromised.

The conclusions to be drawn from the Russian-Georgian War of 2008, and from the Ukrainian crisis are that Russia will actively stand up to the West and will not allow NATO to admit any further countries lying on Russia's boundary. Montenegro's admission to NATO took place on 5 June 2017

and the Alliance's further expansion can take place in the direction of the western Balkans and, possibly, Scandinavia (Sweden and Finland). This could strengthen NATO and give it more flexibility in dealing with Russia (Wolff, 2014, 1103–1121). We do not know, however, what counter-measures will be taken by Russia to counterbalance these NATO's steps.

Military confrontation in Europe

The landing operation conducted by Russia in Crimea using "little green men" devoid of insignia, and subsequent military support for the separatists in the Donbas in the form of arms supplies and Russian soldiers were clear signs that war had broken out in Europe. It was, however, a limited war, and Russia's intervention is described as "hybrid warfare" (Freedman, 2015, 8–12). On the one hand, Russia became militarily involved on the side of the Donbas separatists in its efforts to hinder the expansion of the West's sphere of influence and, on the other, fighting broke out between Ukrainian government forces and the separatists.

Ukrainian government forces, which included foreign mercenaries, took up sharp pacification measures. This cruel armed conflict brought thousands of victims, most of whom were civilians from the Donetsk and Luhansk districts. From the summer of 2014 on, information reached the media about the humanitarian catastrophe in the fighting areas. This war, with the war in former Yugoslavia, became the cruelest armed conflict in Europe in the post-Cold War period. Interestingly, the Western countries, urging the Ukrainian government to put down the rebellion in the Donbas, did not hurry to provide humanitarian aid. In contrast, Russia sent humanitarian convoys, but these were criticized by western politicians and media as a means to smuggle war materials and equipment.

The Ukrainians paid a high price for their revolution, called by them as „Dignity Revolution”. About 100 persons lost their lives during the Kyiv Euromajdan, and several hundred were wounded. The losses caused by the war in Donbas are very high, but there are no current and reliable estimates. As the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry stated on February 2017 since the outbreak of the conflict, nearly 10 thousand people died, about 23,000 were injured and nearly 1.8 million people were deprived of their homes. Estimates from the separatist authorities of the fighting districts of Donetsk and Luhansk

are not available, however. It is worthwhile to note that, despite the Mińsk-2 ceasefire concluded on 12 February 2015, fighting in eastern Ukraine, if less intense, continued nonetheless.

NATO reacted to the armed conflict in Ukraine by reinforcing its eastern flank, in reality to emerge from its lethargy and to prepare itself to fulfill its collective defense function. The United States sent to Poland additional F-16 multi-purpose planes (increasing their number to 12); an AWACS distance reconnaissance plane on a one-time mission; sent personnel for the airbase in Łask (about 250 soldiers); decided to prolong their rotational military presence at that base until the end of 2016; and also undertook to patrol the Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian sections of the Baltic coast, and the Bulgarian and Romanian sections of the Black Sea coast. NATO as a whole decided to increase the frequency of military exercises, to build equipment depots in case there is a need to transfer NATO troops to Poland; to systematically update contingency plans; and also expressed the interest in further enlargement to include the Balkan states as well as Sweden and Finland, if those states decided to join the Alliance. During the NATO Summit in Newport (4–5 September 2014), members were bound to increase the expenditures on defense to a minimum of 2% of GDP. During the summit it was also announced that a Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF) would be established and that the battle readiness of the Multinational Corps Northeast stationed in Szczecin would be increased. All these decisions undoubtedly strengthened the cohesion and the engagement of NATO and the USA in the security of Central Europe. It was decided in Newport that NATO would earmark about 15 million euro for support to Ukraine and also from individual members of the Alliance as part of bilateral agreements.

Furthermore, in the spring of 2015, NATO debated the possibility of sending military equipment to Ukraine. It had been initiated by American Republicans, who demanded that at least defensive weapons be supplied to Ukraine. Such proposals were strongly criticized by Stephen Walt, who wrote that “arming Ukraine, on the other hand, is a recipe for a longer and more destructive conflict. It’s easy to prescribe such actions when you’re safely located in a Washington think tank, but destroying Ukraine in order to save it is hardly smart or morally correct diplomacy” (Walt, 2015). The Barack Obama administration did not agree to arm Ukraine. Only from the spring of 2015 did a few NATO members engage in training Ukrainian sol-

diers. These included Great Britain, USA, Canada and Lithuania. Poland did not send its military instructors to Ukraine, but trained Ukrainian soldiers on its own territory. NATO also conducted a series of military maneuvers on its eastern flank, the largest of which – Swift Response-2015 – took place on the territories of Bulgaria, Romania, Germany and Italy from 20 August to 13 September 2015. The latter were one of the largest international airborne exercises since the days of the Second World War and the largest NATO maneuvers since the 1980s. The maneuvers involved soldiers from eight NATO countries, including Poland, and their number was not made public. The aim of these exercises was to integrate high readiness units of NATO members and to prepare them for joint and effective reaction to security changes on the territory of Alliance. In this manner, NATO demonstrated to Russia that it was ready to respond to any potential aggression. Russia behaved in similar fashion, holding maneuvers along its border with Ukraine and the Baltic states and, since the middle of 2014, for several months the air force of the Russian Federation was particularly active in the Baltic Sea area. The situation was thus quite dangerous, because it was reminiscent of the climate of confrontation from the worst moments of the Cold War. Subsequent decisions about reinforcing NATO's eastern flank were made at the summit of NATO leaders in Warsaw on 8–9 July 2016. As a result, in January 2017 an American armored brigade was stationed on NATO's eastern flank.

Above mentioned actions were carried out as the Alliance's reaction to Russia's involvement in the Ukrainian crisis. It should be noted that although NATO's decisions constituted a significant reinforcement of the alliance's eastern flank, not all its European members were as enthusiastic in this matter as the USA, Great Britain or Poland. Germany, for example, adopted a more restrained stance, not wishing for a stronger confrontation with Russia (Belkin, Mix, Woehrel, 2014, 4). Although NATO's decisions were sharply criticized by Moscow, they did not constitute a significant military strengthening of the Alliance, as much as a manifestation of the readiness of NATO members to oppose any potential aggression from Russia. During the Warsaw summit, like during the earlier meetings of NATO leaders, no decisions were taken in the matter of any direct military action involving NATO troops on the side of Ukraine. The reason for this is that Ukraine is not a NATO member. In other words, the Ukraine crisis sharpened the military confrontation between Russia and NATO, but both sides showed restraint to avoid outright war, albeit controversy in the spirit of confrontation continued.

The weakening of Euro-Atlantic Security

By accepting the argumentation of the realists, it has to be stated that the Ukraine crisis was the result of the ongoing rivalry for spheres of influence between the West and Russia. It was due to an offensive policy of the USA and the European Union aimed at drawing Ukraine toward the West, and a defensive policy in Russia's case aimed at protecting the status quo in Ukraine, which was to remain a buffer state shielding Russia from the West but respecting Russia's influence in that country. The change of government in Kyiv to a pro-western one led to offensive behavior by Russia which, anticipating Ukraine's expected admission to NATO, annexed the Crimea along with the important naval base in Sebastopol and supported the secession of the Donbas. The war in the Donbas that began in the spring of 2014 is an instrument serving to weaken Ukraine and, thus, to preclude its accession to NATO, as it is clear NATO will not grant admission to a country in the midst of a civil war and a territorial dispute with Russia. The latter had already made use of this scenario in 2008 with Georgia, which also harbored some Atlantic aspirations. And so, Ukraine became hostage to the rivalry between the West and Russia, as well as of its own ambitions which a significant portion of its own population didn't share. This logically leads to the conclusion the policy of rivalry for spheres of influence pursued by both the West and Russia has led to a weakening of European security, including Poland's national security (Stolarczyk, 2014, 86).

It is doubtful whether the military strengthening of NATO's Eastern Flank carried out following the decisions taken at the summits in Newport (2014) and Warsaw (2016) contributed to reinforcing international security. From the viewpoint of NATO members neighboring on Ukraine and Russia, one can say that the continued rotational presence of allied units in these countries may be interpreted as a reinforcement of their defense abilities. But from the general point of view, having taken into account the increased military activeness especially of Russian air force near the airspace of those countries and of other NATO members further to the west (on the English Channel), the activeness of the Russian Navy in the Baltic, and the "Zapad 2017" maneuvers in Belarus, it has to be noted that the level of militarization of relations in Europe has grown, and this increases the threat of the outbreak of an armed conflict, if one of limited scale, between Russia and NATO. This has undoubtedly led to lowering of international security

in the entire Euro-Atlantic area. It should be remembered that the rivalry over Ukraine has contributed to this and still has negative impact to the cooperation between the West and Russia. Similarly negative impact on the state of Euro-Atlantic security have had the decisions of NATO's summit in Wales, recommending that the allies increase their defense spending to 2% of GDP in relation to the previous year's GDP have had a. Certain countries of NATO's Eastern flank have considerably increased their military expenditures: Romania by 11%, Slovakia by 7%, and Poland – which had a relatively high level of defense spending since 2002 at 2% of GDP – declared in the fall of 2015 that this level would be increased to 3% of GDP by 2020 and has signed a number of large arms purchase contracts with the USA.

Additionally important factor that worsens the situation is the warlike rhetoric that accompanies the crisis. In order to justify their confrontational steps, both Russia and the West mutually accuse each other of creating threats. Following the experience with Russia's "little green men" (soldiers without insignia) in Crimea, many politicians and experts in the USA, Poland and the Baltic states (Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia) began to propagate the idea that Russia might attack its NATO members in the form of a "hybrid war". Romuald Szeremietiew, former Polish Deputy-Minister of Defense, even stated in March 2015 that Russia could attack Poland using tactical nuclear weapons (Zajac, 2016, 146–147). This propaganda was yet another factor leading to the weakening state of security in the center of Europe, all the more so because it is practiced by media and many experts in the USA and Central European countries.

The result of the high level of tension in the Euro-Atlantic area was the reduction in the frequency of consultations between NATO and Russia within the framework of the NATO-Russia Council (NRC), which had been instituted by accords in 1997 and 2002. Following the annexation of the Crimea, such consultations were suspended on 1 April 2014 by a decision of the NATO ministers of foreign affairs. But channels of political dialogue and military communication were kept open and the NRC as such was never suspended. The first meeting following this suspension occurred only on 20 April 2016, following which they took place every few months, but they did not lead to a rapprochement in positions between NATO and Russia. Regular meeting were held once a year by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, including Russia. NATO tried to discuss the Ukrainian crisis with Russia, as well as the need for the full implementation of the Minsk accords,

and Russia's military activeness around the territories of NATO member states, with particular emphasis on reducing the risk that such activeness entails. Russia, in turn, expressed anxiety with the decisions and successive actions leading to the reinforcement of the Alliance's Eastern Flank. In an interview given to the daily *Izvestia* on 10 February 2017, Russia's foreign minister Sergei Lavrov, commenting on the dislocation of NATO troops (an armored brigade) in Poland and the Baltic states, stated that these actions are provocative and destabilizing in nature. He added that the countries neighboring on Russia are also modernizing their armed forces and expanding their military infrastructure. He also pointed out that, aside from this, the Russian authorities are also concerned with the construction of the US missile defense system in Europe, whose real anti-Russian nature is not doubted by anyone in Russia. He added that the "old new" policy pursued by NATO to contain Russia, including the unilateral decision to freeze civilian and military cooperation with Russia is leading to a drop in confidence and a violation of the existing balance of power on the European continent (Лавров, 2017).

The Ukraine crisis showed very clearly how great power *Realpolitik* prevails. The sharp criticism of Russia's actions did not prevent the severing of the Crimean peninsula from Ukraine in March 2014. The position of the West was ignored by Russia which pointed out – not without some justification – that the western states had violated international law earlier and mentioned as examples to the war in Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan or Libya. Western politicians and commentators generally play down or reject Russian arguments outright. But looking at them objectively, it is impossible to challenge their legitimacy, because in the case of the war over Kosovo with former Yugoslavia (1999) and the war in Iraq (2003) there was no authorization from the UN Security Council, and in the case of the two other wars, the UN mandate was considerably exceeded. In addition, the West's armed interventions cost the lives of thousands of victims and caused enormous material damage. It is a pity that western politicians don't wish to remember this. To all appearances, they feel other standards should be applied to Russia.

Generally speaking, it should be noted that the West seems to have lost its way strategically following the financial crisis of 2008, various diplomatic setbacks, and in the case of the USA also military setbacks (in Iraq and Afghanistan). Not knowing how to find its way in the changing international

order, and remaining on the defensive diplomatically in the face of the BRICS Group, chose as its rival Russia, which it attempted to maneuver into a corner. The point here was not so much Ukraine and its European prospects, because those continue to be unclear, but rather the fact the Russia under President Putin is becoming increasingly stronger and plays an increasingly active role on the global stage. It is for this reason that the West decided to “wrest” Ukraine from Russian influence, and when Moscow opposed this, it condemned it politically, isolated it and imposed on it sanctions aimed at slowing down its economic development. One can only agree with the assessment of John Mearsheimer, who placed the main responsibility for the Ukraine crisis on the shoulders of the United States and its European allies (Mearsheimer, 2014, 1), or at least with the conclusion reached by Russian experts who claim that “both Russia and the West bear responsibility for the mistakes and miscalculations that have resulted in their most serious crisis in relations (Arbatova, Dynkin, 2016, 71–90).

How to solve the crisis?

The Ukraine crisis, even though it gave Ukrainians hope for a better life, turned out to have crippling consequences for the Ukrainians themselves. It was increasingly out of control, it was a threat to the world and it strongly undermined the much needed cooperation between the West and Russia in the resolution of other problems (such as the conflict in the Middle East, especially the problems in Iraq and Syria). It is difficult to understand why western leaders seem to be unaware of this. As John Mearsheimer rightly points out, the United States and its European allies faced a choice in Ukraine. The first scenario entailed continuing their existing policy, which would increase enmity toward Russia, as a result of which all sides to the conflict would end up losing. The second scenario gave the possibility to “shift gears” and act to create a prosperous but neutral Ukraine – one that would not threaten Russia and would allow the West to repair its relations with Moscow, in which case all would be the winners (Mearsheimer, 2014, 12).

Thus if nothing more detrimental takes place in relations between Russia and the West in connection with the Ukraine crisis, stabilizing the situation may be possible. A calming down of relations between the West and Russia is also a necessary precondition for bringing Ukraine out of the cri-

sis. It should be added that cooperation with Russia will be necessary to that end. The question of relations between the West and Russia has become very complicated with the advent of the Ukraine crisis. From the outset there were and there remain chances for a return to normality in the Euro-Atlantic area. Both Russia and the West should become conscious of the benefits that rebuilding their cooperation could bring. Much harm has taken place until now. The West had barely come out of the financial crisis and recession when it started to compete with Russia on such a sensitive and uncertain ground as is Ukraine. This can only benefit our Asian competitors. It is an illusion that the impasse can be rapidly overcome or that a close partnership between the West and Russia can be established quickly, but it is better to recognize that finding some *modus vivendi* is necessary. After nearly four years since the Ukraine crisis began, one can attempt to point to a number of factors making it possible to hope an end to the rivalry over Ukraine is possible. Even if they are not presently very great, certain signs of a breakthrough in the crisis can be seen.

The agreements signed in Minsk (on 5 September 2014 and on 12 February 2015), so strongly criticized in Poland, have helped calm down the situation, despite being violated in the Donbas. Much effort needs to be exerted to find a formula leading to a political solution. Such a solution – much awaited by Russia and Ukraine's western allies, Germany, France and the United States – seems to lie in the federalization of the country and in the Ukrainian authorities granting autonomic status to the rebellious eastern provinces in the Donbas. Despite the fact that the authorities in Kyiv are approaching the idea with great anxiety and much dilatoriness, in July 2015 they nonetheless took the first step in this direction. To many politicians in Kyiv, this looks like capitulating to the separatists and to Russia, but it is worthwhile to remember that Ukraine has lost the war in the east militarily, and that the separatists want much more – separation from Ukraine outright and to join the Russian Federation, as happened with Crimea in March 2014. In the event, the principles of restraint and compromise suggested by the theory of political realism thus seem in order.

Even prior to the annexation of the Crimea, Henry Kissinger, one of the outstanding spokesmen of American realism, called for such an approach. Before the conflict in the Donbas escalated, he wrote that the Ukrainian question is placed on the knife's edge definitely too often: Ukraine will either join the West, or the East. If Ukraine is to survive and grow, it can't opt

for either of the sides against the other, but should function as a bridge between them. Russia has to accept the fact that any attempt to turn Ukraine into a satellite country, this being tantamount to Russia shifting back its boundaries westward, can condemn it to a repeat of the historic and self-perpetuating cycles of mutual tensions involving Europe and the United States. The West in turn must understand that Ukraine will never be simply a foreign country for Russia. Russian history began in Kievan Rus. It is from there that Russian Orthodoxy radiated. For many centuries, Ukraine was a part of Russia, and the history of the two countries is interwoven. Further, Kissinger proposed that Ukraine should have the freedom to freely choose its economic and political partners, including the European Union, but it should not join NATO. On the international stage Ukrainian leaders “should pursue a posture comparable to that of Finland. That nation leaves no doubt about its fierce independence and cooperates with the West in most fields but carefully avoids institutional hostility toward Russia” (Kissinger, 2014).

Some experts suggested to ensure that a fully independent and territorially indivisible Ukraine conducts a policy toward Russia similar to the one effectively pursued by Finland. It is a policy based on mutual respect toward neighbors and extensive economic relations with Russia and the European Union. At the same time, Finland is expanding its ties, but without participating in NATO, which is so threatening from Moscow’s perspective. The Finish model can be an ideal example for Ukraine, the European Union and Russia (Brzezinski, 2014). Former US ambassador in Moscow, Jack Matlock, said that the fundamental condition for the resolution of the Ukraine conflict is an honest commitment on the part of the West that Ukraine will never become a NATO member because, otherwise Russia will not accept any understanding. He also stated that by offering membership to Georgia and Ukraine in 2008, NATO had crossed a red line and he called on the West not to do this a second time, for “Russia is a nuclear power, and no one in his right mind will use force against a nuclear power” (Matlock, 2014). Also worth mentioning are the words of another outstanding America realist, Stephen Walt, who wrote that “the solution to this crisis is for the United States and its allies to abandon the dangerous and unnecessary goal of endless NATO expansion and do whatever it takes to convince Russia that we want Ukraine to be a neutral buffer state in perpetuity. We should then work with Russia, the EU, and the IMF to develop an economic program that puts that unfortunate country back on its feet.” (Walt, 2015).

Another type of complementary solution was advanced by former EU enlargement commissioner Günter Verheugen, who suggested the West react calmly to Russia and propose to Moscow a European-wide security system that would include NATO and Russia and, in addition, a special “economic cooperation area from Lisbon to Vladivostok” (Verheugen, 2014). The second of these was also proposed by former Polish ambassador in Russia, Stanisław Ciosek. This Polish politician has on repeated occasions made public calls to “draw Russia toward Europe, because otherwise we will have an eternal source of conflict. Many difficulties could have been averted had the policy toward Russia been different after the collapse of the Soviet Union” (Ciosek, 2014). In April 2015, the idea of a free trade zone “from Lisbon to Vladivostok” gained the support of Angela Merkel (Merkel, 2015). It is worthwhile in this context to note that these proposals refer to the initiative – announced in January 2010 by the then Prime Minister Putin – for a “harmonious economic community from Lisbon to Vladivostok” and its later extension to include elements of humanitarian cooperation and in the sphere of security. (Выступление, 2014).

In August 2015, former German Deputy-Chancellor and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher argued in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, that while the West can't recognize Russia's annexation of Crimea, it needs to embark on a dialogue with President Putin because he is a pragmatic politician, the West should “extend its hand” to him and lift the sanctions imposed on Russia (Były, 2015). French politicians are also calling on a return to cooperation between the European Union and Russia (Kryzys, 2015). As some Norwegian researchers claim, there are chances for a dialogue between the European Union and Russia about resolving the crisis, and the idea of such a dialogue is supported by France, Germany and the Chairman of the European Commission Jean-Claude Juncker. Any understanding based on mutual concessions would imply the failure of the EU's existing policy consisting in the dissemination its values, as well as an admission that there are geographical limits to the EU's vision of building a security community using the mechanisms of political and economic integration (Riecker, Gjerde, 2016, 319–320).

The above-quoted statements made by retired and active politicians from western countries indicate that there are chances of reaching an understanding with Russia to resolve the Ukraine crisis. They suggest more restraint in the stances of all parties involved in the Ukraine crisis.

Reaching an understanding requires political will among the main decision makers, above all in the United States. Even if this seems difficult to achieve in the short term, it is possible. The international understanding concluded in July 2015 in the matter of Iran's nuclear program shows that Russia is a necessary and useful partner for the West. Other problems await resolution by the western world and Russia, such as fighting Islamic terrorism and, especially, the Islamic State. This crisis has shown that without Russia's collaboration any expansion of Western influence is an impossibility, as are the Ukrainians' dreams about the European Union. In Kissinger's words, "absolute satisfaction" is unattainable, only "balanced dissatisfaction" can be attained, because "If some solution based on these or comparable elements is not achieved, the drift toward confrontation will accelerate. The time for that will come soon enough." Let's remember this voice from an experienced old American diplomat who, as he himself says, has in his own lifetime seen four wars which began amidst great enthusiasm and social support, "which we knew not how to end, and from three of which we withdrew unilaterally. The test of a policy is not how it begins, but how it ends" (Kissinger, 2014). Having read the words of this outstanding realist, one can conclude that in the contemporary world, in which the hard interests of states, and great powers in particular, are decisive, one has to take them into account. This means that the realistic paradigm remains of great explanatory usefulness in the study of international relations.

Bibliography

- 10 tysięcy ofiar śmiertelnych konfliktu na Ukrainie, Polsat News, 21.02.2017 <http://www.polsatnews.pl/wiadomosc/2017-02-21/10-tysiecy-ofiar-smiertelnych-konfliktu-na-ukrainie/> (accessed 02.10.2017).
- Arbatova Nadezhda K., Alexander A. Dynkin, 'World Order after Ukraine', *Survival*, Vol. 58, No. 1, February–March 2016, pp. 71–90.
- Bandeira Louiz Alberto Moniz, *The Second Cold War: Geopolitics and Strategic Dimension of the USA*, Springer, Berlin – Heidelberg 2015.
- Belkin Paul, Dereck R. Mix, and Steven Woehrel, 'NATO Response to the Crisis in Ukraine and Security Concerns in Central and Eastern Europe', Washington D.C: Congressional Research Service, July 31, 2014.

- Becker Michael E., Matthew S. Cohen, Sidita Kushi & Ian P. McManus, "Reviving the Russian empire: the Crimean intervention through a neoclassical realist lens", *European Security*, 2016, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 112-133.
- Brzezinski Zbigniew, *What Obama Should Tell Americans About Ukraine: The crisis is getting worse. It's time for the president to rally the nation*, May, 2014, www.politico.com
- Były szef niemieckiej dyplomacji: pora znieść sankcje i "podać rękę" Putinowi, PAP, TVN24, 21.08.2015.
- Ciosek Stanisław, *Sekielski pyta Cioska: Czy należy negocjować z bandytą Putinem?*, Radio Tokfm, 12 marca 2014.
- Cohen Stephen F., *Patriotic Heresy vs. the New Cold War: Fallacies of US policy may be leading to war with Russia*, "The Nation", 15 September 2014.
- Freedman Lawrence, 'Ukraine and the Art of Limited War', *Survival*, Vol. 56, No. 6, December 2014 – January 2015, pp. 7–38.
- Kissinger Henry, "To settle the Ukraine crisis, start at the end", *The Washington Post*, 05.03.2014.
- Лавров: готовы работать с администрацией Трампа по всей повестке, Известия, 10 февраля 2017.
- Matlock Jack, *Były ambasador USA w ZSRR Jack Matlock: Ukrainie lepiej będzie bez Krymu*, PAP, 21.03.2014.
- Mearsheimer J., "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions That Provoked Putin", *Foreign Affairs*, 2014, Vol. 93 No. 5, pp. 1-12.
- Merkel chce w przyszłości strefy wolnego handlu z Rosją, Bankier.pl, 17.04.2015.
- Riecker Pernille, Kristjan Lundby Gjerde, 'The EU, Russia and the potential for dialogue – different readings of the crisis in Ukraine', *European Security*, 2016, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 319-320.
- Sakwa Richard, *Frontline Ukraine: Crisis in the Borderlands*, I.B. Tauris, London 2015.
- Stolarczyk Mieczysław, „Dylematy bezpieczeństwa Polski w kontekście kryzysu i konfliktu ukraińskiego w latach 2013–2014”, in Katarzyna Czornik, Miron Lakomy (eds.), *Dylematy polityki bezpieczeństwa Polski na początku drugiej dekady XXI wieku*, Regionalny Ośrodek Debaty Międzynarodowej, Katowice 2014, pp. 41-87.
- Verheugen ostrzega przed Kijowem. „Rząd, w którym zasiadają faszyci”, TVN24, 18 marca 2014.

- Walt Stephen M., "Why Arming Kiev Is a Really, Really Bad Idea", *Foreign Policy*, February 9, 2015.
- Wilson Jeanne L., "The legacy of the color revolutions for Russian politics and foreign policy", *Problems of Post-Communism*, 2010, Vol. 57, No. 2, p. 21–36.
- Wolff Andrew T., "The future of NATO enlargement after the Ukraine crisis", *International Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 5, September 2014, pp. 1103–1121.
- Выступление и ответы на вопросы Министра иностранных дел С. В. Лаврова в ходе встречи со студентами и профессорско-преподавательским составом МГИМО(У), Москва, 1 сентября 2014 года. <http://www.rusemb.tj/ru/index/index/pageId/704/> (accessed 02.10.2017).
- Zajac Justyna, *Poland's Security Policy: the West, Russia and the Changing International Order*, Palgrave Macmillan, London 2016.
- Zięba Ryszard, „Międzynarodowe implikacje kryzysu ukraińskiego”, *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 2014, t. 50, nr 2, pp. 13–40.

MAŁGORZATA BIELECKA*Ph.D., Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW, Poland*

Stabilization missions of the European Union

The European Union is currently one of the major international organizations that conduct stabilization activities in post-conflict areas. It is also one of the first organizations that combines a military and civil component in the area of stabilization activities. It uses many years of previous experience of member states in integration, development of economies, and solving social problems. Therefore, it is worth looking at European Union cooperation mechanisms in the field of the construction of stabilization missions.

Keywords: stabilization missions, security, civil protection, rule of law

Introduction

The European Union is a relatively new participant in the international security system. It has been actively involved in this process since the 1990s. It has recently acquired a number of operational capabilities that enable it to undertake organized arbitration outside the territory of its Member States. Nevertheless, during this short period, the EU managed to devise complex and diverse instruments for restoring and maintaining peace. These instruments allow much broader action in conflict areas than conflict resolution and stabilization. This is related to the uniqueness of the European Union as an actor in international relations (Zięba, 2003). This specificity is based on the vast economic potential of the EU, the comprehensive nature of the cooperation between Member States, which creates intensive cooperation in highly specialized areas of the state, such as social support and education. This au-

thority is due to the fact that it is a partnership of several dozen countries, which may be a guarantee of relative impartiality in engaging in stabilization.

