

INSTITUT UNIVERSITARI D'ESTUDIS EUROPEUS

Obs

Observatori de Política Exterior Europea



Working Paper n. 61
Noviembre de 2004

Poland's adaptation to the CFSP: success or failure? ⁱ

Michal Natorski

Doctorando en Relaciones Internacionales de la UAB.
Becario de la Agencia Española de Cooperación
Internacional.

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Edifici E-1
08193 Bellaterra
Barcelona (Espanya)

INTRODUCTION

The year 2004 undoubtedly constitutes a major turning point for the Polish foreign policy. The main “strategic goals” that had guided this Polish foreign policy since 1990 – accession to NATO and the European Union (EU) – have already been achieved. The EU enlargement was possible as a result of international and domestic efforts to transform the country’s international position, which now is widely perceived as the best from centuries. With the achievement of the “strategic goals” many constraints on policy-making have disappeared, but at the same time, Poland’s international position constantly evolves and new challenges and opportunities emerge.

Despite these achievements, the common prognosis of Poland as an actor of the European foreign policy tend to be rather sceptical, if not pessimistic, due to the negative assessment of Polish involvement in the Iraq’s war, Poland’s blocking of the 2003-04 Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) negotiations, and the recurrent interpretation that the Poland’s attitude in the development of the Common European Security and Defence Policy (CESDP) is pro-American and therefore, by definition, anti-European. Hence, the explanation of the Polish foreign policy is often based on commonly assumed clichés, which make it appear as opposing to the European foreign policy agenda.

Likewise, the literature concerning exclusively the analysis of Polish foreign policy is mostly descriptive and prescriptive, with scant attention paid to using the current International Relations theories and approaches that would permit to explain or understand it in depth (Kuzniar, 2001; Kuzniar, Szczepanik, 2002)¹. As result of the scant literature on Polish foreign policy, its adaptation to European foreign policy has neither been thoroughly analysed². But these shortcomings can be also ascribed to the study of the impact of the eastern enlargement on the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and its subset, the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) (Duke, 2003: 3). This impact is normally measured in terms of geopolitics, transformation of the EU’s borders, institutional problems in day-to-day functioning or impact of the specific concerns of each new Member State (Sjursen, 1999; Dunay, 2001; Kok, 2003). In this sense, the most commonly addressed issues revolve around the questions of how the EU will manage the challenge to absorb the new states³. The assessment of such issues has led scholars to adopt optimistic or pessimistic positions. In other cases, prognosis

ⁱ *Earlier version of the paper was presented to the Annual Conference of the European Community Studies Association, Denmark at the University of Southern Denmark, Odense 24-25 September 2004. For comments and suggestions on earlier draft of the paper I am grateful to Knud Erik Jørgensen, Sten Rynning, Jess Pilegaard and Jens-Jørgen Jensen. I am especially grateful to Anna Herranz for all the support and comments.*

¹ The descriptive argument developed in Polish literature on this topic provides valuable insights in specific areas studies, but make it impossible to discuss if the findings are really meaningful. This literature fails under casual and non-casual historical reconstruction category. (Dessler, 1999: 133).

² On the margin of our introductory remarks I have to stress that Polish literature on the issue was written by scholars who at same time acted as actors of Polish foreign policy decision-making. It’s the case of Prof. Roman Kuzniar from Warsaw University, during the 1990’s head of the Strategy and Planning Department of Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and nowadays MFA Diplomatic Academy Director; Prof. Stanislaw Parzymies from Warsaw University was Counsellor of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Adam D. Rotfeld, actually the secretary of state in Ministry of Foreign Affairs, formerly the president of SIPRI. Similarly, the contributions to the *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy, Sprawy Miedzynarodwe* are made mostly by active diplomats, which analyse their own domain of responsibilities. Although there is always present note about personal point of view of their publications I will treat their contributions rather as primary sources.

³ The previous enlargement experiences produced profuse literature focused on the elements of divergence/convergence factors of foreign policies of the acceding countries and thus challenging the mainstream. Some authors were asking if Spain would be the *enfant terrible* of European Political Cooperation, as it had been Greece. (Regelsberger, 1989); On the other hand accession of Austria, Sweden and Finland raised question about the viability of the defence and security area in the CFSP due to their neutral status. (Spence, 1994; Luif, 1997). The further behaviour of Spain or Sweden offered evidences that many predictions were not fulfilled due to evolution of both international context and states’ policies.

related to the consequences of the enlargement on both national foreign policy and European foreign policy predicts relatively limited impact on both of them (Vaquer i Fanés, 2002: 73-74)⁴. But the countries which acceded recently to the EU do not constitute a homogenous group sharing the same interests and objectives or possessing similar resources; therefore they do not either constitute a group whose members coordinate their external performance *vis à vis* others Member States⁵. Therefore, this analysis offers partial conclusions and too general prognosis. The Polish case is all the most different taking into account its resources, interests and declared aspirations as possible participant of group of biggest countries of EU.

This paper attempts to analyse the process of Poland's adaptation to the European Union in the area of CFSP before the enlargement in order to show if such institutional processes might have impact on the present Polish position in the EU's foreign policy. The first, introductory section sets out the analytical framework of such processes based upon the adaptation concept definition. The second section provides the analysis of Polish predisposition to adapt to the emerging external challenge. The third section is dedicated to the analysis of the institutional relations between Poland and EU paying special attention to the CFSP area. The fourth section discusses the Polish behavior towards different aspects of CFSP cooperation and her positions regarding further development of this area of European integration.

I. ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO RELATIONS BETWEEN POLAND AND CFSP

This section is devoted to provide an analytical framework to study the relations between candidate countries and EU in the CFSP area during the enlargement period. In order to carry out meaningful insights in such process of interactions many question need to be resolved: is the national, bureaucratic or agents' level of analysis that provides the adequate insight into the area of inquiry? Is the source of possible change interests-driven or norm-driven? Is the outcome of the cooperation or the attributes of mechanisms of cooperation to provide the outcome more adequate? And at least, what is the measure of the outcome of the process of cooperation?

The literature on the specific relations between Member States and CFSP offer distinct analytical approaches, associated to the wider theoretical puzzles of how to analyse influences of CFSP (or wider, European foreign policy) on national foreign policies and *vice-versa*. The divergence of approaches and conclusions may be attributed to the distinct purposes of the undertaken studies, from those that conclude with frustration about the lack of Member States' disposition to renounce to national sovereignty in foreign policy, to those that emphasise the increasing international actorhood of the EU. As Walter Carlsnaes states, the authors writing about European foreign policy "are talking about different things, and they are talking about them in different ways" (Carlsnaes, 2004: 503). Consequently, there are divergent views about the impact of CFSP on national foreign policies. For some scholars, member states are unwilling to concede their autonomy in national foreign policy to CFSP and thus there is no tangible impact of CFSP on national foreign policies (Allen, 1998; Eliassen, 1998; Soetendorp, 1999); contrarily, other studies demonstrate that the participation in European foreign policy has considerable impact on the wide range of areas which constitute the national foreign policy system: institutions, functions, decision-making, methods and objectives of national foreign policy (Smith, 2004; Glarbo, 1998; Tonra, 2001).

⁴ According to Jordi Vaquer i Fanés (2002b) enlargement will bring to the CFSP, at least in the initial stages, relatively minor changes since attitude of new Member States will be mostly reactive; the foreign policy of the EU will have a more intensive, more coherent and more effective policy towards the Eastern part of the continent and others areas of the world will be relatively unaffected; the candidate countries possess rather limited resources and thus will specialise in geographic and thematic priorities; the foreign policies of the new member states will become more proactive.

⁵ The previous attempts to enhance regional cooperation in the framework of Visegrád Group or other regional initiatives seem to have had rather pragmatic character during struggle for enlargement of NATO or EU. The framework of EU's cooperation increases the existing differences. (Kráľ, 2003).

The assumption adopted in this paper is that the CFSP influences national foreign policy raises analytical dilemmas. The first dilemma is that the attribution of change in national foreign policy only to the 'EU factor' leads to overestimate this variable in cost of other factors (both domestic and international). Even when we are able to pull out the impact of EU from other factors that influence foreign policy, the second dilemma is how to account of the specific impact of CFSP area from other EU's linked influences since CFSP constitute only one of subsystems of European foreign policy system (White 2001). In this paper, the analysis is limited to the interactions in this subsystem for pragmatic reasons and assuming that CFSP features are as distinct from other EU's external action fields as to not interference in excess to the principal theme of the study⁶.

There are many scholars' contributions that share the assumption that EU influence in some way domestic policies and undertake their investigations using the concept of 'Europeanization'. The literature on 'Europeanization' does not constitute a well-established research agenda rather paramount concept, which "consists of processes of constructions, diffusion and institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies" (Radaelli, 2004: 3). As the definition of this concept points out⁷, the literature on Europeanization addresses a wide range of phenomena. Therefore, we find analysis based on different theoretical approaches that situate along the continuum from rational choice theory to social constructivism. However, there is a growing agreement among scholars to adopt both perspectives in order to capture the diverse patterns of EU's influence on national policy. In this sense, it is assumed that the rational and constructivist points of departure are complementary at the same time as well as competing (Checkel, 1998: 545; Koenig-Archibugi, 2004). By the same token, other authors (Smith, 2004; Manners and Whitman 2000; Vaquer i Fanés, 2001), claim that the attempt of grouping both perspectives enables to focus on different features of the same subject of analysis. So, in order to comprehend the interaction process between Poland and EU in the area of CFSP, this paper adopts insights which combine both extremes.

1. Concept of adaptation

The analysis of the CFSP influence on the Polish foreign policy undertaken in this paper is based on the concept of 'adaptation'⁸. In general terms this concept is based on the assumption that states are constantly exposed to international environment pressures. According to the perception of these pressures states modify their policies in the way of actors comprehend international environment patterns as constrains or opportunities to pursued policy goals. This leads to adaptation of its behaviour to the international environment and in effect actors internalize the rules of the system and adapt to it when pursuing its objectives (Rosenau, 1981).

The adaptation concept is widely applied in European integration studies. Nikolaj Petersen (1998) proposed the model of national strategies of adaptation in the situation of integration dilemma⁹. From Petersen's perspective the concept of adaptation assumes "that foreign policy consists of policy-makers' actions to manipulate the balance between society (i.e. internal environment) and their external environment in order to secure an adequate functioning of

⁶ The juridical approach related to the impact of EU's external action on national policies of new member states see Marise Cremona (2003).

⁷ The concept itself raise among many scholars doubts about its usefulness as there is a shared perception that scholars use it in very different ways (Olsen 2002; Radaelli 2004).

⁸ Quoted by Giovanni Sartori (1984: 9) George Paget Thompson (1961:4) stated that concept "in general determine questions one asks, and the answers one gets. They are more fundamental than the theories which are stated in terms of them".

⁹ The integration dilemma results from the trade-offs that nation states have to make in integration projects. The rational actor is pursuing to adopt strategies that allow enjoying the benefits of integration (welfare, security, community) and controlling the perceived drawbacks of integration (diminution of sovereignty, loss of national identity). This approach is based on the assumption that state behaviour depends on the relative balance between external and internal environments of the nation-state, i.e. the material capabilities of influence the external world and the degree of sensitivity of societal structures to international events either measured in material terms

societal structures in a situation of growing interdependences” (Petersen, 1998: 37). The adaptation theory, as Petersen himself recognizes, is “universal and hence fairly general in its theoretical categories” (Petersen, 1998: 53). Therefore, it might result difficult to adopt it in consistent manner in the area of specific policy field providing rather very general guiding framework¹⁰.

The same concept was defined elsewhere by Ernst Hass (1990)¹¹ as “ability of political actor to change its behaviour so as to meet challenges in the form of new demands by altering the means of action”. This broad generic definition was also applied by Hanf and Soetendorp (1998) and Manners and Whitman (2000), although in different ways, in accordance with the purposes of their respective edited volumes. However, both approaches stress the importance of external environment origin of challenge¹² and actor’s actions to respond to it. So, the changes produced as a consequence of the actor’s attempt to adapt to external challenges are operationalised as the dependent variable in three broad dimensions: institutional responses to external pressure, attitude of political decision-makers towards new demands and changes in strategic behaviour of decision-makers.

According to overall aim of this paper and starting from the above mentioned definitions, the concept of adaptation is defined here as actions undertaken in Polish foreign policy in response to the CFSP challenge in order to bring about the adjustment in the area of international cooperation. This adaptation process is evaluated in three dimensions: **internal predisposition to manage the challenge; channels and mechanisms of change; outcome of adaptation process measured as a change in behaviour**. The use of the term ‘challenge’ means that at the beginning it presupposes neutral position on its possible consequences in contrast to other terms such “risk” or “threat”, which implies negative connotations. According to actors’ perception, this external factor during the process of adaptation may evolve into the opportunity or constrain to the pursued policy. On the other hand, the adaptation approach does not assume that this process unavoidably leads to internal changes. The responses to the challenge also include lack of change due to the factors such as the features of the demands or actors themselves.

