

National Security Bureau (Poland)
National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine

POLISH-UKRAINIAN BULLETIN



Warsaw 2012

National Security Bureau (Poland)
National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine

POLISH-UKRAINIAN BULLETIN

Warsaw 2012

**Head of the National Security Bureau:
Professor Stanisław Koziej**

Deputy Head of the NSB:
Zdzisław Lachowski, Ph.D. – Editor-in-Chief

Joanna Warchoń – Project editor

Address:
10 Karowa St., 00-315 Warsaw
Tel.: +48 22 695 18 75
Fax: +48 22 695 18 63

Publisher: National Security Bureau
10 Karowa St., 00-315 Warsaw

ISBN 978-83-60846-14-8

Edition 1000 copies

Copying the whole or a part of article requires written consent of the editorial team.

All articles published in individual issues express the authors' views.

Typesetting, revision, print and cover:
Pracownia C&C Sp. z o.o.
www.pracowniacc.pl

Table of content

Preface – Introduction to the “Polish-Ukrainian Bulletin” Project <i>Stanisław Koziej – Head of the National Security Bureau</i>	5
International Challenges for Regional Security in Central and Eastern Europe – Poland, the EU and Protracted Conflicts <i>Paweł Świeżak</i>	7
Ukraine’s Regional Security Environment <i>Dmytro Adamenko</i>	21
EURO 2012 Security as a Joint Task of Poland and Ukraine – A Challenge for National Security and International Security Systems <i>Krzysztof Liedel, Paulina Piasecka</i>	41
Security Challenges and Ukrainian-Polish Cooperation in the Organization of the EURO 2012 <i>Viktor Soloviov</i>	55
Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland in International Operations – Legal Grounds, Strategic Considerations, and Practical Implementation <i>Paweł Pietrzak</i>	69
Participation of the Armed Forces in International Operations <i>Vladimir Polischuk</i>	87
Biographies	103

Preface

Introduction to the “Polish-Ukrainian Bulletin” Project

The idea of this publication was born during a meeting of Secretaries of the Security Councils of both Poland and Ukraine, in Kiev in May 2011. On a fine spring day, although several sessions of bilateral consultations produced pleasing results, a feeling that something was missing became apparent. There was no time for the discussion of many issues that markedly required in-depth and wide-ranging discussion. The “Bulletin” can therefore be regarded as an extension of those conversations.

The views of the Polish and Ukrainian analysts concerning important security issues are presented in the report. The paper provides an opportunity to compare how the same issues are treated on both sides of the border. It is not surprising to find many converging elements. Cooperation within the security sphere is one of the foundations on which the Polish and Ukrainian relationships are built. However, a difference in emphasis put on issues, also has value. Allowing a better mutual understanding. It is important that between the two countries there are no “white spots” – no topics are excluded from discussion.

The dominant feature of the modern-day international security environment is uncertainty. Very often it is accompanied by a lack of trust. The mechanisms that should ensure predictability and verify the good will of partners, often fail. This lack of confidence could turn out to be extremely destructive, particularly during critical moments (which at present are not difficult to come across).

A reason for satisfaction is that these negative tendencies do not concern the Polish-Ukrainian relationship. The work of each partner contributes to this. However, it should be remembered that this cannot be taken for granted.

In 2012, the Euro 2012 Finals Tournament develops as a symbol of the organisational partnership between the two States. This is understandably pleasing. However, although symbols are important, they should not be limiting. As natural leaders of Central and Eastern Europe, Poland and Ukraine are committed to ensuring that the “strategic partnership”, repeatedly declared on a political level, forms a defined structure. Not only would this

constitute a tangible contribution to the security of the region, it also provides a good example to other European countries. It is sincerely hoped, regardless of other initiatives, this “Bulletin” will be an incentive that will help the identification and development of realistic projects for Polish-Ukrainian projects in the security sphere.

Professor Stanisław Koziej, Secretary of State

International Challenges for Regional Security in Central and Eastern Europe – Poland, the EU and Protracted Conflicts

PAWEŁ ŚWIEŻAK

*Department of Strategic Analyses,
National Security Bureau.*

Transformation in Central Europe proceeded differently from the changes that took place in the Eastern part of the continent. Poland's policy aims at promoting security and stability in Europe and opposes the creation of new dividing lines. Promoting democratization within the neighborhood is an important element of that approach. As a leader of the EU's Eastern policy, Poland is convinced that the cooperation with Ukraine is crucial for achieving the aim of stability and predictability on the continent. Special focus should be placed on protracted conflicts in the region.