The aim of this article is to outline the concept of EU stabilization missions and to answer the question – which areas of external European Union involvement could be further developed or strengthened in the future, so as to optimize its actions for creating peace. The analysis adopts a slightly broader definition of peacekeeping operations – they are referred to as stabilization missions in accordance with the doctrine of US ground forces F –3/24. This definition includes both strictly military activities, such as taking over facilities, disarming local residents or supervising compliance with international, and civil obligations (cooperation with people in conflict areas, legal assistance, police training, restoration of state administration) (Petraeus & Amos, 2006).

The origin of the cooperation in the field of external security of the EU countries

The security issue occupies a specific position among the European Union's priorities. It is seen as an essential, yet not predominant element of the Community's external policy. At the same time, security is perceived as a prerequisite for development, which is the primary and fundamental goal of the European Union (Safe Europe..., 2003). Consequently, the concept of security policy also takes into account broadly understood external activities, allowing for the extension of the security zone into other countries with which the EU can engage in closer economic cooperation.

The European Security and Development Policy (ESDP) was built upon two key documents which were crucial from the viewpoint of the EU external activity: the Petersberg Declaration of 1992 and the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997. The first document contained a directory of missions which initially fell within the competence of the Western European Union (humanitarian operations, rescue operations, peacekeeping, crisis management/crisis response operations and restoring peace operations). The second document has given the EU the capacity to carry out these missions on an equal footing with the Western European Union. By specifying situations where engagement outside of territory of the Member States

may take place, these documents have identified the direction for the development of European Union security cooperation. Further rounds of preparatory talks were held in Cologne (3–4 June 1999), Helsinki (10–11 December 1999) and Nice (7–9 December 2000). The main purpose of the European Council meetings was to establish the structures of political control and strategic management of anti-crisis operations and the rapid reaction forces of the European Union.

In Cologne, a new declaration was adopted according to which the ESDP was to be strengthened in accordance with the spirit of the UN operation principles and without prejudice to NATO activities. The second important document to be adopted in Cologne was the report of the German Presidency, which indicated that the ESDP was to rely on the Union's ability to act independently and on the basis of its own military capabilities and special bodies and decision-making structures. The EU summit in Helsinki in December 1999, on the other hand, led to the refinement of declarations about enhancing the EU's operational capacity, undertaking anti-crisis measures in the situation when NATO fails to do so, and the commitment to create a European Rapid Response Force. The treaty basis for the ESDP was created by the Nice Task Force, which stated that the ESDP is an executive tool of the Common Security and Defense Policy. In February 2000, at the European Council in Sintra, it was decided that missions may be conducted not only in Europe but also throughout the world. The European Union has been conducting crisis response operations since 2003.

The last significant element of the process of strengthening the legal basis for the EU security cooperation is the Treaty of Lisbon, signed on December 13, 2007. It describes a far-reaching organizational reform of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, including the classic *casus foederis*. *Casus foederis* contained in the Treaty is worded as follows: "Where any Member State becomes a victim of armed attacks on its territory, the other Member States have an obligation to assist and support them, using all available means, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter United Nations." (Treaty on European Union, Art. 42, Paragraph 7, 2007). In addition, the Treaty of Lisbon extends the EU's external operations to: disarmament activities, military advisory and support missions, conflict prevention missions, and military missions for post-conflict stabilization. It has been stated that the EU operations can serve the fight against terrorism (Treaty on European Union, Art. III-210, 2007).

The next years of cooperation have forced the EU Member States to revise their views on the role and position of this structure in the global security system. Problems with the economic crisis have contributed to the slowdown in the development of common operational capabilities. The situation of the conflict in Ukraine was also alarming, as was the problem of uncontrolled influx of refugees. On June 17th, the High Representative / Vice-Chair of the Council Frederica Mogherini presented the report "The European Union in a Changing Global Environment". The conclusions also included the statement that the legal bases of the current security system in the world were questioned, in particular the principle of non-use of force and the imposition of force limits. This report was an introduction to the process of preparing a new European Security Strategy. The work on this document has accelerated in 2016. Brexit and Donald Trump's victory in the presidential election in the United States have also contributed to this. In the first case, Brexit refers to a state that did not want to integrate deeply, and in the second, concerns may arise about the quality of cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. It is difficult to say whether these facts have had a decisive influence on the shape of further European defense cooperation, but in June 2016 a "Global Strategy for European Union Security" (EUGS) was published" (Wspólna wizja., 2016). The strategy outlines five priorities for EU external policy:

1. EU security;
2. Investing in the "Resilience of states and societies east and south of the EU";
3. An integrated approach to conflict situations, understood as engaging in various stages of conflict: from prevention, reaction and complete stabilization (avoiding premature withdrawal when another crisis breaks out elsewhere). Also new is involvement at various levels of society in solving the crisis: from the central level to the local environment. The Union also declares its efforts to support regional security systems;
4. Supporting "regional order based cooperation";
5. Working towards a global order based on international law, which ensures respect for human rights, sustainable development and sustainable access to global shared goods.

The concept of the European Union security

In December 2003 the EU leaders adopted the European Security Strategy, which identified both potential threats and challenges, and the measures to counter them. It has three main parts:

- I. Security environment: global challenges and major threats
- II. Strategic objectives
- III. The consequences of the policy for Europe

The first part explores the global challenges and threats faced by united Europe. The strategy identifies a number of challenges to Europe's development, such as: the openness of borders, the close link between internal and external security, globalization – trade, investment, technology, knowledge ... and democracy flow, the growing influence of non-governmental actors, the increased number of linkages and interdependencies, civilization diseases, economic inefficiency, and also limited access to raw materials in the future. And as for threats, terrorism – as a strategic threat to the whole of Europe, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure, organized crime, e.g. sea piracy, are mentioned. It is clear from the provisions of the European Security Strategy that EU Member States are not afraid of a direct, large-scale attack on any Member State. However, contemporary threats are much more complex, less visible and less predictable, making them much more difficult to deal with by individual states.

Therefore, as a strategic security objective, the European Union assumes:

- a joint counteraction against threats, taking into account the combination of various types of resources (military, police, civilian, diplomatic, economic, military and other instruments available under European cooperation);
- building neighborhood security by fostering good governance in the EU neighbouring regions: the Mediterranean region (particularly the Arab-Israeli conflict), the Balkans, Eastern Europe and the South Caucasus;
- actions aimed at maintaining an international order based on effective multilateral relations by supporting existing international institutions. This objective also includes indications for flexible revision of existing international norms to respond more effectively to changing threats;

The third part of the European security strategy defines the rules and ways of involving the EU in international security cooperation. The EU assumes an increased activity, especially in the area of counteracting threats (preventive involvement); an increased cohesion – combining various instruments and capabilities: European aid and European Development Funds, military and civilian capabilities of Member States and other instruments; capacity building, also diplomatic capacity, and the cooperation with partners (international organizations, USA, Russia, Japan, China, Canada, India) (Treaty on European Union, Art. III-210, 2007). The importance of trade policies is highlighted here, which can also be a powerful tool for promoting reforms. They contribute to supporting better governance through aid programs, conditionality and targeted trade measures. It is also worth noting that the EU must “develop a strategic culture conducive to early, rapid intervention, and, where necessary, decisive intervention,” which means the organization assumes participation in various types of external action: from stabilization missions of a civilian character to peace enforcement actions if necessary.

Organization of EU stabilisation missions

In the process of implementing the assumptions of the European security concept, and in particular during the organization of various types of external missions, the Union can deploy a variety of organizational instruments and means of action. These are the relevant decision-making, management and executive bodies, various aid programmes and other civilian influences, and, of course, military units and police forces.

Organisational structures

In the process of implementing the European Headline Goal (EHG), i.e. the strategy for building EU operational capacity, three types of actions can be identified:

- « Establishing governing bodies (civilian and military);
- « Developing rapid reaction forces;

« Looking for an agreement with NATO on the participation of the non-EU members of the Alliance in ESDP, and on the use of NATO resources.

In the case of institutions responsible for operational activity on 14-15 February 2000, it was decided to set up a number of provisional bodies: the Political and Security Committee, a military structure and the secondment of military expert groups to the General Secretariat. On 22nd May 2000 a Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management (CIVICOM) was established. Within the Secretariat, a temporary Situation Center (Crisis Cell, which a year later began functioning as a permanent department within the Political Cell) was set up. As of 1st January 2002, agendas taken from the Western European Union are also in operation:

- Satellite Center in Torrejón;
- European Union Institute for Security Studies in Paris (EUISS).

In addition, as part of strengthening the EU's independence, on 12 June 2004 the European Defense Agency, which coordinates disarmament cooperation and promotes and supports the European defense industry (the development of European defense capabilities) was taken away from the Western European Union.

At present, the EU has a fully structured management structure, consisting of the Political and Security Committee (PSC), the EU Military Committee (EUMC), the EU Military Staff (EUMS), the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC).

Tab. 1. Tasks of the governing bodies of ESDP

GOVERNING BODY	TASKS
Political and Security Committee (PSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monitors of the international situation, assistance in defining the direction of the EU security policy – Gives guidance to other bodies responsible for ESDP implementation – Oversees the work of other bodies responsible for ESDP implementation – Coordinates, supervises and monitors various types of Working Groups responsible for the implementation of the ESDP tasks – conducts a political dialogue related to the ESDP development – is a forum for security dialogue with NATO – bears responsibility for the political direction of the development of EU military capabilities with the support of the European Military Staff (Council Decision, 2001/78/CFSP).
European Union Military Committee (UEMC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – is the highest military body within the EU Council – is responsible for providing military advice within the EU – is the military leader in all EU military operations – is a forum for cooperation and consultation of EU countries in the field of conflict prevention and crisis management – supports the work of the Political Committee, particularly with regard to the development of crisis management concepts, the military aspects of crisis management operations, the risk assessment of potential crises, the identification of EU capabilities, the financial evaluation of potential military activities and exercises, and cooperation with non-EU countries, e.g. within NATO framework – oversees the EU's external military operations (Council Decision, 2001/79/CFSP).

European Union Military Staff (EUMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – deals with early warning, situational assessment and strategic planning of EU missions and tasks – ensures the identification of European national forces and sets the conditions for military cooperation – provides experts in military matters – monitors potential crises using intelligence – coordinates the cooperation of European forces with NATO and UN forces – influences the development of the EU's capacity to fight terrorism (Council Decision 2005/395/CFSP, amending Decision 2001/80/CFSP).
Military Planning and Conduct Capability (MPCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – today: commanding military training missions
Crisis Management and Planning Directorate(CMPD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strategic planning of ESDP missions and operations – Strategic review of existing ESDP missions and operations – Developing ESDP partnership – Coordinating and developing civilian and military capabilities – Devising and developing the concept of cooperation within ESDP – Coordinating and conducting exercises
Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – planning and conducting EU civilian operations under the political control and strategic direction of the Political and Security Committee; – providing assistance and advice to the High Representative, the Presidency and other bodies; – direct coordination, advice, support, supervision and review of civilian ESDP operations

Source: author's own elaboration on the basis of documents and the EU web-site

Managing bodies are assisted by support structures such as:

- the European Defense Agency, which is responsible for the development of the EU's defense capabilities, arms cooperation, the promotion of the European arms market, and research and technological development in this field;
- the EU Institute for Security Studies, which conducts research and promotes the idea of security
- European Satellite Center (Torrejón), which deals with space research, digital geographic information systems and image analysis.

In addition, the European Council decided in December 2004 that, at the request of the European Military Staff, ad hoc Operational Centers could be set up to coordinate the EU security policy (field missions) in terms of crisis management or stabilization missions in a given region of the world. So far, one such Operational Center has been set up to provide civilian-military synergies between the three EU missions in the Horn of Africa (Council Decision 2012/173/CFSP).

Another body that plays an important role in support work is the Office of the EU Special Representative appointed by the EU Council (currently there are nine EU Special Representatives in various parts of the world, including four in the Old Continent, i.e. Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the South Caucasus).

In turn, the armed forces are organised into three structures: the European Rapid Reaction Force, the European Battle Groups (immediate mobilization at the UN request, e.g. during the Artemis operation in March 2006) and the European Military Forces.

The EU leaders' meeting in Bratislava in September 2016 gave a formal impulse to start intensive negotiations and to reach a decision on the implementation of existing commitments to increase real operational capacities by the Member States and the European Commission. Key decisions in this process were the decisions of the EU Council of November 2016, March and May 2017 and the European Council of December 2016 and June 2017. During this period decisions were made concerning:

- command structures – a military planning and conducting unit (MPCC);
- military-technical cooperation – in June 2017 the European Commission established the European Defense Fund;
- planning the development of military capabilities;

- activation of permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) and annual coordinated defense reviews (CARD) and systematic meetings of ministers of defense on this subject;
- improving EU-NTO cooperation.

Financing of the EU operations

Since 2004 the EU operations have been financed under a special joint cost management mechanism called ATHENA. An important complement to the text is Annex IIIa, which concerns common operating costs associated with the active phase of operations which are always to be financed within the Mechanism; Annex IIIb which concerns the costs incurred in a specific operation; and Annex IIIc which specifies special costs approved by the Committee that supervises the operation of this mechanism (Council Decision 2011/871/CFSP). It is a mechanism that administers all the costs of EU military operations, such as transport, infrastructure, medical services, accommodation, fuel, etc. ATHENA is managed by the Administrator and operates under the supervision of a Special Committee composed of representatives of the Member States. In the framework of joint financing, the costs of operations were divided into three groups of financing:

1. Costs incurred by the ATHENA mechanism (AnexIIIa): the costs of hosting the Headquarters, travel, information systems, public administration, local personnel, location and accommodation of mission participants, infrastructure, medical services, diagnosis, information collection (satellite images), the costs of cooperation with other organizations, e.g. NATO, UN;
2. Costs of specific operations (if the Council decides so) (AnexIIIb): the costs of multinational operations involving non-EU states;
3. Additional costs incurred at the request of the Operation Commander and after the approval by the Special Committee (AnexIIIc): recognition of the area of military activities, mine clearance, neutralization of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons, disarmament, storage and destruction of weapons.

The EU funding mechanism for EU operations is based on annual contributions from the EU countries. According to Article 41.2 of the Treaty on European Union, ATHENA Member States' contributions are calculated on

the basis of gross national income. This mechanism raises a lot of controversy concerning, among other things, the determination of the challenges based on the principle of maximum savings. Therefore, most of the EU operations are currently planned as civilian missions because they are at least partially funded by the EU budget (Pacek, 2012, p. 20).

Components of the EU mission

The European Union does not have a permanent army that it could deploy freely in the area of peacemaking activities. It relies on units provided on an ad hoc basis within national contingents. In addition to military units, police, military police and civilian specialists are involved in the EU's activities. This diversity is forced by the necessity of coping with current threats, as well as by a wide range of tasks undertaken by this organization. EU missions include:

- joint disarmament operations;
- humanitarian and rescue missions;
- military advice and military assistance;
- conflict prevention and peace operations;
- crisis management missions, including peace restoration and post-conflict stabilization missions (Miszczak, 2008, p. 249).

We can now classify the following types of EU civilian missions by the subject matter:

- Missions concerning the rule of law;
- Observation missions;
- Missions concerning the sector of security reform;
- Missions for border control support;
- Police missions (see more: Przybylska-Maszner, 2010).

Military component

According to the arrangements adopted at the meetings of the EU Member States in Cologne and Helsinki, until 2003 the Union should have had the military capacity necessary for anti-crisis measures. The European Military Headline Goals assumed that within 60 days Europeans will have at their disposal a corps of 50-60 thousand soldiers (about 15 brigades) capable of car-

rying out any operation lasting at least one year. These forces were to include land, sea and air forces. During the implementation of this goal a number of difficulties were encountered, which led to the extension of the deadline to 18 June 2004 – the date has replaced the old Operational Objective 2010. In the meantime, several planning meetings took place in connection with the declarations of national forces to be at the disposal of the EU (the so-called “toolboxes” idea – as a complement to the EU forces in order to become independent of NATO). At the Laeken meeting, a single European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) was adopted, which became the basis for structured and systematized EU military structures. The plan lets the Union identify the activities where operational capacities are required, the components which have these capacities and the areas in which the EU is not yet fully operational. Possible shortages would cover the obligations of the Member States to divest their military contingents and cooperate with NATO under the Berlin Plus formula. Additional tasks for replenishing the equipment of soldiers would rest with the European Security Agency (European Defence Agency..., 2007).

In May 2003, the EU Council finished working on the EU Rapid Military Response concept. It was acknowledged that there is a need to establish rapid reaction forces, which could, within a maximum of five days, begin their operations. It was also emphasized that they should not duplicate the competence of the NATO Response Force, although in practice this might happen. Another idea of increasing the military capabilities of the EU was reported by France, Germany and Great Britain in February 2004. It concerned the creation of an EU Combat Groups that would serve the Petersberg tasks. They consist of a maximum of 1500 soldiers and are capable of being deployed within 5–10 days after the decision to conduct an operation. They had reached full operational capacity by the beginning of 2007 (Declaration on Strengthening..., 2008). Unfortunately, despite the fact that the EU combat groups have already reached full capacity, their potential has not been utilized so far.

Civilian component

The use of civilian instruments was a natural consequence of the development of cooperation within the EU. The Union has for many years been actively involved in providing civil stabilization after conflicts, engaging in financial, legal and organizational assistance after the conflict. Therefore,

since the beginning of the operational capacity building for the implementation of the Petersberg tasks, the basis of the civilian component has been added to complement the military tasks. Priorities for cooperation in this area were defined at the Feira meeting in June 2000. The four main areas in which the Union should pursue civilian peacekeeping missions were identified:

- 1) **the police** – the aim of the EU is to provide civilian support for peacekeepers, counseling and training for local police. In pursuit of this goal, the Member States committed to provide 5000 police officers, of which 1400 would be prepared to take action within 30 days.
- 2) **Strengthening the rule of law** – the EU's objective is to strengthen or restore the rule of law in conflict-stricken areas. This is a goal the Union is seeking to achieve by supporting legally elected local authorities, providing legal assistance in establishing new public policy rules, supporting a well-functioning judicial system and prisons. In this area experts prosecutors, judges, police officers and mediators may be of a great help. Member States pledged to provide close to 300 officers for crisis management operations;
- 3) **Civil administration** – the EU's objective is to support the continuity of public administration in conflict zones, EU experts can also be helpful in creating new standards for state management, eliminating pathological phenomena, e.g. by supporting the fight against corruption, they may also support the development of local political elites and adapt local administrative rules to the requirements of effective international cooperation;
- 4) **Protection of the population** – the EU's aim is to protect human rights, promote civic attitudes and prevent migration, ensure continuity of education, protect health and prevent social pathologies such as unemployment, social exclusion and epidemics. This goal is achieved through the creation of mobile expert groups specializing in various tasks. In the event of a crisis, the Union has 2–3 smaller 10-person expert groups who can be dispatched within a few hours to the conflict zone. In addition, it has the ability to mobilize large expert intervention teams of up to 2000 people, as well as the ability to send smaller expert groups within 3–7 days (Presidency Conclusions, Santa Maria Da Feira, 2000).

In 2004, as part of the implementation of civilian security cooperation, the *Action Plan for Civilian Aspects of ESDP* was adopted (Action Plan..., 2004). Also in 2004, the European Council adopted the 2008 Civilian Headline Goal, which defined the means by which the Union will pursue its mission of crisis

management throughout its duration, which principles will guide the EU and what objectives it will pursue. The Civilian Headline Goal in relation to the number of experts at the disposal of the EU was met very quickly and in the next document on the Civilian Headline Goal 2010 two additional areas of civilian action and two potential areas of involvement have been added:

- 5) monitoring missions;
- 6) support for EU special representatives;
- 7) reforms of the security sector;
- 8) disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (Civilian Headline..., 2007).

As part of the civilian aspects of stabilization missions, the EU benefits from the help of lawyers, marketing specialists, prison staff, customs staff, doctors, anthropologists and pathologists, teacher-therapists, addiction specialists and above all police officers, who account for nearly 50% of civilian mission staff. It is also worth noting here the interesting initiative launched in 2004 on the behalf of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands, i.e. The *European Gendarmerie Force*. Formation established for police tasks within the EU, UN, NATO, OSCE.

Additional stabilization actions of the EU

In the last decade the EU has organized 23 civilian missions and military operations on three continents. It successfully links civilian and military peacemaking components, paying attention to their complementarity and complexity. The actions were taken in response to crisis situations – from peace-building operations in the tsunami-hit Aceh and protecting refugees in Chad, to fighting pirates off Somalia and the Horn of Africa. The EU plays an increasingly important role in the security domain. All the more so, in addition to the classical crisis response instruments, it has a wide range of additional instruments developed over several decades of cooperation. Thanks to the use of resources available under various levels of community cooperation, the Union is becoming a provider of attractive financial assistance. Additional instrument used during stabilization activities include:

- Instrument for Stabilization, which includes mediation, temporary aid / legal assistance, protection of natural resources during a conflict, and if possible ad hoc financial assistance (EU's Instrument..., 2012);

- European Neighborhood Policy;
- Euro-Mediterranean Partnership;
- EU humanitarian aid program;
- EU Development Assistance Program;
- Cyber Security Strategy

It seems that in the future the EU experts might become interested in more broadly understood economic and social problems, which are now the main cause of many inter-state conflicts. The European Union is an organization that has both the means and the capacity to develop research tools for the diagnosis of social problems. It also seems that one of the most neglected and extremely necessary elements of reconstruction after the conflict in the concept of EU action is the educational and educative component, which increased active implementation could contribute to a more effective suppression of the sources of conflict. Support for experts in the implementation of the concept of education for peace (shaping peaceful social attitudes) may in the future limit the development of various types of fundamentalism or xenophobia, which are often used as a political marketing tool. An interesting direction for the development of the European Union's potential is supporting states and "regional governance" in gaining independent capacity to provide security. Given the lack of effectiveness of the international security system and the urgent need to adapt to new needs, this may be the cheapest and most effective solution.

In the future the European Union will face two very important issues: first, it needs to find a way to optimize the objectives of external actions so that they are consistent with the interests of the Member States and, second, to meet the costs of implementing the security strategy. It may be that the extension of activity in the area of stabilization missions, mainly to experts supporting specific tasks, would be a good solution. However, we have to remember that financial engagement is an important element in the attractiveness of the EU as a crisis management tool.

Conclusions

The specific nature of the EU stabilization missions is the effective combination of various operational components: from the military component, through police forces, judicial officers, economic advisors and to human rights specialists (e.g. gender or children's rights). There is also a mix of dif-

ferent types of mechanisms and aid instruments that allow flexible adaptation of the mission to the situation of the state in conflict. Such a complex mechanism of international intervention seems to be a suitable solution in the face of contemporary threats. Therefore, it seems that in the future, the European Union has a chance to become one of the leaders in the international security system, especially since it is already a model for other regional groups, such as the African Union. At this point, however, the scale of its activities and the difficulty in the analysis of the effects of current operations do not allow for an unambiguous assessment of its actions in this area. Certainly, it cannot yet match in this respect the well-organized and large-scale US operations. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that we compare two distinctly different participants in international relations: a state with a centralized presidential system with an international organization that has a diverse decision-making system, and a not quite shaped operational capacity whose main task is to achieve the national interests of all its members. In this context, it can be argued that the European Union is currently setting trends in organizing international crisis interventions.

Bibliography

- A Global Strategy for the European Union, 19 June 2017. Retrieved from <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/fr/global-strategy-european-union>.
- Action Plan for Civilian Aspects of ESDP, Adopted by the European Council (17–18 June 2004), Retrieved from <http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/ActionPlanforCivilianAspectsofESDP.pdf>
- Building Capabilities for a Secure Europ*, Defence Data 2007. Retrieved from http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/EDA_-_Defence_Data_2007_-_Brochure.pdf
- Civilian Headline Goal 2010, approved by the ministerial Civilian Capabilities Improvement Conference and noted by the General Affairs and External Relations Council on 19 November 2007 – doc. 14823/07.
- Council Decision 2005/395/CFSP of 10 May 2005 amending Decision 2001/80/CFSP on the establishment of the Military Staff of the European Union. *Official Journal of the European Communities* L132/17.
- Council Decision 2011/871/CFSP of 19 December 2011 establishing a mechanism to administer the financing of the common costs of European

- Union operations having military or defence implications (Athena). *Official Journal of the European Union* L343/35.
- Council Decision 2012/173/CFSP of 23 March 2012 on the activation of the EU Operations Centre for the Common Security and Defence Policy missions and operation in the Horn of Africa. *Official Journal of the European Union* L 89/66.
- Council Decision of 22 January 2001 setting up the Military Committee of the European Union (2001/79/CFSP). *Official Journal of the European Communities* L 27/4.
- Council Decision of 22 January 2001 setting up the Political and Security Committee (2001/78/CFSP). *Official Journal of the European Communities* L 27/1.
- Declaration on Strengthening Capabilities, Brussels (11 December 2008). Council of the European Union. Retrieved from http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/esdp/104676.pdf.
- EU's Instrument for Stability: a key contributor in EU responses to international conflicts and crises in 2012. European Commission – IP/13/751.
- Miszczak, K. (2008). Reforma Wspólnej Polityki Zagranicznej i Bezpieczeństwa. In Barcz, J.(ed.) *Traktat z Lizbony. Główne reformy ustrojowe Unii Europejskiej* (236–353). Warszawa: Urząd Komitetu Integracji Europejskiej.
- Pacek, B. (2012). Nowe misje Unii Europejskiej. *Zeszyty Naukowe AON*, nr 4 (89), 2012, pp. 19–30.
- Petraeus, D. H. & Amos, J. F. (2006), *Counterinsurgency, Fm 3–24*, Headquarters, Department Of The Army; Lloyd, J. A., *Counterinsurgency Operations, Joint Publication 3–24*, 05 October 2009. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp3_24.pdf.
- Presidency Conclusions, Santa Maria Da Feira, European Council, (19 And 20 June 2000). Retrieved from http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ue-docs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/00200-r1.en0.htm
- Przybylska-Maszner, B. (ed.). (2010). *Misje cywilne Unii Europejskiej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNPiD UAM.

KRZYSZTOF KSIĘŻOPOLSKI*Ph.D., Warsaw School of Economics – SGH, Poland*

Economic security and integration of the energy market in Trimarium

The aim of the paper is to analyze the integration of the energy market in Trimarium which is a space covering the basins of three seas: the Adriatic, the Baltic and Black sea. Technical and political aspects of cooperation are examined given a clear perspective on possible cooperation. The main question is to what extent integration of the energy market will strengthen economic security of countries from the area. Nowadays integration of electricity market in the EU and the departure from coal according to climate and energy policy means that importance of electricity in the study of economic security is rapidly growing. Hence the paper is focused on the examination of political debate on cooperation, technical opportunities in the energy market and cooperation which- is crucial for strengthening economic security in Intermarum.