2. Dimensions of adaptation

Internal predisposition towards the challenge

State’s predisposition towards the emerging challenge relates to the domestic conditions under which it will be considered. It is assumed here that agents pursued politics on the basis of domestic interests and state identity¹³. The explanation of the Polish predisposition to manage the challenge of CFSP in the foreign policy will take into account both interests and identity, following the theoretical arguments bellows.

In first place, the rationalist approach assumes that actors involved in international cooperation seek to maximize their utility in order to achieve their interest-driven purposes. As a result international institutions are only considered on the basis of purely instrumental calculations as a mean of achieving exogenously given goals and in terms of the limits they impose on states’ autonomy. National governments’ policies towards European integration are strongly committed to national interests defined in terms of geopolitics, history, economic and political expectations (Pfetsch, 1994: 136). Authors emphasize domestic politics as source of interest-driven behaviour of states, since actors are guided in the international relations by domestic

¹⁰ The empirical studies on national strategies of adaptation in the situation of European integration provides evidences that even if states adopt different general strategies in defending their interests in the European contest, “the ultimate strategy choice may still vary from policy sector to policy sector and sometimes even from policy issue to policy issue” and “can change over time” (Börzel 2002: 209)

¹¹ The definition is borrowed from Soedentrop and Hanf (1998: 7) adopted also by Manners and Whitman (2000).

¹² However, the EU appears as mean used to face to other international challenges and as source of this challenge.

¹³ Nevertheless this factor should not be overestimated given the characteristics of CFSP as forum of intergovernmental cooperation. It does not implicate that domestic sources of states’ behaviour relates to the wide societal participation in the foreign policy-making.

preferences of various interest groups or society in general (Putnam, 1988; Moravcsik, 1993)¹⁴. From this perspective, only the changes in the domestic distribution of power might lead to the changes in the state preferences in the international institutions and in consequences, to deviations from previous patterns of behaviour. The adaptation is preconditioned by structural factors of domestic decision-making system and state-societal relations. The external challenge is evaluated rationally in terms of the opportunities and constrains that it may pose if the exogenously given interests are pursued.

In second place, constructivism offers a distinct approximation to assess states' predisposition to manage external challenges. From this perspective some authors see the need of identifying social norms as a first step to the foreign policy analysis (Boekle, Ritterberger, Wagner, 2001: 106), while others prefer the specification of the state identity (Banchoff, 1999: 268) or nation state identity (Marcussen *et al.*, 1999). Their inquiry is based on the theoretical assumptions of constructivism where states are dynamic subjects, its identities are "(re)constituted through complex, historical overlapping (often contradictory) practices – and therefore variable, unstable, constantly changing" (Knutsen, 1997: 281–282). In fact this observation emphasizes that constructivist approach to the foreign policy analysis is based on the assumption that collective identities and its constantly evolving components shape the content of state interests and the course of state action. Therefore, the identity is "particularly suited to explain general attitudes and broad patterns of (foreign policy) behaviour" (Boekle, Ritterberger, Wagner, 2001: 122) and constitutes the social ideational context that generates the particular social norms of behaviour. The concept of state identity has primarily external dimension, that is to say, it refers to the self-placement of a given polity within specific international context. Those contexts consist mainly of the constellations of states, international institutions and historical experiences within which a state is embedded (Banchoff, 1999: 268). In the context of European integration the state identity turns the attention of governments' policies towards the societal perception to belonging to European entity constituting the factor that constrain or enable national attitudes towards European policies.

Channels and mechanisms of institutional change in foreign policy making

Institutional environment is considered both as new institutional structures that operate in foreign policy making and as transforming or new set of norms, rules and identities that shape it's functioning. This second dimension of adaptation process seeks to capture factors that emerge during the process of institutionalised cooperation where institutions constitute the social environment that provide ground to actors' actions. In this paper, this dimension of adaptation is assessed by describing the features of the institutional design of cooperation among Poland and EU in the field of CFSP. This analysis permits to conclude if this institutional environment was efficient in providing ground to the socialization process. This framework emerges from the following analytical aspects.

According to rational choice institutionalism, actors involved in cooperation have a set of fixed preferences, thus institutional design is created in terms of its effects for maximization of actors' benefits. The actions of actors are driven by their strategic calculus which is affected by expectations about other actors' behaviour. However, the institutions provide the structure to the interactions and increase the cooperative attitudes by managing uncertainty and providing flows of information (Hall, Taylor, 1996: 942-946). Institutions are seen as a stable environment not as an independent actor seeking to achieve its own objectives. So, this approach does not take into account some particular patterns of the process of enlargement, where the EU appears as an actor with its own purpose and its institutionalized cooperation with candidate countries might have a much deeper influence on such countries than rational institutionalism assumes.

Addressing this issue, Frank Schimmelfennig applied the concept of "socialization" in the cases of the enlargements of EU and NATO, using rationalists and constructivists' approaches. This concept aspire to capture the dynamics of interaction between the actors involved in the enlargement of European institutions, since it is defined as a "*process that is directed toward a*

¹⁴ International rules and norms either influence domestic debates and national policy choice because government officials and societal interests groups can appeal to international rules and norms to further their own interests in the domestic political arena (Cortell, Davis, 1996).

state's internationalization of the constitutive beliefs and practices institutionalized in its international environment" (Schimmelfennig, 2000: 111, emphasis original). The successful outcome of this process, as put by Schimmelfennig, e.g. the internalization, depends on "*the strength of Western orientations in society and the ideology on which a government has based its claim to authority after the collapse of communism*" (Schimmelfennig, 2000: 132, emphasis original)¹⁵. In the case of Poland, for example, he argues that this country seems to be a typical case of a front-runner in internationalization, since liberal values and attitudes are rooted in political culture, society is strongly oriented toward the West and state actors have based their claim to power on a programme of Westernization. The approach adopted by Judith Kelly (2004) also distinguishes between rationally-driven changes of actors' behaviour in reaction to the membership conditionality imposed by international organizations and socialization based efforts which focus on belief change of actors, being the former more important as a mechanism of domestic change.

However, from the constructivist perspective, scholars argue that rationalist approaches do not seem to take sufficiently into account the dynamic process of interactions between actors involved in European integration that have "a transformative impact on the European state system and its constituents units" (Christiansen, Jørgensen, Wiener, 1999: 529). The constructivist account to the process of change concentrates on agents involved in the institutional interactions and subject of socialization process¹⁶. Socialization, being a central concept for constructivist theory as mechanism that bring about the behaviour accorded to the logic of appropriateness, is understood as actors' behaviour change in pro-norm or pro-social ways due to the internationalization of the values, roles and understandings as a result of social persuasion and social influence (Johnston, 2001). The outcome of this process depends on the institutional environment as structure that enables or constrains it.

Patterns of changed behaviour

The third dimension of adaptation analysed in this paper consist on the changes in Polish behaviour during the preaccession period. The adherence of candidate countries to the *acquis politique* includes both the *substance* and the *means* of the cooperation. The adherence to CFSP policy substance indicates the shift from the previous patterns of behaviour by addition of new instruments to the foreign policy. The means are indicators of the at least compliance to rules and norms of the institutional environment of CFSP that might but not necessarily indicate their internalization. To put it shortly, these indicators of adaptation refer to "how" and to "what" of CFSP. The measurement the patterns of changed behaviour are operationalized observing the policy pursued by Poland in the CFSP, both in its content and discourse. Such construction of the analysis of this adaptation dimension evolves from the following problems.

In first place, assessing the level of convergence/divergence of states involved in international institution depends on the issue addressed in this cooperation. The effectiveness of conditionality during the EU enlargement is based on the assumption that there are stable set of shared norms, rules and policies or institutional target to fulfil that would operate as point of reference (benchmark) when measuring the level of convergence of domestic policies with these established by the international organizations (Kelly, 2001). When this benchmark is present the variations in state behaviour might be modelled in different ways, for example, on the basis of the level of externalities that characterize different types of interactions among

¹⁵ Schimmelfennig assumes that the socialization process is developed on the basis of rational calculations of costs and benefits, but in fact, in his account of the socialization outcome, he concludes that it depends on the societal factor based on the values as they "fulfil the need of identification and legitimisation, as well as assures governments and societies of their identity and of the legitimacy of their political and social values" (Schimmelfennig, 2003: 73).

¹⁶ Authors states that "transnational socialization signifies a process whereby government decision makers internalize international norms, i.e. value-based expectations of appropriate behaviour that are shared among states. In contrast "societal socialization" refers to a process whereby government decision makers internalize societal norms, i.e. value-based expectations of appropriate behaviour that are shared by the citizens. (Boekle, Ritterberger, Wagner, 2001: 111). In the same direction Emilian Kavalski developed the neoliberal constructivism eclectic approach which combines in its understanding of international order rationalist (interest-based and power-based) and cognitive (knowledge-based) perspectives (Kavalski, 2003).

states, design of international institutions and domestic politics (Botcheva and Martin 2001). In the case of CFSP the possible point of reference seems to be more diffuse than in other EU politics where clear legal and institutional norms exist.

Furthermore, in the area of CFSP, the point of reference to measure the convergence and divergence behaviour of new member states remains uncertain because of at least three reasons. First, due to the political character of CFSP *acquis* no formal transposition and implementation into domestic politics was necessary during accession negotiation; rather, it was expected that candidate countries affirmed their “support for and a willingness to be bound by existing foreign and security positions and actions” (Cremona, 2003: 182). Second, the very nature of CFSP as a “moving target” that constantly develops its functions and mechanisms. The third, lack of consensus and different degree of compliance among member states themselves permit distinct interpretations of behaviour. As stress Christopher Hill “perpetual contest between homogeneity and difference, between lumping and splitting (...) European foreign policy is stuck with a full measure of ‘difference’” (Hill, 1998: 36) and among Member States “there is a clear continuum of degrees of socialization”. These factors leads to the difficulties when assessing the “goodness of fit” of new Member States while the level of overall convergence among Fifteen Member States in the area of CFSP is widely contested. We find that along the history of European foreign policy traditionally exist deep-rooted divergences (cleavages) among member states: the split between federalists and intergovernmentalists; the split between Atlanticists and Europeanists; the split among big and small states which conduct to different world-views of each Member State (Barbé, 1997).

The most obvious indicator of convergence to CFSP seems to be the adherence to common positions and politics and the level of compliance with its content. As common positions range remains limited as to assess the overall convergence to the CFSP no more than together with others indicators the fullest possible picture of the changed behaviour is possible to describe. Many scholars arguing that there was some kind of convergence between Member States, shift their attention to the patterns of interactions with its constituting effects instead of the substance of the policy. Indeed, constructivist approaches to socialization at European level does not predict what the specific outcomes of such socialization process are (Jørgensen, 1997: 175). Thus they do not assume that the integration to the EU ineluctably leads to convergence of norms, beliefs and values, including its understanding, by actors exposed to the interaction. But many authors in empirical studies provide evidences that the European foreign policy cooperation created norms and rules of behaviour that are shared by agents involved in it, i.e. consensus-building and consultation (coordination reflex), confidentiality, *domains reserve* established on the basis of common understandings (Manners and Whitman, 2000; Smith 2004).

II. POLISH PREDISPOSITION TO MANAGE THE CHALLENGE – IDENTITY VS. INTERESTS

According to the above sketched analytical framework, this section examines the Polish predisposition to manage the external challenge emerging from CFSP, on the basis of the assumption that predisposition depends on Polish state identity and national foreign policy strategy constructed on the basis of interests.

1. Polish persistent discourse on tragic history and damned geography

Polish foreign policy in 1990s was designed so as to alter the tragic historic and geographic destiny. Therefore, the Western-oriented shift in the Polish foreign policy was based on some long-standing trends and experiences, which not only underlined the state performance in the framework of international cooperation, but either defined its interests, strategies and perception of the international system in broader sense.

So, understanding the contemporary Polish foreign policy is almost impossible without referring to the Polish history. Even foreign policy actors recognize that Polish history constitute the basic

point of reference in the policy-making¹⁷. Thus it is not surprising that Karl Cordell in his outlook of the Polish-EU relations started his introduction stating that “there are few countries in Europe whose history has been as turbulent and indeed sometimes tragic as that of Poland” (Cordell, 2000: 1). The history is ever-present in the Polish public discourse and acts as a crucial factor when setting objectives, strategies and when evaluating the results of external performance¹⁸. This pattern of Polish public discourse has been given the label “historic policy”, certainly one of the features that differentiated Poland from majority of European countries. In the Polish case, history matters in the foreign policy-making in two different senses.