The global economic crisis sharpens and accelerates tendencies that influence the international environment. Still, it can be seen not only as a threat, but also as a chance for “new openings” and for introducing new ideas in the security sphere. The current situation requires an active approach from the EU which shall review the tools used in the neighborhood area.

Central and Eastern Europe – two different stories?

After the collapse of the bipolar system one could fear that Central and Eastern Europe would slide into chaos and instability – just as it happened in the case of the Balkans. Several issues were called into question such as the sustainability of borders (those created half a century earlier, often as a result of external intervention), the situation of ethnic minorities, the reliability of newly created state structures, the burdened relations with the neighbours (some conflicts have been frozen for half a century). Last but not least, one could doubt whether those inexperienced democratic systems were able to build effective market economies.

Looking for the answers to these issues, most countries of the region decided to embark on the path of European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Successive waves of the EU enlargement (2004, 2007) and the enlargement

of NATO (1999, 2004), along with requirements imposed by those organizations, became the stimulus for deep political and irreversible economic reforms. The agenda of reform has worked to stabilize relations between the countries of the region. Also favorable international environment was conducive to the success of transformation process in Central Europe. Among the most important external factors one can point to the long period of economic prosperity, the policy of the Western states that was aimed at overcoming the Cold War divisions, and the relative weakness of countries which were traditionally skeptical of spreading the transatlantic values.

The transformation of the Eastern part of the continent, however, proceeded differently. In the first half of the 1990's several armed conflicts resulted in lack of a lasting peace (Transnistria, Nagorno-Karabakh, and separatisms in Georgia). They generated a potential for instability and contributed to the uncertain security status of the Eastern European countries. Furthermore, the region was not at the center of attention of the Western powers which were focused on the process of creating the institutional foundations of the European Union as well as on the enlargement of the EU and NATO with Central European countries, and on providing stability to the Western Balkans. While it is true that the breakout of conflicts in the eastern part of the continent didn't go completely unnoticed in the key Western states (e.g. engagement of France in the co-chairing of OSCE Minsk Group), more often they were pushed onto the shoulders of international organizations (e.g. the United Nations mission in Abkhazia) or Russia (sometimes acting under the umbrella of the international recognized missions, like in the cases of South Ossetia and Transnistria).

In contrast to Central Europe, Russian military presence remained an important element of the security situation in Eastern Europe. Russian military installations and bases still exist in Belarus, Moldova (Transnistria), Ukraine (the Crimea), on the territory of Georgia (Abkhazia and South Ossetia), Armenia (military base), and Azerbaijan (early warning radar system). It is arguable whether the actions taken by Russian forces in different periods have actually contributed to stability or instability in the region. Nonetheless, the mere fact that some states have questioned Russian presence on their territory proves that frequently it was an antagonizing factor. In any case, military involvement of Russia in Eastern Europe makes it difficult to imagine the solution of the security problems of the region without cooperation with the Kremlin.

At the end of the past decade we could observe a series of events essential to the security of Eastern Europe. Firstly, the enlargement of the EU and

NATO meant that the region became a direct neighbor to these organizations, vital for European security. Due to this situation, the EU and NATO needed to clearly define their interests towards Eastern Europe, including the issue of potential accession. The EU reacted by formulating the initiative of the European Neighborhood Policy (created in the years 2002-2004); the Eastern Partnership (EaP) was added to this framework in 2009. EaP aims to improve the political integration and develop close economic relations between the EU and the region, whilst avoiding the membership perspective. NATO was ready to grant some Eastern European states Membership Action Plans (the case of Ukraine in 2006) and during the summit in Bucharest in 2008 it was agreed that Ukraine and Georgia should be treated like prospective NATO members. Eventually the Alliance did not determine a time frame for their accession, and current cooperation with the countries of the region is based on the mechanism of partnership.

2008 proved to be a difficult year for Eastern Europe as a deep economic crisis limited the EU's absorption possibilities; at the same time, the Russian-Georgian war had a negative impact on NATO's willingness to get involved in the region on a larger scale. It is not true, however, that the West totally gave up on its active policy in Eastern Europe. This is also the case of the sphere of security. It is the EU and its member states that played a decisive role in the ceasefire in Georgia in 2008; they also were able to arrange quickly the European Union Monitoring Mission (EUMM) under the auspices of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). The European Union Border Assistance Mission Moldova-Ukraine (EUBAM) was an important factor in reducing the risks concerning the Transnistrian "black hole" within the European security system. Finally, contrary to the catastrophic predictions, the EU has not weakened, but even strengthened its involvement in the Nagorno-Karabakh region (in the second half of 2011 Philippe Lefort undertook the mission as the EU Special Representative for the South Caucasus and the crisis in Georgia; programs were also initiated aimed at building confidence in the conflict zone).