Keywords: economic security, energy security, electricity market, Intermarum

The economic security prospect to integration of electricity market

Many scholars have dealt with economic security, i.a. (Bogomołow 2006, Cable 1995, A. Collins 2007, Gonciarenko 2007, C.R. Neu, Ch. Wolf 1994, p.xi, Olejnikowa 2005, 58–68, Petrenko 2002, 45–52, Sperling, Kirchner 1998, 221–237, Księżopolski 2004, 2011, Księżopolski, Pronińska 2012, Senciagowa 1998, 12–23, P. De Souza 2000, 37, Thakur 2006, p. 230, Kociergina 2007, 86–152). They define the concept of economic security in dif-

ferent manners. In the present paper economic security is defined as the unimpeded functioning of economies as well as sustaining a comparative balance between the economies of other countries (Księżopolski 2004, 39–54). There are four dimensions of economic security: financial dimension and dimensions of resources and energy, food and access to clean water (Księżopolski 2011, 27–35). They are intertwined and form logically connected sets of threats. The rise in importance of economic security in the world's countries' politics and strategies is a result of the security economization process. The beginnings of this process date back to the oil crisis of the 70s and further to the debt crisis of the 80s, although it was not until the collapse of the two-bloc system that this process became more dynamic, which can be linked to the formation of new areas of security studies (Buzan 1991, 16). The dynamics of the security economization process has also been influenced by the financial crises after 1989, and particularly the latest one of 2008 (Księżopolski 2011, Księżopolski 2013), confirming the thesis that sources of threats to the economic security of the world's states are not only present in the actions of other states but also arise from the functioning of the market e.g. foreign exchange, capital or raw material markets.

Nowadays integration of electricity market in UE and the departure from coal according to climate and energy policy of UE cause that importance of electricity in the study of economic security is rapidly growing. Hence the paper is focused on examination of political debate on cooperation, technical opportunities in the electricity market cooperation which are crucial for strengthening economic security in Intermarium.

Trends of regional integration of electricity market in European Union

The process of electricity systems integration has been in operation for years. Several steps in the Western Europe have been made in the last few years. In May 2014 Southwest Europe (SWE) was combined with Northwest Europe (NWE) making Multi-Regional Coupling (MRC) market. In early 2015 Italian borders have been coupled with the MRC. In May 2015, the Central-Western European Region implemented flow-based capacity calculation for the first time in Europe (#20). Compared to that achieve-

ments in Central and Southern-Eastern Europe are modest. The Memorandum of Understanding by the representatives of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania on cooperation with respect to the two latter states' adhesion to integrated electricity markets. Document signed on the 11th of July, 2013 was agreed by national regulatory authorities, transmission system operators and power exchanges (#21). As a result of this agreements Romania joined integrated power markets of the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary making in November 2014, the 4M Market Coupling Project (#21). Economic impact of this settlement will be discussed later.

In 2015, the Energy Union concept has been finally brought to life. As the EC argues wholesale electricity prices have declined by one-third between 2008 and 2012 due to integration. However, much is to be done. The European Council in October 2014 called for "speedy implementation of all the measures to meet the target of achieving interconnection of at least 10% of their installed electricity production capacity for all Member States" (#21). As a part of the Energy Union package the EC postulates that Europe should aim on achieving the 10% electricity interconnection target.

Previously two other political initiatives are to be linked to the regional electricity integration. The first one is the EU strategy for the Danube region, launched in 2010, which stressed need for better connection in the area. It says that "fragmented markets lead to higher costs and reduced competition. Reliance on too few external suppliers increases vulnerability, as periodic winter crises testify. A greater diversity of supply through interconnections and genuine regional markets will increase energy security" (#22). Moreover, "modernising and extending energy networks, especially in terms of interconnectors, by implementing the European Energy Programme for Recovery and by reinforcing the TEN-E network is essential" (#23). Secondly, 10 Member States signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in 2011, expressing will to further develop the electricity, gas, and oil infrastructure in the region. Its aim was to improve regional market integration, investment environment and stability and predictability of supply (Memorandum 2011) As the EC website states "Many of these projects have since been completed or transferred into the list of EU projects of common interest. Projects can also get financial support through the European Regional Development Fund and the EU's Cohesion Fund" (#24). These initiatives overlap each other to an extent.

Another relevant political initiative in the region is the Energy Community of South East Europe (ECSEE), that is an international organisation established between the EU and a number of Southeast European countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine). Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia were also parties of the agreement before they joined the EU. Its goal is the adoption of the EU's legislation, the so-called "*acquis communautaire*", in energy and related areas to the non-EU state parties (#25). Few priority projects in electricity market integration are envisaged by the organisation, including spot market development, cross-border balancing and cross-border capacity allocation. Finally, it was decided at the Vienna Summit of the Western Balkans 6 Initiative in late August 2015 to set up a regional energy market by establishing power exchanges, a regional balancing market and making best use of the Coordinated Auction Office in South East Europe (The Energy Community Annual Implementation Report 2014/2015). In May, 2015 Slovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania also signed a Joint Declaration backing the idea of building the gas pipeline, designed to link Central with Southeastern Europe (#27).

Political contingent of future cooperation in the Intermarium (internal and external)

Two political events has generated political momentum in the Intermarium region in the first half of 2015. One of the was the region's explicit mention in the Energy Union Package. As the European Commission argues "Given its particular vulnerability, there is a need to improve cooperation, solidarity and trust in the Central and South-Eastern part of Europe." Brussels argues for integration of these markets into the wider European energy market and pledges to take concrete actions in urgency (Energy Union Package 2015).

The second point was the creation of the Central East South Europe Gas Connectivity (CESEC) High Level Group. On 9 February 2015, representatives from Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia and European Commission Vice President for Energy Union, Maroš Šefčovič, and Commissioner for Climate Action

and Energy, Miguel Arias Cañete, held the first meeting of the CESSEC High Level Group. They discussed the establishment and advanced implementation of a regional priority infrastructure roadmap in order to develop missing infrastructure and improve security of gas supplies (#29). Another political declaration on gas supply cooperation is “Joint Declaration on the Strengthening of Energy Cooperation” signed up in Budapest, April 7, 2015 signed by Greece, Macedonia, Serbia, Hungary and Turkey (#30).

However, dr. Michelle LaBelle, an assistant professor at the Central European University in Budapest, sees diverging attitudes in the Intermarium when it comes to gas: “Poland, Czech Republic and Romania display a cautious attitude about expanding gas the use of gas in their energy systems and any dependency that may result from this expansion; Then we have the ‘divergent attitude’ countries of Hungary and Bulgaria that are fine with importing more Russian gas while expanding their interconnectors at a glacial pace, essentially delaying the inevitable infrastructure integration that goes along with EU membership” (#31).

During the Summit of Prime Ministers of the Visegrad Group (V4) and the President of the French Republic, held on 19 June 2015 in Bratislava energy was also quite important topic. Both sides emphasized the need to diversify sources and transit routes of energy and at the same time make maximum and cost-effective use of the existing infrastructure. Need for a technologically neutral approach that respects national circumstances was also expressed. Finally, all countries “stressed the determination to complete the Internal Energy Market and in particular the missing energy infrastructure for efficiently fulfilling each dimension of the Energy Union and achieving the agreed 2030 climate and energy targets” (#31).

Slavcho Neykov, a Bulgarian energy policy expert and a former Director of the Energy Community Secretariat, pointed out to the need of coordination in the region that is needed to increase investments (#32).

“As resulted by all studies performed so far, for the vast majority of the visions analysed, for the study horizon 2030 the predominant power flow directions from East to West (E->W) and North to South (N->S) still prevail.” (Regional Investment Plan Continental South East region – Draft for consultation, 8)

Characteristic of the Intermarum from perspective of electricity market

Sources of electricity production

There are wide differences among the Intermarum states when it comes to potential sources of electricity flowing into the region. Firstly, certain countries in the region have much more diversified energy mixes than others. For example Romania uses gas (32.90%) but also RES (21.30%), solid fuels (17.80%), oil (16.30%) and nuclear (11.50%). Hungary also bases production on a number of sources: nuclear (39.30%), RES (20.50%), solid fuels (15.90%) and gas (15.30%). Slovenia has production divided in to three sources: nuclear (38.50%), solid fuels (30.30%) and RES (30.20%). In the second group are countries that mainly rely on two sources – like Bulgaria (solid fuels 45.40% and nuclear 34.50%) or Croatia (gas 41.60% and RES 41.40%). Finally, to the third group belong countries that rely heavily on one source. These are Poland (solid fuels 80.50%), Slovakia (nuclear (64.10%), Serbia (solid fuels 67.40%) or Czech Republic (solid fuels 59%)¹.

The Intermarum region is also unevenly developed in interconnectors. Croatia, Slovakia and Hungary are well – or even very well – connected. Their levels of connectivity are 69%, 61% and 29% respectively. The Czech Republic and Bulgaria meet the EU requirements reaching 17% and 11% respectively. The last group consists of states which do not meet expectations – Romania (7%) and Poland (2%). Though, the completion of the interconnection between Lithuania and Poland will have increased the level of interconnection of Poland to 4% by the end of 2015. “Another identified PCI, the interconnection between Vierraden, Germany and Krajnik, Poland, would bring Poland’s interconnectivity to above 10% by 2020.” (COM(2015) 82 final, Achieving the 10% electricity interconnection target) According to the ENTSO-E Regional Investment Plan market integration and power transfers are weak in the region. “The volume of electricity market exchanges during the last years is rather moderate compared to the rest of Europe. This

¹ Based on data from Energy consumption in the EU down to its early 1990s level, Eurostat News release

is due to the small size of the power systems comprising the area and also its peripheral location within Europe.”(Regional Investment Plan Continental South East region – Draft for consultation, 8).

Table 4.1: PCI electricity interstate interconnectors in South-Eastern Europe for the near future

PCI Code	State 1	State 2	Commission date
3.16.1	Hungary	Slovakia	2018
3.17	Hungary	Slovakia	2018
3.18.1	Hungary	Slovakia	2021
3.22.1	Romania	Serbia	2015
3.7.1	Bulgaria	Greece	2021
3.5.1	Croatia	Bosnia&Herzegovina	2020

http://ec.europa.eu/energy/infrastructure/transparency_platform/map-viewer/

For The Ten-Year Network Development Plan 2016 several projects have been proposed in the CSE region: 1) BG-GR border: a new 400 kV overhead line Maritsa East 1 (BG) – Nea Santa (GR); 2) HR-RS border: a new 400 kV overhead line Sombor (RS) – Ernestinovo (HR); 3) BG-RS border: a new double 400 kV overhead line; 4) RO-RS border: upgrading existing single to double 400 kV overhead line; 5) HR-BA border: upgrading of existing 220kV lines between substation Dakovo (HR) and substation Tuzla/Gradacac (BA) to 400kV lines. (Regional Investment Plan Continental South East region – Draft for consultation, 8).

According to ACER, in the whole CEE region price convergence rose from 6% of all hours in 2012 to 10% in 2013. What may be surprising, it doubled from 37% of all hours in 2012 to 74% in 2013 between the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia due to the extension of market coupling from the former to the two latter states. However, there was also “a sharp drop in the number of hours with full price convergence due to the decrease in import capacity (NTC) from Slovakia and Austria to Hungary since May 2013.”(ACER/CEER 2013, 114–115).

Because Bulgaria, Greece and Romania, will be the countries with the biggest spur in renewables, ENTSO-E argues. If this is to materialize new interconnectors will be needed but two new ones (BG/GRE, BG/SR) are con-

sidered to be completed in 2030 and beyond. One of the projects needed is the Black Sea Corridor. While not interstate (it consists of several not connected transnationally lines) the project reinforces lines along the coast of the Black Sea in Romania and Bulgaria. Due to increase of wind generation connected in the area it will be necessary to seaside region with the rest of the system. Project aims on integration of about 5000 MW of RES. (The Continental South 2014) The CSE4 project, which goes in 90% in Bulgaria, is designed to increase the transfer capacity in the Bulgaria-Greece borders and help to “safe evacuation of the power from the wind farms expected to be installed in the North-East part of Greece and the North-East of Bulgaria as well as photovoltaic power plants in the South part of Bulgaria.” (The Continental South 2014) Yet, all elements of the project are delayed as well as the Bulgaria – Greece interconnector that is a part of it.

Strategies of energy policy

Hungary

Hungary seems is focused on national sovereignty and its posture is extremely important geopolitically as the state bridges Romania, Hungary and Greece with the rest of Europe. Its vague position towards energy integration was expressed in June, 2015. While the state supports the implementation of an energy union, it, at the same time insists on retaining national competence in energy pricing and the country’s mix of energy supply (#41).

Also in June, 2015 when VP Sefcovic visited the country, MFA said that its government makes every effort to guarantee Hungary’s energy security, and is seeking to interconnect the energy networks of the countries of the region. He remarked that fundamental condition for the low utility bills policy is to be able to buy the largest possible quantity of energy from the largest possible number of sources (#42).

Different, yet not contradictory, opinion was expressed by State Secretary for Energy András Aradszki at the Budapest Energy Charter Forum, which was organised on 07 October 2015. He said that international cooperation is essential for energy security and sustainable energy management. There are two goals for such partnerships: 1) elimination of the risk

factors related to supply routes and 2) support for energy trading. He made an argument that the Energy Union goals of energy supply and affordable energy prices should be realised in parallel, through close cooperation and joint effort. (#43) Therefore two paths are envisioned by analysts for Budapest. "One takes Hungary closer to Europe and this is the market orientated approach, and the other path maintenance Hungary's dependence on Russia" (#44).

In late March, 2015 Hungarian MFA said that from the Hungarian standpoint, first infrastructure developments are needed, and, after that, regulatory issues may be placed on the agenda. He stressed the importance of this order and enumerated important projects: 1) LNG terminal in Croatia on Krk Island; 2) to launch the operation of the interconnector between Hungary and Slovakia; 3) to start two-way gas transmission towards Romania and Croatia(#45).

In December, 2014 MFA expressed the need for even closer cooperation with the Western Balkans, after the cancellation of the South Stream project. Hungary seeks diversification of gas supply routes at the most competitive price, in the most reliable way. One of the measures of cooperation is possible participation of the MVM Hungarian energy group in the construction of an interconnector linking the Macedonian and Albanian electricity networks (#46).

In Hungarian MFA accused its neighbour that the fact that Croatia is not implementing the project, which would make the interconnector which connects the Croatian-Hungarian gas pipelines together two-way, negatively affects Hungary's energy security as well. The issue is important in the context of the liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminal on the Croatian Island of Krk (#47).

Hungarian government is going to buy energy and gas transmission networks back. It fits into two narratives – one that calls on independence of the state's infrastructure on foreign capital and the second that is focused on providing electricity and gas bills subsidies for the Hungarian population. Operation will have been finished until the end of 2017 which is quite important date as the elections will take place in Hungary in April, 2018. These plans were described at the beginning of 2014 by RWE East chairman Martin Herrmann as „expropriation”(#48). Hungary seems to look on Russia more often than on Brussels. It signed agreement on the extension of the Paks NPP by Rosatom in December, 2014.

Bulgaria

On 12th of January, 2015 Bulgaria's PM and DPM met EU commissioners for energy union and climate. Sides agreed on the necessity to increase integration, cooperation and solidarity of the region and provide real diversification of gas supplies to the region and Bulgaria (#51). Neykov, energy expert from Bulgaria, says he is glad to see proactive attitude of the current Bulgarian government as this seems to be new, compared to the past (#52).

Bulgaria's government presents favourable attitude towards further integration in Autumn, 2015. According to the words of the state's Minister of Energy Temenuzhka Petkova "Bulgarian government and companies on state energy work extremely actively and I hope soon Bulgaria to become binding factor on the European energy map." In Bulgaria the inter-ministerial dialogue regarding decrease of the public service obligations tax is under way (#53).

The importance of interconnectors was also stressed as "Bulgaria is very actively working on the inter-system connectivity with the neighbouring countries". Focus includes Greece-Bulgaria, Bulgaria-Romania, Bulgaria-Serbia, Bulgaria-Turkey interconnections. As she remarked "The government is actively working on each of these projects. The major priority and major concept of our efforts are focused on the realisation of the Greece-Bulgaria interconnector." She added that "We are actively working on the construction of the Bulgaria-Romania interconnector, too. The project is at very advanced stage. I hope that we will be able to greet ourselves with the first interconnector in the beginning of 2016." She also stated that she agreed with her Greek counterpart that the Bulgaria-Greece interconnector is a priority (#52).

According to the EU 2013 Bulgaria's energy market study its population is dissatisfied with the monopoly of three electric utilities. The country is divided into three regions, where distribution networks are monopolized by respectively by the Czech firms ČEZ (in the West) and Energo-Pro (northeast) and by the Austrian EVN in the southern part. The study also points out th to the state's overcapacity and the lack of prospects for future demand increases. At the same time demand for electricity in the largest export market – Greece – decreased. Report mentions extended trials for a synchronous operation of the Turkish and ENTSO-E system since September, 2010 (#53).

Romania

As a result of market coupling with the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary on the 19th of October 2014, Romania's electricity exports went up 27% year over year in the first five months of 2015. In effect of this operation Romania exported 4.5 TWh of electricity in the January-May interval of 2015, compared to 3.5 TWh in the first five months of 2014. Similarly, the levels of imports increased, from 1.35 TWh to 1.7 TWh from January to May of 2014 compared to 2015. However, private electricity company argues that these increased exchanges has not used market coupling mechanism. Instead, it is suggested that exports increased to neighbouring uncoupled markets Serbia, Bulgaria and Ukraine. No matter which version is true the fact is that Romanian export has risen two times in 2014, compared to 2013. (Romanian Energy Market Monitor, JUNE 2015)

According to Radu Dudau, Director of the Bucharest-based Energy Policy Group, Romania has never been able to agree on a national energy security strategy. As he argues "it is now scheduled for October 2015, but I'm afraid it will be postponed again." He thinks that the EU now looks to be the main financier of the projects as Russia far more reluctant nowadays. The EU active participation is a must as countries in the region alone will not be able to agree on a solution that is beneficial to all. "This is not a region with an encouraging history of cooperation. Everybody is looking for their own advantage. They all want to be a gas hub. They all want to have transit fees. The EU will need to act as arbiter and broker." Dudau fears that the planned investment in centralised power production will affect the growth opportunities for renewable power in Romania which boomed in 2011–13 but faded when subsidies were cut. (#55). Another energy expert has also stressed need for energy strategy in Romania and that it needs flexible regulatory framework to fully develop its potential as energy hub (#56).

Slovakia

During the bilateral meeting, held on 30 of March, 2015 Miroslav Lajčák, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic, discussed development projects with Hungarian counter

part Peter Szijjarto in Budapest. These talks included energy issues. Ministers agreed that both countries do as much as possible to put the gas interconnector into a commercial operation as quickly as possible. Moreover, plans on linking the Hungarian and Slovak electricity networks have been drafted as the Hungarian minister said (#57).

Lajčák also said on the 5th of June, 2015: "For Slovakia, it is traditionally important that the EU member countries have the right to opt for a given energy mix, including nuclear energy. Moreover, with support from the other V4 countries, in the Energy Union concept we pushed to see that emphasis is laid on the importance of the costs and availability for households and industry." (#58). Though, three weeks later, during the international security conference GLOBSEC in Bratislava he expressed full support for the Energy Union project. Because Slovakia is among six countries in the EU which are fully dependent on one supplier to meet its energy needs it puts much pressure on gas issues (#58).

Conclusions

Political support to cooperation in the Intermarium by the visit of US President Donald Trump to Warsaw in the field of gas can also support other area of cooperation e.g. electricity market (#61). According to results of the strategic game took place in Krynica 2017 during the Economic Forum, all participant stressed that the key to ensuring energy security is regional collaboration and implementing the European mechanisms in the energy sector (Książkowski 2017). One of recommendation is that *"collaboration in the field of energy security should be institutionalized, in particular gas and electrical energy in the Intermarium area, including the closest neighbours from outside of the EU in the South and in the East"* (Książkowski 2017) Summing up politicians and experts are convinced to support cooperation and integration in electricity market in Intermarium however one of key obstacle is investment constraints. Characteristic of Intermarium countries from both sources of electricity production and strategies of energy policy shows that integration of energy market can strengthen they economic security. Also similar level of incomes and export capabilities of Germany plays crucial role in mapping new area of cooperation in the field of economic and energy security.

Bibliography

- Bogomołow W.A., *Ekonomiczeskaja bezopasnost*, UNITY, Moscow 2006.
- Cable V., *What is International Economic Security*, "International Affairs" 1995, t. 71, nr 2, p. 306.
- Collins A., *Contemporary Security Studies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007, p. 210.
- Gonciarenko L.P (ed.). *Ekonomiciskaja i nacionalnaja bezopasnost*, Moscow 2007.
- Neu C.R., Wolf Ch., *The Economic Dimensions of National Security*, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica 1994.
- Olejnukowa E.A. (Ed.), *Ekonomiceskaja i nacionalnaja bezopasnost*, Moscow 2005.
- Petrenko I.N., *Ekonomiceskaja bezopasnost Rossii. Denejnyj faktor*, Moscow 2002.
- Sperling J., Kirchner E., *Economic Security and the Problem of Cooperation in Post-Cold War Europe*, "Review of International Studies" 1998, t. 24, nr 1, pp. 221–237.
- Książopolski K.M., *Strategy Game, Euro-Norwegian Cooperation in the Field of Energy Efficiency and Security*, Warszawa 2017.
- Książopolski K.M., *Ekonomiczne zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa państwa: metody i środki przeciwdziałania*, Warszawa 2004.
- Książopolski K.M., *Bezpieczeństwo ekonomiczne*, Warszawa 2011.
- Książopolski K. M., Pronińska K., (eds.) *Bezpieczeństwo ekonomiczne w perspektywie politologicznej – wybrane problemy*, Warszawa 2012.
- Książopolski K.M., *Finansowy wymiar bezpieczeństwa ekonomicznego Polski w dobie kryzysu strefy euroatlantyckiej*, w: e-Politikon no. 6/2013, p. 208–230 <http://oapuw.pl/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/epolitikon-6-2013.pdf>
- Senciagowa W.K., *Ekonomiceskaja bezopasnost: proizvodstwo-finansy-banki*, Moscow 1998.
- De Souza P., *Economic Strategy and National Security*, Westview, Boulder 2000.
- Thakur R., *The United Nations, Peace and Security: from Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006.
- Kociergina T.E., *Ekonomiceskaja bezopasnost*, ENIKS, Moscow 2007.

- Buzan B., *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post – Cold War Era*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York 1991.
- <http://www.emissions-euets.com/internal-electricity-market-glossary/481-market-coupling>
- <http://www.tge.pl/pl/27/rss/350/next-steps-in-the-czech-slovak-hungarian-polish-romanian-market-integration>
- <http://www.emissions-euets.com/internal-electricity-market-glossary/481-market-coupling>
- Achieving the 10% electricity interconnection target, p.2
- Strategy for Danube Region*; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0715&from=EN>
- Memorandum of Understanding on North-South Interconnections in Central-Eastern Europe*, 2011
- <https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/infrastructure/north-south-east>
- https://www.energy-community.org/portal/page/portal/ENC_HOME/ENERGY_COMMUNITY/What_we_do
- The Energy Community Annual Implementation Report 2014/2015*, p. 12; https://www.energy-community.org/portal/page/portal/ENC_HOME/DOCS/3842305/EnC_IR2015_WEB.pdf
- <http://www.euractiv.com/sections/energy/slovakia-hungary-romania-and-bulgaria-embark-gas-pipeline-project-314793>
- Energy Union Package 2015*, p. 11
- <http://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/news/first-central-east-south-europe-gas-connectivity-high-level-group-meeting-held>
- <http://www.mfa.gr/en/current-affairs/top-story/joint-declaration-on-the-strengthening-of-energy-cooperation-budapest-april-2015.html>
- <http://energyscee.com/2015/09/10/2267/>
- http://www.mzv.sk/servlet/content?MT=/App/WCM/main.nsf/vw_ByID/ministry&NCH=Y&OpenDocument=Y&LANG=EN&TG=BlankMaster&URL=/App/WCM/Aktualit.nsf/%28vw_ByID%29/ID_80606E82F85175B6C1257E6900609DD5
- <http://www.euractiv.com/sections/energy/analyst-politics-have-marred-bulgarias-energy-sector-314170>
- Regional Investment Plan Continental South East region – Draft for consultation*, p. 8
- Based on data from Energy consumption in the EU down to its early 1990s level*, Eurostat News release

COM(2015) 82 final, Achieving the 10% electricity interconnection target, p. 5, 8

Regional Investment Plan Continental South East region – Draft for consultation. ACER/CEER Annual Report on the Results of Monitoring the Internal Electricity and Natural Gas Markets in 2013, pp. 114–115.

