Beata Kamila Maczka

(DE-)SECURITIZING EAST

POLISH DISCOURSE ON EASTERN PARTNERSHIP

Abstract

The subject of this thesis is Polish discourse concerning the Eastern Partnership. The subject creates an opportunity to analyze security policy under current geopolitical conditions in the context of Poland's membership in the EU. Polish literature concerning eastern issues is dominated by classical geopolitical thinking and numerous references to grand narratives. Therefore, the study explores the critical geopolitics theoretical approach. The theory provides a tool for understanding how identity, security discourses and geographical reasoning are being constructed. Security issues, especially those concerning Russia, are in Polish literature and public debates discussed by means of political realism, i.e. a fight over dominance, a sense of threat, and the need of power maximization. The aim of this thesis is to analyze arguments, which are used in Poland to justify the development of the Eastern Partnership Project. Relying on extensive studies on Estonia's situation, I want to follow through correlations between geopolitics and identity and its influence on Poland's perception of Polish and European security. The aim of the thesis was to show the construction of threats in Poland. I will try to answer the question of whether Polish discourse is actually as uniform as it is seen outside Poland, i.e. whether it is only dominated by references to grand narratives and hostile rhetoric. The thesis applies the methodology of the Copenhagen School, which argues that by talking security an actor aims to move a topic away from conventional politics and legitimatize extraordinary means to be used against the constructed threat. The thesis examines how Poland securitizes and desecuritizes its relations with eastern neighbours and what are the consequences of such movements.

Key words: identity, security, Eastern Partnership, ENP, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

CBOS Centrum Badania Opini Spolecznej

CFSP Common Foreign Security Policy

CG Critical Geopolitics

CS Copenhagen School

ES Eastern Dimension

ENP European Neighbourhood Policy

EP Eastern Partnership

ESDP European Security and Defence Policy

ESS European Security Strategy

EU European Union

GUAM Organization for Democracy and Economic Development

IR International Relations

NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization

ND Northern dimension

OSCE Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

PAP Polska Agencja Prasowa

PiS Prawo i Sprawiedliwosc

PM Prime Minister

PO Platforma Obywatelska

PSL Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe

SLD Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej

TACIS Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States

UN United Nations

WTO Warsaw Treaty Organization

Contents

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1. Background

Several historical epochs ago, Poland's political considerations forced the country to develop and pursue an Eastern policy. Different elements of this policy developed when the Soviet Union, later Russia, was the only Eastern neighbour of Poland. This situation influenced all of Poland's political decisions toward Eastern Europe. Polish thinking about Eastern policy has always had its specific character. For Western states such as Germany or France, having their own tradition of political activity in the East, this policy consisted in establishing relations with the centre of the Russian Empire. For Poland, Eastern policy has always meant entering into alliances against this centre to situate itself beyond its borders and outside them. Thus, Poland tried almost all possible concepts aimed at the Soviet disunion. Among those concepts were an idea of entering into a multinational alliance led by Poland with nations of the Soviet Empire against the authority of tsars, ideas of cooperation with a revolutionary movement, and even with the Bolshevik Party against the Russian ancient regime, and the concept of driving a wedge between Russian people and Soviet authority.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, Polish foreign policy has been characterized by consistent activities aiming at integration in the Eastern region and its ideological orientation toward the West. In this issue, Poland was an exception among other countries of Central Europe. After 1989 the Visegrad Group countries (for example, the Czech Republic and Hungary) adopted a strategy of withdrawing from former Eastern allies in the Soviet block and attempted to maximize their national security on their own by integrating into the EU and NATO. Isolating from issues of the Eastern region was a way to relieve a political tension in relations with Moscow and a way to maintain good trade relations with Russia. Poland, which had adopted a pro-Eastern position at the beginning of transformation actively, engaged in issues of the Eastern region. According to Warsaw, the East had and has key importance for national security, cultural heritage, protecting historical truth[1] and Poland's economic and political interests. In Poland, it is often stressed that Warsaw was the first to recognize Ukraine's independence. A question arises: why is the Eastern region so important for Poland's foreign policy? A key reason for Poland's engagement in the East is a traditional perception of geopolitics. Poland perceives Russia as a potential source of threat to political and economic

---

[1] Memory of nation's grand heroes and verity of historical facts and events. Element of politics of the past.

1

interests of the countries from the region. Poland tends to weaken Moscow's influences in former Soviet republics in order to strengthen their stability and international position. The Polish geopolitical thought and Eastern policy are under the influence of the so-called Rapallo myth[2], i.e. fear of agreement between Russia and the West to Poland's disadvantage. Fear concerned among other things attempts to establish special relations between NATO and Russia in 1997 – in relation to the then plans of expansion of the alliance to include Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary – and at present, as a result of Putin's choice after September 11th, 2001 and the second wave of NATO expansion. With time, the disagreement on Russia's new status with the Alliance died down; however, it is worth recollecting the interview with Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz for the *Washington Post* where he opposed Russia's right to veto on NATO's internal affairs. Historical experiences and national memory maintained by the political and intellectual elites creates a sense of threat from Russia. This threat is so far constantly present in the consciousness and subconsciousness of the Polish people and determines Poland's dominant attitude toward other countries from the East.

What is more, Polish historical memory with its main elements like independence, identity and geopolitics still has a huge influence on Poland's contemporary foreign policy and strategy (Smolar, 2002). Poland's national security policy is not free from the burden of the past. Polish historical memory with its beliefs or prejudices shapes a culture of security, which is a point of reference for policy makers in Poland. Poland's culture of security is characterized by geopolitical fears concerning threats of losing independence and national identity.

The previous year was certainly crucial for Poland's foreign policy. On the seventh of May 2009 in the Eastern Partnership was inaugurated. The project is the Polish-Swedish initiative aiming at strengthening the Eastern dimension of the European Union policy within the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy. In Poland, the event is regarded as symbolic and innovative in respect of the shaping of Europe's new geopolitical map. The Eastern Partnership Project is addressed to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. The Project is designed to start a regional cooperation, which will be based on newly

---

[2] The Treaty of Rapallo was an agreement undersigned on April 16, 1922 between the Weimar Republic and Soviet Russia under which both parties renounced all territorial and financial claims against the other. The states also agreed to normalise their diplomatic relations and strengthen the economic and military ties. For Poles, the treaty has a symbolic meaning (source Wikipedia).

developed principles. The Eastern Partnership is closely connected with the European Neighbourhood Policy in respect of principles and ways of acting. The main aim of the Polish initiative is to strengthen the EU's relations with a group of Poland's Eastern neighbours. In other words, it is a plan to develop relations between the EU and the countries of Eastern Europe and Southern Caucasus. The Project assumes the engagement of the above-mentioned countries in policies and programmes of the EU and their integration with structures of the Common Market. The EU cooperation with its Eastern neighbours aims at acceptance of the EU practices in trade, economy and policy by the East and initiating and strengthening changes leading to the Europeanization of the region. Poland and Sweden are the project's initiators. In May 2008, both countries suggested that the European Neighbourhood Policy could be used to strengthen relations with the East. The Eastern Partnership is the first Polish initiative, which was introduced into the system of external relations of the EU.

Poland would like to be seen as a regional leader specializing in Eastern, EU and transatlantic issues. For years, Warsaw was consistently trying to involve the USA into the affairs of the Eastern region. Warsaw's efforts were rewarded with success, for example, the establishment of the Poland-America-Ukraine Cooperation Initiative. However, it turned out that the EU is a more effective body in respect of influencing the situation in the countries in the East. This conclusion was the result of Poland's participation in the EU, and especially the conditionality principle concerning internal reforms. Belief in the transformational power of the EU inclined Warsaw to propagate the need of the EU common policy toward the former Soviet republics, which are still under Russia's influence.

Warsaw stressed many times that the Eastern Partnership Project is not directed against Moscow. What is more, the Polish side does not rule out the possibility of cooperation with Russia within the framework of the initiative. However, it is visible that Poland being the main advocate of separation from Russia is still determined to help the countries of Eastern Europe to break free from Russia's influences. This thesis investigates this determination through the analysis of Polish discourse concerning relations with the East.

Projects being realized within the framework of the EU are much more effective than single initiatives of individual member countries. Poland has preferably relied on the Euro-Atlantic structures with regard to issues of security. For the first time, Poland has decided to use EU structures for this purpose. The Common Foreign and Security Policy aims at keeping broadly

understood security and what gives greater security than systematic expansion of the EU to the East, alongside with simultaneous spread of influence at the expense of Russia's interests? The Russian side is anxious about Poland's intentions. *Kommersant*, a Russian newspaper, writes about the Eastern Partnership in the following way:

"Regarding international relations, one of the most important aspects of the Czech Presidency will be the development of the Partnership Programme with the Eastern neighbours of the EU – so called Eastern Partnership (…) Priorities of the next president of the EU do not include Russia (…) This means that Moscow (,which so far has been the key issue in the Eastern policy of the EU, especially during the presidency of Germany and France) will be an ignored issue in Europe's Eastern policy during the Czech Presidency" (02.12.2008)

Other Russian newspapers arrive at similar conclusions, for example, *Nezavisimaia Gazeta* writes:

"If this initiative is implemented, Moscow's plans will be given up; plans which aim at establishing a common economic area including the former Soviet republics (…) next year, in Brussels, these countries will take part in a summit, Russia has not been invited (…) the conflict in August in Transcaucasia was an additional impulse for the Eastern Partnership implementation (…) the implementation of the Eastern Partnership may exacerbate relations between the Russian Federation and the EU (…)" (02.12.2008).

1.2. Object of research

The research questions of this work are as following:

- What is the Polish discourse on Eastern Partnership initiative and is it unanimous?
- How does Poland spatialize East applying geographical assumptions?
- To what extent do Poland's defence culture and national identity determine its relations with East?
- By what means do Polish elites justify securitizing and desecuritizing moves toward eastern neighbours?

Formulations of these research tasks require a short justification.

As already mention, the aim of this thesis is to present Polish discourse characterizing the initiative of the Eastern Partnership. The EP is the third regional project in the European Union. Individual members of the EU want to attract the Brussels' attention to problems concerning their regions. They try to create particular projects, which institutionalize particular regional initiative. Each such regional initiative is based on national interests of countries, which

introduce the particular initiative. Poland, which had started working on the Eastern Dimension before becoming a member of the EU is not an exception. I will try to answer the question about Poland's motives on establishing own initiative of regional cooperation. I propose a thesis that the Eastern Partnership above all is supposed to strengthen Poland's security by tasks aiming at stabilizing the situation in the countries of Eastern Europe. Moreover, the Eastern Partnership aims at increasing Warsaw's prestige in the EU, which is supposed to give Poland a strong position in relations with Moscow. The analysis of the Eastern Partnership will be conducted in the context of Polish policy and culture of security. There is a strong correlation between Polish security culture and Eastern policy, which I will try to present in a clear way.

At the same time, I will present the complexity of the Polish thinking about the East that in the context of the European Policy toward its Eastern neighbours Poland refers to so-called Marchia's geostrategy (Joenniemi 2008). Poland treats the East as a buffer zone – a safety zone separating the EU from Russia, i.e. order from disorder, stability from the lack of stability, a safety zone from a source of danger.

In this thesis, I will analyze Poland's national interests in the period of the past twenty years, which according to the majority of Polish policy makers still concern Eastern Europe. I will present the main assumptions of the Eastern Partnership and ponder over Poland's position toward another regional initiative: the Mediterranean Dimension concerning the issue of security.

Donald Tusk's government has started work in 2008. It adopted a softer direction in foreign policy, which led to the inauguration of the Eastern Partnership Policy. Despite this success, it shall be remembered that Donald Tusk's government's position (often incoherent and inconsistent, but less ideological) is frequently limited by the president (previously member of a right-winged Law and Justice Party leaded by his twin brother Jaroslaw), who influences Poland's foreign policy. I will present the most important differences in Eastern policies presented by both centres of authority, which are based above all on different attitudes toward relations with Moscow. The diverse attitudes prove that Polish Eastern policy is not determined by historically based, subconscious fear toward Russia, but is constructed by policy makers who do not put identical significance to the security/identity puzzle.

1.3. Previous research

Since the collapse of the Iron Curtain, the academic world has been debating the issue of security in a newly formed region of Central-Eastern Europe. At the beginning of the 1990s, the debate focused on the direction of development of countries, which at that time were under the influence of the Soviet Russia. Their chances for integration into the EU and NATO were discussed. After their accession, the debate focused on analyzing their influence and contribution to the shape of all-European security. Researchers focused mostly on the Baltic countries, which were undergoing a dynamic political transformation. In the context of post-Cold War strategy concerning security of these countries, it was claimed that fear of Russia would determine their choices concerning foreign policy. According to this theory, the whole energy of political elites from Central-Eastern Europe focused on preventing potential threats from Russia. Analyses from that time were still based on realist or neo-realist thought. With time, the Eastern region started to be considered from the perspective of identity problem. The debate focused on the process of construction of threats awaiting newly independent states. Such studies are much more significant because they focus on answering the question of how threats are constructed (assuming that these are more subjective than objective products).

National security is significantly influenced by a collective national identity. A nation perceives itself as a community and realizes who it cannot be, i.e. a nation perceives itself in comparison with other integrated communities. If "We" exist, there are also the "Others" who are outside "Our" community. Such sense seemed to be a key issue concerning the concept of national security in Central-Eastern Europe. Some researchers (Schafer, 1999; Theiler, 2003) put forward an argument concerning the proportion of dislike toward strangers to the willingness to strengthen bonds between members of a group. In other words, a greater willingness to develop a collective identity in a group involves a more negative attitude toward an external group. I would add another aspect of dislike toward "Others". A community struggling with internal problems and social or economic conflicts can often develop a sense of identity only by antagonizing in relationship with the "Others". Therefore, a stranger will exist as long as internal difficulties exist. This stranger will assume different forms without restricting himself to one particular subject. Of course, it is possible that the lack of antagonism is accompanied by a strong sense of separateness of "Us" as a community from external "Them". What is more, issues such as an attitude toward groups from the outside, a concept of hostility and a level of

friendly relations are not given once and permanently. These issues constitute a dynamic and changeable process (Wendt, 1999; Hopf, 2002).

Correlations between security and identity were examined by among others Pami Aalto and Merje Kuus who based their analysis on the case of Estonia. It is worth mentioning about a stereotype discussed by Marje Kuus of Eastern Europe as a region, which is struggling with constant ethnic conflicts and difficult nationalisms and tribal hatreds. According to Kuus, within the framework of this pattern, Central and Eastern Europe has two choices: either a faithful imitation of the Western way of social modernization, which leads to control of demons of nationalism, or surrendering them and plunging into an abyss of cruel and constant tribal wars, which is symbolized by the Balkans - including bloody wars in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. It can be noticed that a stereotypical and oriental opposition between modern, civic societies of Western Europe and ethnically defined (i.e. based on blood ties) societies of Central and Eastern Europe entered the canons of Western social studies. What is interesting, the opposition is repeated in literature of countries, which are depreciated – even in academic publications. The pattern is based on classic oriental stereotypes and implies generalizations, which are difficult to accept and blurring key differences between various European countries.

In the context of the subject, which I discuss in my thesis, the most important issue described by Kuus is the above-mentioned division into "Us" and "Them" which is a typical feature of identity of Estonian people. Kuus thinks that a key element of Estonian identity is fear of Russia. Estonian elites are afraid of Russia as a former successor, a strong state, which has imperial and imperialist tendencies. What is more, they are afraid that Russian minority and omnipresent Russian language can be a cultural threat in Estonia. On the other hand, Aalto is sceptical about conclusions proposed by Kuus. According to Aalto, in the context of Estonia, the link between security and identity is much more complex. He refers to opinions of such researchers as Bially, who claims that relation between security and identity is often misunderstood and shall be studied with the use of a more adequate methodology (Bially, 2000). Aalto does not deny the existence of correlation between security and identity. However, he claims that this correlation shall not be considered as close or loose but as diverse (Aalto, 2003: 588) and dependent on context. Aalto based his analysis on studies of Suny (1999: 140) who focuses on a spread of correlation between security and identity. What is important, Suny describes situation in the former Soviet Republics as distortion of a stable reality by referring to threats, lack of security and historical events leading to conflicts. According to Aalto, security

policy in these countries is restricted because some issues concerning this policy are regarded as being contrary to political identity, which limits peaceful development in the post-Soviet area.

As I have mentioned above, the majority of studies concerning the correlation between security and identity focuses on the Baltic countries, especially Estonia. Relatively few studies concern Polish issues. However, Torsti Sirén devoted his doctoral dissertation to the reconstruction of Polish culture of defensive system after the Cold War. Siren discusses Poland's identity in the context of its membership in the EU. Justifying his choice of the subject, Siren mentions Poland's uniqueness and its significance in shaping world order, which resulted from its geopolitical position in Europe. Siren's aim is to analyse Polish identity and the way it is constructed. He distinguishes three means of conveying identity in Poland: Polish state (including president and prime minister), Catholic Church and Polish Army. Analysis and conclusions concerning the Church in Poland raise doubts and reservations. The position of Catholic Church in Poland is stronger than in countries of Western Europe, however Siren's arguments concerning its importance in shaping Polish defence identity and its influence on foreign policy are not convincing. In a chapter concerning the Church, Siren focuses on actions of Radio Maryja which indeed is a religious radio station and gathers Catholics; however it is not identical to the institution of Catholic Church in Poland. Father Rydzyk's radio station was often criticized for speeches inconsistent with the Church's teachings by the Church hierarchy in Poland and Vatican. Suggestion that the church in Poland incites to anti-Semitism is completely false and such suggestion cannot be treated as an element of Polish identity. Siren raises again the issue of anti-Semitism while discussing the subject of deeply rooted narratives in Polish culture.

The author lists four narratives: Poland as a defender of the West, Poland betrayed by its allies, Poland as an anchor of Christianity and Polish anti-Semitism. The last narrative among three others again seems to be a misunderstanding and a generalization. The first three narratives include two significant and deeply rooted elements – Poland's geographical position and borders between Poland and "Others". Siren mentions several "Others" co-creating Polish "I". He divides "Others" into internal "Others" and external "Others". External "Others" include Russia and Germany, which are believed to be Poland's eternal and confrontational neighbours. Internal "Others" are Jewish minority and German minority. Once again Siren stresses the presence of anti-Semitism in the Polish nation. He lacks the ability to separate populist talk from

actual public feelings in Poland.[3] What is more, just after debunking a myth of Poland as a state of religious tolerance, Siren advances a thesis that Poland supports Turkey's membership in the EU in order to open the doors to Ukraine's accession. It is hard to believe that a xenophobic and intolerant Catholic state (Poland according to Siren) could support the expansion of the EU to a Muslim country with a population of around 72 million only in order to strengthen its own program of the Eastern policy.

In the part devoted to Russia as an essential "Other" Siren analyzes relations between Poland and its most important eastern neighbour. The author stresses that treating Russia as a threat is a classic example of "prepare for self help case" and a sign of Polish attachment to historical conflicts and xenophobia. Siren mentions four functions of a negative image of Russia: the strengthening of Poland's European identity, the uniting of Polish society in the struggle against a threat, the strengthening of sense of being a victim of history, and the justifying of Poland's attitude as an expert on issues concerning Russia and the East. The author gives examples justifying Polish sensitivity to Russia's actions against Poland, e.g. the issue of Polish meat, the war in Georgia or the Katyn Forest Massacre. Siren repeats Polish elites' principal slogan about little chances for the improvement in relations because of the lack of remorse in Russia.

Siren refuses to use the methodology of Copenhagen School. According to Siren, this methodology says that everything may undergo securitization or de-securitization via language. He explains that this is impossible in the case of Poland because of its attachment to grand narratives, which have been handed down from generation to generation. In my opinion, this statement can be easily invalidated. It is true that Poland's identity is characterized by strong historical factors. However, Polish historical memory is often selective and modified. The existence of grand narratives does not rule out the existence of securitization or de-securitization in Poland.

Siren mentions problems and discourses but he does not analyze them in-depth. He regards Poland as a self-contained and xenophobic state, which is a generalization. He claims that Poland lacks the ability to be a constructive European, which is more a slogan than an argument.

---

[3] According to public opinion polls from January 2010 31% of Poles have favourable opinion of Jews, for 35% Jews are indifferent and 7% could not describe their attitude toward Jews. 27% of Poles hold a negative view of Jews, which is slightly less than Poles' negative sentiment toward Russians, Germans or Ukrainians and significantly less than toward Arabs, Roma or Romanians (CBOS January 2010). Anti-Jewish crimes in Poland are mostly restricted to incidents on the football stadiums.

As the aim of this work was the use of Polish sources, I explored most of the studies on Eastern issues that are available in Poland. Polish intellectuals (with a few exceptions) comment at length on Russia's foreign policy. Describing relations between Poland and Russia, they, more or less consciously, play the part of Poland's advocate in an uneven competition with the bigger neighbour.

Marcin Kaczmarski from the Centre for Eastern Studies in a monograph *Russia at the Crossroads* notices that since 2005 Polish-Russian relationships have been at the limit of absurdity. Just like most of the Polish authors writing about Russia, Kaczmarski seeks the causes of this situation in "primitive methods" of Russia's foreign policy. Kaczmarski points out that only when Poland took decisive steps in Eastern Europe did Russia take account of Poland. After the end of the Cold War, Poland did not exist in either Russia's articles on political subjects or documents concerning foreign policy (Kaczmarski 2006:164). In monographs on foreign policy, relations with Central and Eastern Europe were included in several sentences in a chapter about relations with Europe in general, and on more than one occasion, there is none of them. In the context of Russia's foreign policy, the author describes Poland as a non-existing neighbour. Kaczmarski stresses Russia's shock caused by Poland's involvement in Ukraine's issues. What is more, Kaczmarski writes about a power status that is genetically rooted in Russia's foreign policy, which connects with an incorrect treatment of countries, which are not world powers (Ibid:166). According to Kaczmarski, Russia regards Poland as unable to decide about its future on its own. According to Kremlin, Poland exchanged one Big Brother (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) for two others – Brussels and Washington and arguments that this was decided by the Polish nation are not convincing to Russia. Poland responds to this accusation with an argument that Russia still does not understand the term "independence of a nation". In Russia, there is an independent authority and there is not an independent nation. Russia is accused of shaping foreign policy only on the level of political realism, which is also mentioned by Kaczmarski. Author does not mention that in Poland, the attachment to political realism and classic geopolitics is very strong, too. Poland and Russia often raise claims against each other using similar methods of action and similar arguments against the other side.

In a report worked out for the Centre for Eastern Studies, the biggest unit dealing with issues of the East in Poland, the same author analyzes Russia's policy in depth (Kaczmarski 2009). He

mainly studies Russia's revisionist character. According to the author, Kremlin mainly accuses the West (and the USA especially) of ignoring Russia's voice and interests. Russia's criticism includes both general issues, for example, America's aspiration for the creation of a one-dimensional international order, reluctance to arms control, and detailed issues, among other things, NATO expansion and the development of the Anti-Ballistic Missile System. Kaczmarski refers to Putin's speech during which he declared that Russia would no longer go along with the existing international order. As far as Russia's foreign policy is concerned, Putin's speech became a symbol of Russia's entrance to a new stage, which can be described as revisionism because of a determined questioning of a former format of relations with the West (including both global and regional dimension, especially with reference to the Commonwealth of Independent States).

According to Kaczmarski, Kremlin expects that it will manage to become a superpower deciding about a global order, and that its key national interests will be respected. Russia perceives a chance to reconstruct a global order in which the West stops being a dominant actor and is forced to "share" responsibility and international influences with Russia and other non-Western political centres like China or India, which are treated by Russia as close partners (Kaczmarski 2009:58). Opposition of the West (, which is not willing to accept transformations in Russia and a new Russia) is perceived as a basic threat to Russia by its elites. The new Russia is seen from the angle of the future. The driving force of Russian elites' assertiveness and their direct source of foreign policy is their conviction about a favourable situation of Russia, its political rebirth, and a relative weakness of potential rivals (especially the West).

Analyzing Russia's policy in European dimension (and broader – Euro-Atlantic dimension), Kaczmarski points out that Russia's aims come down to the recognition of its special position by the countries of the West and the respect of Russia's political, economic, and safety interests despite the lack of institutional membership in key institutions like the EU or NATO (Ibid:65). With respect to relations with the EU, Russia tends to obtain a real influence on policy of the EU. Such a model shall be included in a new negotiated agreement about legal basis for cooperation between Russia and the EU. In political dimension, Russia expects the right to co-decide about significant EU issues. Moreover, Moscow expects the recognition of its role as one of the elements of "European concert of superpowers", which would increase Russia's influence on situation in Europe in an informal way. Moscow tends to maintain "a buffer zone" or a zone

of "limited presence of the West", which in practice means the aspiration for minimizing military presence of the countries of the West and NATO.

In the article *Uses of Russia: The Role of Russia in the Modern Polish National Identity,* Tomasz Zarycki claims that the Polish national identity refers mainly to the image of Poland as a victim of Russia throughout the course of history. Polish people often stress the superiority of their identity over Russian one. Russia is militarily and economically stronger than Poland. However, according to Polish people, Russia is an uncivilized and brutal country that does not share European values. Poland has the feeling of cultural superiority over Russia, which manifests itself by a special knowledge, morality, and cultural heritage of the Polish nation. Zarycki points out that Russia's exclusion from European cultural community is an element of Poland's European identity.

In a monograph *International Identity of the Russian Federation*, Warsaw university professor Stanislaw Bielen claims that a typical perceptual mistake in Poland is the understanding of Russia from the angle of its complex history. Bielen is a professor of Warsaw University and regards himself a Russophile. According to him, Polish national identity relies more on myths of tsarist or Soviet Russia than on reliable knowledge and actual Russia's reality. Bielen believes that in spite of appearances, Polish people know little about contemporary Russia. The author tries not to surrender to anti-Russian prejudices. On the other hand, he is not a supporter of a popular among Polish scholars pessimism that due to its complexity and mysteriousness, Russia cannot be understood. The author tries to maintain a rational attitude toward Russia as an object of cognition. According to Bielen, Russia is not a metaphysical mystery. He admits Russia's uniqueness, however, he claims that it is one of many normal countries, which can be recognized with the use of some good will and intellectual effort.