In this respect it is worth noting the actions undertaken by Poland. They are founded upon the belief that building a pan-European security system is possible based on existing institutions. Warsaw has opposed the creation of a division within Europe between the countries belonging to the EU/NATO and those that do not belong. To reduce the risk, Poland is developing practical cooperation with its Eastern partners, especially with Ukraine – the most important country in the region. The Warsaw-Kyiv cooperation

in the sphere of security resulted in the establishment of a common military unit designed for peace-keeping missions, cooperation in foreign security and defense missions, and the exchange of experiences concerning the transformation of armed forces and the security sector.

Priorities of Poland in the sphere of international security

Poland perceives its external security environment as relatively favorable. Security of Poland is based on three pillars: memberships in NATO, membership in the EU, and the bilateral alliance with the United States of America. Also, as a responsible member of both above-mentioned organizations, Poland recognizes the need to consistently develop its own potential in the field of defense.

Realizing its strategic objectives, which include independence, territorial integrity, guaranteeing the preservation of civil liberties, creating the conditions enabling socio-economic development, and securing the state's possibility of shaping the international environment, Poland aims to minimize the surrounding threats and risks.

Poland does not recognize any of its neighbors as a threat. However, some actions undertaken by them can be estimated as the ones which are contrary to Polish interests. Poland is trying to counteract such tendencies, primarily by expanding its own potential. Some threats, especially those of supra-regional nature, present the challenges of an asymmetric character (e.g. terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, development of extremist ideology, international organized crime, environmental problems). An appropriate response to them is the development of cooperation between different political entities that form the network structure of the contemporary international environment.

For Poland, membership in European and Euro-Atlantic institutions anchors the country with the world's most effective security structures. It establishes the conditions for stable, comprehensive development. It is therefore in the essential interest of Poland to preserve the high efficiency of NATO and the EU, enhance their complementarity and improve the cooperation between them, while maintaining the open character of the two organizations.

NATO is the most important instrument for Poland to ensure political-military security. It is in Poland's interest to preserve high efficiency of the

basic functions of the Alliance (namely collective defense). Poland supports the selective involvement of NATO in stabilizing and crisis missions, provided that the overall potential and the core function of the Alliance are not put in question. NATO is regarded by Poland also as a guarantee of the durable transatlantic links.

European integration has brought Poland unique benefits over the past two decades. The EU's further development is, therefore, of vital interest to Poland. As a responsible member of the European family, Poland is committed to the principle of solidarity. In return, Poland expects the EU to develop its engagement in the European neighborhood area. Poland strongly supports the development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, including the cooperation with the Eastern partners within the CSDP framework.

Promoting democratization in its neighborhood is an important element of Polish security policy. It results from the belief that systems based on the principles of democratic rule of law provide the highest degree of stability, domestic predictability, and a responsible course in foreign policy.

The implementation of Polish security policy objectives is fostered by friendly relations with neighbors and partners. The major formats of multi- and bilateral cooperation include the Weimar Triangle (with Germany and France), the Visegrad Group (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia), a strategic partnership with Ukraine, and relations with the Baltic states.

Eastern Europe AD 2012

When discussing the most up-to-date security challenges in Eastern Europe it is worth pointing out some important events and trends:

- Impact of the economic collapse of the years 2008-2009 (a double-digit decrease in the GDP of Ukraine and Armenia in 2009, and the not much better situation of Moldova and Georgia; the only positive results were recorded in the oil-rich Azerbaijan, and Belarus which benefited from external subsidies);
- A general decline in the importance of Eastern Europe on the geopolitical map of the world, as a result of the focus of the international community on the challenges in Asia (Iran and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the "Arab Spring", the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the international rivalry in the Pacific region);