The Continental South East Regional Investment Plan (CSE RgIP) 2014, pp. 118–122

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/news/hungary-will-protect-its-own-and-thereby-europe-s-external-borders-from-illegal-migrants>

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-foreign-affairs-and-trade/news/eastern-central-europe-still-vulnerable-from-the-respect-of-energy-security>

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-national-development/news/participants-at-the-budapest-energy-charter-forum-discuss-challenges-in-the-energy-sector>

<http://energyscee.com/2015/06/22/the-energy-union-too-much-profit-for-hungary/>

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-foreign-affairs-and-trade/news/progress-is-needed-in-the-region-s-energy-security>

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-foreign-affairs-and-trade/news/the-need-for-even-closer-cooperation-with-the-western-balkans>

<http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-foreign-affairs-and-trade/news/hungarian-croatian-bilateral-relations-to-be-improved>

<http://biznesalert.pl/nacjonalizacja-energetyki-to-element-walki-wiktora-orbana-o-poparcie/>

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/01/19/us-utilities-unplugged-re-nationalisation-idUSBREA0I03720140119>

<http://biznesalert.pl/wegry-potwierdzily-plany-rozbudowy-elektrowni-paks-przez-rosatom/>

http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-15-3180_en.htm

<http://www.euractiv.com/sections/energy/analyst-politics-have-marred-bulgarias-energy-sector-314170>

<http://www.focus-fen.net/news/2015/09/16/383348/i-hope-soon-bulgaria-to-become-binding-factor-on-the-european-energy-map-energy-minister-roundup.html>

<http://www.energyworldmag.com/16/10/2015/bulgaria-actively-working-interconnectors-energy-minister/>

<http://www.sofia.diplo.de/contentblob/4047990/Daten/3321520/EUKommissionAnalyseBGEnergiesystem.pdf>

Romanian Energy Market Monitor, JUNE 2015, p. 12

<http://www.energypost.eu/interview-radu-dudau-energy-policy-group-urgent-need-new-energy-strategy/>

<http://www.energynomics.ro/en/john-roberts-create-a-flexible-environment-for-both-energy-production-and-energy-transit/>

<http://dailynewshungary.com/hungary-slovakia-foreign-ministers-discuss-infrastructure-energy-cooperation/>

http://www.mzv.sk/servlet/content?MT=/App/WCM/main.nsf/vw_ByID/ministry&NCH=Y&OpenDocument=Y&LANG=EN&TG=BlankMaster&URL=/App/WCM/Aktualit.nsf/%28vw_ByID%29/ID_4A8F1BD55418A1ABC1257E5E00226400

[http://www.mzv.sk/App/wcm/media.nsf/vw_ByID/ID_2F83D9BC7FAA51BAC1257E6A00431A1F_EN/\\$File/Speech%20by%20Deputy%20Prime%20Minister%20and%20Minister%20of%20Foreign%20and%20European%20Affairs%20of%20the%20Slovak%20Republic%20Miroslav%20Laj%C4%8D%C3%A1k%20at%20Globsec%20Energy%20Forum.pdf](http://www.mzv.sk/App/wcm/media.nsf/vw_ByID/ID_2F83D9BC7FAA51BAC1257E6A00431A1F_EN/$File/Speech%20by%20Deputy%20Prime%20Minister%20and%20Minister%20of%20Foreign%20and%20European%20Affairs%20of%20the%20Slovak%20Republic%20Miroslav%20Laj%C4%8D%C3%A1k%20at%20Globsec%20Energy%20Forum.pdf)

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/07/06/remarks-president-trump-three-seas-initiative-summit-july-6-2017>

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

EWELINA WAŚKO-OWSIEJCZUK

Ph.D., University of Białystok, Poland

Europe's position in U.S. security policy at the beginning of the 21st century

The purpose of this article is to analyze Europe's Place in U.S. Security Policy at the beginning of the 21st century. The chronological timeframe of the article are the years 2001–2009, i.e. the years of George W. Bush's presidency, which encompass a number of important events in both U.S. and European security policy. The analysis is designed to answer the following research questions: What place did Europe occupy in U.S. security policy during the reign of President George W. Bush? What was cooperation like between the U.S. and allies in Europe between the years 2001 and 2009? Was Europe an important ally of the Americans? Did Europe influence the White House's decisions on international security? What impact did the Bush administration have on U.S.-Europe relations?

Key words: United States, terrorism, U.S. security policy, European Union, Europe, George W. Bush

Introduction

The pillar of the relationship between the United States (U.S.) and the nations of Western Europe, since they began cooperation in the era of World War II, is based on their similar approach to democratic ideas and values. Broadly understood political and security cooperation, strengthened by economic partnerships, has interlinked the United States with its European allies, providing benefits for both sides. With U.S. support, post-war Europe was able to rebuild and modernize their economies (Zięba, 2007,

16), and in turn, the United States gained loyal allies in the fight against the spread of communism. During the Cold War, the United States assumed responsibility for maintaining security in Western Europe. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, one superpower emerged – the United States of America. The disproportionate military potential and strength of the U.S. were to be used to support Western Europe, which became a protectorate of the superpower (Zajac, 2014, 29–40; Milczarek, 2008, 32). Cooperation within the North Atlantic Alliance was to strengthen transatlantic relations and the security of its members by the spread of the “umbrella of protection”.

Today, the United States and Western Europe, as most important actors in international relations, are involved in broad economic, energy, and political cooperation, and are the main advocates promoting democracy. They also cooperate in terms of security and defense policy. However, because of each nation’s national interests, their vision and policies are not always consistent. The international community criticizes them for this, accusing them of “double standards” and hypocrisy (Huber, 2015, 1).

The purpose of this article is to analyze U.S. security policy at the beginning of the 21st century in a European context. A state security policy is basically the activity of the leader in the sphere in creating and exploiting the state’s defense potential for accomplishing specific tasks and goals (O’Connor & Sabato, 2003; Shafritz, 1993, 197–198; Thompson, Hill, 2001, 110). The main goal of each state’s security policy is to prevent and eliminate threats that may have a destructive effect on the state’s values. Thus, a state’s security policy may be defensive, focusing on the elimination of threat, or offensive – focusing on the prevention of threats (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2014, 37–38).

The chronological timeframe of the article are the years 2001–2009, i.e. the years of George W. Bush’s presidency, which encompass a number of important events in both U.S. and European security policy. The analysis is designed to answer the following research questions: What place did Europe occupy in U.S. security policy during the reign of President George W. Bush? What was cooperation like between the U.S. and allies in Europe between the years 2001 and 2009? Was Europe an important ally of the US? Did Europe influence the White House’s decisions on international security? What impact did the Bush administration have on U.S.-Europe relations?

Different perceptions of security in the United States and in Europe

The American perception of international security differs from the European approach. This is influenced by many factors, the most important being the position of the United States in the international system¹ as the only superpower. The United States, as the strongest and most influential state, strives to safeguard its own interests and achieve its own goals, while at the same time is a decision maker about important international events, including issues of war and peace. In analyzing the criteria for distinguishing a superpower (Włodkowska, 2004, 163–170), aside from demographic and territorial (geopolitical) criteria, or the level of economic and technological development of the state, in the context of the United States, military power also plays a vital role. The U.S. defense budget accounts for nearly 50% of global defense spending (Roser, Nagdy, 2017). Americans invest in the newest military technology, and have huge military potential, all in an effort to ensure a dominant international position. On the one hand, this serves to deter potential enemies from attacking; on the other, it enables a quick reaction to potential threats to the U.S. or to their allies. The United States is the only country in the world whose military potential allows them to be involved in two wars and one conflict at any given time in any given region of the world (Balcerowicz, 2010, 74–77).

The military position of the U.S. influences the political position of the superpower, and it often dictates the terms of cooperation and engagement in solving international problems. Being the strongest member of the United Nations (UN) and the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO), the U.S. has decisive influence over the operation of these organizations, as evidenced by the instrumental treatment of NATO during the U.S. military intervention in Afghanistan in October 2001, when the United States resigned from using NATO soldiers during the first phase of operations. Yet the Americans were eager to support the building of an international coalition after the end of the operation in order to share the financial burden of the stabilization mission. A good illustration of the way the U.S. has treated the United Nations

¹ The international system consists of various elements (participants), connected to one another through specific relationships (see: Pawłuszko, 2014).

in the past was the unlawful war in Iraq in March 2003, which showed the powerlessness of the United Nations against its strongest member, of which I will write more extensively about in the article below.

There are fundamental differences in the European and American approach to security. Some researchers state that U.S. government institutions should shape the international security environment in such a way that American national interests are protected and promoted internationally. This has the effect of simultaneously reducing risk, conflict and aggression in many parts of the world (Reveron, 2010, 39). According to this principle, a safe America = a safe world. While the United States government identifies international security as a common goal for themselves and for other international actors (The White House, 2002, 2), the superpower gives itself the right to decide on the priorities and objectives of global security missions. The European approach to security is quite different. Some European researchers couple international security with the idea of a *security community* (Buzan & Hansen, 2007, 359), which, in order to survive, must cooperate and follow common rules. International security is referred to as „a state in which the survival and security of nations are protected by various means², which are taken to prevent or punish aggression. It is based on international order, rules and laws” (Heywood, 2011, 19). The individual security of nations is largely dependent on international cooperation, common problems, collective solutions and the building of universal trust (Brzeziński, 2009, 37).

The Americans approach security in a much different way. The superpower sees security through the prism of its military might. As Robert Kagan notes, “those who are stronger naturally perceive the world differently from those who are weaker” (Kagan, 2003, 35). Western Europe treats multilateral institutionalized cooperation based on international law and peaceful settlement of disputes as priorities in security policy, where the main instrument is diplomacy. America, on the other hand, places emphasis on the development of military power as a way of influencing other countries. Being aware of the fact that they are the only superpower in the world translates into Americans having a different perception of security.

² We can distinguish between military means – e.g. armaments control, disarmament; political means – e.g. regional agreements, peaceful settlement of disputes; economic means – e.g. elimination of barriers; and cultural means – e.g. human rights (see: Brzeziński, 2009, 37).

Although the United States has a clear tendency towards a militarized approach to security³, the nature of modern threats shows that arming oneself is no longer enough. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, show that an armed fortress may be compromised – not by numerous troops attacking state borders, but by a group of terrorists. As Joseph Nye points out, the American paradox is that the superpower is too strong for any country to compete with it. However, it is not powerful enough to achieve its objectives in foreign and security policy on its own (Nye, 2002).

Europe in U.S. security policy at the beginning of the 21st century – declarations, assumptions and goals

At the beginning, the administration of President George W. Bush did not foretell any radical changes in U.S. security policy. While the newly elected U.S. president did surround himself with “hawks” as chief advisers⁴, Bush was not the first Republican presidential candidate to endeavor to strengthen the military might of the superpower. In relation to the Department of Defense, President Bush had specific plans. His military reform called for

³ It is worth noting that in the United States the dominant trend is political realism, which assumes that the world is a dangerous place where an intrinsic feature of the system is violence. For this reason nations, as the most important participants in international relations, should be guided by national interest and constantly increase their military potential, since they can never be sure of the intentions of other nations. More about realism, see: (Burchill, 2006, 97).

⁴ „Hawks” are supporters of the military approach to US foreign policy, and believe that the main tool for the implementation of foreign policy should be military force. They were therefore in favor of increasing spending on defense, investing in technology, and strengthening military forces. The position of the US in the world depended on it. This camp is characterized by an unilateral approach to international politics. It is the Americans who are the „chosen people”, who have the right to choose what means they are to use, including preventive ones, to intervene wherever they think fit. It is worth noting that the „hawks” were strong supporters of the Iraq invasion in 2003. „Doves” in the Bush administration were in favor of using diplomacy, multilateral international cooperation, democratization and collective security as the main tools in US politics. They worked under the assumption that even the strongest military state was not able to provide security and freedom on its own. „Doves” did not exclude the use of military force as a means of conducting policy, but the military operation had to comply with international law (see: Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2016, 276–299).

the alignment of individual structures and investments in new technologies, including missile defense (Bush, 2010, 83–84). On his first official visit to Europe, he assured his allies of continued U.S. engagement in their defense, and announced NATO reinforcement, the modernization of forces, as well as investment in missile defense, which was to serve as a new approach to deterrence and appropriately prepare the U.S. and European allies for new threats. He also stressed the need to expand and deepen cooperation with partners, including Russia and the Ukraine, and to treat new NATO members with openness, in order to strengthen security in Europe (The White House, 2001a).

The Department of Defense Report also stressed the United States' great role in ensuring peace and security in Europe. The defense activities of the superpower in this region were focused on supporting and encouraging Europe to develop in order to ensure its security and to prevent destructive divisions. They stressed the need for stable democratic governance, an integrated and prosperous economy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and lasting reconciliation between former enemies. They saw U.S. Security as inextricably linked to the situation in Europe, where European allies were perceived as faithful and stable partners who worked with the superpower on such issues as the fight against drug trafficking, the fight against terrorists, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, of arms and human trafficking. The pillar for cooperation on security between the United States and Europe is NATO, which not only provides a collective defense, but is a leading crisis management institution. U.S. military presence in Europe⁵ is perceived as an essential and key instrument through which Americans manifest their continued commitment to European security while protecting their national interests and communication lines in and outside Europe. The purpose for the deployment of military units in Europe was not only for exercises and training, but also to enable a rapid response to crises and to overcome aggression, thereby fulfilling the treaty obligations to NATO. The Department of Defense Report emphasized that ensuring transatlantic security depended on close cooperation between the United States and their allies and improving defense capabilities to meet current challenges and

⁵ At the beginning of 2001 "in Europe, the Army's 62,000 forward-stationed and 9,000 deployed soldiers are engaged in multiple operations and exercises that contribute to the stabilization of the region and to assist in the Balkans" (see: The Department of Defense, 2001, 250).

threats. Successful military operations depended on increasing mobility and flexibility within NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative⁶. The biggest shortcomings were seen in the areas of intelligence, surveillance and , strategic lift, air-to-air refueling, suppression of enemy air defenses, support jamming, precision-guided munitions, defense against biological weapons, and secure communications" (The Department of Defense, 2001). The Defense Department Report also pointed to the need for further development of the Southeastern Europe Defense Ministerial⁷ process and NATO's Southeastern Europe Initiative⁸, which would contribute to enhancing security and stability in the region (The Department of Defense, 2001).

At the beginning of President George W. Bush's term, the Pentagon ensured that the United States would support European efforts to increase their participation in collective defense and crisis management, and thereby build up their capacity for military action within the European Union. At the same time, it also stressed that the development of European military capabilities should not prevent NATO from fulfilling its primary mission and its responsibility for collective defense (The Department of Defense, 2001). According to Justyna Zając, the U.S. authorities feared that the creation of a military component within the European Union could adversely affect the cohesion of the North Atlantic Alliance by depriving the United States of an effective instrument for international influence (Zając, 2014).

As a result, the main pillar of U.S.-Europe security cooperation was to be based on NATO, while the superpower strongly endorsed an «open door»

⁶ The program, launched in 1999 at the NATO summit in Washington, aimed to develop allied defense capabilities in five areas: effective engagement; deployability and mobility; sustainability and logistics; survivability; and command, control, and communications. Thanks to this, the NATO program was to quickly deploy troops in crisis situations, protect them and provide efficient delivery of weapons and ammunition for effective combat against the enemy. The implementation of the program required members of the alliance to increase their individual defense budgets (see: CRS Report for Congress, 2001).

⁷ Co-operation initiated in 1996 between the defense ministries of 16 countries was to strengthen political and military cooperation, to enhance the stability and security of South-Eastern Europe by promoting regional cooperation, promoting good neighborly relations, and strengthening regional defense capabilities (see: *The South-Eastern Europe Defence Ministerial*; Ratchev, 2005, 64–65).

⁸ This includes a number of programs and initiatives to promote regional cooperation and long-term stability in the Balkans (see: *NATO's South East Europe Initiative*; Assenova, 2003, 38).

strategy for potential new members of the Alliance, providing support to aspiring countries (see: Włodkowska-Bagan, 2013, 135–144). The superpower also declared support for the development of democracy in Russia and the Ukraine, and offered their help in building up their economies, wishing to integrate these countries into the international community, therefore strengthening regional security, arms control and counteracting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The United States desired a stable partnership with Russia so that it could play a constructive role in European affairs, such as conducting peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo (The Department of Defense, 2001).

U.S.-Europe cooperation on security after 9/11 – challenges and difficulties

The real test for the relationship between the United States and Europe were the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001⁹, which spawned a change in U.S. security policy. The 9/11 attacks triggered a huge wave of sympathy and solidarity with the United States from around the world. NATO Secretary General – George Robertson called the attacks on the United States „aggression against democracy”, and at the same time declared the support of allied forces in the fight against terrorism. UK Prime Minister – Tony Blair called the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 the work of fanatics. He appealed to the leaders of other democratic governments to create a common front for the fight against terrorism. Joint activities were to facilitate the search for the attackers’ premises, determine how they worked, how and by whom they were financed and how they could be stopped. In the name of all members states, the EU External Relations Commissioner – Chris Patten, expressed solidarity with the United States, calling “this is an act of war by madmen.” Other European leaders used a similar tone in their statements,

⁹ A group of nineteen terrorists belonging to the Al Qaeda organization abducted four passenger planes, two of which hit the skyscrapers of the World Trade Center in New York. The third plane was directed at the Pentagon, the fourth crashed in a heroic action in a field in southern Pennsylvania. The alleged target of the last of the hijacked planes was the White House or the Capitol. As a result of the attacks nearly 3,000 people were killed (see: Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2014, pp. 144–145).

expressing grief and bitterness. German Chancellor – Gerhard Schroeder added: „This is not only an attack on the United States but an attack on the civilized world”(CNN, 2001).

America was undoubtedly able to count on its European allies at the time of the tragedy caused by the 9/11 attacks, almost at every stage of its operations. European allies joined George W. Bush's war on terror as part of an international coalition, responding in this way to the U.S. president's ultimatum: „Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists”(The White House, 2001b). A month later, the European allies backed the military intervention in Afghanistan as a justified American response to the 9/11 attacks¹⁰, all the while offering their support. The reaction of the world to the attacks in the U.S. facilitated the organization of a rapid military intervention in Afghanistan. The United States had the consent of both the European Union and the United Nations Security Council, which, on September 12, 2001, with Resolution 1368, recognized the right of the U.S. to act in individual and collective self-defense under the United Nations Charter (*UN Security Council Resolution 1368, 2001*). The superpower could count on the support of the North Atlantic Alliance, which, one day after the attacks, recited the maxim of the organization, „one for all, all for one.” The Member States referred to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which declares that an assault on one of the members would be considered an assault on all its members, hence each member state was entitled to take whatever action it deemed necessary, including the use of force (*Invocation of Article 5 confirmed*).

Despite the readiness of NATO members to take military action in Afghanistan as part of an international coalition, President George W. Bush did not take full advantage of the proposal at the start of the U.S. operation in Afghanistan, only using the support of their British ally to a limited extent. The reasons for such a decision could have been several, starting with a reluctance to disperse the decision-making process – NATO activities would have had to be widely consulted, and the Americans wanted to make the decisions by themselves. Another reason could have been that since U.S. military potential was disproportionately larger than that of NATO forces,

¹⁰ The purpose of the military intervention in Afghanistan was to capture America's greatest enemy, Osama bin Laden, as well as other Al-Qaeda members; to liquidate terrorist training camps; and to overthrow the Taliban regime (see: Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2014, 148).

support from other states was simply unnecessary for the Americans. Another reason could have been the desire to manifest power – taking into account the scale of the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration wanted to show that the superpower could respond with adequate force against an attack, carrying out quite a spectacular military operation. Americans may not have wished to share the success of the military operation with other partners on a large scale; they wanted it to be an American operation, not a NATO one.

The American military intervention in Afghanistan, launched in October 2001, was a measurable demonstration of the instrumental approach of the United States to the North Atlantic Alliance. The Bush administration resigned from the use of NATO forces during the first phase of operations. It was only during the stabilization mission that the United States desired the cooperation of an international coalition. Special forces, jets and warships were sent to Afghanistan from Great Britain, Italy, Spain, Poland, Germany, France, Denmark and Austria. However, a difference in the objectives of the U.S. and many of the coalition partners, on top of the increasingly complex situation in Afghanistan, promptly led to a number of allies withdrawing their support for the U.S. in Afghanistan¹¹.

The context for the war in Iraq in 2003 was completely different, mainly because the Americans had no reason to start military operations there. For this reason, even before the onset of the invasion, the U.S. sought international allies who would legitimize their mission of overthrowing Saddam Hussein. The invasion of Iraq was part of a security policy that took the form of unilateral and preventive action following 9/11. According to the „Bush doctrine,” the United States was to address threats before they arose, using self-defense through anticipatory strikes (Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2014, 158–160). Resistance from some European countries (see: BBCNews, 2003), which showed doubt about the Bush administration’s argument that the Iraq regime allegedly possessed weapons of mass destruction, was met with dissatisfaction from the U.S. administration. Even before the invasion of Iraq, the U.S. was responsible for causing internal divisions in Europe. The

¹¹ Under a UN Security Council Resolution, the *International Security Assistance Force* (ISAF) was established on 20 December 2001, with operational troops coming mainly from the armed forces of NATO member states, whose task was to provide security, stability and support to the new authorities in rebuilding the country (see: Kozerański, 2012, 243; Pawłuszko, 2012, 31–43; Wordliczek, 2015, 66–67).

U.S. administration symbolically divided the continent into „old Europe”, meaning Germany, France, Luxembourg and Belgium, after they refused to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq, and „new Europe”, which included the war-supporting states of Great Britain, Italy, Spain, Poland, Hungary, Denmark and the Czech Republic. During Bush's first term in particular, „old Europe” was ignored by the United States and regarded as a less important player in international relations (Applebaum, 2003, p. A21; Lantis, 2005, 191). The European states that supported the war in Iraq expressed their official position in the “The letter of eight” issued on 30 January 2003. The letter was signed by the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Poland, Portugal, Hungary, the United Kingdom and Italy. The next declaration was issued on 6 February 2003 by the leaders of ten countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, urging other states to support the United States in action against a joint threat (James, 2003).

Before the start of the war in Iraq, there was a severe decision-making crisis in NATO when U.S. authorities failed to obtain the North Atlantic Alliance's consent to provide a missile defense system to Turkey. The actions of the U.S. were blocked by Belgium, and backed by France (Kiwerska, 2010, 71). Resistance from other states, including those of „old Europe”, was ignored by Washington, and from that point onward, the Bush administration began using the term „coalition of the willing”. According to a declaration made by the White House, at the beginning of the invasion of Iraq, the „coalition of the willing” was made up of 49 countries¹², whose contributions varied from political support, logistical and intelligence support, flight permits, and humanitarian assistance, to direct military participation and declaration of support during the rebuilding of the country after the war (The White House, 2003). Apart from the U.S. Army, which at the beginning of the war numbered 250,000 troops, the U.S. received the greatest support from its most faithful ally – Great Britain (45,000 soldiers) and Australia (2000 soldiers). It is worth noting that most of the states that entered into the coalition did not decide to send troops to Iraq; some governments distanced themselves from the policies of the Bush administration, and even

¹² In Europe, “the coalition of the willing” was made up of the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom. Zob. (The White House, 2003).

began to criticize the aggressive nature of the actions taken by the U.S. One such example were the leaders of the Czech Republic. Others publicly asserted that they were not going to be involved in military activities, e.g. the leaders of the Netherlands (*Coalition of the Willing*, 2003).

The consequence of George W. Bush's decision to launch a war in Iraq against the will of most European Union states led to the undermining of the Transatlantic Partnership, and at the same time drew clear lines of division between Europe and the United States. On one side was the United States, which preferred unilateral, hegemonic, military power, without taking into account international law (Zięba, 2005, 66). On the other side, Europe, a believer in "teamwork", preferring diplomacy over force, acting in line with collective security principles, and showing respect for international law. The Bush administration's unilateral approach to foreign policy had negative consequences not only for the European Union and NATO, but also for the United Nations, which proved to be completely powerless against the unlawful actions of its strongest member. The statements of collaborators, and those of the U.S. President himself, in the context of the United Nations, in the context of the planned Iraq war, which went along the lines of: „The UN can meet and discuss as much as it wants, but we do not need their consent,” (see: Goldenberg, 2002), showed the superpower's approach to collective security. When the United Nations chose not to have a consistent position with the United States, it was treated instrumentally, and its importance was trivialized. President Bush's decision had broad repercussions for the whole collective security system, influencing its gradual erosion. The Iraq war highlighted the weaknesses of the organization. This was true at both the stage of mediation, when the UN's preventive role turned out to be ineffective, and after the commencement of the unlawful military intervention, which met with a passive reaction from the organization. Even though they were condemned by the international community, the act of aggression on the part of the United States did not result in any consequences from the UN. Instead of punishing it, the UN decided to help the U.S. to stabilize the situation in Iraq¹³.

¹³ United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1500 of 14 August 2003 established the *United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq* – UNAMI, whose goal was to support and advise the Independent Electoral Commission in Iraq, the Iraqi Interim Government and the Interim National Assembly in carrying out free and democratic elections; promoting national dialogue and consensus in the process of political transformation,

During his second term, President George W. Bush continued his course in terms of U.S. security policy. Bush used the first months after the election to improve relations with countries that had opposed his military intervention in Iraq. For this purpose, in February 2005, he visited Brussels, to assure the representatives of the European Union that an alliance between Europe and the U.S. was a pillar of U.S. security, and common trade among the countries was one of the engines of the global economy. „Our example of economic and political freedom gives hope to millions of people who are tired of poverty and oppression. A strong friendship between the U.S. and Europe is essential for peace and prosperity around the world” (The Department of State, 2005), stressed Bush. The President also met with the Heads of State and government representatives of other members of the European Union. During the talks, there was confirmation of everyone's common goals in terms of counter-terrorism, defense of freedom and democracy, combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, combating poverty and striving for economic development (The White House, 2005).

Therefore, it was quite a surprise for the international community to learn about the participation of some European countries in the Central Intelligence Agency's program of secret prisons. The real storm was triggered by the „Washington Post” in November 2005. Referring to reports from U.S. and foreign officials, the newspaper revealed that the CIA detained and interrogated al Qaeda members in the territory of countries in Eastern Europe. The CIA used „enhanced interviewing techniques” on detainees, such as spraying detainees with water, putting them in stressful positions for many hours, closing them in dark and tight spaces, having prisoners undress completely, beatings, and manipulating their diet. In the name of na-

including the creation of the Iraqi Constitution by its citizens; advising the Iraqi Government on the development of effective civil service and social protection; supporting reform of public administration and civil service; providing humanitarian aid, providing refugees and displaced persons with safe, voluntary return to the country; supporting the reconstruction, the rebuilding of the economy, and sustainable development of Iraq; promotion of human rights protection, by supporting the establishment of an independent national human rights institution and education, counseling and training programs, aimed at workers of law enforcement and the legal system; supporting the reconciliation of the Iraqi people; support for the demobilization and reintegration of former soldiers; support for the development of a civil society, legal associations and free and independent media; assistance in the reform of the judiciary system and strengthening the rule of law; help in carrying out a census (see: Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2016b).

tional security, the agency's activities were kept in strict secrecy. It was not known who and how long the detainees were held, in which countries and in what kind of conditions, what methods of interrogation were used, or what decisions were made concerning those detained. At the request of the White House, the newspaper did not publish a list of the Eastern European countries that participated in the program of secret prisons for fear that they might become the target of terrorist attacks in retaliation (Priest, 2005).

According to the *Open Society Foundation* Report, suspected terrorists were detained in Afghanistan, Lithuania, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Thailand and Guantanamo military bases as part of the CIA's secret prison program. According to the report's authors, 54 countries participated in various ways in the CIA's secret prisons program and extraordinary rendition, ranging from the provision of custody facilities in their territory as CIA prisons, where „illegal hostile fighters” were detained, interrogated, and tortured, to transporting detainees, allowing the CIA to use their airspace and airports, providing intelligence and providing essential information to U.S. authorities. The 54 governments have been criticized not only for their own actions, but also for their passive attitudes towards the actions of CIA agents towards detainees, giving permission in silence to the torture and detention of prisoners without charge and trial. Only one country – Canada, took responsibility for its actions and apologized to the victims who had been detained under extraordinary rendition in their territory. Only four countries (Canada, Sweden, Australia and Great Britain) offered compensation to those detained in their territory. Italy was the only country where heads of intelligence admitted to cooperating with the CIA, and taking part in such activities as kidnapping (Open Society Foundations, 2013, 61–65). Surprisingly, the „secret prisons” program involved not only countries with low levels of law observance, e.g. Afghanistan, or countries where officers could be bribed to act accordingly, e.g. Poland (see: *Polski wywiad dostał od CIA miliony dolarów za tajne więzienia*, 2014). Countries characterized by a high level of democracy and law observance e.g. Sweden (2nd place on the list), Iceland (3rd place), Denmark (5th place), Finland (8th place) were also found to be involved (see: Waśko-Owsiejczuk, 2016b).

