



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**POLISH DEFENSE POLICY IN THE CONTEXT OF
NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY**

by

Piotr Bieniek

June 2006

Thesis Advisor:
Second Reader:

Donald Abenheim
Mikhail Tsypkin

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE June 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Polish Defense Policy in the Context of National Security Strategy.			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Piotr Bieniek				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) Since the turn of this century, stability in European continent, to a large degree, depends on political-military cooperation among European countries as well as the establishment of common goals in order to eliminate current threats and risks such as terrorism. As far as Poland is concerned, its priority is to be an active leader in improving common security policy within the boundaries of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Polish security policy and strategy is shaped by its geographical location which places Poland in NATO's main strategic area opposite the Russian Federation and Belarus. In other words, Poland sees itself as the eastern "edge" of NATO's area and as a "front-line" country. This motivates Poland to support NATO's further enlargement to the East because Warsaw understands that it is a primary key to stability in Europe and has a responsibility to support NATO activities in this region. Thus, this thesis analyze the character of Polish Defense Policy after integration into NATO and EU and the impact this policy has national interests. It will specifically focus on ongoing efforts to adjust defense policy and strategy to meet contemporary demands through political-military cooperation and dialogue with allies.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Poland, United States, European Union, National Security Policy, Defense Policy, NATO.			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 89	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**POLISH DEFENSE POLICY IN THE CONTEXT OF NATIONAL SECURITY
STRATEGY**

Piotr S. Bieniek
Captain, Polish Army
B.S., Polish Military Academy, 1997

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2006**

Author: Piotr Bieniek

Approved by: Donald Abenheim
Thesis Advisor

Mikhail Tsypkin
Second Reader

Douglas Porch
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

Since the turn of this century, stability in European continent, to a large degree, depends on political-military cooperation among European countries as well as the establishment of common goals in order to eliminate current threats and risks such as terrorism. As far as Poland is concerned, its priority is to be an active leader in improving common security policy within the boundaries of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Polish security policy and strategy is shaped by its geographical location which places Poland in NATO's main strategic area opposite the Russian Federation and Belarus. In other words, Poland sees itself as the eastern "edge" of NATO's area and as a "front-line" country. This motivates Poland to support NATO's further enlargement to the East because Warsaw understands that it is a primary key to stability in Europe and has a responsibility to support NATO activities in this region.

Thus, this thesis analyze the character of Polish Defense Policy after integration into NATO and EU and the impact this policy has national interests. It will specifically focus on ongoing efforts to adjust defense policy and strategy to meet contemporary demands through political-military cooperation and dialogue with allies.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.....	7
A.	CHANGING NATIONAL SECURITY CONCEPT AND DEFENSE AND MILITARY DOCTRINES	7
B.	NEW CHALLENGES	12
C.	GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS.....	16
D.	MAIN TASKS OF NATIONAL ARMED FORCES AND SECURITY SERVICES.....	18
E.	CONCLUSION	20
III.	DEFENSE POLICY.....	23
A.	THE ROLE OF DEFENSE POLICY AS A PART OF NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY.....	23
B.	DEFENSE AND STRATEGIC PLANNING, FUNCTIONS AND ROLES.....	25
C.	CONCLUSION	36
IV.	FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PROCESS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY: THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT, POLITICAL-MILITARY COOPERATION, AND ALLIANCES	39
A.	INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT AND REGIONAL COOPERATION.....	39
B.	EASTERN DIMENSION OF POLISH SECURITY POLICY	42
C.	NEW CONDITIONS OF A NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY: POLITICO-MILITARY COOPERATION, DIALOGUE, CONFIDENCE- BUILDING, AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT.....	51
D.	TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS AND THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE POLISH SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY	54
V.	CONCLUSION	65
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	69
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	77

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Professor Donald Abenheim, and Professor Mikhail Tsykin for their priceless help and assistance in completing this thesis.

I am also deeply grateful to my wife, Elzbieta. Her love, devotion and sacrifice inspired me throughout my studies at NPS. Her support and belief in me gave me strength and motivation during the writing this thesis.

Last, but surely not least, I want to thank my friend Lieutenant Colonel Christi Rose for help and encouragement in the moments of doubt.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the turn of the century, stability on the European continent has depended to a large degree on political-military cooperation among the European countries and their establishment of common goals to eliminate current threats and risks such as terrorism. As far as Poland is concerned, its priority is to be an active leader in improving the common security policies within the boundaries of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Poland's security policy and strategy is largely determined by its geographical location within NATO's main strategic area, opposite the Russian Federation and Belarus. In other words, Poland sees itself as the eastern "edge" of the NATO area and as a "front-line" country. This motivates Poland to support NATO's further enlargement to the East, because Warsaw understands that it is a primary key to stability in Europe and has a responsibility to support NATO activities in this region.¹

Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to analyze the character of the Polish Defense Policy since Poland's integration into NATO and the EU and the impact this policy has on its national interests. The thesis will focus specifically on Poland's ongoing efforts to adjust its defense policy and strategy to meet contemporary demands through political-military cooperation and a dialogue with its allies.

Today, after achieving the most important goal of its foreign and security policy, entering the EU on May 1, 2004, Poland has achieved satisfactory geopolitical stability and has an unprecedented chance to build national structures that will ensure development of the democratic state at all levels. Moreover, membership in NATO and the EU allow Poland to gain a stronger position on the European political stage and provide Poland with a sense of confidence in the face of unpredictable events or crises. Nevertheless, Polish policy makers must be politically aware that passivity and a lack of orientation would cause Poland to be pushed aside, into the background of European policy. It would be perceived as the object rather than the subject.² The proposal for

¹ Jeffrey Simon, "Central and East European Security: New National Concepts and Defense Doctrines," NDU: INSS *Strategic Forum* no. 151 (December 1998) <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF151/forum151.html> (25 Feb 2006).

² Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, "Polska w Zamecie Świata." *Gazeta Wyborcza*, (2004): 4.

Poland's policy should cover broad politico-military horizons, because the key to success is being active on defense, not just in Poland's national interest, but also with a disinterested involvement in problems that are important for the entire EU and transatlantic community.

It is a well known that, currently, the center of gravity is shifting toward so-called "asymmetric" threats and risks that, to a large degree, concern people and societies, not national structures. These changes prompted a need to redefine the nature of transatlantic relationships, because the new challenges create security environments that are different than those of the Cold War period. The United States—the guarantor of security in Europe during the post-war period—today wants to be a partner of Europe as a whole and cooperates in aid of the elimination of global threats.³ Europe, however, wishes to play a significant and independent role in the global security system, although it is beyond its capabilities, especially its military capabilities, which are still insufficient to conduct military operations on a huge scale without the support of the United States. The process of seeking their own identity in the global policy will shape the new formula of transatlantic relations.⁴

For Poland, as one of the biggest supporters of American policy in Europe during the last few years, this poses a very important challenge. Obviously, the problem is not simply the necessity to make a difficult choice or create a simple alternative with America or Europe. It requires Poland to build such a formula in transatlantic relations within the confines of the EU that would treat the United States as a participant in European security. The European continent still needs America, not only as a partner in solving its security problems, but also to stabilize the European system. That is why it would be a mistake for Poland to reject the idea of the inevitability of changes in the transatlantic formula. It could eliminate Poland from the process of seeking new solutions. However, it would also be a mistake to seek a formula beyond European solidarity.⁵

³ Michał Miąskiewicz, ed., *Stosunki Transatlantyckie Wobec Problemów Światowego Bezpieczeństwa* (Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, 2003).

⁴ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, "Polska w Zamecie Świata." *Gazeta Wyborcza* (2004): 5

⁵ Government information on Polish foreign policy in 2006 presented at the session of the Sejm on February 15, 2006, by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, Stefan Meller. <http://www.mfa.gov.pl/Government,information,on,Polish,foreign,policy,in,2006,4599.html> (8 May 2006).

The stability, peace, and security in Europe have been realized not only by the strengthening of transatlantic cooperation but also by close regional and multilateral collaboration among neighbors. Hence, Poland has pursued the initiation of processes of historical reconciliation that facilitate the destruction of the post-Yalta order and the creation of a new security environment in the region. But it will not be done without the active engagement of “old” Europe in the process of integrating “new” Europe into the system of western values and structures, because there will be no cohesive, effective, and loyal Europe. It especially concerns the EU policy toward the eastern European states and Russia, whose democracies and economies are still fragile and susceptible to any external or internal turbulence. In case of their failure, it may lead to serious security consequences on the whole continent.⁶

Today, in Poland, there is a huge debate on a suitable direction for a foreign, security, and defense policy that will not only maintain our strong Atlantic relations but also could facilitate building an appropriate position for Poland on the European stage, so Poland will have an influence on key decisions concerning both security and the economy. The other important issue for Polish policy is to develop, with the support of the EU and NATO, friendly and effective relations with Russia despite their troubling historical relations, which have involved wars, rebellions, repressions, and partitions. The creation of such a policy will not be an easy task because, to a large degree, its success depends on many factors and events both external internal, which are sometimes difficult to predict.⁷

To explain and illustrate Poland’s views on security and defense issues and to understand its strategic culture, this thesis will answer a few very important questions. First of all, how have sociopolitical changes conducted in Europe over the last fifteen years and Poland’s membership in NATO and the EU influenced the Polish national security and defense policy? What is Poland’s current position toward the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP), taking into consideration its 2004 accession into the EU and its recent active involvement in NATO’s operations in the Middle East which,

⁶ Bartłomiej Nowak and Rafał Rowiński, “Unia Europejska po Rozszerzeniu. Na Pierwszym Zakręcie,” *Raporty i Analizy*, no. 8 (2004): 11, <http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rapian0804.pdf> (3 May 2006).

⁷ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, “Polska w Zamecie Świata.” *Gazeta Wyborcza* (2004): 5

according to some analysts, succeeded only militarily, not politically? In other words, what motives speak for Poland's "instinctive" Atlanticism⁸ and simultaneous wish to broaden its influence on European security and defense policy? What is the importance of Polish strategy in the context of the success emerging from the European security architecture? What are the roles and functions of national institutions and structures in the area of security and defense? And how do its relationships with Russia and other ex-Soviet republics influence the Polish security policy? And, finally, what is the prospect for its success?

This thesis is organized as follows. The evolution and development of the Polish national security strategy is the subject of the second chapter. It discusses the security environment and the sociopolitical changes that shaped the security and defense policies of both "old" and "new" Europe. More specifically, it shows Poland's integration with the Alliance and the role of the transatlantic community in regard to Poland's security and defense policy. The chapter also describes the principles, priorities, and challenges of the national security and defense policy in the face of contemporary global threats and risks.

The third chapter focuses on the role of the Polish defense policy in the context of national security. It describes the process that created the national defense policy and its principles and goals, which are derivatives of many internal and external factors. Additionally, the chapter depicts the main functions and roles of the national institutions and authorities that are responsible for defense policy planning and describes how these institutions evolved into democratic civil-military structures.

The final chapter covers, among other things, the most important issues related to regional and subregional cooperation. It focuses particularly on the eastern dimension as the most important and sensitive part of the Polish security and defense policy. The chapter also draws attention, in this era of Middle East interest, to security issues pertaining to Russia and other independent post-Soviet countries that appear to have been

⁸ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century", Occasional Paper No. 56 (Dec 2004): 7, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

forgotten. The main element of this problem concerns relations between Poland and Russia, which have never been easy, because of their common dramatic historical background.⁹

Another issue in this chapter concerns bilateral Polish-American relationships, which undoubtedly have had the biggest impact on the Polish security and defense policy during the last seventeen years, because America became the security guarantor that the Poles had craved since the late eighteenth century.¹⁰ Additionally, chapter four examines Poland's vision, as a member of NATO and the European Union, of the future role of the EU and its security and defense policy. These are generally seen by the Polish political elite more as a stabilizing factor in Europe than a superpower or counterbalance to the United States.

⁹ Irina Kobrinskaya, *Love and Hate: Polish-Russian Relations Marred by Russian Unpredictability and EU and NATO Uncertainty* (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, January 2005) http://www.aei.org/research/nai/publications/pubID.21920,projectID.11/pub_detail.asp (11 May 2006).

¹⁰ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," Occasional Paper No. 56 (Dec 2004): 21, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

A. CHANGING NATIONAL SECURITY CONCEPT AND DEFENSE AND MILITARY DOCTRINES

Since the revolution of 1989–90, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Europe, especially central and eastern Europe, have been challenged by dramatic changes in the European security environment. The many crucial events of this period prompted many of the states to adopt new national security concepts and new military and defense doctrines. In 1990 Germany was reunified; in 1991, the Soviet forces withdrew from Czechoslovakia and Hungary; in mid-1991 the Warsaw Pact collapsed; in 1992, the former Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia disintegrated; and in 1993, Czechoslovakia was divided. At the November 1991 NATO summit in Rome, NATO replaced its 1967 “flexible response” strategy with a new Strategic Concept that better reflected the change in the security environment.¹¹ After the next two NATO summits, it became obvious that the center of gravity of European security was moving toward the East. During the Brussels Summit in January 1994, member states took the first step in responding to the new challenges. They agreed to enlarge NATO and implemented the Partnership for Peace Program (PfP). After the Madrid Summit, three of the eastern European states—the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland—received an invitation from NATO which initiated accession talks. The Alliance then also decided to prepare a new Strategic Concept, which was finally adopted in Washington in April 1999.¹²

It is also notable that, at the end of the 1980s, the Western European Union (WEU) had been reactivated and returned to European politics in hopes of an independent European security policy. The WEU became instrumental in strengthening the operational abilities of the European countries in actions supporting peace. Moreover, many politicians believed that reactivation of WEU would make it an organization whose role was not only political and economic, but also military.

¹¹ Jeffrey Simon, “Central and East European Security: New National Concepts and Defense Doctrines,” NDU: INSS *Strategic Forum*, no. 151 (December 1998), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF151/forum151.html> (25 Feb 2006).

¹² Ibid.

Thus, at the beginning of the 1990s, the western European countries began to express their readiness to take on more responsibility for European security. Creation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) after the Maastricht Treaty in 1991 gave birth to the second pillar of the European Union and initiated efforts to create a common European defense and security policy.¹³ Creating a common policy was not an easy job, however, because, within the Union, there were already several concepts concerning the tasks and goals of this policy. More important, there was no political consensus between the western Europeans about whether this policy should be created within the confines of NATO or beyond it. France strongly insisted on building an independent structure regardless of NATO and the United States. The British and the Americans, however, opted for a new rearrangement within NATO. They had a negative view of the French proposition, because military development of the WEU without cooperation with the alliance did not guarantee the creation of a reliable alternative for NATO and could be a danger to its strength. Eventually, the WEU was designated as the organization responsible for implementing the defense aspects of the European Union's decisions on a foreign and security policy. And at Petersburg, Germany, in 1992, the WEU members agreed that they would use WEU military forces for joint operations in humanitarian and rescue missions, peacekeeping, crisis management, and peace enforcement.¹⁴

In 1994, after the Brussels summit, NATO gave its support to the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI), believing that it could play an important role in the evolution of the European security system. During the meeting, NATO approved the idea of creating a Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) headquarters as part of NATO's integrated command structure. It was designed to give NATO's command structure additional flexibility to accomplish a variety of objectives, including facilitating the dual use of NATO forces and command structures both for the alliance and for operations run by the WEU. Its overall purpose was to encourage European nations to undertake

¹³ Nicole Gnesotto, ed., *EU Security and Defense Policy: The First Five Years (1999–2004)* (Paris: ISS, 2004), 40.

¹⁴ Stanley R. Sloan, *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 167.

missions with forces that were “separable but not separate” from NATO in the context of the emerging European Security and Defense Identity.¹⁵

In 1999, there was a highly significant summit in Washington on the practical dimension of NATO/WEU/EU cooperation in security and defense. In spite of promising and compromise decisions, members found it difficult to reach agreement, because there were differing opinions on the development of a security and defense policy. Generally, NATO defended the position of the new member countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, which had not a chance to participate in shaping a European security policy. France was NATO’s main opponent: it blocked the development of relations between NATO and the EU. Finally, at the end of the year, the NATO–EU negotiations came close to an agreement on how to work together in the future. During the December 14–15 meeting of the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the NATO allies noted that progress had been made by the four working groups. One of the areas discussed concerned agreement about the exchange of classified documents.¹⁶ A second agreement determined the rules of harmonization for planning defense processes. Next, the members negotiated the rules governing the EU’s constant access to NATO resources in independent EU operations. And, finally, they created clear rules of cooperation between the two organizations.

The eastern European countries continued to be challenged by the changes in the European security environment and by NATO’s actions to create their own national security concepts and defense and military doctrines. Doing so, they were told, would secure their future interests on the international stage and enhance their ability to develop and maintain effective crisis management institutions, thereby enhancing their governmental legitimacy.¹⁷ In the late ’90s, a new NATO Strategic Concept was developed that focused on crisis management and civil emergency planning. In addition, after its experience in the Balkans, NATO increased its role in peacekeeping and the potential need to operate out-of-area to reduce the threat of proliferation and terrorism.

