

Poland's Security Policy in an Unstable World*

Jerzy M. Nowak**

President of the Polish Euro-Atlantic Association

A Política de Segurança da Polónia num Mundo Instável

Comunicação proferida pelo Embaixador Jerzy M. Nowak, no IDN no dia 9 de Dezembro de 2009, no âmbito do ciclo de conferências intitulado *Visões Globais para a Defesa*.

Lecture delivered by the Ambassador Jerzy M. Nowak at the Portuguese National Defence Institute on the 9th December 2009. The lecture was delivered in the context of a cycle of seminars on the subject Global Visions for Defence.

* This text expresses purely personal views of the author and may not be regarded as stating position of the Polish Government.

** Ambassador Jerzy M. Nowak was head of the Policy Planning and Security Departments in the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He represented his country as ambassador to OCSE, IAIE, UNIDO, Spain, Andorra and then NATO (2002-2007); in 2009 – heading security policy review in the MFA. He is President of the Polish Euro-Atlantic Association, teaches European security and diplomacy in the University of Torun and Diplomatic Academy in Warsaw; writes and publishes on these subjects.

Introductory remarks

At the outset let me express my sincere thanks and gratitude for this invitation, allowing me to present before this distinguished audience a Polish vision of the security and defense policy. You have invited to Lisbon a representative of a Central European country which constitutes the, Eastern wing of Europe, while Portugal the Western one, both being integral part of the Euro-Atlantic area. This is to me an example of your universal approach to the problems of security and interdependence in our continent.

I have been invited to give this lecture at a crucial moment of a need to redefine some assumptions of the Polish security policy, after 20 years of regaining sovereignty, in view of instability, vagueness and unpredictability prevailing in the present international environment.

Brief historical reminder

After the peaceful liberation from the Soviet domination in 1989, Poland availed itself of an opportunity to return to the Western World, an objective which was not guaranteed at that time. It was not only the question of not achieving proper standards. This could have been done within a relatively short period of time. But, as an aftermath of the "autumn of the Nations", at the end of the Cold War, 20 years ago, the Western Powers concentrated mainly on preventing a violent disintegration of the Soviet Union and then the Russian Federation. Central Europe was then their secondary interest.

For a few years after the fall of the Soviet Empire, Central Europeans were given to understand that NATO was not a realistic option, and European Union was a long distance dream. Central Europeans, or "new democracies" as they were called, were encouraged to democratize the Warsaw Pact and their relations with the Soviet Union, rather than seek an access to the Western Alliance. Wide-spread expectations of a new Marshall Plan for Central Europe did not materialized. Washington gave to understand that the United States would protect new democracies, but economic recovery and integration with Europe was left to the European Union. As a result, Poland, like other States of the region, had to rely mainly on their own potential ruined by more than half century of devastating Second World War, German occupation and then the oppressive communist dictatorship.

I do not intend to describe here the history of the modification of this Western attitude (modified after aborted coup of Gennadi Yanayev in August 1991), which

was a fascinating story in itself, because it does not belong to our to-day's subject. So, let us just remind that this process ended with the accession of the so called "Madrid Troika" (Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic) to the North Atlantic Alliance in 1999 and to the European Union in 2004. It meant *inter alia* that we found ourselves together with Portugal in the same alliance and integration organism. Historic justice to the Central Europe has been done, Yalta system came to an end, Soviet troops were withdrawn, Central Europeans have recovered their sovereignty.

Six pillars of the Polish security

It was then that six basic pillars of the Polish security and defense policy, apart from economic recovery and effectively working democracy, have begun to be gradually formed, based on the following hierarchy:

- 1. Building of modern national defense potential**, based on operability with NATO, relatively modest, but the largest in Central European region, reduced according to the limitations of the CFE Treaty to presently ca. 99.000 troops (during the Cold War - 450 000), 1000 tanks, 210 combat helicopters; 222 combat aircraft (including F-16), around 80 vessels; expeditionary capabilities have been increased; as late as in 2009 conscript system was abandoned and professional army has been introduced;
- 2. Active membership in NATO**; when acceding to NATO, Poland followed, by large, a similar mental approach like the one formulated by Aldo Moro in 1950's: "it was a choice of certain type of civilization"; our participation in this most successful collective defense alliance in history means in particular: interest in the proper functioning of art.5 of the Washington Treaty as a basic security guarantee, effective collective territorial defense (Warsaw believes that there is a need to refocus NATO also on threats near home) and in parallel - meaningful participation in the Alliance's stabilizing and other missions (Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan - 1600 troops, "Active Endeavour" in the Mediterranean - together with Portugal); creating trilateral battle group with Ukrainians and Lithuanians; ensuring NATO enlargement to the East (Ukraine in particular); interest in double function of the NATO Response Force (NRF) - external missions and territorial defense in the meaning of art. 5, i.e rejection of a concept of "NATO as "a gendarme of the world";
- 3. Developing "strategic relations" with the United States**, whose military presence in Europe has been treated in Warsaw as an additional, strategic