- Russia's proposals of new integration projects in the economic and political sphere (Common Economic Space Russia-Belarus-Kazakhstan, and Eurasian Economic Union proposed on its basis). Due to the existence of differences in the economic regimes of the EU and Russia, these projects are in conflict with deep and comprehensive free trade areas proposed by the EU;
- Russia's revitalization of military cooperation: regional (the Collective Security Treaty Organization), and bilateral (the functioning of military bases in Armenia and Ukraine extended until the middle of the twenty-first century, and the dynamic expansion of its military presence on Georgian territory);
- Growing activity of Turkey and China in the region;
- Limiting role of international institutions: the withdrawal of the OSCE and UN missions from the South Caucasus (due to the obstruction of their mandates by Russia) and a stalemate in talks concerning Nagorno-Karabakh;
- The foreign policy of Eastern European countries which appears to be inconsistent and incomprehensible for the West ("balancing", "multi-vector", "out-of-bloc", "neo-titoism");
- The low level of regional cooperation between Eastern European countries; the differences in the level of their aspirations regarding the cooperation with the West (which is in contrast to the situation in Central Europe in the period 1991-2004); the lack of efficient regional formats similar to the "Visegrad Four". It is generally accepted that the only common denominator within the region is the post-Soviet heritage and pathologies (corruption, poor governance, oligarchism, disregard of the standards of democracy);
- Growing trends of authoritarian consolidation of power which are in contrast to the increasing Western sensitivity to the issues of democratization, caused by the "Arab Spring".

The importance of Eastern Europe for the EU and Poland. The special place of Ukraine

The European Union is, next to Russia, the most important power vis-à-vis Eastern Europe. The prestige and credibility of European foreign policy depends largely on whether the EU will be capable of shaping

the situation in its immediate vicinity. From the EU perspective, its interest in European neighbors is firm and goes beyond the cultural-civilizational sphere. The region is crucial in the context of the diversification of energy supplies (the so-called Southern Corridor). The strategic importance of Eastern Europe results from its location close to Central Asia and in the proximity of conflict zones, in which the West is engaged in militarily activities (Afghanistan), or that constitute a challenge for security (Iran). The region is of vital interest to the EU's largest neighbors, namely Turkey and Russia, with which the EU has relations of cooperation, and also of competition. Eastern Europe markets create opportunities for European business expansion (currently discouraged because of the poor investment climate). The instability of the Eastern European countries, along with the existence of disproportion of wealth between West and East of the continent, results in risks for the EU (such as uncontrolled migration).

It is worth noting that the Polish motivation for an active Eastern policy is specific in comparison with that of the EU. It consists in direct geographical proximity, historical and cultural associations, but also the experience of a successful political transition. Poland considers a natural perspective the gradual integration of Eastern European countries into the Western structures. The gradual removal of barriers, accompanied with the harmonization of standards is seen as an integral part of the process, which leads to the formation of solid foundations of a pan-European security system.

Poland is a strong promoter of cooperation of the EU and NATO with the countries of Eastern Europe, primarily with Ukraine. Warsaw promotes EU-Ukraine cooperation which can be driven by combining mutual civil and military capabilities. During its Presidency in the EU Council, Poland supported the deepening of relations with the Eastern partners, holding Ukraine as a priority. Poland supports the development of NATO-Ukraine cooperation on a permanent basis. The Embassy of Poland in the Ukraine serves as the NATO contact point (2011-2012) and the Polish delegate Marcin Koziół is the head of NATO Liaison Office in Kyiv.

It should be noted with appreciation that Ukraine considers cooperation with the EU and NATO in the sphere of security both seriously and responsibly. Kyiv joins the majority of the conclusions articulated in the framework of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy. The framework agreement on participation of Ukraine in EU operations (2008) and the agreement on the protection of classified information (2005) are the only EU agreements of this type, signed with partners from the East.

Ukraine participates in the CSDP missions (the EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Operation Atalanta) and in the work of the EU HELBROC Battle Group (Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus). It was Kyiv's initiative in 2005 that allowed the EU and USA to act as observers in the peace negotiations on Transnistria.

Ukraine is also involved in NATO operations (ISAF – including medical staff in Ghazni, Active Endeavour, and KFOR). Ukraine declared its contribution to the NATO Response Forces. The Annual National Program NATO-Ukraine contributes to the interoperability of the Alliance armed forces and Ukraine's, making easier for it to take part in joint stabilization activities.

Kyiv's policy, focused on responsible and practical involvement within the security sphere, bear fruits for Ukraine as well as for the EU and the North Atlantic Alliance.