¹⁵ Stanley R. Sloan, *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 168.

¹⁶ Ibid., 181.

¹⁷ Jeffrey Simon, “Central and East European Security: New National Concepts and Defense Doctrines.” NDU: INSS *Strategic Forum*, no. 151 (December 1998), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF151/forum151.html> (25 Feb. 2006).

The central and east European states, however, had also to take a deeper look at their security issues. They no longer perceived the major challenges as external, but rather as increasingly internal in nature.¹⁸ Mostly, they were afraid of threats connected with organized crime, illegal migration and smuggling, and government corruption. For Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, especially, given their early accession to the NATO pact, it was very important to adjust their national security concepts to fit western European standards.

As for Poland, it is one of the countries that benefited most from the collapse of the old regime. More than a decade ago, Poland changed dramatically the geopolitical parameters of its security.¹⁹ And Poland's participation in NATO initiated and facilitated its process of integration with not only the EU but also its security system. From the beginning, Poland's political aspirations and objectives were supported mostly by the U.S. government, which views Poland as an important element of regional security. It is particularly important that the United States provide reassurance, because Poland is located at the strategic boundary between eastern and western Europe, which gives it an opportunity to be a key player in the foreseeable future.²⁰

Although Poland has a strong sense of belonging to the European community, the Polish elites aspire to be included in the "inner circle" of America's closest allies and they openly support U.S. hegemony.²¹ Poland's attitude toward U.S. policy is largely a result of its historical experience, which, especially during WWII, was very painful. That is why, for Poland to "become America's protégé is an improvement both for its security and its status".²²

Also since the early 1990s, Poland's status has gradually increased, because, among other things, Poland has supported U.S. foreign policy. This was evident,

¹⁸ Jeffrey Simon, "Central and East European Security: New National Concepts and Defense Doctrines." NDU: INSS *Strategic Forum*, no. 151 (December 1998), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF151/forum151.html> (25 Feb. 2006).

¹⁹ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, *Poland's View on Global Security Issues* (Sydney: University of New Wales, 2003), http://www.polishembassy.ca/news_details.asp?nid=86 (5 March 2006).

²⁰ Stanisław Koziej, *Polityczno-Strategiczny Wymiar Bezpieczeństwa Europejskiego* (Warszawa, Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu i Administracji, 2004).

²¹ Marcin Zaborowski, *Between Power and Weaknesses: Poland – A New Actor in the Transatlantic Security* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2003), 7.

²² *Ibid.*, 5

especially, when Warsaw readily contributed troops in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995, in Kosovo in 1999, and, most recently, in Afghanistan and Iraq.²³ The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, showed that Poland has been and is one of America's closest European allies: Poland responded fully to the United States' policy in Iraq and has become a significant actor in transatlantic security. Poland's role as a regional power has also been strengthened, and it is now a major advocate for further NATO and EU eastward enlargement. For instance, Poland supports the pro-independence movements in Ukraine and Belarus. On all of these issues, the Polish strategy culture agrees with current American security thinking, which promotes proactive military engagement when there is a possible threat to regional stability.²⁴

Poland also highly values EU membership, which has been one of the most important objectives of its security policy since 1989. Poland's attitude toward the European Security and Defense Policy was incorporated for the first time into its National Security Strategy in 2000, which states that the ESDP and NATO constitute the second security pillar of the Polish state.²⁵ Although, of late, EU foreign and security issues have divided Europeans, Poland has declared its readiness to fully participate as an integral part in both the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Security and Defense Policy—as long as they do not threaten or endanger the cohesiveness of NATO.²⁶ Once more, Poland reminds all the European partners that the new European identity cannot be built on anti-Americanism because both the United States and Europe “share a common heritage and values.”²⁷ In any case, in December 2003 the European

²³ Marcin Zaborowski, *Between Power and Weaknesses: Poland – A New Actor in the Transatlantic Security* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2003), 3.

²⁴ Ibid, 6.

²⁵ Fundacja Polska W Europie, “Europejska Polityka Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony,” *Polska w Europie* 32, no 1 (2003): 69-88. <http://www.pwe.org.pl/pdf/3900.pdf> (5 March 2006).

²⁶ CFSP WATCH 2004 – Poland, by Dr. Rafal Trzaskowski and Olaf Osica, p.5, <http://www.fornet.info/CFSPannualreports2004/CFSP%20Watch%202004%20poland.pdf> (6 March 2006).

²⁷ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, *Future of the Common Foreign and Security Policy* (Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 2003).

Council approved the European Security Strategy (ESS), which confirms the United States's leading role in European security.²⁸

Warsaw stresses that cooperation between the EU states must be based on mutual a political solidarity that strengthens the integrity of the Union and effectively serves its security interests. Poland also strongly expresses the importance of supporting countries neighboring the EU by providing assistance in their pursuit of democratic and economic reforms and helping them achieve European standards and facilitate future integration into EU structures. All of the Polish National Security Strategies that emerged during the last fifteen years focused on threats that resulted from sociopolitical and economical changes in the newly independent states in southeast Europe and Russia. Hence, Poland is interested in the EU's preventive political role in places where potential conflicts may threaten Europe's security.²⁹

B. NEW CHALLENGES

Since 1989, after its first Parliamentary elections, Poland has pursued the creation of a security environment that is able to ensure its core principles and the goals of its national security policy. The fundamental security policy objectives are linked with Poland's "sovereignty and independence, border inviolability and territorial integrity."³⁰ Additionally, the state policy must "promote [the] security of the citizens, human rights and fundamental freedoms, democratic order, stable conditions for Poland's civilizational and economic progress, well-being of the people, protection of national heritage and national identity, implementation of allied commitments, [and] defense capability and interests of the Polish State."³¹ The security strategy in Poland was built mainly on the basis of alliances, both transatlantic and European, that could ensure the creation of an

²⁸ "The United States has played a critical role in European integration and European security, in particular through NATO. The end of the Cold War has left the United States in a dominant position as a military actor." European Security Strategy, p.1. <http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (March 6, 2006).

²⁹ CFSP WATCH 2004 – Poland, by Dr. Rafal Trzaskowski and Olaf Osica, 2, <http://www.fornet.info/CFSPannualreports2004/CFSP%20Watch%202004%20poland.pdf> (March 6, 2006).

³⁰ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), p.1, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

³¹ Ibid., 1.

appropriate security environment. Nevertheless, for Polish policy makers, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance is the primary organization that guarantees the fulfillment of the state's security objectives.³²

But the international situation has constantly changed. And numerous socio-political and economical changes have contributed to a rise in new threats and challenges that forced the allied countries to define their security requirements for the twenty-first century. The unprecedented terrorist attacks on September 11 marked a turning point in political thinking about national as well as international security. From the beginning, Poland realized that it should immediately take steps to face the new challenges by actively participating in diplomatic and military efforts and by joining the global antiterror campaign.³³ Those kinds of activities required making several significant changes in doctrinal documents as well as in the state institutions responsible for national security. One of the first steps was the government's decision to replace the "old" 2000 National Security Strategy which was still current as far as the state's principles and goals were concerned. It did not correspond, however, with the dynamic changes in the context of a new national security policy.

In February 2002, Poland's prime minister, Leszek Miller, decided to create a new national security strategy. Many different factors influenced the development of the new document. Two of the most important factors reflected in the new national doctrine were: decisions made during the NATO summit in Prague in November 2002 concerning the direction of alliance transformation and the EU summit in Copenhagen in December 2002 which considered further reforms and development of a European identity.³⁴ Moreover, the support and participation of Polish troops in Operation Enduring Freedom

³² Damian Karwala, "Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej," *Stosunki Międzynarodowe* (November 2004), <http://www.stosunki.pl/main428346040410,4,yisvp.htm> (March 15, 2006).

³³ Adam Rotfeld, *Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP w Nowych Warunkach Międzynarodowych: Nowe Wyzwania, Nowe Zadania*, lecture at the National Defense Academy (October 2003), http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/file_library/29/AON%20110_285.doc (March 25, 2006).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2

in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom allowed the Government to gain important experience and draw political conclusions that were applicable to the new security policy.³⁵

Since 2003, the “new” National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland³⁶ (NSSRP) has become its core document and the starting point for the creation of other sector strategies in fields that are fundamental to the state’s security and defense. An unfortunate exception is the 2000 Defense Strategy, which remains unchanged. Notably, despite differences in their strategic culture, the NSSRP and the ESS are similar in many ways. According to Aleksander Kwasniewski, former President of Poland, this means that the Polish view of security issues and international order are convergent with other important security institutions in Europe.³⁷ The similarities are visible from the very beginning, where both documents describe the new global challenges and define the key threats.

As far as the global challenges are concerned, the National Security Policy draws attention to the tensions and instability caused by “international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the unpredictable policies of authoritarian regimes and the phenomenon of ‘failed states,’ which largely exacerbate the risk of international terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).”³⁸ It also strongly emphasizes the role of globalization and fragmentalization processes that significantly influence national and international security.

In the Polish doctrine, the key threats are redefined from “classical risks (armed invasion) that decrease in importance, toward the unconventional risks that originate from

³⁵ Damian Karwala, “Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej,” *Stosunki Międzynarodowe* (November 2004), <http://www.stosunki.pl/main428346040410,4,yisvp.htm> (March 15, 2006).

³⁶ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland was approved on July 22, 2003, by the Cabinet and on September 8, 2003, by the President of the Republic of Poland. <http://www.msz.gov.pl/index.php?page=1131800000> (March 10, 2006).

³⁷ Aleksander Kwasniewski, Speech on the New National Security Strategy in the President’s Palace (September 2003), http://www.prezydent.pl/ser/index.php3?tem_ID=6209&kategoria= (December 10, 2005).

³⁸ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), p.2, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

barely identifiable nonstate entities.”³⁹ These risks could cause a state of danger for citizens, national services, and the state facilities essential to effective governance.

Unlike the European Security Strategy, Poland’s Security Policy identifies organized international terrorism (OIT) as a primary threat to global and national security, while stressing simultaneously that the level of threat is different for individual states than for the world overall. Although the ESS firmly states that terrorism “poses a growing strategic threat to all of Europe,”⁴⁰ the uncontrolled proliferation of WMD, “is potentially the greatest threat”⁴¹ for Europeans. The issue of proliferation is also identified by the NSSRP as an important risk for the state’s territory, but it gives way to terrorism even though there may be no danger of a direct terrorist attack in Poland. Having studied these issues, we believe that even international organized crime (IOC) is more of a danger to Poland’s security than a terrorist threat, because of the country’s transit location between the East and the West. Poland’s National Security Policy stresses that, to a large degree, it facilitates an increase of new criminal gangs on Polish territory and attracts other international criminal organizations that weaken the state and EU security.⁴²

Undoubtedly, the phenomenon of “failed states” and “rogue states” is a peculiar and particular catalyst for various new threats. Most of these states create risks both for world peace and for the security of their citizens. Their governments respect neither the principles of democracy nor human rights.⁴³ In addition, many of them are bothered by sociopolitical, ethnical, and religious conflicts, which add to their already weak condition. The NSSRP takes note of authoritarian regimes that, to “preserve and expand their hold on power, they are willing and ready to sacrifice peace and violate the

³⁹ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), p.2, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006), 2.

⁴⁰ European Security Strategy (December 2003), 2. <http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (March 6, 2006).

⁴¹ Ibid., 2

⁴² The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 2, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

⁴³ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, *Poland’s View on Global Security Issues* (Sydney: University of New Wales, 2003), http://www.polishembassy.ca/news_details.asp?nid=86 (March 5, 2006).

inalienable rights of their neighbors.”⁴⁴ Indeed, these states are outside the scope of international law and facilitate the creation of transnational terrorist organizations.

Part One of the NSSRP points at a number of significant factors which might destabilize the Polish state in the long run. There are economic, environmental, and population problems that must be solved to guarantee stability and the development of the national economy. One of the most important issues is Poland’s energy security which at present depends to a large degree on the Russian Federation. It is critical, therefore, that Poland to “diversify the supplies of energy carriers, particularly crude oil and natural gas.”⁴⁵

C. GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

According to the Poland’s National Security Policy, the current challenges and threats dictate a need for a holistic approach because “the line of distinction between the external and internal security aspects becomes blurred.”⁴⁶ This is why international cooperation, in particular, within NATO is very important to the preservation of the security environment and the balance of power. Poland supports the evolution of NATO toward new capabilities and missions that add to the vitality of the Alliance. And thus the NSSRP stresses that the evolution of NATO guarantees the extension of the area of democracy and stability in Europe and adjacent regions. Hence, the Polish security policy places great emphasis on active engagement “in the maintenance of international peace and security on both a regional and global scale.”⁴⁷ Therefore, Poland is present in the Balkans, in Afghanistan, and in Iraq, not to mention its UN peacekeeping missions in the Golan Heights and Lebanon, despite the fact that Poland has one of the lowest GDP per capita of the EU states.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, *Poland’s View on Global Security Issues* (Sydney: University of New Wales, 2003), http://www.polishembassy.ca/news_details.asp?nid=86 (March 5, 2006).

⁴⁵ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 3, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Olaf Osica, “A Secure Poland in a Better Union? The ESS as Seen from Warsaw’s Perspective,” *German Foreign Policy in Dialogue* 5, no. 14 (October 2004): 9–15, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/newsletter/issue14.pdf> (17 March 2006).

Unlike the ESS, the NSSRP devotes few paragraphs to Eastern policy issues. Poland wants to deepen cooperation between NATO and Russia in accordance with the Founding Act and the Declaration of Rome. Furthermore, Poland advocates Ukraine's Euro-Atlantic aspirations and opts for strengthening the role of the Partnership for Peace in safeguarding the security of South-Eastern Europe, Transcaucasia, and Central Asia.⁴⁹

Today, Poland's foreign policy and defense system are significant tools in its security strategy, because their goal is to promote a favorable international security environment for the country. Therefore, Poland also participates in security cooperation within the confines of the EU and its Common Foreign and Security Policy, the aims of which include the "effective deterrence of existing and potential threats, consolidation of the underlying values of the Union and an influence—through cooperation and crisis response instruments—on the shape of the international environment, particularly within the immediate neighborhood of the Union."⁵⁰ Poland is especially interested in the development of the EU's Eastern dimension and stresses the need for a common EU approach to Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova with simultaneous involvement in other EU areas of interest.

In comparison to the European Security and Defense Policy, the NSSRP emphasizes that Poland, as a member of NATO and the EU, will support the building of military and civil capabilities within the EU, as they too are part of NATO's European pillar and make use of NATO resources.⁵¹ Yet Poland is also against attempts to create mini-alliances within the Union that duplicate functions of the Alliance and disrupt its efficiency.

Another important issue in the NSSRP is the role of the United Nations (UN) and other international institutions that contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. In spite of the fact that the Iraqi crisis exposed the UN's weaknesses, Poland will continue to opt for maintaining UN responsibilities as defined in the UN Charter. Furthermore, the Polish Government wants to take part in a reformation of the UN by

⁴⁹ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 6, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

⁵⁰ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 6, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

⁵¹ Ibid.

providing both greater support in peacekeeping missions and trained personnel. In addition, Poland will develop standards that “will turn international law into an effective instrument to address the new international challenges, including in particular those that arise from international terrorism, the proliferation of WMD, the ‘failed states’ phenomenon, and states that support terrorism.”⁵² The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) are also important institutions that can help Poland safeguard its security and stability.

D. MAIN TASKS OF NATIONAL ARMED FORCES AND SECURITY SERVICES

According to Poland’s National Security Strategy, the assurance of citizens’ security and the protection of Poland’s national heritage and borders are, to a large degree, the responsibility of the national security institutions. The new threats generally originate in places that are far from Poland, but they those who threaten us may penetrate our borders and materialize on Polish territory.⁵³ So the effectiveness of the state’s internal security also depends on the harmonious collaboration of all its national institutions, authorities, and administrations, in accordance with the “powers and responsibilities assigned to them by the Polish Constitution and laws.”⁵⁴ The police, border guards, special services, counterintelligence, and other national institutions and agencies are responsible for a number of activities that can improve Poland’s internal security standards both locally and nationwide.⁵⁵

A large portion of the NSSRP also is devoted to the armed forces of the Republic of Poland, one of the most significant parts of its defense and security system. The primary task of the armed forces is to “assure Poland’s security and to offer allied

⁵² The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 6, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006), 7.

⁵³ Adam Rotfeld, “Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP w Nowych Warunkach Międzynarodowych: Nowe Wyzwania, Nowe Zadania,” lecture in the National Defense Academy (October 2003), http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/file_library/29/AON%20110_285.doc (March 10, 2006).