First, history provides “a catalogue of resources when Poles set out to discuss Europe and Poland” (Haaland, 2001: 7), thus functions as argumentative background and point of reference in public debate on domestic, European and international issues. The historic argument, the construction and reconstruction of the past transcend the Polish public discourse. The historic experience also constitutes the principal justification argument when assessing the viability of how to act in the international system.

And second, some of the problems of relations between Poland and its neighbouring countries are still stemming from history¹⁹. Relations between Poland and Germany, Russia and Ukraine are conditioned by the mutual perception of the other states’ intentions in interpretation of the common history. As stated recently by the secretary of state in Foreign Affairs Ministry, “Common historic memory – independently: false or truth – is a very important factor of national security and in consequence of the international security” (Rotfeld, 2004b: 10). Despite the normalization of relations with neighbouring countries on the basis of bilateral treaties, historical experiences constitute the source of many disputes. Specially, the policies pursued by Russia and Germany are evaluated on the background of history, so the lack of trust is still present among political forces as well as in public opinion perception. But historic experiences not only define the relations with the bordering countries but they also influence the relations with more distant countries²⁰. The consequence of such omnipresent historical argument is that the negative experiences have been setting up the Polish foreign policy agenda.

Following the historic experiences, the second factor, which define the Polish foreign policy, and intimately linked to historic experiences, is the perception of Poland’s geographic situation, in the heart of Europe and between powerful Germany and Russia (Zieba, 1996b; Garnett 1996). The collapse of Soviet Bloc and the disappearance of bipolar schemes of international relations in fact did not increase the room for manoeuvre when designing the foreign policy strategies. The reappearance of the well known geopolitical/geostrategic²¹ dilemmas arising from the return to the “grey zone of security” constituted determining factors when discussing the international

¹⁷ This thesis is not novel in the scholars’ literature, as Hill and Wallace wrote that “effective foreign policy rests upon a shared sense of national identity, of a nation-state’s ‘place in the world’, its friends and enemies, its interests and aspirations. These underlying assumptions are embedded in national history and myth, changing slowly over time as political leaders reinterpret them and external and internal developments reshape them”. (Hill, Wallace, 1996: 8).

¹⁸ See: Bronislaw Geremek (2004); Jerzy Buzek (2003). Authors of the Report on the State of National Security begun: “Given Poland’s historical experiences, certain things ought to be self-evident to the vast majority of her citizens”. (Prystorm, 1993: 7)

¹⁹ Lithuanians’, Ukrainians’ or Belarusian’s tradition of statehood is contrasted by the long history of the common state shared with Poles until the final of the XVIII.

²⁰ For example, when dealing with United States and United Kingdom, Poland still demand these countries to clarify their policies during Second World War in general. In the case of Great Britain as a source of the dispute served several years ago the case of the movie about “Enigma” code that from Polish point of view did not recognized sufficiently the participation of mathematicians from Poland in the secret services operation. In the case of United States the dispute was on the basis of the demands of American Jewish concerning the compensations for proprieties lost during Second World War. On the other hand, in the case of relations with Turkey the positive background constitute the fact that this country has never recognized the Poland’s partition in XVIII.

²¹ The use of this concept in some degree shows the ambiguous, if not negative position towards the geography factor in Polish foreign policy. The term geopolitics is widely associated with German politics of territorial expansion in Central Europe. Similar position in Polish perception we note when turned to be in use the concept of Central Europe, associated negatively with the concept of *Mitteleuropie*. On the other hand the delimitation of this area is realised on the basis of the cultural identity.

problems (Kuzniar, 1997; Kuzniar, 1993)²². In this analysis we assume that the geopolitics is not a brute material condition, but rather “their impact is always mediated by the ideas that give them meaning” (Faeron, Wendt, 2002: 57), and an ideational social construction of the perception of “self” among “others”. The mutual influence of historical and geographical elements of this ideational construction leads to the situation that Poland is torn between sovereign and post-sovereign discourses on space and identity (Makarychev, 2004: 304-306).

In this sense, Hege Haaland revealed, on the basis of the discourse analysis, that Poles’ ideas of the political shape of Europe and Poland’s place in it are constantly disputed between the metaphors of ‘bulwark’, ‘bridge’ and ‘periphery’ (Haaland, 2001: 97). These metaphors reflect the historically and geographically grounded contents of competing ideas of Polish state identity. They express either the mixed emotions of Poles related to their international position situated between two extremes: “superiority complex” and “inferiority complex”. A the awareness of Polish material’ constraint is competing with the ambition to place the country among the most influential regional, if not global powers. As a result of such combination, Polish attitude towards external environment scores from a preponent behaviour on the basis of an imagined moral exquisiteness to a “second-class state syndrome” that implies an extreme distrust towards external world and to the blind pursuit of external models.

2. Uncertainty towards international environment – security still matters

The transformation of Polish foreign policy took place in a short period of time at the beginning of the 1990s. The shift towards the European institutions – NATO, WEU and the EU – was rapid and commonly perceived as the unique way to achieve the country’s security interests and to improve society’s economic welfare. These two aforementioned interests in great manner define the Polish perception of the international environment since the beginning of the Polish transition and the design of its foreign policy strategy. However, the uncertainties of further developments of international order are still present in Polish discourse in security issues and Polish perception of the EU’s place in the international order remain doubtful, if not contested (Rotfeld, 2004a; Kuzniar, 2002a).

In this context, Poland’s security strategies adopted during the transformation period reflect the evolution of the shared perceptions of Polish policy-makers concerning the dynamic of international order and Poland’s security environment. These perceptions evolved from the uncertainty and prospects concerning the direction of the transformation of European security system expressed in 1992 to uncertainty regarding the global security trends as exposed in Polish Security Strategy in 2003²³. Thus, during the 1990s, Poland apparently attached different interests to each Western institution: NATO as viable guarantor of national security, based on the presence of United States in Europe; the UE as a leverage to increase the opportunities of speeding up economic development and, in this way, strengthen the other security factors; the OSCE as an institution stabilizing the situation in the whole Europe, focusing on soft security issues and democratic transformations; and other subregional co-operation initiatives that could contribute to Poland’s aspirations to enter NATO and the EU and to achieve the security goals (Zieba, 1999: 9-10)). The evolving character of each organization is hardly accepted by Polish political elite, not to speak of their own ideas about European security institutional architecture. The majority of diplomatic resources were destined to achieve the goals of membership in the EU and NATO and in this way the changes in institutional structures in Europe were assessed from this point of view.

Nowadays, Polish foreign policy seems to be in a phase of confusion where new foreign policy objectives and strategies need to be designed (Osica, 2002a). The international situation post 11-September and strained internal affairs further contributed to such situation. The analysis of the dominant governmental discourse on Polish foreign policy during the 1990s provides

²² The importance of the geopolitical factor is reflected in some way that in Poland Zbigniew Brzezinski is one of the most prominent commentators and authority when dealing international issues.

²³ See: “Strategie bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski po 1989 roku”, *Zeszyty Akademi Dyplomatycznej*, N° 13, Part I and II, Akademia Dyplomatyczna Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych 2004. In this context it is worth mentioning that among Polish scholars the evaluation of the European security strategy is rather sceptical since it is seen from the perspective of traditional state’s security strategies (Balcerowicz, 2004).

evidences that foreign policy was based on three underlying norms: safeguarding the *continuity* of foreign policy action, acquire external *credibility* as responsible partner and ally and build up the *internal consensus*. These norms, which were defined as a requirement to achieve NATO and EU membership, are still present but its content in the present context is not obvious. As far as continuity concerns, it is not clear what should be continued after the achievement of all “strategic goals”; Poland’s external credibility is challenged when European and American allies diverge; and internal consensus disappeared after concluding the accession negotiations, resulting in violent internal political disputes.

The impression of many commentators and Polish decision-makers is that the after EU’s accession referendum, Polish foreign policy has evolved in a hardly explicable manner²⁴. From the perspective of the evolution of the international order, it even seems to be “paradoxical”, “out of system” behaviour and going “across main trends” (Cichocki, 2003: 43-44). The striking matter is that the mainstream of arguments is related to the lack of preparation of the Polish foreign policy to enlargement²⁵. In fact, Poland faced with challenges of institutional reform within the EU and the future of European security arrangements without profound internal debate before the enlargement (Stadtmüller, 2000: 43). The European issues seem to be underthought in Polish public discourse. On the other hand even some actors of the foreign policy – making argued that Poland’s position on the basics international issues is non-existent as there is an atrophy of strategic thinking (Kuzniar, 2002b).

On the basis of such general overview on the ambiguous predisposition of Poland to manage the external challenge, the question addressed in the following section is how Poland fits in the framework of CFSP mechanisms of cooperation between the EU and the candidate countries. The question of whether the institutionalized relations have modified the patterns of Polish disposition to cooperate in the CFSP is also addressed.

III. INSTITUTIONAL CHANNELS OF CHANGE IN RELATIONS BETWEEN POLAND AND EU

This section presents the general features of the institutional channels of interaction between Poland and EU during the 1993-2004, with special emphasis put on the CFSP area. In fact, the logic through which these relations were developed is an important factor to understand the Polish motivations to cooperate in this area.

The contractual-based relations of the European Communities with Poland started to develop shortly before the beginning of the political transition in Poland in 1989 and were concluded in a bilateral agreement covering trade, commercial and economic co-operation. The rapid political and economic transformation in the CEECs and their aspirations to develop West-oriented foreign policies proved the necessity to widen the scope of the relations between CEECs, including the political dimension. The Europe Agreement establishing association between the European Communities and Poland allowed institutionalizing the bilateral political cooperation, including CFSP issues²⁶. The preamble of the Europe Agreement stated that both parts would establish and develop regular political dialogue on bilateral and international issues of mutual interest aimed at, among other objectives, “bringing about better mutual understanding and an increasing convergence of positions on international issues, and in particular on those issues

²⁴ It is not so inexplicable when we assume that from political elite’ point of view, the last round of accession negotiation in Copenhagen in December 2002 constituted the final of “*formative period*” for Polish diplomacy (Grela, 2003: 39).

²⁵ It is striking that during public lectures of former prime ministers about Polish foreign policy in European Union all of them underlined the lack of such debate, but in theirs discourses there were no intention to discuss among themselves. (Buzek, 2003: 53-54; Mazowiecki, 2003: 13, 18; Bielecki, 2003: 26-27).

²⁶ The negotiation of this agreement were conducted during Treaty of Maastricht negotiations and entered into force shortly after the Treaty of Maastricht.

likely to have substantial effects on one or the other Party²⁷. Such institutionalization of the bilateral political dialogue raised in Poland expectations that it would serve as a valuable channel of cooperation in the CFSP matters too. In 1994, the Polish government expressed in several occasions its willingness to participate in the CFSP dialogue during the formulation of the EU's positions²⁸. However, the meetings of the Association Council, Association Committee and Parliamentary Committee, the three institutional framework established by the Europe Agreement, very soon proved to be very limited in the light of Polish expectations that it would constitute an effective platform of cooperation in the foreign policy and security matters. During the meetings at the Association Council level, CFSP issues were rarely addressed.

The Polish attitude toward the EPC/CFSP was positive, seeing in CFSP another opportunity to access to European political and institutional mainstream, even before the full integration²⁹. Poland and the other Visegrád Group countries were pressing the EU to allow greater participation in the CFSP decision-making by stressing that, taking into account its intergovernmental and political nature, there was no need of previous institutional adaptation, nor there were economic or social obstacles as in the First pillar issues. Polish insistence was based on the belief that by showing its suitability to participate in this mechanism would demonstrate the viability of Poland as a future Member State. Official statements persisted in declaring that Poland was ready to fully join EU political activities as the existing cooperation proved that Polish foreign policy was to a large extent convergent with the CFSP (Parzymies, 1995: 46-47). The expectations linked to the possible full participation in the CFSP were based on the necessity of a wide and flexible interpretation of the "political dialogue" established by the Europe Agreement. The ultimate objective of the proposals, even before the entry into force of the Treaty of Maastricht and full membership in the EU, was the participation in the cooperation based on the V title of the Treaty on the basis of full Member State's rights, eliminating in this way the "false dilemma" of whether the Western option in the Polish security and defence policy should be "Atlanticist" or "European" (Parzymies, 1992: 17-19).