1.4. The outline of the study

The study is divided into seven parts. In the introductory chapter, after short conceptualization of the research topic, I aimed to familiarize the reader with previous research review. Then object of the research was shortly discussed and research questions formulated. I inform that the study will be narrowed down by setting it in the theoretical framework of geopolitics and Copenhagen School's securitization methodology.

In the theory chapter, I lay out the most fundamental assumptions of geopolitical theory. I present its development from classical geopolitical thought to contemporary critical geopolitics considerations. Critical Geopolitics is the fundamental theory applied in the thesis; however, references to classical geopolitics in Polish public debate appear frequently. Moreover, critical geopolitics is also a tool of criticising traditional geopolitics. Therefore, there was a need to point out the main arguments of both geopolitical schools and the fundamental differences between them. Justification of theory choice is provided in the chapter.

In the next chapter, I introduce the methodological tools applied in the analysis. As a key methodological approach, I use the securitization concept. The Copenhagen School of security studies can be a very helpful analytical tool to explore the role of Polish elite discourses in the building process of the Eastern Partnership initiative. This approach emphasizes that it is the 'securitizing actors', who are typically 'state-representatives' and the 'political elite' who can make an issue a security one ('securitize' an issue). Therefore, by using this approach, one can explore how the Eastern partnership works as a tool in securitizing and desecuritizing attempts by particular political elites. Moreover, it helps to answer the question about how the advancement of the process has been justified and legitimized by such discourses. Three analysis chapters follow the chapter on the research methods.

Chapter 4 contains an analysis of Polish security discourses and reveals their paradoxical character. Despite a complete change of Europe's geopolitical map after 1989 and Poland's integration with the EU and NATO, the lack of security and potential threats are still present in Polish debate. Analyzing the project concerning regional cooperation in the East which is based on the idea of separating the Eastern countries from Moscow which is seen as a potential threat, we can put a thesis that such a threat is desirably needed in Poland as it creates a sense of togetherness and unity. Citing David Campbell's view, Merje Kuus points out, that countries of Central Europe tend to refer to concepts of enemy and hostility. In political, economic or military context, external threat may be either a motivating factor or a tool for gaining social support for the state's policies and strategies. A significant part of the Polish political and intellectual elite wants to perceive the lack of security as an integral part of identity. Poland presents itself as a European country, which is exposed to non-European Russia's hostility. Such an attitude serves as an instrument for prioritizing certain issues in the political debate. Political decisions result from identity and security conditions; however, all above they are made by the not objective elites. The threats are produced subjectively and justified by historical

arguments. Yet, history is frequently used selectively and constitutes a useful tool to enhance the contemporary national interests.

Chapter 5 begins with a detailed explanation of Eastern Partnership's content. Next, it focuses on the securitization's motives in the Polish Eastern Partnership discourse. I argue that Poland's securitizing moves referring to East and EP initiative have many similarities with EU eastern enlargement. Moreover, I present how Poland, categorized as a euro-sceptical state utilizes tools provided by EU to increase its own security. I cover the main aspects of Mediterranean dimension, which is the Polish initiative's biggest rival when it comes to EU subsidies division. I simultaneously claim that Eastern Partnership is a result of a lesson drawing process. I indicate the concurrences between both initiatives when it comes to approaching security issues arguing that Polish and Spanish actions are characteristic for peripheral states.

In chapter 6 I analyze more circumstantially Polish policy toward East of the past five years. I indicate that there are significant differences in Polish eastern policy, which depend on the executing party. Analyzing Polish-Russian relations, I refer to refraining and engaging strategies. I claim that the foreign policy of President Lech Kaczynski and Donald Tusk's government result (at least to some extent) from the personal background of both leaders. Subsequently I focus on Polish actions undertaken toward Ukraine and Belarus. The chapter ends with a short summary of Warsaw's successes and failures in its eastern policy.

The final chapter completes and concludes the research work. It begins by a summary of covered topics and presents the results of the study – the most crucial discourses of Polish Eastern Policy. Next, it offers a short discussion on Poland's strategy toward the East. The aim of this discussion is to provide some recommendations for the Polish elites. Finally, the chapter lists some recommendations for a potential future research.

CHAPTER 2: Theoretical Outline

The primary purpose of any theory is to clarify concepts and ideas that have become, as it were, confused and entangled. Not until terms and concepts have been defined can one hope to make any significant progress in examining the question clearly and simply and expect the reader to share one's views (Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, 132)

2.1. Justification of the theory choice

It can be said that Poland is a safe country and its geopolitical situation has never been better in the Modern Age, i.e. the age of a huge significance of geopolitics. Poland's geopolitical location stopped to be disastrous and became normal, which means that it does not burden Poland's security. In other words, Poland's geopolitical location worries sometimes but also allows a peaceful existence. However, the future of Eastern Europe might be a source of anxiety. It is about the uncertain situation of Belarus, the possible instability in Ukraine, and Russia's energy policy. However, there is no military threat to Poland as such. The probability of such a threat from Russia is small. Poland can carefully shape Eastern Europe's geopolitics. In the 1990s, in Poland, people often repeated Giedroyc's thesis that "the more significant a role Poland plays in the East, the more it is bound to count in the West".[4] This thesis is deep-rooted in Poland.

This study's aim is to analyse Polish discourse on the Eastern Partnership. I present the way in which Poland as a member of the EU steers its Eastern policy and transfers it on to the EU ground. The analysis of the problem in the theoretical sense is based on the Critical Geopolitical School, which is suitable for uncovering the character of the Polish political thought. Critical Geopolitics is a tool for criticizing traditional geopolitical reasoning and because of it I decided to apply it in this thesis. Policy makers in Poland often refer to geopolitics, thus this theory does not reflect the way of their thinking. Poland's perception of its geographical location and potential threats resulting from it is far from a neutral view. Geopolitics is an ideological product, which assumes that not pure geography but geographical reasons, and claims shape foreign policy of countries. Hence, this thesis includes the critical geopolitics theory, which is a

---

[4] The Giedroyc doctrine was developed in the émigré circles in the 1950s, whereby Poland gave up on any territorial claims on its eastern neighbours, recognised their independence and postulated the end of the Russian-Polish rivalry for influence over Belarus or Ukraine. This doctrine has been an important benchmark in the Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation whereby the two states gradually overcame historic grievances and thus laid the foundations for good neighbourly relations.

tool of criticising traditional geopolitical claims. The theoretical part of this thesis presents a brief evolution of geopolitics – since its beginning to its critical version. In Poland, references to classical geopolitics are often heard. However, they seem to be groundless in the present day's geopolitical circumstances. Poland has never enjoyed such a convenient security situation; however, the classical geopolitical threats are being continuously brought to the agenda. I want to show the most important differences between the classical and critical geopolitics, which will contribute to a better understanding of the Polish foreign policy characteristics.

While characterizing critical geopolitics, I will refer to leading representatives of this thought such as Gearóid Ó Tuathail and John Agnew. I will also use an Estonian researcher's studies, Merje Kuus, who claims that critical geopolitics was established on the ground of the Central and Eastern Europe. Merje Kuus in *Geopolitics Reframed* shows that the collapse of the Iron Curtain was the beginning of a new relationship between identity and security in Eastern Europe. References to geopolitics are an integral part of foreign policy and security discourse. They are also strictly connected with the development of national identity, which refers to a hostile Stranger in the case of Poland. The process of Stranger selecting, imagining and characterizing is worth observing.

Following this track, I will try to illustrate the Eastern Partnership as a project of a country, which on one hand is distrustful of former usurpers, and on the other hand is full of ambitions to become a regional leader. Poland tries to transform its weakness (i.e. the neighbourhood of unpredictable Russia) into a success story in the European context.

So far, representatives of critical geopolitics have not bestowed a lot of attention on Central or Eastern Europe. The most detailed studies concern the Baltic states with Estonia in the vanguard (Aalto, Bers, Kuus). *Geopolitics Reframed* by Merje Kuus showed the complexity of geopolitics in the Eastern countries, especially the Baltic countries. In this thesis, Poland is the subject of the analysis. I will analyse Poland's way of creating geopolitics in accordance with the principle that production of geopolitics happens in specific places and can be adequately studied only in the context of these places. Security in Poland's Eastern policy establishes specific political claims as natural and thus eliminates them from the public debate. Kuus explains that security discourses do not reflect either objective truth or subjective fear, but they construct the meaning of security by declarations expressed in its name. That is why security cannot be examined without analyzing practices, which are used to define threats.

2.2. Geopolitical theory

The paradigm of geopolitics lost its homogeneous character and therefore this thesis deliberates the key concepts of geopolitical theories. Both traditional and critical geopolitics create an integral theoretical framework for geopolitical analysis. The central element of this scrutiny is geopolitical identity. According to Wendt (1999) identity is a relatively fixed and role-specific self-perception of a particular group. Moreover, the group holds certain expectations toward this perception. An empirical analysis of geopolitical identity is an essential factor for forecasting in foreign policy.

The concept of 'geopolitics' has regained a lot of attention during the recent years. Some authors use geopolitics as an analytical tool by which international events may be predicted and explained. Other scholars accuse geopolitics of incorrect interpretation of political facts describing it as pseudo-science. It is argued that geopolitics is obsolete in the globalizing world since geography and space are no longer key factors determining the world politics. However, geopolitics applied properly, taking into account the latest advancements, known as 'Critical Geopolitics' paradigm, provides useful perceptions which explain the events on the international political scene.

2.3. Geopolitics: general overview

It has been frequently highlighted that geopolitics shares the same background with political realism. At least in traditional understanding, geopolitics focuses its attention on power politics and national identity issues perceiving state as a unitary actor. A wide range of authors concentrate on relations between geographical settings and political power. In other words, "geopolitics represents an offshoot of realist thinking, conceptualising realist struggle for power in more specific terms as a struggle for territory." Geographical knowledge is still frequently seen as a natural and solid ground of politics. Therefore the mainstream geopolitical analysis deals mostly with "laying out of spatial frameworks that embrace interacting political power units" (Cohen 2003:11).

The renaissance of geopolitics in the Cold War era has visibly occurred mainly in Central and Eastern Europe. In this region political decisions are usually explained by geographical and geopolitical arguments. In countries such as Poland it is believed that the geopolitical location in

the Eastern part of Europe determines significantly the security situation and poses possible threats. Eastern European countries perceive the East as an insecure and unstable region and therefore struggle over locating themselves on the western side of the geopolitical center. West is being associated with stability while East needs to be securitized. Nowadays eastern geopolitics is a political process which goes beyond the geographical factors and touches cultural and civilizational aspects of politics (Kuus 2007b:10).

The obvious association referring to geopolitics is the correlation between the space, geographic location and politics. On the one hand neither space nor location should be treated as fixed in terms of its importance for geopolitical analysis, which is always the product of some particular epoch. (Cohen 2003: 11). As J. H. Mackinder remarks: "Each century has had its own geographical perspective" (Mackinder 1919: 21).On the other hand, objective spatial conditions have been playing significant importance on the development of civilization, even if they are not deterministic (Kristof 1960: 16). Geographical location affects nation's history and culture and cannot be excluded from geopolitical analysis. Merje Kuus argues that "Identity and culture have always been keywords in the study of geopolitics and international relations since the end of the Cold War" (Kuus 2007b: 10). Perhaps they haven't been pivotal elements of those studies always as Kuus claims but genuinely such linkage aroused interest among researchers in the post-Cold War period.

It is important to point out that there is a strong impact of subjective perception of geographical conditions on the decision making process. Already in 1919 Mackinder claimed that "The influence of geographical conditions upon human activities has depended, however, not merely on the realities as we now know them to be and to have been, but in even greater degree on what men imagined in regard to them" (Mackinder 1919: 21). Such a statement may be treated as an adumbration of the future trend in geopolitical studies known as critical geopolitics. However, I argue that it is essential to frame a clear knowledge of Geopolitics as a research discipline in order to apply it to a particular case study in a regional configuration.

2.4. Geopolitics - origins of the term

To comprehend the main points of critical geopolitics, the uneasy relationship between academic geography and classical geopolitical thought should be considered.

Classical geopolitics, dealing with the statist, Eurocentric, balance-of-power conception of world politics dominated much of the twentieth century and is closely related to academic geography. The traditional way of explaining the history of geopolitics has often started from the basic assumption that geopolitics can be derived from the origins of the term itself (Moisio 2001). The term has been developed in 1899 by a Swedish academician and politologist Rudolf Kjellén (Holdar 1992). Kjellen was inspired by the work of another geopolitical thinker, representative of the so called German school – Friedrich Ratzel. In his literary work *Undersökningar till politikens system* (1918) Kjellen, referring to Ratzel's works, claimed that the state was a political organism that was bigger than the individual, which had proven its power compared to the individual in a way that the citizenship required by the state had taken priority over individualism (Haggman 1998).

This biological-organic state theory of Kjellen was an expansion and complacement of Ratzel's thoughts. According to Ratzel social phenomena, including political ones, are determined by geography. Ratzel resting on Darwinian Theory and social views of Herbert Spencer acknowledged that state may be compared to a live organism, which aims to economic, demographic and territorial development. Territorial growth is a natural consequence of development achieved in other areas of existence. Also Kjellén believed that territory is the most important attribute of each state, much more significant than population. In line with Darwinian theories Kjellén claimed that the state faces constant competition with other states. All states place geographical individuality and borders as their overriding interest in order to provide the best possible security. Thus, grand and quickly developing states absorb weaker entities to fulfill their own natural needs. Ratzel believed that nations' mobility is a symptom of moral health and historical magnitude, ineluctably leading to war. Ratzel educed from his theory terms of locus (Lage) and land (Raum). Locus meant that every member of a particular nation is a part of that nation wherever he lives since land meant that state should be defined by its neighbors. Thereby the geopolitical system comprised according to Kjellén of the states territorial politics, ecopolitics, demopolitics and social politics (Moisio 2001). Geopolitics was at the same time the states' territorial politics and entirety.

As we can notice from Kjellen's and Ratzel's works, from the very beginning, geopolitics was focused on the competitive ambitions of European states (G. Parker 1998; Heffernan 2000). For instance, Ratzel's idea of living space grew out of the extensive anxiety about Germany's position in European politics, and Halford Mackinder's heartland theory reflected analogous

worries in Great Britain (Ó Tuathail 1996b). For many writers geopolitics appeared as a new, objective field of science and perspective on world affairs. (Ó Tuathail 1996b).

Classical geopolitics perceives politics as a territorial practice in which states and nations struggle for power over territories and resources. Such behaviour was perceived as related to the natural evolution of living organisms. Classical geopolitics provided its own explanation of the rivalry between states throughout the twentieth century until the end of the Cold War (Dodds 2000; Agnew 2003).

As possibly one of the most popular examples of theories and concepts connected with geopolitics should be mentioned the model of historical heartland created by Sir Halford Mackinder. Connecting Mackinder's (1904, 1919) theories to geopolitical perception in this context is descriptive, because the author himself has never used the term geopolitics, however the history of geopolitics is frequently connected to Mackinder's theories' continuum. Mackinder believed that small states located in Eastern Europe could have a significant meaning – not proportionate to their size - in balancing the competition between Germany and Russia to dominate the Eurasian heartland. According to this theory Eurasia was a cardinal part of the civilized world and those states which were able to exercise control in heartland automatically controlled the rest of the world. Thus, according to Mackinder's classical geopolitics world politics is based on a rivalry about control in Eurasia.

From Mackinder's thoughts emerged a whole network of geopolitical theories. Out of this Nicholas J. Spykman was famous for being a representative of the American school of political realism. He interpreted Geopolitics as a special stream. He argued with American isolationists who propagated the purposefulness of defending only the American hemisphere. Spykman claimed that the defence of the American hemisphere against a hegemonic continental power would fail because after being cut off from the European and Asian markets, the USA would fail to survive economically. Consequently, the American national interest urged for intervention in places where victory or failure in the World War II could be determined, thus in Europe or in Asia. Spykman supported U.S.'s direct involvement in the Second World War, which was seen in 1939, in Panama Conference where it was decided that the Monroe Doctrine would apply to the areas from an open ocean to the Azores Islands. The latter Spykman's work concerned world order at the end of the World War II. The main thesis of the work was a statement that it is not the heartland, but the rimland, (i.e. peninsular and insular region

surrounding European and Asian continent), which is a driving centre for conflicts and the most serious threat to world peace. Thus, maintaining peace (complying with the American national interest) would include taking control over the region, which was crucial to Geopolitics because of its human, economic, technological and military potential. The priority of American Geopolitics was to prevent the unification by maintaining military bases in Europe and the Far East, and by maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union – "a natural" Washington's ally in preventing the aggregation of rimlands.

American Saul B. Cohen also continued in Mackinder's footprints. It is particularly noticeable in work *Geography and politics in a divided world*, in which Cohen divided the world into geostrategic and geopolitical zones according to Mackinder's world model. Also Immanuel Wallerstein used mackinderisque points of views in his work *Geopolitics and geoculture*; although Wallerstein connected earlier theories about land and sea powers to braudelian analysis of world order (Carlo 2003: 61). Mackinder's theories have inspired also in the field of political research, since the analysis which took place on the global level suited to the American realistic research tradition after the World War II. Mackinder's world models worked especially well in connection with the politics of the Soviet Union. After the World War II ended, geopolitics was brought to shame due to the concepts and theories connected to it. The reason of this was that, especially Ratzel's theory of nation's space and Mackinder's world model became, according to allegations, one of the Natzi government's main theories. Unfavourably for geopolitics as a field of science Natzi intellectuals applied it to their own philosophy, mostly because of the works of the German geographer Karl Haushofer (Moisio 2001). This episode was subsequently a reason to treat the whole field of geopolitics as a synonymous with Natzi expansionism. Geopolitics became a very controversial term and the whole discipline started to be eclipsed and excluded (Ibid).

During the Cold War geopolitics focused on strategic analysis and was closely connected to foreign and security policies of states (Ó Tuathail 1986). Geopolitics of that time still treated geography as an objective, stable and natural reality. After the Cold War era, geopolitical studies changed their character, as they were no longer focused on the superpower competition. It became interesting how power is being spatialized in IR studies.

2.5. Critical geopolitics

Critical geopolitics emerged in the 1990s as the link between Geopolitics and International Relations. Critical political geography rejects the classical geopolitical reasoning perceiving it as closely related to the tradition of political realism and thereby finds it responsible for some of the bloodiest events in the contemporary history. It may be said that Critical geopolitics' aims to denaturalize classical geopolitics. It is characteristic for the Critical school of geopolitics that it tries to set classical geopolitics aside by placing it in its historical context and indicating its inaccuracies and contradictions. Scholars representing Critical geopolitics treat political geography as a social and cultural practice instead of legible reality of international regime (Dalby 1998:2).

The key element of critical geopolitical thought is that Critical geopolitics researchers do not perceive geographical knowledge as an objective and neutral science. On the contrary, Critical geopolitics scholars understand geopolitics as a set of discourses, representations and practices. "The Critical Geopolitics approach states that world leaders find themselves in a constant battle to represent the world, via their discourse, in a particular way so as to convince their constituents and the wider world of the legitimacy of their course of action" (Criekemans 2007).

Critical geopolitics investigates various phenomena. It is especially interested in specializations of identity, nation and danger and how they demonstrate themselves in different states. It also examines how certain concepts such as: moral and aesthetic, self and other, security and danger, proximity and distance, indifference and responsibility interact with each other (Dalby, 1998:4). In short, Critical Geopolitics is the study of the spatialization of international politics by core powers and hegemonic states. It explores the geographical assumptions and understanding underpinning foreign policy-making and theories of world politics (Kuus, 2007b).

Critical geopolitics deals with the geographical conjectures that affect the world politics making process (Agnew 2003:2). It aims to explain how political actors spatialize international politics. (Ó Tuathail, Agnew 1992:190). By such analysis, geopolitics is treated as a deeply ideological and politicized scientific product. Critical geopolitics does not seek how geography can shape politics. Instead, it tries to illuminate how geographical claims and assumptions function in political debates and practice. Critical geopolitics is not a neatly delimited field, but the diverse

works characterized as such all focus on the processes through which political practice is bound up with territorial definition (Kuus 2007b).

"Contemporary geopolitics is a tool to research how geographical labels and designations enter into popular and formal discourse rather than to imply strong causal relationship between global physical geography and state behavior" (Criekemans 2007: 79)

As mentioned above, critical geopolitics deals with the specialization and space as such. However, unlike classical geopolitics it questions any direct connection between geographical space and world politics. Instead, it investigates the social constructions of space, treating it as a product of the social classification of meaning and human action. In other words, it is not so relevant to our understanding if Poland is threatened by its political location between its immemorial enemies Germany and Russia but that it perceives its own geopolitical location in this manner. Likewise, geographical proximity does not make Ukraine or Belarus automatically the Russian buffer zone. According to critical geopolitical logic it is rather the ideological framework and power struggle which attributes those countries with such image. In other words, all analyses of international affairs make geographical assumptions. Critical geopolitics aims to recognize those assumptions and analyse their background and consequences. Merje Kuus perceives geopolitics as a "contested political process". According to Kuus: 'critical geopolitics starts from the assumption that geographical knowledge is not innocent and objective' (Kuus 2007b: 6). Basing on the ideas of Ó Tuathail she emphasizes that "It treats geography as a technology of power that does not simply describe but also produces political space". All politics is also geopolitics, because it necessarily involves geographical assumptions about territories and borders. Every global consideration of human affairs involves geographical imaginaries whether acknowledged or not. Consideration of security necessarily involves bounding the threat as well as the threatened object, and defining them as particular kinds of places. Even claims about escaping geography and geopolitics are geographical insofar as they assume a particular geographical configuration of power that is to be eluded. Categorizations made by classical geopolitics are part of both: active writing of geographical space and the violence that emerges as a result of spatial divisions i.e. East/West (Klinke 2009).

Another characteristic of Critical geopolitics thought is a statement that geopolitics is not a singularity but a plurality. It refers to a plural group of representational practices that are present in all states. To the above mentioned insight of geopolitics as the practice of statecraft by leaders and their advisors, critical geopolitics adds an understanding of geopolitics as a broad

social and cultural phenomenon. Geopolitics is a decentered collection of acts, which includes both highbrow and popular modes of arguing and speaking (Dalby 1998).

Critical geopolitics deals with the plurality of space and the variety of possible ways space may be constructed. Furthermore, it focuses on the "boundary –drawing processes" and state's specializing behaviors. Critical geopolitics differs from classical geopolitical school also in its interest in borders. Critical geopolitics, on the contrary to conventional political geography, studies not only material borders of the state, but also the conceptual borders designating a boundary between a secure inside and threatening outside. (Dalby 1998) As Walker points out *Critical geopolitics is not about the "outside" of the state but about the very construction of boundaries of "inside" and "outside", "here" and "there", the "domestic" and 'foreign'.* (Walker 1993). In other words, geopolitics is concerned with both: maps of meaning and maps of states.

2.5.1. 'Critical geopolitics' – The new constructionist approach

The post-Cold War geopolitics applied a new constructionist approach. Critical geopolitics assumes that people perceive the world based on subjective perceptions. Thus, action results from individuals' perceptions, evaluations and goals based on their constructions of the spatial and social situation. In other words, critical geopolitics applied a thesis about the lack of any universal truths. As a consequence of the new constructivist approach also research perspective has changed significantly. The new project of critical geopolitics was contributed by Gearoid Ó Tuathail (1996), Ó Tuathail and Dalby (1996), Dodds and Sidaway (1994) and many others. The main change directed focus of the research to examination of how geographies are being produced by actors equipped with different extent of power (Werlen, 1995:6). Critical geopolitics seeks to deconstruct unilateral notions about geography in international politics. All the political and cultural representations are 'geographical imaginations' produced from a particular point of view (Reuber 2000:38) As Ó Tuathail argues, such representations are usually an outcome of active geopolitics, of "the social inscription of global space by intellectuals of statecraft" (Ó Tuathail 1996:61). In every state new images of geopolitical opponents are being produced. In addition, scientific regional division of earth is based on cultural differences and may be treated as a geographical construction, which can be used for political purposes (Reuber, 2000:39). Constructionist approaches present in political geography may be helpful in revealing the strategic significance of geopolitical models. In other words,

"critical geopolitics involves deconstructing the ways in which political elites have depicted and represented places in their exercise of power" (Dodds and Sidaway 1994:515). Geopolitical visions are usually manipulative and therefore should be demythologized so the real 'archaeology of power' is exposed. Thus, critical geopolitics may be used to explain how notions like place-identity, ethnicity, etc. are frequently abused for political interests. As Reuber notices: "Right-wing extremist 'blood and soil' rhetoric, for example, can then be exposed as a strategy employed by the actors for the sake of their own dubious goals." Thereby constructed geopolitical images are used to manipulation or acquisition of mass' loyalty in public debates, wars and in the most extreme cases ethnic cleansings or genocides (Reuber 2000).

2.5.2. Identity/Culture/Security

Closely related to the concept of space is, as an effect of geopolitical construction, Critical geopolitics' understanding of identity. Identity and security culture have been a subject of geopolitical studies since the beginning of post Cold War era. Identity, similarly to space is not seen as being pre-given but as notoriously (re-)constructed. Critical geopolitics focuses on this spatial construction of social identity investigating how the spatial actors such as nations, ethnic groups or organizations such as EU or NATO construct group identity via references to spatial divisions. As Merje Kuus argues, the state of insecurity is culturally produced because it is related to the cultural concept of a community's identity. State's international behavior is determined by the interplay of material and cultural factors influenced by identity. Every state does everything to maintain its identity against threatening factors from the outside. Therefore cultural identity should be one of the main concerns in security studies. This approach is particularly applicable in Central and Eastern Europe.

