

## **SUBJECT: THE WORLD AT THE CROSSWORDS**

**President Aleksander KWAŚNIEWSKI as a guest at NDU Security Forum**

13.12.2012

Dear Rector, Generals, Prime Minister, Your Excellency the Right Reverent, Ladies and Gentlemen, friends and colleagues - from this position, I would like to address especially the young people and would like to say it right away that I am impressed by the number of young people, as I also remember the National Defense University at different stages and never have I seen so many young people in this hall, which means, in my opinion, that there have been a lot of positive changes taking place, changes regarding the approach to security, national defence and the interest in the University as such. At the end of my talk, I will be ready to answer your questions.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Poland is a country of many symbolic dates and it is difficult to find a day without any historic significance attached to it. However, 13th December is particularly important, as it bears a particular emotional charge.

13th December 1981 is known to the young generation only from books or stories; those sitting in the first rows remember it very well personally. Poland experienced martial law, the evaluation of which will obviously be greatly diversified for many many years, but that was a moment when those fighting on both sides deeply believed that the whole affair is going to lead to some inevitable end, to a confrontation, which may lead to some dramatic consequences. I am not going to talk about martial law, as this is not the subject of this lecture, yet it was undoubtedly one of those moments in the Polish history, which was extremely

important, the moment which leads to consequences that are also negative and those that are far-reaching and that change the mind and life of many Poles.

I have no intention of evaluating the event and categorizing it in terms of black-and-white values, yet I believe that on 13th December it is important to pay tribute especially to those who fell victim to martial law; however, it is also important to understand their intentions, understand their patriotic intentions that drove those who believed that the Polish confrontation may bring about many more casualties than what happened, and took a decision about martial law. These were not egoistic decisions, these were not decisions connected with a realization of a political concept of one person or another, this came from a deep fear about what can happen in Poland if the spiral of tension is not broken.

We have a happier date associated with 13th December, I mean the year 2002. 10 years ago, to be precise, on the night of 12th December, as on an anniversary of the martial law, negotiations in Copenhagen ended, the conclusive, finalizing decision concerning the accession of new countries, including Poland, to the European Union. There is a very beautiful symbolism in that after the night of the martial law, we could experience the eve of the European Union - at the very same moment, only 21 years later. This is an event the positive consequence of which we experience and especially, as I hope, their benefits can be experienced by the young people gathered here. Poland obtained a unique development opportunity in the form of our presence in the EU. I think we are using this opportunity quite well. There is still a lot to be done, a lot ahead of us, yet I am confident that our anchoring to the EU, our future in the EU, will be a great asset for generations of Poles to come.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Rector Pacek suggested that we should speak today from a wider perspective, and not only about security itself. As a matter of fact, there are in this hall outstanding specialists on security issues and I wouldn't like to take their role in any way, yet I would like to share my reflections on many aspects of what is going on in the modern world so that we could try and define what directly concerns your interest here, namely problems of security in the context of the changing environment. Hence the title of this lecture has emerged „The world at a crossroads”.

When I was wondering how to begin this lecture, I realized something pretty trivial: namely, if we were taking into consideration different époques of the history of our civilization, we could always say that the world has always been at a crossroads. It may come from the mere fact that the globe is round and in its rotation, so to speak, we always find ourselves in this rotary movement. Even the mentioned year 1980 or 1981 was also a world, at least in the Polish dimension, at a crossroads. Yet if we come to think about the specificity of this crossroads we have found ourselves now in, namely of the first decades of the 21st century, we could state that this time might differ from the others, which were also very complex, vague, unclear, connected with a multitude of new challenges. Yet now, in the period we are going through, we are experiencing a lot more changes taking place simultaneously, and what might be even more important, the speed of these changes is incomparable to anything that happened in the past.

Changes that used to take 10 years, today take a year. What used to take one generation, today takes place in a fraction of the lifespan of one generation. We can undoubtedly say that in this respect the period we are living in is very peculiar since the number of changes, their depth and pace is extraordinary. This, on the one hand, is extremely inspirational, we could even say fascinating, and this Chinese proverb is very relevant here, saying „May you live in interesting times”, as we are indeed living in interesting times. On the other hand, it imposes on us, who consciously deal with politics, economy, who try to forecast anything, an obligation to analyse what is happening around us very precisely, since if we find the right recipes, we will surely make a success. If we don't find the recipes, we can end up in a lot of trouble.

If we were to pinpoint the main factors of change, I would distinguish four main groups of those changes, or causes of the changes we are observing, experiencing, and which we found ourselves in.

The first one appears to be, in my opinion, the factor which is absolutely the most important among the ones I am going to outline - technological progress. What we have here is a technical revolution that we already experienced in the past, as in 19th century it was related to the invention of the steam engine, in 20th century with aviation, space travel, with conquering and discovering space, nuclear energy. Yet none of these was ever introduced into our lives as dynamically and abruptly and none of them ever, in my opinion, influenced us as directly as the technical

revolution we are experiencing now, a revolution which is most of all connected with information technology and communication, the Internet, which means access to information, with the possibility of transferring information in real-time and human communication, also the physical one.

This is a vast subject to discuss and it would be best tackled separately however as I am going to talk about a lot of issues. In order to prove that this technological revolution is so important, let me quote just some data, not to bore you too much with an excess of information.

In the whole world, there are 7 billion people at the moment. When the Internet started to spread in the mid nineties, it was used by 16 million consumers. In the year 2011, there were over 2 billion of them. According to recent forecasts, within the period of 8 years, in 2020, there will be 5 billion users. What does that mean? That means that apart from children, who are still unaware, and apart from people permanently excluded, due to their age or poverty or access to those means, all people will be involved in the Internet system, all of us will be, so to speak, online. These are not only geometrical changes, these are snowball changes.

If we count today the instruments enabling us to get connected to the information system, such as the computer, the cell phone, the TV, as all those elements involved in the system, those devices today constitute, and I am referring to the data from the year 2011, about 5 billion in total. In the year 2020 - this is in the very near perspective, I mean only 8 or 7 years, there will probably be 20 billion, and maybe even more. Therefore, it is not only that everybody is going to be involved in this system; each of us will possess a multitude of such means, the above mentioned instruments. I can already see that many of my friends have not one but two or more cell phones. This will probably soon be integrated into one system, but we all know it too well that these things that used to be called gadgets, that the amount of them that surrounds us is simply huge.

The piece of information I am going to present in a moment is probably going to be a bit more attractive. I have already talked about the information revolution. Supposedly, we assumed that all information produced over the whole history of our civilization, I mean since the time of Adam and Eve, to speak symbolically, until the year 2003 constitutes 100 percent of information. Today, this amount is produced in 48 hours. Therefore, in two days we receive as much information as

we used to get over centuries, for thousands of years. To make it more interesting, according to reliable forecasts, in 2020 this amount of information, the 100 percent will be produced in an hour. For each of us, who has access to the Internet, it poses an important question: how to deal with this amount of information, how to verify it, how not to go nuts, to put it bluntly?

Recent data I would like to quote here to support my thesis about this incredible information and technological change which is taking place now, is the dynamism of using such tools as, for example, Facebook.

Facebook started in 2009 with 140 million users, and only in 2011 there were already 4 billion. So, within only 2 years this number has increased 28 times.

Twitter is another well-known example. Now I hear that not only Prime Minister Tusk uses Twitter, who recently tweeted from the Nobel Prize award ceremony, but to my positive surprise I read, that even Benedict XVI deals with twitter, that the inauguration of his activity took place there. Neither of them, I mean Tusk nor Benedict XVI, is included in these statistics, yet it is still interesting. In the year 2009, there were 20 million Tweeter members, in the year 2011 there are already 200 million. In 2012, there are not only 200 million, but there is also the Pope and the Prime Minister. That's not bad, is it?

An even more interesting story is connected with something, which has already revolutionized our channels of communication. These are emails. Traditional post is becoming obsolete. In 2006 the number of sent per day amounted to 50 billion, in the year 2010 - 300 billion, so over a few years the changes have grown six times, five times, ten times and so on.

SMS is a form devised quite recently, that is in the year 1997, when for the first time telecommunication operators came up with a formula for communicating information using short messages, in order to, in the first place, inform about technical aspects regarding the network itself. Today, SMS is actually the main form of communication between users, thus killing the art of writing letters, killing the idea of postcards, killing the beautiful love letters written so willingly by men or women. Honestly, I can't imagine a beautiful love SMS that we could compare to the greatest achievements of this art from the past.

The world is working faster, so to conclude this thread of technological changes we must say: yes, they are characterized by incredible dynamism, they are commonplace, they change our lives thoroughly and irreversibly.