⁵⁴ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 4, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 25, 2006).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

assistance under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.”⁵⁶ Participation in national defense is realized by adequate preparation and use of the appropriate assets to secure the national interests and to counteract any threats during both wartime and peacetime. Simultaneously, the armed forces participate in the implementation of Poland’s allied commitments and ensure the collective defense on the continent according to international agreements and resolutions within the alliances of which Poland is a member.⁵⁷

The armed forces are also a component of the security assurance process, in the state’s close neighborhood and other parts of the European territory, through the development of military cooperation with other states creating collective security. They take part in consolidating the international security environment by participation in military stabilization missions, mainly within the confines of the United Nations, NATO, the EU, and OSCE, as well as ad hoc coalitions.⁵⁸

An important element of the new strategy is the opinion expressed about the gradual replacement of static forces with modern, mobile, and highly specialized units that are capable of cooperating with the civil structures and institutions in reaction to military and nonmilitary threats. These units have an obligation to prepare and maintain their military capabilities so they can take part in crisis-response and peacekeeping missions in or out of the area.⁵⁹ The Strategic Defense Reviews’ response to specific needs serve to define the state’s defense requirements and to adapt its armed forces to changing scenarios and new challenges.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 4, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 25, 2006), 9.

⁵⁷ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 4, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 25, 2006).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁵⁹ Adam Rotfeld, “Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP w Nowych Warunkach Międzynarodowych: Nowe Wyzwania, Nowe Zadania,” lecture at the National Defense Academy (October 2003), http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/file_library/29/AON%20110_285.doc (March 25, 2006).

⁶⁰ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland, (July 2003), 9, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

E. CONCLUSION

It is generally believed that even the best security doctrine would not be worth much without its effective realization. Thus, the NSSRP can set an example for others to follow, because few states realized, in the last three years, with such determination, the assumption that “passiveness is not a solution.” The active participation of Poland in the antiterrorist coalition engaged in military operations in Iraq, and its involvement in the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, have definitely changed the Polish view of security issues. Participation in these kinds of operations is a matter of collective security, both globally and regionally, and what follows as a consequence is the state’s security. Some opponents of this point of view claim that sharing in stabilization operations may be more dangerous for a state’s security and may generate more risk. But, paradoxically, by fighting the phenomena of state failure and organized crime and by preventing regional conflicts, the coalition is actually contributing to worldwide security.⁶¹

Although the NSSRP takes into consideration many significant new trends in the area of international security, several strategists and analysts have revealed a number of weak points. In February 2006, the new minister of national defense, Radek Sikorski, criticized the NSSRP, claiming that there needs to be a new national security strategy, one that is more focused on internal security issues. The present strategy concentrates primarily on external aspects of national security and fails to sufficiently define Polish national interests and strategic goals.⁶² According to some military specialists, mistakes were made in the very beginning when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, not the Ministry of National Defense, led the way in creating Poland’s strategy. Consequently, the document was written from a foreign affairs’ point of view and covers issues that are mostly directed to international security, omitting national needs and requirements. Military strategists, especially, point at the document’s lack of clear and logical goals for the armed forces. In addition, implementation of the NSSRP was not accompanied by the

⁶¹ Damian Karwala, “Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej,” *Stosunki Międzynarodowe* (November 2004), <http://www.stosunki.pl/main428346040410,4,yisvp.htm> (March 15, 2006).

⁶² Tadeusz Mitek, “Czas Nowej Strategii,” *Polska Zbrojna* 477, no.11 (March 2006), 12–13, http://www.zolnierz-polski.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=1921 (March 12, 2006).

creation of a new national defense strategy as a derivative and executive document. Therefore, it is very difficult to define new security priorities and goals.⁶³

The vice-minister of national defense, retired general Stanislaw Koziej, also thinks that a new national strategy should be created that addresses Polish national goals and interests; then, Poland should try to find consensus within the Alliance. It is exactly opposite to the way that previous Polish national doctrines were created: they were dominated by allied prospects relating to common threats.⁶⁴

No doubt, the discussion of a new national security strategy should be conducted in a public forum: it would be a unique opportunity to win societal support and understanding of security thinking. Obviously, it is not easy to create a document that will satisfy everybody and meet all demands. It could be accomplished, however, by appointing a special group of independent specialists from a variety of national departments and institutions. According to security specialists, the next national security strategy of the Republic of Poland will be ready to sign within the coming year (2007), and what follows, will facilitate efforts to work out other sector strategies responsible for the State's security to include the new National Defense Strategy.

⁶³ Antoni Podolski, *Polska Strategia Bezpieczeństwa jako Praktyczna Implementacja Europejskiej Strategii Bezpieczeństwa – między teoria a praktyka* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2005), 13.

⁶⁴ Tadeusz Mitek, "Czas Nowej Strategii," *Polska Zbrojna* 477, no.11, (March 2006), 12–13, http://www.zolnierz-polski.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=1921 (March 12, 2006).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. DEFENSE POLICY

A. THE ROLE OF DEFENSE POLICY AS A PART OF NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Over the last two decades, the definition of security changed from a typically military-centered meaning of the term to a broader definition that draws more attention to the kinds of threats that became dominant with the turn of the century. These threats have forced Poland, like many other nation-states, to create new tools to address the new challenges: international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the unpredictable policies of authoritarian regimes and the phenomenon of “failed states,” an increase in ethnic and religious hatred, and factors such as environmental and natural disasters and globalization, and their “side effects.” For centuries, a country’s defense establishment and armed forces comprised the primary tool to prevent and eliminate emerging threats. But now, countries’ defense systems must be much more complex and sophisticated and require the exploitation of their entire national potential. The collective national effort required to prevent and defend against such risks necessitates the involvement of all the national and international civil and military institutions and services. Success in this effort requires their cooperation, integration, compatibility, and interoperability as they develop adequate security concepts and policies and create and maintain an integrated command system and its executive structures.⁶⁵

The defense policy is a crucial element of national security, and one of the main roles of the national security strategy is to implement that policy. As part of the security policy, the defense policy covers a variety of activities—diplomatic, economic, military, and those pertaining to intelligence gathering—conducted by the state. Those activities serve various purposes: securing the inviolability of state borders, protecting state bodies and public institutions and ensuring their continuity, and protecting the citizenry and assuring their survival in times of conflict or crisis.⁶⁶ Thus, the main role of the defense policy is to identify and evaluate potential military threats and their effects. In addition, it

⁶⁵ Stanisław Koziej, “Sztuka Reakcji,” *Polska Zbrojna* 597, no.4, (March 2002), 3–4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/arttykul.html?id_arttykul=597 (March 25, 2006).

⁶⁶ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 4, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 25, 2006).

defines the concept and determines the optimal capability package of the state that is necessary to realize its strategic goals and the tasks that are required to prevent dangerous situations such as military conflict and crises.

During peacetime, the state uses the defense policy to coordinate the defense processes involved in assuring the readiness of the system overall for implementation during times of crisis or war. Defense policy tools and defense structures can also be used to neutralize nonmilitary security threats and risks as well. For example, participating in actions that help a civil society cope with catastrophes—search and rescue (SAR) missions, crisis management operations, peacekeeping and humanitarian aid projects, and international relations and cooperation promotion—also contributes to European integration processes.⁶⁷

The state's general strategic assumptions, goals, and the specification of potential threats and challenges are defined in and derived primarily from the national security strategy and other legal statutes. The national defense strategy is considered the primary document of defense policy. It directs the defense establishment, including the armed forces and the other national defense institutions and services, in areas such as planning, molding structures, and developing training plans for readiness in defending the state. In addition, the national defense strategy outlines defense contributions to other areas of national security.⁶⁸

The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (NDSRP) was implemented in May 2000, shortly after the 2000 National Security Strategy, and was a result of Poland's entering NATO in 1999. Although the security environment changed after the terrorist attacks in America on September 11, 2001, and the government enacted a new national security strategy in 2003, the NDSRP has remained the same. Although a new national defense strategy could be developed that would respond more effectively to this century's new challenges and threats, especially global terrorism, the original policy is still in use. And it continues to be the basis of Poland's defense assumptions and

⁶⁷ Margus Kolga, "Defense Policy Planning vs. Planning," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 32–40. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

concepts because it remains linked to NATO's strategy concepts and thus helps to determine its leading principles and to define NATO's primary strategic tasks.

B. DEFENSE AND STRATEGIC PLANNING, FUNCTIONS AND ROLES

In Poland, many significant factors, both internal and external, influence and contribute to the process of creating a national defense policy and strategy. First, the basis of the policy and its legal framework derive from several legal documents and statutes:

- The Constitution Act, which regulates the basic laws and relationships between executive power and the administrative bodies;
- The law designating a universal duty to defend the Republic of Poland, which regulates basic issues related to the rules and procedures of the functioning of the Polish national defense system during peacetime;
- The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland;
- The law pertaining to the Office of the Minister of National Defense, which defines the minister's role in managing the defense system, including the initiation and coordination of work on projects to find solutions in the area of national defense.⁶⁹

There are also some significant external legal documents that represent or affect Poland's position in today's security environment. The North Atlantic Treaty and NATO's Strategic Concept play a significant role. The treaty establishes guidelines for the development of detailed policies and military plans and provides defense planners with the main purpose, tasks, instructions, and strategic perspective in the context of the evolving security environment and the potential challenges and risks in today's world.⁷⁰

The state's collective expression of those legal acts and documents is the national defense policy, which, as part of the national security policy, is based on the following principles:

⁶⁹ Stanisław Koziej, "Defense and Strategy Planning," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanisław and Julietta Szymanowska, 25–31. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

⁷⁰ *NATO Handbook* (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001), 42.

- **National responsibility and the common defense system:** Poland's citizens and state structures are responsible together for the collective defense of the country and for providing the services necessary to create a common defense system in times of crisis or conflict;
- **Solidarity and integration with allies:** Poland stands ready to be an active member of the NATO Alliance, stressing the importance of maintaining transatlantic relations, solidarity, and cohesion in realizing common strategies and policies;
- **Cooperation and partnership:** Poland's integration into the European Union includes full cooperation with its security and defense policies and the development of a military partnership with various armed forces interested in the consolidation of security and stability both in the region and on the Continent as a whole;
- **Building of mutual regional trust and military stability:** Poland's regional commitments will determine the potential size of the Polish military, as Poland continues to build a mutuality of trust and to facilitate the preservation of a balance of power in the region;
- **Reliability and deterrence:** Simultaneous with the building of mutual regional trust and stability, Poland pursues and maintains the appropriate military strength to assure an indispensable strategic deterrence to potential enemies and guarantees its defense credibility within the NATO framework. Because, for Poland, one of the most important elements of deterrence is the Alliance's military potential, particularly its nuclear weapon capability;
- **Flexibility of defense response:** Poland joins NATO in assuring a defense system with the ability to conduct all kinds of operations and maintain continuity in all possible situations, as well as the flexible to move from peace functions to crisis and conflict operations;
- **Civil–military cooperation:** This plays a significant role in the defense system overall, based on cooperation between the civil and military

institutions, as well as other internal or external nongovernmental organizations and civilian populations during peace, crisis, and war;

- **Balancing the country's defense needs with available resources:** A basic principle that facilitates an optimal characterization of the defense needs and abilities of the state. Poland's national defense needs are determined in keeping with the state's geostrategic location and the prognostic development of its international situation and its roles and responsibilities resulting from NATO membership.⁷¹

Give the great significance of those principles, in Poland's defense policy, the concept of a *national* defense system plays an important role among all the other defense concepts. Its national defense system is the whole of the forces and means, both military and nonmilitary, that the state provides in order to execute the requisite defense tasks. Poland's national defense system consists of three basic elements: a control defense subsystem, the national defense authorities; and two executive subsystems, one military, the Polish Armed Forces, and one consisting of nonmilitary elements.⁷²

The control defense subsystem is responsible for assuring the realization of state decisions in the area of national defense at all levels, ministerial as well as field-level, during all states of alert, peace, crisis, and war. The president of the Republic of Poland and the Council of Ministers, the Cabinet, as organs of the executive authorities, are the main bodies responsible for the management and execution of tasks in accordance with the Polish Constitution and other legal documents and statutes. According to the Constitution, the president "shall ensure observance of the Constitution, safeguard the sovereignty and security of the State, as well as, the inviolability and integrity of its territory." The president is the supreme commander of the armed forces, appoints the chief of the general staff and commanders of the branches of the armed forces,⁷³ and, during wartime, and designates the commander in chief of the armed forces. The National Security Council is the advisory organ to the president in regard to the internal and

⁷¹ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland, (May 2000), 11–15.

⁷² Stanisław Koziej, "Defense and Strategy Planning, in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanisław and Julietta Szymanowska, 25–31. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

⁷³ Article 126 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/prawo/konst/angielski/kon1.htm> (April 21, 2006).

external security of the state. Currently, the security council consists of a prime minister and the ministers of national defense and foreign affairs. In addition, there is a minister of the interior and administration and of the Sejm and the Senate and, finally, a head of the Law and Justice Party.⁷⁴

The Council of Ministers and the Government Administration is responsible for defense management during peacetime and cooperates with the president in the areas of domestic and foreign policy.⁷⁵ The Committee for Defense Issues, part of the Council of Ministers, is an internal organ that supervises and coordinates the implementation of government tasks and state administration agencies responsible for the internal and external security of the state. If necessary, the realization of individual tasks resulting from either national needs or those executed within the framework of NATO or other international organizations could be done by the implementation of additional procedures and temporary operational structures.⁷⁶

In the area of national defense, the minister is a key element in the defense administration, managing all the activities of the Polish armed forces during peacetime. He also initiates the creation of the state's basic defense assumptions and is responsible for coordinating and supervising the implementation of task realizations by the civil administration, local governments, institutions, economic agencies, and other organizations.⁷⁷ The general staff, however, is the body that typically deals with the strategic planning of the armed forces.

In accordance with the NSSRP, the Armed Forces comprise the most crucial element of Poland's national defense system. Their role is to protect the state's borders and safeguard Poland's national interests. Their primary tasks are included in both the NSSRP and specified in the Politico-Strategic Defense Directive (PSDD) as well as in other national and allied operational plans.

Poland's National Defense Strategy emphasizes the concept of using the military forces in accordance with the differing levels of risk and types of strategic operations.

⁷⁴ Article 135 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/prawo/konst/angielski/kon1.htm> (April 21, 2006).

⁷⁵ Article 146 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/prawo/konst/angielski/kon1.htm> (April 21, 2006).

⁷⁶ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 26.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 25

This concept evolved as a result of Poland's participation in a variety of military and nonmilitary operations both within and outside Poland's national borders, a necessity of its burden-sharing responsibilities within the Alliance. The main idea is that the Polish armed forces must be prepared at all times to execute three types of operations: prevention and stabilization, crisis management, and warfare.⁷⁸

Prevention and Stabilization. These operations occur during peacetime and rely on continuous foresight and the monitoring of external politico-military threats and risks. Their purpose is to prevent such threats from developing into crises or military conflicts by intervention and the use of immediate neutralization and stabilization strategies. Prevention and stabilization operations strengthen the international security environment through cooperative military programs such as the Partnership for Peace. The PfP program promotes democratic values and enhances the stability and security of non-NATO countries by primarily peacekeeping, humanitarian, and SAR operations.⁷⁹

Crisis Management. The purpose of these operations is to rapidly overcome and control crisis situations that may endanger the state or international community's interests and to minimize possible results and restore precrisis order, especially within Polish and allied territories. According to the Alliance's Strategic Concept, Poland must also maintain appropriate interoperative military capabilities to manage crises; this is essential for the preservation and strengthening of Polish and Euro-Atlantic security.⁸⁰

Warfare. According to the Constitution, Poland may conduct war operations only in the case of direct enemy aggression on Poland or its allies. Such aggression could mean be large-scale war that forces the state to employ all its defense forces for a long time, or it could be a local military conflict that engages only limited state resources and capabilities for a short time. Regardless of the scale, for Poland as a NATO member, any war would be a coalition effort because of the Alliance's concept of collective defense of all its members. Hence, Poland bears in mind the possibility of waging war on its own territory or taking an active part in a military action directed by an ally.⁸¹ In addition, the

⁷⁸ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 15.

⁷⁹ *NATO Handbook* (Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press, 2001), 67.

⁸⁰ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 17.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

Polish armed forces must be ready to execute a variety of other nonmilitary tasks such as relief operations and aid actions taken during and after natural disasters.

Today, Poland's armed forces comprise land forces, air force, navy, and Special Forces. The land, air, and navy forces all include operational units that are trained to execute their tasks both jointly within a multinational structure and as domestic territorial units. To ensure their appropriate effectiveness, the Polish armed forces focus on the achieving and maintaining the following operational abilities: combat and mobilization readiness, intelligence and reconnaissance effectiveness, command efficiency, mobility and respond flexibility, lethal effectiveness, and survivability.⁸²

Another very important part of the Polish defense system consists of its non-military defense elements which are responsible, in general, for the protection of citizens and national structures in the event of a crisis or military conflict. They are prepared to provide material, informational, and spiritual assistance to the population in the event of an external threat. The nonmilitary groups are also tasked to provide material and human reinforcement the armed forces and nonmilitary support of Poland's allies operating on Polish territory. In all these situations, they provide three elements: information, protection/security, and economic aid.⁸³

Information. For a defense system is function effectively, it must have various kinds of accurate and current information that is pertinent to the protection and propagation of Polish national interests in the international arena. It must be informed about the weaknesses of potential enemies. In a conflict situation, the defense administration must keep the public appropriately informed so as to maintain the national will, morale, and determination and the population's persistent cooperation in the war effort. Now, on the threshold of the twenty-first century, the tasks involved in obtaining, sustaining, and using information have intensified and are increasingly sensitive issues. Thus, a proper exploitation of media is vitally important both to Polish society during peace and war and to our potential enemies.