The political dialogue, including CFSP was intended to be maintained in the framework of the so-called "Structured Dialogue" since 1994. These multilateral meetings between EU and associated countries were held twice a year at the level of Heads of State and Government, foreign affairs Ministers, Political Directors from the national foreign affairs Ministries, European correspondents and working groups. In order to maintain regular contacts with the permanent representatives of the Member States, the Commission and the Council Secretariat each associated country established contact points in their diplomatic mission in Brussels. In fact, substantial work was held by working groups³⁰, which day-to-day functioning also raised doubts on the Polish side. These mechanisms were repeatedly criticised for their purely consultative

²⁷ "Europe Agreement establishing an association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Poland, of the other part", *Official Journal of European Communities*, L 348 , 31.12.1993.

²⁸ "Pro memoria. Memorandum rządu RP z dnia 11 kwietnia 1994 r., przedstawione w związku ze złożeniem przez Polskę wniosku o członkostwo w Unii Europejskiej", Warszawa, kwiecień 1994r., in: *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 3, 1995, pp. 38 – 43. „Oczekiwania Polski dotyczące przyspieszenia integracji z Unią Europejską – dokument z dnia 2 sierpnia 1994 r., przedstawiony przez Rząd RP Prezydencji niemieckiej. Warszawa, 2 sierpień 1994 r.”, in: *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 3, 1995, pp. 44 – 47.

²⁹ See for example: *Political Memorandum of the Governments of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Poland on Strengthening their Integration with European Communities and on the Perspective of Accession* , Budapest, Prague, Warsaw, September 11, 1992, source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/3/4.html> (11 September 2004). *Statement by the Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski on the Report by the Commission of the European Communities to the European Council in Edinburgh*, Warsaw, December 9, 1992; source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/4/1.html> (11 September 2004); *Letter from the Polish Prime Minister Hanna Suchocka to the Heads of Governments of the twelve and to the President of the Commission of the European Communities*, Warsaw, June 2, 1993; source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/4/1.html> (11 September 2004).

³⁰ Working groups covered following areas: terrorism, the United Nations, disarmament, security, the OSCE, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons exports, chemical and biological weapons, drugs, ex-Yugoslavia, arms exports, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, human rights, planning and analysis.

character, the very general nature of the discussion and lack of thematic continuity³¹ that “do not favour the intensification of dialogue, but rather is the cause of its weakness” (Parzymies, 1997: 43). Such problems tended to leave associated country experts “disillusioned” (Popowski, 1996: 42). However, while the Polish government criticised the EU for not taking into account Polish interests, the EU insisted that problem was that Poland did not manage to articulate what kind of interests should be preserved (Osica, 2002b: 77-79).

However, this disillusion related not only to CFSP issues but stem from the general negative assessment of bilateral relations between EU and Poland in the framework of the Europe Agreement. Polish politics perceived that the asymmetric concessions made under the European pressures in the access to internal market were not balanced by at least symbolic gestures of EU. The day-to-day problems in the implementation of this agreement turned the bilateral relations in the constant negotiations of technical disputes on trade of textiles, steel or agriculture products. The discussion on other political issues was hardly possible due to the number of urgent problems and time constrains. And very soon, the logic of bilateral relations started to be conditioned by difficult enlargement negotiations on accession with number of very conflicting issues (agriculture, budget, environment, free movement of persons etc). Thus, the energy of both parts was focused on solving these problems and defending its well-defined interests.

During the enlargement negotiations, the chapters regarding both external relations and CFSP were unproblematic from both the Polish and the EU's point of view. The Polish position on CFSP chapter was very declarative in essence, since the adoption of the *acquis* in this area did not imply the adaptation of the Polish legal system. So, as soon as the accession negotiations begun, Polish government declared that it was ready to fully accept the rights and obligations of CFSP when joining the EU, that is to say, all political goals defined in Treaties and Declaration and participation in all the operations necessary to protect the Community interests of the Member States³². The periodical reports of the European Commission indicated that Poland's policy was in the line with CFSP, though a further effort in administrative adaptation was required. The Polish negotiation position on CFSP chapter reflects the perception that this area of cooperation was only rhetorical. The consequences of the integration to the CFSP mechanism were largely underestimated on the Polish side. However, after the 11 September shock, the government urged the European Council to modify the means of cooperation with candidate countries in the areas of CFSP that may have relation with the prevention and combating terrorism, to make the CESDP effective implementation more dynamic and to agree on interchanging information between the EU and candidate countries³³.

In the area of ESDP, since 2001 the candidate countries participated through two bodies: the Political and Security Committee and Military Committee. The formulas of this dialogue were EU+6 (six non-EU member states of NATO) and the EU+15 (thirteen associated states, Norway and Iceland). And since the signing of the Accession Treaty in April 2003, the representatives of the acceding countries participated as “active observers” in the meetings of the EU's institutions, COREPER, Political and Security Committee and other working groups. The status of “active observers” did not envisage the voting right, but allowed participating in the process of decision-making at all levels and in this way influencing the shape of the CFSP output. The aim

³¹ The most productive were considered by participants working groups on the OSCE, security and disarmament dealing with non-proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, arms exports and NPT. These consultations supplemented the regular consultations held in the framework of other organizations and usually attended by the same experts, thus compensate the aforementioned problems. (Popowski, 1996: 42; Popowski, 1997: 48).

³² “Poland's Negotiation Position in the Area of Common Security and Foreign Policy, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland , 27 August 1998”, (in:) *Poland's Position papers for the Accession negotiations with the European Union, Chancellery of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Poland*, Government Plenipotentiary for Poland's Accession Negotiations to the European Union, June 2000, pp. 471 – 472. The negotiation were opened on this chapter in October 1998 (among first seven) and provisionally closed in April 2000, with certain delay due to the EU problems with position on Cyprus. The only possible problem indicated was of the technical character, thus joining the CORTESY network.

³³ „Oswiadczenie Rządu RP w związku z nadzwyczajnym “szczytem” Rady Europejskiej, Warszawa, 20 wrzesnia 2001”, in: *Studia Europejskie*, Nr 3, 2001, pp. 157 – 158.

of such an upgrading of the status of the acceding countries' officials within EU institutions was their familiarization with the day-by-day EU work.

It is rather difficult to assess if Polish policy-makers involved in CFSP cooperation internalized the norms and rules of behaviour that exist among the Member States policy-makers. It seems that this cooperation did not serve as an adequate background to this process. The character of the institutionalized relations indicate that policy-makers contacts were irregular and it was not exist the habit of everyday cooperation that provided ground for the socialization process. Moreover, the overall character of relations was conditioned by enlargement negotiations that were based mostly on the defence of national interests that usually was in opposition to persuade the common policy goals. Despite long history of relations the CFSP mechanisms seems to Polish policy makers very distant, as stated in March 2004 Marek Siwiec, chief of National Security Bureau, the primary task after enlargement is "to get know well the mechanisms of community working, the norms govern their functioning and rules of "game" in this team" (Siwiec, 2004).

After presenting the institutionalized channels of cooperation between Poland and the EU in foreign and security matters, the question analysed in the following section is how Poland effectively behaved when dealing with CFSP issues.

IV. POLISH POLICY TOWARDS THE CFSP – PATTERNS OF CHANGE OR CONTINUITY

On the basis of the analysis of former two dimensions of the adaptation, the expectations concerning Polish adherence to CFSP should be rather sceptical. As we have seen, Poland represent rather limited predisposition to be involved in the international cooperation that challenge the established patterns of state identity. Additionally, during the enlargement period the strong EU's institutional pressure to involve Poland in the CFSP cooperation was inexistent. It seems that this area did not constitute the priority for both parts.

The initial positive attitude towards CFSP presented by Poland soon evolved into a more sceptical and reserved one. From the Polish political elites' perspective, the CFSP was perceived rather negatively as well. Poland viewed this cooperation as a declarative mechanism due to the modest EU capabilities to implement CFSP objectives. Several factors that influenced this generalized sceptical opinions: the inability of EU to act in the Balcanes without referring to the United States military capabilities, the Member States' "Russia-first" policy and the lack of a positive strategy towards Ukraine and Belarus. These factors raised Poland's concerns about the internal coherence of the EU's external action and strengthened the perception of diverging interest between Poland and some Member States (Osica, 2002b, 73-75). The common opinion about CFSP viability is that as long as Europe will not be able to solve problems in Europe, the EU aspirations to participate in global international relations are only rhetorical. In the same way, Poland understood the CFSP as a lowest-possible-level of compromise as a consequence of the divergent positions among the Member States guided by particular, national interests.

The first EU common action, the Balladur Plan on the Stability and Security Plan in Europe contributed to such a worsening of the Polish view of EU foreign policy (McManus, 1998: 128-129). Indeed, from Poland's point of view, this initiative was "based on several false premises" and "resulted from a sheer ignorance of the geography and history of the region", also demonstrating that "the European Union had not sufficiently matured for a serious deliberation on crucial problems of security" (Kuzniar, 2001: 73 – 74)³⁴. The Polish negative opinion of this initiative stemmed from the fact that Poland had already signed Treaties of friendship and good

³⁴ See: *Statement by Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland Andrzej Olechowski at the Inaugural Conference for the Pact on Stability in Europe*, Paris, May 26, 1994, source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1994/2/15.html> (11 September 2004)

neighbourhood with all bordering countries³⁵, but compliance and participation in this initiative was seen as the condition of speed up the accession talks to the EU that proved to be another rhetorical promise of EU Member States. The plan was interpreted as an attempt to raise the barriers for Central European states in their efforts at inclusion in Western integration institutions also as regards security (Kuzniar, 2001: 74).

Despite this poor beginning of cooperation in the CFSP, Poland in many others areas pursued less emotional policy. We can observe it when analysing the behaviour regarding the adherence to CFSP common positions.

1. Alignment with EU's Declarations. "Other" does not allow?

The level of alignment of Poland to the declarations and common positions, two main policy instruments existing in the framework of Second Pillar, is crucial since it means agreement on the substance of CFSP. Until accession, each member-to-be country coordinated its foreign policy with the EU's partners by aligning itself with EU declarations and political demarches, and joining EU common positions. The possibility to align to these instruments was established by the EU on a case-by-case basis and without uniform criteria to decide which associated countries should be invited to subscribe to declarations and demarches. Despite that Poland's manifested a growing interest in a direct participation in the phase of elaboration of the CFSP positions; its claims remained largely unattended. From the point of view of Poland this situation was highly unsatisfactory as it "perpetuated the belief that they were still not equal partners" (Czubinski, 1998: 91).

In general terms, the level of adherence to the EU declarations goes in crescendo during the whole period analysed (see Annex 1). But there were some cases of clear divergence where Poland was the sole candidate that did not align. The available data indicate that during the whole period of functioning of the mechanism of the cooperation with associated countries in the field of CFSP Poland did not align itself in sixteen cases in contrast to other CEECs (see Annex 2)³⁶. While the most part of these divergent positions were due to technical problems because of the scant information provided by the EU or the few hours left for the alignment, in some other cases Poland's position differed on the very substance of the declarations.³⁷ Some of the technical problems were sometimes solved by CEECs expressing their alignments to Declarations *ex-post*, through separate Declarations. For example, in 2001, CEECs aligned themselves with 13 declarations previously issued by the EU Presidency, all of them related to the situation in the former Yugoslavia states.

Among the Polish divergent cases, the most important are those related to Ukraine (1996), Belarus (1998), Myanmar (1998), Libya (1999), elections in Yugoslavia in September 2000, and Kosovo elections in November 2000, finally concerning Malaysia in July 2002. The divergence regarding EU declarations related to Ukraine and Belarus were due to the pretended Polish special relations or sensibility towards these states. However, Poland adhered to subsequent declarations dealing with Ukraine and Belarus; thus the importance of such divergence should not be overestimated as a sign of clear tendency to conduct a divergent Eastern politics, but rather as a predisposition to such move in order to put on view the special Polish relations with

³⁵ Precisely, the unique CFSP Declaration concerning Poland referred to the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between Republic of Lithuania and Republic of Poland issued in March 1994. The Statement of the Presidency on behalf of the European Union express the satisfaction of signing this Treaty as contribution to increase the stability of the region, which will be useful as confidence measures when initiate the way of the closer integration with European political and economic structures. *Bulletin of the European Union*, March, 1994, p. 69.

³⁶ The analysis of these declarations was made on the basis of the information published in the *Bulletin of the European Union* for the period 1994 – 2003. However, in other source we find very different data.

³⁷ The initial information provided by the Council Secretariat to the CEECs permanent missions in Brussels usually did not provided all the information about the details of the declaration or demarche to be mad but rather limited itself to communicating the general direction of the measures to be taken. Based on that the associated countries had to inform the Council Secretariat whether or not, they accepted the proposed declaration or demarche. Later in short period of time the associated countries gave their acceptance. (Czubinski, 1998: 91).

this area³⁸. In the other divergent cases regarding more distant countries have a more contingent explanation; in the case of Malaysia for example, the most suitable explanation is that at the moment when the declaration was issued, Poland was dealing negotiations with the Malaysian government on a supply of military equipment to this Asian country³⁹.