If I was to conclude this part, I'd say, nothing is going to be the way it used to be. This means activities in practically all dimensions, irrespective of whether it concerns the politicians, businessmen, generals or soldiers, or if it simply concerns regular consumers, common citizens. This world has already changed and it will only progress with these changes faster and faster. Not all the changes we might like, not all of them appeal to me personally. I think that this whole access to information today causes a lot of tumult, it leads to newspapers losing their importance, and they used to once be a kind of guidebook in the world of politics. The fall of newspapers, in a way the fall of the whole Gutenberg's world, who invented printing and made the first printing house, is inevitable. There is only one question - when are we going to touch the last newspaper or when will they become only collectibles. Unfortunately, consequences such as the fact that instead of the newspaper, which nevertheless is a commentator, and at the same time a place for explaining the events, we are going to have a lot of information, which will often cause disorder, tumult and will not provide this indispensable explanation of events, which the newspaper used to provide.

I do not want to elaborate on that anymore, the first and foremost cause of the changes, if we are to formulate any forecasts, is demography. Demography is much more static than technologies. In short, a child has to be born in about 9 months. New ideas, on the other hand, can be born within a couple of seconds or minutes, if anyone comes up with such a great idea. Yet demography has also its own dynamics. It is already settled, at least for the following couple of decades, as not much can change here, even if countries are implementing active pro-family policies, if due to security, social well-being they develop pro-family activities.

We already know that the number of people is going to grow faster, which comes from a better healthcare system, a greater number of births, lower number of deaths, a longer life expectancy in some regions. We are going to have the two most populated countries in the world - India and China, which are going to have a population of 1.5 billion - we are talking here about forecasts concerning the year 2050. Most probably, India is going to become a more populated country than China, as China will have to pay the price for its long-standing policy - one

family, one child. We are going to have the third mostly populated country, it will probably be Indonesia. We are going to have an increasing population in Africa, in Brazil. From among the well-developed countries, those best-developed, we are probably going to have a positive population dynamism in the USA, caused by both a relatively high birth rate, but most of all due to significant migration from Latin America, which leads to Americans having a population of over 300 million people and in the year 2050 they could have a country with a population of 350 million.

Against this background there is Europe, including Poland, with a serious problem as the birth-rate in this region is very small. That means that the population in most European countries is going to decrease, including Poland. Forecasts for Poland, which today has about 38 million people, are 32-33 million within the coming decades. Obviously, the factor which can change this state of affairs might be migration, but I will return to that soon. So, demography will cause our number to increase, that we will have, on the one hand, very young countries with a great number of citizens below 20 years of age and we will have ageing, highly developed countries - mainly European. And there are going to take place two phenomena worth elaborating upon.

First is the fact that in this proportion, in the world's population structure, there will be a significant number of people in, and importance of, the Islamic world. The world of Islam, the Muslim world is already extremely numerous. It is additionally going to increase with all its social, political consequences. I am not a supporter of a theory propounding a clash of civilizations, which various intellectuals have been writing about, yet undoubtedly we have to take for granted this factor of growth in the importance of the Islamic world, thus the more any forms of dialogue with the Islamic world, including the world of Islam in various common international enterprises, is important.

The second factor stemming from demography is migration. The upcoming decades are going to be a period of huge migrations. A migration resulting from a lack of social balance in some regions, but also a migration which will be inevitable, especially for Europe. To put it bluntly - Europe is not going to survive, if it does not bet on the multicultural policy, an idea which is being discussed too much in Germany now. This concept of multi-culture, criticized by some, is, whether we like it or not, inevitable. Today we can see it very well in

the example of Finland opening its borders to immigrants as it does not have the possibilities of development with its low number of births and with the extending life expectancy (remember that today in Scandinavia the average life expectancy for women is over 90 years and men around 88 - 89 years). If such a great part of society cannot be professionally active due to obvious reasons, the more the labour market will need an inflow of people from abroad. Migration, similarly to the growth in strength and importance of the Islamic world, is going to be this kind of a factor coming from demographic phenomena.

Poland must be ready for that as this will also be a necessity in our country. For us this is a difficult subject as Poland after WWII from a very multicultural society before the war, with a great number of minority groups (Jewish, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, German) has become a very homogenous country after WWII. This came as a result of moving borders, Yalta, Potsdam Conference and the Holocaust, which means the killing by the Nazis of 3 million Polish citizens of Jewish origins. As a result, Poland as a homogeneous country is not really sensitive to the migration problem. However, this problem will be, maybe not necessarily a problem, but as a phenomenon it will intensify and I believe that in the governments' policy, but the public debate as well, we must be more and more open, we have to think about how we can assimilate, adapt and create conditions for hundreds of thousands of people, mainly from the East (which is also good news for us), from Belarus, Ukraine, who are ready to work in Poland, settle in Poland and in the upcoming twenty or thirty years also become Polish citizens. So the conclusion to the part about demography is that we have to take into account the growth in the population's number in general, an increase in the world of Islam's strength, migration as a common phenomenon and a multicultural Europe as an irreversible trend in Europe's growth - for the time being in the Western, yet in the future, in my opinion, in the whole Europe.

The third factor worth discussing here and which is an important element of this change, of this world at a crossroads, is obviously the economy. I would not like to speak of economy too much as we are at such a difficult moment that we would have to devote many hours to discussing this matter thoroughly.

Beyond any doubt, the market economy, capitalistic economy, is today an economy, which is not threatened by any other economic problem, since with all its weaknesses, predilections for cyclic crises, no other system has ever displayed

a greater effectiveness, has stood competition against other economies. No centralized, nationalized system, no system based on any other assumptions has ever made it. All experiments, and there have been many of those in the world's history, all come down to one: the market, free market, enterprise, are all natural human features, and all attempts to limit those bring about negative effects.

Having said that, it is also important to note that we are going through the deepest crisis since the 30s, when it comes to a highly developed economy, capitalistic economy. On the one hand, we can say that there is nothing peculiar about it, as the cyclical character of the capitalistic economy is its natural feature. In the economic situation, crises are a part of this system. We can even say that the theory of cyclical crises was already described in the Bible. What else is said through the seven years of plenty and seven thin years if not the first record of economic cycles? So we are going through yet another such economic cycle, yet it has its significant consequences.

The first consequence worth mentioning is that this economic model is strongly based on the idea of free market economy, as it has often been called - turbo capitalism, a model which has been valid for the last 20 or 30 years, which has been pretty successful, as when I am talking about this extraordinary technical revolution that took place, it happened because, among other factors, those young people in the Silicon Valley in the USA had easy access to credit, had easy access to money. If they hadn't had this easy access to credit, if they hadn't received these means, such giants as Apple or Microsoft would have probably still emerged but they would not have had such development dynamism. However, it is beyond any doubt, that this model of turbo capitalism with relatively easy access to capital, with various derivatives on capital markets, including banks, which in the pursuit of increasing their profits, also took great risks, that this stage has been exhausted. I'm not thinking of it as of a negative one but I believe that it played its role at the time when it was used. If this model has run out, the only question that remains is how we could replace it. A natural reaction to this very free market economy idea, which has run out, is a return to various forms of national interventionism, greater control, greater regulations, and this is taking place today. You must have heard today on the radio that at a meeting in Brussels, common bank monitoring in Europe has been accepted, in the Eurozone, which is obviously a typical regulatory, interventionist element, interventionist but it

is necessary following the idea that if the former method, a very open, very free market has been depleted, we will have to search for more interventionist ways. I think that for the following decade we will be experiencing a return to various forms, which we in a simplified form call Keynesianism, which is a concept of a greater share, greater responsibility of the country and policies in economic processes. And with a great deal of probability I state that after this stage, when the increase in interventionism and regulations takes place, in about 10 to 15 years, we will be coming back again to deregulation, we will be searching for solutions which will transform the processes into more market-oriented ones. Indeed, economy is a little bit like grass, which you must trim from time to time so that we can live and use it.

What in the economy, in the economic situation, can be more serious and problematic, are the social consequences of the crisis, which we are observing now. By this I mean a growing social inequality in many countries, a dramatic increase in unemployment; in Spain it amounts to over 20 percent. What is particularly dangerous is an increase in unemployment among young people who are about to finish their studies. This critical mood influences our psychology in a way that people consume less. If they consume less, we have to produce less, if we produce less, companies go bankrupt, if companies go bankrupt, there is unemployment - this spiral is quite risky. However, when it comes to country matters, the lack of demand or an economic slump means less budget income, less budget income means less investment possibilities. Additionally, there is a strong pressure to balance countries' budgets as debt is a risk for too many countries and economies.