Protection. In addition to their information-related activities, the nonmilitary agencies are tasked with the assurance of secure functions of national structures as well

⁸² The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 33.

⁸³ Ibid., 36.

as the protection of citizens and Poland's national heritage against military and nonmilitary threats. This includes protection of national borders, important persons (VIPs), and governmental buildings, and the maintenance of public order during military conflicts. In regard to nonmilitary threats, within its defense system and complex planning, Poland maintains an adequate population security system and civil crisis management systems based dispersed structures of the public administration and other nonmilitary services and formations.⁸⁴

Economic aid. In the economic arena, the nonmilitary agencies ensure the material and financial basis of defense realization tasks and facilitate civilian survival during times of crisis or war. They are also responsible for creating and maintaining the state's defense reserves. Moreover, they must maintain the national defense infrastructure and continuously conduct developmental research to improve national defense. They take part in the execution of tasks that support allied forces operating on Polish territory and participate in the accomplishment of ally defense investments in Poland and NATO member countries. One of the most important elements of the nonmilitary agencies' economic-defense efforts is the defense industry, which must be constantly restructured and modernized in close cooperation with military industries in the EU and NATO.⁸⁵

To ensure the readiness of all aspects of the Polish defense system and to prepare the Polish people to live and survive in emergency situations, Poland systematically runs defense preparation programs. Generally speaking, defense preparations consist of defense planning and programming and the maintenance and development of the defense system. They are coordinated by the minister of national defense, who must also take into consideration the tasks and duties inherent in Poland's Alliance commitments and requirements. In the process of the state's defense preparations, it is important to define the strategic goals, establish exact defense tasks, and determine means and forces appropriate to Poland's to national and allied needs.⁸⁶ Those goals, tasks, and duties are determined as part of the state's strategic operational planning and defense programming.

⁸⁴ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 37.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 38.

⁸⁶ Stanislaw Koziej, "Sztuka Reakcji", *Polska Zbrojna* 597, no.4, (March, 2002), 3 - 4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=597 (March 25, 2006).

The defense system's strategic goals are defined in keeping with several internal and external factors. First, they must relate to the national interests stated in the 1997 Constitution. Second, they must preserve Poland's fundamental values: independence, freedom, human rights, security of its citizens, and safeguard of its national heritage.⁸⁷ These are the basic rights of Polish society, and the state's and government's foremost responsibility is to create a security environment that ensures the fulfillment of Poland's most valued national interests.

Other factors that influence the determination of the defense system's strategic goals are the external security environment and related circumstances. Nowadays, that environment is quite stable, and Poland's involvement in various alliances gives Poland a great opportunity to strengthen its own security. Poland's membership in NATO, its integration into the EU, and its bilateral relations with the United States allow Poland to think about its security in new and different ways than during the last three hundred years. During that lengthy period, Polish territory was continuously occupied, except for thirty brief years, by enemy forces, and it had no participation in alliances to ensure the stability and security of the state. So, it is particularly important for all of Poland's security institutions to be involved in creating a proper security environment and to actively participate in collective defense. Poland shares with its allies the responsibility to contribute military forces to various kinds of missions in the vicinity as well as in remote places in the world.

Undoubtedly, Poland's historical experience and geopolitical location challenge its defense policy. The goal in the region is twofold. First, there is a regional effort to take part in an ongoing process of democratization and integration of newly independent states such as Ukraine and Moldova. A second goal is to support pro-independence movements in Belarus and promote NATO's and the EU's enlargement beyond Poland's eastern borders.⁸⁸ In this context, it is crucial for Poland to normalize its political relations with Russia and then act as the more significant partner in the process of shaping relations between NATO and Russia. Other aspects shaping Poland's strategic goals are the

⁸⁷ Article 5 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/prawo/konst/angielski/kon1.htm> (April 21, 2006).

⁸⁸ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European: Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," Occasional Paper No.56 (Dec 2004): 9, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (April 24, 2006).

contemporary threats and risks mentioned above that require a holistic approach to the problem of security. In the end, only cooperation, integration, and the propagation of democracy can preserve the balance of power in the Euro-Atlantic security environment.⁸⁹

In Poland, defense planning and programming are the responsibility of all the public administration bodies combined with the military commanders and their staffs. The Polish defense planning cycle is precisely determined by chronological planning phases integrated with NATO's collective defense planning system. There are three main phases of defense planning. In the first phase the main goals of defense planning are defined, the second determines the target levels in individual areas, and the third phase focuses on plans preparation.⁹⁰ This approach facilitates the definition of common goals and the determination of appropriate means and forces needed for the realization of strategic tasks.

At the end of every even-numbered year, the Defense Planning Committee releases the NATO Ministerial Guidance which starts the first phase of defense planning and programming. In general, the Ministerial Guidance determines common goals, which are normally achieved by states' armed forces during a six-year period of planning. After approval of the NATO Guidance, the Council of Ministers' releases its Guideline for Defense Planning and Programming as a directive starting point for Poland's planning process. This facilitates the creation of a Polish defense system and indicates its basic goals, tasks, and requirements for the long term.⁹¹ The document is prepared in keeping with national and Alliance priorities, military requirements, technical abilities, resource availability, and political considerations.

The next phase of Poland's defense planning and programming includes negotiations, discussions, and mutually consultations to harmonize national and Alliance planning. The most crucial action during this phase is setting target levels for the individual spheres of defense planning and programming. This includes a special focus

⁸⁹ Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Mysli o Obronnosci Polski," *Polska Zbrojna* 754, no.4 (March, 2004), 3 –4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=754 (March 25, 2006).

⁹⁰ Wladyslaw Staron, "Struktura NATO: A System Planowania Obronnego," *Biuletyn Departamentu Integracji z NATO BBN* 10, no.1(Jan 1999): 26-31, http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_nato_struktura (April 24, 2006).

⁹¹ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 40.

on the armed forces and nonmilitary defense as well as a determination of the rules required to ensure economic and financial support for realizing set goals.⁹² During this phase also a strategic document, the Politico-Strategic Defense Directive (PSDD), is produced and successively actualized up to the highest level of the state administration.

First, the Defensive Directive presents a defense planning and programming assessment as well as financial plans for the next five years. Second, it determines the way the entire Polish defense system will react and function in the event of a crisis or war. Third, it gives directions for armed forces development and the target levels in individual areas of defense planning and programming. The Defense Directive is also the basis for the preparation of action plans for individual defense system elements.⁹³

During the third phase of the Polish defense planning cycle—plans preparation—there is an Annual Defense Review Cycle that evaluates Poland's development plans and the financing of its armed forces. The Defense Review begins in March and is sent along with the Defense Planning Questionnaire (DPQ) which provides information on the level of task realization of accepted goals of the armed forces. It also presents the development plans of the Polish Army and financial plans for the next five years. The questionnaire is carefully analysed by NATO institutions is the subject of additional negotiations and arrangements with other NATO members. Finally, the Defense Review Committee releases the General Report, and, after the ministers of defense acknowledgment, the General Report along with its supplementary documents comprises NATO's Five-Year Plan.⁹⁴ With the report's acceptance, Poland's defense documents and plans are actualized and the defense planning and programming process is finalized.

However, even the best national defense system needs continuous maintenance and development. Therefore, a current full realization of Poland's defense plans and programs includes the following: maintenance of the armed forces and actualization of their defense-economy tasks, including defense industry functions; maintenance of

⁹² Stanisław Koziej, "Defense and Strategy Planning," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanisław and Julietta Szymanowska, 25–31. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

⁹³ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 40.

⁹⁴ Władysław Staron, "Struktura NATO: A System Planowania Obronnego," *Biuletyn Departamentu Integracji z NATO* BBN 10, no.1 (Jan 1999): 26–31, http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_nato_struktura (April 24, 2006).

strategic stocks and a mobilization potential within the limits of the national economy; maintenance and development of defense infrastructure and defense and military training.⁹⁵

Thus, in the area of maintenance of the defense management system, Poland is focused on the assurance of the essential military skills and knowledge of management and administrative personnel, military staffs, and commanders in accordance with the changing needs and conditions of defense task realization. Moreover, the efficiency of the defense management system is developed by implementing different system solutions that ensure interoperability with allied institutions, effective civil-military cooperation in both a national and ally dimension as well as command continuity in times of peace, crisis, and war.⁹⁶

As far as the maintenance and development of nonmilitary elements are concerned, attention is focused on characterizing the legal and organizational basis that assures the efficient execution of defense tasks by nonmilitary agencies. In addition, it is important to assure effective civil-military cooperation, including support of both Poland's forces and allied forces, within the tasks of a host state. One way to maintain these elements is by the optimal exploitation of protective, economic, and information potential to accomplish defense tasks and the adjustment to war of the defense industry.⁹⁷

Another significant area of defense system development is training. In a nutshell, the goal of training overall is to prepare all the management structures, military forces, nonmilitary defense elements, and the entire society to contribute effectively to the realization of defense tasks and self-defense under crisis and war conditions. Organizing serial war games and strategic, operational, and tactical exercises on all levels of the civil and military structures will facilitate revision and verification of adopted strategic-operational concepts and organizational-functional solutions in the area of national defense.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ The National Defense Strategy of the Republic of Poland (May 2000), 40.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 42.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 43.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 44.

C. CONCLUSION

After the collapse of communism in 1989, the reform of Poland's national defense system and the restructuring of its armed forces was one of its most important challenges. It was crucial to determining Poland's readiness to become a part of the new world, whose security values at the time were very different. The process of democratizing the state's administration and infrastructures began after the Round Table agreement between the Communist government and the banned trade union Solidarność and other opposition groups in Warsaw on April 8, 1989; it included, among other things, the establishment of a legal framework of civilian control over the armed forces.⁹⁹

During the first part of the 1990s, the establishment of a strong democratic basis for the defense sector proceeded very slowly. This was partly because, until October 17, 1992, when the "Little Constitution" was implemented, the legal framework was based on the Polish Constitution of 1952. Even the creation of a contemporary constitution did not resolve all the problems. It did not give sufficient power to the minister of national defense and created conflicts between the ministry of defense (MoD) and the chief of the general staff. The so-called Drawsko Dinner in 1994 showed the weaknesses inherent in civilian control over the military, as the highest ranking generals issued a vote of no confidence for the defense minister. This vote was done with the cooperation and support of the president of Poland, Lech Walesa, who was against some of the new military reforms proposed by the new prime minister, Waldemar Pawlak, concerning the principles of subordination of the general staff to the defense minister.¹⁰⁰

Fortunately, during the second part of the '90s, the process of transformation sped up and a political consensus for joining NATO was established. New defense reforms, the 1997 Polish Constitution, and activities such as participation in various peacekeeping, stabilization, and humanitarian missions within the Partners for Peace program facilitated

⁹⁹ Central European Review. "NATO w polityce bezpieczeństwa w Polsce. Reforma Systemu Obronnego RP, Restrukturyzacja Sił Zbrojnych," <http://www.medianet.pl/~ceurorev/numer22/nato4.htm> (April 24, 2006).

¹⁰⁰ Jeffrey Simon, *NATO Enlargement and Central Europe: A Study in Civil-Military Relations*. Washington D.C.: NDU Press, 1996, 82.

Poland's integration into a new common European security system which changed forever the balance of power on the Continent.¹⁰¹

Nowadays, Poland, as a part of the democratic world, along with its allies and partners, pursues the improvement of the world's security environment by its active participation in undertakings that could, directly or indirectly, contribute to its own security as well. Although Poland's defense policy has a regional (European) and subregional (eastern European) range, Poland readily contributes its military forces to other regions in the world while remembering that its strategic culture is rooted in Polish geopolitical history. This attitude toward a holistic approach to global security is the only solution in the fight against such phenomena as international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and other equally dangerous activities that could destroy the existing security order.¹⁰²

For ages, the security environment around the globe has been constantly changing. Recently, however, it has entered a phase of turbulence, changeability, and unpredictability and a period of sudden innovations and quick and radical changes. It is a very dangerous, unpredictable time, in which it is often difficult to predict even the near future. The events of 9/11 indicate that tomorrow's security environment could be drastically different than today's and the notion of security itself could suddenly undergo radical changes. All countries must build national institutions and structures that have the appropriate resources to survive and to function and cooperate effectively with other international security institutions in the face of threats in order to protect their citizens.¹⁰³

In Poland, there are many authorities and national institutions involved in the process of creating the national defense policy. While the Ministry of Defense, because of its resources, has the leading role, today's reality forces the state to create one

¹⁰¹ Maria Andrzej Falinski, "Interoperacyjność: Klucz do NATO," *Biuletyn Departamentu Integracji z NATO BBN 11*, no.2 (January 1999), 33–41, http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_nato_interop (April 25, 2006).

¹⁰² Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," *Occasional Paper No.56* (December 2004), 9, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (April 24, 2006).

¹⁰³ Krzysztof Oblój, *Zarządzanie strategiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1987, 80.

integrated civil-military security system at the highest level of the administration.¹⁰⁴ But, in spite of the fact that Poland has recently made enormous progress and has become a more important and reliable partner on the European stage, it still has plenty to do in the areas of both internal and external security and defense. Hence, as many of Poland's experiences in the last several years have proved, the best way to achieve that goal is through politico-military international cooperation, partnership, and dialogue. And these must occur not only within a NATO or EU framework but also with other subregional and regional collaboration as well.

¹⁰⁴ Stanisław Koziej, "Sztuka Reakcji," *Polska Zbrojna* 597, no.4 (March 2002), 3–4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=597 (March 25, 2006).

IV. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PROCESS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY: THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT, POLITICAL-MILITARY COOPERATION, AND ALLIANCES

A. INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT AND REGIONAL COOPERATION

Since the dawn of history, sovereign states' existence has depended on maintaining good relations and alliances with other states in the region. Alliances were created to strengthen a state's international position, to maintain the balance of power, and for religious, political, and economic reasons. But whatever the reason, they have always been supported and strengthened by military cooperation between the states that created collective security and defense. This process has gone on at least since the Renaissance and it continues to constitute a guaranty of improvement of national security.

Due to its geopolitical position between Germany and Russia (formerly the Soviet Union), Poland repeatedly throughout history has strived to accomplish various alliances that would secure its national interests. Unfortunately, most of those alliances proved unreliable, and, therefore, the last three hundred years was marked by inherent insecurity and vulnerability to external aggression.¹⁰⁵

The recent history of the Third Republic shows that Poland has tried to improve its security environment and to pursue its national interests, in an effort to become an important international player on the European continent. From the beginning of the 1990s, Poland's strategic goals were directed toward achieving Western democratic values and developing its security system. Hence, the main purpose driving its national foreign and security policy was to attain membership in NATO and the EU. The most obvious way to achieve this was to join in an international regional collaboration that included states from the Euro-Atlantic community, neighboring countries, and

¹⁰⁵ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," *Occasional Paper No.56* (Dec 2004): 7, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

international organizations.¹⁰⁶ Poland made an effort to strengthen the influence of its policies by promoting them on both a north-south and a west-east axis.

Earlier experiences resulting from participation in international security organizations such as the UN, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and, later, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, undoubtedly prompted Poland to change its political thinking in the area of security and defense.¹⁰⁷ In addition, Poland was actively engaged in bilateral and multilateral cooperation within the regional framework, which became a very important part of its foreign and security policy. First, it facilitated creation of new methods for overcoming the Cold War division of Central Eastern Europe and provided an effective foundation for new security architecture and cooperation in the region.

The formation of the “Weimar Triangle” in August 1991 by France, Germany, and Poland was the expression of the historical reconciliation between nations. It also served as an instrument designed to help Poland endorse the European policy trend and to support its integration into Euro-Atlantic structures.¹⁰⁸ Another form of regional cooperation, the “Visegrad Group,” was also created in 1991, by Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. The main idea of this undertaking was the realization of common Euro-Atlantic aspirations, owing to the convergence of their national interests, historical and cultural similarities, and geographical closeness.¹⁰⁹ Along with these projects, there were many other examples of regional and subregional cooperation—the Council of the Baltic States, Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA), and the Central

¹⁰⁶ Jozef Tymanowski, “Rosja-Białorus-Ukraina w Polskiej Polityce Bezpieczeństwa,” *Zeszyty Naukowe AON* 51, no. 2 (February 2003), http://www.aon.edu.pl/zn2003/tymanowski_2.htm (10 May 2006).

¹⁰⁷ Roman Kuzniar, „Polityka Zagraniczna Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej,” *Stosunki Międzynarodowe*, (May 2000): 501.