During Bush's second term, a key element in U.S. security policy was the building of an anti-missile shield in Eastern Europe – on the territory of Poland and the Czech Republic – to provide effective defense against possible attacks by hostile regimes, such as Iran and North Korea. The idea turned

out to be quite controversial in Europe, with both strong supporters and determined opponents. This initiative met with strong opposition from Russia, which believed it threatened their interests and security. Critics of the installation from other European countries pointed out that Europe did not face a serious threat from Iran or other regimes, and that the deployment of anti-missile systems would make Poland and the Czech Republic possible targets for terrorist attacks. Instead of reducing it, it would increase the threat of terrorism in these countries. Opponents also emphasized that bilateral agreements between states go against the idea of defense within NATO, which provides a guarantee of security for members through an alliance clause on mutual defense. This, in effect, would lead to the weakening of the North Atlantic Alliance. It was emphasized that the establishment of any anti-missile system in Europe should be under the auspices of NATO and not under a bilateral agreement with only two NATO members. Bilateral agreements between the U.S. and Poland and the Czech Republic, according to critics, would cause unnecessary misunderstandings with other European countries and undermine their support for missile defense. Supporters, on the other hand, emphasized that, thanks to the installation of the missile system, not only the United States but also Europe would be protected under an „umbrella of protection” in the event of an attack. It was further pointed out that joining the missile defense system program would strengthened the relationship between Poland and the Czech Republic with the U.S., and make them important partners of the superpower, while providing the ultimate guarantee of security in the event of aggressive actions on the part of Russia. Some in Poland voiced that they did not need to improve bilateral security relations with the United States, as they had shown sufficient loyalty in making a significant contribution to military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Critics also emphasized that the U.S. missile defense system would be another manifestation of American unilateralism. Others pointed out that plans had not been widely consulted with European allies and Russia. Some voiced concern that this would cause new divisions in Europe (see: Hildreth, 2010).

Over the eight years that President George W. Bush was in office, the attitude towards the United States changed dramatically in Europe, from pro-American to very skeptical. Not only „old Europe” was disappointed by the unilateral policy of the White House, but also „new Europe” felt the high cost of engaging in the war in Iraq and the lack of promised profits (e.g.

changes in visa requirements or increased military aid). As shown by the Gallup poll in April 2008, from the 139 countries surveyed, the lowest support for U.S. policy came from two regions of the world – Europe and the Middle East. It is worth noting that key U.S. allies in Europe dominated the list of states where the support of the people for U.S. politics and leadership was the lowest (Ray, 2008). Anne Applebaum, a columnist for the “Washington Post”, ended one of her articles in this way: „when we evaluate Bush’s foreign policy, the damage done to Old Europe may seem as great as that in Iraq” (Applebaum, 2007).

Conclusions

The approaches to security in the U.S. and Europe are quite different. Having at their disposal a disproportionately larger military, the United States approaches security policy from the position of a superpower, often imposing their viewpoints and methods on other actors in international relations. Americans view the world differently from Europeans, resulting in different reactions to events occurring internationally. While Europe stubbornly strives to respect international law, the use of military diplomacy, the United States has no qualms about using military power when decision-makers come to the conclusion that diplomatic measures are not enough.

U.S. security policy after the September 11, 2001 attacks can be characterized by unilateralism and militarism. The symbol of “the Bush doctrine” became the preventative attack. Based on the premise that prevention was better than fighting, Americans were expected to face threats head on. This issue caused a rift between Americans and Europeans. Although preventive actions are not prohibited by international law and may be regarded as acts of self-defense, there must be a real and inevitable threat of physical attack (see: Zająć, 2010, 362–374). Nations, as full-fledged participants in international relations, may only use force in the case of individual or collective self-defense, or if such a decision is made by the UN Security Council (see: *Karta Narodów Zjednoczonych*). The preventive war launched in 2003 by President George W. Bush did not meet the conditions given by international law. The Second Gulf War cannot be regarded as an act of self-defense of the United States against physical attack, since neither the attitude nor

the statements of the Iraqi authorities suggested the presence of a direct threat to the superpower.

The issue of Iraq has caused a division between Europe and the United States. Differences in the approach to international law, and the means and methods of resolving conflicts, has worsened relations between Washington and Brussels. The answer to the question of what place Europe holds in U.S. security policy at the beginning of the 21st century is not clear. On the one hand, the U.S. needed Europe to sanction an illegal war in Iraq, then to rebuild the country and share the costs of prolonged stabilization missions in Afghanistan and Iraq. On the other hand, Europe's resistance to the arbitrary actions of the Americans, to the invention of various reasons for military operations in another sovereign state without the authorization of international law, caused astonishment and indignation in the United States. Faithful American allies, whom they could always count on, suddenly ceased to speak "in one voice" with them. In the wake of the tragedy of 9/11, Europe did not fail to support their ally. European nations joined the international coalition against terrorism, supported military intervention in Afghanistan and then suddenly said stop. Europe said stop when the United States wanted to violate international law. The Bush administration was dissatisfied with the resistance shown by some European nations, and in response provoked an internal division, dividing Europe into „old" (less important) and „new" – „visionary" nations, depending on their approach to international relations. From that moment on, America ignored „old Europe" and built a „coalition of the willing" in order to conduct unlawful activities in Iraq. This led to a split within the European Union, and to an internal crisis within the United Nations, which proved to be powerless against the aggressive actions of its strongest member, as well as a crisis in NATO, which was treated instrumentally by the United States.

Bibliography

- Applebaum, A. (2003, January 29). Here Comes the New Europe. *Washington Post*, p. A21.
- Applebaum, A. (2007, June 5). Farewell, New Europe. *Washington Post*, Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/04/AR2007060401378.html>

- Assenova, M. (2003). *The Debate on NATO's Evolution: A Guide. A Report of the CSIS Eastern Europe Project*. Washington: The CSIS Press.
- Balcerowicz, B. (2010). *Siły zbrojne w stanie pokoju, kryzysu, wojny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- BBCNews (2003). *EU allies unite against Iraq war*. Retrieved from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2683409.stm>
- Brzeziński, M. (2009), Kategoria bezpieczeństwa. In S. Sulowski, M. Brzeziński (Eds.), *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państwa*. Warszawa: Elipsa.
- Burchill, S. (2006), *Realizm i neorealizm*, In S. Burchill, R. Devetak, A. Linklater, M. Paterson, C. Reus-Smit, J. True (Eds.), *Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Bush, G. W. (2010). *Decision Points*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Buzan, B., & Hansen L. (Ed.). (2007). *International Security*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- CNN (2001). *World shock over U. S. attacks*. Retrieved from: <http://edition.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/09/11/trade.centre.reaction/>
- Coalition of the Willing* (2003, March 28). Retrieved from http://www.ny-times.com/cfr/international/slot1_032803.html
- CRS Report for Congress (2001), *NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative*. Retrieved from: https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20010522_RS20907_367521e23c4db9940f465956b97d07aa5c527e4b.pdf
- Department of Defense (2001). *Annual Report to the President and the Congress*. Retrieved from: http://history.defense.gov/Portals/70/Documents/annual_reports/2001_DoD_AR.pdf?ver=2014-06-24-153714-257
- Department of State (2005). *President Discusses American and European Alliance in Belgium*. Retrieved from: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/42518.htm>
- Goldenberg, S. (2002, November 11). *US will attack without approval*. *Guardian*, Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/nov/11/iraq.usa>
- Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hildreth, S.A. (2010), *Long-Range Ballistic Missile Defense in Europe*, *CRS Report for Congress*, Retrieved from: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=24752>
- Huber, D. (2015). *Democracy Promotion and Foreign Policy: Identity and Interests in US, EU and Non-Western Democracies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Invocation of Article 5 confirmed*, Retrieved from: <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/1001/e1002a.htm>
- James, B. (2003, February 1). Action by 8 countries reveals deep breach : Iraq letter splits Europe. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/02/01/news/action-by-8-countries-reveals-deep-breach-iraq-letter-splits-europe.html>.
- Kagan, R. (2003). *Potęga i raj. Ameryka i Europa w nowym porządku świata*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Studio Emka.
- Karta Narodów Zjednoczonych: Rozdział VI — Artykuł 39*, Retrieved from: www.unic.un.org.pl/dokumen-ty/karta_onz.php
- Kiwerska, J. (2010). USA–Unia Europejska. Stan i perspektywy relacji transatlantyckich. *Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej*, 4, pp. 67-86.
- Kozerański, D. (2012), Wysiłki międzynarodowe w stabilizacji państwa upadłego na przykładzie Afganistanu w latach 2002-2010, In R. Kłosowicz, A. Mania (Eds.), *Problem upadku państw w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Lantis, J.S. (2005), American perspectives on the transatlantic security agenda, In K. Longhurst, M. Zaborowski (Eds.), *Old Europe, New Europe and the Transatlantic Security Agenda*, New York: Routledge.
- Milczarek, D. (2008). Stosunki transatlantyckie w sferze polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa: kontynuacja czy przełom? Polski punkt widzenia. *Studia Europejskie*, 2, pp. 31-57.
- NATO's South East Europe Initiative, Retrieved from: <http://www.nato.int/seei/home.htm>
- Nye, J. (2002). *The Paradox of American Power. Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Connor, K., & Sabato L. (2003). *American government: continuity and change*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Open Society Foundations (2013). *Globalizing Torture. CIA Secret Detention And Extraordinary Rendition*, Retrieved from: <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/globalizing-torture-20120205.pdf>
- Pawłuszko, T. (2012), Afganistan w polityce Stanów Zjednoczonych, In Ł. Smalec (Ed.), *Stracona dekada? Polityka bezpieczeństwa Stanów Zjednoczonych wobec „globalnych obszarów niestabilności” (Iraku, Iranu, KRL-D oraz Afganistanu) w latach 2001–2011*, (pp. 31–43), Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych.

- Pawłuszko, T. (2014). Użyteczność analityczna kategorii systemu międzynarodowego. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 1, pp. 9–28.
- Polski wywiad dostał od CIA miliony dolarów za tajne więzienia (2014, 23 January). *Newsweek*, Retrieved from: <http://www.newsweek.pl/polska/wiezienia-cia-w-polsce-najwiekszym-tajnym-na-swiecie-osrodkiem-po-ataku-na-wtc,artykuly,279427,1.html>
- Priest D. (2005, November 2). CIA Holds Terror Suspects in Secret Prisons. *Washington Post*, Retrieved from: www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/01/AR2005110101644.html
- Ratchev, V. (2005), Defence Diplomacy: The Bulgarian Experience, In T. Edmunds, & M. Malešić (Eds.), *Defence Transformation in Europe: Evolving Military Roles*. Amsterdam: ISO Press.
- Ray, J. (2008), U.S. Leadership Approval Lowest in Europe, Mideast, *Gallup*, Retrieved from: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/105967/us-leadership-approval-lowest-europe-mideast.aspx>
- Reveron, D.S. (2010). *Exporting Security. International Engagement, Security Cooperation and the Changing Face of the U.S. Military*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Roser, M., & Nagdy M., *Military Spending*. Retrieved from <https://ourworldindata.org/military-spending/>.
- Shafritz, J.M. (1993). *The Harper Collins Dictionary: American Government & Politics. A Wealth of Information on National, State and Local Government and Politics*. New York: HarperPerennial.
- The South-Eastern Europe Defence Ministerial*, Retrieved from: https://www.morh.hr/en/agendacrm/sedm/240-crm2015/agenda/12145-south-eastern-europe-defence-ministerial-sedm.html?%20%20%20%20option=com_content
- Thompson Hill, K., & Hill, G.N. (2001). *The Fact On File Dictionary of American Politics*. New York: Checkmark Books.
- UN Security Council Resolution 1368 (2001), Retrieved from: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/533/82/PDF/N0153382.pdf?OpenElement>
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk, E. (2014). *Polityka bezpieczeństwa narodowego Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki w latach 2001-2009*. Kraków: Avalon.
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk, E. (2016a). Droga Condoleezy Rice do wielkiej polityki. *Studia Politologiczne*, 41, pp. 276–299.

- Waśko-Owsiejczuk, E. (2016b). Misja Wsparcia Narodów Zjednoczonych dla Iraku – cele, zadania i inicjatywy ONZ po zakończeniu II wojny w Zatoce Perskiej. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe-International Relations*, 3 (53), pp. 133–153.
- Waśko-Owsiejczuk, E. (2016c). Globalizacja tortur – o programie tajnych więzień CIA na świecie. *Politeja. Pismo Wydziału Studiów Międzynarodowych i Politycznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, 45, pp. 207-233.
- White House (2001a). *Remarks by the President at Opening of NATO Meeting*. Retrieved from: <https://georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010613.html>
- White House (2001b). *Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People*. Retrieved from: <https://georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>
- White House (2002). *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Retrieved from <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/>.
- White House (2003). *Coalition Members*. Retrieved from: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030327-10.html>
- White House (2005). *President Meets with E.U. Leaders*. Retrieved from: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/02/20050222-8.html>
- Włodkowska, A. (2004), Mocarstwowość w polityce zagranicznej państw. In R. Zięba (Ed.), *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa* (pp. 163-170). Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Włodkowska-Bagan, A. (2013), *Rywalizacja mocarstw na obszarze post-radzieckim*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Wordliczek, Ł. (2015). *Polityka Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki wobec regionów o niskim stopniu zainteresowania. Na przykładzie wybranych państw Afryki Północnej oraz subregionu andyjskiego na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Zajac, J. (2010), Doktryna uderzenia wyprzedzającego w polityce bezpieczeństwa USA. In J. Symonides (Ed.), *Świat wobec współczesnych wyzwań i zagrożeń* (pp. 362–374). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Zajac, J. (2014). UE w polityce bezpieczeństwa USA w XXI wieku. *Krakowskie Studia Międzynarodowe*, 4 (XI), pp. 29–40.

- Zięba, R. (2005), Polityka w ramach NATO i wobec Unii Europejskiej. In J. Zając (Ed.), *Polityka zagraniczna USA po zimnej wojnie* (pp. 33–66). Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Zięba, R. (2007). *Wspólna Polityka Zagraniczna i Bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

KATARZYNA CZORNIK

Ph.D., University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland

New directives in Donald Trump's administration's foreign policy towards the Middle East

The Middle East constitutes one of the most strategic regions on a global scale. It is a region of complex interplay and clash of interests of both regional and global powers such as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, The Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, the United States, or the Russian Federation. The aim of the following article is to attempt to indicate new accents (i.e. elements of change and continuation strategies) of Donald Trump's policy towards the Middle East. Donald Trump took over the presidency on 20 January, 2017. Having announced serious re-evaluations and tough policy lines, the president almost entirely rejected the policies of his Democratic predecessor, Barack Obama. Hence, two crucial questions remain open at this point: Which new accents have been introduced since the beginning of Donald Trump's presidency? Is the new president consequently realizing his declarations delivered at particular stages of his presidential campaign

Key words: the Middle East, Donald Trump, the U.S. foreign policy

Introduction

The Middle East constitutes one of the most strategic regions on a global scale. It is a region of *complex interplay and conflicts of interests of both regional and global powers such as* the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, The Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, the United States, and the Russian Federation. Since the announcement of President Dwight Eisenhower's doctrine in

January, 1957, the Middle East has been continuously playing a leading role in American foreign policy and the United States still retains its super-power status in this part of the world. Nevertheless, the U.S. presidential elections always entail fundamental questions regarding the shape and dimension of political, economic and military participation of the country, in Middle East affairs. The significance of relations and interaction between the United States and a particular Middle East country also constitute an issue of a great concern.

Thus, the aim of the following article is to attempt to indicate new directives (i.e. elements of change and continuation strategies) of Donald Trump's policy towards the Middle East. Becoming the 45th U.S. president of the Republican Party, after defeating Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump took over the presidency on 20 January, 2017. Having announced serious re-evaluations and tough policy lines, Donald Trump almost entirely rejected the policies of his Democratic predecessor, Barack Obama. Hence, two crucial questions remain open at this point: Which new directives have been introduced since the beginning of Donald Trump's presidency? Is the new president consequently fulfilling his declarations delivered at particular stages of his presidential campaign?

The Middle East in Donald Trump's presidential campaign

Running for presidential election, Donald Trump repeatedly demonstrated his attitude towards the Middle East affairs evoking controversies and discrepancies in opinions especially among other presidential candidates. For the American society, the Middle East did not evoke much significant interest during the campaign. According to Gallup's public opinion poll conducted in October, 2016, before the third presidential debate, only 1% of respondents regarded the situation in Iraq and the problem of the so-called Islamic State as a crucial problem. The presidential campaign was not, in any way, determined by the issues concerning the U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East. Such aspects were only discernible during the first presidential debate in September, 2016. However, the debate was not focused on the strategies of Donald Trump's potential presidency but mainly on Hillary Clinton's mistakes that had been made while serving as the U.S. Secretary of State under President Barack Obama.

Undoubtedly, during several months of the U.S. presidential campaign, Donald Trump presented himself as a determined politician taking an uncompromising and tough stand as regards the Middle East issues. First of all, in the course of his election campaign, Donald Trump announced the destruction of the so-called Islamic State (F.A. Gerges, 2016). At the same time, in one of his interviews for *The New York Times* in July, 2016, Donald Trump controversially declared Syrian and Iraqi Kurds to be a strong partner force on the ground to fight the so-called Islamic State:

I'm a big fan of the Kurdish forces. At the same time, I think we have a potentially – we could have a potentially very successful relations with Turkey. And it would be really wonderful if we could put them somehow both together (Trump, 2016).

Giving support to Kurdish military actions, Donald Trump somehow impinged on the Turkish interests. However, he was gently trying to emphasise that when it came to cooperation and support for the Kurds, there was a possibility for all interested sides to come to terms (Leach, 2013). It should be added that Donald Trump did not mention Turkey in terms of fighting radical Islam, even despite undemocratic changes being introduced by the Turkish President, Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Such attitude of the Republican candidate seemed to be deliberate and particularly important not only for the sake of the appropriate U.S.-Turkish relations but also with regard to evolving ties between Moscow and Ankara.

In a speech on terrorism on 15 August, 2016, and referring to his 'Make America Great Again' campaign slogan, Donald Trump pointed out that the annihilation of ISIS would be a priority during his presidency (Griffin, 2016). He stressed that combating the so-called Islamic State should not be separated from a broader problem, namely, combating radical Islam. He stressed the need to confront radical ideology which is the root of various forms of radicalism and terrorism. Donald Trump emphasised that an important mission of NATO and The United Nations Security Council was to impose sanctions on states and other entities supporting radical Islam.

In the 20th Century, the United States defeated Fascism, Nazism, and Communism. Now, a different threat challenges our world: Radical Islamic Terrorism (...). We will defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism, just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before (...). The rise of ISIS is the direct result of policy decisions made by President Obama and Secretary Clinton (Donald Trump, 2017).

As the Republican Party candidate, Donald Trump mainly criticised his main opponent, Hillary Clinton, for accepting donations from countries whose social, political, and economic system had been based on radical Islam. It was one of the Republican candidate's most important arguments against the former Secretary of State. Although Donald Trump did not mention concrete countries at that time, it was clear, on the basis of other speeches or interviews which he had already given, that he meant Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Bill Clinton's pro-Saudi posture during his two-term presidency also strengthened that impression. In this context, there was a big question mark concerning the potential Washington-Riyadh relations in case Donald Trump took office. Both Donald Trump and Michael Flynn¹, one of Donald Trump's closest political advisors, insisted that neither Saudi Arabia nor Qatar could be recognized as reliable partners to fight radical Islam and international terrorism and, at the same time, could not be regarded as allies aiming to annihilate ISIS. The Republican presidential campaign might seem contradictory in its nature: The U.S. extreme anti-Shia and anti-Iranian attitude appeared to presume that in the course of proxy wars on the territory of Yemen, Bahrain or Syria, The United States would support Riyadh, not Tehran (Fisher, 2016). However, the presidential campaign revealed quite unambiguous declarations which proved the degradation of Saudi Arabian position as the U.S. ally, in case Donald Trump became the president. There should be mentioned that Donald Trump, unlike Barack Obama, accepted The Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) passed by the United States Congress which allowed families of victims of the September 11 attacks to bring civil suits against Saudi Arabia. Donald Trump emphasised the necessity for withdrawing American forces from Saudi Arabia (Wuerth, 2016). He drew attention to Riyadh security remaining reliant on the United States and considered Saudi Arabian threats to sell off \$750 billion of US assets as unfounded. Thus, both Riyadh and

¹ Michael Flynn, former National Security Advisor for President Donald Trump, from January 20 to February 13, 2017, and former director of the Defence Intelligence Agency; author of *The Field of Fight: How We Can Win the Global War Against Radical Islam and Its Allies* (2016), co-authored with Michael Ledeen, one of the leading neoconservatives and supporters of hard line policy towards the Islamic Republic of Iran; In his work, Flynn claims there is no Shia-Sunni conflict but there are strong links between Shia in Iran and Sunni al-Qaeda. He criticized The United States for giving support to Salafists and the Muslim Brotherhood demanding the former to be published on the State Department's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations.

Doha were permanently identified as a source of threat to international security and regions where radical Islam had been fostered and spread.

In the course of Donald Trump's presidential campaign, Al Qaeda, Hamas, and Hezbollah, alongside the so-called Islamic State, were permanently declared to be the main enemies of the United States and, more broadly, entities that threatened international security (Global Terrorism Index, 2016). On the other hand, Israel, Egypt, and Jordan were indicated as the U.S. chief allies. Donald Trump's rhetoric allowed assuming that Egypt would remain the U.S. strategic partner and the new president's administration would intend to improve relations that had been weakened as a result of the Arab Spring and the fall of a pro-American president, Hosni Mubarak. Simultaneously, it was not surprising that, contrary to President Barack Obama, pro-Israeli orientation of the Republicans allowed to find a common ground with the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu. In the last days of Barack Obama presidency, the U.S. abstained from a vote while the UN Security Council was passing a resolution condemning Israel's establishment of settlements in Palestinian territory on the Western side of the Jordan River and Eastern part of Jerusalem. President-elect, Donald Trump, demanded to veto the Security Council resolution and that would account for a strategic support for Benjamin Netanyahu's policy and the acceptance for Israeli settlements. Moreover, five days before Donald Trump's inauguration, the American Secretary of State, John Kerry, took part in the Middle East peace conference in Paris aiming at regulating the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the initiative which had not been accepted by Israel itself. The conference gathered 72 countries (mainly European and Arab states) including Russia. Only Great Britain refused to sign the final declaration calling for *a two-state solution* that is Israel's return to the 1967 border agreement as well as the return of Palestinian refugees. The United States also accepted the agreement which meant that President Barack Obama had been continuing his Middle East policy since the beginning of his presidency. Donald Trump's presidential campaign was characterized by a strong criticism of the Obama administration's policy regarding Israel. Barack Obama was blamed for the deterioration of the U.S.-Israeli relations. To strengthen the two countries' cooperation, President Trump promised to move the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. His pro-Israeli strategy can be even more understandable in the context of Kurdish problem since Israel voiced support for Kurdish statehood, especially for Kurds from Iraqi and Syrian

(Rojava) regions (Tripathi, 2015). Donald Trump was aware of the fact that the creation of independent Kurdish state would constitute a beneficial factor in Israeli international relations and the newly-established state would be an Israeli allied entity as opposed to the hostile adjacent countries. The new entity would play an important role in the United States politics as it would be another American ally in the region in opposition to the Shia in Iran. Additionally, it would destabilize Shia relations with Iraq and Iran.

While referring to Donald Trump predecessors' policies, particularly to Barack Obama's and Hillary Clinton's politics styles, Donald Trump used several occasions to point out, in his opinion, wrong tactics towards the Middle East region. Those tactics resulted in destabilization, provoked wars, allowed jihadists to flourish and, through rather 'soft' approach of the Democrats towards some countries in the region, strengthened the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In this context, Trump criticized George W. Bush's foreign policy and his military intervention in the Persian Gulf in 2003 which reinforced Iranian interests in the Middle East region. According to Trump, an early withdrawal of American forces from Iraq left a security vacuum which allowed al-Qaida to take over the region and led to the rise of the so-called Islamic State (Bokhari & Shapiro, 2017).

As for the appearance of jihadists, Donald Trump explicitly condemned Obama administration, including Hillary Clinton, for supporting the Free Syrian Army rebel group after the outbreak of the Arab Spring in Syria, 2011 (Shapiro, 2017). Trump officially underlined the fact which majority of world leaders had been trying to avoid, namely that most of the Free Syria Army fighters became, in the later period, jihadists within the so-called Islamic State. During his campaign, Donald Trump stressed the need to fight ISIS and, at the same time, intensify the American engagement into the war but only by means of increasing the number of air operations that is bombing terrorists. He unequivocally opted against sending American troops to Syria. His stand was also shared by Hillary Clinton. It might seem surprising, though, that Donald Trump intended to find consensus with the Russian Federation in order to defeat the so-called Islamic State. Such approach seemed to be both important and controversial to the U.S. decision-makers. It should be noticed, however, that such cooperation in Donald Trump's strategy when creating new de-escalation zones in Syria, did not mean any political convergence or a strategic U.S.-Russian partnership in the Middle East but it was a rather thoughtful, pragmatic and 'business-oriented' at-

titude which was to give the United States a beneficial position as far as the spheres of influence in war-torn Syria are concerned.

In contrast, in the sphere of relations with Tehran, Donald Trump, in his numerous speeches and presidential election debates, declared to be an opponent of the Iran nuclear deal, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) (2015). He equally expressed his disapproval of the idea to lift international sanctions against Iran in exchange for suspending its uranium enrichment program. Similarly to Israeli political decision-makers, Trump did not trust Tehran's plans and remained sceptical about Iran following up on its announcement. According to Trump and most of the Republicans, JCPOA constituted "one of the worst deals ever made" (Trump, 2016) and the agreement would not prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons but only postpone the process. It is important to emphasize that under no circumstance did Trump's attitude have a positive effect on the U.S.-Iranian relations which had already been remarkably complicated. Trump's philosophy undermined trust in the United States as a country which was to guarantee the realisation of the nuclear program. Regarding the fact that Trump, in his campaign, did not propose any alternative plan to solve the Iranian problem, all those issues seemed to be even more important.