In short, we are living at a moment when the amount of negative social phenomena, dissatisfaction, frustration, is increasing and at the same time the instruments that are at countries' or corporations' disposal are becoming weaker. There is less money. We can, of course, legally regulate various things, however, this does not change the fact that today banks have problems with emitting new credits while countries have problems with financing their needs due to saving policies or insufficient budget incomes. I am saying this in order to emphasize that the risk of this state of affairs, especially in well-developed countries in Europe, is very high. I don't agree, when one tries to compare this crisis to the one from the 1930s. The previous crisis had not only deeper sources but also deeper consequences, and it

was taking place when the world was bound through a confrontation outside the economy and the liberal, market idea. It was bound by confrontation between two big ideologies - fascism in Germany and Italy and communism in the USSR. Today, fortunately, we don't have this ideological confrontation, at least not at this level.

We must remember that crises usually brought about consequences in the form of either a revolution or war, or inflation, sometimes all of them simultaneously. Today we can say that there is an inflation but not at a dramatic level. In my opinion, this inflation is inevitable, when it comes to the world economy, as there has been too much money pumped into it in recent years so it can't just disappear like that. As a matter of fact, this inflation can be observed for example in the USA, yet it is still controllable. Fortunately, we don't have wars, if only for the reason that those big confrontational ideologies don't exist any more. However, as far as revolutions or tensions are concerned, I'm afraid that these might be taking place because crisis is natural fuel for nationalism, group egoism, populism, and therefore all those slogans, people and political groups that by offering simple and primitive recipes, respond to frustration, anxiety or a dramatic situation in many social groups. Therefore, the global economy needs new regulations, without resigning in any respect from this general market idea. However, it is important to counteract the negative consequences which are taking place now. This will be a question for all governments and international structures in the upcoming time, at least in this analysis of changes and threats awaiting the modern world, that's the way I'd conclude my point.

The economy. The old model has been exhausted, the new model is being built now, and the consequences of the present crisis in well-developed countries can be risky if they aren't contained in the first place through economic growth and through a reasonable saving policy which will take account of the rules of social justice, and so won't cause the growing economic differences that exist now.

Let me move on to the last point of these changes, factors of changes, which we are experiencing. This is politics, geo-strategy, this is all what has happened in recent decades. We are, as Poland, a country which began this great change, which is taking place in the world now, as for sure the greatest event on the geo-strategic map were the years 1989, 1990, 1991, namely the end of communism to put it simply, the fall of the USSR, the end of the Eastern Bloc, the end of

the Warsaw Pact etc. All this was the result of liberal opposition movements in Poland and in Central-Eastern Europe. We made a great transformation in Poland through peaceful processes, through the Round Table Agreement and everything that followed. Most countries followed our way so we dealt with peaceful transformations, yet this does not change the fact that this world, which existed from the end of WWII up to 1989, has ceased to exist.

That world and those relations were dominated by two superpowers: the USA and the USSR, which had nuclear weapon, which constantly proved their military potential, which also lead to a very strong ideological confrontation. We've already said that the former world was based on the balance of fear, and this is true. However, this balance of fear brought, as a matter of fact, at least in Europe, a period of peace, yet it wasn't such a flawless and unconditional peace. On the one hand, it was paid with the lack of sovereignty of countries from Eastern Europe, on the other hand, with Russian or Warsaw Pact military interventions, either in Hungary in 1956 or in Czechoslovakia in 1968. We have also dealt with wars which were serious in their character, such as the Korean War in 1950, the Vietnam War in 1960s and 70s, Afghanistan in 1980s. These were also territories of the two systems' political and ideological confrontation. Thus this balance of fear wasn't so unconditional, absolute, and yet ensured peace in a big part of the world. This has ended.

Then we had a shorter period, which Poland and countries of the Central-Eastern Europe benefited from, the unilateral world, the world of the USA's domination. Why am I saying that we benefited? Because in this period between 1989 and, let's say 2005, great decisions were taken. First of all, the decision about extending NATO, incorporating our country into the North Atlantic Treaty, it changed the map of security and provided us with indispensable guarantees of our security. Without this American role at that time, it would have probably been impossible. Likewise, we must say, the Americans in a very straightforward and decisive manner supported the question of extending the EU, which wasn't that obvious at the beginning of the process. The unilateral world is past now and now we are going through a new period, a new stage of development, namely, building a new architecture for the modern world, a multilateral, multipolar world.

What does that mean? This means that to the traditional political, economic, military centres we have new ones attached. The traditional ones are obviously

the USA, Europe in the EU formula. The new one is China, the position of which is unquestionable and which, in my opinion, is becoming today a definite political power that will soon start to compete with the USA. We have the increasing significance of India, Brazil and Latin America, which are particularly connected with the Mercosur. Brazil's leading role is beyond any discussion here. We have obviously not yet a superpower, but a changing role for Africa, which, with its human and resource potential, will claim its place in this new architecture. We have the growing role of Turkey, which in an increasingly visible manner, is trying to be a leader of its region and maybe even of the Islamic world due to its economic dynamism, due to the kind of democracy that is present there, its rooting in the North Atlantic Treaty, and so relations with the West. Turkey has a lot of data, a lot of arguments for being this significant centre of the modern world. The Russian Federation rightly has its aspirations due to its territory, possessed resources and nuclear weapon. In short, this world is definitely becoming multipolar. It is not that one or two countries will decide about the future but a kind of a conglomeration of these different countries or organizations, integrated countries, will define our fate.

What is the result of this? In my opinion the result is quite positive. This world is becoming multipolar because such form responds to the real picture of what we have around us, yet it also creates, instead of the balance of fear, which dominated and which organized our lives over the recent decades, a new type of balance, which is much more positive, which is much more creative as this is a balance of mutual dependence. How could we explain it in the simplest terms? It used to be feared that if we press the nuclear button, others will press this button too and the world will blow up. Today, however, the situation is better to the extent that the Chinese, even though they might not like the Americans, know very well, that the American crisis is not in their interest. Because of having so many American bonds in their reserves, they are not interested in Europe undergoing a deep stagnation or crisis as somebody must buy these Chinese goods which they produce in great quantities. On the other hand, we, obviously wishing the Chinese that they become more and more democratic and that they fully respect human rights and so on, we are not, to put it bluntly, it is not in our interest that the Chinese changes or Chinese reforms lead to destabilizing this country as the Chinese are important for us as the producer of the goods we don't want to or can't produce in Europe. I could complete this map with similar examples, yet this

does not change the fact that we have here a new situation, which is incomparably better than the balance of fear. The balance of interdependence results in a situation in which we can believe that the world will get out of the most difficult critical situations rather through dialogue, through cooperation than through a rough confrontation, which could bring about absolutely dramatic consequences.

There is probably one more remark I would like to make against this background. Namely, this balance of mutual dependence is good news, yet we must also point out a growing ideological confrontation. It is still comparable to what there was between communism and the democratic world, but it is getting more prominent. It's this confrontation of two models, namely, the democracy and free market, the model represented by the USA and Europe, which we thought of as being the best and we had strong arguments until the time when the crisis began. During the crisis we have a problem to justify that this model is the best, even among our own citizens, as they complain that some decisions are taken too slowly, that some things require a lot of time, but that's the price we must pay for democracy. And this model, shall we call it the Western model, today is being confronted with the Asian model, Chinese, but not only, as Singapore and Malaysia have been following the same path. So the market both in the liberal form, but very limited democracies or no democracy, authoritarian systems which allow to allocate resources in a more effective manner, and which do not every now and then have to deal with problems connected with future elections - can be simply ruled without any limitations coming from democratic systems.

This confrontation is growing today. I'm talking about it especially because I often visit such countries as Kazakhstan or Ukraine. I think that these countries, which have not yet entered the path of democratic growth, are today looking at the Asian model with curiosity, a model which clearly displays its effectiveness. If China has a problem, as from 10 percent GDP they descend to 8 percent, it is a different problem than of countries which have a zero or minus growth.

This confrontation is growing and, in my opinion, it will be one of important elements of these changes, of what is happening in the present world.

Since I've spent a lot of time making this rough draft, let me briefly touch upon two issues, so that there is still time for your questions.