In several occasions, Poland representatives raised their concern about the unclear and arbitrary criteria employed by the EU to decide on the invitation of the associated countries to align themselves with the EU declarations. From the Polish view, "the assessment of the participation to the declaration was partisan" and so, the implications of not aligning oneself "acquire political, even propagandist dimension", whereas Poland's disposition to converge in the majority of positions was not being taken into account (Wenerska, 1999: 115). In fact, when analysing the thematic and geographical continuity of the cases where the associated countries were invited, it seems clear that the invitation was only offered in the less polemic issues. During the initial period 1994 – 1999, the majority of adherence cases were related to uncontroversial declarations about African or Asiatic countries. Another important domain where the associated countries were invited to align themselves was related to international treaties about Non-Proliferation or disarmament. The statements regarding the situation in the Former Yugoslavia or the peace process in the Middle East were reserved during many years only to the EU. For example, only in 2003 acceding countries were allowed to align themselves to the declarations on the Middle East peace process. Although to a lesser extent, this observation can also be made in the case of the statements regarding the situation in the Former Soviet Union countries.

2. The coordination reflex in the UN General Assembly voting

During the Cold War period, despite the limitations resulting from Poland's subordination to the Soviet Union, Poland's participation in the United Nations was very active, thus building up the positive image of a country engaged in the multilateral organization's works (Popiuk – Rysinska, 2001: 378). After the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the new orientation in the Polish foreign and security policy made Poland focus on regional level. Although Poland has not lost its interest in supraregional or global issues, this interest has remained rather selective. Poland remains especially active at UN's fora when discussing issues related to the maintenance of international peace and security⁴⁰, respecting human rights, fighting against organized crime and reform of the UN organization. This latter issue has recently gained a new impetus within the Polish UN's agenda as a response to the post-September 11 changes in the international security environment⁴¹.

Regarding the convergence of Poland with the EU common positions in the UN General Assembly, Poland's voting records shows that even before being officially recognised as a candidate, this country achieved the highest level of convergence with the EU of all CEECs. Polish representatives attributed a great deal of importance to such convergence "in order to be accepted as worthy 'Europeans' and show their European credentials to opt-in to the exclusive club of the EU" (Johansson-Nogués, 2004: 81). Within the UN Assembly, Poland was nominally member of the so-called Eastern Europe Regional Group, but in fact, this group did not fulfil its functions of co-ordinating positions and recommending the officials to represent the Group

³⁸ Many times repeated case of Polish divergence is the declaration on Belarus from 1998. As stated recently "Poland's policy in questions of Belarus do not must be just the same as Community policy. Here we can and should differentiate our approach a little bit, because it is our neighbour with shared long border". (Oleksy, 2003: 21).

³⁹ „Wizyta Ministra Włodzimierza Cimoszewicza w Azji Południowo-Wschodniej”, *Media zagraniczne o Polsce (analizy, oceny, opinie, wywiady)*, *Biuletyn codzienny*, Departament Systemu Informacji MSZ, Rok XI, Numer 164 (2695), 30 sierpnia 2002.

⁴⁰ Poland traditionally is very active in this area contributing substantial military and policy troops to UN peace operations and it is ranked among biggest contributors to such actions. Golan Heights, Lebanon and Bosnia – Herzegovina are the most important operations with Poland's participation.

⁴¹ See: *Statement by H.E. Dr. Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland at the Fifty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 15 September 2002*, source:http://www.msz.gov.pl/start.php?page=1100602000&obj_display_cat=11&obj_display_full=89&obj_to_display_type=21 (11 September 2004); Adam Daniel Rotfeld (ed.), *New Political Act for the United Nations*, Warsaw 2004.

within the UN bodies (Matuszewski, 1999: 46)⁴². In order to ensure Poland's progress towards the integration into NATO and the European Union, Polish representatives tried to coordinate their positions both with the United States and other NATO members and with the European Union, although in this latter case the co-ordination was conducted in a more institutionalized framework⁴³.

The Poland behaviour during the UN General Assembly voting reveals that the European Union's ability to adopt coherent positions had an important impact on the Polish representatives. The empirical analysis proves that Polish behaviour is highly coherent with EU when the Union itself was able to reach consensual position (about 80% of the total voting). The analysis made by Paul Luif reveals that since the beginning of 1990s, Poland voted in accordance with the EU's tendency, even when facing extreme time constraints to get the EU positions known. While during the period 1990 – 1997 the divergence margin scored 1-2 % of all voted resolutions, in the period 1998 – 2002 divergence was nearly inexistent. The only relevant divergences were observed in the following areas and years: on the Middle East questions voting the distance was observed only in 1990 (in 2% of recorded votes), 1994 (6% of recorded votes) and 1997 (2% of recorded votes); on the security and disarmament questions voting the distance was observed only in 1995 (5% of recorded votes). Similarly Elisabeth Johansson-Nogués summarized her research presenting the so-called "factor score graphs", which reveals that in the 1997 – 2002 period Poland voted just in the same way as Italy on such issue areas as human rights, decolonization/self-determination, nuclear proliferation and disarmament (Johansson-Nogués, 2004: 83).

3. Polish policy towards CFSP development

Two contradictory strategies were present when discussing the Polish view towards the future of EU's integration: keeping silence so as to not harm the enlargement negotiations or actively engaging itself in the debate in order to demonstrate the Polish European identity and its active support to the European integration (Trzaskowski, 2002a: 10). Initially the Polish positions were to a great extent a mere reflect of the debate realized among EU's Member States, rather than the expression of original ideas grounded in a wide domestic debate (Buras, 2002; Parzymies, 2003). In general, the debate on the future of Europe in Poland was limited to high-level political speeches and, the vast majority were launched only as a negative reaction to the most polemic propositions expressed by European politicians (Joshka Fischer Humboldt University speech). However, when it has come to ESDP issues, the Polish position has been clearly differentiated from the declarative propositions regarding the CFSP.

Poland contributed proposals during the IGC in 2000 and the subsequent Nice European Council in December that year, where Poland adopted rather neutral stance on question of CFSP and ESDP arrangements⁴⁴. After the Leaken European Council in December 2001, Poland issued a statement where the CFSP was identified as one of the three main priorities that needed to be addressed by the European Convention in order to increase its effectiveness. This statement also stressed that the future Member States should be included to the process of the decision-making of the EU's external action policy⁴⁵.

Institutional arrangements – learning EU high politics

During the European Convention, the candidate countries were able to participate as observers, so they could submit their proposals on an equal footing with the member states. Poland's

⁴² Even after enlargement East European Regional Group was not be merged with West European and Others Group which align all Fifteen Member States, as it would probably reduce the representation of European states in UN organs. (Luif, 2003: 7).

⁴³ The cooperation with the EU was pursued by regular meetings between EU "Troika" and representatives of Poland, individual contacts with Member States EU delegates, in particularly with EU Presidency.

⁴⁴ Konferencja Miedzyrządowa 2000 – polski punkt widzenia", in: *Studia Europejskie*, No. 3 (16), 2000, pp. 133 – 151; "Traktat z Nicei. Polski punkt widzenia", Warszawa, 15 lutego 2001 r., in: *Studia Europejskie*, 2 (18), 2001, pp. 143 – 183.

⁴⁵ Oświadczenie Rządu RP w związku z posiedzeniem Rady Europejskiej w Leaken w dniach 14.15grudnia 2001 r., Warszaw 11 grudnia 2001 r., in: *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 49, 2002, pp. 11- 13.

representatives to the Convention fully supported the strengthening of the EU external dimension, notably foreign and defence policy, and stressed the need to further specify the EU's external role. Their underlying conception of the CFSP institutional design was based on the idea of ending up with the artificial distinction between the First and the Second pillars as CFSP both included community and intergovernmental method. All Polish representatives to the Convention called for greater coherence and effectiveness of the EU's external dimension⁴⁶.

The Polish representative to the Convention and member of Working Group on External Action submitted a proposal regarding the institutional mechanisms of the EU's external action. The proposal supported the so-called double-hat concept of external representation, that is to say, that the new figure of the European Foreign Affairs Minister would at the same time be member of the European Commission and holds a mandate from the Council. Indeed, the creation of an EU Foreign Affairs Minister was claimed to be one of the most important achievements of the Convention and the precise delimitation of his competences was deemed to be satisfactory by the government (Hübner, 2004: 14-17). Thus Polish government adopted the intermediate positions between the option of maintaining the High Representative under the Council and that of placing a new figure responsible for the whole EU external action within the EU European Commission. Polish representative did not oppose to the idea of the "enhanced cooperation" if this mechanism was to have an open character; however, the idea was deemed to be premature in the case of defence of the "structured cooperation".

However, as the European Convention came to end, the Polish position evolved towards a less enthusiastic stance towards the strengthening a 'Common' Foreign Security Policy. In this sense, Polish representatives stressed that to implement the Community method to the CFSP was impossible. From Polish officials, it was even acknowledged that "there was a general growth in pragmatism tendencies and that the national interests were the priority" (Oleksy, 2003: 15-16) and that the decision-making system in EU in fact was encouraging the member states "to calculate and haggle according to common rules" (Oleksy, 2003: 17).

Creating geographic priorities

The development of an EU Eastern Dimension has recently turned out to be the Polish absolute priority in the European foreign policy. This region was rapidly identified as the area where Poland could contribute its expertise in the CFSP activities, due to its geographical position, wide knowledge of region and its own experience of political, economic and social transition. The recent insistence of a Polish leading role in this area reflects to some extent the perception that without a Polish active participation in the CFSP, its vital interests might be challenged. The stimuli for a more active participation in designing the Eastern Dimension stemmed from two factors directly related to Russia: the Kaliningrad question and the talks about energetic supplies and transport infrastructural networks. The fact that both issues were addressed by the EU without Polish participation, in the eyes of Poland was suspiciously seen as another case of the "Russia first" policy, with possible harmful consequences for the Polish security interests⁴⁷. So, since 2000, the Polish diplomacy adopted a more active behaviour in the issues regarding Eastern Europe, by issuing documents on situation of Ukraine and Belarus and by participating in the discussion about Kaliningrad. Similarly, Poland was very active in the elaboration of the New Neighbourhood Initiative by submitting very detailed propositions⁴⁸. The preparation of Polish positions and strategies regarding EU Eastern Dimension were held in the context of an

⁴⁶ Hübner Danuta (2002a); Oleksy Jozef (2002a; 2002b; 2002c).

⁴⁷ In President Kwasniewski's view the Eastern policy of EU was not exist because "this policy is a policy of particular states. This is a policy that we are against. We are against that this policy would be realized without counting with Poland". Without common actions, common thinking about EU-Russia relations, EU-Ukraine relations (...) "whatever we speak about the common European policy, it will be nothing that common policy" (Kwasniewski, 2004).

⁴⁸ The first comprehensive proposition was submitted in 2001. The Eastern policy of the European Union in the run-up to the EU's enlargement to include the countries of Central and Eastern Europe – Poland's viewpoint, Warsaw, 13 June 2001, Warszawa: Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych 2001. See either: "Non-paper with Polish proposals concerning policy towards new Eastern neighbours after EU enlargement, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, January de 2003", in: *EU Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy*, Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw 2003, pp. 85 - 98; Detailed description of Polish contributions see: Dziejulski, (2003).

open public discussion with participation of many experts and NGOs involved in these countries. In general, this discussion is the unique case when Polish foreign policy issues were publicly commented in such detail. From the Polish point of view, the neighbourhood policy should be enforced due to the security concerns, energy dependence, demographic structure of Europe and the aspirations of those countries to form part of the integration process (Hübner, 2002).

The second geographic priority of Polish foreign policy in the CFSP framework are the transatlantic relations. In fact growing importance of bilateral relations with United States in some sense is related to the aforementioned Polish policy towards Eastern neighbours. Since the Polish claims about the direction of policy towards its neighbours were received with great attention by United States which sees in Poland as regional leader this relationship begun to be of mutual interests due to the shared security concerns. On the other hand the continuation of US involvement in Europe is “the key underlying dogma of the Polish foreign policy” (Zaborowski and Longhurst, 2003: 1027). Paradoxically Poland see in United States the principal factor that speed up the building of common foreign policy arguing that “if there was no America, it would have to be invented in order to create the common European policy” (Kwasniewski, 2004). The United States presence in Europe assure the European integration for the reason that the progress in the enhancing the European policy not results from “European readiness to solve European problems, and readiness to give up European [sic] or national egoisms” (Kwasniewski, 2004).