security guarantor; this relation required some sacrifices from our part, such as supporting the US in Iraq (again together with Portugal), buying F-16 instead of Mirage aircraft and risking problems in relations with France, having understanding towards American superpower politics, often against domestic public opinion etc.;

4. **Integration within the European Union, in particular the development of the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP):** strengthening of the "Battle Groups", stabilizing missions, defense industry cooperation; interest in gradual development of the territorial defense concept within the European dimension; it is not a surprise that the Polish Presidency in the European Union in 2011 will concentrate on giving breath of new life to ESDP, consolidating EU defense potential, including European Defense Agency, stabilizing missions etc.;
5. **Building stable, good and close relations with the direct neighbors;** instead of three neighbours as during the Cold War (USSR, GDR and Czechoslovakia), Poland is bordering now seven **new** States: four of them belonging to NATO, three of them belonging to the Community of Independent States and to the Collective Security Treaty Organization, including Russia, having an enclave in the Kaliningrad district. Relations with Russia and Belarus require different attention and we will return to them later; however, three issues should be emphasized at this point: first, in our view there will be no safe Poland without independent Ukraine and Belarus; second, that the role of Germany on Poland's security is of paramount importance, and third, there are two particularly important instruments for the Polish regional activity: "Weimar Triangle" (France, Germany and Poland) and "Visegrad Group" (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, collaborating closely with Slovenia, Romania and Ukraine) and EU "Eastern Partnership";
6. **Participation in developing a cooperative system of security and arms control in Europe,** based on the concepts of indivisibility of security as well as an inclusion of all partners, as a supplementary instrument of the overall security, on the basis of the OSCE, CFE regime, Confidence and Security Building Measures (CSBM's) regime, Open Skies regime, and various UN based disarmament projects, as well as some informal initiatives like "The Cracow Non-Proliferation Initiative".

NATO and EU membership, creating solid fundamentals for our security policy, were not, however, a goal in itself or a panacea for all the security problems Poland

and other Central Europeans were faced with. They created only advantageous and secure external conditions for home development, based on respect for the principles of democracy, market economy and human rights, as well as for the strengthening of the international position of the country. However, such a condition has not been given forever and it is up to us to contribute effectively to common, indivisible and lasting security.

Change and new threats – global dimension, Polish perspective

Our view of the world, as in the case of other nations, Portugal I guess included, depends to a large extent on the persistence of particular historical experience, related with wars and other dramatic historical memories. Different geographic locations, psychologies, new challenges and threats as well as burdens of history, cannot be disregarded when dealing with international relations. It applies also to Poland and they shape the evolution of the Polish security and defense policy.

Some of them are common to the Polish and the Portuguese perspective and are related to stronger neighbors (although in case of Portugal it should be written in singular). Let me present a Polish perspective on this matter and refer briefly to our challenges, both real and perceived ones.

The situation before 1989 was clear: bipolar system ensured a high level of stability, but for Poland it meant stabilization of a satellite status. The last 20 years of unipolar system meant for us a security protection by the United States and NATO. The accelerating modification of this system and of the geopolitical situation has become more and more visible. The line between the internal and the external politics is becoming more and more blurred. On the one hand we have a growing interdependence with other States and on the other hand, globalization has great implications.

We are facing even more instability and unpredictability than before, due to changes in balance of strategic power. Economic strength is shifting to Asia, China in particular, and other emerging powers, including Brazil. The United States continues to be the most powerful country in the world but its unquestioned dominance is gone. Russia's quest for recreation of an era of great power primacy is worrying in particular its closest neighbors, but it may have larger negative strategic consequences. The position of the West has been weakened due to internal divergences. There is a decrease in solidarity because of the lack of a clear enemy. As a result, a phenomenon of renationalisation of security policy has reappeared. The European Union has gained a stronger economic position, but is unable to convert it into influential military factor as well.