To understand actions and foreign and security policies of central European countries, first their historically constructed identities should be studied. Security threats are inherent components necessary to consolidate and preserve community's identity. Kuus referring to Simon Dalby notices that it is essential for geopolitics to divide the space into "Our" and "Their". Thus, foreign and security policies constitute the "Self" identified with state and define the external "Other" as a source of threat and evil (Kuus 2007b:12). The most common reference concerns the threatened 'We' and the threatening, imperialistic and aggressive 'Them', located in a fundamentally different territory. They illuminate not only what is identified as foreign and threatening on the outside but also what is constituted as normal inside the state. Danger from

the outside thus, is not a threat but rather a precondition for national identity within the state's borders. Insecurity can thereby become the principal mechanism of legitimating for the state.

Kuus' book *Geopolitics Reframed* highlights that in history, geopolitics has been used as a tool of *statecraft and guide for statesmanship*. In other words, geopolitics is a form of knowledge that is connected with the beginning of the modern state. Policy makers applied geopolitics to legitimize their exclusivist foreign policy agendas and invasions. States produce pictures of Otherness through geopolitical institutes such as universities and government bodies (Kuus 2007b:8). Critical Geopolitics aims to comprehend geopolitical knowledge's creation process and therefore focuses its attention on the action of so-called 'intellectuals of statecraft'. This group is deep-seated in the structures of the modern state, significantly circumscribes the global politics (Ibid:9) Therefore:

"Geopolitical writing, then, is not a neutral consideration of geographical facts but a deeply ideological form of analysis. It is "a discursive practice by which intellectuals of statecraft 'spatialize' international politics and represent it as a 'world' characterized by particular types of places, peoples and dramas" (Agnew, Ó Tuathail 1992:192).

Its theoretical and practical significance lies in its productive capacity – namely, the ways in which geopolitical analysis naturalizes and normalizes particular political claims and practices as "geographical" and hence given."

Basing on the definition of geopolitics presented above and taking into consideration the reasoning of critical geopolitics I will argue that this approach creates a good platform for dealing with the analysis of foreign policy as it highlights both objective setting of a geopolitical actor and seeks to understand his view of international politics through the perspective of 'geopolitics'. Connecting of these views explains well the world events. Geopolitics is a much broader cultural phenomenon than is normally described by the geopolitical tradition of wise men' of statecraft. Geopolitics is not simply a specific school of statecraft. It is rather a set of spatial practices of the statecraft itself. Therefore, the critical study of geopolitics must be grounded in the particular cultural mythologies of the state (Dalby 1990). "Critical geopolitics confronts and analyses geopolitical imagination of the state, its foundational myths and national exceptionalist lore" (Agnew 1983).

2.5.3. Critical Geopolitics and Agency

Critical geopolitics focuses on the production of geopolitical knowledge in these elite circles. In other words, it does not aim to reveal what the "wise men" think. Instead, it analyzes the assumptions on which elites' geopolitical practices are based. Critical geopolitics does not focus on the given outcome but investigates a dynamic process.

Critical Geopolitics examines how the policy makers construe pre-given political facts and shape the policies applying their own significant agency. Factors such as personal backgrounds, interests, identities or even prejudices and aversions do not remain without an impact on the individuals who evince the geopolitical claims. As Merje Kuus notices, intellectuals of statecraft and the state are not synonymous with each other (Kuus 2007b:16). Therefore, it cannot be presumed that the intellectuals barely articulate some pre-given state interest. The geopolitical practices need to be embedded in the specific context and societal settings. The main geopolitical discourses are shaped by the intellectuals of statecraft even if they are not completely uncompromised. The study of geopolitics must definitely include opinions of the state power executors; however, it cannot be limited only to their views. Voices challenging the dominant geopolitical statements have their sources both in the inside and on the outside of policy structures (Ó Tuathail 1999; Dijkink 2004). Critical geopolitics takes into account different empirical settings. Therefore, we need to investigate the correlation, which exists between the agents and their geopolitical practises (Agnew 2007a). In other words, we need to consider carefully the daily production of geopolitical knowledge – the mundane repetition of claims not just in official speeches, but also around the coffee machine (Neumann 2007).

To summarize, critical geopolitics is not a supplement to classical geopolitics but a needed alternative to it. Critical geopolitics is not an evident opposition to classical geopolitical thought since elements as space, identity and statecraft are present in the both schools of political geography. First of all critical geopolitics rejects the causal relationship classical geopolitics detects between geographic space and global politics. Moreover, it questions the rigid boundaries existing between the territorial selves. Critical geopolitics differs from classical geopolitical views in many ways. It rejects the state-centric rhetoric as not capable of characterizing particular locations. Moreover, critical geopolitics is not free of the localized context and agency issues while classical geopolitics usually makes this factor seem unimportant. Another characteristic of critical geopolitics is that it calls to account a simplified

strategy of "Other" as the hostile object (Agnew 2003). Instead it investigates how the policies in world politics are prejudiced by constructed meanings. According to scholars such as Ó Tuathail, geopolitics is an interpretative practice embedded in traditions and cultures of geopolitical thinking and therefore needs to be deciphered and interpreted (Ó Tuathail 2006).

In the next chapter I am going to approach The Copenhagen School of security. Security is a key concept and trope in political life today. Political debates in Poland are full of geopolitical rhetoric that operates with explicitly hostile and imperialist language. Such rhetorical acts, which make an object a security issue, are known as securitization. CS is a useful tool to reveal a discursive character of geopolitical assumptions and therefore was applied in this thesis.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

3.1. The construction of security

Security is frequently defined as a state of no danger. In a common use, security defined by state representatives is an emergency situation in which any means should be used to stop the threat (Waever 1995). In fact, what constitutes security changes dramatically depending on the actor concerned as well as specific cultural and political contexts (McDonald 2002:3). The definition of security is: "a political act in terms of defining an issue's importance, elaborating a group's core values and privileging certain means of responding to particular problems". In traditional military-political context security is about survival (Ibid:21). Existential threats must be handled by the extraordinary powers and the invocation of security legitimizes their usage by states. Taking this argument a step further, the Copenhagen School has put forward the idea, based on a combination of realism and post-structuralism that 'security' is what state leaders say it is. In other words, by declaring an emergency situation states' representatives gain a right to stop the threat with all the necessary means (Waever 1995). The nature of existential threats is not given and fixed. On the contrary, it varies depending on the sectors and level of analysis. (McDonald 2002:22). From the political point of view, existential threats are usually understood in terms of state's sovereignty and ideology.

The idea of security as being a speech-act on the part of state leaders, while problematic in terms of its statism, introduces the idea of the importance of power and representation in defining security, relating to Foucault's conception of the relationship between power (in this case, that of state policy makers) and knowledge (what constitutes security).

As Michael Dillon (1996:16) argues, states and other actors' legitimacy emerge from the challenge of providing security. The way in which security is represented must reflect on the group in question. When it comes to recognizing the role of structural factors in the process of defining security this idea is of great importance. State leaders and policymakers do not merely choose the security discourses. At times, these discourses may define and limit actors' options. However, these actors who are most capable of defining security are also the ones who are most likely to bring about response for their policies. Moreover, they are also able to present the issues creating contexts convenient to a specific security discourse with usage of so called 'common sense'. Therefore, 'security' is not ontologically fixed, but can change based on the

situation. Since the context in which security is evoked or invoked is in a state of constant change the factors which define security are also continually changing: over periods of time, and in societies. When considering why or how certain definitions of security gain control in different context the political characteristics of security are important to be understood. To appeal to an issue as to a security issue one must find a response within the represented group. Even if this feedback is moderated by the ones in power and their representational practices it is still possible that the alternative understandings of security will emerge and become relevant over time. Thus, security is fluctuating, constructed, and has political character meaning that the security discourse in question is more relevant than an issue posed as a threat.

Security framework created by Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde depicts that "securitization" considers a process where "the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure." Hence, security is subjective by nature meaning that an issue becomes a security matter when it is introduced as such. In other words, security is a "speech act" (Ibryamova 2004).

3.2. Copenhagen School

In *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, the contributors state that the primary aim of their study is to 'present a framework based on the wider agenda that will incorporate the traditionalist position' (Buzan, Weaver, de Wilde 1998). The Copenhagen School claims that security agendas refer to many different types of threats. With the purpose of avoiding the limitless expansion of those agendas they need to fulfill certain conditions. First of all, The Copenhagen School presents an approach that 'security is a speech act'. This approach is proposed as a useful analytical tool for exploring 'the logic of security'. The School rejects any objective definition of security. According to its point of view security is a notion without any fixed meaning, and defining it objectively is simply not possible. Copenhagen School's approach is that, "in any case, it is neither politically nor analytically helpful to try to define "real security" outside of the world of politics and to teach the actors to understand the term correctly" (Buzan, Wæver, de Wilde 1998: 31). Threats and sense of security or insecurity can not be objectively measured but are socially constructed.

3.3. Securitization Theory

The rhetorical act which makes an object a security issue is called 'securitization' defined by Wæver as a discursive process which starts with a 'securitizing move' made by a 'securitizing actor'(Buzan, Wæver, de Wilde 1998:25). Securitization studies try to reveal: " who securitizes, on what issue (threats), for whom (referent object), why, with what results and, not least under what conditions (i.e., what explains when securitization is successful)" (Higashino 2003:32). An issue becomes a matter of security when 'securitizing actors' who are usually 'state-representatives' point out that something is an 'existential threat', and requires urgent actions. This gives to the political elite 'a special right' to deal with the security matters through 'extraordinary means', which are frequently outstanding from commonly accepted rules of the political game.

Generally, securitization may be understood as an extreme version of politicization. However, it can also be seen as an opposition of politicization. When an actor tries to present issue as a matter of choice, open and entailing responsibility he or she politicizes it. By contrast, securitization takes place when an issue is designated as urgent and therefore cannot be handled by commonly agreed means but should be exposed to prioritative haggling. Both securitization and politicization are intersubjective processes. Objectivist approach would be impossible to judge and measure. Since there are no objective measurements, which could define a security issue, security arguments are very hypothetical in their nature. All above, in most cases they are about alternative future scenarios. Security arguments try to answer what will happen if we undertake a security action or not (Buzan et al. 1998:24-25).

When something is presented as a security issue, it is also argued that it should have an absolute priority over other issues. In this way, an existential threat is produced. Therefore, security is a self-referential practise because it is the practise, which brings a security issue to life. It is not relevant if the existential threat exists for real or not; it is the designation of an issue as such a threat what matters. It is important to notice that the discourse, which presents something as a threat, does not create securitization. Such discourse constitutes a securitizing move, which may turn into securitization if the audience accepts it. Securitization is accomplished only if the 'audience' accepts such a securitizing move, and an issue has been discursively transformed into a matter of security (Ibid: 29). Thus, the success of securitization depends on the audience of the security speech act, not on the securitizer. Speaking security per se does not guarantee success

(Wæver 1995). It is important to notice that speech acts do not necessarily mean a direct, face-to-face communication but any situation when speech act's content is forwarded from a policy agent to the audience. Therefore there is a significant difference between the individual speech act which constitute also the securitizing moves and the speech act recognized by the audience. In other words, security matter is never objectively and naturally given. Instead it is defined as such by politicians who have their benefits from calling it this way. Therefore the 'security logic' of the policy-makers has a crucial meaning for the securitizing process. In the context of the Cold War, for example, by definition the main security issue was seen to be the East-West conflict. Western oppositional forces securitized the nuclear confrontation itself either because it could run out of control and lead to nuclear war or because the East-West conflict dominated Europe and repressed the thought of other possible threats.

The Copenhagen School's members argue that 'securitization' is not necessarily a good tool from the normative point of view. On the contrary, securitization may work as an obstacle to solve the problems through so called 'normal politics' (Ibid:25). According to them, security works as 'a kind of stabilization of conflictual and threatening relations' (Higashino 2004:7). Security might be even perceived negatively as an unsuccessful outcome of politicization. In ideal conditions politics should be able to solve the issues without proclaiming them as existentional threats requiring extraordinary means. Therefore a concept of de-securitization is introduced. 'De-securitization' proposes an alternative action for defining security issues as threats. Instead, issues should be moved out of this threat-defense model and into the ordinary public sphere' (Higashino 2003:29). In other words, de-securitization means 'the shifting of the issues out of the emergency model and into the normal bargaining process of the political sphere' (Ibid:29).

A security issue arises – not necessarily, because a real existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat. Security then is simply a speech act. An issue becomes a security issue if the social actors frame it as such: "In this approach, the meaning of a concept lies in its usage and is not something we can define analytically or philosophically according to what would be 'best'" (Buzan 1998: 24). Not every speech act may be qualified as a securitising act. The Copenhagen school's members believe that at least three conditions must be fulfilled to acknowledge an act as a security move: existential threats to the survival of some kind of a referent object that require exceptional measures to protect the threatened referent object, which justify and legitimise the breaking free of normal democratic procedures (Ibid).

"A successful speech act is a combination of language and society, of both intrinsic features of speech and the group that authorizes and recognizes that speech" (Buzan 1998: 32). Therefore, the social position and authority of the securitising actor is of big importance since it determines the success of a securitizing act. Even if no single group holds a prerogative in shaping the securitizing process, the security experts and political elites are in a better position to gain the audience's recognition on the need for security. However, Waever points out that even if a speech act might be socially conditioned by the position of the speaker on the general level it is borderless and entirely disclosed: "A speech act is interesting exactly because it holds the insurrecting potential to break the ordinary, to establish meaning that is not already in the context" (Wæver, 2000: 286).

"The constant articulation of danger through foreign policy is thus not a threat to a state's identity or existence: it is its condition of possibility" (Campbell, 1998: 12-3). Consequently, security can be understood as a signifier that brings the categories of a friend and foe to existence. These categories do not occur prior to the securitising act that constitutes them.

"The signifier is identified with the things signified which would not exist without it, and which can be reduced to it. The signifier is not only that which expresses and represents the signified group: it is that which signifies to it that it exists, that which has the power to call into visible existence, by mobilizing it, the group that it signifies" (Bourdieu, 1991: 207).

The concept of 'de-securitization' is presented in the Copenhagen School literature as 'the shifting of issues out of the emergency mode and into the normal bargaining process of the political sphere' (Buzan et al., 1998: 4). De-securitization is about moving issues off the security agenda and bringing them back into public political discourse. While securitization can be defined as a form of de-politicization, de-securitization can be characterized as a form of re-politicization. In other words, the goal of a 'de-securitizing move' is to take the 'security' out of the agenda and reintroduce it to everyday politics. As Wæver argues, de-securitization is a 'limitation of the use of the security speech act' (Wæver, 1995: 60). De-securitization may happen if it is decided that a threat seems to be in decline and is not perceived anymore as 'existential'. Then, the extraordinary emergency measures introduced in securitization process may no longer be justifiable.

3.4. Securitization Theory - Ethical criticism

Securitization faces lots of criticism, which seems to result from a lack of understanding of the theories' realm. The Copenhagen School's theory is being reproached by the criticism for the absence of any ethical goals. Such opinions can be found in the writings of Claudia Aradau, who criticizes the moral dimension in the process of securitization. For her, "securitization brings a sudden rupture into the routinized, everyday life by producing an existential threat, which provokes experiences of the real possibility of violent death" (Aradau 2001).

Aradau understands securitization theory differently than Waever presents it. According to her, securitization is not a theoretical tool that facilitates actors' analysis. Instead, she perceives it as a political method. From this point of view, securitization seems an ethically and morally flawed issue. In Aradau's opinion, process of securitization has mostly negative consequences (Aradau 2001). However, Aradau's criticism explicitly reveals author's confusion of 'securitization the theory' and 'securitization the normative practice' (Taureck 2006).

As Taureck notices, Aradau based her criticism on the belief that the analyst is never neutral when he or she writes about security. On the contrary, analyst participates in the constitution of the political reality by producing his own texts. According to Wæver's constructivist approach such a critique is defeatist as he 'reproduces the security agenda when [he] describes how the process of securitization works' (Huysmans 1995: 69, Taureck 2006).

In other words, as it was mentioned above, while writing or speaking security, the analyst him/herself executes a speech act. The speech act (a securitizing move) is successful if the problem becomes recognized as a security issue in the academy or in the policymaking discourse. According to Copenhagen School, there is a need to "accept the normative dilemma as a dilemma'. In other words, "the securitization analyst cannot escape from the fact that its own security writing risks to contribute to the securitization of an area" (Huysmans 1999: 18).

According to Aradau, analyst's involvement in the constitution of political reality puts a political responsibility on him/her (Aradau 2004: 389). Thus, an analyst who uses the tool of securitization is political in his action. Aradau believes that security studies should deal with problematizing of existing patterns of security and insecurity. Moreover, for her security is by

necessity bad, in fact it is the ultimate disciplining governmental technology. According to her, there is a necessity to remain political since:

" It is only in the context of the subject of security that it is 'possible to envisage a critical discourse about security, a discourse which engages with contemporary transformations of political life, with emerging accounts of who we might become, and the conditions under which we might become other than we are now without destroying others, ourselves, or the planet on which we all live" (Walker (1997: 78, Aradau 2004: 399).

In Wæver's securitization theory, unlike in the case of normative theorists, being political is only a secondary matter. This is because being political 'can never replace the securitisation/desecuritization processes as such' (Wæver 2000: 252). Securitization/desecuritization is a political choice of a securitizing actor, which the analyst attempts to reveal using securitization theory. The question whether the analyst agrees with the securitization/desecuritization is simply not relevant. Thereby, taking into account their analytical goals, normative security theory and securitization theory are lacking a common quality on which to make a comparison. Thus, the ethical criticism toward securitization theory does not seem to be relevant.

3.5. Limitations and potential problems

The Copenhagen School has initially focused on creating a theoretical framework to security studies. It can be claimed that insufficient attention was paid to the empirical dimension of the study. Issues, which require the empirical exploration, concern the reasons for which some securitization moves turn out to be successful and others fail. Answering such questions is always challenging, as we need to study many discursive factors.

Another weakness of the Copenhagen School, which limits the study, is the lack of clear boundaries between security and politics. As Collins points out, definitions of securitization as an extreme version of politicization may cause confusion and overlap between de-politicized, politicized and securitized issues (Collins 2007 :117). In other words, the model may not sufficiently differentiate a process of securitization from severe politicization. In the empirical part, numerous political statements have been analysed. It must be important that politicians may use the security rhetoric in order to increase or maintain their popularity. In the context of this study, it was important to remember that identity is neither pre-given nor fixed, and that

particular identities are constantly being reproduced and reified through a range of representational practices.

3.6. Materials

 "The way to study securitization is to study discourse (speech) and political constellations (gathering): When does an argument with a particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieve sufficient effects to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed? If by means of an argument about the priority and urgency of an existential threat the securitizing actor has managed to break free of procedures or rules he or she would otherwise be bound by, we are witnessing a case of securitization," (Buzan 1998:25)

The aim of this thesis is the analysis of Polish discourse concerning the Eastern Partnership. This subject is an opportunity for a discussion about Polish national identity and culture of defensive system in the context of relations between Poland and the East. Empirical part is based on Polish authors' materials and Polish political elite's statements.

The thesis is based on qualitative data. Materials collected and used in this thesis include books, academic publications and articles concerning the subject of security and identity of Polish people, and correlations between these two issues. Analyzing papers of several leading researchers of international relations (from the largest Polish academic centres, scientific and research institutions), I will show Polish researchers' tendencies in presenting the issues of security in the East. Analyzing the materials, I focus on securitization movements, which are an element of securitization and de-securitization of security issues.

I selected works concerning the Eastern issues, i.e. involving the Eastern Partnership, relations between Poland and Russia, relations between Poland and Ukraine and relations between Poland and Belarus. I will also refer to original documents such as the Establishment of the Eastern Partnership in order to present the main principles of the project. In the part concerning Polish culture of defensive system, I analyze the most important elements of Poland's security strategy.

Other types of resources include statements, speeches and interviews of Poland's leading politicians. I analyzed official statements of the president, prime minister and particular ministers of foreign affairs and their press interviews. I analyzed statements of the President of the Republic of Poland – Lech Kaczynski, prime minister – Donald Tusk (and his predecessors – Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz and Jaroslaw Kaczynski), and ministers of foreign affairs – Radek

Sikorski and Daniel Rotfeld. I used press materials from the most reliable and opinion-forming daily newspapers – *Gazeta Wyborcza* and *Rzeczpospolita*. Texts were searched for via digital archives of newspapers. Key words used in the process of searching were Poland, Russia, the Eastern Partnership, Ukraine, Belarus.

The collected data dates from the post-Cold War period. Particular emphasis was placed on materials dating from 2004, i.e. Poland's accession to the EU. It was also the time of deterioration of Polish-Russian relations and increase of Poland's activity in the East, which was connected with its membership in the EU. It was the time of development of Polish identity in new geopolitical conditions, too.

CHAPTER 4: Geopolitical Reasoning of Polish Eastern Policy

Analysing Polish geopolitical identity it is necessary to turn the clocks back to the early 1990s when Poland started to shape its foreign policy independently. Polish geopolitical thought in the post Cold war aftermath concerned a few quintessential discourses: "return to the West" meaning integration to EU and NATO structures and the role of a regional leader and a guard of democratization processes behind its Eastern border. Moreover, Warsaw's Ostpolitik developed mostly in paradigm of classical geopolitics.

4.1. Geopolitical revolution of '89 – Implications for Poland

An important element of the geopolitical revolution of '89 was the emergence of Central Europe. It was the time when Central Europe emerged as a geopolitical entity which was not thought out from the outside (H. Mackinder, F. Naumann), but established by political elites from the region. They perceived the establishment of Central Europe as a chance of a fast separation from post-communist inheritance. They aspired not to be treated as a part of the former block either in a civilizational sense or geopolitical one, i.e. as a part of the Soviet and then Russian sphere of influence. Emphasizing a separate geopolitical identity was supposed to both force the West to diversify its attitude toward the countries of this sphere after 1989 and create a chance for their faster admission to international institutions of the West, especially those connected with the sphere of security. The elites executed a phenomenon, which from critical geopolitics'' point of view can be described as "geopolitics of naming". The former Soviet satellites aimed to define themselves as fundamentally Western and shift the negative association of the East further eastward (Kuus 2006:16). Poland started successfully developing its post-cold War identity as a state, which is a core part of Europe and shares values with Western democracies.

After 1989, Poland feared that the West would show tendencies to treat the newly emerged Central European countries as geopolitical Eastern Europe associated with insecurity and lack of stability. There were at least three reasons for that: force of habit, discouragement for a fast cooperation with the EU and NATO, and reluctance to provoke Moscow. During the first years after the collapse of the Communist Bloc, Moscow wanted to treat the region as its sphere of historically justified interests of security, which was respected by the West initially. The Central European countries started to cooperate in the field of security due to among other things

suggestions from outside (e.g. Zbigniew Brzezinski). Distrust toward Moscow based on traditional geopolitical approach still existed among the countries of the region (Kuzniar 2008:53).

Demands made by e.g. Samuel Huntington suited Poland. In his famous article "The Clash of Civilizations", Huntington called for an immediate extension of international institutions of the West to the whole European area (Huntington 1993). This process lasted several years and was divided into stages. As far as security is concerned, the process was completed in the fastest way in the Visegrad countries, which were highly motivated to leave the grey zone of security. A new type of specialization in Europe became a fact when the Atlantic Alliance decided to invite three Visegrad countries to become members. It was a fundamental change for Poland. As far as geostrategic and geopolitical sense is concerned, Poland was no longer situated between Germany and Russia. For the first time in history, Germany became Poland's ally. Poland's security became an important issue for the whole Atlantic Alliance. However, the fear and distrust toward neighbours did not disappear from Polish public discourse.

4.2. Eastern policy after '89

The term "Eastern policy" played an important role in tradition of Polish political thought. In the 1980s Juliusz Miroszewski's and Jerzy Giedroyc's ideas became the axis of independent thoughts on Polish relations with Eastern European countries. When in 1989 Poland regained independence, these ideas determined an aim and methods of developing new foundations of these relations. Moreover, their ideas contributed to the abandoning of imperial tradition in Polish thinking about the lands of the Former Republic of Poland. Thus, the ideas facilitated Poland's reintegration into Europe, and even in the world system. It is believed in Poland that "Eastern policy" which is an integral part of Polish political thought belongs to an exclusive group of ideas, which changed the history of nations. Its content is determined by specific historical and social considerations (Debski 2006:9).

The keynote of "Eastern policy" which in the past co-shaped the program of Polish foreign policy and left its stigma on Polish tradition of establishing relations with Eastern neighbours created a historical root, which is nowadays correlated with Polish membership in the EU and NATO policy towards particular Eastern neighbours. Eastern policy is nowadays an element of

a doctrine describing general aims and methods concerning Poland's actions towards Eastern European countries.

Recently, in Poland the term Eastern policy is used in the context of the policy of the EU toward its eastern neighbourhood. Poland is supposed to participate in the process of establishing the Eastern policy of the EU". This term is not completely adequate because many Western European countries understand the term "Eastern Policy" as a policy toward Russia, which is inconsistent with the Polish understanding of this term and Polish political intentions. However, developing a common attitude by countries participating in the integration of Europe toward eastern neighbours proves that Poland is undergoing the process of synthesis of thinking about Eastern Europe. Not only the content of the term Eastern Policy but also its role is changing. As a result, in recent years some views developed in the form of a doctrine, which inspires the process of developing and pursuing Polish policies toward eastern neighbours (with the use of tools of the EU and the NATO).

Initially, Polish attitudes toward Russia, Ukraine and Belarus had a lot in common. Poland tended to counteract tendencies, which could lead to the reconstruction of imperial order. Krzysztof Skubiszewski's (the Minister of Foreign Affairs 1989–1993) information directed to the Parliament in 1993 reflected the evolution of Polish foreign policy. Skubiszewski stated:

"Strengthening and developing democratic transformations and consolidating the independence of our eastern neighbours remain in Poland's interest. Thus, these countries would become an integral and functional part of the European System in various dimensions. (…) As far as relationships with eastern countries, including Russia, are concerned, we cannot ignore the existence of forces aspiring to the reconstruction of imperial order. On the one hand Poland has to support democratic and independence forces in these countries, on the other hand in accordance with Polish reason of state and because of a possible dangerous evolution we must tighten relations with the West and treat as the priority the connection with the Euro-Atlantic system of security" (Skubiszewski 1993).