In the case of other geographic priorities of the EU and other Member States, the official Polish statements are limited to the recognition that the EU accession creates for Poland opportunities to widen its international presence⁴⁹.

“Nothing about us, without us” – ESDP chapter

The Polish position regarding the reform of the CFSP/ESDP matters was largely influenced by the fact that during the enlargement process of both NATO and the EU, Poland had made efforts to adopt rather neutral and unsubstantial positions on the future security system in Euroatlantic zone in order to maintain its room of manoeuvre within both institutions. So, during the 1990s, Polish official statements included vague references on the most important issues debated in both NATO and EU, especially about the institutional architecture of the security system in Europe and European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI). After the NATO enlargement Polish position on European security system could be summarized by, on the one hand, a “NATO-first policy”, that is to say a deep-rooted belief that NATO is the main security instrument in Europe, as it was proved during the Cold War. Consequently, the American involvement in Europe should not be questioned; and on the other hand, a strong conviction on the merely complementary role of CESDP in the European security architecture⁵⁰. Hence, it has been recurrently said that the accession countries had only limited interest in the evolution of the ESDP because they focused on more difficult areas of negotiations and so, “their input has been negligible, their potential contribution ignored, (and) even their potential risk seemingly undiscussed” (Edwards, 2000: 18). However, it is not fairly true that the candidate countries were not interested in ESDP development. Certainly, when the discussion about the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) emerged at the beginning of the 1990s, the Polish government declared only its general support for it, as Poland did not wish to get involved in transatlantic disputes that could harm its strategic goals of becoming a member of NATO and the EU. The observed overlapping functions between the WEU and NATO and the transatlantic

⁴⁹ The official statements sometimes pronounce the aspirations to participate in Middle East peace process but the propositions remains vague.

⁵⁰ The Strategy of National Security from 2003 state that: „Poland as a member of NATO and EU shall support the building up of the military and civilian capabilities within Union, which will be simultaneously a European pillar of NATO and which will utilize the Alliance’s assets”. Despite that Poland’s contribution declared to Headline Goals is relatively limited as include some 1500 soldiers, air rescue group, two mine-sweepers and one supporter and one rescue ship, and military police unit force. But Poland’s potentially contribution may grow, and include other troops planned to NATO’s Rapid Reaction Force, multinational Polish – Lithuanian and Polish – Ukrainian battalions. (Karkoszka, 2004: 130; Zurawski vel Grajewski, 2001).

disputes caused the growing concern to the Polish government. From the Polish view, both the WEU and NATO should remain compatible in the European security system.

So, despite the regular, institutionalized links of bilateral cooperation between Poland and EU institutions, Polish government was surprised by the relatively fast incorporation of the WEU tasks to the EU and it became seriously disappointed with the fact that the so-called *WEU acquis* regarding associated members were simply eliminated (Szlajfer, 2000: 36). Such a movement was perceived as a marginalization of Poland's position when discussing and implementing the security measures in Europe. However, it seems that Polish government's reaction to Cologne and Helsinki European Councils' conclusions was influenced by lack of transparency and thorough information from the EU side. As stated by Ryszard Zieba, "the states aspiring to become members of the European Union were unprepared for this idea [CESDP] and had to work out their position" (Zieba, 2001: 201). Thus the main Poland's claim was to be allowed to participate in the discussion on the ESDP in order to monitor the situation, since it indeed would have direct implications for Polish security position. But for Poland to be allowed to this debate meant that "consultation and dialogue will not substitute cooperation" (Bartoszewski, 2001b). After the Helsinki European Council in December 1999, the intensification of the debate inside the EU around security and defence and the development of the EU's capabilities in the ESDP forced the Polish authorities to adopt more balanced positions on the issues at stake. From the initial refusal and suspicion, the Polish government's positions evolved towards "ambivalence" (Trzaskowski, 2002b: 20) or "caution" (Latawski, Smith, 2002: 223). When the idea of CESDP gained dynamism, the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that the idea, being in some sense the higher level of CFSP "seems ambitious, but realistic". Its success would strengthen the position of the EU on the international arena and "filled with substance the Common Foreign and Security Policy" (Bartoszewski, 2001c: 27). Once Poland was allowed to join the discussions make CESDP operative, the government elaborated several proposals on how to articulate cooperation between the EU and non-EU member states. Poland insisted on the need of a close cooperation with NATO and that an overlapping between ESDP and NATO functions would make impossible for Poland to the effectively contribute resources to both institutions⁵¹.

The most recent positions on the vision of the CESDP formulated by Adam Daniel Rotfeld, is based on assumption that the NATO privileged position should be guaranteed, because "we just do not know what kind of security guarantees can emerge from CESDP". But on the other hand, he stressed that CESDP is the most effective instrument of prevention of the re-nationalization of security policy, since states talking on European security foremost watch out its own security. CESDP would serve as platform of looking for the balance of their interests, overcoming splits existing in Europe and prevent the emergence of new splits. But the idea that transcends this position is that differences among countries on general security issues had not disappeared (Rotfeld, 2004: 21 – 35). Thus from Polish positions it is better to wait and observe what will emerge from ESDP than involve itself.

CONCLUSION

Nowadays we can only speculate about the impact of the enlargement on the CFSP, as there is too limited time perspective as to draw some long-standing conclusions. However, it is possible to conclude if the CFSP had some impact on Polish foreign policy during the enlargement process. The new Member States adaptation to the CFSP mechanisms is still under way and the enlargement constitutes another, but not the exclusive factor, which influences the EU's external capabilities to "speak with one voice". This paper constitutes the background for further researches on Polish policy towards CFSP, providing the analysis of a decade of institutionalized relations prior to enlargement. The concluding remarks indicate some possible path of the research agenda on Polish adaptation to CFSP.

⁵¹ *Propozycje praktycznego rozwinięcia postanowień z Feira w zakresie współpracy UE i non-EU European Allies*, Lipiec 2000, source: www.msz.gov.pl

The analytical approach based on the definition of the adaptation concept permit to analyse in three dimensions the Polish policy towards the CFSP challenge. The conclusion regarding the first dimension of the adaptation process, i.e. the Polish predisposition to manage this challenge remains ambiguous, is that the analysis of state identity and national foreign policy strategy leads to the conclusion that the competing visions of the Polish place in the European and international systems increased the already existing perception of uncertainty regarding the future of its security. It seems that Poland's foreign policy has been focused on incompatible agendas and actually situates itself in a process of reconsidering its own place in the international system. European foreign policy does not constitute the priority in the design of new Polish foreign policy strategy, since political elites are still embedded in a discussion on the very basis of the Polish interests and objectives in the international relations.

As far as the second dimension of adaptation process is concerned, after more than a decade of EU-Polish cooperation in the foreign policy and security field, a set of very well established patterns of the behaviour as well as the expectations of further cooperation were created. Polish representatives were dissatisfied with CFSP as it did not match with their pre-conceived image of CFSP functions. The learning process to which Polish actors of foreign policy were exposed brought about more a sentiment of disappointment and distrust, rather than a sense of shared community. Furthermore, the perception of the lack of viability and coherence of the CFSP to defend the sensible issues of the Polish foreign affairs agenda is still present among Polish policy-makers. However, they are aware that participation in CFSP mechanisms will change previous patterns of foreign policy. Moreover, they stress that CFSP is widening the possibilities of achievement of "our objectives (...), incrementing our engagement in global policy" (Cimoszewicz, 2003: 37) and "strengthening the negotiating position in relations with third parts" (Grela, 2003: 43). But on the other hand, Poland's participation in the CFSP "will not alter our bilateral and multilateral relations" (Cimoszewicz, 2003: 39) or "there is the question of eventually keeping on these issues in foreign policy that may be important for Poland in the future" (Grela, 2003: 43). The participation in CFSP, in fact, means "the obligation to notify the other EU partners about planned and undertaken initiatives, mutual consultations and, if possible, position coordination" (Cimoszewicz 2003: 39). These recent opinions reflect in great manner that the accession period created the Polish perception of CFSP as set of purely consultative mechanisms subordinated to national policies, and functioning as means of strengthening them.

Despite that, taking into account the results of the third dimension of the adaptation process it is hardly possible to state that Poland will oppose the further development and strengthening of CFSP institutions, mechanisms and policies. The high level of adherence to EU common positions might be considered as a proof of the existence of some "coordination reflex", even without being closely involved in day-to-day relations of policy makers on all levels. However, remains the question of where the limits of Polish concession in sovereignty are. But whatever are the possible future scenarios, Poland is at the present convinced that the CFSP remains too weak as to assure the defence of its national interests. There are several sensitive issues in Polish foreign policy agenda that might affect the predisposition to the convergence with the EU mainstream in the future. The areas of primary concern for Polish foreign policy are the Eastern Dimension of EU and Transatlantic relations and notably the viability of the future institutional security architecture in Europe. As stated by Andrzej Karkoszka (2004: 124), as the new member states "have specified and well-grounded foreign-policy agendas, they want their views to be incorporated, not subsumed by the agenda of larger nations". So the question if Poland will be really involved in the strengthening of CFSP in great matter depends on the other Member States policies as regards the widening of the CFSP political agenda.

For any comments, please contact: micnat@wp.pl

ANNEX 1⁵²

Alignments of the CEECs with EU Statements or Presidency Statements on behalf of the EU; 1994 – 2003

Year	Total N° of Declarations	Alignment to Declarations CEEC	Alignment to Common Positions	N° of cases of Polish divergence
1994	109	3	0	0
1995	102	30	0	2
1996	110	33	2	3
1997	123	33	1	1
1998	159 (1) ⁵³	62 (1)	11	3
1999	128	60	10	2
2000	181	123	9	2
2001	182 (13)	125 (13)	8	1
2002	193	132	14	2
2003	150	130	8	0
Total	1437	731	63	16

ANNEX 2

Poland's divergence cases

Year	CFSP Act	Issue
1995	Presidency Declaration on Niger – February 7	Correct development of elections
1995	Presidency Declaration on Sudan – September 8	Liberation of the political prisoners
1996	Presidency Declaration on Angola – April 4	Support of peace process
1996	Presidency Declaration on Ukraine – July 5	New constitution approval
1996	Presidency Declaration on Zambia – September 3	Support for ongoing elections
1997	Presidency Declaration on Sierra Leone – July 28	Condemn of coup d'état
1998	Common Position on Belarus – July 10	Entrance prohibition
1998	Presidency Declaration on Myanmar – October 26	Visa prohibition and human rights
1998	Common Position on Myanmar – 26 October	Visa prohibition
1999	Common Position on Libya – April 26	Suspension of restrictive measures
1999	Presidency Declaration on Uganda – May 4	Capital punishment
2000	Presidency Declaration on Yugoslavia – September 29	Elections lost by Milosevic
2000	Presidency Declaration on Kosovo – November 3	Local elections
2001	Presidency Declaration on Filipinas – May 4	Violence before elections
2002	Common Position on Zimbabwe – March 18	Restrictive measures
2002	Presidency Declaration – July 19	ex-Vice-president trial in Malaysia

⁵² Source: *Bulletin of the European Union 1994 – 2003*.

⁵³ Numbers in brackets reflects the additional declarations issued by CEECs after the publication of declaration by the EU or Presidency.