When it comes to Iraq, where Shiites represent 60% of the country population, in the context of Iraqi-Iranian relations and the attempts to build up ties with the Iranian Shiites, Donald Trump's administration, including Michael Flynn, claimed that Iraq had become the fallen country totally subordinate to Iran. It meant that if the Republican candidate came into power, Iraq would constitute an entity with no real value as the American ally. In this matter, Trump repeatedly drew attention to the mistakes that had been made by his predecessors. During the first presidential debate in September, 2016, Donald Trump made a point that after the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, the USA should have taken control over Iraqi oil fields to allow American companies to make profits. Such policy, in his view, would prevent the so-called Islamic State from emerging and maintaining its powers. He described such solution as justified and legitimate because America deserved compensation for overthrowing Saddam Hussein's dictatorship and bearing the costs of war. Thus, issues concerning the Middle East's oil and gas reserves constituted Trump's priorities and this way of binary thinking made him immensely pragmatic. He assumed that the United States should not be expected to undertake any military interventions, send its forces or

carry out raids until the intervention brought the country advantageous economic and political profits. Those interventions should not be undertaken for the sake of human rights or democracy, but for the sake of the country's financial and political benefits. He estimated that America had spent 6 billion dollars as a result of intervening into the Middle East affairs, with no beneficial effects. In 2011, during Libya's uprising against Muammar Gaddafi, Donald Trump insisted on taking over oil reserves and taking control over oil exploitation. As he proclaimed in one of his interviews, "Once the war was finished, the winner took all; you get involved, you win, you take" (Trump, 2016). This was, to a large extent, Donald Trump's Middle East policy proclaimed during his presidential campaign.

Donald Trump's Middle East policy in the first months of his presidency

Donald Trump's presidential victory in November, 2016, verified his strategy towards the Middle East that had been proclaimed during his campaign. During his inaugural address on 21 January, 2017, he said "We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones, and unite the civilised world against radical Islamic terrorism which we will eradicate completely from the face of the earth" (Trump, 2017). On 27 January, Trump's decree summarily denied entry to citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. That decision was not surprising. Donald Trump explained it as one of the most effective instruments while fighting Islamic radicalism and international terrorism.

First months of Donald Trump's presidency allow delineating certain tendencies in the Republican administration's Middle East policy. According to Trump's presidential campaign announcements, the most reliable and long-standing allies in the fight against terrorism would be Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Kurds in Iraq and Syria. The Islamic Republic of Iran was still permanently indicated as incompatible with the U.S. interests. As it was stressed during the campaign, the Muslim Brotherhood and the so-called Islamic State remained terrorist entities to be annihilated. Simultaneously, Donald Trump signed off on a plan to arm the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF) which had been regarded as the United

States most efficient ally in Syria. In the above context, Qatar was proving to be problematic.

Referring to the United States' allies in a very synthetic way, it is necessary to point out that the president of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, was the first Arab leader Donald Trump talked to after his swearing-in ceremony. Trump underlined the Egyptian president's contribution to the fight against terrorism as well as the importance of their bilateral relations. Both leaders' objective is to combat the Muslim Brotherhood which proclaims extremist Islam and stays in opposition to Sisi and, in a broad sense, to Western countries (Sharp, 2017). Similar attitude towards the Muslim Brotherhood has been represented by Jordan and the United Arab Emirates as this terroristic organisation threatens both countries' inner stability and security in the region. Both Jordan and the United Arab Emirates do not belong to Israeli adversaries and this fact strengthens their chance to remain in the American sphere of influences and cooperation in the field of security. As far as Egypt is concerned, an additional aspect appears to be influential at this point, namely, The U.S.-Russia rivalry for influence in the Mediterranean region. In 2013, after the downfall of President Mohammad Morsi of the Muslim Brotherhood and Abdel Fattah el-Sisi's electoral victory, the United States' deteriorating relations with Egypt made Russia take advantage of the new situation and take effective measures to reinforce cooperation with Egypt. Realising the importance of Egypt and the risks of Egypt remaining out of the U.S. sphere of influence, Donald Trump, just after his swearing-in, took appropriate measures to improve reciprocal relations. Abdel Fattah el-Sisi's visit to the White House at the beginning of April, 2017, as well as an official visit to Cairo of the American Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Michael Pompeo, provides evidence for such attempts. Egypt does not only struggle with political instability generated by illegal actions of the Muslim Brotherhood but also with terroristic activities of the so-called Islamic State on the Sinai Peninsula (Trump, 2017) as well as with economic problems evoking social outrage. That is why, Egyptian authorities, who remember their profitable position under Hosni Mubarak's presidency, recognise 'the status of being an American client' as an extremely beneficial offer. Cairo is definitely given that chance by Donald Trump (Trump, 2017)

With regard to Israel, the symbolic fact that Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, was one of the first world leaders who talked with

Donald Trump after his swearing-in ceremony and, as early as in February, 2017, Benjamin Netanyahu paid an official visit to the White House, could signify that the U.S.-Israeli partnership is a strategy. Another evidence supporting that theory would be David Friedman's nomination to be the U.S. ambassador to Israel. For many years David Friedman has been a donor to illegal Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank questioning the need for a two-states solution (Borger, Beaumont, 2017). Moreover, one of the first decree by the new American president aimed at withdrawing the U.S. funding from UN agencies that admit Palestine as a full member of the UN. These particular measures indicate that the U.S. administration will not accept any solution to Middle East conflict that would be in opposition to Israeli interests. More pragmatic and cautious opinions of some government officials in Donald Trump's administration, including the U.S. Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson, and the U.S. Secretary of Defence, James Mattis, make the Palestinian issue more problematic. Rex Tillerson, during his congressional hearing in the Senate, declared that the United States permanently support a two-state solution, although the Palestinians should overcome the problem of terrorists whose activities make reconciliation of both sides impossible and undermine any diplomatic efforts. The ultimate standpoint of the U.S. president concerning the concept of a two-state solution has not been entirely precise. Declaring the necessity to achieve Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement, Donald Trump appointed Middle East peace negotiators including Jared Kushner, Trump's son-in-law and a businessman of a Jewish descent, Jason Greenblatt, a lawyer and an orthodox Jew from New York, and David Friedman. In this context, an issue of a significant importance was an official visit of the Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, to Washington, on May 3. At that time, Trump was calling for an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which, as he said, should be achieved through direct negotiations. Donald Trump's tough standpoint at the time of his presidential campaign was modified later on. The decision of The White House Press Secretary, Sean Spicer, to remain the U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv can be an example. It is worth mentioning that such declarations had been announced unsuccessfully in the mid 90s of the XX century. All those attitudes are far more balanced and they have a positive influence as far as the U.S. relations with the Middle East countries are concerned. Both Egypt and Jordan, that is Arab countries, replacing the embassy or resigning from a two-state solution is unacceptable. Such steps would definitely

lead to deterioration of bilateral relations which would not satisfy the U.S. administration.

In conclusion, it should be emphasised that within the first months of Donald Trump's presidency, there were a number of situations which proved that the U.S. and Israeli relations had been improving. President Trump's official visit to the Middle East in May, 2017, could be an example. Israel was the second stop on Trump's first foreign trip and the visit confirmed the U.S.-Israeli strategic relations which had been undermined under Barack Obama. As Donald Trump put it, his Israeli trip aimed at restarting the Israeli-Palestinian reconciliation process. Pursuing 'the ultimate deal', between Israelis and Palestinians, Donald Trump took part in meetings and talks with both sides' representatives including Israeli President Reuven Rivlin, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and, later, Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas. Unfortunately, Trump's summit with Middle East leaders remained heavily symbolic with no concrete actions following that would restore the peace process (Zanotti, 2017).

It should be mentioned that Donald Trump's administration has not changed their anti-Iranian rhetoric which was visible during the presidential campaign. Iran has been permanently condemned by the Republicans for representing radical Islam and being associated with al-Qaeda. As Rex Tillerson underlined, after the U.S. victory over the so-called Islamic State and the U.S. simultaneous political power demonstration during its military strikes against the Syrian airbase in April, 2017, which was a reaction to Bashar al-Assad's decision to launch a chemical attack in Khan Sheikhoun, the United States would need to confront Islamic radicalism in Iran (Nichols, 2017). Such perspective has been fully compatible with Israeli policy and with Israeli political dissident's attitude towards Iran as a threat to their own security. For Israel, Iran remains an enemy not only for the sake of its hegemonic ambitions in the Middle East region but also because of its support for Palestine and Hamas. This situation is unacceptable both for the United States and for Israel. Moreover, in the first months of Donald Trump's presidency, questions concerning the future of Iranian nuclear programme agreement appeared. Since the U.S. president is obliged to notify Congress every 90 days that Iran is complying with the terms of the 2015 nuclear deal, it needs to be emphasised that in spite of the Washington tough stance towards Iran, on 19 July, 2017, Donald Trump issued the certification of Iran's compliance. This was Donald Trump's second approval

during his presidency. It did not change the fact the United States has been sending a clear and unequivocal message that it opposes Tehran's activities in the Middle East region. Thus, the administration imposed new sanctions on Iran following rocket launch. A statement issued after the Trump's approval by the U.S. Department of State indicates that The United States are deeply concerned to see Iranian damaging operations which undermine stability, safety and welfare in the Middle East region. The sanctions, as it was justified, were the result of Tehran's support for Hezbollah, Hamas and The Palestinian Islamic Jihad which threaten Israel's safety and its regional stability. Moreover, Iran provides significant support to Bashar al-Assad's regime in Syria as well as for the Shia-led religious-political movement in Yemen, the Houthis. Above all, Iran has been continuing to develop ballistic missiles. Hence, the United States' sanctions on 18 legal entities that contributes to the development of either illegal organizations in Iran or transnational crimes. Among those entities there are: *Aerospace Force Self Sufficiency Jihad Organization* responsible for missile tests and flight test launches and *Research and Self Sufficiency Jihad Organization* responsible for research and development of ballistic missiles. Sanctions were also imposed on those entities that fulfil contracts to equip Iraq's forces and The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. The contracts entail the development of drones, the Guard's weapon system or the production of efficient military water units. Two Iraqi businessmen as well as those entities that stole and, later on, sold software produced in the United States and other Western countries, were sanctioned likewise (2017). It should be pointed out that Trump's first nuclear deal approval of 2015 was similar to the second one. Despite the U.S. administration demands to re-open the terms of the 2015 nuclear deal during Trump's presidential campaign, Trump's second approval indicates that, on one hand, the United States is not going to withdraw from the nuclear deal but, simultaneously, it points at Iran as a country hostile to American interests in the Middle East and warns that it will not stay passive if Tehran breaks the agreement. This is the Washington's explicit two-track approach towards Tehran with its manifested emphasis on hard line policy. Iran criticises the U.S. decisions which, undoubtedly, strengthen the position of its Conservative Party but Tehran remains aware of the supportive attitude of Western Europe countries and Russia which, mainly for economical reasons, care about sticking to the nuclear deal, of which Donald Trump has been fully aware.

As far as Qatar is concerned, it has been difficult to discern whether the country remains an ally or an opponent of the United States. Qatari media, especially Al Jazeera which has been the most popular broadcaster in the Arab states launched in 1996, permanently criticises Donald Trump's policy, not only the Middle East policy². An important fact is that on June 5, 2017, pro-American Saudi Arabia, Egypt, The United Arab Emirates and Bahrain broke their diplomatic, consular and economic relations with Qatar. They accused Qatar of developing closer relations with Iran as well as supporting terrorism including al-Qaeda and the Muslims Brotherhood with its leader residing in Qatar, Yusuf al-Qaradawi. Libya, Yemen and Maldives also cut diplomatic ties with Qatar. Riyadh, apart from breaking diplomatic ties with Qatar, imposed its sanctions by halting all land, air and sea connections. Saudi Arabia closed its sole land border. Cairo, which, above all, accused Qatar of backing the Muslim Brotherhood, decided not to allow Qatari citizens into the country. Doha, the capital city of Qatar, was also excluded from the Arab coalition operating in Yemen under the leadership of Saudi Arabia and fighting the Shiite Houthi rebels. Four days after imposing sanctions, President Donald Trump officially called Qatar to stop sponsoring terrorist groups which, according to the U.S. administration, had been widely practised by Qatar. Remaining on the side of the countries that put sanctions on Qatar, the U.S. president stated that "no civilized nation can tolerate this violence, or allow this wicked ideology to spread on its shores" (Smith, Siddiqui & Beaumont, 2017). Such attitude was entirely compatible with decisions made in May, 2017, during a Muslim leaders' summit with Trump in Saudi Arabia. It should be added that despite the trials to mitigate the crisis, Iran and Turkey's opposition and positive signals from Emir of Qatar, Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani, the sanctions were upheld. Those conditions were not changed even when Rex Tillerson urged Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Bahrain and The United Arab Emirates to lift a land blockade as Washington had been discerning the Qatari efforts after signing a memorandum on of understanding on fighting terrorism. For Qatar it was a strong signal that the Arab states of the Persian Gulf prefer cooperation with the United States and they are able to do much in order to stay within the sphere of the U.S. influence and benefit from such relations.

² A few days after imposing sanctions on Qatar, *Al Jazeera* underwent hacking attempts. The hackers published a series of controversial fake news stories on The Emir of the State of Qatar as well as on Iran, Izrael and other countries of the region.

Thus, President Donald Trump policy towards the Sunni Arab monarchies of the Persian Gulf, namely, Saudi Arabia and Qatar, appears to be most surprising. As for Riyadh, one should discern that during the U. S. presidential campaign, there was a growing criticism of Saudi Arabians for the support they had given to extremists, for atrocities which Saudi Arabia had committed in Yemen, and even for its role during the September 11 attacks. Since President Donald Trump's victory and in comparison to what was being declared during the campaign, the White House position regarding Riyadh has changed. The newly elected president quickly held a phone conversation with Salman bin Abdulaziz Al Saud, the king of Saudi Arabia. There appeared statements on both sides concerning the will to cooperate in Syria and Yemen in order to solve escalating problems in those countries. A mutual policy towards Tehran was established, although Riyadh, in spite of its official nuclear deal approval, expressed its unequivocal objections to realize its terms. The most spectacular sign of the U.S. bilateral strategic relations was President Donald Trump's trip to the Middle East region which he undertook on May 20, 2017, beginning with Saudi Arabia.

Donald Trump's visit to the Middle East was exceptional for many reasons. It should be mentioned that so far none of the U.S. presidents has chosen that region to be the first destination regarding a presidential official foreign trip. Donald Trump became the first American president to visit three holy sites representing the three religions of the region: Islam, Judaism, and Christianity. In a symbolic way, Donald Trump became his trip to Saudi Arabia which took place on 20–22 May, 2017. During a historical Arab Islamic American Summit with over 50 Arab leaders participating, the U. S. president underlined, "The path to peace begins right here, on this ancient soil, in this sacred land. America is prepared to stand with you – in pursuit of shared interests and common security". As he put it, "The clash against terrorism is a 'battle between good and evil,' not a clash between 'different faiths, different sects, or different civilizations'" (Trump, 2017). Donald Trump's visit to Saudi Arabia was abundant with new initiatives in the economic and political sphere as well as new agreements proving bilateral strategic relationship. First of all, the U.S. president and the king of Saudi Arabia, Salman bin Abdulaziz Al Saud, signed joint trade agreements valued at up to \$350 billion. A set of agreements to implement within 10 years included, among other things,

\$110 weapons deal on instant armament delivery including Littoral Combat Ships, M1A2 Abrams Battle Tanks, Black Hawk helicopters and 2 CH-47 Chinooks, THAAD missile defence system and PAC-3 MSE deliveries. Extremely important \$50 billion deals in the extractive industry were signed, out of which over \$22 billion in deals was signed with the national oil and gas company, Saudi Aramco, allowing the U.S. oil refineries to cooperate on the Saudi Arabian market. The deals enable cooperation with General Electric (GE), Honeywell International Inc. or McDermott International Inc. Additionally, Saudi Arabia announced a \$40 billion investment in the U.S. infrastructure initiatives as well as investments in astronautics, energy, petrochemical industry and information technology (2017). Signing “the single largest arms deal in US history” (Spicer, 2017) as a symbolic gesture which proves Riyadh’s importance in the U.S. policy in the Middle East but it is also a form of warning for the Islamic Republic of Iran that the White House has ceased to be interested in balancing out the influence of regional powers. By doing this, Donald Trump’s administration is sending a message that Saudi Arabia will get a military support in order to become responsible for the security in the region, ensure stability and fight terrorism. It is also a sign for Tehran that the United States has not changed its ally in the Middle Eastern proxy wars and it will strengthen its allies (clients) in the region.

Thus, it should be mentioned that an agreement on combating terrorism, which was signed in Riyadh by The United States, Saudi Arabia and other Sunni countries of the Arabian Peninsula, will be supervised by the United States. To underline the importance of mutual cooperation between the United States and all of the Gulf Arab states, the U.S. president and Saudi Arabia’s king announced the establishment of The Terrorist Financing Targeting Centre (TFTC) and Global Centre for Combating Extremist Ideology. Bringing together the state leaders of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) in Riyadh resulted in regular meetings of foreign ministers within GCC-US Strategic Cooperation Forum. In the context of Saudi Arabian involvement in financing Wahabi and Salafi militants as well as the Muslim Brotherhood, the U.S. actions should be perceived as initiatives aimed at making Riyadh cease financing terrorists. However, a stress has been put only on those terrorist groups that act on the U.S. territory. The spread of radical Wahabi ideology in other parts of the world is being given connivance.

Conclusion

The analysis of Donald Trump's strategy towards the Middle East, which he was trying to expose during his presidential campaign, allowed one to draw the conclusion that, after his taking office, the White House would implement tough policy line towards the countries connected with radical Islam. Contrary to that, Donald Trump's public speeches were abundant with catchy, vague and contradictory slogans which might suggest that the newly-elected president's policy towards the Middle East would be unpredictable.

After a few months of Donald Trump's presidency, one is able to try to delineate the elements of change and continuation in his strategy towards The Middle East. It is also possible to discern important pillars the strategy will be based on during the first term of office, namely, three negative reference points regarding the U.S. policy: the so-called Islamic State and the Muslim Brotherhood as the most dangerous and radicalised Islamic organizations to be annihilated, and the Islamic Republic of Iran. There is no doubt that Donald Trump perceives Tehran as the main challenge and threat for the realisation of the U.S. national interests in the Middle Eastern region. Iranian isolation with the simultaneous strengthening Saudi Arabia's and Egypt's military positions, constitute the priorities of the U.S. president's foreign policy. Thus, the leading and positive points of reference in Donald Trump's Middle East strategy are: Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The U.S. administration has been implementing measures to attract Qatar which balanced between supporting radical terrorists and cooperation with the Western countries.

Hence, it is definitely right to say that Donald Trump's administration has re-evaluated its priorities making the Middle East affairs extremely crucial in the U.S. foreign policy. However, the re-evaluation constitutes a sign of a new American *Real politics* as it is based on the concept of pragmatism and taking advantages of being the Middle East power rather than on the concept of democratization of the region.

Bibliography

- 2016 presidential candidates on the Iran nuclear Deal. Available from: https://ballotpedia.org/2016_presidential_candidates_on_the_Iran_nuclear_deal [Accessed 29 May 2017].
- Bokhari K., Shapiro J.L.: *The Middle East Changes Shape*. June 9, 2017, Available from: <https://geopoliticalfutures.com/middle-east-changes-shape/> [Accessed 12 June 2017].
- Borger J., Beaumont P.: *Donald Trump says US not committed to two-state Israel-Palestine solution*. 16 February 2017, Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/15/trump-says-us-not-committed-to-two-state-israel-palestine-solution> [Accessed 25 July 2017].
- Fisher M.: *How the Iranian-Saudi Proxy Struggle Tore Apart the Middle East*. NOV. 19, 2016, Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/world/middleeast/iran-saudi-proxy-war.html?mcubz=0> [Accessed 22 June 2017].
- Full text: *Donald Trump's speech on fighting terrorism*. 08/15/2016, Available from: <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-terrorism-speech-227025> [Accessed 23 July 2017].
- Gerges, F.A. (2016). *A History ISIS*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Global Terrorism Index 2016. 17 Nov 2016, Available from: <http://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-terrorism-index-2016> [Accessed 22 June 2017].
- Griffin, M. (2016). *Islamic State. Rewriting History*. London: Pluto Press, 2016.
- Gunter M.M.: *Trump, Turkey and the Kurds*. Middle East Policy Council, Available from: <http://www.mepc.org/journal/trump-turkey-and-kurds> [Accessed 28 June 2017].
- Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Vienna, 14 July 2015, Available from: http://www.eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/statements-eeas/docs/iran_agreement/iran_joint-comprehensive-plan-of-action_en.pdf [Accessed 29 May 2017].
- Lee M., *Trump administration says Iran complying with nuclear Deal*. April 19, 2017, Available from: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nation-world/ct-trump-iran-nuclear-deal-20170418-story.html> [Accessed 29 May 2017].
- Lesch, D.W. (2013). *Syria. The fall of the House of Assad*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

- Nichols M., Osborn A., Perry T.: *Russia warns of serious consequences from U.S. strike in Syria*. April 6, 2017, Available from: <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-mideast-crisis-syria-idUSKBN1782S0> [Accessed 14 July 2017].
- President Trump's Speech to the Arab Islamic American Summit*, May 21, 2017, Available from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/05/21/president-trumps-speech-arab-islamic-american-summit>, [Accessed 27 July 2017].
- Saudi Arabia and the Visit of President Trump*, June 2017 Report, Available from: https://www.saudiembassy.net/sites/default/files/WhitePaper_TrumpVisit_June2017.pdf [Accessed 30 June 2017].
- Shapiro J.L.: *The Myth of the Arab Spring*. April 28, 2017, Available from: <https://geopoliticalfutures.com/myth-arab-spring/> [Accessed 22 June 2017].
- Sharp J.M.: *Egypt: Background and U.S. Relations*. March 24, 2017, Available from: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33003.pdf> [Accessed 26 May 2017].
- Smith D., Siddiqui S., Beaumont P., *Gulf crisis: Trump escalates row by accusing Qatar of sponsoring terror*, 9 June 2017, Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/09/trump-qatar-sponsor-terrorism-middle-east> [Accessed 28 July 2017].
- Statement by President Donald J. Trump on the Attack in Egypt*. May 26, 2017, Available from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/05/26/statement-president-donald-j-trump-attack-egypt> [Accessed 27 July 2017].
- The Inaugural Address*. 20 January, 2017, Available from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address>, [Accessed 25 June 2017].
- Tripathi D.: *Why Israel is backing Kurdish independence*, 12 February 2015, Available from: <http://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/whats-behind-netanyahu-s-support-kurdish-independence-1536584149> [Accessed 28 May 2017].
- US Election 2016, How the world views the US elections, from Israel to North Korea*. 31 October, 2016, Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/oct/31/world-opinion-us-election-russia-china-mexico-europe> [Accessed 25 June 2017].
- US election 2016: Middle East awaits Trump policy decisions*. 9 November, 2017, Available from: <http://www.bbc.com/news/election-us-2016-37924747> [Accessed 26 July 2017].

- US sanctions 18 Iranian entities day after certifying nuclear deal compliance.* 18 July 2017, Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jul/18/iran-is-complying-with-nuclear-deal-but-is-in-default-of-its-spirit-says-us> [Accessed 29 July 2017].
- Wuerth J.: *Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act: Initial Analysis*. September 29, 2016, Available from: <https://www.lawfareblog.com/justice-against-sponsors-terrorism-act-initial-analysis> [Accessed 29 July 2017].
- Zanotti J.: *Israel: Background and U.S. Relations in Brief*. May 17, 2017, Available from: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R44245.pdf> [Accessed 26 July 2017].

MIRON LAKOMY

Dr hab., University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland

The race for Syria: evolution of international rivalry in Levant 2011-2017

This article overviews the evolution of international rivalry in Syria between 2011 and 2017, as well as to present its current trends, with special emphasis put on the recent escalation of military incidents. It argues that regional and global powers are increasingly affecting the course of events in Levant in order to realize their particular interests. Events in this country are rightly considered to be a regional and global “proxy war”, in which all interested sides are exploiting religious and political divisions to achieve their goals. Syria has proved to be a battleground of Shia (Iran, Hezbollah) and Sunni (Saudi Arabian-led coalition) actors, while there is also a limited rivalry and shifts in the Sunni block (case of Turkey and Qatar). It is also an area of the intensifying competition between Russia and the U.S. Such a state of affairs reduces the chances of reaching lasting peace in Syria, in contrast to official announcements of all parties involved. Moreover, their increasing military involvement create serious risk of uncontrolled escalation, even to the level of accidental war.

Key words: war in Syria, Levant, Russia, United States, international rivalry, ISIS

Introduction

War in Syria is currently considered by many academics and experts as one of the most complex military conflicts in the Post-Cold War era (Lister 2014, 1). A relatively simple anti-Assad revolution in just a few years developed into multilayered, internationalized armed conflict, influenced by multi-

ple local, regional and global players competing for control over this area. Their goals and ambitions combined with a multitude of other factors, e.g. increasingly clear lines of religious and ethnic divisions in al-Sham¹, Islamic fundamentalism, and the continued activities of terrorist organizations, create a real “Syrian conundrum”, which is difficult to unravel. It is even more obvious, as the warring parties combine classic fighting methods with information warfare, both offline and online (including professional propaganda campaigns), cyber warfare, and even the limited use of the weapons of mass destruction. In effect, the picture of the Syrian war is still unclear, just as are its potential outcomes in the future.

Michael Kofman was surely right stressing in 2016 that “the subsequent five years bear witness to diplomatic coups, political maneuvers on an international scale at the UN, covert operations, and arms deals in support of an escalating proxy wars and military brinkmanship between two coalitions trying to intervene in the same country” (Kofman 2016, 65). In this context, the paper aims to overview the evolution of international rivalry in Syria between 2011 and 2017, as well as to present its current trends, with special emphasis put on the recent escalation of military incidents. It argues that regional and global powers are increasingly affecting the course of events in Levant in order to realize their particular interests. Events in this country are rightly considered to be a regional and global “proxy war”, in which all interested sides are exploiting religious and political divisions to achieve their goals. Syria has proved to be a battleground of Shia (Iran, Hezbollah) and Sunni (Saudi Arabian-led coalition) proponents, while there is also a limited rivalry and shifts in the Sunni block (case of Turkey and Qatar). It is also an area of the intensifying competition between Russia and the U.S. Such a state of affairs reduces the chances of reaching lasting peace in Syria, in contrast to official announcements of all parties involved. Moreover, their increasing military involvement creates a serious risk of uncontrolled escalation, even to the level of accidental war.

It has to be stressed that this manuscript has one important caveat. Due to the size limitations, it focuses on activities of the most important participants in the conflict, such as Russia, the United States, Iran, Saudi Arabia or Turkey. Therefore, it skips ambitions and actions undertaken by less significant or unaffiliated countries, such as Jordan or Israel.

¹ Al-Sham is usually translated as Levant.