What from this picture, from this state of affairs, which I outlined, can we draw for Europe and for Poland? Europe is at a very important point because Europe is facing a dilemma, which we can voice as are we going to be one of the significant players in this new world, a player who will be competing for its place on a podium (I'm talking about a podium as in my opinion competing for gold or silver is already a forgone conclusion as it will take place between the USA and China, but the bronze medal is still within our reach...)? Bronze is not bad either, however, obviously, one would wish for the other medals. Europe has all the potential for becoming the third significant, leading player in this new world architecture. What is the alternative to this fight for the podium in the modern world? It is, unfortunately, what many publicists define as a peculiar world backwater. A backwater that will be interesting, which will be visited by tourists but which will not exhibit any dynamism. It will rather be about protecting, conserving the values which we have and which deserve the highest respect, but there will be no development dynamism, there will be no drive to be this important player.

What is important and what the Europeans at this difficult moment, critical moment, when various disorganizing tendencies emerge, when also in Poland some doubt the true meaning of the European Union, in the meaning of European integration, what the Europeans must understand. They must understand that we have potential, that we are not in any way condemned to the role of the backwater. This potential is, among other things, the fact that today in Europe there are over 500 million people so we are bigger than the USA. This already doesn't look that gloomy if you talk about 500 million and compare us to, let's say, the Chinese. This is still much less, but not so hopeless.

We must remember that if Europe decided on what is on the cause list, for example give accession to Turkey (remember that we have been conducting negotiations with Turkey about their accession since 2005) or Ukraine - the Ukrainians want to be in the EU, so we have additionally 130 million, so then the EU has got not only 500 million people but 630 million, and if we add to all this also some of the Balkan countries, Serbia etc., there could even be 650 million people, so the potential is there.

Second, this potential is also unusual when it comes to culture, science, technology and the standard of life. It's also what we used to treat in Europe as our problems, but what is extremely interesting for all countries, which sooner or later we will

have to, at least partially, use our experiences, and maybe even they will have to take some of the patterns. For the Chinese, and I hold evidence for that from my own conversations, but also for the Brazilians, also for many countries in the world, what was done in Europe with social policy, with the insurance system, with labour law, with the status of a worker in a corporation, with citizen's minority rights, women's rights, how we are dealing with multinationalism, multiculturalism, what the education system looks like, all this is extremely educative and extremely important for this country. And we have all the rights like those who are in the middle of the events, change them and criticize them, however, we must not deprive ourselves of the belief that we have contributed, and we are still contributing, crucial values, models, and elsewhere unknown values to the heritage of the civilized world. Asia is soon going to experience a great issue, what to do with labour laws as the labour exploitation, which is taking place there can't be maintained and increases in those people's awareness, I'm sorry for using these Marxist terms, will enforce this kind of changes, regarding work, work security, work dignity. Thus Europe has a potential which is important in this domain, Europe has still a huge potential when it comes to technical and scientific solutions, production at the highest level.

In order to conclude this conversation about potential with something lighter... let's have a look at this small detail. This year we had the Olympic Games in London and a passionate competition in the medal classification between the USA and China. Finally American won against China by 2 or 3 gold medals but if we wanted to count gold medals - and we are talking here only about gold medals - won by sports persons from the 27 countries of the EU, we won almost as many as the Chinese and Americans together. This also shows what potential we have at our disposal. I'm the last person who would like sports persons to take part in the Olympics carrying the EU flag, there's no use in doing that. However, we must be aware that we are not fighting a losing battle, we are not in a passive situation disabling us from thinking about success in the future.

What to do to turn this success into reality, what to do so that Europe doesn't miss this opportunity? Undoubtedly, a short-term goal, which is very important, is coming out of this difficulty, from this crisis which we have and I don't want to talk about means, steps that are being undertaken, but I generally believe that they are going in the right direction. There might be some reservations regarding

the speed of the decision making processes, but as I said before, it comes from the fact that Europe is democratic so we are paying the price for the fact that we want to consult, that we are having a dialogue, that everyone has their voice, that each country has the power of veto. This costs but it makes sense, this is not an absolutely senseless concept which we would gladly change into a kind of authoritarian rule or dictatorship or a kind of a group of people or a man in Europe. Anyway, there have been dictatorships in Europe and we already know how much it cost. This is not an argument for me.

In the long-term perspective, we have to count on integration so we must absolutely and with all might fight all ideas which actually disintegrate the EU. This is why I am a great supporter, albeit with a lot of controversies regarding the costs and credibility, of the idea of helping Greece as, if we decided, that the rule of European solidarity doesn't work with regard to one country, on the next day it may not concern the second or third country and finally it will disintegrate Europe as such.

So Europe has to be not only integrated, but it must deepen this integration. Europe must also be integrated as even the strongest country in Europe such as Germany, cannot single-handedly stand a chance in the new world architecture. It won't stand a chance due to its small potential compared to the Americans or the Indians or Brazilians, or soon with Indonesia. There is no chance, so the only strength, Europe's only chance is a community and integration which should be deepened in two directions. First, institutional, so deepening European institutions, increasing the number of policies, we need a few policies - energy policy, common foreign policy, common European policy related to our main partners such as the USA, China etc., so deepening integration, which in the end should be a formula for creating a shape, a federation of the European Union. I'm not talking about the perspective of a few years but I'm talking about a perspective of 15-20 years. The second thing we should continue and which is today totally unpopular in Europe is the further expansion of the EU. I'm mainly thinking about Balkan countries and the Ukraine but about Turkey as well, which, in my opinion, if it doesn't choose a different path, which means playing the role of a leader of its region and the Islamic world, but chooses Europe, may be an extremely important partner and a real bridge to the Middle East and the world of Islam.

So Europe must be more integrated, must have more common policies and must create forms of cooperation which will turn it into a big player of the 21st century.

The last part - Poland. What has happened in Poland in recent 20 years, already over 20 years, is, undoubtedly, a great success. It's a big change which took place, which generally is a change for the better, is a positive change. One can easily say that I'm not objective in these evaluations, as I'm not, since from the beginning of these changes I've been taking an active part in the process, I was president for 10 years, so I can say, in a way, for those 20 years, 10 years of my presidency is still a controlling interest in my pocket. Yet when looking at any objective indications, Poland is today a country which is incomparably better than the one it used to be in 1989. For many of our partners in the world, we are a real standard of reference and this is a good reason for satisfaction, most of all, of Poles. Not only for politicians, not only businessmen but Poles - as without the effort of millions of people, without the spirit of enterprise which Poles exhibited even to their own astonishment, we wouldn't have achieved it. But this is the past, we are in the EU, we are in NATO. We are a country which in recent years has been one of a few, maybe the only one, in Europe, which has had economic growth, a visible growth.

These are all successes we have a good reason to be happy about. We must, however, remember that there are new challenges, that in this world of changes the one who is not taking part in them condemns himself to the sidelines outside the mainstream. Undoubtedly, this would be the worst thing in Polish politics, if we didn't understand that these changes require a new attitude, require new ideas, require also greater initiative in new generations, especially from those who are the children of the Internet era.

If we were to name two main challenges standing in front of Poland in the years to come, I'd say they are related to two main questions, which are somehow interrelated, as they are going to define the position of countries in the modern world. This is the competitive advantage and innovative advantage. I'm not lobbying for Poland to compete in domains where we are absent, but where we have arguments, we have assets, there we should be competition, and in order to be competitive, we should be innovative - nevertheless, this remark concerns the whole of Europe.

Polish competitiveness is today a challenge more at the economic level. Over the last 20 years, we have effectively taken advantage of the fact that we could offer the world a relatively high quality of work, quality of production, for a lower remuneration. Labour costs in Poland were definitely lower than in well-developed countries, yet the quality of work was comparable. Labour costs are increasing, as the right expectation of Poles is to have in the coming years a salary at least at an average European level, but if the salary is to be at this level, labour costs must be at an average European level. If so, our competitiveness is growing weaker - as we either have to add to this a higher level, a higher effectiveness, better production level, better organization, or all these production lines will be moving away from Poland to where labour costs are still lower. Today, moving a car factory is not a big deal, factories of any other machines or devices neither. Such countries as Ukraine, Vietnam, China or India are waiting. So we have to increase our competitiveness, both when it comes to the economy, education, but also the social capital, which means people's behaviour. For that, we need better education. Here we can find the best reserve we have in Poland, so improving education at the basic level, through all the subsequent levels up to the highest one. If we don't make this huge educational change, this higher change within the coming years, if we don't do it in order to enable a young Pole, either after high school, being 18 years of age, or after college, being twenty something, to be competitive among his peers, not only in Europe, but in the world as well, in China, in the USA - we'll make a grave mistake.

Therefore, competitiveness. In terms of economy, but not only, also science. These are the two domains, which, in my opinion, require today a totally new approach, also making them the most important issue in the policy of governments. Unfortunately, we are not speaking about it enough, yet I don't want to polemicize with the current policy as this is not the subject of today's lecture.