The EU, Poland and (non-)frozen conflicts

The Russian-Georgian war of August 2008, and repeated incidents on the military ceasefire line in Nagorno-Karabakh, discredited the notion of "frozen conflicts". Unsettled, protracted disputes in Eastern Europe could easily get out of control and cross into a phase of escalation, which could include the initiation of military action. They represent a serious challenge in the field of security. Limiting oneself just to maintaining the status quo proved to be a shortsighted policy – the cost of passivity and inaction turns out to be higher than the cost of active involvement. The prolonged conflicts obviously have a demoralizing effect on the situation in individual countries. Conflicts distract attention from the issues of modernization and necessary reforms. They consume budgetary expenditures and impose the shape of policy agenda. This in turn discourages potential investors, fuels corruption, and contributes to non-transparent connections between politicians and corrupted business structures.

Although the European Union with its anti-crisis tools is far from the ideal, the community is facing the need to address the conflicts in its eastern neighborhood. Especially since there are no other candidates to take on this role: Eastern Europe is not part of the current priorities of NATO; the OSCE is crippled by a lack of consensus among its participating states; and the contribution of the UN is negligible.

Up to now the EU has not been able to exploit its political and economic potential to play a significant role in the areas of prolonged conflict. This has been primarily a result of the general weakness of its Common Foreign and Security Policy. Moreover, the coordination of the various instruments used by Europe in external relations (like the technical assistance under the European Neighborhood Policy, CSDP missions, and bilateral cooperation with individual states) was insufficient. Finally, the EU's involvement in security policy in Eastern Europe was "reactive" i.e. producing *ad hoc* responses to emerging crises. Mistakes were made starting from the planning phase: the final goals set for missions were often too ambitious in relation to the resources dedicated for the given task. These shortcomings undermined the credibility of EU policy in the East.

Nevertheless, the overall picture is not solely pessimistic. The Union reported some successes, effectively intervening in crisis situations and contributing to strengthening the stability in volatile regions. In this context three CSDP missions launched in Eastern Europe should be noted:

- EUJUST Themis (2004, the EU rule-of-law mission to Georgia focused on strengthening the Georgian justice system);
- EUBAM Moldova-Ukraine (2005, the development of border management practices to support the functioning of the Ukrainian-Moldovan border, the mission launched by the European Council, funded and managed by the European Commission);
- EUMM (2008, Georgia, reaction to the Russian-Georgian war; mission aimed at stabilization and normalization in the conflict zone. The Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism under EUMM led to a reduction of tension between the former warring parties. The mission also provides reliable information from the conflict zone).

Furthermore, the appointment of EU special envoys (EU Special Representatives, EUSR) is an example of constructive engagement in the East. Since 2003 they have been dealing with the crises on South Caucasus and from 2005 – in Moldova.

One should not forget about the EU's backing for the structural reforms in the region. That support has long-term consequences for lasting stability. These can be seen through gradual implementation (despite the crisis) of the instruments within the framework of the Eastern Partnership.

Poland is firmly committed to the afore-mentioned actions. The contribution of Poland is important to EUBAM and EUMM missions: Polish General Andrzej Tyszkiewicz has been in charge of the second mission since

July 2011. In the EU, it is Warsaw that initiates discussions on security issues concerning Eastern Europe. Apart from that, numerous informal meetings of experts, officials and politicians from East European countries with their EU counterparts, are held in Poland. The final declaration from the second summit of the Eastern Partnership held in Warsaw in September 2011 indicates a possible expansion of the components of security within the EaP.

The EaP itself also enables the “re-branding” of the region which is welcomed in light of the fact that its reputation was poor and perceived through the prism of its Soviet past.

Poland is also taking part in actions outside the EU format: The Polish Ambassador Andrzej Kasprzyk is a Special Representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, and Polish experts are represented in the structures of NATO in Eastern Europe (such as staff liaison officers of the Alliance).

Conclusion: is the crisis an opportunity?

At the beginning of 2012, the regional security situation in Central and Eastern Europe remains ambiguous. Prolonged conflicts of the past twenty years have not been resolved. The process of enlargement of the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions, which had had a stabilizing effect throughout the previous two decades, seems to have slowed. There is a risk of new divisions in this part of the continent: between the countries with strong security guarantees (members of the EU and NATO) and the those, who face uncertainty.

The global economic crisis sharpens and accelerates tendencies that influence the international environment. It seems that, in particular, the “multi-vector” policy is now reaching its natural limits. Maintaining “an equal distance” from regional power centers (EU, Russia, and Turkey) in a long term perspective does not guarantee success. It becomes easier to survive a period of turbulence as a member of one of the emerging integration systems, or at least as a state that closely cooperates with such a one.