Radical Islam (Al Qaida) and the relative power of nonState actors (Hamas) contributed to the destabilization phenomena and lead to the increase of frequency of limited wars, like in Afghanistan.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles enhances these concerns. None of us, including Poland and Portugal, is free of the danger of interdependent instability. Global climate warming is a problem for all, although we should treat it more as a chance than a threat, although in Polish conditions, it is a complicated matter due to the role of coal in our energy supplies.

This is a typical situation in flux, a kind of *interregnum*, in which old rules of the game are not respected any more, but new ones have not yet been worked out and approved. Previous bipolar and later unipolar systems have ceased to exist, but a new system has not yet emerged, once it is still under construction. The sovereignty concept has been questioned and dispersed among differentiated decision centers. Local and regional threats gain global dimension. For a medium sized country, located in the heart of continental Europe, in between two big powers – Russia and Germany – such a chaotic and transitional situation is both a concern and a challenge. The Polish existential question is: how to work out a new order and how to introduce it effectively?

European dimension – Polish specificity

Peace and security in Europe, or – if you wish – loose European security architecture, has been guaranteed in the last 20 years by a specific balance of forces among great powers, NATO's presence, common rules of the game embodied primarily in the Helsinki Final and OSCE agreements, a number of following six mutually interrelated elements, constituting an interesting configuration:

- a. **American presence** *sensu largo* in Europe, including military (NATO), economic and cultural fields,
- b. **Enlarged NATO** and its ever developed partnership concept, ensuring *inter alia* strong trans-Atlantic link,
- c. **European Union**, its ESDP and neighborhood policy; recently also – “Eastern Partnership”,
- d. **Institutionalized NATO and EU cooperation with Russian Federation and Ukraine**; it is worth to recall that Russia is demanding in the Medvedev's proposal that post-Soviet area institutions dominated by it, like CIS and CSTO, are fully recognized as European partners equal to NATO and EU,

- e. **OSCE, its CFE and CSBMs regimes**, including establishment of a “Corfu Initiative”, to discuss the Medvedev’s initiative,
- f. And last but not least, **supplementary elements, like Council of Europe**, dealing with enlarged human rights aspects of this configuration, as well as some **sub-regional organisms**, like Visegrad Group, Central European Initiative, Weimar Triangle, Mediterranean Dimension etc.

Each of these elements has its strengths and weaknesses, but so far this system has worked relatively well, though without giving equal protection to all members of the Euro-Atlantic area. I have in mind in particular Ukraine, Moldova and Caucasus States.

Polish specificity in this delicate configuration consists of striving to strengthen all these elements towards establishment of an enhanced order which may be called a **cooperative security**, within which NATO ensures credible collective defense. In the Polish thinking (main theoretician: professor Adam Daniel Rotfeld, now a member of the NATO “Wise Men Group” on the NATO Strategic Concept), the basis of such a system should be a triad: security (including soft and hard), economic and social development and human security. One of the implications in creating such an order is an imperative to strengthen both NATO and EU, their gradual mutual institutional bonding, with the aim of creating, in the future, a Trans-Atlantic community of security and defense. In other words, more integration and strengthening of the West, more openness to the outside world, more multilateralism, more effective international organizations. The latest should base their activity on four basic principles: solidarity (common confrontation of challenges), subsidiarity (mutual assistance in actions), compatibility (cooperation to achieve common goals), harmonization of actions.

Recently, however, there are signs that this sensitive Euro-Atlantic configuration may be at stake and deteriorate. I believe that there are three main reasons for that: a decreased US interest in Europe (including in its central region), new Russian assertiveness, and psychological factors. The last one results from strategic changes in relations among powers and from a search of many States for a new place in an unstable world. Among destabilizing factors there is an inclination of the great powers to be wrapped up in zero-sum games, return to geopolitical thinking, often accompanied by emotions and careless rhetoric.

There are also new real areas of conflicts: “frozen conflicts”, Arctic Sea - a quest for national resources and transit routes (less known problem in Portugal), access to oil and gas and their transfers, lack of common human rights standards in Russia, arms control and missile defense problems etc.

There are three specific problems related to the Polish security that I would like to treat separately.

The Russian case

Russia is the main foreign policy issue that preoccupies the European Union, both as a challenge and as an opportunity. From the Polish perspective, shared by many in Europe, the "Russian question" may be described as follows: can Russia become an integral part of the Euro-Atlantic community? Due to Polish historical experiences, the answer is not an easy one. For centuries Poles lived between Germany and Russia which tried to dominate Poland. No surprise that there is an inherent, instinctive fear of being encircled by these two powers.