REFERENCES

Speeches and Documents

- BARTOSZEWSKI Władysław (2001a), *The Treaty of Nice - the Polish Point Of View*, Speech delivered at conference organized by the Warsaw University and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Warsaw, 22 February 2001.
- BARTOSZEWSKI Władysław (2001b), *European Security Policy – The Polish Point of View*, Speech delivered at conference organized by the Warsaw University and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Warsaw, 11 May 2001.
- BARTOSZEWSKI Władysław (2001c), „Przemówienie Wizja i możliwości. O nowy kierunek w integracji europejskiej. Przemówienie wygłoszone w Centrum Studiów Polityki Europejskiej, Bruksela, 25 lipca 2000 roku”, in: BARTOSZEWSKI Władysław, *Ponad podziałami. Wybrane przemówienia i wywiady lipiec – grudzień 2000 r.*, Warszawa.
- BULLETIN OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, 1994 – 2003.
- “Europe Agreement establishing an association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of Poland, of the other part”, *Official Journal of European Communities*, L 348 , 31.12.1993.
- HÜBNER Danuta (2002), *The European Union – open to citizens, open to the world*, Contribution concerning Future of the European Union by Ms Danuta Hübner, Secretary of State for European Integration, representative of Poland’s Government in the Convention, CONV 20/02.
- HÜBNER Danuta (2002a), *Personal remarks by Prof. Danuta Hübner Representative of Poland’s Government to the Convention on the Future of the European Union, Plenary Session*, Brussels, July 12, 2002.
- „Konferencja Miedzyrządowa 2000 – polski punkt widzenia”, in: *Studia Europejskie*, No. 3, 2000, pp. 133 – 151.
- KWASNIEWSKI Aleksander (2004), *Wystąpienie Prezydenta RP podsumowujące II konferencje z cyklu „Silna Polska w silnej Europie”*, Second Conference “Strong Poland in Strong Europe” speech, Warsaw, 17 March 2004, source: <http://www.prezydent.pl/ue/index.php?menu=151&view=139> (10 October 2004).
- Letter from the Polish Prime Minister Hanna Suchocka to the Heads of Governments of the twelve and to the President of the Commission of the European Communities*, Warsaw, June 2, 1993; source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/4/1.html> (11 September 2004).
- „Oczekiwania Polski dotyczące przyspieszenia integracji z Unia Europejska – dokument z dnia 2 sierpnia 1994 r., przedstawiony przez Rząd RP Prezydencji niemieckiej. Warszawa, 2 sierpień 1994 r.”, in: *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 3, 1995, pp. 44 – 47.
- OLEKSY Józef (2002a), *Intervention of Mr Jozef Oleksy, Representative of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland in the Convention on the Future of Europe*, Brussels, July 11, 2002.
- OLEKSY Józef (2002b), *Speech by Mr Jozef Oleksy, Representative of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland at the plenary session of the Convention*, Brussels, 20 December 2002.
- OLEKSY Józef (2002c), *Speech by Mr Józef Oleksy, Representative of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland at the plenary session of the Convention*, Brussels, May 16, 2003.
- „Oswiadczenia Rządu RP w związku z nadzwyczajnym „szczytem” Rady Europejskiej”, Warszawa, 20 wrzesnia 2001 r., in: *Studia Europejskie*, Nr 3, 2001, pp. 157 – 158
- „Oswiadczenie Rządu RP w związku z posiedzeniem Rady Europejskiej w Leakn w dniach 14.15grudnia 2001 r., Warszaw 11 grudnia 2001 r., in. *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 49, 2002, pp. 11- 13.
- “Poland’s Negotiation Position in the Area of Common Security and Foreign Policy, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland , 27 August 1998”, (in:) *Poland’s Position papers for the Accession negotiations with the European Union, Chancellery of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Poland*, Government Plenipotentiary for Poland’s Accession Negotiations to the European Union, June 2000, pp. 471 – 472.
- Political Memorandum of the Governments of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Republic of Hungary and the Republic of Poland on Strengthening their Integration with European Communities and on the Perspective of Accession* , Budapest, Prague, Warsaw, September 11, 1992, source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/3/4.html>

- (11 September 2004).
- „Pro memoria. Memorandum rządu RP z dnia 11 kwietnia 1994 r., przedstawione w związku ze złożeniem przez Polskę wniosku o członkostwo w Unii Europejskiej”, Warszawa, kwiecień 1994 r., in: *Monitor Integracji Europejskiej*, Nr 3, 1995, pp. 38 – 43.
- Propozycje praktycznego rozwinięcia postanowień z Feira w zakresie współpracy UE i non-EU European Allies*, Lipiec 2000, source: www.msz.gov.pl
- SIWIEC Marek (2004), *Stosunki transatlantyckie po rozszerzeniu Unii Europejskiej – implikacje dla Polski*, Second Conference “Strong Poland in Strong Europe” speech, Warsaw, 17 March 2004, source: <http://www.prezydent.pl/ue/index.php?menu=151&view=125> (10 October 2004).
- Statement by H.E. Dr. Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland at the Fifty-Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations 15 September 2002*, source: http://www.msz.gov.pl/start.php?page=1100602000&obj_display_cat=11&obj_display_full=89&obj_to_display_type=21 (11 September 2004).
- Statement by the Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski on the Report by the Commission of the European Communities to the European Council in Edinburgh*, Warsaw, December 9, 1992; source: <http://www.zbiordokumentow.pl/1992/4/1.html> (11 September 2004).
- „Strategie bezpieczeństwa narodowego Polski po 1989 roku”, *Zeszyty Akademii Dyplomatycznej*, N° 13, Part I and II, Akademia Dyplomatyczna Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych 2004.
- „Traktat z Nicei. Polski punkt widzenia”, Warszawa, 15 lutego 2001 r., in: *Studia Europejskie*, 2 (18), 2001, pp. 143 – 183.
- „Wizyta Ministra Włodzimierza Cimoszewicza w Azji Południowo-Wschodniej”, *Media zagraniczne o Polsce (analiza, ocena, opinie, wywiady)*, *Biuletyn codzienny*, Departament Systemu Informacji MSZ, Rok XI, Numer 164 (2695), 30 sierpnia 2002.

Articles and books

- ALLEN David (1998), “Who speaks for Europe? The search for an effective and coherent external policy”, in: PETERSON John, SJURSEN Helene (ed.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing visions of the CFSP*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 41-58.
- BALCEROWICZ Bolesław (2004), „Strategia obronna Unii Europejskiej a strategie narodowe państw członkowskich”, in: HALIŻAK Edward (ed.), *Polityka zagraniczna i wewnętrzna państwa w procesie integracji europejskiej*, Bydgoszcz-Warszawa.
- BANCHOFF Thomas (1999), “German Identity and European Integration”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 259 – 289.
- BARBÉ Esther (1997), “European Values and National Interests”, in: LANDAU Alice, WHITMAN Richard W. (ed.), *Rethinking the European Union. Institutions, Interests and Identities*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 129-145.
- BIELECKI Jan Krzysztof (2003), “Polska w Unii Europejskiej: Jaka polityka zagraniczna?” *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 3 (13), maj – czerwiec, pp. 26 – 27.
- BOEKLE Henning, RITTERBERGER Volker, WAGNER Wolfgang (2001), “Constructivist foreign policy theory”, in: RITTERBERGER Volker (ed.), *German foreign policy since unification. Theories and case studies*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 105 – 137.
- BÖRZEL Tanja A. (2002), “Pace-Setting, Foot-Dragging, and Fence-Sitting: Member States Responses to Europeanization”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, 193–214.
- BOTECHOVA Liliana, MARTIN Lisa L. (2001), “Institutional Effects on State Behaviour: Covergence and Divergence”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 1–26.
- BURAS Piotr (2002), „Polska wobec dyskusji o przyszłości Unii Europejskiej”, CICHOCKI Marek A. (ed.), *Polska – Unia Europejska. W pol drogi. Wybrane problemy*, Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, pp. 39 – 65.
- BUZEK Jerzy (2003), „Polska w Unii Europejskiej: Jaka polityka zagranicza?”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 1(11), styczeń - luty, pp. 37 – 54.
- CARLSNAES Walter (2004), “Where Is the Analysis of European Foreign Policy Going?”, *European Union Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 495–508.
- CHECKEL Jeffrey T. (1999), “Social construction and integration”, *Journal of European Public*

- Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Special Issues, 545–560.
- CHRISTIANSEN Thomas, JØRGENSEN Knud Eric, WIENER Antje (1999), “The social construction of Europe”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Special Issue, pp. 528 – 544.
- CICHOCKI Marek A. (2003), “Starsza czy nowa Europa? Szkic do filozofii polskiej polityki w Europie”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 6 (16), listopad – grudzien, pp. 25 – 50.
- CIMOSZEWICZ Włodzimierz (2003), „Polska w Unii Europejskiej: Jaka polityka zagraniczna?”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 3 (13), maj – czerwiec, pp. 35 – 50.
- CORDELL Karl (ed.) (2000), *Poland and the European Union*, London and New York: Routledge.
- CORTELL Andrew P., DAVIS Jr. James W. (1996), “How Do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 451–478.
- CREMONA Marise (2003), “The Impact of Enlargement: External Policy and External Relations”, in: CREMONA Marise (ed.), *The Enlargement of the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Academy of European Law, European University Institute, pp. 161-208.
- CZUBINSKI Zbigniew A. (1998), “Polish Perspective on the European Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy”, *Yearbook of Polish European Studies*, No. 2, pp. 75 – 92.
- DESSLER David (1999), “Constructivism within a positivist social science”, *Review of International Relations*, No. 1, Vol. 25, pp. 123 – 137.
- DUKE Simon (2003), *Beyond the Chapter. Enlargement Challenges for CFSP and ESDP*, Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration.
- DUNAY Pál (2001), „Boxes: why CFSP and CESDP Do Not Matter Much to EU Candidate Countries”, *Policy Papers*, RSC no. 01/05, European University Institute, Florence, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.
- DZIEWULSKI Robert (2003), „Inicjatywa *Wider Europe – New Neighbourhood* – geneza i stan prac”, *Biuletyn Analiz UKIE*, Grudzien, Nr 13, , pp. 101 – 115.
- EDWARDS Geoffrey (2000), “Europe’s Security & Defence Policy and Enlargement: The Ghost at the Feast?”, *EUI Working Paper*, N° 69, European University Institute , Robert Schumann Centre for advanced studies.
- ELIASSEN Kjell A. (ed.) (1998), *Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications 1998.
- FAERON James, WENDT Alexander (2002), “Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View”, in: CARLSNAES Walter, RISSE Thomas, SIMMONS Beth A. (ed.), *Handbook of International Relations*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 52 – 72.
- GARNETT Sherman W. (1996), “Poland: Bulwark or Bridge?”, *Foreign Policy*, No. 102, pp. 66 – 82.
- GEREMEK Bronislaw (2003), „O polskiej polityce zagranicznej po 1989 roku”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 4, nr 1 (17), styczen – luty 2004, pp. 13 – 30;
- GLARBO Kenneth (1999), “Wide-awake diplomacy: reconstructing the common foreign and security policy of the European Union”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Special Issues, pp. 634–651.
- GORKA – WINTER Beata, POSEL – CZESCIK Edyta (2002), “Europejska Tozsamosc w dziedzinie Bezpieczenstwa I Obrony – perspektywa europejskich czlonkow NATO pozostajacych poza Unia Europejska”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 2, nr 1 (5), pp. 29 – 56.
- GRELA Marek (2003), „Polska w Unii Europejskiej – implikacje dla polskiej dyplomacji”, *Rocznik Strategiczny 2002/2003*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, pp. 37 – 44.
- HAALAND Hege (2001), *Bulwark, Bridge, or Periphery? Polish discourse on Poland and Europe*, Report No. 263, August, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs.
- HALL Meter A., Taylor Rosemary C.R. (1996), “Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms”, *Political Studies*, Vol. XLIV, No. 5, pp. 936–957.
- HANF Kenneth, SOETENDORP Ben (ed.) (1998), *Adapting to European Integration. Small States and the European Union*, London, New York: Longman.
- HASS Ernst (1990), *When Knowledge is Power*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HILL Christopher (1998), “Convergence, Divergence and Dialectics: National Foreign Policies and the CFSP”, in: Zielonka Jan (ed.), *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy*, The