Skubiszewski in his speech from 1993 verbalized belief that it would be beneficial for Polish national interest if Eastern European countries followed Poland in its actions. Poland accepted that democracy strengthening in these countries, their rapid economic development and growth of welfare is a scenario, which is favourable to Poland and favours the safety level in the whole Europe. Promoting democracy and welfare growth in Eastern Europe became an important part of Polish thinking about relationships with eastern neighbours. Andrzej Olechowski, Skubiszewski's successor, confirmed this in his speech:

"Poland strongly supports the process of cementing the East with the West: we want to fulfil the principle of security integrity in the whole Europe, and even in the whole Euro-Atlantic region. (…) We think that developing the structures of the NATO and the EU is the best way to create a Europe without divisions" (Olechowski 1995)

This statement not only aptly declared direction of Polish eastern policy but was also the first sign of securitizing and desecuritizing movements toward Eastern Europe. Since that time discourse of Poland as a guard of democratization in Eastern Europe - as one who attempts to stop the imperialistic tendencies in the region - has been present in Polish public debate.

The establishment of new, independent countries on Poland's eastern borders created completely new geo-strategic conditions for safety and foreign policy. For example, from Poland's point of view, Ukraine's independence is an effective factor preventing neo-imperialistic tendencies of Russia, which guarantees Poland security and independence and protects Poland from Moscow's interferences. That is why the establishment of independent Ukraine as a new powerful force in Europe was perceived by Poland as a completely new and significant feature of Poland's geopolitical environment. Since 1991, Poland's Eastern policy has developed only within the framework of mutual relations with Russia, Ukraine and Belarus.

Throughout the 1990s, relations with Russia were based on a permanent crisis, which resulted from Russia's discontent with Poland's integration to the EU and Euro-Atlantic structures. Russia's discontent was treated as a proof of bad intentions holding by Kremlin. It was also a green light for securitizing relations with Moscow. In 2002 after a short period of improvement, the relations deteriorated because of Poland's involvement in the Orange Revolution in Ukraine. Nowadays, according to the Polish foreign policy, Russia is the biggest threat to Poland because of its energy policy or the policy of "close abroad". Not wanting to become the object of Moscow's blackmail, Poland tries to avoid alleged energy dependency on Russia's gas supplies. Another Poland's fear concerned Russia's obstruction of democratic changes in Ukraine. Some analysts stress that close relations between Poland and Ukraine establish a new and significant feature in the post-Cold War system of security (Brzezinski 1993; Pavliuk 1997).

When Poland intensified its aspiration to become a member of the NATO and the EU, the membership in these institutions was a tool for the maximisation of Poland's international position. Policy toward eastern neighbours was strictly connected with Polish aspiration to improve its international position. It was believed that without normalising its relations with neighbours, Poland would not be able to achieve its aim.

Poland's aspiration to join the NATO and the EU contributed to the extension of values and standards of the most developed countries in the world toward Central Europe. Poland opted for keeping the principle of openness in both institutions. This principle would enable Eastern European countries to become members of these institutions. However, before that, these countries, including political elites and communities, which aspire to make up for the age-old civilizational underdevelopment in relation to Western Europe, will have to accept and adapt norms and values common for both the EU and the NATO. Poland often adduces this principle of conditionality, which "should be applied consistently to the relations with all Eastern European neighbours, neither discriminating nor favouring any of them". This principle concerns the progress in democratic reforms, the respect of human rights and minority rights, "the standards recognized by the international community in international relations", and on "building democratic institutions and market economy, improving governance as well as fighting corruption" (Cimoszewicz 2003).

Poland's membership in the EU did not influence in any significant way the Polish attitude toward Eastern Europe. However, the membership gave Polish foreign policy new tools. Starting membership negotiations with the EU, the Polish government declared its aspirations to take an active role in shaping relations of the EU with its eastern neighbours. Then, Polish concept of "Eastern Dimension of the EU" was formulated for the first time. In 2001 a document "Eastern Policy of the EU – the Polish Point of View" was submitted. The document stated that after admission of Central European countries into the EU, it would be necessary to develop a new and common strategy for all members toward Eastern Europe. Poland proposed to its EU partners a common policy toward eastern neighbours, which would favour their development toward democracy and free market.

4.3. Cultural roots of the Polish geopolitical thought

Poland's strategic actions are often perceived as incomprehensible and controversial. This strategic conduct cannot be explained without analyzing its sources and historical background. A strategic culture is a carrier of a sense of identity and nationality and national strategy aims. Moreover, this culture gives weight to the uniqueness of a given nation, often by referring to historical failures and national dramas. A strategic culture aims to protect a country's security. This culture is based on a sense of loyalty toward allies and a sense of dislike toward nations, which are culturally perceived as enemies. Such reasoning brings geopolitics back. State's

security situation requires choosing friends and enemies that are clearly defined in the classical geopolitical sense.

Poland's strategic culture and security policy is directed toward the past. The memory of numerous invasions of aggressors on the Polish territory is constantly present in a discourse on national security and the Polish *raison d'etat*. Poland still perceives its geopolitical location as a source of potential threats. Russia is still the major potential aggressor in the Polish consciousness, which is constructed by policy makers. Such an image of Moscow, which is deeply rooted in the Polish strategic culture determines Warsaw's attitude toward countries of Eastern Europe and obtrudes a role of their advocate on Poland.

4.4. Security and Polish national interests puzzle

The Polish national interests have been defined relatively lately. Poland had to determine priorities concerning its security and foreign policy from the very foundations when it became an independent country in 1989. A changing domestic situation and geopolitical changes in the region forced Poland's political elites to revalue the national interest. The Polish *raison d'etat* based on a realistic thinking and classically understood security is the foundation of the Polish foreign policy. Since the beginning of the development of its external policy, Poland determined its national interests and at the same time, it observed an internal situation and the level of stabilization in neighbouring countries in Western Europe.

In comparison with countries in Western Europe, in Poland the term *raison d'etat* appears very often in a political discourse, which results from a historical thinking of political elites and deeply rooted concern for national security. A national interest has many definitions, which are often mutually exclusive. Analyzing the meaning of the term *raison d'etat*, we shall determine three groups differentiated by Z.J. Pietras (1995). Firstly, we can distinguish interests due to which *raison d'etat* becomes the most significant national interest (*supreme*). Secondly, there are interests, which determine *raison d'etat* as a relative superiority (*relatively important*). The third group includes interests, which determine *raison d'etat* as a state's independent interest, which is uninfluenced by other partial interests (important). The national interests in Poland are often connected with securing a significant role in a globalizing world for the state. The Polish strategists also use the concept of national interest as synonymous term to security.

Supreme interests relate to the first and fundamental priority of the national policy: the defence of the territory and its inhabitants. I other words, supreme interests include the need for protecting the country's independence by maintaining the country's integrity, protecting inhabitants and human rights and strengthening the democratic order. Relatively important interests are defined as a mission of assuring a stable and proportional civilizational and economic development. Relatively important interests focus on the culture as a source of a national identity, continuity and development of conditions, which are necessary for a social affluence. Important interests concern efforts referring to the building of Poland's strong international position and possibilities to promote its interests in the whole world. The state's responsibility is to build prestige and create favourable conditions in an international environment.

All three groups share the following issues and values: the maintenance of independence and territorial integrity, the ensuring of national security, the maintaining of national identity, the ensuring of the best external conditions for the development of the country and its economic success. The Polish elites securitize all these elements. Theoretically, *raison d'etat* cannot or at least shall not be determined depending on the change of a governing party or political forces. *Raison d'etat* concerns long time divisions and its changes shall result from international changes and change of external political situation. However, each governing party alters the thinking of *raison d'etat*. "Ensuring security for Poland" (this statement repeated in her speeches many times) was the priority for the former minister of foreign affairs, Anna Fotyga, who comes from the Law and Justice Party. Her successor, Radek Sikorski, thinks that Poland's interest concerns above all the accenting of "Poland's deeply rooted position in Europe". However, the issues of security are still of key importance in Poland's foreign position, which is frequently stressed by President of the Republic of Poland, Lech Kaczynski.

4.5. Poland's Eastern doctrine

The very first idea of the Eastern Dimension of the EU assumed that overcoming the division of Europe into democratic and undemocratic, free market and lacking free market was a workable project and its realisation could result in the next extension of the EU including Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. The concept excluded the membership of the Russian Federation because of the scale of a venture which would mean Russia's integration with Spain, Germany, France, Luxembourg, and for example with Poland, and Lithuania. However, the project

expected that the EU should tend to achieve close and friendly relations with Russia and try to abolish all barriers concerning Russia's social and economic development. Thus, the set of views called Polish eastern doctrine came into existence. The doctrine says that a lasting security in Europe can be ensured by the harmony of social and economic development in the whole continent, i.e. a democratic order resulting from social aspirations shall be present in all countries of the Eastern Europe. This vision of Europe's order was a result and continuation of Eastern policy. Its new quality results from the elements of thinking in categories of European integration.

Poland's membership in the EU enriched Polish foreign policy with new instruments. Additionally, Polish foreign policy was strengthened by the success of Polish diplomatic actions toward Ukraine and an effective involvement of Polish authorities (political and social elites) in solving political crisis in Ukraine in 2004. In January 2005, Minister Adam Daniel Rotfeld gave speech in the Parliament. He said:

"The peaceful victory of democracy in Ukraine is the success of millions of Ukrainian people. It is also our Polish success. (…) The myth that our eastern neighbours cannot cope with democratic standards and human rights has been refuted. The thesis, that the people of this part of Europe belong to different civilisation and culture, has been questioned. Finally, the myth that societies of this part of Europe are immersed in apathy and are unable to built civil society has not been proved. Earlier events in Georgia and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine force politicians to change their opinions, which are based on prejudices and stereotypes"[WWW document].

Events in Ukraine in 2004 constituted an empirical proof of the rightness of Polish doctrine calling on to unite the West and the East of Europe "as one body", which would be based on a democratic community. It was the priority of Polish European policy. Many countries are convinced that it is impossible or very doubtful that democratic values will ever be entrenched in any of the countries established after 1991 in the former USSR area. Such an attitude contributes to realist policy toward these countries, which are not expected to obtain any impressive results in respect of democratic standards, good rule or the clarity of political life. It is believed that these countries may have difficulties with meeting certain requirements. Hence, it is better not to give occasion to any unnecessary tensions and it is better to accept this whole region as "an area of influences" of political values and behaviours, which are incongruous with values and behaviours developed by European civilization.

After political transformations in Poland in 2005, Polish eastern doctrine maintained its meaning in the process of developing Polish attitude toward Eastern Europe, which has been proved by numerous statements made by the president – Lech Kaczynski. For Polish political elites, events in Ukraine of autumn 2004 (and the Revolution of Roses of autumn 2003 in Georgia) constituted an empirical proof of the rightness of the most important assumption concerning Polish doctrine. Poland envisaged that societies of Eastern European countries eventually would be able to establish a democratic society with democratic values and standards, which will guarantee good relationships between Poland and Ukraine and Belarus.

4.6. Geopolitics of regional leadership

According to the constructivist theories including critical geopolitics, states act according to the roles that they ascribe to themselves and others. A typical feature of the Polish strategic culture is an emphasis on Poland's role as a regional leader. Poland has always had an ambition to be a regional leader pursuing its strategic goals adamantly. A culture, which is based on a conviction: "an uncompromising attitude or a political death" has never been perceived favourably by other political entities. Especially members of the EU criticize Poland for its policy, which is too strict toward Moscow. After 1991, Poland with its 40 million inhabitants and a strategic location in Central and Western Europe became a significant regional power and adopted an unequivocal and consistent pro-American attitude in a foreign policy. At the same time, Poland undertook steps to enter the structures of the NATO and EU. The Polish perception of security remains in accordance with classical geopolitics, i.e. Poland is afraid of both Russian and German supremacy in Central and Western Europe. That is why, Poland has looked askance at France's ambitions concerning its security and defence policy since it was based on a strong French-German axis, which was extended to Russia. Therefore, Poland has perceived the NATO as the best tool for fulfilling objectives, which consist in "keeping" Americans under control and Russians outside Central and Western Europe. The EU with its internal divisions and struggle for influences is perceived by Poland as an institution, which is important but not completely reliable. Such attitude is particularly adopted by the right winged Law and Justice party and Polish president Lech Kaczynski. Referring to the conflict in Georgia in 2008 in an interview "*Rzeczpospolita*" he stated:

"Again, it occurred that in fact in this organization decisions are made between Berlin and Paris. Sarkozy settled his position with Angela Merkel whose voice turned out to be decisive. Saying that the EU is supposed to have a common policy toward Russia is ridiculous. What sort of policy shall it be? A

submissive one? If I conduct any action including the EU, if I expose myself to different people, I do this to end the situation in which the most important decisions are made by France and Germany without consultation with the most concerned countries. France and Germany have a very specific attitude toward Russia."

Such a statement emphasizes Poland's difficult geopolitical situation, which should be a reason for active policy in the East. The active foreign policy of Poland towards East and its aspirations to be a kind of a bridge between its eastern neighbors and Western Europe stems from numerous areas. It can be seen to stem from the old myth of the Polish Commonwealth, which can be viewed to be Poland's need to hold a leading role in the region (Kosowska, 2007). The possibility of being a regional leader came about due to the geopolitical changes of the early 1990s. These changes meant that it was possible to speak about this subject as a foreign policy explicitly. Poland's unique position in Central-Eastern Europe was guaranteed by multiple factors, such as the successes of Balcerowicz's reforms[5], the driving political transformation and the efficacious foreign policies towards East and West, along with participating in various regional organizations. However the situation, where Poland had enjoyed both internal and external success stories and was willing and able to assist its neighbors and was even able to act as an advocate for the area, has changed significantly over the last few years. This leadership role was put in doubt due to various internal political and economical problems. Over the past few years the strategic relations with Poland's nearest neighbors and most notably with Germany and Russia, were quite strained. Due to this, the Eastern Dimension can actually be viewed as an opportunity to reconstruct Poland's position, in order to have at least some influence in the area. Polish Eastern foreign policy could benefit from the "made in Brussels" label, it could also prove to be helpful when it comes to the difficulties with Polish-Russian, or Polish-Belarusian relations. Moreover, it could help integrating EU members from Central and Eastern European countries, such as Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. This is a large group and the countries in it face similar obstacles when it comes to their eastern neighbors. Economically speaking they are closely linked with East; most notably they all depend on raw materials from Russia. If united, the eight eastern EU members could be imperative in political bargaining and in lobbying as well. Poland, being the most active member of this group and also the largest, seems destined to take the role of the leader.

We shall give some thought to whether belief in Poland's special ability to be a mediator (a kind of a bridge between the Western Europe and Russia) is not exaggerated. The belief seems to be

---

[5] The Balcerowicz Plan was a method adopted in Poland in 1989 for rapidly transitioning from a communist economy, based on state ownership and central planning, to a capitalist market economy. The plan was named for its author, the Polish minister and economist Leszek Balcerowicz (Wikipedia).

supported by such arguments as Poland's cultural closeness to both Germany and Russia, a common history, a general knowledge of both neighbours' languages and mentality, and wide prospects concerning transit due to a geographical location. However, current political and economic contacts show that the above-mentioned arguments are insufficient for assuming the role of a link by Poland. In the time of globalization and vanishing barriers, Western Europeans are motivated enough to learn languages, culture and mentality of their partners from the East.

The Eastern Partnership concept proposed by Poland was supposed to increase its significance in the region. "The need for developing Poland's strong position in the EU shall be based on our country's dominance over the Eastern region. Poland as an outpost of Europe shall treat as priority those actions, which strengthen its status not only in the region but also in a decision-making process of the whole Community. Due to its geopolitical location, Poland is obliged to lead the region. Such voices are typical of Polish public opinion. "There are certain issues which are regarded as our competences by the EU, e.g. the Eastern neighbourhood, or issues concerning political transformations. (…)" says Adam D. Rotfeld, former Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs (2007). The Eastern Partnership is perceived as the best tool for developing a right position of Poland in the hierarchy of the EU countries. Polish elites hope that this initiative and similar ones will both determine a positive perception of Poland as a more experienced and helpful collaborate and develop Poland's powers of persuasion in the EU. Such belief corresponds well with arguments about Polish superiority based on "particular knowledge, initiation, wisdom, possession of cultural heritage, competence in high culture, possession of formal education, manners, or moral qualities" (Zarycki 2004:601). All these elements are present in the contemporary discourse of Polish national identity.

4.7. Security/Identity/History

4.7.1. Us and them & friends and foes

When Poland regained the independence in 1989, the Polish foreign policy developed according to traditional geopolitical approach. It was based on out-of-date statements, which resulted from experiences of the political elites who come from the post-war generation, i.e. people who were brought up in non-dependent Poland. Hence, policy makers' background is not without relevance for politics itself (Kuus 2007), thus talks about threats appeared in the context of the Polish *raison d'etat*. The East, and especially Moscow and its policy were regarded as the main source of the above-mentioned threats. Consistently with this classical geopolitical reasoning

Ukraine's independence was an important issue at that time. The Polish political elite enthusiastically accepted Ukraine's independence; however, the public opinion was apprehensive. People in Poland were afraid of a new country, which was bigger than Poland and had a nuclear weapon. Initially, Polish-Ukrainian relationships were full of grudges and painful historical experiences. Despite deeply rooted concerns, political elites managed to promote the need of brotherly relations with Ukraine and other western neighbours. Apart from Belarus, relationships with the East were regarded as a huge success of the Polish foreign policy in its initial stage of development (Hunin, 2006 p.4). Polish political elites successfully securitized relations with Russia and took a first step toward desecuritization of Ukraine. Polish audience accepted the securitizing and desecuritizing moves, which lead to a new spatialization of the region.

Poland protects Ukraine's interests more eagerly than Ukraine itself. The Polish experts on international relations frequently repeat this statement. The word Ukraine means a border country, which indicates that this state for years was the subject of a duel between its stronger neighbours – Poland and Russia. Belarus is a similar country to Ukraine. Their independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union did not eliminate the risk of an external interference. Russia would like to increase its influences in Eastern Europe. Meanwhile, Poland attempts to change its eastern neighbours' policy into a more pro-Western one. According to the Polish *raison d'etat*, eastern countries' membership in the EU would make the region fully independent and Poland would be able to strengthen its position in the East. This Polish-Russian rivalry explains why good relations with eastern neighbours are a priority for Warsaw's foreign policy (Hunin, 2006:5).

Analyzing the Eastern Partnership from Poland's point of view, we shall investigate a special position of Ukraine in Warsaw. With its 50 million inhabitants and a huge economic potential, Ukraine as the biggest post-Soviet neighbour of Poland and has a special place in the Polish foreign policy. Ukraine is the second biggest trade partner of Poland in the East. On the other hand, Poland is the sixth biggest export partner and the fourth import partner of Ukraine (Kosowska 2006). As far as energy issue is concerned, the consolidation of stability and democracy in the region is of crucial importance for Poland, too. Poland depends on Russia's energy resource supplies, which are transported via the territory of Ukraine. For Poland, Ukraine's accession to the EU would mean the extension of the safety zone toward the East and the change of Poland's position as the country located on the borders of the EU. In contrast to

other eastern neighbours such as the Kaliningrad Region or Belarus, which struggle with serious domestic problems, Poland's partnership with Ukraine seems to be the most probable to achieve.

According to Polish discourse, Ukraine is the most important point on the Polish eastern border because it balances threats coming from the Russian side. Pro-European Ukraine is a geo-strategic aim for Poland. Ukraine's membership in the Euro-Atlantic structures would prevent Russia from introducing its neo-imperialistic policy near Poland's border. Here we can notice two important discourses visible in the polish geopolitical reasoning. First, Russia due to its neo-imperialistic tendencies needs to be securitized. Second, Poland perceives Ukraine as a buffer zone that serves the purpose of keeping Poland and Russia distant from one another. Belarus is another important element in Poland's Eastern policy. Poland perceives Belarus as a source of constant tensions, for example, the violation of rights of the Polish minority. Hence, Poland attempts to establish the EU policy and strategy, which would regulate the EU cooperation with the East. Eastern Partnership is a geopolitical tool to fulfil its hierarchical security strategy, in which Ukraine plays a key role.

Moscow – especially Moscow cooperating with Minsk and Kiev – is treated as a main geopolitical rival and threat by the Polish decision-makers. If Russia managed to create "small Soviet Union" with Belarus and Ukraine, Poland woul have over 1000 km border with Russia's hostile federation. The aforementioned explains Poland's accession to the NATO in 1999 and its active support for pro-Western Ukrainian social movement, which elevated Victor Yushchenko to authority in December 2004.

Poland securitizes relations with Ukraine and Belarus in a different way than with Russia. Ukraine's and Belarus' membership in the EU and NATO would be an ideal situation for Warsaw. In this case, securitization is an introduction to de-securitization. Relations with Russia are on the contrary securitized even if current geopolitical situation is completely different from the situation 20 years ago. Even if Poland has never been in such a favourable geopolitical situation; however, it still perceives the region of Eastern Europe as a place full of security dilemmas.

Poland excluding Russia refers to self-evident, geographical reasoning and friend-enemy rhetoric. In fact, such behaviour is far from objective. According to critical geopolitics, regions

lie where statesmen want them to lie. Moreover, regions are defined by political boundaries and their construction emerges from political reasons. As Merje Kuus presented in *Geopolitics Reframed*, regions (Europe, Eastern Europe, Central Europe, etc.) are not concrete and observable places but

"discourses in which their meaning is produced through statements made in their names… Nobody is completely outside the shifting contours of Europeanness, but nobody is completely inside either. Everyone can be included to some degree, but everyone can also be excluded to some degree" (Kuus 2007:151)

There are no self-evident and objective criteria for belongingness and exclusion in Europe's margins. There is no rational reason to include Ukraine, Belarus or Moldova to Europe and exclude Russia out of it. However, Poland is aware that decisions about inclusion or exclusion made in Brussels (e.g. Turkey) stem from political reasoning. Eastern Partnership is a Polish tool for advocacy of the political "in" or "out" ratiocination.

4.7.2. Russia-energy blackmailer, Ukraine energy ally

Energy geopolitics is a salient element of Polish eastern policy. Also in this area, Poland manifolds the "friends and foes" rhetoric. Energy has been a fundamental issue in Polish-Ukrainian relations. Both countries are importers of Russian gas and oil. Moreover, they are transit countries and important holders of strategic energy infrastructures such as refineries. The dependence on Russian energy resources is a highly sensitive issue in both countries from political and security points of view. In Warsaw, Russian gas monopoly is perceived as a tool of Russian control over Poland and as a powerful instrument of the Russian foreign policy that gives this country a disproportioned advantage vis-à-vis countries dependent from Russian gas. For Ukraine, Russian attempts to bypass Ukraine as transit country have increasingly been a matter of concern[6]. However, applying the critical geopolitical point of view we can assume that mentioned dependency on Russian gas is a constructed threat, not a fact. Namely, only 10% of the energy used in Poland comes from Russia, which is one of the lowest in Europe. Poland has still significant deposits of coal and in fact, coal remains the main source of energy for Poland. Despite this, energy issues have been successfully securitized in Poland and Polish public with sparse exceptions do not wonder whether the dependence on Russian gas is a pivotal issue or not. Gas valve seems to be the scariest weapon in Russia's hands and Russia is constantly criticized for its energy blackmail.

---

6 Ukraine strives for joining the EU energy market through integration to infrastructure networks in energy, transport and telecommunications fields and has declared its will to participate in the Pan-European gas markets.

Poland's gas demand reaches 13.5 billion m^3 yearly. Nowadays Poland has to import about 9 billion m^3 per year from the East (in 2007 it was 8.8 billion – 6.5 from Russia and 2.3 from Uzbekistan). These supplies account for about 63% of domestic gas consumption. The rest of demands are covered by Germany and one third comes from domestic sources. The latter create an important alternative for the Russian dependence. Poland as a relatively small country with convenient geographic conditions could explore, store and provide gas on its territory. Every government called for new solutions aiming to diversify gas sourcing; however, there is no significant progress on that. Even if the demand for Russian gas in Poland remains high, the Polish "dependence" and "blackmail" rhetoric is rather a product of critical geopolitical discourses than geopolitics.

4.7.3. Successful securitization and deeply rooted perception

Security is produced by the discursive practices of elites, media, and intellectuals. However, though there are various securitizers within the Polish society, successful securitization is not decided by the securitizer but by the audience of the security speech act (Williams, 2003). This raises the question of whether the Polish audience 'buys' securitizing moves. Securitization of certain political issues at the domestic level creates an ideologically driven, inflexible, and enemy-oriented foreign policy in regional politics. Domestic politics and foreign policy interacted dynamically, causing external relations to become an extension of local political contentions. Underpinning of old fears and stereotypes create more favourable conditions for successful securitization. Therefore, the deeply rooted perception of securitizing object is of big relevance for successful securitization.

Polish society believes that Russia tries to punish Poland for its support for democratic changes in Ukraine, especially during the Orange Revolution. Poles believe that Russia's cold attitude forced Warsaw to put more efforts to change the East into a more pro-Western region. The assumption that Russia will never give up its neo-imperialistic policy determines each element of Poland's eastern policy. This attitude is rooted in Polish mentality and is underpinned by political and intellectual elites. Poles' perception of Russians is determined in part by historical stereotypes (passed down through generations) which are summoned and applied as seen fit. On the other hand, it is also determined by specific events and incidents, which flare up emotions and enable negative perceptions and grudges (Grabowska 2006: 423).

Perception of Russia and Russians affects acceptance of the securitizing moves by the Polish audience. Poles carrying wary and sceptical attitude toward Moscow's politics easily buy the hostile rhetoric. Polish public is eager to believe that Russia's policy is full of bad intentions as the country itself is a source of existential threat. Therefore, policy makers are justified in use of extraordinary tools in relations with Moscow.

Russians share similar prejudices toward Poland. The image of Poles in the eyes of Russians (and vice versa) is without a doubt influenced by historical, political and social factors (which have impact on economical relations). The process of systemic transformation seems to be one of the major elements influencing the mutual perception of these two nations. The regaining of independence by Poland in 1989 had a big part in the changes regarding perception of Russians. Polish opinions became independent, but not necessarily did they become more positive. The process of transformation created an explosion of negative emotions, which were muffled during communism.