However, the new reality should not be squeezed into past stereotypes. To-day's Germany is our ally in NATO and partner in EU. On the other side, Russia is no longer the Soviet Union, it is not a military threat to Central Europe. Problems between the Russian Federation and the West are not a new stage of the Cold War. Russia needs Europe and the West needs Russia as strategic partners. Russia desperately needs modernization and is unable to perform it with her own potential. This reality is imposed on everybody, including Russia, and the need for a new thinking related to the realistic assumption that security should be based on the well controlled interdependence and not on seeking for an enemy, on an increased confidence and not applying old stereotypes. Concept of security indivisibility cannot be used as a vehicle to paralyze NATO and EU and dominate neighbors.

But this is only part of the problem. At present, there are, in fact, two Russias: one nostalgic of its imperial past and other open to the world, in particular to Europe. They compete with each other. Some elements of the present Russian's policy are based on the imperial nostalgia and generate tensions in particular in its immediate vicinity. After some failures in democratic reforms, Russia has decided not to integrate with the West, to adhere to a concept of "a sovereign democracy" and to return to the outdated concepts of "correlation of power" and "concert of powers" in building a multipolar world order. Domination of the neighborhood is treated as an additional tool of national security. The Russian political elite believes that a new security order should be negotiated by leading powers only, on the basis of their interests, rather than on the basis of equality of partners and on the common values embodied in the Helsinki Final Act. It seems that Russian governing elites are not able to reconcile themselves with the idea that the era of great power primacy and privileged spheres of influence is over. They still believe that it would

be possible to push Poland, and other Central European States to second class category of NATO members and to some kind of dependence on Russian empire. Russian intervention in Georgia in August 2008 was an example of this anachronistic policy and constituted an infringement of principles of inviolability of frontiers and of sovereignty (which occurred for the first time after the end of Cold War).

Poland is concerned by these aspects of the new Moscow's policy, in particular its efforts to limit the inherent rights of sovereignty of the Central European States, but is not afraid of a massive, classic aggression. On the contrary, Poland is serious about reaching out to Russia and deeply interested in formulating a common political strategy of NATO and EU on this strategic subject. Joint Polish-German leadership within the EU on this crucial matter may give additional legitimacy to this issue.

Poland tries seriously to reach out to Russia also by contributing bilaterally to this process, forming a "Joint Group for difficult matters" and gradually removing points of contention (in particular the sensitive psychological issue of the murder of 22.000 Polish POW officers in the Katyn forests under Stalin's order in 1940). There is a lot of common economic, cultural and other interest between the two countries. One has to admit, though, that a real point of national difference between Warsaw and Moscow is a view on the future of Ukraine: Poland is in favor of an independent Ukraine, integrated in the Western institutions, closely collaborating with the Russian Federation, while Russia sees Ukraine as an integral, autonomous part of a larger Russian empire.

In brief; there is strong believe in Warsaw that positive signals sent recently by West to Russia (Obama's "reset" policy, NATO SG Rasmussen's proposals, "Corfu" dialogue in the OCSE on the Medvedev's proposal, Polish bilateral efforts etc.) require proper reciprocity from the Russian side, instead of the organization of huge military exercises on the Polish and Baltic States borders (with a scenario including the use of nuclear weapons against Poland) or the continuing anti-NATO Cold War type propaganda.

The American case

It seems that the United States is gradually reconciling itself with the fact that the world is moving towards a more multi-polar order. The new Administration is shifting its focus to the Pacific and China, and, at the same time, it is decreasing the attention given to Europe so far, it has become a relatively peaceful area. Russia became an object of American increased interest mainly regarding policy of Teheran,

the engagement in Afghanistan and the prevention to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction..

This is rather understandable and natural process. Washington probably came to the conclusion that Poland and other countries of the region should be providers of security rather than importers. However, these policy modifications have caused some alarm in Central Europe, in particular after the unexpected and abrupt change of the missile systems proposals (style also counts: Poland was informed of the change ironically exactly on the 70th anniversary of the Soviet invasion in 1939).

What is the reason of such a concern in Poland and other countries of the Central European region? To a large extent it is the question of perceptions rather than reality. Some people in Central Europe think that a new policy towards Russia may leave us alone with Russia in its quest to recover its spheres of influence. Others believe that putting Central Europe on the lower place on the Washington's list of priorities means leaving possible problems of Russia's relations with this region to the European Union, which, in practice, means to Germany, which in turn is now strongly engaged in an economic and investment offensive directed to Russia, Siberia in particular. Still some others are concerned with a possibility of creating a kind of "security vacuum" in Central Europe, which easily may be filled in by the Russian Federation or a Russian - German "condominium".