¹⁰⁸ Regional Triangle of Weimar Website, “History of Weimar Triangle,” <http://www.trireg.net/artukul.php?idart=1084463191&idtematu=1084245839> (10 May 2006).

¹⁰⁹ Declaration of the Republic of Poland, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, and the Republic of Hungary on Cooperation in Pursuit of European Integration. Zbiór Dokumentów – Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski i Stosunków Międzynarodowych. Visegrad, February 15, 1991. Also Statement by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the “Triangle States” Concerning Cooperation with the NATO. Zbiór Dokumentów – Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski i Stosunków Międzynarodowych. Cracow, October 5, 1991.

European Initiative—which, in addition to unity and cohesion, also promoted democratic values, freedom and respect for human rights, and the rule of law in Central and Eastern Europe.

As a result of this cooperations, Poland gained valuable experience in various areas and at different levels of its national structures. Although Poland continues its collaboration with all those partners, its geopolitical situation has changed since 1999 when it became a part of the transatlantic community. Finally, Poland's efforts of many years were crowned with success. Poland's satisfaction at becoming a member of NATO was expressed by then President Aleksander Kwasniewski, in a speech he gave during the gala event in Washington marking the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Alliance:

To us Poles, the very existence of NATO had always been a beacon of hope in a pre-1989 divided Europe that freedom and democracy could survive. That the iron curtain would not be there forever. That as soon as Poland recovered its full sovereignty and self-determination it would be in a position to create, together with the whole Euro-Atlantic community, a better future for itself and the entire European continent. Today, sixty years since the outbreak of World War II, since the bombing of Warsaw and Gdańsk, since the days of hate and contempt, since the Holocaust, our dreams, and the dreams of our fathers and grandfathers have come true.... Our satisfaction with this fact is further enhanced by our awareness that it closes the door on an almost three-hundred-year run of misfortunes in Polish history. Freedom was the cause for which the best sons of our land have fought, died in executions, or been deported, generation after generation.... The North Atlantic Alliance has over the past fifty years proved its worth as a reliable and effective organization. Its political and military umbrella has protected its member countries, safeguarded for them conditions for normal development, and strengthened their cooperation and solidarity. All of us, living on both sides of the Atlantic, need the continued presence of the Alliance today, after the global collapse of the bi-polar political set-up following the disintegration of communism, and in the wake of the conclusion of the cold war. Both NATO and the American presence in Europe help stabilize the situation in the Euro-Atlantic area and lay the foundation for its democratic development. The organization's enlargement to include Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary has expanded the zone of security in Europe. The Poles hope for its further expansion. Also other European

countries—friends and partners of Poland—must become the beneficiaries of the guarantees of security, stability, and development: The door to NATO must remain open.¹¹⁰

From then on, Poland began to realize its efforts to broaden its foreign and security policy toward the east, acting as a “bridge to the new democracies of Europe, and a champion of the interests and security of [its] neighbors, such as the Baltic States, Ukraine and Slovakia.”¹¹¹ This became one of Poland’s most important strategic challenges, because further enlargement toward the east would create a security buffer against the threats and risks resulting from Poland’s politico-geographical location.

B. EASTERN DIMENSION OF POLISH SECURITY POLICY

Poland’s interest in the politico-geographic space between the current border of the EU and Russia is a characteristic of its defense and security policy. Polish policy makers pursue and establish new relations with close neighbors that would assist in continuing the EU process of integration and enlargement to the East. Poland realizes that desisting from that process would cause a lasting peripherization of Eastern Europe and backwardness in the region. As a consequence, Poland, has for many years remained the front state with all the complexes of a “bulwark.”¹¹²

Because of their common historical background, Poland’s relations with its eastern neighbors have never been easy, and it has sometimes been extremely difficult to find a compromise. Currently, of its eastern neighbors, Russia is the most significant in terms of Polish security. In Polish–Russian relations today, the political atmosphere does not correspond to the current level of their economic, humanitarian, and cultural cooperation. Although between 2000 and 2004, Presidents Putin and Aleksander Kwasniewski met ten times in both official and working visits and the intensity of their contacts on the parliamentary, ministerial, and social levels increased, political relations

¹¹⁰ Speech by the President of Poland, Aleksander Kwasniewski, *Zbiór Dokumentów, Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski I Stosunków Międzynarodowych*, no. 2, (April 1999), <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1999/1-2/15.html> (11 May 2006).

¹¹¹ Address of the President George W. Bush to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University “*No More Munichs. No More Yaltas—Lift Up Your Hearts.*” Embassy of the United States in Warsaw, Poland, (June 2001).

¹¹² Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, “Polska w Zamecie Świata.” *Gazeta Wyborcza* (2004): 4.

between Russia and Poland are the worst they have been since the collapse of the Soviet bloc in 1989. According to political analysts, the immediate cause of tension is the lead role that Poland played in late 2005 in the Ukrainian conflict. President Kwasniewski clearly sided against the Russian-supported presidential candidate and supported the leader of the so-called Orange Revolution, Viktor Yushchenko.¹¹³

But the problems in their mutual relations actually began much earlier and are caused primarily by prejudices and fears from the past. History remains a sore point between the two nations, beginning with their different approaches to the 1945 Yalta conference agreements and their assessments of the events in Katyn. In addition, relations between the Russian Federation and Poland continue to be directly affected not only by the political situation in the two countries, but also, to a far greater extent, by their relations with the West. Both the complex political situation in Poland and the difficulties that the Putin administration has encountered in Russia are giving rise to a “populism that feeds on myths and stereotypes of social consciousness. In Poland, it is Russian imperialism, in Russia, the Polish-American anti-Russian conspiracy.”¹¹⁴ In all probability, this is the reason Polish-Russian relations have had so many ups and downs during the last decade and are often analyzed as a love-hate relationship.

Undoubtedly, during the last decade, these prejudices and a mutual reluctance have had a significant influence on bilateral relations. Russia strongly opposed NATO's eastward enlargement, which in 1999 brought Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into NATO.¹¹⁵ From Moscow's perspective, NATO was a Cold War military bloc that lost much of its relevance with the demise of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the Warsaw Pact (WP). “Furthermore, eastward enlargement created a new division of Europe and brought NATO directly onto Russia's border via the Kaliningrad exclave. Russia felt betrayed by former Central and East European allies that quickly distanced themselves from democratic Russia in matters of security and aligned

¹¹³ Irina Kobrinskaya, *Love and Hate: Polish-Russian Relations Marred by Russian Unpredictability and EU and Nato Uncertainty* (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, January 2005) http://www.aei.org/research/nai/publications/pubID.21920,projectID.11/pub_detail.asp (11 May 2006).

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Suzanne Crow, *Russian Views on an Eastward Expansion of NATO*, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (hereafter RFE/RL) Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 41, 15 October 1993.

themselves with NATO. Poland's drive for NATO membership was especially hurtful given its geopolitical significance, proximity to Russia, and “Warsaw” being the namesake of the Warsaw Pact.”¹¹⁶

Once Moscow unwillingly accepted “Poland's close accession into NATO it then sought to dissuade further NATO enlargement, particularly involving the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, former Soviet republics, and possibly Ukraine. Poland, however, was a strong proponent of NATO's open-door policy of continued enlargement and was a vocal supporter of the Baltic states as well as being an advocate for Ukraine. Thus, the second wave of NATO enlargement also proved to be an irritant in Russian–Polish relations.”¹¹⁷

In addition, the Russian attitude toward further enlargement, remaining negative in principle, depends, in a sense on possible reactions and consequences. First, on the mutual ability of Russia and NATO to achieve a compromise on security issues considered to be essential and, accordingly, to increase the level of confidence and cooperation. Allowing for the considerable differences between the concerns of both parties, the important factor in Russian–Polish relations is what Poland’s position will be as a NATO member in resolving these contradictions, and in Russian–Ukrainian relations, the degree to which Ukraine will understand the Russian position. At the present stage, Poland’s active support of further enlargement, owing to misgivings about its situation as a frontier-state, has a negative influence on the the Russia–NATO dialogue in general and on Russian–Polish relations in particular.¹¹⁸

Unlike NATO enlargement, the EU’s eastward expansion did not cause such strong opposition or criticism on the part of Russia. Moscow did, however, raise concerns about the “negative consequences that Poland’s and Lithuania's membership in the EU would pose for the Kaliningrad exclave”.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Jaro Bilocerkowycz, *Russian and Polish Relations: A New Era* (DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management. Wright-Patterson AFB: Fall 2003.Vol.26).

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Dmitri Danilov, *Poland-Russia-Ukraine In A Structuring Europe: Russian Foreign and Security Policy* (Institute of Europe, Moscow, October 2000).

¹¹⁹ Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press, Vol. 54, No. 22, June 26, 2002, 19-20.

Despite the fact that economic and cultural cooperation between the two countries started to improve before Polish accession to the EU, the political relations between the two countries still are hardly constructive or positive.¹²⁰ As some Russian analysts note, the Kremlin regards Poland not only as a major factor in the triumph of the Orange Revolution in Kyiev, but also as a key geopolitical “link in the ‘tier of unfriendly states’ that is being formed along Russia’s western borders from the Baltics to Ukraine.”¹²¹

For a number of Polish and Russian commentators, Warsaw’s active role in the 2004 Ukrainian political upheaval—which ended in what Moscow perceives as its largest strategic defeat since the end of the Soviet Union—is but an element of a broader trend. The Kremlin views the European Union’s 2004 sweeping eastward expansion, especially the emergence of the “Eastern Dimension” sponsored by Poland, as a serious geopolitical threat. The Kremlin credits that threat particularly to what it perceives as NATO’s “tendency of selectively offering partnership arrangements” to the countries sandwiched between Russia and United Europe. “There exists a widespread feeling in Russia,” one commentary argues, “that Poland is reluctant to accept the common rules of the game and is eager to distinguish Ukraine (and potentially Moldova and Belarus) from other eastern neighbors, which transfers the whole issue to the domain of power politics.”¹²²

As the Poles see it—and the Poles contend that, for obvious reasons, they have a special understanding of Russia–Ukraine’s reorientation toward the EU is a major, even historic, additional increment in Russia’s steady loss of influence in its own region, a loss of influence that began with the success of Solidarity in Poland in 1989. Polish analysts attribute what they regard as Russia’s bad behavior, especially over Ukraine, to its failure to carve out a post–Cold War identity for itself. At the same time, while the Russians are

¹²⁰ Irina Kobrinskaya, *Love and Hate: Polish-Russian Relations Marred by Russian Unpredictability and EU and Nato Uncertainty* (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, January 2005) http://www.aei.org/research/nai/publications/pubID.21920.projectID.11/pub_detail.asp (11 May 2006).

¹²¹ Igor Torbakov, “What is Behind Growing Tension in Russian-Polish Relations?” *The Jamestown Foundation-Publications* 158, no. 2 (August 2005) http://www.jamestown.org/publications_details.php?volume_id=407&issue_id=3436&article_id=2370143 (11 May 2006)

¹²² Ibid.

tempted to recognize the EU and its expansion east as an economic opportunity, they see it as a danger, especially to Russian prestige.¹²³

It is notable that, despite many disputes between these countries, there were also many attempts to improve mutual relations. In 2000, when Vladimir Putin became president, Russia and Poland showed their desire to make some changes in their political relations. During an official visit in July 2000, Putin, along with his Polish counterpart, Aleksander Kwasniewski, decided to improve bilateral relations and pledged to put behind them a decade of frosty relations between the two countries and to forge closer links for the future.¹²⁴ It was a very significant move which showed the goodwill of both countries, because this visit was preceded by the largest spy scandal since the collapse of the USSR as well as by very aggressive Chechen protests in Poland against Russia in February 2000. Most likely, for Russia, it was also a good occasion to improve its relations with NATO and the EU. At the time, Putin saw Poland as a bridge to the West, rather than as a disloyal former ally who changed sides.¹²⁵

For many observers it was a great breakthrough and gave hope for normal relations. A visible shift toward an improvement in Russian–Polish relations became evident in 2001, after Prime Minister Kasyanov’s visit to Poland and after the Polish parliamentary elections, which brought the Social Democrats to power. President Kwasniewski’s team wished to advance its dialogue with the Kremlin and was much more successful in that than their liberal predecessors, who had drastically worsened relations with Russia.

After September 11, which radically changed the face of global politics, the Russian president clearly demonstrated his support for the Western alliance. Not everyone in Russia—especially the top military leaders—appreciated his position however. President Putin tried to be consistent. Even before September 11 he had started to purge the opposition within

¹²³ Richard Bernstein, *Old rivalry persists as Russian-Polish relations take turn for worse* (The New York Times, July 2005).

¹²⁴ *Russia and Poland hail new relations* (BBC News, January 2002). <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1764482.stm> (11 May 2006).

¹²⁵ Jaro Bilocerkowycz, *Russian and Polish Relations: A New Era* (DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management. Wright-Patterson AFB: Fall 2003.Vol.26).

the Russian Ministry of Defense, dismissing the strongest opponent of Russia–NATO cooperation, General Leonid Ivashov.¹²⁶

Some Western media pointed out that the events of September 11 forced East European nations to reevaluate their relations with Moscow. Speaking about the Chechen Information Center in Krakow, Kwasniewski said that he would “never allow terrorist organizations to act from Polish territory against partners of Poland.”¹²⁷ He was not the only Central European leader to gradually change his position regarding Russia. The Czech prime minister, Milos Zeman, noted that the time had come to “take note of the depth of the political and economic changes that took place in the Russian ‘democratic state.’ ” “Cooperation with Moscow does not mean that we reject the values we have chosen after 1989,” said Zeman.¹²⁸ “The Central European countries were trying to find their proper place, one in which they would not feel dependent on Russia as in the years of Communism, and one in which they would not distance themselves from Russia as they had done just after the fall of the Berlin Wall.”¹²⁹

In January 2002, President Vladimir Putin went to Poland on an official visit. It was the “first official visit by the head of the Russian state to Poland in eight years and the first visit of a Russian leader to a member of the former Warsaw Pact that had become a member of NATO.”¹³⁰ For Poles, it was a special gesture, because Putin not only honored the Soviet soldiers who liberated Warsaw from the Nazis, but also laid flowers at the monument to the warriors of the *Armia Krajowa* (the internal Polish Army which during World War II operated from London and fought against both the Germans and the Soviets). This was widely commented on by the Western reporters who covered Putin’s visit to Warsaw as a sign that Putin was definitely moving beyond protocol and the usual Soviet stereotypes.¹³¹ After that, political ties between the two countries became warmer and meetings between the respective prime ministers became frequent

¹²⁶ Peter Cheremushkin, *Russian-Polish Relations: From Stereotypes to Reconciliation* (Moscow State University, 2002).

¹²⁷ Quote from Interfax, *Le temps* (October 2001).

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Peter Cheremushkin, *Russian-Polish Relations: From Stereotypes to Reconciliation* (Moscow State University, 2002).

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

and institutionalized. Unfortunately, since 2003, the effort to improve relations between Russia and Poland has been partially wasted because of a lack of political compromise.

As a result of recent political events, especially the planned Baltic gas pipeline between Russia and Western Europe, the economic situation between Russia and Poland has deteriorated as compared to three years ago. In September 2005, President Putin and the former German chancellor, Gerhard Schröder, signed an agreement to build a pipeline across the Baltic Sea. Undoubtedly, to the conservative new Polish cabinet, this was a clear signal: the agreement was directed against Poland and its interests. Poland is always suspicious of deals to its detriment between Moscow and Berlin. Therefore, Warsaw called on the European Commission to consider alternatives to the planned route because it bypasses Poland and other formerly communist countries that are now part of the European Union.¹³²

The Kremlin's quickly responded. Gazprom, the Russian gas giant, announced that it planned to review its contract with the Polish Oil and Gas Company (PGNiG), Poland's gas monopoly. As a result, since the beginning of 2006, Poland, as a member of the EU, has been charged as much for gas as the other western EU members. Additionally, Russia temporarily banned meat and plant imports from Poland because of alleged sanitation problems. In November 2005, Stefan Meller, the former Polish foreign minister, who earlier had served as ambassador to Moscow, went to Russia in an attempt to bring relations with Russia back to normal. During the visit, he talked with his Russian counterpart, Sergei Lavrov, about contentious issues and laid the groundwork for a meeting of both nations' prime ministers and chiefs of industry.¹³³

Although Russian–Polish relations have always been difficult and far from ideal, there is hope for a restoration of bilateral cooperation based on mutual trust and respect. Obviously, much work still remains to be done, but both countries understand that they will not achieve their goals unless they abandon long-standing stereotypes and prejudices.

¹³² *Merkel Takes Heat Out of Russian Gas Deal in Poland* (Deutsche Welle, December 2005), <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,1800001,00.html> (12 May 2006).

¹³³ "Meller Wants Polish-Russian Relations to be Normalized," *Interfax Information Service*, November 2005 <http://hww.interfax.com/17/105306/interview.aspx> (12 December 2005).