The new challenges concern also Poland's foreign policy, in other words our place in the world - this is because for the first 20 years this too was right, it was the right evaluation, Poland was focusing on three elements.

First, it was security, so our main interest was in the Euro Atlantic environment such as the USA and NATO. And here we achieved great success, which is our presence in the NATO forces. Second was the EU, as we wanted to be in the EU. Our Eurocentric policy has been well grounded for the last 20 years, as it was

simply absolutely indispensable for us to achieve this goal, that is our accession to the EU. The third was the region where we played a stabilizing role and an exporter of stability. This is important, in this hall probably all of you know that it is worth mentioning that Poland found itself in a situation absolutely extraordinary at the verge of 80s and 90s. Poland did not change its borders even by one centimetre while all our neighbours did. There is no East Germany, there is no Czechoslovakia, there is no USSR. Instead of three neighbours, Poland now has 7 of them: Germany, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania and Russia.

That didn't cause any conflict, we signed contract deals with all our new partners, we get on well with all of them. Poland was at that time an absolute exporter of stability. This is a great credit about which they should write books. And this is not so obvious and trivial, as not so far away from Warsaw, in Belgrade or Zagreb or Sarajevo, we observed a totally different phenomenon. We had one of the bloodiest wars in recent decades, including ethnic cleansing, murdering people, destroying cities etc. These are two scenarios, which happened almost simultaneously. The scenario of our region, stability and peaceful changes, and on the other hand - war, which took place in the Balkans.

Thus it seems that this policy has been proved right. Poland has achieved a definite success and it's important to talk about it. Yet today, also the foreign policy must be slightly modulated, must take account of new elements, and these are, in the first place, that Poland must play for, fight for, strengthening its position in the EU and thus influence with greater effectiveness the positive European scenario. This is possible, Poland has arguments, it has a potential and, in my opinion, there is a great chance for us to become such a drive, such a European engine in the future.

Second, we undoubtedly must still keep this regional position, which will stabilize the situation and will be an exporter of a good example for our region.

Third, we have to continue our solid policy regarding the North Atlantic Treaty and the USA. However, we must, to a much greater extent than so far, as these are absolutely neglected territories and domains, increase our activity regarding new centres. Especially such counties as Brazil, China, and India. We have a deficit in the political dialogue here. The dialogue is definitely there, but there is neither

economic cooperation nor any other form of relations that follow, which would make us a partner - obviously not any leading one - but still a partner in these relations with new players of the modern world.

Undoubtedly, foreign policy demands such a, I would say, shift of an emphasis, as it doesn't require any revolution; it requires only understanding that these new phenomena require a new approach in many respects.

The last issue is safety matters. This world is both safe and dangerous at the same time. Safety in its nature is not granted once and for all, it undergoes some influences, often predictable, sometimes unpredictable, and the latter are much more difficult, however, we can easily imagine what main threats to security in the coming years there will be also for Poland.

The first ones are connected with the fact that the population is growing everywhere. However, the resources left at our disposal are remaining either identical or, due to their depletion, are shrinking. Probably, conflicts, which will emerge in the modern world, will be much more connected with resources, especially energy, but also with food and water. Some prognostics state that struggle for water may become such a symbol of events in the upcoming decades as it might appear to be a scarce good.

The second kind of threats is more concerned with regional conflicts rather than any wars between countries or blocks as firstly, these blocks do not exist any more and secondly, there are no ideologies which would animate those conflicts and thirdly, there is, as I said, this balance of interrelation, so no one is interested in fighting in a military way for their primacy - you can use much more refined economic and political methods.

However, what can be seen with a naked eye, we are not free from regional conflicts, which can be observed in Africa, also in Europe, the example of which might be the Dniester region - territory between Moldavia and Ukraine. They can suddenly create unexpected regional conflicts connected with separatist tendencies as in Spain, where up until recently it seemed that there are no serious separatist problems any more. In one article I saw an interesting analysis that today the only argument that keeps the Catalonians attached to Spain is the fact that if Catalonia got separated from Spain, where would Barcelona play? If there are no matches between Real and Barcelona, there is no reason to live; there is no

sense in that. But regional conflicts might undoubtedly be such a phenomenon, which will emerge in various places and which will be very dangerous. After all, we have a traditional, so far unresolved and serious problem in the Middle East, namely the question of Israel – Palestine, but also a growing role and dangerous atomic projects in Iran.

We have phenomena we went through not so long ago and which, despite serious action, they were carried out in order to diminish the threat of terrorism, and nevertheless terrorism still exists. Different kinds of terrorism: political, religious, economic, is still taking place. It can have various scales but this is a phenomenon which will probably accompany the modern world through the upcoming decades. What is unusual is the threat connected with cyber-terrorism. Today it is really not sufficiently brought to our attention or brought to attention but only in few circles, a threat that could paralyse the world very effectively and very fast. If terrorists could hack into systems managing the life of societies starting with energy through the information system itself, the paralysis would be unimaginable. It would concern all communication, the passing of information, nation management, corporation management; it would concern the lives of each of us. I think that cyber-terrorism today is much more than only turning off energy in a city or in a neighbourhood for a couple of days, which results in us not knowing how to live, as we have neither candles nor food reserves you can not cook etc. Cyber-terrorism could paralyse our everyday life in a more acute manner. When fighting cyber-terrorism, even when defining this threat, defining its sources, we are just at the beginning of its use.

Threats will be there, and if they are, also the policy of security has its significance and of great significance are the activities of such institutions as the army, as people who deal with these issues. If I was to say at the end, that for ten years I was in charge of the armed forces, took part in a lot of sessions tackling these issues, if I was to point out the most important aspects that our military forces are facing in respect of security, I'd say that we, undoubtedly, have to take advantage of the fact that Poland is a part of NATO, that Poland is a member of the EU, as these are those institutions - one as a military-political pact, and the other as political-economic organization - which give us the most reliable guarantee of security.

I could say about NATO that I believe that in Europe the interest in NATO and its image are shrinking. This is, undoubtedly, connected with a direct engagement

of these structures in various activities in the fields of conflict. This is very risky. Europe must understand that NATO is still an important institution. Even when looking for different solutions, which would be new, such as, for example, common European military forces or some systems of European security, one must be very careful in forming this as for the time being, we don't have anything to replace NATO. So we have to strengthen the NATO structures, and never resign from financing the modernization processes in the army. This is very important. Poland is doing that, I'm glad with what I heard from General Koziel, that this new doctrine is ready and will be implemented. This is very necessary. I also believe that our participation in external military missions plays a great role and we should use that in the future as a permanent element of our policy. I know it raises a lot of controversies but I'm expressing here my opinion. In my view, it both raises the quality of armed forces here in Poland, and constitutes an element of a serious signal outside - showing Poland as a political partner. Both peace missions, and those typically military, that we have been taking part in recently, in my opinion, were necessary and very important.

We obviously must be ready, we must effectively counteract threats of terrorism and cyber-terrorism and, what is also very important, we must build our good relations with our neighbours. Against this background, I would really like to make this last remark regarding the Russian Federation. The problem of Russia is that what is also this country's advantage, and is simultaneously its problem. On the one hand, Russia's asset is that it has the biggest territory in the world and, on the other hand, managing such a great territory is a difficult task and there is a lot of trouble involved in that, such as disintegration tendencies. On the other hand, Russians have at their disposal a huge military potential including nuclear weapons. However, this potential consumes money, requires modernization and today it doesn't constitute in the international game a decisive factor. This is not a factor which leads the country to the super league. Thirdly, Russians have at their disposal a huge amount of natural resources, which is definitely their great advantage, but because they have it, they still can't undertake the effort to modernize the whole economy, which is indispensable, if anyone wants to count in the 21st century. In the 21st century the economy is based on gas, crude oil export and various natural resources; it is an archaic economy, and it is additionally so perverse, that if the prices of oil are higher, there is more money in the budget, so again there are no incentives to modernize the system. When the prices are lower

and one wishes to modernize the economy, there are no sufficient funds in the budget. This is a permanent, so to speak, dilemma which has been accompanying Russia for many years but there is one solution to that: to modernize the country. The modernization cannot be understood only in economic categories, the modernization must be understood also in social categories, which means that Russia must build a civic society. In this matter this country is only at the beginning of this road. Together with the information revolution, with opening to the world, expectations (especially of the young generation in Russia) will be more and more typical of us all, so democracy, which means freedom, people's dignity, the possibility to influence the elections etc.