Poles do not believe that there will ever be a fresh start for mutual perception, although, ridding relations of grudges concerning the past may put the minds of new generations at greater liberty. Polish people are most uneasy about Russians projecting the results of systemic transformation onto the processes of mutual perception. Polish people are afraid of Russians as a nation, igniting imagination to process and apply stereotypes, even if they declare a lack of those in their attitude. Poles believe that the specific pride and imperialism of Russians are an inherent trait of the entire Russian nation. These attitudes hinder the development of partnership – it is hard to develop partnership with someone who wants to dominate, with a lack of compromise possibilities. Russians are generally most uneasy about the Polish superiority complex, which they believe is a side effect of the systemic transformation. Poles shock Russians with the aversions built-up during communist times – it certainly does not provide a good foundation for building new quality relations (Ibid).

"No fresh start" does not mean the Polish-Russian relations as well as mutual perception could not possibly improve. The main problem is that Polish and Russian people are constantly referring to the past. They are constantly blaming each other for ancestors' faults. Russia refers

to the Polish occupation of Moscow and Kremlin at the beginning of the 17th century[7] and the defeat in the Battle of Warsaw in 1920 when several dozen thousand Bolshevik prisoners were captured by Polish soldiers. On the other hand, Poland refers to over two hundred years of Russian occupation and numerous crimes against people of Polish origin, especially the Katyn Forest Massacre. Polish people brood over the fact that they were victims of Russia, while Russian people think that Poland has betrayed the Slav solidarity. Bartlomiej Suchocki, Russian analyst from the East European Study Centre in Warsaw argues:

"I think that Russia, for its own interests, should somehow redefine its past. The problem is that Russians completely do not know what the Red Army has been doing on our territory. They do not know about the repressions toward the underground state in Poland. They do not know that the Red Army actually stood at the Vistula River and waited and did not help the Warsaw Uprising. They feel rather sorry that Poles today look like they forgot about the victims, Red Army soldiers, and 700 thousand soldiers killed on Polish territory" (Interview for Polish radio 05.01.2007).

For these reasons, relationships between Poland and Russia remain cold. However, it should not be claimed that their relations are doomed to this political coldness.

It is worth emphasizing that Ukraine, unlike Russia, is always presented as Poland's partner and ally. One of the main reasons why Polish-Russian relations remain in stagnation is, as mentioned above, the history. However, it is important to remember that Poland and Ukraine share dramatic and brutal historical events as well. Both nations are in disagreement over the assessment of the events like the Polish-Ukrainian War 1918-1919, policy of the Second Polish Republic toward national minorities, the Second World War including the anti-Polish action performed by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine and post-war forced displacement of people, especially the Operation Vistula. The issues that have aroused the strongest emotions concern the anti-Polish action performed by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine in 1943-1944/1945 in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia. Cruel assaults claimed 80-100 thousand Polish people. Polish historians unanimously agree that anti-Polish actions performed by the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine were criminal, unjustified and genocide acts. They argue about the scale and character of the Polish retaliatory actions. However, they oppose equating Polish actions with Ukrainian ones (Kulinska 2008:152). In this case, there is a

---

[7] The Polish–Muscovite War (1605–1618) took place in the early 1600s as a sequence of military conflicts and eastward invasions carried out by the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the private armies led by the Commonwealth aristocracy, when the Russian Tsardom was torn into a series of civil wars. After early Commonwealth victories, which culminated in Polish forces entering Moscow in 1610, Polish king's Sigismund's son, Prince Wladislaus, was briefly elected Tsar.

deep Polish-Ukrainian conflict of memories which hinders the process of reconciliation (including the development of a mutual history book). Today, it is known – not only from accounts of Polish witnesses but also from commands and reports of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine, which have been found recently by historians – that the anti-Polish ethnic cleansing was performed in a planned way and on a large scale.

Whereas in Polish-Russian relations the history factor is present in the agenda continuously, Poland was able to pragmatically head off its historical disputes with Ukraine. This example challenges the statements according to which fresh start between Warsaw and Moscow would not be possible.

Once I touched the problem of historical tensions between Poland and its eastern neighbours I will shortly analyse the role, which history plays in identity and threat construction.

4.7.4. History or historical policy?

Most studies on identity and geopolitics rely empirically on statements by intellectuals of statecraft. One of the most active groups among intellectuals of statecraft in Poland advocates the so called historical policy in Western Europe known as policy of the past. This group consists of many Law and Justice Party's politicians and some of its members act as president Kaczynski's advisors. Policy of the past is one of the most characteristic elements of Polish foreign policy under the "Law and Justice" and Lech Kaczynski's rule and therefore requires some closer attention.

The policy of the past is worth examining because it has numerous supporters who often exercise power. The resolution of the Political Council of the Law and Justice Party (from September 2004, which was signed by Jaroslaw Kaczynski) changed "historical policy" into an official cultural programme of the ruling party. Another proponent of "historical policy" is Kazimierz Michal Ujazdowski, Minister of Culture and National Heritage. Kaczynski's collaborator, the Law and Justice Member of Parliament and Head of the Parliamentary Commission For Culture, Pawel Kowal, also wrote enthusiastically about "historical policy" in "Gazeta Wyborcza" (8th February). Even if "historical policy" is a field of intellectuals - not politicians, it seems to be applied into politics in countries like Poland or Russia. Major authors

of "historical policy" have different opinions, however they often appear together and they are bound by their attachment to that project.

There are academic philosophers and historians of ideas among them, such as Dariusz Gawin and Marek A. Cichocki[8]. Another prominent author of "historical policy", Tomasz Merta, became Vice-minister of Culture and National Heritage responsible for the care of museums, monuments and cultural education including "the protection of the amateur artistic movement, folk culture and artistic handicraft" after the victory of the Law and Justice Party. Moreover, numerous journalists supported "historical policy", e.g. Piotr Semka ("Rzeczpospolita", 25-26th March), and an editor of a weekly "Ozon", Grzegorz Gorny who presented "historical policy" as the main subject of an issue. Carl Schmitt wrote that the essence of policy is a fight, and a fight connects integrally with fear (Schmitt 1970). Fear permeates through the whole project of "historical policy" – from its foundation to its vault.

In the middle of the 30's, Schmitt was a leading lawyer of the Nazi regime (at that time, he also published an anti-Semitic text). Although he was quickly pushed aside by the Nazi, he could not continue his academic career after the war. In the 60's, Schmitt expressed also his fascination with Mao, Fidel Castro, and Che Guevara (surprisingly, Cichocki does not mention this while discussing the philosopher's biography). Schmitt was an original and influential thinker, and today, he belongs to the pantheon of classic authors of an authoritarian and conservative theory of politics. He is eagerly read by American conservatives. He also inspired some left-wing intellectuals who approved his radical criticism of liberalism. Poland's "historical policy" owes a lot to Schmitt, as well.

Cichocki makes a summary of Schmitt's main concept, i.e. the idea of diplomacy in the following way:

 "People […] have always perceived the others as friends or enemies. In addition, that basic existential distinction will be all over the world forever. Anyway, a world in which there would be no friends and enemies, no significant differences and contradictions, would not be our world, human, historical world, which we know well. Thus, diplomacy refers to a constant dispute" (Cichocki 1998).

Schmitt accused liberals of two major mistakes concerning the understanding of politics. According to him, they are trying to establish a community in which basic distinction between a

---

[8] Both Marek A.Cichocki and Dariusz Gawin are well-recognized polish philosophers, historians of politic thought, journalists and conservative publicists. Cichocki acts as a social advisor to president Lech Kaczynski.

friend and an enemy will be blurred, which is a dangerous utopia because – as he writes – the division is irremovable: "In an existential aspect, an enemy is the "Other", a stranger, and it is enough to determine its nature".

As mentioned already before – the intellectuals of statecraft (politicians, bureaucrats and academics) who regularly participate in and comment on the activities of statecraft (O'Tuathail and Agnew, 1992:193) – play a pivotal role in the construction of geopolitical thinking. These intellectuals are responsible for promoting the claims of geographical and scientific truth on which geopolitical discourses are based (O'Tuathail, 1996a). Moreover, intellectuals of statecraft construct the moral "Self" bounded with state's borders, which are threatened by the external enemy (Dalby, 1990, O'Tuathail, 2000). Intellectuals representing the politics of the past play a significant role in shaping geopolitical awareness of the Polish audience.

Law and Justice Party frequently accuses Russia of leading the history of the past against Poland and its discriminatory consequences. However, the same party emphasises that history should remain a pivotal element of Polish foreign policy and applies the hostile rhetoric constantly.

Most geopolitical reasoning is not formal but practical: it draws not from theoretical arguments, but from 'common sense' (O'Tuathail and Agnew, 1992). Most influential intellectuals of statecraft tend to combine 'scientific' claims with seemingly self-evident observations. Their influence is based not on the 'accuracy' of their claims, but on their mastery of everyday language. Polish elites frequently refer to Russian policies as to self-evident hostile action. History quoted selectively in martyrological spirit effectively strengthens the self-evidence and makes public more disposed for approval of securitizing moves.

CHAPTER 5: Materializing EU Membership

Poland's security strategies are traditionally based on transatlantic forces. However, Poland attempts to use the EU political instruments for securitization of Eastern Europe. The eastern policy of the EU is based on a common foreign policy and security policy. In Poland it is believed that the above-mentioned instruments can help to prevent this part of Europe return to so-called post-Soviet area. Poles claim that well organized eastern policy of the EU, including Poland's actions and intentions, is the instrument, which can prevent Russia's neo-imperialistic domination in the region.

5.1. The Eastern Partnership – Major assumptions of the project

The description of the Eastern Partnership shall be started with its division into a bilateral and multilateral dimension. A Polish offer postulates cooperation with the Eastern neighbours, which aims at development of a gradual integration through a multiphase abolishment of visa requirements, joint negotiations of trade and sector reforms, the establishment of the Free Trade Area between the EU and its partner countries, shared educational undertakings, and a slow standardization of intra-state changes according to the EU model. It must be mentioned that each country will be considered individually and in regard to its political, economic, and social situation. The European standards will be flexibly adjusted to conditions in a given country. Certain norms of the EU legislation (especially standards concerning accession directly) will remain immutable and as such will not be a subject of any attempts to bend them, which was repeatedly emphasized by Radoslaw Sikorski - one of originators of the Swedish-Polish Partnership in its current shape. However, the Action Plans agreed with individual countries will enable to set tasks to these countries.

With time, newly established principles will become a subject of severe assessments by the Commission and thus they will assimilate to the European principles. A simulator increasing the speed and effectiveness of undertaken reforms will be the distribution of aid funds depending on results and progress of these reforms. Depending on absorption ability and outbound situation, each country (EP partner) will receive financial support for further reforms. Ukraine was the first neighbour included in a bilateral cooperation within the framework of the Eastern Partnership Project. Depending on their abilities and ambitions, other countries will be able to

participate in this process of incorporation of values, patterns, norms, and principles belonging to tradition and legislation of the EU (SEC 2008:2974).

The second dimension of the Partnership – a multilateral dimension – concerns a wider group of the European pretenders. This dimension will include 27 countries of the EU and 6 aspiring neighbours from the East: Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Belarus, which may arouse controversy. However, already at the beginning it was stressed that cooperation with Belarus will concern only expert and technical issues. Further progress of work toward integration in this special case will depend on the political situation in Minsk (Ibid). According to the project assumptions, if Russia shows interest, it can count on open reception, which is unlikely to happen because of the present international situation. Cooperation within the framework of Eastern Partnership is supposed to be based on the pattern of the Euroregional cooperation. It will also supplement other similar initiatives of the Commission (the Black Sea Synergy and the Northern Dimension) with the difference that the Eastern Partnership assumes the development of relations between not only the EU and aspiring countries, but also between the Eastern Partners, which implies an increase of political and economic potential and the strengthening of joint interests.

A distinctive feature of a multilateral dimension of the Eastern Partnership is presented in Poland in its pioneering approach toward Belarus and its participation in the programme. As the first project of this kind, the Polish-Swedish idea sees chance of success in the European dialogue with certain structures of Belarus' society (young people, students, associations of entrepreneurs and low-ranking officials). One of the strongest points of the Eastern Partnership is a way of financing projects resulting from the idea of a multilateral cooperation. Funds will come from already available and earlier checked financial resources, i.e. budget lines for the ENPI. Credits granted by the European Investment Bank or the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development are supposed to be an additional asset. So, there is no fear that costs of the Polish-Swedish initiative will affect the budget balance of the EU. Institutions responsible for negotiating, completing, establishing and implementing agreements shall have a limited character. A working body consisting of particular countries and representatives of certain countries from the EU will work on current agreements and proposals of agreements or negotiate over already-established agreements. With respect to administrative character of the Eastern Partnership Project, the reduction of institutional network is a priority {SEC(2008) 2974}.

Experiences show that leaving the scope of activity only in the hands of the European institutions or institutions connected with authority centres of aspiring countries leads to an increase in bureaucracy (because interest of a political authority or a group representing this authority becomes a priority). More effective and reliable are agreements, which are established on a lower level – with the most competent parties. Areas of cooperation were determined widely in separated fields. Thus, a division into five spheres was established. These theme areas are politics and security, boundaries and transit traffic, economy and finances, environment and society. They are established for the whole Eastern Project of Poland's Ministry and Sweden's Ministry. According to Radoslaw Sikorski, Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Polish Eastern Partnership aims at strengthening the European offer toward the East. This strengthening shall be considered from two points of view.

The first point of view concerns the maintenance of close relations with countries included in the Partnership, i.e. Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Belarus, which could perhaps lead to their membership in the EU even if the document does not envisage such a situation officially. According to many Polish political commentators, such a scenario will destroy relations between Brussels and Moscow.

The second possibility is an attempt to keep Brussels intensively engaged, which means that the EU would support the Eastern countries in their economic, political and social development but with Russia's approval. Poland as a major advocate of a complete separation from Moscow is determined to help the eastern countries in breaking free of Russia's influences. The Eastern Partnership initiative may be a perfect way to achieve this aim. Everyone remembers Poland's engagement in the success of the Orange Revolution in Ukraine and Polish President's involvement in resolving the conflict in Georgia in August. It is easy to reach a conclusion that the Eastern Partnership is a kind of transference of ideas concerning the eastern part of Europe on the EU forum. It is a tool to make EU apply the Polish geopolitical spasialization of eastern region. It has one basic advantage. Poland is aware that projects being realized within the framework of the EU are much more effective than single initiatives of individual member countries. The Common Foreign and Security Policy aims at keeping broadly understood security of the EU in all its areas. Poles assume that a systematic expansion of the EU to the East alongside with simultaneous spread of influences at the expense of Russia's interests may ensure security in the region and in Poland. Therefore, Eastern Partnership was planned by Poles as a tool for desecuritizing East.

By supporting transformations in Georgia, Ukraine, or Azerbaijan, the EU is establishing a base for future actions. If people feel significant changes resulting from help from Brussels, they will be more eager to vote "yes" during a possible accession referendum. This way, the geopolitical vision of westernized post Soviet republics could succeed. According to political elites in Poland, Moscow will never voluntarily give up countries, which were under Russia's control just 20 years ago. On the other hand, material situation of a given society has impact on political decisions, and Russia is not able to support these countries. Poles believe that Russia has too many internal problems to deal with, so supporting neighbouring countries is out of the question. This belief raised up frequently in Polish discussion seems to ignore the fact that Russia has been actively supporting previous Soviet republics despite the internal difficulties.[9]

In the EU, there are different patterns of cooperation with Russia. Most of the countries (with Germany at the head) want to achieve systematic and non-conflict cooperation with Russia. However, there are states (including Poland and the Baltic countries), which pursue a tough policy toward Moscow. It seems that the latter want to depreciate Russia's indirect influence on actions of the EU. Concluding this part of deliberations, it seems that the Eastern Partnership is a perfect tool for starting all kinds of transformations in countries included in the project. The Eastern Partnership may lead these countries to integration with the EU. However, all this may result in bad relations with Moscow.

Another possible scenario concerning the realization of the Eastern Partnership is a wide cooperation between the EU and Moscow. This cooperation would consist of Russia's approval for the European supporting/reforming of the countries included in the Partnership, however without approval for any talks about a possible accession. This scenario is unlikely to happen because of the current distribution of political power in the EU. Radoslaw Sikorski, stated that Russia can participate in certain projects within the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy and in selected projects of the Eastern Partnership. Selected means projects, which the EU will agree on (Sikorski 2009). For Poland, it is connected with the fact that during the gas conflict in January 2009 the EU member states saw the real face of Moscow and its determination to dominate relations between the EU and Russia. In fact, the Russian-Ukrainian gas conflict was far more complex as it was presented in Polish public debate. Ukraine accused Russia for cutting gas supplies to Europe by two-thirds. Gazprom claimed that it was Ukraine,

---

[9] e.g. the energy subsidies for Belarus

which shut down three of its four export pipelines. Poland once more revealed its tendency to immediate criticism toward Russian actions interpreting it as blackmail toward Ukraine and the EU. It is true that Russia could benefit from supplies cut-off as it could for example force Ukraine to purchase Russian gas at appreciated prices. Moreover, it could be a signal to Brussels that Russia is in position to destabilize European economy by making security decisions alone[10]. However, Ukraine had its reasons to cut off gas supplies to Europe. By using EU advocacy it could re-negotiate gas price with Gazprom. Further Ukraine wanted Moscow to drop the aggressive demands of Ukrainian debts' payback. It is not possible to unequivocally say who was responsible for conflict's escalation. Poland's standpoint was based on prejudice rather than on objectives facts. Poland underpinned the "friends and foes" division toward Ukraine and Russia and once again Polish reaction inscribed itself in the lazy rhetoric of "Self" and "Other".

Poland in the Eastern Partnership initiative goes by the principle of differentiation. The differentiation was an element of previous projects concerning EP initiative. This principle concerns two main issues: the differentiation among the addressee countries of the initiative and the differentiation of the EP from other EU ENP initiatives (Natorski 2007). The differentiation principle provides the possibility of individual development of relations with each state. It allows taking into consideration the differences between Eastern countries' needs, aspirations and potential. In other words, the differentiation was aimed at instituting the equality between Eastern states in relations with the EU (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2003: 86, Sikorski 2009). "The principle of differentiation must be of high priority in the ENP's development, so it will allow partner countries to approximate EU standards at whatever pace they choose" (Sikorski 2009).

5.2. EP as Polish national security strategy

In 1998, Poland presented its own vision of the Eastern Dimension of the EU for the first time and five years later prepared the first non-paper about the initiative. According to the former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Wlodzimierz Cimoszewski, the Polish EU accession fulfilled the most important priorities of Poland (independence and security) additionally confirmed by Poland's membership in the NATO. The Polish elites assured that "the membership does not mean that Poland will turn its back on its eastern neighbours". The Polish *raison d'etat* aims to

---

[10] Such arguments were present in Polish public debate.

strengthen the EU policy toward the East, support their European aspirations, and prevent partition of Europe.

Similar voices are present in the Polish political debate regularly; a leading politician from the Law and Justice Party, Pawel Kowal said: "Perhaps today our partners from the East need our help most of all. Perhaps today we shall say loudly that we do not agree on the establishment on new zones of influence in Europe, that we will support our partners in each situation, even the most difficult one". He stressed: "We live in the country on the Vistula River and we must look where that country lies". The independence of Ukraine and Georgia lies in Poland's independence. "It is not the programme of dreamers – but realists (…), and Poland shall be the centre of a cool assessment of contemporary Russia's policy" (Kowal 2009).

Poles emphasize that as far as global policy is concerned, Russia regards itself as an equivalent subject with the Union. Moreover, in Poles' opinion Russia stresses its individual character and does not aim to be a country, which will attempt to modernize itself in accordance with the European model. Quite the contrary, Russia attempts to mark its identity and become a magnetic pole attracting other countries. Certainly, there is a lot of evidence that Russia successfully undertakes Europeanizing reforms. However, admitting it would not be in line with Polish rhetoric of Russia as a wild, mysterious and dangerous neighbour. This belief influences the shape of Polish-Russian relations.

The securitization of Eastern policy is not directed toward either neighbours themselves or a particular enemy because actors who are responsible for a given threat are anonymously grouped under the slogan - the lack of stability. This anonymity causes that neighbours are only the sides of the lack of stability. They do not become actors, ipso facto – enemies. Such terminology extends neighbours by stressing that although they are a source of concern for the EU's security, they are not responsible for such a situation. The European Neighbourhood Policy does not say that neighbours of the EU have to solve security problems resulting from a geographical location on their own. Instead, the European Neighbourhood Policy aims to encourage partners to cooperate with the EU. The closer the Union and its neighbours will cooperate with each other, the greater stability, safety and prosperity in the region will be achieved. The rhetoric of EP is based on the vision of a future friendship, which does not mean that present relationships are hostile. Neighbours can be perceived as threats to the EU security only because they can spread threats from a distant world on the territory of the Union. The

neighbourly EU is based on a simple principle – by helping neighbours achieve stability and consolidate democracy, we help ourselves.

The policy of Eastern Partnership can be perceived by Poland as the national policy of security, which aims at political and economic stability on Poland's eastern border. Poland's activity concerning the promotion of the EP is clearly connected with concerns for security that result from the nearness of the East. It may be concluded that EP initiative aim's goal is a transition from securitization to desecuritization. Polish eastern border since May 2004 is also the EU border. Poland gained an important supporter who also strove for desecuritizing East. Warsaw was aware of the emergence of convenient environment for desecuritization at the regional level. Eastern Partnership is an attempt of desecuritizing Eastern Europe. Poland uses similar arguments to those, which justified the EU enlargement East-wise. Poland is aware of small interest in Eastern Europe's issues and scepticism toward next enlargements. In order to remove such pessimism Poland has warned of the "heavy costs" of choosing not to get involved in closer cooperation with Ukraine, Belarus or Moldova. Those "heavy costs" include the maintenance of previous divisions, the rise of destabilisation and escape from democratic values and, in more extreme cases, a return to Europe's previous balance-of-power system and in most extreme cases war. The first and foremost threat articulated in securitization of Eastern Europe is Europe's own past' (Diez, 2001: 6). In order not to allow Europe's own past to become its future, integration has been made an aim in itself, and an explicit link between security and ENP has been constructed. As Copenhagen School points out even though a 'securitizing move' dramatizes a certain issue as a matter of survival, the actual policy instrument, which derives from such a move might well be a 'desecuritized' one. In other words, an issue is being shifted into 'the normal bargaining process of the political sphere'. As argued above, the security logic presented in the context of Eastern Partnership attempts to advance the application process of EU values by the eastern countries thus, to desecuritize Europe. Therefore, Polish initiative of structurizing EU's relations with the East is a clear example of a securitizing move (naming something as an existential threat), which leads to a desecuritizing effect (stabilization democratization or Europeanization of East and as a destination aim even continuation of European integration). Here, Eastern Partnership has been presented as an extraordinary measure, which drags Europe away from an unknown future of hatred and confusion. This suggests that, while the argument is based on security, the long-term effect will be desecuritization.

5.3. Boundaries

One of the biggest paradoxes of the European integration is the fact that boundaries inside the EU are being abolished, but at the same time, the importance of common external boundaries is growing. According to Thomas Diez, external boundaries separate the European identity from everything what is non-European and thus protect from a potential threat from the outside. External boundaries of the EU preserve a modern character, in contrast to post-modern internal boundaries. This view is eagerly used by countries, which actively aim at promoting the European neighbourhood policy. As far as an international activity is concerned, Poland often refers to axiological division into enemies and friends. Further, Poland attempts to involve "friends" from the outside to the EU and NATO in order to strengthen security in the region. The securitization of boundaries of the former Communist Bloc is an often reference in the Eastern Dimension of the EU. The European Neighbourhood Policy aims at abolishing differences between "us" and "them" and establishing the previously mentioned circle of friends. Documents proclaiming the European Neighbourhood Policy are dominated by rhetoric of security. The European Neighbourhood Policy is determined as the implementation of the European Security Strategy at the regional level (Ifversen & Kølvraa, 2007). Poland attempts to support such a stance and uses it to strengthen its position in the region and fulfil its *raison d'etat*. Poland aims to support independence of its neighbours and bring them closer to the EU. This step is supposed to increase Polish security and strengthen Poland's position in the region.

The establishment of the axiological circle of friends can be also interpreted as the transfer of the external boundaries of the EU to external boundaries of neighbours. The transfer would cause the formation of a buffer zone or satellite states, which would not belong to the Union, but they would protect it from geopolitical threats. The accession of Poland's eastern neighbours aims to eliminate instability flowing in from those countries, exclude the application of force by them, and involve those countries in the further development of our continent.

The Eastern Partnership's authors from the beginning wanted to differentiate the EU Eastern policy from the strategies undertaken in the framework of the Northern or Mediterranean Dimensions. Spanish Dimension is perceived as a competitor of Polish initiative. Due to the "essential differences" between Eastern and Southern neighbours, a "different approach and diverse policies of the Union towards these two regions" were strongly supported from the beginning by the Polish party (Cimoszewicz 2003: 43). Poland emphasises the great importance

of its eastern project. "In Poland we make a distinction between the southern dimension and the eastern dimension [of the ENP] and it consists in this -- to the south, we have neighbours of Europe, to the east we have European neighbours," Sikorski said. According to Polish MFA this constitutes "a big difference. "These are countries -- Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova -- whose entire territories lie in Europe, and by the provisions of the Treaty of Rome they all have the right one day to apply, to fulfil the criteria [for EU membership], and, perhaps, to become members" (Sikorski 2008). In the next subchapter, I will analyse the main similarities and differences between these two regional initiatives.

5.4. EU Eastern Partnership – a Polish response to the Spanish initiative?

From the early 1990s, Spain defined its foreign policy in the framework of the ENP with the aim of balancing Southern and Eastern dimensions of EU's neighbourhood (Barbé 1998a). This could be achieved through the policy of advocating its own international objective, particularly in Maghreb, promoting the Mediterranean issues in each European institution and changing its security policy, with the purpose of participating in the core of the "international Europe" (Barbé 1996: 260). In view of these constrains and opportunities offered by the EU, the projections of national concerns and problem transfer (Torreblanca 2001) to the EU's level was perceived as the rational approach to deal with issues that were hardly resolvable unilaterally outside the EFP realm.