Even if these are only perceptions and speculations, far from realities, they should not be completely discarded or neglected because they may produce political consequences. One of them is already evident: American popularity has decreased in Poland and other countries of the region to a level comparable with other Western European States (a well known manifestation of it was a letter to President Obama issued in August 2009, signed by a number of Central European statesmen and intellectuals appealing to the new American Administration "not to abandon this region"). It should be added at this juncture, that in spite of these new Polish perceptions towards the United States, the US continues to be seen as "an indispensable power in Europe and the world".

Another implication, is getting rid of long lasting Polish illusions on America, for example that Poland and US share the same objectives *vis-a-vis* Russia. Therefore, it would not be surprising if more healthy realism takes ground in Poland regarding the "strategic relations" with the United States; while preserving and increasing American crucial commitments in supporting Polish defense arrangements, in particular regarding antimissile and air defense. At the same time European Union links may be gaining in relative importance.

The Energy case

Energy dependence as security challenge in Central Europe, in the Polish context, also merits a brief separate treatment. The use of energy supplies and its transportation by Russia as political weapon is well known. But this problem became much more complicated once a decision has been taken to construct the ambitious Nord Stream gas pipe line from Russia to Germany through the Baltic sea, conspicuously avoiding Poland and Baltic States, in spite of the fact that building it on land in Central Europe would be three times cheaper. A question arises: what is behind such a decision?

Russia's intension is clear: Nord Stream route is to by-pass an area Moscow considers to be part of its sphere of "privileged interests" or zone of influence. Even more – Russia does not trust Ukraine and the new EU members, Poland in particular, as transit countries, and is ready to undertake appropriate costs to by-pass them, instead of seeking a negotiated common *modus vivendi* in this field. In other words, it is also an effort to isolate Central Europe from the Western part of the continent.

There is no need to hide that the role of former German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder and Germany itself in this project has been painful to Poland, having in mind close the allied relation of Warsaw and Berlin. The interests of German industry and financial centers prevailed to such an extent that Germany lobbied successfully for the EU endorsement of the project even though pipeline consortium is controlled by Russian Gazprom and no single company from Central Europe is involved in it. To say it more openly: German position has made more difficult the efforts carried out by Poland and other countries of the region to reduce Europe's energy dependence on Russian gas and oil and its transportation around Central Europe.

It is not my intention to overstate this case, but Polish dilemma is difficult. On the one side we have to limit the damage caused by Russian energy policy and decrease our dependence of Russian gas and oil. In Poland fears reappeared that Germany is putting her own interests before Europe's. On the other side, it would be unrealistic to expect Chancellor Angela Merkel to change position on the Nord Stream at a so late stage. After all, energy links with Russia should be within the normal interdependence model of relations. Our expectation is that, at this stage, our following interests are taken into account both by Berlin and Brussels:

- To lay the pipe deep enough in the Baltic bottom to allow transportation of heavy vessels carrying liquid gas to the Polish LNG ports near Szczecin;

- to support the EU "strategic priority", i.e. to develop a Southern Corridor, which includes Nabucco pipeline project;
- to send a diplomatic message to Moscow that the principle of solidarity on energy still works in the EU and Russian policy "*divide et impera*" will not work.

Poland is not limiting her efforts to arrangements with Russia. A key word for this policy is "diversification", looking for gas and oil links also with North Africa and Gulf States, and last but not least - searching for alternative sources of energy.

To conclude this subject: it is necessary to remind that access to energy resources, being fossil, water or others is more and more linked to the security policy of the European Union. Polish interest is to bring about a situation in which a European energy network, with Russian participation, is created on a safe and credible basis. Here, the Polish close cooperation with Germany in this field is again crucial in building a common European energy policy on Russia.

Security policy priorities and perspectives

Stereotypes apart, Polish security policy is concentrated much more on current and future security threats and challenges than on the past memories. An unstable security environment forces to revise the security strategy, to get rid of illusions, to strengthen the international position of the State and to reply to the question: what will be the place of Poland in the future security system on the regional and global level?

In case of a medium sized country, located at the heart of Europe, there is no reply based on the going alone principle. Therefore, the unity of the West and Trans-Atlantic security community is of key significance to Poland. It is clearly in the well understood Polish interest to build a strong Europe and prevent its strategic marginalization in the construction of a multipolar model of the world.