In the end of 2005, the new Polish president, Lech Kaczynski, recognized that relations with Russia should be improved. They are the key to Poland's regional security, not only from military threats but also from threats such as terrorism, organized crime, and the influx of illegal immigrants. Promoting Poland's economic interests also is a key priority regionally, just as achieving membership in NATO and the EU is its top foreign policy priority. For Russia, Poland is increasingly seen as a useful bridge to western Europe. Poland's prospective role as the most important NATO/EU member from the east and as an expert on the east within NATO and the EU makes Poland especially important.

In recent months, another very important issue for Poland's foreign and security policy is the matter of Belarus, which continues to experience complications, especially with Russia, on its way to democratization and a free market economy.¹³⁴ The Polish–Belarusian relationship is in trouble, mainly because of Belarus' unfriendly activities directed against Polish activists and community centers in Belarus.

Initially, in early 1990, relations between the two countries were quite intense, as Poland influenced Belarus to join in various operations to strengthen the position of both countries on the Berlin-Warsaw-Minsk-Moscow axis. Unfortunately, since the presidential elections in 1994, when Alexander Lukashenko became president of Belarus, their bilateral relations have gradually worsened. In December 1999, Belarus and Russia signed an agreement in Moscow that, in the future, would facilitate bringing common associated states into existence. This means that their defense and security systems would be even more integrated than they are now and therefore would constitute a regional counterbalance to NATO troops. Because of that agreement, it is clearly in Poland's best interest to support the Belarusian democratic opposition, which is trying to overcome Lukashenko's regime. Some of the opposition leaders come from Polish minorities, organized in Polish community centers, and belong to the biggest nongovernmental organizations in Belarus.¹³⁵ Unfortunately, in spite of many attempts to exert pressure on Lukashenko's regime, Poland's have been completely useless. And the diplomacy of the

¹³⁴ R. Linder, "Domestic and Foreign Policy Candidates Behind Structural Changes in the Ukraine and Belarus," *Asienpolitik*, no. 4 (May 1995): 366-367.

¹³⁵ Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs' statement on Polish-Belarusian Relations (Warsaw, 2 July 2005).

EU and the United States has evidenced a similar ineffectiveness. After the fraudulent elections in March 2006, it became obvious that the Euro-Atlantic community should stop this vicious circle of impossibility and should consequently take a break from its bureaucratic approach to Belarus. The best scenario for Belarus may be to conduct a bloodless revolution similar to the Ukrainian “Orange Revolution,” which prevented the government from stopping the process of democratization.

According to many analysts, the Polish government’s and Polish society’s active support of the Ukrainian revolution resulted in an increase of mutual confidence and cooperation between the two nations. In addition, the president of Ukraine, Victor Yushchenko’s last visit to Poland in May 2006 confirmed that both countries are interested in the further development of mutual cooperation in the economic and security areas.¹³⁶ This kind of relationship has not been seen for a long time in modern history. Therefore, it is especially important for Poland to build a strategic partnership with Ukraine in order to create an appropriate balance of power in the Central-Eastern region.¹³⁷ Like Poland, Ukraine’s geopolitical location determines its importance in the European security environment.

Beginning in 2004, Ukraine has made an effort to overcome its past and to join the European security and economic network. Ukraine recently became a member of several European organizations: OSCE, the Council of Europe, and the Central European Initiative. Moreover, Ukraine strengthened its relations with other organizations, such as World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), which guarantee the stability and security of its economy.¹³⁸

Ukraine’s most significant effort, however, is its cooperation, within the confines of the Partnership for Peace program, with NATO. Its relations with the Alliance began in 1991 when Ukraine became a member of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council

¹³⁶ Piotr Kosciński, “Polska Wyznaje Wine,” *Rzeczpospolita*, no. 111 (May 2006) http://www.rzeczpospolita.pl/gazeta/wydanie_060513/swiat/swiat_a_7.html (17 May 2006).

¹³⁷ Jozef Tymanowski, „Rosja-Białorus-Ukraina w Polskiej Polityce Bezpieczeństwa,” *Zeszyty Naukowe AON* 51, no. 2 (February 2003), http://www.aon.edu.pl/zn2003/tymanowski_2.htm (10 May 2006).

¹³⁸ Ibid.

(NACC). Then, in 1994, it joined the PfP program, developing further relations with NATO which facilitated the signing of the Charter on Distinctive Partnership in Madrid in 1997. This moved cooperation between NATO and Ukraine to a new level. In the last few years, Ukraine has visibly increased its participation in European security by signing the PfP Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) in 2000 and approving the Open Skies Treaty which makes an important contribution to transparency in arms control.¹³⁹ Besides their significant contribution to international peacekeeping activities, Ukrainians, along with Poles, pursue regional military cooperation as expressed by their common military exercises and the creation of the Polish-Ukrainian Battalion (UKRPOLBAT), which is not only able to act regionally but is also capable of executing other missions out-of-area.

Undoubtedly, Poland and Ukraine have shown that different kinds of cooperation within the confines of different organizations that propagate democratic values, freedom and respect for human rights, and the rule of law contribute to preserving the balance of power and significantly increase chances of global peace. Currently, due to the new security challenges which require close politico-military cooperation and dialogue, according to many strategists, the regional and global interdependence between states is mostly manifested in their security and defense policies.¹⁴⁰

C. NEW CONDITIONS OF A NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY: POLITICO-MILITARY COOPERATION, DIALOGUE, CONFIDENCE- BUILDING, AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The end of the Cold War did not cause changes that would eliminate all global threats and risks, but it did open doors that make it more possible to solve other problems surrounding security issues. Today, the world still faces the kinds of racial, religious, and ethnic intolerance that often lead to serious conflicts and the creation of dangerous phenomena such as terrorism. The transformation period that resulted in peace in many regions is very fragile, and the only way to stabilize it is to create a new balance of

¹³⁹ *NATO Handbook* (Brussels: NATO of Information and Press, 2001), 88.

¹⁴⁰ Marc Bentinek, "Participation in Politico-Military Alliances and National Defense Planning," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 63-70. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

power. Peace depends also on the international community's will and ability to implement existing mechanisms of European and world security. An important part of this security is solving potential conflicts by preventing them from escalating by building confidence and security.¹⁴¹

Poland, as a serious and reliable partner that is trying to create an environment in which the state can develop in peace and security, understands that a country must ensure its security itself. So, it is important that Poland's defense and security policy not be limited, as in the past, to the protection of its own national borders.¹⁴² National defense and security must become an international issue, because the disruption of peace by anyone anywhere in the world is a danger to the peace and security of the whole world. That is why, each country, regardless of its potential or size, must join with other states to contribute to the establishment and reinforcement of a collective security system.¹⁴³

It is notable that Poland does not promote a wide-ranging security and defense policy that is merely responsible for preventing war and restoring peace. The policy must also actively and effectively address tensions that may appear and ways to eliminate sources of crisis. Moreover, Poland will not implement this policy only by using armed forces or its diplomacy, but is supported by a national policy as well as by individual international organizations in which Poland is an active participant.¹⁴⁴ Stability, peace, and security in Europe can be realized, first, by strengthening the collaboration and building mutual confidence between states. Thus, Poland as a new element in the Euro-Atlantic security system, seeks more comprehensive and productive foundations on which to build bilateral, regional, and multilateral cooperation in the various areas of

¹⁴¹ Ivan Hostnik, "Politico-Military Cooperation," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 47-52. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

¹⁴² Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, "Polska w Zamecie Swiata." *Gazeta Wyborcza* (2004): 4.

¹⁴³ Ivan Hostnik, "Politico-Military Cooperation," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Stanislaw Helnarski and Julietta Szymanowska, 47-52. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

¹⁴⁴ Government information on Polish foreign policy in 2006 presented at the session of the Sejm on February 15, 2006, by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, Stefan Meller. <http://www.mfa.gov.pl/Government,information,on,Polish,foreign,policy,in,2006,4599.html> (8 May 2006).

security. The overall objective should be to establish regional strategic stability and contribute to the reinforcement of European and international peace.¹⁴⁵

Poland's contribution to the prevention of crises and war is based on the dissemination of legitimate democratic values and cooperation within the confines of international forces for crisis management and maintenance of international and regional security under different security organizations. Participation in security organizations provides all the members protection from contemporary risks. Members are also able to play a significant role on the international stage through the implementation of their nation's contribution to the collective defense according to each one's capabilities. Generally, international military cooperation is successful when it is flexible and when participants choose the size and type of engagement that their countries will support during all kinds of operations. Therefore, it is especially important to support the creation of multinational units. These will provide a chance for all states, even small ones, to share the burden of the common security.¹⁴⁶ Political decisions made in the spirit of a broader linkage, cooperation, and solidarity for the basis for the creation of multinational military forces. The question of national sovereignty and identity, which that has to be guaranteed in cases of multinational cooperation, has an important influence, but it should not be a reason to find it impossible.¹⁴⁷ The conditions for entering such cooperation include, among other things, creation of common strategies, doctrines, and the civil-military structures for unifying planning and procedures. The readiness and effectiveness of these structures are achieved by common exercises, which help to overcome national diversities resulting from culture, historic, and linguistic differences.

¹⁴⁵ Ivan Hostnik, "Politico-Military Cooperation," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Stanisław Helnarski and Julietta Szymanowska, 47-52. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

¹⁴⁶ Stanisław Koziej, *Polityczno-Strategiczny Wymiar Bezpieczeństwa Europejskiego* (Warszawa: Wyższa Szkoła Businessu i Administracji, 2004) <http://www.europa.wojsko-polskie.pl/Skins/default/download/konferencja/Stanislaw%20Koziej%20-%20Polityczno-strategiczny%20wymiar%20bez%20pieczenstwa%20europejskiego.doc> (10 May 2006).

¹⁴⁷ Ivan Hostnik, "Politico-Military Cooperation," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Stanisław Helnarski and Julietta Szymanowska, 47-52. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.

D. TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS AND THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE POLISH SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Military alliances are an essential tool in the realization of a national defense policy. Membership in international security organizations do not absolve Poland, however, from the duty of taking care of its own security. Thus, Poland must actively engage in various internal and external undertakings aimed at ensuring the state's security and strengthening its position on the international stage.¹⁴⁸

It is a well-known fact that Poland's security and defense capability is mainly built on the basis of the Atlantic Alliance. Even so, Poland is involved in the development of the European Security and Defense Policy. The need for this policy seems obvious to Poland: it views NATO as the most effective and reliable alliance because NATO has the appropriate infrastructure and procedures. Furthermore, the presence of the United States, the world's only superpower, in NATO also affects its credibility. So Poland opts for harmonic cooperation between the European states and the United States in the name of their common security and defense interests. Poland also emphasizes that Europe should not compete with America in the matter of global security because going in that kind of direction in its policy could have negative consequences for both global and European security.¹⁴⁹

Poland's preference for a strong U.S.-led Alliance and its role in the global security and defense system is part of a tradition that started much earlier than 1992 when Poland applied for NATO membership. Clearly, strategic considerations played a central role in current Polish–American relations, but cultural and historical factors brought the two partners together and facilitated their cooperation. Historically, these include the prominent role of two Polish generals, Kosciuszko and Pulawski, in the America's 1776 war for independence; America's role in recreating the Polish state in 1918 (President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" declaration); and America's role in ending the Cold War.¹⁵⁰ In addition, the Polish American community of ten million members provided a strong

¹⁴⁸ Expose of Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz in Sejm (November 2005).

¹⁴⁹ CFSP WATCH 2005: Poland, by Dr. Rafał Trzaskowski and Olaf Osica, p.1 <http://www.fornet.info/CFSPannualreports2005/CFSP%20Watch%202005%20Poland.pdf> (16 May 2006).

¹⁵⁰ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," *Occasional Paper No.56* (Dec 2004): 8, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

political constituency, with well-connected and determined individuals working behind the scenes with the U.S. government to make sure that Yalta would never happen again in Europe.

For Poland, it was the U.S. administration and the Federal Republic of Germany that, along with central and eastern European nations, overcame the reluctance of the Western states and opposition from Russia for NATO enlargement. More important, it was done without a crisis in relations with Russia or evisceration of NATO as military alliance critics had predicted.¹⁵¹ The driving force for NATO enlargement to the East was “to create a democratic, peaceful, and secure Europe as a whole, whose future could be better than the continent’s bloody past.”¹⁵²

Poland, especially, was interested in the creation of a new security environment in the region, so it vividly supported U.S. policy in this matter. As time went by and bilateral military as well as economy cooperation developed, Poland appeared to be one of the United States’ closest European allies. As a result of this realization of their common goals, Poland became a regional leader and warmly supported the second wave of enlargement, setting an example for others to follow in the matter of state democratization.¹⁵³

The special bond between the United States and Poland was also confirmed by the United States’ powerful support, both financial and educational, during the modernization of Poland’s armed forces. The most significant example of this aid was a \$3.8 billion loan from the U.S. Congress in 2002, the largest military loan in memory, to purchase forty-eight F-16 fighter jets from Lockheed Martin.¹⁵⁴ It demonstrated the unique closeness of the two countries and indicated the direction and priorities of Poland’s defense policy. During bilateral politico-military meetings, politicians typically stress how Polish-American military cooperation has strategic importance for Poland. Thanks to it, the Polish armed forces have undergone huge structural, organizational, and technological

¹⁵¹ Ronald D. Asmus, *Opening NATO’s Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), xxiv.

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ John Reed, “Warsaw Gives a Powerful Friend a Warm Welcome,” *Financial Times* (June 2001).

¹⁵⁴ Leslie Wayne, “Polish Pride, American Profits,” *The New York Times* (January 2003): 1.

changes. The process of Polish military transformation was conducted by drawing on, among other things, the strength of American experience and assets that facilitated the development of Poland's combat readiness. This was tested in the last several NATO-led missions and operations.

Poland's dedication to the Alliance during the Kosovo conflict and its readiness to support development of an antimissile shield on its territory caused the American government to become convinced that Poland had become an important part of the common defense system. From then on, the U.S. administration began to consider Poland as a model ally and a regional leader in Central and Eastern Europe.¹⁵⁵ The events of 9/11 and the global war on terror were the main factors that revealed Poland's distinctive Atlanticism.

Poland emerged as a one of the few European countries prepared unconditionally to support American foreign policy in Iraq.¹⁵⁶ It is notable that, up to 2003, there was no decision as controversial in the Third Republic of Poland, as its call-up of armed forces. Poland's support for the antiterrorist coalition was manifested, first, by its organization of an international conference on terrorism just after 9/11; second, by sending more troops to the Balkans to relieve U.S. and British military forces that might be needed elsewhere. Finally after 2001, when Americans started the Afghan campaign, Poland declared its readiness to give direct military support, by sending antibiological and engineering troops to Afghanistan, along with "GROM," its best Special Forces unit.¹⁵⁷

Although the decision to participate in Operation Iraqi Freedom was made by a majority of the Polish parliament and had substantial support from the Polish populace, with time, this became the subject of many disputes. The criticism concerned, especially, the legitimacy of using military force against the Saddam regime and the lack of any rational benefits resulting from participation in the coalition. Warsaw's request for

¹⁵⁵ D. H. Dunn, "Poland: America's New Model Ally." In M. Zaborowski and D. H. Dunn, *Poland: A New Power in Transatlantic Security* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003): 70.

¹⁵⁶ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," *Occasional Paper No. 56* (Dec 2004): 8, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

¹⁵⁷ Rafal Trzaskowski, "The View From Central Europe: Poland," in *Bigger UE, Wider CFSP, Stronger ESDP?*, ed. Antonio Missiroli (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies Press, 2002): 19-26, <http://aei.pitt.edu/709/01/occ34.pdf> (20 May 2006).

removal of nonemigration visa requirements, for example, received a negative response from the U.S. Congress. Also, Poland's military industry was also allowed only minor participation in the rearmament of the Iraqi military forces and in the reconstruction of Iraq.

In addition, many Polish politicians known for their pro-Americanism, such as Poland's former prime minister, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, and the former U.S. National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter, Zbigniew Brzezinski, criticized Polish defense policies toward Washington. First, they noted the importance of Poland's independent thinking, which could guarantee increased respect on both sides of the Atlantic. Second, they advised Poland, in the future, to take into consideration the possible political complications that might result from its decisions and actions. Finally, they advised Poland to maintain moderation in its interminable desire to manifest Poland's devotion to America.¹⁵⁸

Today, some Polish political scientists agree that sending Polish troops to Iraq was not preceded by appropriate public debate and an analysis of the profits and losses that would have implications for future Iraqi operations. According to them, the arguments for and against were considered only after the first Polish combat casualties occurred and the first political failures connected with Poland's clear-cut subscription to the "coalition of the willing." The original idea, incidentally, was to create "coalitions defined by the mission" from outside NATO. The opponents of Poland's intervention in Iraq strongly believed that it might endanger the unity of the Atlantic Alliance as well as Poland's position regarding the EU and its rising foreign, security, and defense policies.¹⁵⁹

Another pro-American view, however, depicts Poland's engagement in Iraq as a political break-through that has provided Poland with an opportunity to increase its influence and importance in transatlantic relations and thereby improve Warsaw's

¹⁵⁸ Olaf Osica, *Irak: Początek Nowej Epoki w Polityce Zagranicznej III RP* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 9, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0404.pdf (20 May 2006).