In short, Russia is in a situation in which, on the one hand, it wants to build its great position (for example it wants the Eurasian union and this is why the question of Ukraine is such a sensitive point, as this Eurasian union with Ukraine, which is Vladimir Putin's dream, would be something extremely serious and extremely anticipated by him), on the other hand, it has a lot of internal problems.

In short, Russia is in a way in a period of search and this particularly imposes onto the EU an obligation to lead an active policy towards Russia. What I observe today is, unfortunately, a passive policy. The EU as a whole is not conducting any policy in relation to Russia, and we, due to historical reasons, have serious problems in maintaining any serious dialogue with the Russian side.

I don't think Russia poses any threat today but as long as Russia does not confirm its position, its role about the future; as long it remains a partner in an intensive dialogue, persuading it to the ideas, values that we represent. I believe that the policy of a much greater activity towards Russia, taking into account that a part of Russian actions is not friendly to us, should be carried out.

General Pacel asked me to talk for an hour, I'm talking much longer, for that I'm really sorry. The subject has been depicted so widely that I wanted to touch upon so many matters and to conclude it with the statement I started with, undoubtedly, we are living in very interesting times. The number of questions greatly outweighs the number of answers we can give, but all this is fascinating and to be honest, I can't imagine a better moment or times to study, wherever it is possible, and especially at the National Defence University. If you have such an opportunity, we can only envy you and wish that after your studies you will find answers to some of

the most difficult and most important challenges that the world and Poland have to face. I strongly believe that we will then be able to ensure safety and growth and satisfaction. This is what I wish you and thank you for your patient attention.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

**A question from the audience:** Mister President, although you touched upon a number of significant issues concerning security and international political relations, today's date raises a question about Polish-Russian relations. And so on 13 December 1923, that is 89 years ago, Poland officially acknowledged the existence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Starting proper relations with the eastern neighbour for many reasons raised a number of issues, problems. As a matter of fact, these problems are still present today, so any initiatives that could lead to closer relations between the two nations are priceless. Not so long ago, only 4 months, on 17 August, during the visit of Cyryl, the patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, there was an agreement reached between the Roman Catholic Church of Poland and the Orthodox Church. Often this event been compared to the famous letter sent by Polish bishops to the German ones on 18 November 1965. Mister President, can this agreement become a platform for cooperation and reconciliation?

**President Kwaśniewski:** I see the common declaration as a significant step forward and, of course, it is important but it cannot, unfortunately, be overrated. We must remember that the bishops' letter from '65 was a historic event and a breakthrough. It was only 20 years after the war, when the wounds were far from healed, when the generation of victims, those who survived, were present. Another thing which made this event so exceptional was the decisive, negative, if not aggressive, reaction of the Polish People's Republic authorities. This context made the meaning and importance of the bishops' declaration that great. Of course, I am not urging the present authorities to treat the Polish and Russian clergy's appeal in the same way only to raise the importance of the document, as here, I believe, the thinking of both Churches, or at least the thinking of the Polish side, and of most political elites, is identical. We want and we should pursue a real, honest reconciliation with the Russian side.

The reconciliation is needed and this is indisputable. But the reconciliation must be based on truth, even assuming that we perceive the truth a bit differently, that is we respect the fact that regarding certain historical events we retain our interpretation and the Russian side retains theirs. There cannot be, however, any dispute as to facts! There can be no doubt that the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact took place, there can be no dispute about the Katyn massacre, about the fact that it happened, and who did it, there can be no dispute about sending people to Siberia and so on. It seems to me that today the problem is the Russian side's reaction – that is their readiness to conduct such a vivisection. This does not concern only relations with Poland. Judging by what is happening in Russia, it seems that there is still no readiness – of course I am not talking about everyone, because there are groups such as the Memorial society, there are intellectuals, film directors who approach seriously the problem of reckoning with the past – there is no mood for such reckoning. We must not forget that the crimes in Stalin's times were chiefly committed on the USSR's citizens, who made up the largest number of victims. There is still no such readiness.

For some time we could even observe different moods – both Putin and Medvedev spoke differently about these issues. The latter seemed almost ready to initiate a process of reflection or reckoning. But the political configuration has changed again and the subject matter seems postponed for some time.

Nonetheless, reconciliation is needed and any effort in this direction should be welcomed with respect, as I welcome the common declaration of both Churches. I welcome the activities of another kind with similar respect, namely that of the Commission for difficult issues in Polish-Russian relations. What I miss, however, is similar contact on the top political levels which would change the situation through important declarations and gestures. There have been no such relations between prime ministers, practically since the Smolensk plane crash, the presidents are rarely in touch as well. Of course this state of events is influenced by the crash itself and the debate around it taking place in Poland. What is incomprehensible for me is the behaviour of the Russian side, which seems unable to hand over the plane wreck. In my opinion this is inexplicable. In short, we are in a situation in which Polish-Russian relations are far more complicated than European-Russian ones. If I were to accuse European-Russian relations of anything the accusations would be very precise. First of all, there is no common European policy, which

allows Russia to play her music on various instruments. I have always said that Russia has 27 plus one policies towards Europe. Those 27 are bilateral policies, privileged with some countries, like with Germany, or passive with others, like with Poland. This extra one is the policy towards Brussels, that is towards the European Commission, and they are not so concerned with it. As a matter of fact, Russians still believe that the EU will not survive because if the USSR failed, how can the EU succeed? There is logic behind it but in my opinion, of course, it is faulty...

We need a common policy towards Russia and we absolutely need a common energy policy because the lack of a common European energy policy results in actions which are very difficult for some European countries. North Stream, which became a kind of gas bypass going around Belarus, Ukraine and Poland, is a problem, but not so long ago the construction of South Stream was initiated, which again goes around Ukraine! In short, deciding on various projects out of context we make the Russian side's dominance practically indisputable. This lack of common policy weakens us, but whatever can be done towards reconciliation must be done.

**Prof. Pawłowski:** You have already partially referred to the question which I would like to raise, but which is strongly connected with some of your very difficult but also unprecedented decisions about using our armed forces abroad, Mr President. I mean, of course, Iraq and Afghanistan. At that time, when the decision about our soldiers' participation in Afghanistan was taken, you said, Mr President, publicly justifying your decision, that (this is not a direct quote) Poland's security was connected with this particular region. With the benefit of hindsight, how would you refer to this question, Mr President?

**President Kwaśniewski:** To be honest, I don't know if Afghanistan isn't a more difficult issue than Russia. Let me go back to the decision which we took at that time. We took the decision based on a few premises. The first one was, of course, the terrorist threat, which was real and we saw it with our own eyes, not only in New York or Washington, but also in Madrid, on Bali, in London and so on. This is why eliminating places which are, if you will, the source of terrorism, or the main bases for terrorism, made sense. Afghanistan is a place very which is dangerous for everyone, not only due to the high concentration of terrorists and

their training facilities there, but also because of the cash flow connected with drug dealing. This is why the decision was justified.

The second justification is as follows – Poland is part of the western world, and since her access to two major organisations, that is NATO and the EU, we are officially part of this world. Consequently, if this world, as a result of its analysis, knowledge or information, takes such decisions, then Poland should be part of this process, as in this way, firstly, we mark our presence, secondly we show our political significance, and thirdly, we show that we understand what the policy of solidarity is all about. Poland in particular should care about the realisation of the rule of solidarity because we cannot say that for us “solidarity” means only the Polish “Solidarity” of 1980, but any other, mundane, practical solidarity is of no interest to us.

Thirdly, and this is the last premise, I believed that the potential of the Polish Armed Forces allowed us to take such actions efficiently and in accordance with the aim of these international missions, and so it happened. Both Iraq and Afghanistan, if we set aside the whole propaganda, so to speak, are countries which as a result of the last decade’s military interventions, of course, did not solve all their problems, did not become the land of milk and honey but surely became safer places, more controlled and predictable, with some perspective for development. Afghanistan has its government now. There is a will to withdraw the coalition troops in the nearest future. There are great economic programmes and investments which are to help the Afghan economy. All that must be obviously treated as a plus. But we must remember that we are dealing with Afghan mentality. We are dealing with a social structure which is tribal, and that is the cause of serious conflicts between these tribes. We won’t change it in a couple of years, it needs a generation. I participated in a few international discussion panels on economic help for Afghanistan, and the biggest problem which occurs there is what to do to ensure the help gets where it should and not to the pockets of various, if you will, local leaders who would all too eagerly misuse the money and leave it in their pockets. But these are problems which we won’t solve regardless of the best efforts, neither military or political.