- Hague, London, Boston: Kluwer Law International, pp. 35–51.
- HILL Christopher, WALLACE William (1996), "Introduction: actors and actions", in: Christopher Hill (ed.), *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.
- HÜBNER Danuta (2004), "Przebieg i dotychczasowe rezultaty Konferencji Miedzrzadowej", *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 4, Nr 2(18), marzec – kwiecień, pp. 7 – 20.
- JOHANSSON-NOGUÉS Elisabeth (2004), "The Fifteen and the Accession States in the UN General Assembly: What Future for European Foreign Policy in the Coming Together of the 'Old' and the 'New' Europe?", *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 67 – 92.
- JOHNSTON Alastair Iain (2001), "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 487–515.
- JØRGENSEN Knud Erik (1997), "PoCo: the Diplomatic Republic of Europe", in: JØRGENSEN Knud Erik (ed.), *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 167 – 180.
- KARKOSZKA Andrzej (2004), „Poland and the ESDP”, in: PILEGARD Jess (ed.), *The politics of European Union*, Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Relations, pp. 123 – 140.
- KAVALSKI Emilian (2003), "Conceptual reflections on Euratlantic Accession: the Security Implications of the Enlargement dynamic", *Papeles del Este, Transiciones Poscomunistas*, N° 5, source: www.ucm.es/bucm/cee/papeles
- KELLY Judith (2004), "International Actors on the Domestic Scene: Membership Conditionality and Socialization by International Institutions", *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 425–457.
- KELSTRUP Morten, "Integration Policy: Between Foreign Policy and Diffusion", *COPRI Working Paper*, No 17, 2002.
- KNUTSEN Torbjorn L. (1997), *A History of International Relations Theory*, 2nd edition, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- KOK Wim (2003), *Enlarging the European Union. Achievements and Challenges*, European University Institute. Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.
- KRÁL David (2003), *Profile of the Visegrád Countries in the Future of Europe Debate*, Working paper, EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy, September.
- KUZNIAR Roman (1991), "Nowa polska polityka zagraniczna", *Sprawy Miedzynarodowe*, Nr 10, pp. 7 – 26.
- KUZNIAR Roman (1993), "Geostrategiczne uwarunkowania bezpieczenstwa Polski", *Sprawy Miedzynarodowe*, nr 4.
- KUZNIAR Roman (1997), "Zagadnienia bezpieczenstwa narodowego w polityce Polski", in: BOBROW David. B., HALIZAK Edward, ZIEBA Ryszard (ed.), *Bezpieczenstwo narodowe i miedzynarodowe u schylku XX wieku*, Warszawa, pp. 285 – 291.
- KUZNIAR Roman (2002a), „Miedzynarodowa tozsamosc Europy (UE)”, in: HALIŻAK Edward, PARZYMIES Stanislaw (ed.), *Unia Europejska. Nowy typ wspolnoty miedzynarodowej*, Warszawa.
- KUZNIAR Roman (2002b), „Odważ się myśleć, polski strategu!”, *Tygodnik Powszechny*, Nr 46 (2784), 17 listopada 2002.
- KUZNIAR Roman (ed.) (2001), *Poland's Security Policy 1989 – 2000*, Warsaw: Scholar Publishing House.
- KUZNIAR Roman, SZCZEPANIK Krzysztof (eds.) (2002), *Polityka zagraniczna RP 1989 – 2002*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo AKSON, Fundacja Studiów Miedzynarodowych.
- LATAWSKI Paul, SMITH Martin A. (2002), "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. CESDP since 1998: The View from London, Paris and Warsaw", *Journal of European Area Studies*, Vol.10, No.2, 2002, pp. 211 – 228.
- LUIF Paul (2003), "EU cohesion in the UN General Assembly", *Occasional Papers*, December No. 49, Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- LUIF Paul (1997), "Enlargement as a Challenge and Incentive for Reform", in: REGELBERGER Elfriede, SCHOUTHEETE Philippe de, WESSELS Wolfgang (ed.), *Foreign Policy of the European Union. From EPC to CFSP and Beyond*, Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 335 – 361.
- MAKARYCHEV Andrey S., "Where the North Meets the East. Europe's 'Dimensionalisation' and Poland's 'Marginality Strategy'", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 299-315.
- MANNERS Ian, WHITMAN Richard G. (2000), *The foreign policies of European Union Member States*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

- MARCUSSEN Martin, RISSE Thomas, ENGELLMANN-MARTIN Daniela, KNOPF Hans Joachim, ROSCHER Klaus (1999), "Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities", *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Special Issues, pp. 614 – 633.
- MATHIAS Koenig-Archibugi (2004), "Explaining Government Preferences for Institutional Change in EU", *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 137-174.
- MATUSZEWSKI Zbigniew (1999), "Main Directions of UN Work in 1998 and Participation of Poland", in: WIZIMIRSKA Barbara (ed.), *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy 1999*, Warsaw: Administrative and Maintenance Services, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pp. 43 – 57.
- MAZOWIECKI Tadeusz (2003), "Polska w Unii Europejskiej: Jaka polityka zagraniczna?", *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 4 (14), lipiec – sierpień, pp. 8 – 18.
- MCMANUS Clare (1998), "Poland and the Europe Agreements: the EU as a regional actor", in: PETERSON John, SJURSEN Helene (ed.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing visions of the CFSP*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 115–132.
- MORAVCSIK Andrew (1993), "Preferences and Power in the European Community: Liberal Intergovernmentalists Approach", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. ..
- OLEKSY Jozef (2003), „Polska w Unii Europejskiej: Jaka polityka zagraniczna?”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 3, nr 2 (12), marzec – kwiecień, pp. 15 – 25.
- OLSEN Johan P. (2002), "The Many Faces of Europeanization", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, N° 5, pp. 921–952.
- OSICA Olaf (2002a), "W poszukiwaniu nowej roli, Polska jako nowy aktor euroatlantyckiej polityki bezpieczeństwa", in: OSICA Olaf, ZABOROWSKI Marcin (ed.), *Nowy członek „starego” Sojuszu. Polska jako nowy aktor euroatlantyckiej polityce bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych, pp. 85 – 128.
- OSICA Olaf (2002b), „Polska wobec wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa UE”, in: CICHOCKI Marek A. (ed.), *Polska – Unia Europejska. W pol drogi. Wybrane problemy*, Warszawa: Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych.
- PARZYMIES Stanisław (1992), Problematyka dialogu politycznego w Układzie o stowarzyszeniu Polski ze Wspolnotami Europejskimi, *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, Vol. XLV, Nr 4 – 6, pp. 11 – 24.
- PARZYMIES Stanisław (1995), „Poland along the Road to European Union”, in: WIZIMIRSKA Barbara (ed.), *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy 1995*, Warszawa: Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, pp. 39 – 48.
- PARZYMIES Stanisław (1997), *Unia Europejska a Europa Środkowa. Polityczne aspekty współpracy*, Warsaw: Polska Fundacja Spraw Międzynarodowych.
- PARZYMIES Stanisław (2003), "Polska wobec traktatu konstytucyjnego Unii Europejskiej", *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, , Vol. LVI, Kwiecień – Czerwiec, Nr 2, pp. 87 – 121.
- PETERSEN Nikolaj (1998), "National Strategies in the Integration Dilemma: An Adaptation Approach", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 36, No.1, pp. 33–54.
- PFETSCH Frank (1994), "Tensions in Sovereignty: Foreign Policies of EU Members Compared", in: CARLSNAES Walter, SMITH Steve (ed.), *European Foreign Policy. The EC and Changing Perspectives in Europe*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 120 – 137.
- POPIUK – RYSINSKA Irena (2001), "The United Nations in Poland's Security Policy", in: KUZNIAR Roman (ed.) (2001), *Poland's Security Policy 1989 – 2000*, Warsaw: Scholar Publishing House, 347 – 400.
- POPOWSKI Maciej (1996), "Relations with the European Union", in: WIZIMIRSKA Barbara (ed.), *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy 1996*, Warsaw: Services Division of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pp. 38 – 46.
- POPOWSKI Maciej (1997), "Relations with European Union in 1996", in: WIZIMIRSKA Barbara (ed.), *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy 1997*, Warsaw: Services Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pp. 43 – 49.
- PRYSTORM Janusz (coord.) (1993), *Report on the State of National Security. External Aspects*, Warsaw: Polish Institute of International Affairs.
- PUTNAM Robert D. (1988), "Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games", *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No.3, pp. 427-460.
- RADAELLI Claudio M.(2004), Europeanization: Solution or problem?, *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, Vol. 8, N° 16, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm>

- REGELSBERGER Elfriede (1989), "Spain and the European Political Cooperation – No *Enfant Terrible*", *The International Spectator*, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, April – June, pp. 118 – 124.
- ROSENAU James N. (1981), *The Study of Political Adaptation*, London: Pinter.
- ROTFELD Adam Daniel (2004a) „Czy Unia Europejska potrzebuje Wspólnej Europejskiej Polityki Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony?”, *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, t. 4, nr 2 (18), marzec – kwiecień, pp. 21 – 35.
- ROTFELD Adam Daniel (2004b), "Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe czasu przemian. Wykład Belwederski Akademii Dyplomatycznej MSZ", *Zeszyty Akademii Dyplomatycznej*, N° 8, Warszawa: Akademia Dyplomatyczna Ministerstwa Spraw Zagranicznych.
- ROTFELD Adam Daniel (ed.) (2004), *New Political Act for the United Nations*, Warsaw.
- SARTORI Giovanni (1970), „Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, pp. 1033-1053.
- SARTORI Giovanni (ed.) (1984), *Social Science Concepts. A Systematic Approach*, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- SCHIMMELFENNIG Frank (2000), "International Socialization in the New Europe: Rational Action in an Institutional Environment", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 1 March, pp. 109 – 139.
- SCHIMMELFENNIG Frank (2003), *The EU, NATO and the Integration of Europe. Rules and Rhetoric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SJURSEN Helene (1999), "Enlargement and the Common Foreign and Security Policy: transforming the EU's external identity?", in: HENDERSON Karen (ed.), *Back to Europe: Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union*, London: UCL Press.
- SMITH Michael E. (2004), "Institutionalization, Policy Adaptation and European Foreign Policy Cooperation", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 10, No 1, pp. 95-136.
- SOETENDORP Ben (1999), *Foreign Policy in the European Union: theory, history and practice*, London: Longman.
- SPENCE Amhild (1994), *Enlargement of the European Union. A step towards a common foreign and security policy*, NUPI Report, October N° 182, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs.
- STADTMÜLLER Elzbieta (2000), "Polish perceptions of the European Union in the 1990s", in: Kart Cordell (ed.), *Poland and the European Union*, New York: Routledge.
- STARZYK Jaroslaw (2003), "Poland Co-operation with the European Union within Common Foreign and Security Policy", WIZIMIRSKA Barbara (ed.), *Yearbook of Polish Foreign Policy 2003*, Warsaw: Administrative and Maintenance Services, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pp. 112 – 116.
- STEBELSKI Stanislaw L. (1997), „Wspólna Polityka Zagraniczna i Bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej”, *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, Vol. L, nr 3, pp. 23 – 44.
- SZLAJFER Henryk (2000), „Kształtowanie Europejskiej Polityki Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony: Polska Perspektywa”, *Rocznik Strategiczny 1999/2000*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, pp. 32 – 39.
- THOMPSON George Paget (1961), *The Inspection of Science*, London: Oxford University Press.
- TONRA Ben (2001), *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- TRZASKOWSKI Rafal (2002a), "From candidate to member state: Poland and the future of the EU", *Occasional Papers*, September N° 37, Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- TRZASKOWSKI Rafal (2002b), "Poland", in: MISSIROLI Antonio (ed.), "Bigger EU, wider CFSP, stronger ESDP? A view from Central Europe", *Occasional Papers*, April, No. 34, pp. 19 – 25.
- VAQUER I FANÉS Jordi (2001), *Europeanisation and Foreign Policy*, Institut Universitari d'Estudis Europeus, Observatori de Política Exterior Europea, Working Paper N° 21.
- VAQUER I FANÉS Jordi (2002), "The candidate countries' foreign policies on the eve of enlargement", in: BARBÉ Esther, JOHANSSON NOGUÉS Elisabeth (eds.), *Beyond enlargement: The new member and new frontiers of the enlarged European Union*, Bellaterra: Institut Universitari d'Estudis Europeus, pp. 53 – 77.
- WENERSKA MALGORZATA Lidia (1999), "Kwestie polityki zagranicznej w okresie stowarzyszenia Polski z Unia Europejska", *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, Vol. LII, Nr 2, pp. 105 – 122.
- WHITE Brian (2001), *Understanding European foreign policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- WIND Marlene (1997), in: JØRGENSEN Knud Erik (ed.), *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 15 – 35.
- ZABOROWSKI Marcin, LONGHURST Kerry (2003), "America's protégé in the east? The emergence of Poland as a regional leader", *International Affairs*, Vol. 79, October No. 5, pp. 1009 – 1028.
- ZIEBA Ryszard (1996a), „Rola zjednoczonych Niemiec w Europie Środkowej”, in: WOJTASZCZYK Konstanty Adam (ed.), *Zjednoczone Niemcy*, Warszawa: Elipsa, pp. 129 – 148.
- ZIEBA Ryszard (1996b), „Międzynarodowe bezpieczeństwo Polski w przyszłych relacjach z Niemcami i Rosją”, in: DOBROCZYNSKI Michał (ed.), *Między mocarstwami: Niemcy, Polska, Rosja*, Warszawa, 151 – 164.
- ZIEBA Ryszard (1999), „Polska w nowym systemie bezpieczeństwa europejskiego”, *Stosunki Międzynarodowe*, No. 20, pp. 9 – 33.
- ZIEBA Ryszard (2001), „European Security and Defence Identity. The Polish Viewpoint”, *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1), pp. 183 – 212.
- ZIEBA Ryszard (2002), „Polska debata na temat UE”, in: Edward Halizak, Stanisław Parzymies (ed.), *Unia Europejska. Nowy typ wspólnoty międzynarodowej*, Warszawa: Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 113 – 128.
- ZURAWSKI vel Grajewski Przemysław (2001), „Polska wobec Wspólnej Polityki Zagranicznej i Bezpieczeństwa – proces decyzyjny, zdolności interwencyjne, obszary interesów UE a interesy Rzeczypospolitej”, (in:) DOBROWOLSKI Piotr, STOLARCZYK Mieczysław (ed.), *Proces integracji Polski z Unią Europejską, Materiały z Konferencji naukowej, Wisła, 25 – 27 września 2000*, Katowice: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, pp. 71 – 94.