¹⁵⁹ Maria Wagrowska, *Udział Polski w Interwencji Zbrojnej i Misji Stabilizacyjnej w Iraku*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 4, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_1204.pdf (20 May 2006).

position in Europe.¹⁶⁰ Obviously, it is very difficult to evaluate all aspects of Poland's participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom, because Poles, first and foremost, did not feel the same threat from global terrorism that the Americans and the British did. Furthermore, Poland did not have any direct geopolitical interests in the Middle East region, so the political decision to send Polish troops was the result of many other different and changing factors.

The arguments for Poland's active participation in a politico-military coalition were legitimized by the conviction that Iraqi regime posed a threat to international security because of its alleged possession of WMD. In addition, as an example of an authoritarian state, which openly supported radical Muslim extremists, Iraq contributed to the proliferation of global terrorism. Thus, the Polish government decided, not only because of its allied commitment, but, foremost, because of its active engagement in the global war on terror to facilitate building a safer future.¹⁶¹ Poland's assumption that world security is also Poland's security shows a preventive approach toward terrorism which is then fought on its own territory. Therefore, the controversial policy of deterrence and a preventive strategy, along with a preemptive strike, became the main tools in its policy against the "Axis of Evil."¹⁶² One of the chief arguments legitimizing using force was a declared will to oppose global terrorism in the name of protection and spreading democratic values to other parts of the world.

It is often argued that Poland, by taking part in the GWOT, also wanted to gain more political power and thereby strengthen its transatlantic bonds and gain economic and military benefits. Additionally, some political experts claim that it was also an expression of Poland's discontent with the fact that its influence on the EU's security and foreign policy was being reduced by France and Germany because of the so-called Letter

¹⁶⁰ Artur Golawski, and Ryszard Choroszy, "Byc Albo Nie Byc w Iraku," *Polska Zbrojna*, no. 49 (December 2003): 3, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=1403 (20 May 2006).

¹⁶¹ The Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz interview on situation in Iraq. (September 2003), <http://www.msz.gov.pl/8,wrzesnia,2003r.,-,Wywiad,dla,Gazety,Wyborczej,nt.,sytuacji,w,Iraku,1369.html> (20 May 2006).

¹⁶² Maria Wagrowska, *Udział Polski w Interwencji Zbrojnej i Misji Stabilizacyjnej w Iraku*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 6, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_1204.pdf (20 May 2006).

of Eight,¹⁶³ which was widely perceived as opposing the Franco-German attempt to speak for the entire EU in the area of foreign and security policy.

Nowadays, many find it difficult to answer the question whether the Polish way of dealing with the growing Iraqi crisis has been appropriate. In analyses of the current political situation, Poland finds itself in the position of a state whose status depends to a large degree on transatlantic relations between America, France, and Germany. Undoubtedly, it is Germany, France, and Great Britain, not Poland, despite its contribution to the Iraqi campaign, that are the main strategic allies in Europe and have the appropriate military and financial capabilities to deal with worldwide terrorism.

For those reasons, Warsaw has blended well into the American, and also Franco-German, division of Europe: those who were with America or those against it; those who took a stand on global security or those who “missed a great opportunity to shut up.”¹⁶⁴ Although Poland had practically no chance to affect the U.S. or Franco-German positions, Poland’s policy was to keep a reasonable distance and maintain its composure while still maintaining its view on this issue. Instead, Polish society was witness to a sequence of bizarre events that exposed the essential weaknesses of Polish foreign policy during actions conducted under the pressure time and events.¹⁶⁵

It is generally believed that, presently, in the face of changing priorities and political situations, there is a need for the creation of a new approach to Polish-American relations. The eastward EU and NATO enlargements, combined with political stagnation or regression in the East, mean that principled geopolitical change draws to an end and, along with it, the kind and character of American activities. According to Polish strategists, the United States, a state that supports political transformation and ensures

¹⁶³ “The Letter of Eight” was a memorandum signed by the eight European leaders of Spain, Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Denmark, and Portugal, supporting President of the United States George W. Bush. The memorandum was published in *The Wall Street Journal* on January 30, 2003. M. Champion, European Leaders Declare Support for US on Iraq: Letter from Eight Countries Isolates France, Germany, Smooths Path for War. *The Wall Street Journal*. New York, January 30, 2003, A1.

¹⁶⁴ “Chirac Lashes Out at ‘New Europe,’” *CNN* (February 2003), <http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/europe/02/18/sprj.iq.chirac/> (20 May 2006).

¹⁶⁵ Olaf Osica, *Irak: Początek Nowej Epoki w Polityce Zagranicznej III RP* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 7, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0404.pdf (20 May 2006).

psychological security, should, to a larger degree, become a partner in common undertakings in the areas of economy, politics, and science. As for cooperation on global terrorism and organized crime, both countries should continue to cooperate, but it should be done within a NATO framework. Another pillar of the Polish–American collaboration is police, intelligence, and public security cooperation.¹⁶⁶ Poland’s contribution to transatlantic relations to tighten the bilateral Polish–American bond should be conducive to America in Europe and Europe in America. Just as America wants to lead but not to command, Europe wants to increase cooperation, not opposition to America.

Although Atlanticism continues to dominate Poland’s security thinking, there is also a growing desire among the Polish ruling elite to maintain a balance in the Atlantic and European security dimension.¹⁶⁷ Unfortunately, there are different views in Poland and “old” Europe concerning European security and the presence of the United States there. To Poland, the Americans are essential not only for ensuring security, but also for guaranteeing that there will be no dangerous renationalization of European security policies.¹⁶⁸

Since its 2004 accession to the EU, one of Poland’s main strategic goals is to achieve an appropriate position within the European structure so as to ensure its vital influence on key decisions. In Poland today there is a need for a united, effective, and solid Europe which could facilitate dynamic economic growth, with a leveling of the disproportion in regard to regional issues. The key to political and economical revival is further enlargement of the EU, the most powerful tool for shaping its neighborhood.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ The Common: Presidents Bush and Kwasniewski Announcement on Polish-American Cooperation in the 21st Century, Warsaw (January 2004), http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_kronika_2004_01_2602 (20 May 2006).

¹⁶⁷ Marcin Zaborowski, “From America’s Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century,” *Occasional Paper No. 56* (Dec 2004): 8, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

¹⁶⁸ Maria Wagrowska, *Udział Polski w Interwencji Zbrojnej i Misji Stabilizacyjnej w Iraku*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 6, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap__i_an_1204.pdf (20 May 2006).

¹⁶⁹ Olaf Osica, “A Secure Poland in a Better Union? The ESS as Seen from Warsaw’s Perspective,” *German Foreign Policy in Dialogue* 5, no. 14, (October, 2004): 9 – 15, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/newsletter/issue14.pdf> (17 March 2006).

The main instrument necessary to realize this policy should be the CFSP, which unfortunately has many weaknesses and is considered the weakest aspect of the European Union. Poland's approach is similar to that of most new EU members who say that the Union acts too slow and too late when there is a need for European engagement. Moreover, according to Polish officials, the EU's foreign and security policy is too focused on issues concerning western Europeans, and, what is more, the participation of new EU members in the decision-making process is limited. Thus, it is very important that cooperation in shaping a future foreign and security policy should be based on collaboration and the common political will of all elements of the Union in order to work toward a political consensus concerning various security issues.¹⁷⁰ A good example of an improvement of foreign-policy effectiveness was the EU's active engagement in the Ukrainian Orange Revolution in 2004. Poland is particularly eager for further development of the EU and its ability to play an active role in the East, especially in regard to relations with Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, and Russia, because cooperation with its eastern neighbors is one of Poland's vital interests.¹⁷¹

Another crucial issue for Poland's security and defense policy is the role of the European Security and Defense Policy, which recently gained greater importance but is still in a phase of deep transformation. This is a result of the end of West-East confrontation which directly influenced changes in the parameters of security policies on the European continent. Like other new Europeans, the Polish attitude toward the ESDP has undergone considerable evolution, from skepticism to cautious enthusiasm.¹⁷² The reason is that some Europeans, led by France, wanted to develop an independent

¹⁷⁰ Olaf Osica, *Irak: Początek Nowej Epoki w Polityce Zagranicznej III RP*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 20, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0404.pdf (20 May 2006).

¹⁷¹ Rafał Trzaskowski, "The View From Central Europe: Poland," in *Bigger UE, Wider CFSP, Stronger ESDP?*, ed. Antonio Missiroli. (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies Press, 2002): 19-26, <http://aei.pitt.edu/709/01/occ34.pdf> (20 May 2006).

¹⁷² Ibid.

European security and defense structure and planning capacity, regardless of NATO. This confirmed Poland's fears that the ESDP might be politicized and eventually duplicates NATO.¹⁷³

The atmosphere surrounding the ESDP substantially improved in 2002 when the EU–NATO declaration provided a formal basis for cooperation between both organizations in the fields of conflict prevention and crisis management. The declaration outlines the political principles for EU–NATO cooperation and gives the European Union assured access to NATO's planning and logistics capabilities for its own military operations.¹⁷⁴ Unfortunately, the lack of strong leadership in the EU, the languid and complicated decision-making structure, and the susceptibility of the biggest states to act independently during the crisis illustrate the difficulties in building a Common Foreign and Defense Policy (CFDP). Nevertheless, the European security policy poses the answer to essential needs of European identity, and also to new challenges and threats. Today, for Poland, the challenge is to appropriately evaluate these tendencies and to build its position as a reliable and active participant in the rising mechanisms that will consolidate security and stability in Europe and beyond it.¹⁷⁵

Warsaw is ready to take on its responsibilities, contribute to the development of the ESDP, and fulfill the EU's "Headline Goal" by participating in peacekeeping and anticrisis actions, even if those actions are out of the area. This includes the engagement of Polish troops within the confines of a European Rapid Reaction Force (ERRF), knowing the ERRF needs to be improved and has several unresolved problems to overcome. These problems mainly stem from the lack of appropriate capabilities in the fields of intelligence, logistics, communications, and strategic lift caused by the political and economical difficulties of Europeans.¹⁷⁶ In May 2004, the European Ministers of

¹⁷³ Marcin Zaborowski, "From America's Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century," *Occasional Paper No.56* (Dec 2004): 8, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

¹⁷⁴ "EU and NATO Adopt Framework for Co-operation," *NATO Update* (December 2002), <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2002/12-december/e1216a.htm> (20 May 2006).

¹⁷⁵ Zdzisław Lachowski, "ESDP: Złudzenia i Realia," *Polska Zbrojna* (August 2002), http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=886 (21 May 2006).

¹⁷⁶ Alistair Shepherd, *ESDP Events Unresolved Issues* (London: Defense Academy, 2001), 75 [http://www.da.mod.uk/CSRC/documents/CEE/G93%20\(Security%20in%20the%20Black%20Sea%20Region/G93.chap17](http://www.da.mod.uk/CSRC/documents/CEE/G93%20(Security%20in%20the%20Black%20Sea%20Region/G93.chap17) (21 May 2006).

Defense determined a new “Headline Goal 2010” that assumes the creation of Battle Groups that are capable of conducting wide-spectrum anticrisis operations up to 6,000 km from Brussels, and lasting from 30 to 120 days. According to previous arrangements, the Battle Groups should reach their full operational capability in 2007.¹⁷⁷

The Polish–German Battle Group, with the participation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Slovakia, is scheduled to start its activities in 2009. The Polish–German position, however, assumes that the Battle Groups cannot violate the cohesion of NATO Response Forces because those have priority importance for both states.¹⁷⁸ Many believe that the creation of Battle Groups is desirable and essential because they may serve as preparation for bigger operations on the strength of an initial military (Battle Groups) that is part of a stronger tactical-operational command of European intervention forces.

For now, however, Europeans are struggling with a lack of the financial resources needed to realize this concept. In addition, there is an evident lack of political consensus between EU members on the definition, meaning, character, and method for conducting future military operations. That is why the idea of Battle Groups can only be a virtual entity.¹⁷⁹

Although Poland still has a lot of work to do in the area of its security and defense policy, its geopolitical situation has radically changed over the past seventeen years. The everlasting dilemma resulting from Poland’s geographical location between Germany and Russia has finally been resolved. The way to overcome two overpowering and invasive former global powers is its strategic alliance with the United States, which facilitated Poles’ return to the European Community and became an important part of its security environment. To Europe, through Germany, the American way: that is a brief summary of the optimal geopolitical strategy for Poland in the twenty-first century.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Krzysztof Miszczak, “Grupy Bojowe: Europejskie Sily Szybkiego Reagowania,” *Central European Review*, no. 40 (July 2005), <http://www.medianet.pl/~ceurorev/numer40/3.htm> (21 May 2006).

¹⁷⁸ Włodzimierz Kaleta, and Tadeusz Wrobel, “Militarna Straz Pozarna,” *Polska Zbrojna* (December 2004), http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=1695 (21 May 2006).

¹⁷⁹ Marcin Zaborowski, “From America’s Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century,” *Occasional Paper No.56* (Dec 2004): 21, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

¹⁸⁰ Janusz Majcherek, “Miedzy Europa a Ameryka,” *Kapitalista Powszechny* 75, no. 3 (February 1999), <http://www.ktp.org.pl/kapitalista/majcherek76.html> (21 May 2006).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. CONCLUSION

Since 1989, Poland's security, political, and economical situation has changed radically. During that time, Poland has evolved from a communist country into a state that largely exercises and deeply supports democratic values. The success of the process of transformation in Poland is a result of multilateral cooperation at different levels with diverse organizations in Europe and beyond. In addition, internal consensus among Poland's political elites and the peoples' support facilitated achievement of strategic goals such as membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and the European Union. In spite of many disputes, revolts, and political crises, no government in Poland has challenged the vision of Poland's development based on fundamental democratic values, such as human rights, a free market economy, law and order, and social justice. Undoubtedly, Poland had not had such good conditions for building its sovereignty and developing its economic potential for a long time.

Poland's accession into NATO in March 1999 surely constitutes one of the biggest events in its modern history. The importance of this event was expressed in both the 2000 and the 2003 national security strategies, which recognize NATO as the main guarantor of Polish security. At the same time, it also ensures politico-military stability in Europe. Poland's membership in the Atlantic Alliance, however, is not only benefits and privileges. In becoming a rightful member of NATO, Poland accepted specific commitments, both political and military. The method and the range of Poland's fulfillment of these obligations will determine its allied credibility.

That is why it is particularly important for Poland to take an active part in prevention undertakings that facilitate preservation of "international peace and security on both a regional and global scale."¹⁸¹ Therefore, Poland is present in the Balkans, in Afghanistan, and in Iraq, not to mention its UN peacekeeping missions in the Golan Heights and Lebanon. In spite of the fact that Poland does not have as great an economical potential as most western European countries and that its GDP per capita is one of the lowest in the entire EU, Poland accomplished some significant military

¹⁸¹ The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), 3, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf> (March 10, 2006).

achievements that are comparable to those achieved by the “old” European countries.¹⁸² One example of that is Poland’s participation in the Iraqi Freedom Operation, which undoubtedly strengthens its position on the European stage and proves that Poland is a reliable partner that is ready to share the burden with other allies. Moreover, it shows that the Polish armed forces are able to cooperate within the NATO framework and take part of the responsibility for global security.

Another very significant factor that strengthens Poland’s military and economical security is its membership in the European Union. The end of negotiations and signing of the Access Treaty were a crowning achievement to the many efforts of Polish society. Today, despite some problems, the European Union is a successful and unique political project that combines the policies of all the individual member states. Surely, the idea of European integration along with transatlantic cooperation has helped avert the centuries-old curse of danger and an unfair balance of power, which the incessant domination of superpowers in Europe. Obviously, even today, some of the nations’ interests are divergent, as the biggest and wealthiest EU countries try to dominate, creating a variety of smaller coalitions within the EU framework. It is a very dangerous phenomenon, which mobilizes Poland to bigger engagement on the European stage and which could facilitate the equal development of all the member states.

Another very important goal of Poland’s security and defense policy, which also has a strategic aspect, is a common European policy toward Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, Poland tries to draw Europe’s attention toward the eastern European states and Russia, whose democracies and economies are still fragile and susceptible to any external or internal turbulence and, in case of their failure, may lead to serious security consequences on the whole continent.¹⁸³ Thus, Poland wants the Western countries to focus not only on issues concerning the Middle East or Africa, but also to pay more attention to the European continent, especially countries like Belarus.

¹⁸² Olaf Osica, “A Secure Poland in a Better Union? The ESS as Seen from Warsaw’s Perspective,” *German Foreign Policy in Dialogue* 5, no. 14 (October 2004): 9–15, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/newsletter/issue14.pdf> (17 March 2006).

¹⁸³ Bartłomiej Nowak and Rafał Rowiński. “Unia Europejska po Rozszrzeniu. Na Pierwszym Zakręcie,” *Raporty i Analizy*, no. 8 (2004): 11, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0804.pdf (3 May 2006).