It is not by chance that a thorough review of the Polish security policy has just been under consideration in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is based on the evolving NATO Strategic Concept, EU European Security Strategy and Polish national needs.

So, what are the basic priorities of this policy in facing new threats and challenges? I would spell out five of them which I consider to be of particular importance:

The first is strengthening NATO collective defense guarantees resulting of art. 5 of the Washington Treaty, as a kind of a security policy in an unstable world. This includes a return to credible contingency plans in case of a real threat, keeping alive credible deterrence arrangements (taking into account nuclear weapons and missile systems), improving the automaticity of decisions in an hypothetical case of application of art. 5.

The second is using all possibilities of the Lisbon Treaty regarding ESDP to increase security and defense integration, strengthen EU's global stabilizing and security building functions, in particular those complementary to NATO, and the development of energy solidarity. These questions will be on top of Poland's priorities during its EU Presidency in the second half of 2011. It is in the interest of the whole of Europe, our region in particular, to promote strategic partnership of the EU with the United States as guarantors of global stability and security. In general terms, our expectation is that EU starts putting Eastern Europe back on the diplomatic map, using *inter alia* effectively "Eastern Partnership" (an idea put forward by Sweden and Poland) for this purpose. Polish-German leadership in formulating a Russian-EU policy is of particular importance.

The third is pragmatic development of security and defense bilateral ties with the United States, as the most powerful NATO ally, in particular in their support of the Polish defense potential (as promised by the US Government in joint Declaration in August last year, in Warsaw), within a framework of general NATO policy. Washington is expected to work out a realistic program of security engagement in Central Europe. As far as proposal of the installation of American missile defense systems (SM-3) is concerned, Polish primary interest will be the integration of this system on NATO's defense arrangements in this field.

The fourth is to work out an institutional cooperation and effective link between NATO and the EU and seek a new definition of the tasks of these two major Western world institutions in the new security environment on combating terrorism, humanitarian interventions in failed States, preventing pirate attacks and preventing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as well as responding to possible cyber-attacks. A particularly urgent task is to work out a joint strategy regarding access to energy resources. Prevention of the re-nationalization of security policies of major European and North-American States and the return to "concert of powers", "directorates", or other forms of imposing the will of the big powers onto medium-sized and small States, also belongs to the important tasks of this group of priorities.

The fifth is to make all the possible efforts to enhance NATO and the EU as a common and credible “two-track” policy towards Russia (initiate efforts to bring Russia closer to the West and respond positively to constructive offers, react adequately to aggressive behavior). Western policy towards Russia should be an integral part of a larger dimension embracing “open door” policy to Ukraine, Georgia and all other democratic States of the continent interested to join NATO and the EU, of course after meeting necessary standards of membership. It is also important for the European security to have Turkey within the EU integration framework.

Final remarks

These priorities do not exhaust the list of other important tasks of the Polish security policy. Their common denominator is strengthening the existing security arrangements and institutions, without creating new ones and establishing any superficial new security “architecture”. To us, hard security challenges should still be on the international agenda as an insurance for unforeseen circumstances.

What is interesting to take note in the list of the Polish security policy is a certain modification of the United States position of importance. It continues to be high, it is indispensable, but America is not treated as an ultimate protector and the only guarantor of our independence and security. At the same time the European Union model of security has been located higher than before.

The revision of our security paradigms also confirms that Russia is not treated as a threat but rather as a challenge and opportunity. There are hopes for gradual integration of Russia within the Western world and for its constructive involvement in the security of Europe. Polish first hand reaction to Medvedev's proposal is to ask ourselves, Russians, and other partners whether Moscow's ideas mean security enhancement. If they do, they will be met with a positive response. But creating new institutions just for “psychotherapy” is not a rational solution in seeking Russia's dignified place on the continent. As I have already said, by building a new Polish-German alliance, it could match what the Franco-German rapprochement did for Europe after 1945, also in the context of the so called Russian question.

Finally, let me describe in brief Polish security position: **Poland is a regional power, an important European player and a country of some limited global interests as well**, the latest implemented mainly through NATO and EU. Its ambition is to protect itself in a credible way, to be an integral element of regional correlation of

forces in a constructive meaning of this notion, and to contribute to working out a new set of rules for the game and a new global security order, where all States, small and large alike, may have their dignified and secure place (“multilateralising multipolarity”, to use the expression of Alvaro de Vasconcelos). Here, no doubt, Polish and Portuguese interests coincide.