The crisis provides an opportunity to create new openings. Poland, as a member of the European community, expects the EU to pursue such moves. Current problems can cause a temporary decrease in the attractiveness of the EU model. However, it is likely that new, “post-crisis” Union will be more active in the East.

In relations with the countries showing strong ambitions of integration, the EU cannot avoid the issue of redefining its attitude to the issue of their membership. At this stage, the EU decided on a “meritocratic” approach, that is, a close linkage between the integration instruments offered to Eastern neighbors and the reforms undertaken by the given state (according to the principle “more for more” contained in the revision of the European Neighborhood Policy of May 2011).

The issue of human rights for the EU is non-negotiable – the events in the southern neighborhood convincingly proved that the dilemma of “stability versus freedom” is false, and that it is not possible to achieve a sustainable internal balance without observing the system of a democratic rule of law.

In respect to the sphere of security, including ongoing conflicts, the EU room for maneuver ranges from the consistent policy of non-recognition of all entities that have arisen from the violation of international law, and to making sure that they are not totally internationally isolated. Hence the possibility of a wide use of “soft” tools for reducing tensions in conflict zones does exist: it is possible to facilitate local and regional cooperation, to support the development of civil societies, to contact those on opposite sides of the temporary border lines, to involve local elites in multilateral projects of a neutral character (e.g. science, journalism), and to undertake limited economic cooperation. These forms of cooperation may create favorable ground for the most difficult negotiations – concerning the final political status of breakaway regions. Combining the tools available to the EU in the field of traditional security policy (CSDP missions, diplomatic measures, sanctions, confidence-building measures), with instruments dedicated to bring “soft” effects seems to be offering promising perspectives. The Eastern Partnership brings added value to the EU policy – not only by the possible development of programs aimed at the security sphere, but also by the fact of creating a multilateral platform for dialogue.

The key to building stability in Central and Eastern Europe is to break the stereotypes thinking in the bloc terms. This can be achieved through bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Poland and Ukraine, the two most important countries in the region, play a leading role in this context.

Breaking the barriers of mistrust between the West and the East of the continent is possible. The good example of it is the enhanced dialogue of Ukraine with NATO and the EU. Positive experience of Ukraine’s participation in stabilizing missions and initiatives undertaken by these organizations is particularly encouraging.

Warsaw and Kyiv have “hard” security instruments at their disposal. The formation of the Polish-Ukrainian-Lithuanian brigade intended to participate in peacekeeping missions, the cooperation developed under CSDP, the politico-military dialogue, and the opportunities that exist in the field of sharing defense capabilities belong to them.

An area of particular interest for Polish and Ukrainian initiatives is the situation in Transnistria. Traditionally both countries have close and good relations with Moldova. It seems that reaching of an agreement among the parties is conceivable in the medium term. This is due to a favorable international climate created by the “reset” of US-Russian relations, and the improvement of Polish-Russian relations. The contribution of Poland and Ukraine, the latter to hold the OSCE chairmanship in 2013, should become a visible input of both countries in strengthening the European security system.

Bibliography:

1. A New Response to a Changing Neighborhood, Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Social and Economic Committee of the Regions, European Commission, High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Brussels 25 May 2011
2. Balcer A. (Ed.), *The Eastern Partnership in the Black Sea Region: Towards a New Synergy*, demosEUROPA, Warsaw 2011
3. Boonstra J., Melvin N., *Challenging the South Caucasus Security Deficit*, FRIDE, 2010
4. Cooley A., *Engagement without Recognition: A New Strategy toward Abkhazia and Eurasia's Unrecognized States*, *The Washington Quarterly*, October 2010
5. Hanson P., *On Europe's Fringes: Russia, Turkey and the European Union*, Chatham House, July 2011
6. Huff A., *The role of the EU defence policy in the eastern neighborhood*, Occasional Paper, ISS, May 2011
7. Pełczyńska-Nalecz K., *Integracja czy imitacja? UE wobec wschodnich sąsiadów*, (*Integration or Imitation? The EU's eastern neighbours*), OSW, April 2011
8. Popescu N., Andrew Wilson, *Presence Turning Into Power: Lessons from the Eastern Neighbourhood*, the European Council on Foreign Relations, May 2011