In this area, the Polish security and defense policy achieved partial success, engaging the EU representatives in an “Orange Revolution” that facilitates the further development of Ukraine toward democratic values. Moreover, Poland, as one of the biggest and most influential states in the region, became a fervent supporter of further NATO enlargement which brought, among other things, the Baltic States and Slovakia into the transatlantic community.

All the political undertakings of the Polish security and defense policy in regard to the Eastern dimension, however, has been strongly supported by the United States, which constitutes a strategic partnership for Poland. As far as the Polish political elites are concerned, they still consider the United States as a most valuable partner, which let Poland gain more power on the European stage. Although the bilateral partnership between Poland and the United States has a very long tradition and is very important for Poland, the Polish government emphasizes that all security and defense issues should be resolved within the NATO framework. But a NATO in which the transatlantic community constitutes the basis on which European security is built.

The common European Security and Defense Policy is an important new element of the security system, but, undoubtedly, only NATO and the United States are able to guarantee regional and global security. Obviously, the politico-military situation in the world has changed, so NATO and U.S. policies must also constantly change. That is why Poland’s priorities should be to adjust its policy to the new challenges and threats, while simultaneously maintaining the balance between the Atlantic and European security dimensions.¹⁸⁴

The Polish traditions of struggle, for independence and freedom, and its experience of a successful transformation provide the necessary political know-how that entitles Poland to participate in other international security organizations that contribute to the dissemination of human rights, democratic values, and a free market economy. Some of the most common forms of these activities are the peacekeeping and humanitarian missions that are conducted by Poland under the auspices of the United Nations, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in

¹⁸⁴ Marcin Zaborowski, “From America’s Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century,” *Occasional Paper No. 56* (Dec 2004): 8, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf> (24 April 2006).

Europe. This kind of activity imposes on Poland the role of promoter of international solidarity, which is open to the needs not only of neighboring countries, but also of countries in other parts of the world. That is why the role of Poland in the region, in the new Europe, and in the world will depend in the foreseeable future solely on Polish accomplishments, failures.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- “Chirac Lashes out at ‘New Europe’”, *CNN* (February 2003),
<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/europe/02/18/sprj.irq.chirac/>, 20 May 2006.
- “EU and NATO Adopt Framework for Co-operation,” *NATO Update*, (December 2002),
<http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2002/12-december/e1216a.htm>, 20 May 2006.
- “The Letter of Eight” was a memorandum signed by the eight European leaders of Spain, Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Denmark and Portugal, supporting President of the United States, George W. Bush, The memorandum was published in The Wall Street Journal on January 30, 2003. M. Champion, European Leaders Declare Support for US on Iraq – Letter from Eight Countries Isolates France, Germany, Smooths Path for War. The Wall Street Journal. New York, January 30, 2003, p. A 1.
- “The United States has played a critical role in European integration and European security, in particular through NATO. The end of the Cold War has left the United States in a dominant position as a military actor.” European Security Strategy, p.1.
<http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf>, March 6, 2006.
- Address of the President George W. Bush to Faculty and Students of Warsaw University
‘*No More Munichs. No More Yaltas – Lift Up Your Hearts.*’ Embassy of the United States in Warsaw, Poland, (June 2001).
- Asmus, D. Ronald, *Opening NATO’s Door. How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), xxiv
- Bentinikc, Marc, “Participation in Politico-Military Alliances and National Defense Planning,” *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 63-70. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.
- Bernstein, Richard, *Old rivalry persists as Russian-Polish relations take turn for worse*, (The New York Times, July 2005)
- Bilocerkowycz, Jaro, *Russian and Polish Relations: A New Era*, (DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management. Wright-Patterson AFB: Fall 2003.Vol.26)
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, “Mysli o Obronnosci Polski,” *Polska Zbrojna* 754, no.4 (March, 2004), 3 –4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=754 (March 25, 2006).

- Central European Review. "NATO w polityce bezpieczeństwa w Polsce. Reforma Systemu Obronnego RP, Restrukturyzacja Sił Zbrojnych," <http://www.medianet.pl/~ceurorev/numer22/nato4.htm>, April 24, 2006.
- CFSP WATCH 2004 – Poland, by Dr. Rafal Trzaskowski and Olaf Osica, p.5, <http://www.fornet.info/CFSPannualreports2004/CFSP%20Watch%202004%20poland.pdf>, 6 March 2006.
- CFSP WATCH 2005 – Poland by Dr. Rafal Trzaskowski and Olaf Osica, p.1, <http://www.fornet.info/CFSPannualreports2005/CFSP%20Watch%202005%20Poland.pdf>, 16 May 2006.
- Cheremushkin, Peter, *Russian-Polish Relations: From Stereotypes to Reconciliation*, (Moscow State University, 2002).
- Cimoszewicz, Włodzimierz, *Future of the Common Foreign and Security Policy* (Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 2003).
- Cimoszewicz, Włodzimierz, *Poland's View on Global Security Issues* (Sydney: University of New Wales, 2003), http://www.polishembassy.ca/news_details.asp?nid=86 (5 March 2006).
- Cimoszewicz, Włodzimierz. "Polska w Zamecie Świata." *Gazeta Wyborcza*, (2004): 4.
- Crow, Suzanne, *Russian Views on an Eastward Expansion of NATO*, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (hereafter RFE/RL) Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 41, 15 October 1993.
- Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press, Vol. 54, No. 22, June 26, 2002, pp. 19-20.
- Danilov, Dmitri, *Poland - Russia -Ukraine In A Structuring Europe: Russian Foreign And Security Policy*, (Institute of Europe, Moscow, October 2000).
- Declaration of the Republic of Poland, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, and the Republic of Hungary on Cooperation in Pursuit of European Integration. Zbiór Dokumentów – Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski i Stosunków Międzynarodowych. Visegrad, February 15, 1991. Also Statement by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the "Triangle States" Concerning Cooperation with the NATO. Zbiór Dokumentów – Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski i Stosunków Międzynarodowych. Cracow, October 5, 1991.
- Dunn, D. H., Poland: America's New Model Ally. In M. Zaborowski, D. H. Dunn. Poland: A
- European Security Strategy (December 2003), 2. <http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (March 6, 2006).
- Expose of Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz in Sejm, (November 2005).

- Falinski, Maria Andrzej, "Interoperacyjnosc: Klucz do NATO," *Biuletyn Departamentu Integracji z NATO* BBN 11, no.2 (January 1999), 33–41, http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_nato_interop, April 25, 2006.
- Fundacja Polska W Europie, "Europejska Polityka Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony," *Polska w Europie* 32, no 1 (2003): 69-88. <http://www.pwe.org.pl/pdf/3900.pdf>, 5 March 2006.
- Gnesotto, Nicole, ed., *EU Security and Defense Policy: The First Five Years (1999–2004)* (Paris: ISS, 2004), 40.
- Golawski, Artur, and Ryszard Choroszy, „Byc Albo Nie Byc w Iraku,” *Polska Zbrojna*, no. 49 (December 2003): 3, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=1403, 20 May 2006.
- Government information on Polish foreign policy in 2006 presented at the session of the Sejm on February 15, 2006 by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, Stefan Meller. <http://www.mfa.gov.pl/Government,information,on,Polish,foreign,policy,in,2006,4599.html>, 8 May 2006.
- Hostnik, Ivan, "Politico-Military Cooperation," *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 47-52. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.
- Kaletka, Włodzimierz, and Tadeusz Wrobel, "Militarna Straz Pozarna," *Polska Zbrojna*, (December 2004), http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artukul.html?id_artukul=1695, 21 May 2006.
- Karwala, Damian, "Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej," *Stosunki Miedzynarodowe* (November 2004), <http://www.stosunki.pl/main428346040410,4,yisvp.htm>, March 15, 2006.
- Kobrinakaya, Irina, *Love and Hate Polish-Russian Relations Marred by Russian Unpredictability and EU and Nato Uncertainty*, (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, January 2005) http://www.aei.org/research/nai/publications/pubID.21920,projectID.11/pub_detail.asp, 11 May 2006.
- Kolga, Margus, "Defense Policy Planning vs. Planning," in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 32–40. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.
- Koscinski, Piotr, „Polska Wyznaje Wine," *Rzeczpospolita*, no. 111 (May 2006), http://www.rzeczpospolita.pl/gazeta/wydanie_060513/swiat/swiat_a_7.html, 17 May 2006.

- Koziej, Stanislaw, "Defense and Strategy Planning, in *The Role of Defense Policy Planning*, edited by Helnarski, Stanislaw and Julietta Szymanowska, 25–31. Warszawa: Department of International Security, 2000.
- Koziej, Stanislaw, "Sztuka Reakcji," *Polska Zbrojna* 597, no.4 (March 2002), 3–4, http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=597, March 25, 2006.
- Koziej, Stanislaw, *Polityczno-Strategiczny Wymiar Bezpieczeństwa Europejskiego*, (Warszawa, Wyższa Szkoła Businessu i Administracji, 2004) <http://www.europa.wojsko-polskie.pl/Skins/default/download/konferencja/Stanislaw%20Koziej%20-%20Polityczno-strategiczny%20wymiar%20bezpieczenstwa%20europejskiego.doc>, 10 May 2006.
- Kuzniar, Roman, „Polityka Zagraniczna Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej,” *Stosunki Międzynarodowe*, (May 2000): 501.
- Kwasniewski, Aleksander, Speech on the New National Security Strategy in the President's Palace (September 2003), http://www.prezydent.pl/ser/index.php3?tem_ID=6209&kategoria=, December 10, 2005.
- Lachowski, Zdzislaw, "ESDP: Złudzenia i Realia," *Polska Zbrojna*, (August 2002), http://www.polska-zbrojna.pl/artykul.html?id_artykul=886, 21 May 2006.
- Linder, R., "Domestic and Foreign Policy Candida tions Behind Structural Changes in the Ukraine and Belarus", *Assenpolitik*, no. 4 (May 1995): 366-367.
- Majcherek, Janusz, "Między Europa a Ameryka," *Kapitalista Powszechny* 75, no. 3, (February 1999), <http://www.ktp.org.pl/kapitalista/majcherek76.html>, 21 May 2006.
- Meller Wants Polish-Russian Relations to be Normalized, (*Interfax Information Service*, November 2005) <http://hww.interfax.com/17/105306/interview.aspx>, 12 December 2005.
- Merkel Takes Heat Out of Russian Gas Deal in Poland* (Deutsche Welle, December 2005), <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,1800001,00.html>, 12 May 2006.
- Miaskiewicz, Michał, eds., *Stosunki Transatlantyckie Wobec Problemów Światowego Bezpieczeństwa* (Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, 2003).
- Miszczak, Krzysztof, "Grupy Bojowe – Europejskie Siły Szybkiego Reagowania," *Central European Review*, no. 40 (July 2005), <http://www.medianet.pl/~ceurorev/numer40/3.htm>, 21 May 2006.

Mitek, Tadeusz, "Czas Nowej Strategii," *Polska Zbrojna* 477, no.11 (March 2006), 12–13, http://www.zolnierz-polski.pl/arttykul.html?id_arttykul=1921, March 12, 2006.

NATO Handbook (Brussels: NATO of Information and Press, 2001) p. 88

New Power in Transatlantic Security. (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003): 70

Nowak, Bartłomiej and Rafał Rowiński. „Unia Europejska po Rozszerzeniu. Na Pierwszym Zakręcie,” *Raporty i Analizy*, no. 8 (2004): 11, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0804.pdf, 3 May 2006.

Oblój, Krzysztof. *Zarządzanie strategiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1987, 80.

Osica, Olaf, "A Secure Poland in a Better Union? The ESS as Seen from Warsaw's Perspective," *German Foreign Policy in Dialogue* 5, no. 14 (October 2004): 9–15, <http://www.deutsche-aussenpolitik.de/newsletter/issue14.pdf>, 17 March 2006.

Osica, Olaf, *Irak – Początek Nowej Epoki w Polityce Zagranicznej III RP*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 9, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_0404.pdf, 20 May 2006.

Podolski, Antoni, *Polska Strategia Bezpieczeństwa jako Praktyczna Implementacja Europejskiej Strategii Bezpieczeństwa – między teoria a praktyka* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2005), 13.

Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs' statement on Polish-Belarusian Relations, (Warsaw, 2 July 2005).

Quote from Interfax, *Le temps* (October 2001)

Reed, John, „Warsaw Gives a Powerful Friend a Warm Welcome”, *Financial Times*, (June 2001).

Regional Triangle of Weimar Website, "History of Weimar Triangle," <http://www.trireg.net/arttykul.php?idart=1084463191&idtematu=1084245839>, 10 May 2006.

Rotfeld, Adam, "Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego RP w Nowych Warunkach Międzynarodowych: Nowe Wyzwania, Nowe Zadania," lecture in the National Defense Academy (October 2003), http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/file_library/29/AON%20110_285.doc, March 10, 2006.

Russia and Poland hail new relations (BBC News, January 2002),

- Shepherd, Alistair, *ESDP Events Unresolved Issues*, (London: Defense Academy, 2001), 75
[http://www.da.mod.uk/CSRC/documents/CEE/G93%20\(Security%20in%20the%20Black%20Sea%20Region/G93.chap17](http://www.da.mod.uk/CSRC/documents/CEE/G93%20(Security%20in%20the%20Black%20Sea%20Region/G93.chap17), 21 May 2006.
- Simon, Jeffrey. "Central and East European Security: New National Concepts and Defense Doctrines" NDU: *INSS Strategic Forum*, no. 151 (December 1998), <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF151/forum151.html>, 25 Feb 2006.
- Simon, Jeffrey. *NATO Enlargement and Central Europe: A Study in Civil-Military Relations*. Washington D.C.: NDU Press, 1996, 82.
- Sloan, Stanley R., *NATO, the European Union, and the Atlantic Community* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 167.
- Speech by the President of Poland, Aleksander Kwasniewski, *Zbior Dokumentow, Dokumenty z Zakresu Polityki Zagranicznej Polski I Stosunków Miedzynarodowych*, no. 2, (April 1999), <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1999/1-2/15.html>, 11 May 2006.
- Staron, Wladyslaw "Struktura NATO: A System Planowania Obronnego," *Biuletyn Departamentu Integracji z NATO BBN 10*, no.1(Jan 1999): 26-31, http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_nato_struktura, April 2006.
- The common, Presidents Bush and Kwasniewski announcement on Polish-American Cooperation in the 21st Century, Warsaw (January 2004), http://www.bbn.gov.pl/?strona=pl_kronika_2004_01_2602, May 2006.
- The Constitution of The Republic of Poland (April 1997), <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/prawo/konst/angielski/kon1.htm>, May 2006.
- The National Security Strategy of the Republic of Poland (July 2003), p.1, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/Poland-2003.pdf>, March, 2006.
- The Polish Minster of Foreign Affairs, Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz interview on situation in Iraq. (September 2003), <http://www.msz.gov.pl/8,wrzesnia,2003r,-,Wywiad,dla,Gazety,Wyborczej,nt.,sytuacji,w,Iraku,1369.html>, May 2006.
- Torbakov, Igor, "What is Behind Growing Tension in Russian-Polish Relations?", *The Jamestown Foundation-Publications* 158, no. 2 (August 2005) http://www.jamestown.org/publications_details.php?volume_id=407&issue_id=3436&article_id=2370143, 11 May 2006.
- Trzaskowski, Rafal, „The View From Central Europe – Poland,” in *Bigger UE, Wider CFSP, Stronger ESDP?*, ed. Antonio Missiroli. (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies Press, 2002): 19-26, <http://aei.pitt.edu/709/01/occ34.pdf> (20 May 2006).

- Tymanowski, Jozef, „Rosja-Białorus-Ukraina w Polskiej Polityce Bezpieczeństwa,” *Zeszyty Naukowe AON* 51, no. 2 (February 2003), http://www.aon.edu.pl/zn2003/tymanowski_2.htm, 10 May 2006.
- Wagrowska, Maria, *Udział Polski w Interwencji Zbrojnej i Misji Stabilizacyjnej w Iraku*, (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2004): 4, http://www.csm.org.pl/pl/files/raporty/2004/rap_i_an_1204.pdf, 20 May 2006.
- Wayne, Leslie, “Polish Pride, American Profits”, *The New York Times*, (January 2003): 1.
- Zaborowski, Marcin, “From America’s Protégé to Constructive European, Polish Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century”, *Occasional Paper No.56* (Dec 2004): 7, <http://aei.pitt.edu/3392/01/occ56.pdf>, 24 April 2006.
- Zaborowski, Marcin, *Between Power and Weaknesses: Poland – A New Actor in the Transatlantic Security* (Warszawa: Center for International Relations, 2003), 7.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. 2nd Mechanized Corps
Commander
ul. Rakowicka 29
31-910 Kraków, Poland
4. 6th Airborne Brigade
Commander
ul. Wrocławska 21
31-901 Kraków, Poland
5. Piotr Bieniek
ul. Ceglarska 16/45
30-362 Kraków, Poland