The evolution of the international rivalry in Syria 2011–2014

The anti-Assad revolution that was sparked in March 2011 has quickly drawn attention of the key regional actors. Syria's closest Shia partners, Iran and Hezbollah, quickly expressed their support for the Alawi-dominated dictatorship (Javedanfar 2011). The reasoning behind Teheran's steady assistance to Damascus was accurately described in 2012 by Ali Akbar Velayati, Senior Advisor for Foreign Affairs to Iran's Supreme Leader. He stated that: "The chain of resistance against Israel by Iran, Syria, Hezbollah, the new Iraqi government and Hamas passes through the Syrian highway... Syria is the golden ring of the chain of resistance against Israel" (Goodarzi 2013, 33). In this context, from the Iran's perspective, the "Shia crescent" in the Middle East would be null and void, without the crucial Syrian element. Other regional actors, mostly Sunni-dominated states, such as Turkey, which previously maintained cordial relations with al-Assad, and Saudi Arabia, criticized government for the crackdown against the opposition and demanded democratic reforms (Bayoumy 2011). As Julien Bars-Dacey and Daniel Levy note "regional players at first viewed it through the lens of the Arab uprisings then sweeping across the region, provoking caution rather than support, particularly among Gulf states fearful that instability might seep into their own kingdoms. These states, as well as Turkey, initially responded by reaching out to Assad, hoping to persuade him to appease the street with limited reforms and thereby maintain domestic stability and his position in power. However, as Hassan Hassan demonstrates in his piece on the Gulf, with Assad rapidly embracing a policy of repression – and drawing closer to Tehran – in short order Saudi Arabia and Qatar came to view the conflict through a broader strategic lens and turned their focus towards regime change" (Bars-Dacey, Levy 2013, 9). In other words, two blocks of regional actors emerged in the advent of the Syrian conflict, which adopted contrary perceptions of the events in al-Sham. This was mostly caused by their particular interests (national security, race for regional leadership, "Israeli factor"), as well as by the sectarian divisions, i.e. Shia-Sunni rivalry.

Interestingly, Western powers, such as the United States, France and Great Britain, while they expressed concern and limited criticism towards al-Assad's actions against its own people, at the time (2011) were much more focused on the events in Libya. This stance changed due to two reasons. On the one hand, the conclusion of the NATO's *Unified Protector* operation in

Maghreb, resulting in the Qaddafi's death, allowed to move West's attention towards Levant. This was perfectly visible in the media reports, which were increasingly concentrated on Syria at the turn of 2011 and 2012. On the other hand, internal situation in this country shifted from revolution to the civil war. This created new challenges for the security and stability of the Middle East. At the same time, armed resistance against al-Assad regime provided opportunities for these states, which were interested in modifying regional order. In effect, the accelerating course of events in Levant also raised Russia's attention, as it traditionally maintained cordial contacts with the al-Assad regime.

To recapitulate, in 2011/2012 generally two blocks of actors active on the Syrian matters were formed. Pro-Assad mostly consisted of Russia, Iran and Hezbollah. The Moscow's interest in supporting Damascus regime was fueled by several factors. To begin with, Syria was perceived as one of its last allies in the Middle East. In this context, Kremlin was worried that the West would like to use the civil war to repeat the Libyan conflict scenario, in order to marginalize its position in Mashriq. Secondly, Damascus was also traditional consumer of the Russian arms industry. Al-Assad's ouster would probably change this state of affairs. And thirdly, a Russian military facility was located in Tartus, Syria, which logistically supported Mediterranean activities of its navy. Its loss would mean that the Federation's abilities to defend its key interests in the region would be significantly weakened. Therefore, it is not a surprise that Moscow perceived the events in Syria through the lens of global rivalry with the West (Lakomy 2013, 239-240). Since day one, Russia frequently accompanied by China, expressed support to the al-Assad regime. It also blocked many UN Security Council resolution projects, which were targeting government in Damascus (Harris et al., 2012). According to many sources it also provided military equipment to the Syrian Arab Army throughout the intensifying war, including not only small arms and munitions, but also UAVs, armored vehicles, spare parts and electronic warfare systems (Saul 2014). The Russian involvement in the Syrian affairs during the period of 2011–2014 reached its apogee in 2013, in the aftermath of the Goutha chemical attack. The subsequent U.S. preparations to launch air campaign against loyalists were successfully countered by Kremlin through military buildup in the Mediterranean, as well as by its proposal on the destruction of Syria's WMD stocks (Rogers 2013). Its reaction manifested determination and will to defend its interests in the Middle East.

Russian policy was supported by the two aforementioned Shia actors: Iran and Hezbollah, as the fall of al-Assad would mean isolation for both of them. It is therefore not a surprise that they got quickly involved in the civil war. Initially, Teheran's help to the SAA consisted of financial and technical assistance provided by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (Quds Force). Iran also played a crucial role in creating National Defense Forces in late 2012. According to Ali Ansari and Aniseh Bassiri Tabrizi, when the situation of the government worsened, it sent IRGC ground forces to provide advice, training and logistical support for the Syrian army (Ansari, Tabrizi, 2016, 4). On the contrary, Hezbollah provided more direct military support to loyalists. While, in 2012 a number of its operatives advised loyalist troops, since 2013 its forces have been increasingly present on the frontlines. As the 2013 Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center report indicate, at the time Hezbollah's direct military involvement in war was still limited and its "overall influence on events in Syria" was secondary (Hezbollah Involvement, 2013, 3). However, its military activity was growing over time, which was manifested by the fact that between 2013 and 2016 it had lost over 1000 fighters in battles against the rebels (Choucair, 2016, 2).

The second, much less heterogeneous block included a number of states, which supported the broadly understood opposition. To begin with, the United States officially expressed their traditional concern over the violation of human rights in Syria. As the promoter of the universal values, Washington was also interested in introducing democracy in Levant, regardless of the past Iraqi experiences. Moreover, policy of the White House was traditionally aligned with the ambitions and goals of its Persian Gulf partners, most notably Saudi Arabia, which supported the Sunni rebels. And finally, United States aimed to uphold the well-being and security of its regional allies such as Israel and Turkey. Unofficially, Washington's position was also probably influenced by the fact, that the al-Assad's ouster would seriously complicate Iran's strategic situation in the Middle East, as well as weaken Russia's regional influence. It is therefore not a surprise, that the Barack Obama administration chose to side with the Sunni-dominated opposition. Its initial actions included criticism and sanctions against the al-Assad regime, combined with unofficial help for the Free Syrian Army. Similar policy was conducted by most of the Western European powers, such as France and Great Britain. Also European Union as a whole introduced numerous sanctions against the regime, for instance in October 2012 (Lakomy 2013,

241–243). Similarly to Russia, the West's interest in the Middle Eastern events throughout the period of 2011–2014 grew in time, and reached its apogee in 2013. The previously mentioned Ghouta chemical attack triggered resolute reaction from the United States, supported by Great Britain and France, which initiated preparations for the military intervention against loyalists. These plans were, however, canceled due to diplomatic agreement (Blanchard, Sharp 2013), which was concluded by the UN Security Council resolution 2118.

As mentioned above, the reasoning behind activities undertaken by regional Sunni powers, such as Saudi Arabia and Turkey, was based both on political and religious motives. On the one hand, intention to combat Shia-aligned actors in Syria, i.e. SAA, was especially evident in case of the wahhabi regime in Riyadh. On the other hand, however, there were also other, strictly political ambitions at play. Turkey² and Saudi Arabia, as well as other Sunni states, rightly concluded that the war in Syria will have a great impact on who will emerge as a leader in the new Middle East. Thus, it is not a surprise that regional Sunni actors transferred financial assets and arms to the various rebel groups, depending on their ideology and political preferences. Moreover, they condemned al-Assad government, imposed sanctions against the regime, and participated in peacemaking initiatives, frequently using the League of Arab States and the Cooperation Council of the Arab States of the Gulf frameworks. Turkey also provided logistical help for some factions on its own territory. In this context Hussein Ibish rightly state that "Saudi Arabia and Qatar, in particular, are convinced that the strategic future of the Middle East, and specifically the role of Iran, will be determined by the outcome of the Syrian conflict. They believe that if Iran and its allies prevail and the current Syrian regime survives unreconstructed it will open the door for further inroads by Teheran into the Arab world and the eventual creation of a Persian miniempire in the region" (Ibish 2016, 1).

To recapitulate, the Syrian conflict which erupted in 2011 drawn increased interest of a various, both regional and global international actors, which quickly formed two rivaling blocks. One composed mostly of Russia, Iran and Hezbollah struggled to keep al-Assad government in power, while the second, spearheaded by the United States, France, Great Britain, as well

² It is worth mentioning that Ankara had also other reasons to support some rebel movements, as its policy was driven by the need to secure its borders, as well as to block the Kurdish ambitions to create their independent state in Rojava.

as Turkey and Saudi Arabia, supported various rebel groups. Their rivalry in Syria through 2011–2014 period constantly grew, which was particularly visible in the aftermath of the Ghouta chemical attack.

New trends in the international rivalry in Syria 2014–2017

2014 marked a period of increasing international involvement in the Syrian and Iraqi affairs. Due to actions undertaken by the so called Islamic State, in September 2014 United States, along with Bahrain, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and United Arab Emirates, launched airstrikes against its positions in Syria. At the time American Congress also voted for training and equipping moderate Syrian rebels, fighting both against IS and the regime. The main idea of the U.S. strategy was described by CENTCOM, which stated that: “Going forward, the U.S. military will continue to conduct targeted airstrikes against ISIL in Syria and Iraq as local forces go on the offensive against this terrorist group” (Miller 2014). In this context, as Martin Zapfe noted in 2014, “the US mission in Syria is not aimed at bringing about a realistic political end-state – not least because most parties would find it difficult to define one. Thus, the military attacks have no political purpose beyond a strategic weakening of the IS as well as the elimination of the Khorasan Group. Thus, the air strikes in Syria are of secondary importance to the US compared to Iraq” (Zapfe 2014, 3). It is worth mentioning that this move was combined with the decision to send 3100 soldiers to Iraq, in order to help its forces to repel Daesh offensives and with the program aiming to train moderate Syrian rebels. However, this initiative quickly proved to be a serious failure (Starr et al., 2015). In effect, in time Washington started to express its support for the Kurdish rebels instead of other, more controversial factions.

The U.S. strategy in Syria soon had to be reassessed, due to surprising actions undertaken by Russia in the mid-2015. At the beginning of the year situation of the Bashar al-Assad forces seriously deteriorated, as they suffered multiple defeats from the rebel forces, for instance in Idlib and Jisr al-Shegour. Regime was also increasingly threatened by the Islamic State in the eastern and central Syria. It is therefore not a surprise that many commentators and journalists at the time were convinced that it is a matter of time when the loyalists will lose the war. For instance, Jeremy Bender from

the “Business Insider” wrote in May 2015 that “fatigued, over-stretched, and losing the support of its base constituency, the Syrian army is conceivably nearing the point of collapse” (Bender 2015). These signs of apparently inevitable defeat were also noticed in Kremlin, which understood that the previous means of supporting al-Assad were inadequate to the challenges faced by loyalists. Thus, Vladimir Putin decided to make a step which was a huge surprise for the international community. The intervention, which began in September 2015 proved to be a game changer in Syria. Initially, the Russian corps in Levant was composed of more than 30 fighters and bombers (Su-25, Su-24, Su-34, Su-30), as well as 21 helicopters (including Mi-24/35, Mi-8/17 and Ka-27). Air forces were supported by the elements of the 810th Independent Marine Brigade from Sevastopol, as well as tanks, armored personnel carriers and artillery (Gawęda 2015). Later on, multiple other kinds of weaponry were exploited in the Russian operations. Among others, one can mention: *Kuznetsov* aircraft carrier (including Su-33, Ka-27PL/PS, Ka-29TB, Ka-52K, Mig-29UB/R aircraft), other naval forces, such as *Buyan-M* class corvettes, *Adm. Grigorovich* class frigates, *Kirov* class nuclear battlecruiser (Admiral Kuznetsov, 2016), *Kalibr-M* ship-launched cruise missiles (Russia fires, 2017), Tu-95MS *Bear* long-range strategic bombers (O’Connor, 2017), as well as Tu-22M3 *Backfire* and Tu-160 *Blackjack* bombers (Cenciotti, 2015). Federation’s military activities in Levant proved to be very intensive and efficient. Until March 2016, Russian air forces flew about 9000 sorties. This, combined with a series of SAA offensives, allowed to free 400 localities (9,000 sorties, 2016). The biggest, symbolic victory of loyalists was achieved in December 2016, when Aleppo was finally recaptured from the rebels. These successes were possible because of the fact that, according to Western media, Russian air force targeted not only terrorists, as they officially supposed to, but also various other rebel groups fighting against government (‘More than 90%’, 2015). Interestingly, Russia’s intervention in Syria was also followed by the increased involvement of Iran, as it sent additional troops sent to Levant. Multiple reports suggested that this time they directly participated in combat against the opposition. According to Emile Hokayem Teheran’s moves were coordinated with Moscow, as “Iran contributes skilled manpower and Russia air power, probably increasing in form of close air support” (Black, Dehghan, 2015).

The Federation’s military activities in Levant surprised the West, which did not expect Moscow to send its troops to the Middle East, while the

situation in Donbass remained unresolved. Its involvement in Levant was quickly countered by actions initially undertaken by regional backers of the rebellion. For instance, in October 2015 media reported that Saudi Arabia supported Free Syrian Army with 500 TOW guided antitank missiles, which caused heavy casualties among the SAA troops (Bender 2015). This was followed by the increased military presence of some Western European states in the Eastern Mediterranean, however, this was officially caused by the need to fight against the Islamic State. For instance, Great Britain decided to join the US-led coalition against Daesh in December 2015. France decided to dispatch its *Charles de Gaulle* aircraft carrier to the Syrian coast due to terrorist attacks in November 2015 (Shaheen et al. 2015). Finally, president Obama authorized “boots on the ground” in this country by agreeing to deploy a small unit of special forces operatives, which should help Kurdish rebels to fight against the IS (Starr, Diamond, 2015). In time, this contingent was increased. For instance, in March 2017 media reported that Washington was about to send additional 400 troops to Syria (Gordon, 2017). Obviously, the primary reason of this decision was to support the moderate Kurdish and Arab rebels, gathered in the Syrian Democratic Forces faction, as the only valid rebel group efficiently combating against the Islamic State. At the same time, however, it could be perceived as a manifestation of the U.S. interest in the conflict. In this context, the presence of American troops in al-Sham serve as a restraint to other parties involved, including Russia, Iran and al-Assad regime.

Finally, the situation in Syria was additionally complicated by Turkey, which suffered from serious internal instability due to failed *coup d'état* in July 2016. As Eran Lerman note, “in the wake of the failed coup d'état, Turkey is going through a massive and convulsive wave of repression, apparently aimed against anything remotely related to Fethullah Gulen's supporters and the Hizmet network of educational projects. The fallout in terms of the regional balance of power is bound to be significant” (Lerman 2016, p. 1). The following changes in the Turkish foreign policy resulted, among others, in its military intervention in northern Syria. It was mostly caused by the need to counter both threats generated by the Islamic State to its borders, as well as to prevent Kurdish progress in this area. Other reasons listed by the Arab Center for Research & Policy Studies, include among others: testing ability of the Turkish government to exert control over the army, finding new equilibrium in post-*coup* relations with the United States and Russia,

and harmonizing interests with Iran (Motives for Turkey, 2016). The *Euphrates Shield* operation, which was successfully concluded in March 2017, in consequence allowed to boost the position of the Free Syrian Army in the north. It was also a manifestation of the rising independence and ambitions of Turkey in the Middle East, both for internal and external use.

All these aforementioned actions suggest that since 2014 the specificity of international rivalry in Syria altered, as various parties started to use their armed forces to directly influence the course of events in Levant. Earlier most of regional and global actors based their activities on diplomatic and financial means, usually combined with deliveries of military equipment. Between 2014 and 2017 interested sides (Russia, the United States, Western European powers, Iran, Persian Gulf states) got involved in war. Partially, this was caused by the emergence of the so called Islamic State. However, frequently the IS served just as a good excuse to realize also other interests in al-Sham through increased military presence. In effect, rising military tensions between rivaling parties could be spotted. Since 2015 there were numerous incidents that prove this.

To begin with, the upsurge of Russian troops in Syria caused a number of military incidents with the Turkish Air Force. In October 2015 Russian Armed Forces were accused of violating Turkey's airspace. Effectively president Erdogan stressed that his country "cannot endure" such actions and that Moscow risked of "loosing" Turkey (Shaheen 2015). This increase of tensions between both states escalated even more on November 24th 2015, when the Turkish F-16 fighter jet shot down Russian Su-24. One pilot was killed, while the second was rescued. Moreover, during the subsequent CSAR³ mission, Russia lost one naval infantryman, as well as a transport helicopter to the FSA rebels (Heintz, Fraser, 2015). These events created potential risk of retaliation, but Moscow's reaction was well-thought-out, as it introduced painful economic sanctions against Turkey. It also sent advanced weaponry to Syria (Jenkins 2015). Additionally, some journalists and experts speculated that the Federation might reinforce its relations with the Kurdish rebels in northern Syria, which would seriously enrage Ankara (Implications of Downed Russian, 2015). In this context, it is interesting to note that, despite this short-term crisis in bilateral relations, after the 2016 failed *coup* contacts warmed up again. Nevertheless, both states still

³ CSAR – Combat Search and Rescue.

held contrary ambitions in Levant, which hindered full rapprochement. It is also worth mentioning that in February 2017 another military incident occurred, as the Russian planes accidentally killed three Turkish soldiers in the al-Bab area. It is possible that this “friendly fire” was just a delayed Russian response to the shoot-down of Su-24 in November 2015.

Secondly, in September 2016 the U.S. warplanes bombarded positions of the Syrian Arab Army, killing 62 soldiers and wounding more than 100. American strike was stopped after the Russian military issued a warning. While officially Washington stated that it was a mistake, Moscow and Damascus remained unconvinced on its motives. On the one hand, Russia called for an emergency UN Security Council meeting to discuss this incident. Syria, on the other hand, accused the United States of “very serious and flagrant aggression”, as well as of supporting the Islamic State (Barnard, Mazzetti, 2016). It was a visible sign of the rising tensions between Washington and Moscow, when it comes to Syrian affairs.

Finally, a new wave of serious military incidents in Levant occurred in 2017. In April 2017 the United States fired 60 cruise missiles at the Syrian airfield Shayrat in retaliation to the chemical attack that was allegedly launched from this SAA base. It obviously sparked serious criticism from Moscow. Effectively, Russia announced that it was cutting the military hotline that prevented incidents in the Syrian airspace with the U.S. and coalition air forces. Moreover, Vladimir Putin described U.S. actions as an “aggression against a sovereign state in violation of international law under a far-fetched pretext”, while the U.S. secretary of state Rex Tillerson blamed Russia, as it “failed in its responsibility” to meet the 2013 chemical weapons deal (Russia cuts “deconfliction” hotline, 2017). Furthermore, in June 2017 U.S. Air Force shot down two Iranian *Shahed* 129 drones as they reportedly operated near American troops at at-Tanaf. Once again these incidents caused harsh criticism from Moscow, which accused the U.S. of “complicity with terrorism”. Finally, on June 18th, U.S. F/A-18E shot down the SAA warplane, as it dropped bombs near the Kurdish-dominated SDF forces at Tabqa. This provoked a resolute Russian reaction, as the Kremlin threatened to shoot U.S.-led coalition airplanes that operated west of the Euphrates river. In effect, Russian-American “proxy war” in Syria in the mid-2017 got so intense, that it sparked the UN secretary general Antonio Guterres reaction. He warned that these incidents might lead to further escalation of the Syrian conflict (Borger 2017; US plane shoots down, 2017).

There are generally two groups of reasons of this visible escalation in the military incidents involving international actors in 2017. On the one hand, this was caused mostly by the more resolute approach to the Syrian conflict, adopted by the new Trump's administration. This change of American strategy in Levant was caused, among others, by the need to secure its ground forces fighting alongside the Kurds with the Islamic State. Possibly, White House's rising dedication in Syria was also caused by internal factors, such as the ongoing debate concerning the possible Kremlin's influence on the presidential election in the United States in 2016. On the other hand, these incidents were also provoked by the changing military situation in Syria, due to the visible fall of the Islamic State. All interested actors attempt to gain as much as possible from the setbacks suffered recently by this terrorist organization. It is due to the fact that the aftermath of the "race to Raqqa" will heavily influence the future strategic situation in Levant. The side which will conquer most of territories currently under Daesh control, will possibly find itself in a much more beneficial position in the next, post-Islamic State's stage of this war.

Conclusion

The aforementioned considerations allow to draw certain conclusions on the evolution of the international rivalry in Syria. To begin with, it has to be stressed that generally three layers of this competition can be identified:

- traditional Sunni-Shia rivalry, fueled by sectarian differences. The religious factor strongly influences both the activities of Saudi Arabia and other Sunni states, as well as of Iran and Hezbollah.
- Struggle for the regional leadership between the Sunni states. While Turkey and Saudi Arabia maintain similar goals in Syria, they both struggle for achieving a dominating role in the Middle East. Their clashing ambitions were manifested not only by their support of different rebel groups in Syria, but also by the recent crisis in relations with Qatar. Turkey proved to be the only serious regional actor, which actively defends and supports Qatar in face of allegations and sanctions imposed by Saudi Arabian-led group, composed of e.g. Egypt, United Arab Emirates and Bahrain (Ant, Kozok, 2017).

- Competition between Russia and the United States (and broadly understood West) over the final results of this conflict. It is a major evidence of the intensifying process of their global rivalry, also manifested by the war in Donbass, as well as by the recent cyber attacks against the U.S.

In this context, the international rivalry in Syria can be divided into two chapters. The first, between 2011 and 2014, consisted of rather indirect actions undertaken by most of interested sides. While there were some noticeable military manifestations of international actors in the proximity of Syria, there were relatively few examples of direct involvement in Syrian affairs throughout this period. Exceptions from this tendency include the aforementioned IRGC advisors, Hezbollah operatives, as well as a number of incidents involving Syria's neighbors. Most important foreign actors, such as the West, Russia, Turkey or the Gulf states usually limited their activities to providing logistical and financial support to warring sides, which represented their interests in Levant.

In 2014 and 2015 the situation significantly changed, due to two reasons. On the one hand, the emergence of the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq *per se* forced the US-led coalition to intervene in al-Sham. Additionally, this proved to be a good excuse for other parties to get involved in the conflict. On the other hand, the crisis of the regime in 2015 forced Russia to send its troops to Syria, despite the unresolved conflict in Ukraine. Its intervention had several implications for the war. While it helped SAA to regain strategic initiative, it also possibly influenced Turkish and U.S. decisions to increase their military presence in Syria. Given the contrary interests of these actors, their rising military activities in Levant caused the aforementioned series of military incidents, which escalated in 2017.

To recapitulate, the international rivalry in Syria since 2014/2015 has significantly intensified. Nowadays, both regional and global powers are directly engaged in the proxy war in Levant. This trend has generally two groups of implications for international security. Firstly, it has increased the risk of escalation to the level of accidental war between these actors. This was manifested during the November 2015 crisis in Turkish-Russian relations, as well as in the aftermath of the U.S. actions against the SAA and Iranian forces in 2017. Secondly, at the current state of the conflict, it is unlikely to expect its resolution initiated and conducted by the local, Syrian actors, as their activities are heavily influenced by their external sponsors. In effect, military activities of all interested powers, in contrary to their official statements, are a factor prolonging the conflict, which possibly under normal circumstances would be already settled.

Bibliography

- 9,000 sorties, 400 localities freed: What Russia has achieved during its 5-month Syria operation. *RT*, 14.03.2016. Retrieved from <https://www.rt.com/news/335596-russia-syria-operation-results/>.
- Admiral Kuznetsov Battlegroup to Start Active Phase of Operation in Syria in Coming Days – Reports (2016). *Southfront*, 08.11.2016. Retrieved from <https://southfront.org/admiral-kuznetsov-battlegroup-to-start-active-phase-of-operation-in-syria-in-coming-days-reports/>.
- Ansari A., Tabrizi A.B. (2016). The View from Tehran. In A.B. Tabrizi, R. Pantucci (Eds.). *Understanding Iran's Role in the Syrian Conflict* (3-9). London: Royal United Service Institute for Defence and Security Studies.
- Ant O., Kozok F. (2017). Turkey Chooses Sides in Gulf Conflict as Erdogan Defends Qatar. *Bloomberg*, 07.06.2017. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-06-07/turkey-chooses-sides-in-gulf-conflict-as-erdogan-defends-qatar>.
- Barnard A., Mazzetti M. (2016). U.S. Admits Airstrike in Syria, Meant to Hit ISIS, Killed Syrian Troops. *The New York Times*, 17.09.2016. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/18/world/middleeast/us-air-strike-syrian-troops-isis-russia.html>.
- Barnes-Dacey J., Levy D. (2013). *The Regional Struggle For Syria*. London: European Council on Foreign Relations.
- Bayoumy Y. (2011). Lebanon's Hezbollah says most Syrians back Assad. *Reuters*. 25.05.2011. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-hezbollah-syria-idUSTRE74O61Y20110525>.
- Bender J. (2015). Here are all of the problems with the reeling Syrian Army. *Business Insider*, 01.05.2015. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/the-syrian-military-is-on-the-verge-of-collapse-2015-4?IR=T>.
- Bender J. (2015). Saudi Arabia just replenished Syrian rebels with one of the most effective weapons against the Assad regime. *Business Insider*, 09.10.2015. Retrieved from <http://www.businessinsider.com/syria-rebels-and-tow-missiles-2015-10?IR=T>.
- Black I., Dehghan S.K. (2015). Iran ramps up troop deployment in Syria in run-up to 'anti-rebel offensive'. *The Guardian*, 14.10.2015. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/oct/14/iran-troop-deployment-syria-anti-rebel-offensive-revolutionary-guards-assad>.

- Blanchard C.M., Sharp J.M. (2013), *Possible U.S. Intervention in Syria: Issues for Congress*. CRS Report Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress, 12.09.2013.
- Borger J. (2017). US shoots down second Iran-made armed drone over Syria in 12 days. *The Guardian*, 20.06.2017. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/20/us-iran-drone-shot-down-syria>.
- Cenciotti D. (2015). Russian MOD Video Shows Tu-160, Tu-95 And Tu-22 Bombers (With Su-27 Escort) Bomb ISIS in Syria. *The Aviationist*, 17.11.2015. Retrieved from <https://theaviationist.com/2015/11/17/russian-mod-video-shows-tu-160-tu-95-and-tu-22-bombers-with-su-27-escort-bomb-isis-in-syria/>.
- Choucair C. (2016). *Hezbollah in Syria: Gains, Losses and Changes*. Al Jazeera Centre for Studies, 01.07.2016.
- Gawęda M. (2015). Rosyjski kontyngent w Syrii. Potencjał i przypuszczalne cele. *Defence24*, 27.09.2015. Retrieved from <http://www.defence24.pl/264428,rosyjski-kontyngent-w-syrii-potencjal-i-przypuszczalne-cele>.
- Goodarzi J.A. (2013). Syria and Iran: Alliance Cooperation in a Changing Regional Environment. *Ortadoğu Etütleri* 4(2), pp. 31-54.
- Gordon M.R. (2017). U.S. Is Sending 400 More Troops to Syria. *New York Times*, 09.03.2017. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/09/world/middleeast/us-troops-syria.html>.
- Harris P., Chulov M., Batty D., Pearse D. (2012). Syria resolution vetoed by Russia and China at United Nations. *The Guardian*, 04.02.2012. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/feb/04/assad-obama-resign-un-resolution>.
- Heintz J., Fraser S. (2015). Turkey shoots down Russian jet it says violated its airspace. *AP*, 24.11.2015. Retrieved from <https://apnews.com/066bc52167e844bb9f5732d8650b0b35/report-turkey-shoots-down-war-plane-over-airspace-intrusion>.
- Hezbollah Involvement in the Syrian Civil War* (2013). The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center, 17.07.2013.
- Ibish H. (2016). What's at Stake for the Gulf Arab States in Syria? *The Arab Gulf States Institute in Washington Issue Paper*, 6.
Implications of Downed Russian Jet on Turkey-Russian Relations. Al Jazeera Center for Studies Position Paper, 02.12.2015.