The key goal of the Spanish Dimension is to promote long-term stability in the Mediterranean region. Stability is to be achieved through the economic development and liberalization. Spain's plan is to create more job opportunities, improve the living conditions and to weaken influence of extremist ideologies. Achieving those goals would significantly limit illegal immigration, which is the biggest source of concern for Spain at the moment.

The first explanation of the resemblance of the Polish and Spanish priorities regarding the ENP might be explained by how their analogous national concerns emerge from converging perceptions on the challenges and opportunities posed by their respective neighbourhoods. (Natorski 2007). It is assumed that dominant national concerns constitute the basis for construction of national interests, driving motivations for national foreign policy actions. In Spanish as well as in Polish cases these concerns are related to the security aspects of their respective foreign policies in the neighborhood.

The initiative of the Mediterranean dimension is one of the most important elements of the Spanish foreign policy. The project emerged from two factors: geographical proximity and historical tradition. Southern Mediterranean and North African region are traditionally a main security concern for Spain. However, the key moment influencing Spain's view on the Mediterranean region concurred with the end of the Cold War and the first war in the Persian Gulf. At that time, security issues, which had been previously determined by military and territorial factors were redefined and larger number of threats and security concerns started to be taken into the consideration. Spain focused its attention on "soft" security issues (social instability, immigration, Islamic fundamentalism, high demographic rates etc.) which could constitute a threat to country's security. Conflict with Morocco in July 2002 or continuing conflicts in Western Sahara reinforced the perception of insecurity in the South Mediterranean region (Ibid).

Another important outcome of the post Cold War order in Spain was a concern frequently called as a "periphery syndrome". Spanish policy makers were distressed about potential domination of Eastern European concerns on the EU agenda. There was a risk that Spain with its security problems particular for the Mediterranean region could be forgotten and neglected due to the peripheral location. Thus, starting from the early 1990s Spain aimed to balance the Southern and Eastern dimensions of EU's neighbourhood (Barbé 1998a) shaping its foreign policy into the ENP framework. Spanish foreign ministry was actively promoting the Mediterranean issues and transferring them to the EU security agenda.

The same concerns were shared by Poland, which started to promote actively its own initiative of neighborhood policy even before joining the EU. There are a few reasons for why Poland advocates the need for putting the Eastern Dimension in to the framework of the EFP. First of all, Poland traditionally perceives its Eastern neighbors as a challenging area from the security point of view. The geographical proximity to the politically unstable Eastern neighborhood is an obvious but important factor for Poland's interest in the region. As Osica argues, Polish foreign and security activities are significantly determined by historical arguments while Polish public discourse is driven by the construction and reconstruction of the past and historical memory (Osica 2004). The disintegration of the Soviet Union led to the emergence of new states characterized by unstable political situation and uncertain future. Thus, Poland since the very beginning has striven to influence the developments of its Eastern neighbors so as to safeguard its new found policy based on pro-Western objectives. As it was mentioned before, Poland was seriously concerned about the lack of a strong authority in the newly emerged Eastern states. Another reason for Polish anxiety

was a vision of a resurgence of imperialistic tendencies in Russia (Kościuk 1993:36-44; Kuźniar 1993: 15). Poland feared the emergence of a new, unfavorable geopolitical order that could be an outcome of the post-Cold War changes in Eastern Europe. Another justification for Polish activity in the Eastern European region was a belief that dynamic Eastern policy would accelerate the accession into NATO and EU structures, (Pavliuk 1997: 53) which would consecutively relieve the biggest security challenges on Poland's Eastern boarder (Zięba 1997).

Spain promoted issues important for the Mediterranean region within the EFP framework engaging continued diplomatic tools and flexibly adapting to changing contexts both in the EU and outside of it. Spain used the combination of alliance, pressure and compromise to achieve its goals, especially the ones concerning the financial aid. Moreover, Spain attempted to build a close cooperation with Italy and France, which would facilitate convincing other European countries about the necessity of the Mediterranean initiative. Spain's rhetoric was based on an argument that Southern Dimension would improve European security and stability. The improvement was supposed to happen through established mechanisms of economic, cultural and political cooperation and common activities against "the demographic and fundamentalism challenges that are threatening the stabilization of these countries and the calm in the Mediterranean" (Natorski 2007:82).

Similarly as in the Spanish case, Polish activity in promoting the Eastern Partnership of the EU also relates to specific security concerns originating from the Eastern neighbourhood of this country. It is due to various internal factors that Poland appears to be very active in the domain of the Eastern Dimension in the framework of the EFP. Generally, Polish perception of its Eastern neighbourhood as a vital security area is grounded on historical experiences and geographical proximity to the potentially turbulent Eastern neighbourhood.

Poland's marketing strategy by which it promoted its ideas of the Eastern Partnership was based on similar diplomatic and institutional tools. Warsaw quite early understood the need of forming a wider coalition supporting enhanced cooperation with EU's eastern neighbours. To achieve it Poland intensively used its diplomatic resources. Poland started to pursue the Eastern Dimension initiative long before it became EU member and many of its promotion actions were developed outside the framework of the ENP. Poland engaged its diplomatic efforts into the framework of several Central European regional organizations. Poland tried to take advantage of its participation in those organizations. Especially time when Poland held the presidency was suitable for pursuing own ideas and priorities.

Since its accession to the EU, Poland frequently made use of EU institutions in order to gain support for its priorities and policies. Poland was actively lobbying the implementation of the Eastern Partnership. Polish MEPs from different political groups have mutually co-operated to increase awareness of the EP of the issues concerning EU eastern neighbours.

Spanish and Polish ideas about translating their national concerns related to the neighbourhood to the EU agenda are based on an analogous belief that the geopolitically marginal position in Europe is a potential source of threat. Both Poland and Spain promote their neighbourhood agendas due to strong security concerns ("hard" and "soft" ones). Both countries share another concern – they do not want to be marginalized due to their periphery location. On the other hand, the specific geographical location is perceived in both Madrid and Warsaw as a possibility to securitize their national interests concerning the neighbourhood. Such action provides both countries with an opportunity to strengthen their position in the framework of European Neighbourhood Policy. Spain and Poland attempted to gain the biggest possible recognition and support for their actions. An objective, which is common for both these proposals, is the "Europeanization" of regional challenges, which serves as a tool for presenting them as meaningful to the entire Community. However, the key element of the discursive reference concerns (as mentioned above) the security agenda. Poland and Spain are aware that only by promoting their national concerns on the European Agenda may result with desirable financial support. Moreover, both countries applying the leader's role attempt to increase their own prestige. As Natorski argues: "Poland refers to Spanish experiences in promoting the Barcelona Process as an inspiration for the Polish positioning in the making of the Eastern policy of the EU" (Natorski 2007).

Spanish project of the Mediterranean regions in the EFP framework was taken into consideration and learned when Poland forwarded its first proposals on the Eastern Dimension of the EU. Thus, the lesson-drawing theory developed by Richard Rose (1993) refers to voluntary transfer of innovatory policies developed elsewhere in the belief that it will be efficient in a different geopolitical context as well (Natorski 2007:66).

5.5. Eastern Partnership and Poland's mission in the East

Poland has been very consistent in promoting its eastern policy since presenting its first proposals concerning the Eastern Partnership in 1998. Since that time, the Polish elites raised already well-known arguments, which aim to justify the need to establish the Eastern

Dimension. Those arguments directed to the EU countries are repeated in both documents and discussions. Above all, Poland attempts to formalize its project concerning the Eastern Dimension in order to increase the cohesion and coordination of the European Neighbourhood Policy. Stressing its good relations with eastern countries, Poland presents itself as the best possible mediator in relations with those countries. Warsaw plays a role of an advocate of eastern countries in their integration into Western Europe. What is more, Poland promotes its success concerning the economic and political transformation, which can be treated as a model to follow for the rest of the Eastern Europe. Poland's Ministry of Foreign Affairs justified the establishment of the Eastern Partnership as a separate strategy of the EU aiming at the elimination of existing divisions. Poland often stressed that it will try hard to prevent new divisions in Europe, especially divisions that could be a source of threat to its neighbours. Another argument is the responsibility of both Poland and the EU for the situation in neighbouring countries. Poland tries to act as a guardian of the independency of post-Soviet republics, which are threatened by Russia and the insufficient protection from the West. President Kaczynski criticized the West while speaking about the conflict in Georgia:

"In the West, there is, unfortunately, a kind of consent to Russia's actions. Whatever they do, it can always be justified. But I do not accept such justification. Not only for moral reasons, but also with regard at interests of the country, where I am the president and with regard for interests of the EU and world peace" (Kaczynski, interview for *Rzeczpospolita* 17.08.2008).

The editor-in-chief of *Nowa Polsza*, Jerzy Pomianowski, formulates the Polish priorities in the East:

"In the West, we have a team of allies which was established to settle conflicts only by compromise. In the East – two independent political subjects. The bigger one – Russia – has a choice: to be loyal and prosperous partner of the whole EU or to be the leader of the continent on the ruins of the EU. The latter one requires the absorption of Ukraine with its pipelines, ports, and western border. So, Poland's national interest seems to be clear and obvious" (Pomianowski 2009).

President Kaczynski adds:
"The mixture of an increasing deficit and backwardness with ancient ideology boosted the aggressive policy of expansion of the Soviet Union" or "The litmus paper that enables us to learn intentions of the Russian politicians has the colour of national flags of the former Soviet republics which are independent today" (Kaczynski, interview for *Rzeczpospolita* 17.08.2008).

By the fulfilment of the Eastern Partnership, Poland wants to become the country, which will be responsible for leading the eastern policy of the EU. Poland as the expert in issues concerning the East appears often in political debates. Being a member of the EU and the nearest member to

territories included in the Partnership, and due to its historical experience, Poland wants to show Western Europe the way to achieve successful cooperation with Eastern Europe. Sweden's involvement (it is a small country but highly respected in Poland) in the project is perceived by Warsaw as a sign of willingness to cooperate out of concern for both its own interests and interests of the EU as a whole. Poles try to present a need of engagement to the EP project referring to the EU countries' common interest:

"It should be the common concern of EU countries and the whole of Europe to narrow the economic and social gaps between the Union and its eastern neighbours. Otherwise the risk is that they may generate negative political and social forces that inevitably would affect the West. The joint Polish and Swedish initiative is an open offer of closer cooperation, and has the aim of supporting transformation by stimulating their economic development and strengthening democracy, freedom and civil societies by enhancing legal and administrative capacities enough to approach EU standards" (Sikorski 2009).

The Poles are aware of the fact that their country has always been associated with putting vetoes, blocking and demanding often without justification. Poland does not want to pursue the subordination policy because of its national pride and national interest. On the other hand, the Polish elites (even euro-sceptical ones) understand that the realization of national interests is possible mainly with the help of the EU instruments. For pragmatic reasons, Poland often Europeanizes its foreign policy, especially its eastern policy; however, its defence policy Europeanized eagerly. Poland is inclined to a more constructive and substantial cooperation. It is beyond doubt that the acceptance of the Eastern Partnership was influenced by the conflict in Georgia in 2008 and the gas crisis in 2009. Poland milked the wave of support for helping Eastern Europe and according to the Polish political elites gained greater respect among countries included in the Partnership. During the EU discussion, Poland opted for a straightforward assessment of Russia's actions in Georgia and the abstinence from further diplomatic contacts with Russia by postponing the summit meeting between the EU and Russia (it took place according to the plan in November). However, Poland did not support economic sanctions and focused its attention on the issue of the EU offer to Georgia, Ukraine and other countries from Eastern Europe and the issue of energy safety. Poland claimed that the most advisable move for the EU in that moment was the tightening of relations with eastern partners included in the European Neighbourhood Policy. In the light of the conflict in Georgia, the idea of the Partnership gained a new meaning, which aroused satisfaction of the Polish politicians (minister Sikorski called it a "prophetic idea"). Speaking about the conflict in Georgia, president Kaczynski said:

"Today it is Georgia, tomorrow it will be Ukraine and the day after tomorrow it may be my country. Taking into consideration Putin's speech in Bucharest where he undermined Ukraine's territorial integrity, I am convinced that if Russia succeeds in Georgia, Ukraine will be the next target. It will never happen if Georgia does not fail. But if Georgia fails, yes, I'm expecting such scenario. It will start from the Crimea" (Kaczynski'speech in Tbilisi, August 2008).

Kaczynski envisages a scenario, which is rather unlikely to happen; namely, he projects potential military attack coming from Russia. There were numerous such statements in the Caucasian conflict's context. They are an example of successful securitization.

Polish elites are aware that its policy is contrary to Russia's plans toward this region. Kremlin may regard each action closing Poland with Ukraine as anti-Russian. Thus, Russia's interest includes neither Poland being closely connected with the West nor Poland being a permanent and stable member of the NATO. Russia's interest excludes Poland being closely connected with the East, i.e. Ukraine, Belarus, and Lithuania, too. On the other hand, Poland's interest excludes powerful Russia being able to fulfil its aspirations at the expense of Warsaw. In this sense, we can talk about a symmetry-securitization, where both countries perceive each other's actions as threats.

It is important to remember that Poland should not want Russia to be a country, which is weak, unsettled, and full of conflicts and domestic feuds if its main goal is to desecuritize East permanently. Therefore, total exclusion of Russia from Europe cannot be a solution to Poland's security problems. Polish discourse on Russia's engagement or refraining is not consistent and unanimous. The main political forces choose different strategies. Those differences will be a subject of the next chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER 6: Poland's Eastern Policy Defined

6.1. Poland – Russia "engaging" or "refraining"

Actions and statements of politicians of the former government of Jaroslaw Kaczynski and representatives of the current government of Donald Tusk illustrate the division in the Polish political scene with reference to the policy toward Eastern Europe. This division is not transparent; however, the differences exist and are worth analysing. In the former case, we observed a strong criticism of a neo-imperial character of domestic and foreign policy in the Russian Federation and the necessity to oppose this phenomenon. First of all, this included the tightening of Poland's relations with countries and organizations competing with Russia for political leadership in the post-Soviet region: Ukraine, Georgia, and the Organisation for Democracy and Economic Development (GUAM) uniting Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova. Moreover, there was a strong opposition to the energy policy of Russia. Finally, we could notice the realization of strategy of diversification of energy supply sources and blocking the expansion of Russian consortiums in the Polish energy sector. That government explicitly exercised geopolitics in its foreign policy toward East. First, it attempted to construct the "ring of friends" composed of post-Soviet republics disposed cautiously toward Moscow. Such an attempt can be recognized as a geographical assumption and from the critical geopolitics' point of view has a discursive character. It is a concrete example of an ideological and politicized spatialization exerced by Poland. Energy diversification issue broached in Kaczynski's political line is another example of subjective bounding of threat, which emerges rather from a axiological division than substantive lack of energy security. After the change of government in October 2007 this line in policy is represented by President Lech Kaczynski.

The terms "refraining" and "engaging" - which were borrowed from American political science for the purpose of analysis of policy of two last governments in the Republic of Poland toward Eastern Europe – illustrate that competition between these two ways of thinking about relations between Russia and the former Soviet Union republics is not a Polish peculiarity. In context of the Polish eastern policy the terms are introduced by Cichocki and Swiezak (2008). The division between supporters of both concepts is seen among political elites and opinion-making bodies in most countries of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) prosecuting business behind the Bug River.

6.1.1. Jaroslaw Kaczynski's eastern policy

During the times of Jaroslaw Kaczynski's government the term "refraining" underwent certain special conditions. 10.11.2005 during Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz's yearly political statement in Sejm (10.11.2005) Russia put embargo on Polish food products providing unclear reasons for the restrictions imposed. Polish public debate was dominated by statements about constant sabotaging of Polish and later EU propositions to solve crisis by Moscow. Meat embargo was one of the most explicit cases of depoliticizing the trouble spot in mutual relations and transferring it on the security field. This securitizing move can be seen as government's justification of geopolitical assumption of Russia as a hostile political opponent. During election campaign of 2005 the Law and Justice party had propagated the idea of softening relations with Russia after Ukraine's Orange Revolution[11]. In those circumstances new government damped down the enthusiasm concerning the future relations with Russia. It was commented in Poland that Jaroslaw Kaczynski's government policy toward Eastern Europe would have been different if Russia had not incited conflict. Russian embargo exacerbated Polish-Russian relations and was immediately inscribed in the hostile rhetoric of both states.

It is important to remember that Russians could perceive some of Poland's actions as a direct provocation. For example, Russia's media reproached Lech Kaczynski for being one of the originators who named a Warsaw roundabout after the Chechen leader Dudayev. Moreover, Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz's government program included action plans, which evoked discontent of the Russian side – for example, Poland's aspiration to participate in American project concerning the building of an anti-ballistic missile system and a declassification of the Warsaw Pact documents. Poland supported integration of Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia and Azerbaijan into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation due to its securitizing reasoning based on geographical assumption that a shift of borders of democracy and modernization further to the East from the Bug River is a safety pillar to the Republic of Poland. Poland did not direct any hostile rhetoric toward Russia at that time. Nonetheless, Moscow regards Poland's actions (as well as actions of each western country) in the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States as aspiration for widening its influence at the cost of Russia.

---

[11] Russia banned import of polish food in November 2005 accusing Poland of providing fraudulent veterinary certificates. As a result of Russian embargo despite of fixing the omissions Poland blocked negotiations between Russia and EU concerning new agreement about partnership and cooperation.

Before taking the lead, the Law and Justice Party had to take the conflict with Russia into consideration but only in relation to the sphere of a historical policy and energy security, which was obvious after celebrations of the 60th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising organized by the Warsaw City Hall under Lech Kaczynski's leadership.[12] During the presidential campaign in 2005, Lech Kaczynski expressed his negative attitude toward the German-Russian pipeline (Nord Stream) and he certainly knew that his statements would influence Poland's relations with Russia. He stated:

 "Russia would run this kind of policy it was an obvious fact for us. Russians do not even withhold that the serious gas reserves is one of their biggest tools to preserve their influential positions in Europe; it is even clearly written in their official energy strategy". (Kaczynski 13.09.2005)

Kaczynski again bounds the threat generated by the Russian "Other" and refers to Polish – "Our" energy security as a threatened object. Such a perception allows legitimizing foreign policy agendas. During the same interview Kaczynski referred to a lack of solidarity within the EU and justified Poland's actions using realist rhetoric:

"And here the other states say: We are Germans, we are French, and we defend our national interests. I constantly hear from the Euro-enthusiasts that Poland should moderately defend its *raison d'etat*, should inscribe itself in others' interests and by the way perhaps some Polish interest will be fulfilled too. But we should clearly say that within the EU – which is a common good - we will solidly fight for our national interests." (Ibid)

Here the previously presented rhetoric is strengthened by a discursive assumption of Polish solitude on the European scene. Once again, in the history Polish national interests remain overlooked by West. Polish *raison d'etat* is in danger due to Western ignorance and lack of solidarity. Therefore, state-representatives play the role of securitizing actors, who determine the existential threat and undertake the necessary actions.

It is possible that a clearly defined policy of the Law and Justice Party in relation to history and energy security caused the fact that Kremlin did not even attempt to undertake a political dialogue with Warsaw in 2005-2007.

---

[12] President Putin did not participate in the celebration – after he was publicly invoked by Polish Prime Minister Marek Belka and MFA to apologize for Red Army's passivity toward the Warsaw Uprising. Russian MFA described Poland's demands as blasphemy.

6.1.2. Donald Tusk's eastern policy

The policy concept toward Eastern Europe of Donald Tusk's government is more difficult to grasp because of inadequate and conflicting reference sources. Statements of Waldemar Pawlak, Vice Prime Minister and the Minister of Economy, from the end of November, 2007, on equal share of Russian consortiums in privatization of the Polish energy sector and a market approach toward a policy of energy diversification were here of great importance. A decision of the leader of the Polish People's Party (PSL) about liquidation of the Department for Diversification of Energy Supply Sources was also of great significance. Opinions of representatives of the governing coalition concerning Russia's decision about removing the embargo on Polish meat products from December 2007, and partial removal of embargo on Polish plant products from January 2008 were of distinctive character. These opinions stressed the prospects of economic cooperation with Russia and pushed aside the circumstances referring to placing and removing the embargo by the Kremlin.

Soon after taking office Donald Tusk paid an official visit to Moscow. Although both sides maintained previous positions concerning key issues, Tusk's meetings with Prime Minister Viktor Zubkow and President Vladimir Putin (08.02.2008) were presented as a success. It is worth mentioning that some points of Tusk's visit programme were inconsistent. On one hand, he met with a presidential election candidate of the democratic opposition – Michail Kasjanow who was eliminated by the Central Election Commission. On the other hand, Tusk met with Dmitri Medvedev who was appointed by Vladimir Putin as his successor (although Medvedev was then the First Vice Prime Minister, the meeting was held in a room in the Kremlin). Thus, Polish Prime Minister made two steps that are hard to reconcile: on one hand, he supported groups opposing Putin's internal policy, and on the other hand, he approved a scenario referring to a controlled delegation of power in the Kremlin.

Tusk's statement of programme concerning relations between the EU and Russia which was published in the *Financial Times*, 17th February 2008, did not determine the concept of Poland's policy toward Eastern Europe. On one hand, the author stressed the importance of Russia to the EU and the necessity to tighten cooperation between the above-mentioned sides, on the other hand he called on EU partners to develop common policy toward the eastern neighbour, to maintain an uncompromising attitude in reference to the issue of Moscow's acceptance of rules included in the Energy Charter Treaty and Transit Protocol, and to offer membership to

countries which implement certain reforms included in the European Neighbourhood Policy (Cichocki & Swiezak 2008). During his visit to Moscow, Tusk confirmed that Poland is still opponent of the Nord Stream Project. However, the lower-ranking government representatives admit that Warsaw accepted the idea of the German-Russian gas pipeline under the Baltic Sea. On the other hand, the above-mentioned statements of Waldemar Pawlak (PSL) suggest that the coalition partner of the Civic Platform does not perceive any geopolitical element in the strategy of Russian energy consortiums toward Europe. The warming of relations with Russia was the main subject, which was taken up by Radek Sikorski during his press conference summing up his work in the capacity of the Minister of Foreign Affairs on 20th February 2008. The issue concerning negotiations on small border traffic with Ukraine was the only "eastern" subject not concerning Russia, which was brought up by Minister Sikorski.

There are several issues worth mentioning in Tusk's policy toward Eastern Europe. First of all, there was the lack of bringing up the issue of political character of Russia's embargo and declaration that the problem is solved before it had been solved in fact. Second, Tusk's cabinet shows readiness to treat the Russian energy expansions as a phenomenon of a purely economic character. Third, there is the lack of support for democratic parties in Russia and readiness to accept undemocratic actions of the authorities in Russia in order to improve the Polish-Russian relations.

In spite of all the above-mentioned inconsistencies in Tusk's policy toward Eastern Europe, it can be marked as "engaging" Russia. However, these inconsistencies mean that Warsaw's strategy can be susceptible to changes, e.g. under the influence of Russia's actions – in the direction of "refraining" and "engaging" strategy. In the first case, Moscow's hostile actions against Poland (referring to "hard security") in response to the Polish-American missile shield agreement or Russia's interference in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries can result in a radical change on the Polish side. In the second case, the following actions can be significant: Russia's concessions concerning disputed historical issues (genocide in Katyn) or trade and investment agreements profitable to Poland.

Tusk's government applies more careful and diplomatic rhetoric toward Russia. There are much less evident securitizing moves in Tusk and Sikorski's policy. Especially Radoslaw Sikorski is a supporter of Russia's engagement. In his article concerning Eastern Partnership, he argues:

"Russia remains a strategic partner of the EU and one of the essential pillars of the European Political architecture. As part of that search, our Russian partners at times resort to instruments and formulas from the past, although doing so tends to reflect their helplessness and their problems with adapting to new realities. Although we in the EU may refuse to accept certain Russian actions, we should, nevertheless judge them in the context of Russia's ambitions and against the traumatic background of recent Russian history. Most important of all, we should look at them in the context of a not so distant future in which it would be hard to imagine a Russia that is not in Europe and of Europe" (Sikorski 2009 WWW document).

However, his statements are far from recognizing Russia as a stabile and reliable partner. Justifying the EP initiative minister Sikorski explains that the faster we integrate the states of Eastern Europe and the south Caucasus with the EU, the more likely it will be that Russia itself adopts a pro-European orientation. "Russia has vast potential, but we learned during last August's conflict in South Ossetia and the gas crisis in January, it is a potential that can be used to the detriment of Europe's economic stability and its security," Sikorski continues. Such a statement is a good characteristic of Tusk's foreign policy, which justifies the need of Russia's engagement through pointing out potential consequences of refraining scenario. In other words, we cannot talk about desecuritized Europe without close cooperation with Russia. Tusk envisages that on the strength of Russia's engagement Moscow will apply the European and democratic values and perhaps will be able to join Poland's "ring of friends". This could be possible since Tusk's cabinet (as well as whole Civic Platform Party) does not follow the politics of the past and Carl Schmitt's enemy rhetoric.

The relatively softer approach towards Russia during Tusk's government from the beginning faced discontent and wave of critical remarks from Law and Justice's side. Pawel Kowal criticized Tusk for its campaign of success concerning Polish meat embargo's abolition. Law and Justice perceived the meat case as a proof of Russian discrimination toward Poland and most of all a political case. Tusk's pragmatic movements and problem solving oriented policy does not meet enthusiasm in Kaczynski's circles. For Law and Justice party reluctance-free dialogs with Russia, without reference to Poland's national interest and pride disparages Poland's status on the international arena. According to Kowal, Tusk should be ashamed of positive feedback from Moscow (*Rzeczpospolita*, 27 December 2007). Moreover, he criticizes Tusk for undertaking conciliating steps toward Russia during the undemocratic campaign of Duma elections. Such conflicts are very visible on the polish political stage. Those are not in fact conflicts about concrete issues. The disputes circulate around concepts of national identity, patriotism and Poland's *raison d'etat*, which are not perceived unanimously by the Polish policy makers.