I assess that our involvement both in Afghanistan and Iraq made sense and that owing to this involvement our political position rose and that the Polish Armed Forces handled these two very difficult missions. On the other hand, the biggest

question of the modern world and that of the western world is not how to win the war, as the military potential is sufficient to win most, if not all, wars, but how to secure peace? That is what needs doing once we have concluded those military actions so that the processes taking place there would hold water, make sense.

But listen, we don't have to talk only about Iraq or Afghanistan. If you are looking at what is happening in Egypt, if there was a social explosion which wiped out Mubarak's regime, if this regime passed and choices were made, by the will of the people there is a new president, if it turns out that a few months after the elections we are practically experiencing a *déjà vu*, that is we again have demonstrations in the street and again more casualties, then this shows how complicated a process this is! It is all the more reason to appreciate the transformation process in Poland. If you look at what we went through on 13 December 1981, in 1989 and so on, only then do we see how meaningful this peaceful, dialogue-oriented and persuasive democracy is, and why it mustn't be destroyed, why all those who are trying to destabilise it are dangerous. I think you know who I'm talking about...

**Prof. Pawłowski:** A recently famous author of many a comment, chief American intelligence officer, George Friedman talks about Poland and security, taking under consideration the change or reorientation of American foreign policy mainly on Asia and the Pacific. How do you, Mr President, find these comments by Friedman and those, who raise those security issues?

**President Kwaśniewski:** I don't agree with him. I don't know if all of you are familiar with his views, but I believe those views to be outright dangerous. Why? Friedman speaks more or less like this: Americans are shifting their priorities and interests from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This is no revelation and is obviously true, and not easy to dispute with. It would be strange if Americans, seeing the rising role of China, seeing the rising role of Asia, didn't decide to treat this region more seriously. However, it is important, and it the EU's standpoint, that we do not relieve Americans of shared responsibility for security and for the entire Euro-Atlantic sphere as it is in their interest too. It is very important to talk about at the present time. This is not only the question of the fact that Mr Obama was raised, so to speak, away from Europe, as he grew up in Hawaii, in Indonesia, so his sensitivity to the European part is not so great. But please remember that the US social structure is changing. After all, in the recent years there has been an inflow of several dozen million immigrants from Latin America and today the US

are far more sensitive to the problems of Mexico, Cuba or Colombia rather than to European problems. Our migration practically finished with the end of World War II. Today, someone who wants to talk of some significant role of the German or Dutch community, or Polish for that matter, in the USA, is talking nonsense. Of course, they are there, they have melted in, assimilated in 100%, but this European group in America is growing less influential. However, if the American structure has changed, if it is more Asia- Latin America-oriented, then we should all the more strengthen the Euro-Atlantic ties. From this viewpoint Friedman's conceptions are, in my opinion, risky, because telling Europeans or Poles to relieve Americans of responsibility for what is happening in their region (of course I am simplifying it a little) and to take responsibility for countering any eastern threats is, in my opinion, both an infeasible and risky thesis. I believe that we should be the country which decidedly underlines the role of the United States, of course remembering about our own armed forces, our own security, but accepting the fact that NATO and the US are the main guarantee of security in this region and that it is their main responsibility. And they can't be in any way relieved of this duty, because otherwise they will be asking for trouble, which they have already experienced (as in Yugoslavia), and which they resolved mainly owing to their own efforts, since the Yugoslavian conflict would remain unresolved without Clinton's and the USA's active participation. Friedman is convincing us to accept things which are unreal, as they would cost too much, but would also have no political justification. I believe that, for instance, extending NATO in East-Central Europe is a better guarantee of security than some radical doctrinal changes and attempts at replacing NATO with some other ways of ensuring safety.

**A question from the audience:** A question from a representative of the post-graduate studies, almost a doctor, Ms. Witecka.

**Magdalena Witecka:** In your speech you spoke of the role of the information revolution in the shaping of socio-economic processes. Hence the question: in your opinion, can this space be used as a tool for the realisation of Poland's interests, and if yes, to what extent?

**President Kwaśniewski:** Are you writing about this? I would like you to try and answer this question yourself, as I will refer to it quite generally: cyberspace is becoming part of reality, which means that nowadays one can't say it is of no interest or doesn't concern us. It does concern us. However, I do not feel in any way

competent enough to say what could be the most efficient means of protection, how to counter or define such exact threats. I have, of course, attended a few international conferences, where this issue was discussed, but my impression after these conferences is that practically nobody is a 100% or even 50% ready for this new phenomenon. We are walking in the darkness and should thank fate that so far there has been no hacker or other formidable power, which would take advantage of this lack of concepts or instruments. I am convinced that, security-wise, the questions of cyberspace, data protection, protection of all those networks will be one of the most significant issues in the future. I would love to listen to you if you have some output in this field and you would like to offer us something. Tell us. Everyone will learn from this. If you think that the generals in the front row already know...

**Magdalena Witecka:** I don't know if we have enough time for this...

**President Kwaśniewski:** No, no, no! Why don't you let your former official superior for ten years use up some of your time... I insist, say at least a few words, this is a very interesting topic.

**Magdalena Witecka:** I can, of course, talk about this for a very long time, but I think we could say something about e.g. the possibility of using social media. We can talk about informational operations, about information warfare. And here's the question: what is Poland's role? How should we use the potential offered by cyberspace, not only in terms of protection from threats, but also to project an image or to carry out our interests.

**President Kwaśniewski:** Could you tell me when you are going to finish your doctoral thesis?

**Magdalena Witecka:** Soon, I hope.

**President Kwaśniewski:** General Koziej, we have human resources. I see your future in cyberspace, Ms. Witecka, it looks good.

**Magdalena Witecka:** Thank you very much.

**Michał Podubiuk, a third-year student of European Studies:** Mr President, in your speech you touched upon the question of demography, both in Poland and in Europe. I would like to ask if the events from France or Germany shouldn't be

a lesson for us, to be careful with immigrants and the expansiveness of Islamic culture.

**President Kwaśniewski:** An important question. My first remark is as follows – and please don't get angry with me – demographic problems can be resolved with domestic forces, and you are part of those forces. All you have to do is set up a family, have children and bring them up. I don't think I have to get into details here, you know the rest of it. I am not against pro-family policies although as someone has rightly said, if a family decides to have offspring only because of the state financial aid, then they shouldn't do it because they can't be good parents. But, of course, all forms of supporting families are absolutely indispensable. What is more important in the state pro-family policy is to assure women – and I'm thinking about ladies such as the ones sitting here – that maternity will not be a problem in their professional career. This is because now the biggest problem for women who are well-educated graduates, and there are more female graduates now in Poland than male, is that they have to withdraw for a year or two, which results in the fact that in the on-going race in various corporations or workplaces, those women don't stand a chance. This is the essence of what Scandinavians quite quickly understood and skilfully dealt with – there should be a full guarantee that maternity is treated as something desirable, needed and not devastating for the professional career. Now, as to migration, the examples of both France and Germany call for analysis. Of course, it is a very complex issue. How far should we assimilate, how far should we respect and let the immigrants keep their identity? These are very delicate issues and the two examples that you brought up, those of the French and Germans, are worth analysing. Anyway, I believe that the sooner we – be it the Polish government or even the presidential level – start dealing with this problem, the better. This is because I think it is inevitable. It is already happening. Over 2 million Poles left in 2004 and are working in the West, mainly in Great Britain. And that's good, they found jobs there, they're sending money to Poland, and these are pretty big sums, they are investing in Poland. But someone came to fill in the vacated posts. We have a few hundred thousand Ukrainians working every day in Poland. If the demographic processes look the way they are looking now, we will need not 600 thousand, but a million, two million or even more. Of course, our policy should consist in opening borders most of all for our neighbours who do not have great language, cultural or religious barriers – this is all happening in a circle which is, so to speak, well-known and

domesticated. It might be that in some time this number of immigrants will be increased by newcomers from India or African countries, I don't know, this is just my prognosis. But we, with our ageing society, low birth rate, are unable to stop this wave. We will simply need it, especially if we continue to experience the drain – which fortunately isn't that big now – of the Polish workforce to the West. It is in my opinion a foregone conclusion. Of course, using the foreign experience, this policy has to be implemented in a smarter and better way. For example, one rule that should be set up is that all newcomers would have to learn Polish. This is a very complicated matter but, as I have said, inevitable. In my opinion, there is not a single European country, maybe except for some Balkan countries, such as Macedonia or Kosovo, where there is a very fertile, so to speak, Muslim community, there is not a single European country that could close its borders for immigrants, because it simply wouldn't survive such a closure, economically. We have to face the truth.