- Javedanfar M. (2011). Khamenei won't support Assad to the end. *The Guardian*. 13.08.2011. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/aug/13/khamenei-support-assad>.
- Jenkins L. (2015). Vladimir Putin announces Russian sanctions against Turkey. *The Guardian*, 28.11.2015. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/28/vladimir-putin-calls-for-greater-sanctions-against-turkey>.
- Kofman M. (2016). US and Russia in Syria's War: Cooperation And Competition. In A. Kudors, A. Pabriks, *The War in Syria: Lessons for the West* (pp. 65-88). Riga: University of Latvia Press.
- Lakomy, M. (2013). Wewnętrzne i zewnętrzne uwarunkowania wojny domowej w Syrii. *Studia Polityczne*, 31, pp. 217-245.
- Lerman E. (2016). Regional Implications of the Failed Coup D'état and Purgues in Turkey: Initial Indicators. *BESA Center Perspectives Paper*, 351.
- Lister C. (2014). Dynamic Stalemate: Surveying Syria's Military Landscape. *Brookings Doha Center Policy Briefing*, May.
- Miller Z.J. (2014). U.S. Launches Air-Strike Campaign Against ISIS in Syria. *Time*, 22.09.2014. Retrieved from <http://time.com/3419906/u-s-launches-airstrike-campaign-against-isis-in-syria/>.
- More than 90% of Russian airstrikes in Syria have not targeted Isis, US says. *The Guardian*, 07.10.2015. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/oct/07/russia-airstrikes-syria-not-targeting-isis>.
- Motives for Turkey's Military Intervention in Syria*. Arab Center for Research & Policy Studies Assessment Report, September 2016.
- O'Connor T. (2017). Russia military uses new war weapon to fight ISIS in Syria. *Newsweek*, 05.07.2017. Retrieved from: <http://www.newsweek.com/russia-military-new-war-weapon-fight-isis-syria-632082>.
- Rogers P. (2013). The Syrian Chemical Weapons Agreement in Perspective. *Oxford Research Group Monthly Global Security Briefing*, September.
- Russia cuts "deconfliction" hotline with U.S. following Syria strikes. *CBS News*, 07.04.2017. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/russia-agrees-maintain-deconfliction-channel-us-syria-strikes/>.
- Russia fires cruise missiles at ISIL targets in Syria (2017). *Al Jazeera*, 31.05.2017. Retrieved from: <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/05/russia-fires-cruise-missiles-isil-targets-syria-170531093826139.html>.

- Saul J. (2014). Exclusive: Russia steps up military lifeline to Syria's Assad – sources. *Reuters*, 17.01.2014. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-syria-russia-arms-idUSBREA0G0MN20140117>.
- Shaheen K. (2015). Turkey 'cannot endure' Russian violation of airspace, president says. *The Guardian*, 06.10.2015. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/oct/06/nato-chief-jens-stoltenberg-russia-turkish-airspace-violations-syria>.
- Shaheen K., Torpey P., Gutiérrez P., Levett C. (2015). Who backs whom in the Syrian conflict. *The Guardian*, 02.12.2015. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2015/oct/09/who-backs-whom-in-the-syrian-conflict>.
- Starr B., Diamond J. (2015). Syria: Obama authorizes boots on ground to fight ISIS. *CNN*, 30.10.2015. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/10/30/politics/syria-troops-special-operations-forces/index.html>.
- Starr B., Kopan T., Ascota J. (2015). U.S. suspending program to train and equip Syrian rebels. *CNN*, 09.10.2015. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/10/09/politics/us-syria-rebels-arms-program-suspended/index.html>.
- US plane shoots down Syrian aircraft that attacked US-backed fighters. *The Guardian*, 18.06.2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jun/18/us-plane-shoots-down-syrian-aircraft>.
- Zapfe M. (2014). The US Campaign against the "Islamic State". *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, 165.

RADOSŁAW FIEDLER*Prof. UAM dr hab., Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland*

The European Union and the Iranian Islamic Republic – opportunities and challenges

The aim of this article is to conduct analysis of Iranian foreign policy within potential areas of cooperation between Iran and Western powers. Iranian foreign policy has begun to shift from an ideological stance to a more pragmatic approach. The nuclear deal with Iran was possible due to increased practicality in Iranian and United States policies. Engagement and regulation of an extremely complex issue was thus made possible.

Key words: Iran, foreign policy, pragmatism, United States, European Union

Introduction

The European Union could be a potentially more active external actor in bilateral relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran. Thorough their bilateral relations were noted difficulties, barriers and serious setbacks. At least five phases of European and Iranian relations could be examined: 1979–89 or Ayatollah's Khomeini's era with revolutionary favor and the slogan 'Neither West nor East but only the Islamic Republic (Mohammadi, Ehteshami, 2000, 60). During this stormy decade were American hostage crisis and breaking down US and Iranian diplomatic relations with the Iraq-Iranian war; 1989–97, identified with the presidency of Hashemi Rafsanjani and pragmatic approach but also with crises; 1997–2005 associated with president Muhammad Khatami's project to reform the Republic and finally was blocked by more conservative establishment; 2005–2013 Mahmud's Ahmedinejad

presidency, additionally with nationalistic rhetoric and escalating nuclear crisis and the fifth phase related with president Hassan Rouhani and pragmatic approach and his effective efforts to appease the nuclear crisis' consequences and brought for lifting harmful for Iran sanctions. Although, the current president is not focused on reforming the Islamic Republic, but are visible and reciprocated his attempts aimed in improving relations especially with the European partners and opening for trade, investments and facilitate doing business with Iran.

However, in Iranian political system the president is elected his role is minor to the those which the Supreme Leader possesses and it has great impact on the general course of Iranian foreign policy (Moshaver, 2003, 287).

Apart from dealing with the autocratic state with all its limitations, there are still at least further three difficulties which in bad scenario could undermine relations with Iran:

1. EU internally is not coherent body in its policy towards Iran because of imbalanced institutional framework and interests of member states, additionally preoccupied with the Great Britain's exit from the European integration.
2. In period 2002–2015 domination the nuclear issue. Predominance of it overshadowed another topics as such as human rights.
3. Internal and external context and risks of reproaching with Teheran.

These three issues causes potential limitations for developing mutual relations between EU and Iran. The greatest problem is to build a reliable and credible means which could positively impact on bilateral relations.

Ad. 1 However, the EU accounts for one-third of the world's economic production. Europe is the world's largest exporter of manufactured goods and services, and is itself the biggest export market for around 80 countries as a global political actor is not so consistent and influential as other powers as United States, Russia, China. EU apart pursuing some small civilian and military missions in Balkans, some African States is not a military power and does not have military bases across the World. In terms of military power and security the EU is almost an invisible actor. The most effective tool is trade and European goods and investments and finally European market is promising for gas and oil producers.

EU is in the fields of its monetary and commercial policies, or as a highly institutionalized and integrative intergovernmental organization. Another issue are its member states as Germany, Great Britain or France and the rest

of 25 EU's states. For example EU's member states are pursuing their own foreign policies in case of very significant national interests, sometimes taking EU's institutional coverage for achieving some their goals (Wagner, Onderco, 2014, 717–728).

In case of Germany, France and Great Britain could be observed some differences in their relations with Iran. The most difficult are British – Iranian relations on them are still influencing the colonial past and also Shah time when UK was besides US the Iranian strategic partner. First important blow which undermined relation was the Islamic Revolution and ten year later great rupture in the relations occurred in 1989, when Salman Rushdie published *The Satanic Verses* in the UK. Publication of the book, perceived as blasphemous by Iranian mullahs (but not only by them), prompted severe criticism by Ayatollah Khomeini, who issued a fatwa over Rushdie. Although Iranians later moderated their statements and said that they would not be sending a killing commando to the UK, the damage had been already done (Onderco, 2015, 56). In 2011 British embassy was attacked and demolished it was similar action as occupying US embassy in years 1979–81 but that time without hostages. Four years after closure the embassy was reopened but mutual relations are full of suspicion.

France seemed had a better relations with Iran. At the beginning of Islamic Revolution, Iran glanced at France as its emerging main partner in Europe, a “friend of Iran”. Ruhollah Khomeini found asylum in France (Onderco, 2015, 56–76). Some nuisance was related with selling arms and chemicals and more pro-Baghdad course in French policy during Iraqi-Iranian war. Besides, France actively assisted with Iraqi nuclear program, which was demolished by Israeli air assault in 1981. Now France arises as Teheran's business partner in vast range from car industry to infrastructure.

Germany is very popular destination for Iranian officials at various levels – from mayors to ministers. German policy towards Iran led to major disagreements with the USA and Israel on a number of occasions. In 1993, Germany and the USA differed in the North Atlantic Council over the US policy of isolation towards Iran. For Berlin the policy of engagement would be much better for moderate Iranian politics. As S. Mousavian noted: “The crisis reached its apex by the 1997 ruling of Kammergericht (the highest state court) in Berlin (Mykonos crisis – R.F.). This led to a diplomatic crisis and ensuing withdrawals of EU ambassadors from Tehran” (Mousavian, 2008). Besides this setback, Germany is the most active trade partner with

Iran. In 2012, Germany exported to Iran goods worth \$3.15 billion—one-third (31.5 percent) of all the exports of the 27 EU countries (Kiani, 2012, 112). After nuclear deal in 2015 Germany is back as the most active Iranian trade partner and possibly the greatest European investor .

For the rest member states the European Union institutional cover is essential for securing their business with Iran. However , in dealing with Iran on behalf of EU is the most outspoken is the group of three (troika: Germany, France and Great Britain called EU-3). British position to Iran would be weakened after Brexit. Probable scenario will be Germany-French tandem except EU-3 in dealing with Teheran, especially in case of trade issues. Great Britain as an ally in the NATO would be active and an important partner in case of Iranian nuclear ambitions. There is open question whether Italy would replace Great Britain place in EU-3.

Iran is a significant trade partner for EU, supplier of reliable oil, and, amongst the population at large, a sensible and sophisticated source of hi class researchers and cultural exchange. The EU offered to enhance trade ties with Iran through a dedicated EU–Iran Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) but this proposal due to setbacks and crisis ensued from nuclear program has not yet fulfilled.

The EU proposed diplomacy and engagement instead of pressing on Iran as a rouge state as had been perceived by American administrations from Carter to Bush Junior. European attitude reflects the idea of utility of soft power as a more effective instrument to overcome problems arouse with the Islamic Republic. The first coherent initiative wasthe “Critical Dialogue”. It was endorsed by the European Council at the European Union summit in Edinburgh on 11–12 December 1992. The Critical Dialogue was adopted to pursue a range of goals, which were clearly expressed by the European Council of Ministers: “ (...)This should be a critical dialogue, which reflects concern about Iranian behavior and calls for improvement in a number of areas, particularly human rights, the death sentence pronounced by a Fatwa against the author Salman Rushdie, which is contrary to international law, and terrorism. Improvements in these areas will be important in determining the extent to which closer relations and confidence can be developed European Union maintenance Critical Dialogue was in contrary to United States’ dual containment strategy aimed in Iraq and Iran. From 1995, Washington implemented severe sanctions. US had a plan not only isolate Iran but also acting for changing political system in that country (Pillar, 2013:211–231). The

EU's refusal to support the sanctions also within Iran Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA) led to tensions between US and its European allies (Küntzel, 2014, 225–233). EU's diplomatic strategy was perceived as a method to urge Iran observes international norms and also by tying it through commercial relations. Despite the approach and some positive signs of improvement Critical Dialogue was suspended. On 10 April 1997 a German court found the highest Iranian authorities, including the Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, responsible for assassination members of the Kurdish opposition, which was done in Mykonos restaurant in Berlin (Wilford, 2011).

Assuming the presidential office by Muhammad Khatami and a new moderate rhetoric renewed EU's crisis diplomacy with Iran. New phase was called a "Comprehensive Dialogue", which was launched in 1998 (Kaussler, 2014, 276). Comprehensive Dialogue was concentrated on issues of mutual interests in which the cooperation regarding the areas of energy, drugs, trade and investments, human rights, terrorism, the fatwa against Salman Rushdie were possible to get some improvement (Dupont, 2009, 185). Despite many difficulties in 2000, the EU advanced with Iran negotiations on a Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) linked to the Political Dialogue Agreement. Within the scope were four areas: human rights, non-proliferation, terrorism, and the Middle East peace process. The strategy was simple: getting Iran closer to the EU politically and economically would allow Europe to extract significant concessions from Tehran (Kaussler, 2008, 169–170). Reciprocity of president Khatami and some improvement in general relations with Iran helped to restore relations with the United Kingdom. As noted Bernd Kaussler: "the irony of the Comprehensive Dialogue was that while the human rights dialogue bore progress in legislation and policy as well as supporting stakeholders of human rights and democracy thorough various multi-track roundtables organized by the EU, by 2004 Germany, Britain and France had largely shifted their priorities to non-proliferation" (Kaussler, 2014, 112).

Ad. 2. In years 2002–2015 the main barrier which blocked mutual EU-Iran relations was the problem of Iranian nuclear program (Barzegar, 2017). Initially the EU attempted solved it through diplomacy without US assistance (Bowe, Kidd, 2004, 257–276). Germany, France and Great Britain were convinced in more effective diplomatic solution for nuclear deadlock. It was not easy task not only because Washington's plan for isolating and sanctioning Iran but another powers preferred maintaining cooperation with

Iran for. For instance Russia concluded an \$800 million contract in 1995 to complete construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant. The investment was started by Siemens and its subsidiary Kraftwerke Union in 1974, but abandoned after the Islamic revolution and Iran's war with Iraq. Germany's refusal to allow completion was based on Iran's apparent interest in nuclear weapons (Cirincione, Wolfstahl, Rajkumar, 2002, 257–260). EU-3 had to handle between two attitudes to Iran: isolating or do not noticing some possible concealed military dimension of Iranian nuclear program.

The apparent crisis at the beginning of 2000s induced EU-3 for offering Iran seemed to be face-saved solution. It was worked out and it revealed European approach for diplomatic engaging with Iran. The offer was following: 1. Engage full cooperation with the IAEA, meeting all obligations regarding the adherence to the Safeguard Agreement and full transparency with its nuclear program; 2. Sign the IAEA Additional Protocol, which allows more intrusive and deep inspecting system, also objects and plants which IAEA would like to supervise; 3. Suspension of all uranium-enrichment and re-processing activities, as it was defined by the IAEA.

However the main European diplomatic achievement turn to be a failure. The Paris Agreement was not implemented there were at least four main reasons of its failure: 1. France, Germany and the Great Britain acted without United States' contribution and essential support which could help to implement this agreement with security assurances for Iran. Contrary to it, Washington presented very critical attitude to Iranian nuclear program and even considering military option as the only mean for stopping Iran from the acquiring hypothetical nuclear weapon. 2. Nuclear talks with Iran was led by European troika but not the EU, which had only secondary role. European powers did not deeply consult its offers to Iran with other EU members states and did not consider a more considerable activity of EU institutions. 3. Iranian authorities were against permanent suspension of uranium-enrichment activities, arguing – it was necessary for developing a civilian nuclear program and was undeniable Iran's right to do it with no constraints according to the rules of NPT. The European powers demand for a full cessation of enrichment process and for Iran it was not fair to be excluded from all nuclear activities under safeguards. 4. Complicated Internal politics in Iran. Hardliners against reformers envisage by the president Muhammad Khatami. Reformers and the president himself did not control nuclear program. Even Hassan Rouhani nuclear negotiator was more close

to Ayatollah Khamenei and beyond president's control. Although seemed to be progressive EU-3 negotiations with Khatami but their positive outputs were impossible to implement (Kazemzadeh, 2014, 133).

Proposed "Paris Agreement" was the sole European initiative to Iran. Though, engaging Iran was unsuccessful. The Iranian nuclear crisis became internationalized. In the period of 2006-2012 EU-3 was more concentrate in align with the US position in more punitive approach to Iran. The Group P-5+1 was formed (China, Russia, United States plus EU-3) as a platform for negotiations with Iran (Gaietta, 2015, 153–160). There were at least two reasons with aligning EU to the more US hard position aimed in Iran: 1. President's Mahmud Ahmadinejad populist rhetoric and giving reasons that Iranian politics is unpredictable and visible gap between declarations and facts, as for example Fordow's enrichment plant beyond IAEA's surveillance (Ehteshami, Zweiri, 2008). 2. Risk of rising costs for European companies and banks. Since 2010, however, US president Obama has enforced US unilateral sanctions also against European companies by way of executive orders (Pieper, 2017, 99–119). As Giumelli and Ivan noted: "at the same time, US financial threats (secondary sanctions, threats to exclude trading partners from US financial institutions) served to coerce other actors into acceptance of US policies" (Giumelli, Ivan, 2013, 76).

The sanctions were adopted on the Islamic Republic of Iran have had significant effects on the general population, including an escalation in inflation, a rise in commodities and energy costs, an increase in the rate of unemployment and a shortage of necessary items, including medicine (Nichols, Charbonneau, 2012). The EU decided on an oil embargo on Iran, imposed sanctions on a large number of Iranian banks and insurance companies, and decided to deny access to Iranian banks to SWIFT, a provider of specialised financial messaging services.

Rising costs caused by the conduct of nuclear program and Iran's international isolation and its deepening financial and economic crisis opened a diplomatic solution for nuclear issue (Moret, 2015, 120–140). In June 2013 HasanRouhani (former nuclear negotiator) won presidential elections. His plan was clear from the beginning – lifting harmful sanctions in exchange for a comprehensive nuclear deal with the P5 +1. Though, there were a lot of problematic issues, which needed to be thoroughly discussed, a comprehensive agreement was reached. The agreement called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), composes of not only rules aimed in limiting range

of nuclear program but also included detailed technical issues précising its significant issues (Parameters, 2015).

The JCPOA seemed to be a turning point in relations of EU and US with Iran. European partners focuses on Iran's role and potentially the greatest trade partner in the Persian Gulf. As a result of the verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that Iran had fulfilled its JCPOA engagements, on 16 January 2016 triggering the lifting of UN, EU and US nuclear related sanctions. The January 2016 president Rouhani visit to Italy and France ensued in signing business agreements worth billions of USD business deals to modernize Iran's infrastructure (Will, 2016).

Ad. 3. Although Iran has opened on unprecedented scale its internal political situation has not changed. The strongest reformists movement was during Khatami presidency but without acceptance of the Islamic Guardians of the Revolution and Ayatollah Khamenei did not transform the Islamic Republic onto more democratic structure and they finally lost influence in 2015.

There are visible internal risks related with headliner's desire for closing again Iran and treating foreign investment as a conspiracy aimed in Iran. They perceived economical changes in Iran after the nuclear deal and lifting sanctions as a risky for maintaining unchanged political system in the Islamic Republic. Nuclear program is the reason concentration of the power and building parallel state apparatus which would be fully controlled by hardliners. Moreover, foreign ideas influx into Iran might initiate society's dissent to the Islamic Republic. The another challenge is related with approaching succession power on the *Velayat-e-Faqih* (Supreme Leader). However Ali Khamenei is conservative and associated with hardliners, still is not known who would replace him. Possible are at least two extreme scenarios: 1. Even more centralized and controlled by the hardliners with only decorative and symbolic role of the president and parliament (Majlis). 2. Through reforms and enhancing the role of elected bodies the president and parliament with the Supreme Leader more constraint for example by the Expert Assembly. It is a question whether such reforms are possible in the imbalanced system with a predominance of unelected institutions within the Iranian political systems. Reforms can just undermine all the structure and its logic. The essence is to control all political institutions by the unelected one.

European Iranian partners need to take into consideration also external factors which may negatively effect on trade and investments with Iran.

Iran is in Saudi Arabia, is involved in conflicts in Yemen, Syria and also in Iraq and also long supporter for Lebanon's Hezbollah (Ożarowski, 2011). Particularly after nuclear deal – Saudi Arabia perceived Iran as a gravies threat and promotor of Shia Column in the Arab world. Apart turbulent Middle East for EU policy to Iran US has significant influence. As it was in sanctions time, finally EU partners accepted the policy of a comprehensive sanctions and loses derived from banning access to the Iranian market. President Donald Trump during presidential campaign declared that JCO-PA is unsymmetrical agreement, which favors Iran. New administration opts for more tightened security and regional collaboration with Israel and Saudi Arabia. Within such policy Iran is perceived as a threat for regional stability. After final defeating the Islamic States the area of possible US cooperation with Iran would more limited. Another issue are new American sanctions imposed on Iran in February 2017, after missile tests. However its provisions are not related with the nuclear deal but it visibly undermines cooperation with Iran. In beginning of June 2017 terrorist attack shit the parliament and Imam's Khomeini mausoleum. JavadZarif an Iranian foreign minister denounced as “repugnant” President Trump's controversial compassion (Bacon, 2017).

During this two years after nuclear deal not built a durable framework for collaboration between Tehran and Washington nor credibility. Deteriorating American and Iranian relations probably might decrease EU business relations with Iran.

Conclusions

European Union and its member states, especially EU-3 (Germany, France and Great Britain) have not built a stable platform for developing relations with Iran. The Islamic Republic is not easy and predictable partner. Though president Khatami declared Iranian commitment to the human rights observance, his political role in Iranian politics was more than symbolic. In formulating the policy to Iran has to be considered the problem of contradictory attitudes of Iranian authorities, onecannot forgiven, hardliners treated the Western partners as a threat for Iranian political system. For decision makers in Teheran is a contradictory task how to preserve intact political system without social upheaval. It is very difficult to handle opening Iran

for foreign investments and protecting it from the “Western conspiracy”. Iran would not reign for supporting Shiites in its close and more distanced neighborhood with automatically

EU policy to Iran could be analysed as both by engagement or gaining mutual benefits to more crisis and tense relations, especially during so called nuclear issue in years 2002–2015. However nuclear deal was achieved there are a number of risks which can undermine the JCPOA.

The EU cannot play self-reliant role to Iran. There are internal and external factors impacting on relations with Iran. Khameni’s successor can continue opening of Iran but can do otherwise – trying to ignite new crisis and also with nuclear issue. The most visible external factor is related with US policy to Iran. If Washington decides to break JCPOA as not reliable treaty in case of Iran it would certainly start new crises in relations with Iran.

EU should reconsider its instruments to Iran and which strategy. There are rifts in pursuing policy to Iran. It brought to the situation that EU is only a coverage to national interests and goals for EU-3. It is an open question about Great Britain’s position after Brexit.

There are a lot of opportunities, as such as a vibrant market, well-educated youth, a great desire for technologies, infrastructure, a vast of gas and oil reserves and another assets. In case of Iran there are a large quantity of challenges. Analysig EU relations with Iran could be observed such regularity. After some improvement occurred crisis and again improvement and new crisis. There is a question – is the JCOPA enough platform for building more durable relations with Iran?

Bibliography

- Bacon J. (2017), *Iran: Trump response to terror attack in Tehran ‘repugnant’*; <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2017/06/08/iran-trump-response-terror-attack-tehran-repugnant/102621204/> (accessed 20.06.2017). Barzegar K. (2017), , *The European Union and future nuclear talks*; http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20582/european_union_and_future_nuclear_talks.html (accessed 25.09.2017).

- Bowe W. Q., Kidd J. (2004), *The Iranian nuclear challenge*, "International Affairs", 80(2).
- Cirincione J., Wolfstahl J. B., Rajkumar (2014), *Deadly arsenals*, Washington.
- Ehteshami A., Zweiri Z. (2008), *Iran's Foreign Policy from Khatami to Ahmedinejad*, Berkshire: Ithaca Press.
- Gaietta M. (2015), *The Trajectory of Iranian Nuclear Program*, New York.
- Giumelli F., Ivan P. (2013), *The effectiveness of EU sanctions. An analysis of Iran, Belarus, Syria and Myanmar (Burma)*, EPC Issue Paper, No. 76, p. 15.
- Kazemzadeh M. (2014), *Hassan Rouhani's Election and Its Consequences for American Foreign Policy*, "American Foreign Policy Interests"; 36(2).
- Kaussler B. (2014), *European Union Constructive Engagement with Iran (2000 – 2004): An Exercise in Conditional Human Rights Diplomacy*, October.
- Kaussler B. (2014), *Iran's Nuclear Diplomacy. Power politics and conflict resolution*, London-New York.
- Kiani D., (2012) *Iran and Germany's New Geopolitics*, "Iranian Review of Foreign Affairs" 3.
- Küntzel M. (2014), *Hidden Diplomacy: The German–American Dispute over Iran*, "American Foreign Policy Interests", 36(4).
- Moret E. S. (2015), *Humanitarian impacts of economic sanctions on Iran and Syria*, "European Security", 24(1).
- Moshaver Z. (2003), *Revolution, Theocratic Leadership and Iran's Foreign Policy: Implications for Iran–EU Relations*, "Reviewed International Affairs" 3(2).
- Mousavian S. H. (2008), *Iran-Europe relations: challenges and opportunities*. New York: Routledge.
- Nichols M., Charbonneau L. (2012), *UN chief says sanctions on Iran affect its people*. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/05/us-iran-sanctions-un-idUSBRE89412Z20121005> (accessed 20.09.2017).
- Omelicheva M. (2012), *Russia's Foreign Policy toward Iran: A Critical Geopolitics Perspective*, "Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies", 14(3).
- Onderco M. (2015), *Money can't buy you love: the European Union member states and Iranian nuclear programme 2002–2009*, "European Security", 24(1).
- Ożarowski R. (2011), *Hezbollah w stosunkach międzynarodowych na Bliskim Wschodzie*, Gdańsk.
- Parameters for a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran's Nuclear Program* (2015): https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/jcpoa_key_excerpts.pdf; (accessed 22.09.2017)

- PieperM. (2017), *The transatlantic dialogue on Iran: the European subaltern and hegemonic constraints in the implementation of the 2015 nuclear agreement with Iran*, "European Security", 26(1).
- PillarP. R. (2013), *The Role of Villain: Iran and U. S. Foreign Policy*, "Political Science Quarterly", 128(2).
- WagnerW., M. Onderco, Accommodation or Confrontation? Explaining Differences in Policies Toward Iran, "International Studies Quarterly" , 2014; 58(4),.
- WilfordM. (2011), *The Assassins' Trail: Unraveling the Mykonos Killings*, "World Affairs", November/December 2011;
<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/assassins%E2%80%99-trail-unraveling-mykonos-killings> (accessed 22.09.2017).
- WillW. (2016), *EU-US : Export Controls & Sanctions Alert The Iran Deal – Implementation Day*, 2016, 3.

www.isecs.eu