6.1.3. Policy Makers' Background

Closer focus on policymaking processes requires interest in specific geographical contexts. As Merje Kuus notices, "such contexts include the personal backgrounds, interests, and identities of the individuals who actually articulate geopolitical claims" (Kuus 2007). It is not to be claimed that executors of statecraft are identical with the state as such. However, their geopolitical practices need to be contextualized in particular societal settings (Ibid). For instance, it would be difficult to understand the American geopolitics of the Cold War era without considering the personal anticommunism of some of the leading writers (Crampton and Ó Tuathail 1996; Ó Tuathail 2000). Critical geopolitics takes into account different empirical settings. Therefore, in this subchapter I will analyse shortly backgrounds of two leading characters of Polish politics of these days.

The 60-year-old Lech Kaczyński born in intelligentsia family is a law professor and previous oppositionist. He identifies himself with the older generation. He wants to be perceived by electorate as a pre-war politician, someone who remembers the times of Marshal Pilsudski[13]. 52-year-old Tusk appears a much younger character who he seeks for accord mostly with young Poles, students and free traders. Both politicians seem to be directed in the opposite directions, which deepens the mental difference between them. Despite the small age difference they seem to be descended from completely different generation which has a significant impact on shape of their politics and power exercising.

For Lech Kaczyński, Tusk is not a statesmanlike character, as he does not possess a historical legitimacy, resolute political beliefs or genuine patriotic roots. It is Kaczynski who pays a visit in Tbilisi during a Caucasian conflict and risks his life on behalf of Georgia's freedom and independence; but it is Tusk who should deal with the consequences. Kaczyński attempts to wake up Europe's moral conscience, but it is Tusk who negotiates the treaties, participates in negotiations or makes the political compromises (Janicki 2009). Kaczynski claims, demands and requires actions both in home politics (then the claims are addressed to the governing opposition) and in foreign politics (in this case demands are directed to Poland's partners). It becomes clearer that the disputes such as the one over an appropriate reaction to the events in

---

[13]Starting from the interwar era Marshal Pilsudski became an object of specific worship. The cult was about ascribing to Pilsudski the features of genius leader, remarkable strategist and visionary. During Nazi occupation and communism times, Pilsudski's worship was combated by authorities, who only intensified the Marshal's glorification. Until today Pilsudksi is considered to be one of the greatest characters in Poland's history. Especially right-wing parties treat Pilsudski as a symbol of their patriotic attitude.

Georgia suits both the president and prime minister. By his inflexible attitude, president Kaczynski strengthens his electorate, which is traditionally reluctant towards Russia. On the other hand, the prime minister promotes his image of a statesman and politician who plays his strategic game and rarely gets carried away. Their attitudes caused numerous animosities over who played the main role in presenting the Polish position. Opinion polls in Poland indicate that Kaczynski is naturally associated with patriotism. Tusk instead has to prove constantly that he has the patriotic feelings toward Poland. Kaczynski's patriotism is consistent. Vision of Polish reason of state, Pilsudski's cult, glorification of Warsaw uprising, family history, oppositional past, denunciation for the Second and Third Polish Republic – all this create an integral image of Kaczynski's patriotism determined by anti-Russian attitude and insidious West.

Tusk's patriotism is questioned constantly. The most common charge raised up against Tusk is his grandfather's adherence to Wermacht[14]. What is more important, Tusk's patriotism is not so integral and consistent and does not follow the common Polish pathos. He carries a Kashubian-Gdansk-Polish patriotism, identifies himself with patriotism of a new wave of Polish immigrants to the UK and Ireland. Tusk's patriotism supports Polish integration with the EU, opening the borders or Euro's enforcement. Such patriotism seems to lose against the patriotism of Polish dramatic history, uprisings, wars, battles and betrayals.

6.2. Ukraine first

Kiev is regarded as Warsaw's main strategic partner and the Polish-Ukrainian relations were and still are of great importance. The Republic of Poland aims to help independent Ukraine become a member of the same cultural and political space in Europe. Warsaw's policy toward its eastern neighbour consisted of supporting Ukraine's aspirations for integration into the European Union and into the Euro Atlantic structures.

Forming the government in 2005-2007, representatives of the Law and Justice Party continued their predecessors' efforts to strengthen Ukraine's geopolitical independence from Russia. It was frequently highlighted that Ukraine is a country that shares Polish values and is close to Poland in respect of culture and history. Strengthening position of Kiev in Europe was connected with strengthening position of the Republic of Poland in the European Union,

---

[14] Opposition revealed the fact about Tusk's grandfather during presidential campaign. Tusk's campaign managers have suggested the revelation was meant to smear the front-runner ahead of the tight vote. Tusk, who initially dismissed the claim, later admitted his unawareness of his grandfather's service in 1944.

especially in the sphere of co-forming the European Union's foreign policy. Jaroslaw Kaczynski's government stressed importance of Ukraine as a transport corridor linking Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus with the European Union and its significance for energy security in Poland and Europe. Warsaw perceived that Ukraine could help solve the Transnistrian conflict and contribute to the success of international military missions Poland is taking part in (Polukrbat in Kosovo, Ukrainian contingent in Polish zone in Iraq). Additionally, years 2004-2005 brought favourable conditions for the Polish-Ukrainian cooperation. Poland showed its effectiveness as Kiev's good partner by using its newly obtained membership in the EU to engage Brussels in solving political crisis, which prevented the development of authoritarian tendencies in Ukraine. The party which took the initiative after events from November and December, 2004, was democratic, wanted to reform and modernize the country, and in foreign policy it aimed at the departure from "multiple" orientations and the adoption of European orientation (Cichocki & Swiezak 2008:72). This situation created favourable conditions for Ukraine's integration into the EU, which is the strategy of "restraining" Russia. However, years after Ukraine's Orange Revolution showed that Poland met with obstacles in achieving its aim.

The emphasis on common values between Poland and Ukraine was a consistent element of Kaczynski brothers' eastern policy. Shared values lead to cooperation and trust in mutual relations. Therefore, Ukraine is included to the European ring of friends. Its geopolitical belonging is an effect of constructivist thinking of shared identities and interests. Ukraine's desecuritization is based on the argument that, as a part of European civilization Ukraine is no danger for Poland or the EU. Ukraine is portrayed as a democratic state, which must preserve its independency from Russia as Poland did previously. The relationship between the two countries is predicated on the trust, values, and interest that arise out the democratic governance. Polish-Ukrainian historical disputes seem to be forgiven and do not determine mutual relations as history between Poland and Russia.

On the international scene lots of EU countries were sceptical about Ukraine's aspirations. The scepticism was proved by offer presented by the European Commission in response to the Orange Revolution (the offer was restricted to actions concerning the European Neighbourhood Policy, which was accepted with scepticism by Ukraine). The increase in conflicts in relations between Russia and the West, including the conflict between Warsaw and Moscow, additionally worsened the whole situation. The above-described problems in relations with Ukraine became

arguments for supporters of the strategy of "engaging" Russia who came to power in Poland in 2007. They proposed keeping distance in policy toward Kiev and turned to the strategy of "engagement" in relations with Russia.

The newly formed government of Donald Tusk started to signal the change of Poland's strategy toward East, including Ukraine. The first such signal consisted in the order of visits Tusk made to the in the first place – Moscow, then – Kiev. Tusk and his government were accused of neglecting the situation on the Polish-Ukrainian border. The entry of Poland into the Schengen border free zone resulted in the tightening of rules concerning the crossing of the Polish-Ukrainian border. Polish customs officers' strike and the prolonging of negotiations on small border traffic agreements were negatively perceived in Ukraine.

Moreover, Ukraine's commentators noted statements of Vice Prime Minister, Waldemar Pawlak, and understood them as a change of Warsaw's attitude toward the Brody-Plock pipeline project. Signals of change of Poland's policy toward Ukraine weakened Poland's position as an advocate of Kiev's interests in the EU. Although Warsaw and Kiev's shared scepticism about a current way of cooperation between the EU and Ukraine (avoiding the prospects of membership in the EU), there was an impression that in practice Poland had little influence on the Ukraine's integration into the EU. The Eastern Partnership initiative is believed to rush the process.

6.3. Belarus – a difficult neighbourhood

For over 10 years, each Polish government had dilemmas while determining its policy toward Belarus. On the one hand, geopolitical reasons suggest that Poland should support independence of Belarus and on the other hand, authoritarian character of Aleksander Lukashenko's authority hampers cooperation with Minsk. It is often emphasised that Poland's support for democracy and independence of Belarus is of great importance not only because of the geographical proximity, but also because there is the Polish minority of several thousands of people. There is a probability that Belarus will rather tighten its relations with Russia instead of aiming to integration into the EU. At the moment, it is not certain whether Poland can effectively influence what is happening in Belarus. Poland seems to be at a crossroads between two options. The first choice is Belarus, which is democratic and respectful to the Polish minority rights, but generally pro-Russian. The other one an "independent" (meaning a not pro-Russian Belarus), which is still authoritarian and unpredictable, in respect of its foreign policies and

attitude toward the Polish minority. Therefore, Poland is forced to decide on its goal of desecuritization – Belarus's stability and democratic performance or Polish minority's rights.

Strategy options toward Belarus must include potential, which Poland has in relations with Minsk, and determine what reasons make Poland attractive in bilateral contacts. This potential is mostly about Belarus' interest in Poland as a member of the EU, which can influence decisions of this organisation, e.g. concerning visa issues or a common trade policy. However, Poland has limited possibilities to present an interesting political offer to Belarus because on the one hand, Minsk is not interested in the integration into the EU and on the other hand, it participates in security mechanisms, which were prepared under the auspices of Russia. Strong role of the government in the economy (owner and regulator influencing the whole business) restricts possibilities of Polish capital in Belarus. However, there are spheres in which Poland can be an interesting partner to Belarus; for example, energy diversification in Belarus, which has been actively postulated by Lukashenko since 2007 (Lichtarowicz 2006:147). Poland takes part in important regional projects (the Brody-Plock pipeline project, building a nuclear power station – the Ignalina-2, Polish diversification projects, e.g. gas pipeline) which are interesting in Minsk's eyes.

Events concerning the Union of Poles in Belarus[15] in 2005 showed that Warsaw was not prepared to react to the situation, which affected a very sensitive sphere for the Republic of Poland. Actions against the Association of Poles were not caused by nationalist motives but a general dislike for all independent organisations, which are out of the authority's control. Poland quickly used the strongest diplomatic instrument – withdrawal of its ambassador from Belarus. All high-level contacts were severed officially but Warsaw did not achieve expected results. Quite the contrary, a deadlocked situation showed that Poland is not able to put pressure on Belarus and solve the conflict. The whole situation complicated even more after presidential elections in Belarus at the beginning of 2006. Every gesture of Warsaw toward Minsk was seen as verification of the dictator. Meanwhile, the elections in Belarus provoked the West to react by introducing a list of people who are not allowed to enter the territory of the EU (which after

---

[15] The **Union of Poles in Belarus** has 20 000 members and represent the Polish minority in Belarus. The Union received international attention in 2005 when Belarusian authorities cracked down its activity. Belarus accused Poland and EU of trying to use the group to create revolution similar to the one, which took place in Ukraine. (Source: Wikipedia)

all was proposed by Poland earlier). At the end of 2006, Brussels offered Minsk a prospect of integration into the EU conditioning its decision on particular demands concerning the observance of basic democratic standards by the authority in Belarus. For Poland, this situation was very uncomfortable – sovereign Minsk was not interested in developing relations with the West and at the same time, it violated the rights of Poles living in Belarus. In practice, Lukashenko's Belarus did not meet any expectations expressed by Poland – a sovereign country adopted an undemocratic position. The next year brought an unexpected change, which did not directly concern the Polish-Belarusian relations. Moscow expected gratitude from Lukashenko for support given during elections in March 2006. It can be assumed that the bill included a constant sabotaging of decisions concerning economic concessions toward Russia by the Belarusian leader and his evading the Belarusian-Russian integration. Gazprom increased prices of gas supplies, and conditions of trade in oil deteriorated, which was even more severe for Belarus. Russia's pressure forced Lukashenko to declare a "Western vector" in foreign policy, which resulted in releasing most political prisoners at the beginning of 2008 (Cichocki & Swiezak 2008).

Relations with Belarus are one of the most challenging elements of Poland's eastern policy. Poland does everything to include Belarus to the European "ring of friends" and widen this way the security area. Poland attempts to constitute a stabile buffer zone on its eastern boarder however, cooperation between Warsaw and Minsk does not run smoothly. Polish steps toward Belarus need to be considered carefully. Poland tries to take advantage of Belarus' geopolitical situation and its dependency from Russia. Poles welcome enthusiastically every tension on the Minsk-Moscow line. Belarus' engagement to the Eeastern Partnership initiative aims to Westernize the state through pragmatical tools such as possible loans from IMF or EU, which would reduce debts toward Kremlin. Moreover, Poland tries to convince Belarus to closer cooperation securitizing Russia's energy policy. Lukashenko's unpredictability and democracy's violation (such as actions against the Polish minority) could theoretically lead to complete securitization of relations with Belarus and its gradual isolation. Polish-Belarusian relations seem to be at least as tensed as relations between Poland and Russia are however; Poland softens the rhetoric toward Minsk and seeks for possible improvements in mutual contacts in order to fulfil its geopolitical vision of the eastern region. The ideological framework and Poland's struggle for dominance in the region attribute Belarus with the image European ally.

CHAPTER 7: Conclusion

In the thesis, I have studied the role of security and identity concerns in the Polish eastern policy, particularly in the initiative of the Eastern Partnership. Many statements linking EP and security have been identified. The concept of security has been used as a 'securitization' approach by the Copenhagen School in order to understand how such links have been discursively constructed. It has been established that Poland argues for securitization and desecuritization of particular elements of its eastern policy. I have grasped Polish policy toward East as a process of 'securitizing moves'. The ones taken toward Ukraine or Belarus are supposed to cause a 'desecuritizing effect', in order to facilitate the understanding of its particular mechanism, in which an issue is presented in security logic and then is actually dealt with in normal politics. In its relations with Russia Poland depoliticizes and securitizes the problematic issues justifying them by "self-evident" threats constituted in Kremlin. The securitization's intensity is more visible in the presidential palace than in the pragmatic policy of PM Tusk. Polish elites' justification of introducing a new regional policy very often took the form of a 'securitizing move': this refers to various uncertainties as 'existential threats' and claims that the EP would be an 'extraordinary tool' to counter them.

7.1. Identity

Threats are constructed objectively. Moreover, they are constructed differently by different political formations. There are significant differences in threat perceptions and policy directions between leading political parties in Poland. Personal background of intellectuals and policy makers has significant impact on the identity construction and security perception. History and grand narratives play an important role in the Polish identity/security puzzle, but there is evidence that historical claims can be successfully replaced by more pragmatic and up to date approach. Even if identity/security linkage remains strong in Poland, it is important to remember that the identity factor is not pre-given but constitutes a result of constructing procedures. Poland wants to play a pivotal role in the EU foreign and security policy. Eastern Partnership is an effect of Poland's ambitions on that matter. It is important that Poland focus on the impact it has on the peaceful development in Europe rather than on its national interests. I believe that the study will be beneficial mostly in Poland since there is very little discussion on threats as subjective constructions. Classic geopolitical perspective still dominates the IR studies in Poland leaving out the subjective factor due to a lack of adequate conceptual tools.

7.2. Implications of findings

Difficulty of Polish-Russian relationships lies in a similarity of both parties' tactics. Both Poland and Russia create a historical policy and are sensitive to any movement of a neighbour. Both states utilize the lazy strategies of "othering" typical for classical geopolitical discourse, which essentialize, exocitizise, and totalize places in frames such as "evil empire" (Agnew, 2003). Thus, the "Other" perceives each movement of another side as a hostile intention. Poland has ambitions to be a respected partner in the whole Europe. A big part of Polish intellectuals believes that the aim can be obtained by its strong position in East. Poland tends to strengthen its position using all possible means. Regarded as a pro-Atlantic country, Poland also uses EU tools for fulfilling its interests. Knowing that the EU is a bureaucratic institution and having a complex about being a marginal country, Poland engaged in the development of concept concerning a regional cooperation, just like Spain and Finland did. In the Polish discourse, Ukraine is the first point of reference on its Eastern border, as it constitutes a valuable partner to counter-balance the risks generated by Russia. A pro-Western Ukraine is one of Poland's main strategic goals. Poland aims to engage Ukraine into the Euro-Atlantic security system. On top of that, most of the Polish elites believe that a pro-European Ukraine would constitute an uncontested obstacle for the rebirth of a Russian "near abroad" policy. Belarus is another point of reference in the Polish Eastern policy. Lukashenko's regime, especially its violation of Polish minority rights creates a permanent state of tension. In general, from the Polish point of view, Eastern neighbourhood constitutes the major source of security challenges and issues.

7.3. Discourses

The main goal of this study was to identify the Polish discourses concerning the Eastern Partnership initiative. I differentiated five basic characteristics of the newly introduced project. First of all, the strongly visible since early 1990s self-perception of Poland as an expert and regional leader remains up to date. Second important element of the polish eastern policy is establishing the constructivist ring of friends based on common values and shared interests. Poland spatializes European area referring to objective and self-evident geographical assumptions. In fact, geopolitical vision of Europe emerges from polish *raison d'etat* and national identity, which is past-oriented. Third and the most complex discourse concerns Russia's exclusion. It is believed in Poland that Russia is a source of potential threat for Europe due to its unpredictable policy, neo-imperialistic inclinations and governance, which is far from

democratic standards. Relations with Russia are securitized successfully. However, I claim that there are two contradictory visions of cooperation with Kremlin, "refraining" proposed by the presidential palace and "engaging" proposed by the PM Tusk's government. Poland incites for solidarity with post-soviet republics as they are part of Europe and supporting them should be a priority for the EU. Therefore, fourth discourse is about East's desecuritization through efficient cooperation with Brussels. Finally, Poland introduces a rule of conditionality toward the East, which requests from the eastern neighbours' acceptance of EU values and norms; however, it poses a chance for miscellaneous development, due to individual abilities and disposability.

7.4. Poland versus the East – Discussion

Currently, it can be said that Poland is a safe country, and its geopolitical situation in the era of the great importance of geopolitics has never been as good as it is now. Poland's geopolitical location is no longer alarming, i.e. it is not dangerous for Poland's security. Of course, global policy is not free of problems concerning security. There are certain reasons for anxiety, which will not be eliminated for a long time. Warsaw's reason for anxiety is the direction of development of Eastern Europe. Instable situation in Belarus and Ukraine, Russia's energy policy and situation in Transcaucasia may worry Poland. Yet, none of the above-mentioned countries poses a military threat to Poland. Poland may try to influence the situation in the Eastern Europe. However, not necessarily "Poland's place is in the West and its interests in the East". Being a member of the EU and NATO, Poland has its interests in every other part of the continent or world. Giedroyc's thesis that the more significant role Poland plays in the East, the more it is bound to count in the West, which was very popular in the 1990s seems to be invalid. However, significant part of elites in Poland still believes that the first place in Poland's foreign policy shall belong to Eastern Europe. In my opinion, the thesis is not supported by any strong arguments connected with Poland's *raison d'etat*. Undeniably, Poland has interests in the East because it is its close neighbourhood. However, Poland's chances in the East are rather a consequence of its significance in the West than the key to success in Brussels. As an EU member, Poland can fulfil all its important interests: security, economic and civilization development, international prestige and position. The role of a bridge is not necessary. Such opinions are rare in Poland because they are muffled by the rhetoric of fear, threats, Poland's ambitions and mission. However, it is important that there are more and more such opinions because they show that the discourse is becoming more diverse.

Aims and tools of Polish eastern policy started to expire in the changed geopolitical conditions. There was a need for a new, strong impulse, which would combine two keys issues. First of all, the new policy had to take into consideration the changes which took place in the US and EU-Russia relations. On the other hand, it would correspond with newly defined interests of Poland as an EU member. Eastern Partnership is above all a chance for an upgrading of Poland's eastern policy. It will make Warsaw reconsider which political, economic and social objectives can be pursued independently and which need to be solved through the EU's instruments. Poland will need to adjust its actions within the Eastern Partnership to the size of the EU policy framework. It means that its actions will have to be in an adequate proportion to the EU's regional policy.

7.5. Recommendations for Poland

Normalization of Poland's geopolitical situation brings out conclusions concerning its security policy. Firstly, the situation shall be strengthened because geopolitical situation is not constant. However, it can be believed that a current trend in geopolitical situation will last longer than in the past. Past decades were burdened with prospect of a new war and consequences of previous wars. Currently, international institutions have more and more significance in maintaining stability, security and peace. Economic correlations discourage from military actions, too. There is no indication of the next geopolitical revolution. In the past, Poland was a victim of the geopolitical situation of the time. By means of uprisings, Poland strove to change the situation. That is why it is in Poland's national interest to maintain the current geopolitical situation. In other words, Poland shall focus on proving its European identity. This means activity in two basic spheres. Firstly, strong and cohesive EU lies in Poland's interest. Poland shall be interested in developing the European integration, especially political integration. Poland shall also support the strengthening of instruments connected with foreign policy, security, and defence of the EU, including the establishment of political-strategic alliance. Poland needs the EU which is strong internationally and cohesive institutionally. Secondly, only the EU can influence the development of the geopolitical situation in the Eastern Europe. For many obvious reasons, the eastern policy is the most difficult issue for Poland. Risk and possible costs (such as embargo imposed on Poland by Russia) are significant.

Poland will have to develop new concepts and give up its somewhat archaic (meaning based on historical policy's narratives) patterns of thinking. There is definitely a need for re-evaluation

and critical reflections. Because of its parallel integration into the EU and the NATO, Poland has to coordinate its policy toward eastern neighbours with its whole European policy. Poland drew a conclusion that in order to create effective policy toward eastern neighbours, it must integrate this policy with its western policy which is pursued by means of both bilateral relations with countries co-participating in European integration and multilateral cooperation which is developed in the EU and the NATO. Accepting the opposite assumption and subordinating Polish European policy to political actions toward Eastern Europe would involve Poland in an ineffective policy and even isolation.

The Eastern Partnership introduces a new approach to the EU Eastern policy because it proposes a convergence that depends on the reforms fulfilled by a particular state instead of old patterns of integration. Old member states do not posses many tools to stimulate reforms in the EU eastern neighbours. Eastern Partnership leaves the membership question open for the time being and offers gradual inducements through the convergence funds. Concerning the future development of the Eastern Partnership initiative, which does not foresee the institutionalized engagement of Russia, the biggest challenge for the initiative lies in different perceptions of security interests of Russia and the EU (Shune 2009:13).

A traditional feature of Poland's engagement in the realization of the European Neighbourhood Policy is focusing on "great policy" (, above all a constant referring to a prospect of Ukraine's membership in the EU) and at the same time a poor effectiveness of actions. As an example, an unequal division of funds between the South and the East by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, which continues since the time of separate instruments (– TACIS and MEDA). A Moroccan citizen can count on almost twice-higher financial support from the EU than a Ukrainian citizen. However, it shall be mentioned that Poland also contributed to the increase in expenditure on realization of tasks concerning the European Neighbourhood Policy (up to 12 billion Euros) and the availability of credit lines in the European Investment Bank for partners of the Neighbourhood Policy (Wozniak 2007).

7.6. Recommendation for the future research

The study would be even more efficient and valuable if a more advanced methodology was applied. For instance, Pami Aalto in his study concerning identity/security puzzle in Estonia (2001) avails a so-called Q methodology invented by William Stephenson. In such a study, a

group of interviewees receives a sample of statements about certain topic and rank-order the statements from their individual point of view, according to judgement or feeling about them. The subjective viewpoint analyzed what allows gaining a more detailed understanding of the problem. Study about practical geopolitical reasoning could be successfully conducted among a group of Polish respondents.

Another suggestion for the future research concerns the Europeanization of Polish policy toward East. Poland decided to institutionalize its eastern policy within the EU framework. Thus, it will be interesting to study to what extend the Europeanization of Polish policy toward East will be possible. Europeanization of national foreign policy requires changes in policy' formulation, national preferences, attitude of governing elites and frameworks of institutional cooperation. Poland transferred some of its preferences on the EU level in order to influence Brussels' eastern policy and fulfil polish security interests. However, will Warsaw be ready to fit its actions to EU strategies, if they happen to be less favourable to Poland? Will Polish eastern policy become Europeanized or will Poland only attempt to "Polonize" Brussels' policy toward East according to polish *raison d'etat*? The analysis of an uploading/downloading mechanism in the EP context would bring an answer to these questions and an interesting perspective of Poland as an efficient EU member.

Another potential direction of future research could be a focus on the symmetric-securitization. Most likely Poland and Russia's securitizing moves consider the same security dilemmas. Russia as an object of securitization exercised by many states applies similar tools and mechanisms toward them. Such comparative studies could be beneficial for the peace development in the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and articles

Aalto, P. (2001) Constructing Post-Soviet Geopolitics in Estonia, a Study in Security, Identity and Subjectivity, Yliopistopaino, Helsinki

Aalto, P. (2003) Revisiting the Security/Identity Puzzle in Russo-Estonian Relations, Journal of Peace Research, vol. 40, no 5, pp. 573-591.

Agnew, J. (1983) An excess of 'national exceptionalism': Towards a new political geography of American foreign policy, Political Geography Quarterly, 2:151-166.

Agnew, J. & Corbridge, S. (1995) Mastering Space: Hegemony, Territory and International Political Economy (London: Routledge).

Agnew, J. (1998) Geopolitics: Re-visioning World Politics (London: Routledge).

Agnew, J. (2003) Geopolitics: Re-visioning World Politics, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Agnew, J. (2007a) Know-where: Geographies of Knowledge of World Politics. International Political Sociology 1, 138–48.

Agnew, J. (2007b) No Borders, No Nations: Making Greece in Macedonia. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 97 (2), 398–422

Aradau, C. (2004) Security and the Democratic Scene: Desecuritization and Emancipation, Journal of International Relations and Development 7(3): 388–413.

Aradau, C. (2006) Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto', Security Dialogue vol 27 no 4, p. 443-487.