9. Proedrou F., Ukraine's foreign policy: accounting for Ukraine's indeterminate stance Between Russia and the West, Southeast European and Black Sea Studies, Vol 10, no. 4, December 2010
10. Przekształcić obecność w siłę. Doświadczenia sąsiedztwa wschodniego. Komentarze i Polemiki, Fundacja Batorego, Warszawa 2011. (Presence in the power to transform. The experience of the Eastern Neighbourhood. Comments and Polemics, Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw 2011.)
11. Rodkiewicz W. (Ed.), Transnistrian Conflict after 20 Years. A Report by an International Expert Group, CES, „Viitorul”, Warsaw, Chisinau, 2011
12. Zarembo K., Ukraine in EU security: an undervalued partner, FRIDE, Policy Brief No. 88, August 2011

Ukraine's Regional Security Environment

DMYTRO ADAMENKO

*State expert, Staff of the National Security
and Defence Council of Ukraine*

The goal of this study is to examine and analyze the interrelated processes of global, regional, and national security of Ukraine, namely the general security environment in which our country found itself at the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century; as well as to determine the specific aspects of the security environment around Ukraine and to outline trends that could potentially appear as the sources of threats to the national security of Ukraine.

This is an attempt to highlight some features of the current security agenda, which, in my opinion, require increased attention. However, we cannot leave aside the world's globalized context and the major events that have occurred in greater or lesser approximation to the borders of our country recently.

Another point of the current agenda, influencing Ukraine and its security environment, is the formation of a polycentric world with the increased contribution of individual regions to global governance.

Global processes and regional security

Undoubtedly among the most significant achievements during Ukraine's twenty-year period of independence, marked last year, are the preservation of civil peace and inter-ethnic harmony in the country, as well as a peaceful and good neighborly existence in the European environment.

The end of the "Cold war" led away from the global security issues to the challenges of the regional or local levels thus creating a new security reality in the immediate vicinity of Ukraine, which is located at the intersection of at least two regions: 1) Central and Eastern Europe and 2) the Black Sea – Caspian Sea.

International security as well as national security at the present stage is preconditioned by the trends of globalization. The world's leading nations, which for the most part dominate in global economic processes and influence the solutions of international security issues, have taken key positions in supranational and international institutions. At the same time, multina-

tional corporations and financial groups further intensify their influence on the economic and socio-political development of the national states.

In turn, globalization processes directly affect the security and defense policy of the world powers. New positioning of the leading political players at a global stage defines the balance of power and interests, changes the character, scale and substance of the former challenges, threats and risks.

We can observe the world splitting into two spaces, one of which enjoys the advantages of globalization while the other is sidelined. Essentially, this is what preconditions the polarization of the whole world system into the area of comparative peace, stability and prosperity and the area of chaos, instability and stagnation. In the second case, the situation is characterized by backwardness, low development level, authoritarianism and oppression. Naturally, the latter harbors the main threats to global stability and security. It is where the security agenda for the whole world is determined largely.

Dynamic changes, related to globalization, create new challenges and threats to security. In the present-day world the difference between domestic and external security aspects is levelled, while the importance of economic, social, ecological components of security grows¹. There is aggravating intolerance, extremism and fanaticism between civilizations, on socio-cultural, religious, inter-ethnic grounds, growing social tension, sharpening military and civil conflicts, as well as struggling for energy resources. The emergence of the wide range of new-type threats increases uncertainty of the international security space and provokes international actors to pre-emptive use of the policy of force, both “hard” and “soft”.

Negative implications of globalization have much more powerful impacts on the countries with poorly developed public administration structures. Present-day Ukraine and its surrounding region find themselves at the junction of countries that enjoy the advantages of globalization and those that suffer from its negative impacts. Due to the inability of rapid accomplishment of the European integration strategy, it has turned into the bridgehead of the “West vs. East” competition of values.

Ukraine, as well as the other new independent states, has been facing a very sharp contradiction: from one side the interests of formation and consolidation of the statehood demand intensification of the processes

¹ National Security Strategy of Ukraine, #105 Decree of the President of Ukraine of February 12, 2007, <http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=105%2F2007> (accessed November 28, 2011)

of cultural revival and the growth of national identity. From the other – the process of social and economic modernization requires the widest possible openness of the country, turning it into a target of intensive but usually far from welcomed political, economic, social and cultural influences.

Disintegration and fragmentation of the national identities, growing ethnic nationalism and separatism, leading to the collapse of multinational states, characterize the world's social and political development in the globalization framework. Fragmentation also takes place in the line of ideological confrontation between the extraneous political groups. Political extremism and religious fundamentalism have become the extreme forms of public division.

Unpredictable policies of authoritarian regimes and “failed states”, whose activity or inactivity directly or indirectly facilitates the formation of a conflict environment with a favorable breeding ground of extremism and terrorism, intensify these threats. Most of them are not involved in globalization processes or are incapable of or unwilling to accommodate themselves to their requirements. Consequently, they are pursued by the permanent economic downfalls leading to social revolts and the collapse of the state administration capacity.