**Marcel Paprocki, first-year student of National Security:** What were the consequences of the 11 September terrorist attack for international and Polish security?

**President Kwaśniewski:** Immense. Firstly, because it was a shock and nobody expected it. Most of all, nobody expected an attack on objects in the USA, which seemed to be the best prepared to ensure its own security, and that the attack would be conducted from the territory of the USA. Let me tell you a story. Already towards the end of my term in 2005, I was invited as the first foreign president to Colorado. There is this mountain, Cheyenne Mountain, which was supposed to be the command HQ in case of a nuclear war. Something incredible, there is actually enough room for a couple of thousand men, an entire command centre, gates a few metres high with pressure-sensing closing mechanisms. They showed to me – and it was 2005 - what it looked like before and after 11 September. Why did they pay so much attention to that date? Well, because this Cheyenne Mountain had already been working as a control centre for the US and Canadian airspace, and until the events of 2001 they had been controlling only the airspace outside US borders, because they hadn't expected the attack to be conducted from America. So it was a shock, it completely changed their thinking. At that time it was also a vital question for us: to what extent are we vulnerable to such an attack. We also came to very important conclusions. The first one was a need

for international cooperation. This is because terrorism has global character, and if it has global a character, then it requires global cooperation. No single country, even as large as the USA, can handle it alone. Hence the cooperation of intelligence agencies, appropriate services and military cooperation – they have a fundamental meaning and results. In terms of the civil sphere it was best seen in the USA. There was a huge debate on the topic. Because of the events of the World Trade Center, the discussion about how much freedom and how much security a citizen should have came back. This is why the dilemma between security and freedom is so big and evident. Because if it is security, then it means agreement for citizens to be more often tapped, surveillance of various groups and a much deeper information transfer etc. If freedom is our priority, then we lose robust security apparatuses. Bush solved this dilemma by moving towards increased security. Currently, Obama and his administration are shifting towards increased freedom thus resigning from some elements introduced by Bush. In other countries, including Poland, there is a need for compromise. There have to be found as many apparatuses guaranteeing security as needed. If you travel by plane then you know what procedures you go through. You have to agree that this is what it's going to be like. And it could be worse judging by what we have heard recently in Poland. After the idea to attack the Parliament, we could expect access to public buildings to be more restricted or the entry such buildings to involve some control. There is no shortage of madmen or some organized groups, and the atmosphere around the economic crisis and the growing social frustration favours certain situations. We aren't living in a period of prevailing happiness, where everyone can be convinced by the message of love alone. We are living in times when love is spoken of, but hatred grows. And that is the problem.

**Rector-Commandant Pacek:** Mr President, I would like to report that our university has 9 thousand civilian students, who seem to be very active today, but we also have over 2 thousand military students and course participants who, ranging from majors to generals, take part in the educational process. Therefore, Mr President, please allow one such student who doesn't look like a typical student, yet participates in a generals' course, Colonel Malec, to ask the last question.

**Col. Malec:** In my question on the one hand I would like to refer to the thesis that you mentioned, Mr President, the one about the declining image of NATO, and on the other hand to the notion raised by Prof. Pawłowski – the shift in the

USA's interest from Europe to Asia and the Pacific. Will it significantly influence NATO as such, its cohesion and its credibility? Shouldn't it be a stimulus for consolidating cooperation between European countries within the framework of common security and defence policy?

**President Kwaśniewski:** Yes, of course, there is that risk. I can go back to the reasoning behind it. One of the most important centres which is competitive for the USA is emerging in Asia – China and its surroundings. This is a fact and we cannot change it. If I were the president of the USA, I would say myself that this is a priority. On the other hand, it is Europe and NATO, which through shared values and history with the USA remain their true ally, and Americans have to understand it. NATO can't be neglected and declared an institution which has fulfilled its task, because it protected the West from communism and the USSR for a number of years. It is important that the American policy retains the balance. The reason why both internal debates in the USA and talks with us are so significant is that Americans don't stop seeing this, all the more given the fact that the structure of the American society is growing less and less European. Our European conviction that they are our "younger brothers" and will forever remain so, European, has to be put aside, as today America grew much more Latin American and may well soon become something Latin, Asian, European, American or something even less easy to identify and name. Europe on the other hand should play an active part in this policy and it hasn't been going so well. Why is that? Well, first of all Europe has her own problems. Each subsequent month or year Europe spends focusing on herself weakens our external position, also towards the USA.

The US president has problems talking to Europe because every time he asks a question the answer is that we can't do it because we have to fight back the economic crisis, we can't do it because we have to wait until we do something else, or we can't do it because there is an election coming soon. Now in Europe – and this is my prognosis – there will be such a period of abeyance and looking for new solutions because this autumn there is an election in Germany, and until it is held there will be problems. Germany and Mrs Merkel won't be able to go far in their actions because they will be awaiting the election. And Germany, as we know, plays a significant role in Europe. Europe needs two things in relation to the USA. Firstly, a common policy towards the USA, just as it needs a common policy

towards Russia or China. It can't allow everyone to have their own little policies and let it work like that. So, Europe needs a common policy towards the USA and it should clearly state, if not today, in the period of economic trouble, then in the perspective, how it sees the European responsibility for security issues and how a common European security policy should look. In my opinion, especially in the face of the crisis, especially in the face of financial restrictions and in the face of the fact that there is less willingness to provide for the expenses connected with the armed forces in European countries, Europe should all the more care about NATO's cohesion, its presence and image. That's because we have nothing better to replace it with. We don't have any means, any possibilities or any big money to organise anything. Therefore, I believe that the concern for the consolidation of NATO and not allowing it to break, and breaking is exactly what this diminished American interest means, are the most important questions in the European policy, from Berlin to Lisbon or Warsaw. Otherwise we could really find ourselves in a kind of a security void, which would be calamitous.

**An NDU student:** Two years ago Angela Merkel distanced herself from multiculturalism. She said it failed completely. Half a year later, in his speech David Cameron said the same: multiculturalism failed as a concept, which was supposed to shape a strong, homogenous society. Mr President is going a little against the grain saying that multiculturalism is a necessity. I would like to make sure if you believe that multiculturalism should be a tool for forming society or maybe there is a need for deeper integration and the formation of homogenous societies.

**President Kwaśniewski:** It seems to me that there has been a little exaggeration in the opinions about Merkel's and Cameron's speeches, that is that they are talking about homogenous societies, as such societies are possible neither in Germany nor in the UK. What does a homogenous society mean? Does it mean that out of 60 million British people they are sending back home 10, maybe 15 million? To what home if most of them were born in the UK. This is simply impossible. The same in Germany. Of course, I understand their conservative viewpoints, but in my opinion they are trying to turn the tide. This cannot be done because the openness of the contemporary world will favour multiculturalism and its economic and demographic needs will favour it all the more. There is a different question – what should be done so that multiculturalism would not mean the

creation of new ghettos, separation, seclusion in their own residential areas and conflict between communities, but so that it would be a process based on two basic elements. On the one hand, there should be respect for autonomy, for other cultures or religion, but on the other hand for assimilation. That's why I believe that demanding from foreigners who are about to gain citizenship that they speak the language, respect the country's law, have everything certified, including the knowledge of the country's anthem together with singing it out is right and proper. The Swiss have been doing it for years. After all in America it is similar. These are no exaggerated demands, these are the basic elements of building an open society, but one that has its backbone built around tradition and law obedience in a given country. Angela Merkel has a very positive example of multiculturalism at hand. If you have a look, and I don't know to what extent you are a football fan, at the German national football team, which has been successful for many years and which plays beautiful, modern, artful and very German football, then you will see that in this team there are two Poles: Klose and Podolski, there is a Spanish-Brazilian German, Gomez, there is a Turk, Özil, and a Tunisian, Khedira. I think I mentioned over half the team. I know that if those who ruled Germany years ago rose from the graves, then they would just as quickly go back terrified by the fact that something like this ever happened. But it does work and I believe that multiculturalism is an irrevocable phenomenon. In three European countries – in Germany, France and the UK, I would say it has gone so far that it is impossible to change. However, in countries in this respect relatively free from problems, and Poland is surely one of them, people should already start thinking about this problem. In my opinion this should mean that we can be open for those people, we can make the rules valid in this country accepted by them, but we also respect their separateness. So far this problem hasn't been that visible in Poland, as all immigrants are from the same cultural sphere, but we have to be ready for the coming of people much more different from us, than Ukrainians or Belarusians. But let me say it again, there is a simple answer to demographic problems... And that is the only reason, General Pacek, why we should end this lecture, as the youth needs to attend to much more important business...