Archer, T. (2009) Between Kant and Hobbes: Finnish Security Policy after the Cold War and European Integration, EUSA Eleventh Biennial International Conference. Los Angeles, California [WWW document]
http://www.unc.edu/euce/eusa2009/papers/archer_04G.pdf

Barbe, E. (1998b) Spanish Security Policy and the Mediterranean Question, in: ELIASSEN Kjell A. (ed.), Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union, London, SAGE Publications, pp. 147-160.

Bassin, M. (1996a) Eurasianism and geopolitics in post-soviet Russia. In Godzimirski, J.M.,editor, Russia and Europe, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs Report 210, 33–42

Bially, M. (2000) Taking Identity Seriously, Cooperation & Conflict Sep2000, Vol. 35 Issue 3, p299-308.

Bieleń, S. (2006) Tożsamość międzynarodowa Federacji Rosyjskiej, Warszawa.

Bodio, M. (2005) Stosunki między Unią Europejską a Federacją Rosyjską, Stan i perspektywy rozwoju, Warszawa.

Browning, C. & Joenniemi, P. (2008) Geostrategies of the European Neighbourhood Policy European Journal of International Relations Copyright Vol. 14(3): 519–55

Brzezinski, Z. (1993) Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the 21st Century, New York: Collier.

Buzan, B (1997) Rethinking Security after the Cold War, Cooperation and Conflict, Vol.32, No 1, March, 5-28.

Buzan, Barry & Ole Wæver & Jaap De Wilde (1998) Security: New Framework for analysis. London; Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Campbell, D. (1992) Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Campbell, D (1993) Politics Without Principle: Sovereignty, Ethics, and the Narratives of the Gulf War, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO.

Campbell, 1998 D., Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Carlo, J. (2007) Geopolityka, OSSOLINEUM.

Cichocki, M. (1998) Konserwatyzm Afirmatywny. Struktura konserwatywnego myślenia w tradycji niemieckiej filozofii politycznej od politycznego romantyzmu do Carla Schmitta, Praca doktorska, PAN

Cichocki, B & Swieżak, P. (2008) Bezpieczeństo Narodowe, Warszawa: 65-82

Chodorowska, D. (2007) Białoruś bez Łukaszenki? Stosunki białorusko-rosyjskie po konflikcie gazowym, available at:
http://www.pism.pl/zalaczniki/Bialorus_bez_Lukaszenki.pdf

Cohen, SB. (2003) Geopolitics of the Word System, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford.

Collins, A. (2007), Contemporary Security Studies, New York: Oxford University Press.

Criekemans, D (2007) in Dodds Klaus (ed.), Global Geopolitics: A Critical Introduction, Pearson Prentice-Hall, Harlow, England, New York, 2005, 254 pp', Journal of International Relations and Development, 10: 79–81.

Czajkowski, A. (1997) 'Geopolityka' in Andrzej W. Jabłoński and Leszek Sobkowiak, eds, Studia z teorii polityki. Tom II, 97-111, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Dalby, S. (1990) Creating the Second Cold War: The Discourse of Politics (London: Pinter).

Davies, N. (2005a) God's Playground – a History of Poland in Two volumes, volume I; The Origins to 1795 (Revised Edition). Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Davies, N. (2005b) God's Playground – a History of Poland in Two volumes, volume II; 1795 to the Present (Revised Edition). Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Dębski, S. (2006) Polityka wschodnia – mit i doktryna, Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny, numer: 3 (31) / 2006, str.: 518.

Diez, T. (2001) Europe as a Discursive Battleground: The Study of Discourse and the Analysis of European Integration Policy, Cooperation and Conflict, vol. 36, forthcoming.

Dijkink, G. (2004) Geopolitics as a Social Movement? Geopolitics 9 (2), 460–75.

Dillon, M. (1996) Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought. Routledge.

Dodds, K. (2005) Global Geopolitics: A Critical Introduction (Harlow: Pearson Education).

Dodds, K. & Sidaway, J. D. (1994) 'Locating critical geopolitics' Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 12: 515-524.

Forsberg, T. & Ojanen, H. (2000) Finland's new Policy: using EU for stability in the North, in: The Northern EU. National Views on the Emerging Security Dimension, G.Bonvicini, T. Vaahtoranta, W.Wessels (eds.), FIIA, Helsinki, p.116.

Fedorowicz, K. (2004) Ukraina w polskiej polityce wschodniej w latach 1989–1999 [The Ukraine in the Polish Eastern Policy 1989–1999]. Poznan: Wydawn. Naukowe UAM.

Fedorowicz, K. (2007) National Identity and National Interest in Polish Eastern Policy, 1989–2004, Nationalities Papers, Vol. 35, No. 3.

Grabowska, I. (2006) Polityczne, gospodarcze i kulturowe uwarunkowania wzajemnego postrzegania Polakow i Rosjan w Kocój, H. (red.) Z dziejów Rosji i Polski w XX wieku, Instytut Historii i Muzeum Dyplomacji i Uchodźstwa Polskiego Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszczy ; Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych Wyższej Szkoły Ekonomiczno-Humanistycznej w Bielsku-Białej ; Zamiejscowy Wydział Kultury Fizycznej w Gorzowie Wlkp, pp 419-431

Haggman, B. (1998) Rudolf Kjellén and modern Swedish geopolitics. Geopolitics 3 (2): 99-112.

Haukkala, H. (2002) Towards the Union of Dimensions. The effects of Eastern enlargement on the Northern Dimension, FIIA Report 2, p.7.

Holdar, S. (1992) The Ideal State and the Power of Geography – The Life-Work of Rudolph Kjellen, "Political Geography" p. 307-232.

Hopf, T. (2002) Social Construction of Inter- national Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 & 1999. Ithaca, NY & London: Cornell University Press.

Hunin, J. (2006) Dear Neighbours Poland and the Eastern Dimension of the European Union WUMCS.

Huntington, S. (1993) The clash of Civilization? Foreign Affairs no 3 pp. 22-49.

Huysmans, J. (1995) Migrants as a security problem: dangers of 'securitizing' societal issues, in R. Miles and D. Thränhardt eds. Migration and European Integration: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion. (Londen: Pinter), pp. 53-72.

Ibryamova, N. (2007) Security, Borders, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series Vol. 4 No. 15 [WWW document] http://www6.miami.edu/EUCenter/ibryamovasecurityfinal.pdf

Jarzynski, W. (2008) Wschodnie Partnerstwo, success story? [WWW document] http://www.mojeopinie.pl/wschodnie_partnerstwo_success_story,3,1228423133

Joenniemi, P. (1998) The Baltic Nexus: Towards Co-operative Regional Security, in Hard and Soft Security in the Baltic Sea Region: A Report from a Seminar Held in the Aland Islands, August 29-31, 1997. Stockholm: Olof Palme International Center (209-223).

Kaczmarski, M. (2006) Nieistniejący sąsiad. Relacje polsko-rosyjskie w Rosja na rozdrożu, Warszawa str 163-175.

Kaczmarski, M. (2009) Russia's revisionist policy towards the West, OSW [WWW document]. http://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/PRACE_33.pdf

Kamiński, A.Z. (1994) Bezpieczeństwo polityczno-wojskowe Polski w: Bezpieczeństwo Polski w zmieniającej się Europie, Departament Studiów Strategicznych MON, Warszawa-Toruń.

Klinke, I. (2009) Five minutes for critical geopolitics: A slightly provocative introduction

[WWW document]
http://www.exploringgeopolitics.org/Publication_Klinke_Ian_Five_Minutes_for_Critical_Geopolitics_A_Slightly_Provocative_Introduction.html

Korzeniowski, B. (2005) Dylematy polityki historycznej III Rzeczypospolitej w Kostro, R. i Merta, T. (red.) Pamięć i odpowiedzialność, Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, Centrum Konserwatywne, Kraków-Wrocław str. 152 – 159.

Kosowska, A. (2006) Dimensionalism as a national policy in the EU. [WWW document] http://www.ceeisaconf.ut.ee/orb.aw/class=file/action=preview/id=164126/Kosowska.doc.

Kristof, LKD. (1960) The origins and evolution of geopolitics. Journal of Conflict Resolution 4 1 (1960), pp. 15–51.

Książek, J. (2003) Stosunki dwustronne Polski. Federacja Rosyjska. In Rocznik Polskiej Polityki Zagranicznej [Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy]. Warsaw: PISM.

Kulińska, L. (2008) Tragiczne wydarzenia polsko-ukraińskie z lat 1939-1947 w świadomości współczesnych Polaków; O zrozumienie i przyjaźń, czyli które z wątków naszej najnowszej

historii trzeba zweryfikować, by stosunki między polskim i ukraińskim narodem wróciły do normalności; w Grott, B. Materiały i studia z dziejów stosunków polsko-ukraińskich, Krakow

Kuus, M. (2002) European Integration in Identity Narratives in Estonia: A Quest for Security, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 91-108.

Kuus, (2004b) M. Kuus, Europe's eastern enlargement and the re-inscription of otherness in East-Central Europe, Progress in Human Geography 28 (2004) (4), pp. 472–489.

Kuus, M. (2007a) Intellectuals and geopolitics: The 'cultural politicians' of Central Europe, Geoforum, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 241-251.

Kuus, M. (2007b) Geopolitics Reframed. Security and Identity in Europe's Eastern Enlargement, New York, Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuźniar, R. (1994) Krajobraz po transformacji – II w: Między polityką a strategią. Polska w środowisku międzynarodowym, red. R.Kuźniar, Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych UW, Warszawa, s.11-12.

Kuźniar, R. & Lachowski, Z. (2003) (red.) Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe czasu przemian. Zagrożenia – koncepcje - instytucje, Warszawa.

Kuźniar, R. (2008) Geopolityka i polityka bezpieczeństwa Polski, Sprawy Międzynarodowe no 1, pp. 49-64.

Mackinder, H. (1919) Democratic ideals and reality: a study in the politics of reconstruction. Constable, London.

Mazur-Rafal, M. (2004) Na Wschodzie wiele zmian. Polska a unijna przestrzen wolnosci, bezpieczenstwa i sprawiedliwosci. Podsumowanie konferencji, zorganizowanej przez Centrum Stosunków Miedzynarodowych w Warszawie 17–18 pazdziernika 2003 r., McDonald, M. (2002) Security, sovereignty and identity, Australian National University, Canberra.

Miller, A. (2000) Obraz Polski i Polakow w Rosji od roku 1989. In Polska polityka wschodnia, edited by S. Miklaszewski and G. Przebinda. Krakow: Institute for Strategic Studies.

Moczulski, Leszek (1999) Geopolityka. Potęga w czasie i przestrzeni, Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Bellona.

Moisio, S. (2001) Viisi näkökulmaa geopolitiikkaan [WWW document] http://www.tieteessatapahtuu.fi/014/sisalto.html

Munster, R. (2005) Logics of Security: The Copenhagen School, Risk Management and the War on Terror [WWW document].
http://www.sdu.dk/~/media/Files/Om_SDU/Institutter/Statskundskab/Skriftserie/05RVM10.ashx

Natorski, M. (2007) Explaining Spanish and Polish Approaches to the European Neighbourhood Policy, European Political Economy Review No. 7, pp. 63-101.

Neumann, I. (2007) A Speech That the Entire Ministry May Stand For, or: Why Diplomats Never Produce Anything New. International Political Sociology 1, 183–200.

Noreen, E. & Sjöstedt, R. (2004) Estonian Identity Formations and Threat Framing in the Post-Cold War Era Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 41, No. 6 pp. 733-750.

Osica, O. (2004a) Poland: A New European Atlanticist at a Crossroads?", in: European Security 13:4, 301-322.

Ó Tuathail G. and Agnew J. (1992) Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy Political Geography, Volume 11, Issue 2, Pages 190-204.

Ó Tuathail, G. (1996) Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Ó Tuathail, G. & Agnew, J. (1992) Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy. Political Geography 11(2): 190-204.

Ó Tuathail, G. & Dalby, S. (1998) Rethinking geopolitics (London: Routledge).

Ó Tuathail, G. (2000) Spiritual Geopolitics: Fr. Edmund Walsh and Jesuit Anti-Communism. In K. Dodds and D. Atkinson (eds.) *Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought.* London: Routledge, pp. 187–210.

Ó Tuathail, G. et al. (2006) The Geopolitics Reader (London: Routledge).

Ó Tuathail, G. (2009) Russia's Kosovo, A Critical geopolitics of the August war over South Ossetia. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, vol 50 Issue 1.

Pavliuk, O. (1997) Ukrainian-Polish Relations: A Pillar of Regional stability? In: Wohlfeld, Monika (ed.), The Effects of Enlargement on Bilateral Relations in Central and Eastern Europe, Chaillot Papers, June, No. 26, Paris: Institute for Security Studies of WEU, pp. 43-62.

Pietraś, Z.J. (1995) Polityka zagraniczna państwa [w:] Współczesne stosunki międzynarodowe, pod red. T. Łoś – Nowak, Wrocław, ss. 51 – 66.

Pomianowski, J. (2004) Na Wschód od Zachodu – Jak być z Rosją? Rosner&Wspólnicy, Warsaw Rosner&Wspolnicy, Warsaw.

Pomianowski, J. (2009) Rudymenty naszej polityki wschodniej [WWW document] http://www.psz.pl/tekst-17495/Jerzy-Pomianowski-Rudymenty-naszej-polityki-wschodniej 2009.

Reuber, P. (2000) Conflict studies and critical geopolitics – theoretical concepts and recent research in political geography GeoJournal 50: 37–43, Netherlands.

Rose, R. (1993) Lesson-drawing in Public Policy: A Guide to Learning across Time and Space, Chatham, NJ, Chatham House Publishers.

Rotfeld, AD. (2007) On Polish foreign policy in 2007 in The Polish Diplomatic Review 3 (43)/2008.

Rościszewski, W. (1992) Europa Środkowa i jej specyfika przestrzenna, „Przegląd Geograficzny", styczeń-luty, pp .11-12.

Schafer, Mark. (1999) Cooperative and Conflictual Policy Preferences: The Effect of Identity, Security, and Image of the Other, Political Psychology 20(4): 829-844.

Schmitt, C. (2001) Teologia polityczna (1970), tlumacz. M. Cichocki, Znak.

Shupe, C. The Eastern Partnership and the New European Security Architecture: A New *Ostpolitik*? [WWW document]. http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/bst/en/media/xcms_bst_dms_30307_30308_2.pdf

Sikorski, R. (2009) The EU's "Eastern Partnership" is key to relations with Russia [WWW document] http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/PARTNERSTWO%20WSCHODNIE/Radoslaw%20Sikorski%20%20The%20EUs%20Eastern%20Partnership%20is%20key%20to%20relations%20with%20Russia.pdf

Siren, T. (2009) State, Agent, Identity and the New World, Order Reconstructing Polish Defence Identity after the Cold War Era, Department of strategic and Defence studies series 1: strategic research No 26.

Smolar, A. (2002) Polska polityka wschodnia i członkostwo w Unii Europejskiej w Wymiar wschodni UE – szansa czy idée fixe polskiej polityki? red. Kowal, P. CSM str. 3-8.

Smolar, A. (2004) National Interest in Poland's Foreign Policy since 1989 Publication: The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest (2 (11) p. 89-101.

Spykman, N. (1942) American strategy in world politics, New York.

Stańczyk, J. (1998) Uwarunkowania bezpieczeństwa postsocjalistycznych państw Europy Środkowej w Studia Europejskie, Red. Dariusz Milczarek numer 4, str. 93-116.

Suny, R. (1999) Provisional Stabilities: The Politics of Identities in Post-Soviet Eurasia, International Security XXIV (3), p. 139-178.

Taureck, R. (2006) Securitization theory and securitization studies, Journal of International Relations and Development 9, p. 53–61.

Theiler, T. (2003) Societal Security and Social Psychology, Review of International Studies 29(2): 249-268.

Torreblanca J. I. (2001) Ideas, preferences and institutions: Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy, ARENA Working Paper, 01/26, Oslo, ARENA Center for European Studies, University of Oslo.

Trenin, D. (2004) Moscow's Realpolitik, Carnegie Moscow Center.

Waever, O. (1995) Securitization and Desecuritization, In Ronnie D.Lipschutz (ed.), On Security.New York:CUP.

Walker, R.B.J. (1993) Inside/Outside International Relations as Political Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wendt, A. (1999) Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wojna, B. (2008) Wdrażanie Europejskiej Polityki Sąsiedztwa – raport Komisji Europejskiej, Biuletyn nr 16 (484), Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych.

Wojna, B. (2009) Gniazdowski M., Partnerstwo Wschodnie: geneza, możliwości i wyzwania, Biuletyn nr 24 (556), Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych.

Woźniak, B. (2007) Europejska Polityka Sąsiedztwa: „Udawane rozszerzenie" czy niedoceniany instrument? Sprawy Międzynarodowe, nr 3.

Zarycki, T. (2004) Uses of Russia: The Role of Russia in the Modern Polish National Identity East European Politics and Societies, Vol. 18, No. 4, p. 595–627.

Zięba, R. (2002) The "Strategic Partnership" between Poland and Ukraine, The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest, Vol. 2, No. 3 (4), pp. 195-226.

Zoppo, C. (1985) Classical Geopolitics and Beyond. In Zoppo, C. & Zorgbibe, C. (eds.) On Geopolitics: Classical and Nuclear. NATO ASI Series, Series D No. 20. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Nijhoff.

Newspaper articles

Adamski, L. Europa krytykuje Rosje Gazeta Wyborcza, 25 May 2005, p.1.

Bosacki, M. "Warmer with Russia", Gazeta Wyborcza, 21 February 2006, p.1.

Davies, N, "Polish Road to Hell", Newsweek Polska, n0. 14, 9 April 2006, p.16-17.

Dębski S. & Cornell S.E., Najwyższy czas na Partnerstwo Wschodnie!, http://wyborcza.pl/1,75515,6573778,Najwyzszy_czas_na_Partnerstwo_Wschodnie_.html.

Gryz, C. "Ministry of Truth", Wprost, 27 March 2005.

Jagielski, W., Radziwinowicz, W. Jesteśmy tu, by podjąć walkę (Tbilisi) Gazeta Wyborcza 2008-08-13

Janicki, M (2009), Polityka Historyczna, Polityka, availabe at: http://www.polityka.pl/kraj/opinie/301442,1,polityka-historyczna.read

Komorowski, T. "Through Europe to Russia", Gazeta Wyborcza 19.09.2005 p.1.

Kwaśniewski, A. "Misja kijowska." Polityka, no. 51, t18 December 2004: 31–37.

Leszczynski, A. Polityka historyczna. Wielki strach, Gazeta Wyborcza, 2006-04-07

Łakoma, A. Gaz: Europa zagrożona, Rzeczpospolita 07-01-2009

Niemcy: Partnerstwo Wschodnie to duży sukces Sikorskiego i Polski, http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/Wiadomosci/1,80708,5251195.html.

Nowakowski, M. „Poland-Russia", Wprost, 24 April 2005, p.32.

Pawlicki, J. „Kaczynskie Euronationalist" Gazeta Wyborcza, 24 March 2006, p.20.

Rosja otwarta na Partnerstwo Wschodnie, http://www.tvn24.pl/12691,1600779,0,1,rosja-otwarta-na partnerstwo wschodnie,wiadomosc.html.

Rosja zaniepokojona Partnerstwem Wschodnim, Wprost 2009-04-28

Rotfeld, A. "PiS has a problem of trust with the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs", Gazeta Wyborcza, 5 April 2006, p.6.

Sikorski R. (2009) The EU's "Eastern Partnership" is key to relations with Russia, http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/PARTNERSTWO%20WSCHODNIE/Radoslaw%20Sikorski%20-%20The%20EUs%20Eastern%20Partnership%20is%20key%20to%20relations%20with%20Russia.pdf.

Smolar, A. "World and Poland according to the Kaczynski brothers", Gazeta Wyborcza, 1-2 April 2006, p.2.

Skubiszewski, K. Nowe sojusze, system bezpieczenstwa w Europie Srodkowo-Wschodniej.Tygodnik Powszechny, no. 11 (1991): 6–7.

Strzelczyk, J. "Lech, Borys i NATO." Polityka, no. 45, 9 November 2002, 80.

Szostkiewicz, A. Partnerstwo Wschodnie Zaczęło się w Pradze Polityka 5 maja 2009 http://www.polityka.pl/swiat/komentarze/290635,1,partnerstwo-wschodnie.read

Torbakow, I. "What to do about Poland", Forum, 10-16 October 2005, p.12.

Tusk, D. Europe must speak with one voice to Russia interview Published: February 17 2008

Wojciechowski, M. „Putin's range", Gazeta Wyborcza, 24-26 December 2004 p.1.

Wojciechowski, M. Pomarańczowe Partnerstwo Wschodnie, Marcin Wojciechowski 2009-03-23, available at: http://wyborcza.pl/1,75515,6411717,Pomaranczowe_Partnerstwo_Wschodnie.html?utm_source=RSS&utm_medium=RSS&utm_campaign=5095994

Wronski, P. "The Truth about Katyn", Gazeta Wyborcza 23 March 2005, p.1.

Wroński, P. "Powstanie Warszawskie częścią europejskiej historii", 1 sierpnia 2008 r.,

Wawrzycka, A (2004) Ludobojstwa nie było, przeprosin nie będzie, Tydzień na Wschodzie 27(361), 12 sierpnia 2004, Ośrodek Studiow Wschodnich.
Wschodnie Partnerstwo to marka polskiego przewodnictwa w UE 2008-05-26
http://wiadomosci.gazeta.pl/Wiadomosci/1,80708,5245233.html

Zawadzki, J. Czy Polska może zostać bez gazu? Gazeta wyborcza 2009-01-06

Евросоюз задвигает Россию в Азию 02.12.2008 nezavisimaja gazeta
http://www.ng.ru/world/2008-12-02/1_eu.html

Interviews and speeches

Cimoszewicz, W. (2003a) The Eastern Dimension of the EU: The Polish View. Speech by Wlodzimierz, Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, European Union Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw.

EU Eastern Policy – the Polish perspective - Lecture by Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs Prague, February 21, 2003b.

"Głowne elementy polskiej polityki wschodniej. Wystąpienie Ministra Spraw Zagranicznych Andrzeja Olechowskiego." Przegląd Rządowy, no. 3 (1994): 83–87.

Polska polityka zagraniczna. "Exposé ministra Andrzeja Olechowskiego w parlamencie 12 maja 1994 r." Przegląd Rządowy, no. 5 (1994): 60–64.

K. Skubiszewski, Informacja rzadu o polityce zagranicznej, 43. posiedzenie Sejmu, 29 kwietnia 1993 r.

Olechowski, A. Informacja rzadu o głównych kierunkach polityki zagranicznej Polski, 20. posiedzenie Sejmu, 12 maja 1994 r.

Exposé of prime minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz
10.11.2005, Warszawa
http://www.sztokholm.polemb.net/files/pdf/expose_eng.pdf

Kowal, P. Wystapienie 6 kadencja, 35 posiedzenie, 3 dzień (13-02-2009).

Monika Olejnik rozmawia z Lechem Kaczyńskim
http://www.lechkaczynski.pl/article.php?id=102&st=2

Musimy zmienić Unię, Igor Janke , Piotr Zychowicz 16-08-2008, Rzeczpospolita, wywiad z L. Kaczynskim.

Suchocki, B (Interview for Polish radio 05.01.2007).

Official documents

Communication from the commission to the European parliament and the council
Eastern Partnership {SEC(2008) 2974}
http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/PARTNERSTWO%20WSCHODNIE/2en.pdf

The first conceptual document providing for the establishment of the Eastern Partnership was a joint Polish-Swedish non-paper of May 2008
http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/PARTNERSTWO%20WSCHODNIE/1en.pdf

Strategia bezpieczenstwa narodowego rzeczypospolitej polskiej
http://www.wp.mil.pl/pliki/File/zalaczniki_do_stron/SBN_RP.pdf

Non-paper z polskimi propozycjami w sprawie przyszłego kształtu polityki rozszerzonej UE wobec nowych wschodnich sąsiadów, [w:] Polityka rozszerzonej Unii Europejskiej wobec nowych sąsiadów, Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego, Warszawa 2003, s. 93–107, nr 1 (6), s. 129–143

Informacja ministra spraw zagranicznych o zadaniach polskiej polityki zagranicznej w 2009 r., sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 35. posiedzenia Sejmu RP VI kadencji, 12 lutego 2009 r., s. 251, www.sejm.gov.pl; Informacja Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych na temat polskiej inicjatywy Partnerstwa Wschodniego..., op.cit., s.3.

P. Kowal w dyskusji nad Informacą ministra spraw zagranicznych o zadaniach polskiej *polityki zagranicznej w 2009 r.*... s. 259; *Nowoczesna, solidarna, bezpieczna Polska. Program Prawa i Sprawiedliwooeci*, Kraków 2009, s. 179.

Głos M. Grubskiego w dyskusji nad *Informacją Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych na temat polskiej inicjatywy Partnerstwa Wschodniego...*, *op. cit*., s. 21–22.

Głos senatora Jana Olecha (PO) w dyskusji nad *Informacj¹ Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych na temat polskiej inicjatywy Partnerstwa Wschodniego...*, s. 13.

Komunikat Komisji do Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady „Partnerstwo Wschodnie", COM(2008)823, s.17.

Propozycja Polsko-Szwedzka – Partnerstwo Wschodnie
http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/PARTNERSTWO%20WSCHODNIE/1PL.pdf.

Komunikat Komisji do Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady „Partnerstwo Wschodnie", COM(2008)823,
http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0823:FIN:PL:PDF.

Wspólna deklaracja przyjęta podczas szczytu partnerstwa wschodniego w Pradze, 7 maja 2009
http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/pl/09/st08/st08435.pl09.pdf.

Konkluzje prezydencji Rady Europejskiej w Brukseli, 19 i 20 marca 2009 r.,
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/PL/ec/106835.pdf.

Informacja rządu na temat polskiej polityki zagranicznej przedstawiona na posiedzeniu Sejmu 21 stycznia 2005 roku przez Ministra Spraw Zagranicznych RP prof. Adama Daniela Rotfelda
http://www.msz.gov.pl/Wystapienie,Ministra,(tekst),1160.html