The “Arab Spring” wave of uprisings, though still raising some questions concerning the role of external interferences, digital media and social networks, and, most importantly, what the consequences will be, has fully confirmed what was previously mentioned.

State borders have been losing their “sacral” meaning mainly playing the role of limits dividing separate territories. The attention of the world community to territorial claims issues and the legal settlement of borders has been diminishing while the issue of the inviolability of borders seems to be the principal one for the consolidation of sovereignty of the new independent states. Territorial claims from the other states' radical political forces and incompleteness of the legal settlement of state borders are substantial challenges for Ukraine in particular.

Shifting of the center of gravity from the conventional threats (armed invasion in particular) to non-typical (asymmetric) threats, originating from non-state entities, specifies the current security situation. The world-wide web of terrorism poses the most serious danger to the international system and security of individual states, caused first of all by trying to get access to the newest nuclear, biological, bacteriological, information technologies, which is especially dangerous considering the openness of contemporary

society, the extreme vulnerability of the essential foundations of the social being and the anthropogenic density of the modern ecosphere².

The modern world after a relatively long period of bipolar confrontation and a short one-polar phase moves to multi-polarity, the formation of a poly-centric world with the increased contribution of individual regions in global governance. Competition between the leading world powers in the political, military, economic, humanitarian, and security spheres has increased.

According to research³, the world has entered a new era of nuclear arms race. The widening circle of leading powers today implements the modernization programs of existing arsenals and the creation of new types of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery. Hundreds of \$ billions will be spent in the next ten years for these purposes throughout the world. Besides the Russian Federation and the United States, China, India, France, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea participate in the nuclear arms race. All these states are developing and producing new nuclear weapons according to their needs and capabilities.

Global strategic stability is being disturbed due to the weakening efficiency of the international proliferation control mechanisms for weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems. At the same time the nuclear arms factor is reinforced first of all due to some regimes' increasing ambition to acquire their own nuclear potentials, which stimulates their interest in the technologies and experts already available in Ukraine.

New complicated and multidimensional patterns of international interaction are being shaped actively instead of the US-dominated one-polar world order that formed after the end of "Cold War" and was functioning roughly until the middle of the 21st century's first decade.

The United States is trying to preserve its leading role by other, more flexible means, depending less on its own individual will while more on the joint accomplishment of this or that tactical and strategic task engaging other countries and international bodies. At the same time, other centers of influence, the European Union and Russia for example if speaking of the European continent, are increasing their weight.

² Horbulin, V., Security of Ukraine 2010, http://uf.org.ua/books/1758494_bezpeka%202010.pdf (accessed November 7, 2011)

³ Kearns, I., Beyond the United Kingdom: Trends in the Other Nuclear Armed States, Discussion Paper 1 of the BASIC Trident Commission, 2011, <http://www.basicint.org/sites/default/files/commission-briefing1.pdf> (accessed November 2, 2011)

The world geopolitical environment has been changing; rivalry of the leading global and regional powers for redistribution of the spheres of influence, particularly in the post-soviet area, has intensified. The interests of the most influential nations are objectively present in the region around Ukraine. Since their relations have not gained a lasting positive character, it is especially challenging in view of Ukraine's current non-aligned status. Under these conditions new independent states with complex socio-political transformations underway due to certain political and strategic ambiguity turn into the targets of asymmetric political, economic and media influence.

The role of "Big Stick" policy strengthens within the changing global context. Leading world powers add the pre-emptive defense concept to their armory, mapping out operations outside their national borders and the use of force to protect their economic interests, to reach post-conflict settlement objectives, to fight international terrorism.

Struggling for natural resources stirs up, first of all the desire for control of the energy sources and their transportation routes. It becomes especially visible in growing tension around the new energy transportation corridors from the Caspian region, competing with traditionally existing ones.

There is an especially sharp antagonism in the information and media sphere. As a consequence of intensive information technology development, its crucial importance for the governmental decision-making system, administration in different spheres of life, information and media have drawn increased attention of states and international organizations seeking world domination as well as of terrorists' groups and destructive forces which are trying to disrupt the execution of publicly important functions.

Due to the high vulnerability of the governmental information and communication systems, there is a serious threat of purposeful hacking attempts by individual hackers or alien special services able to disrupt critical information systems of the governmental institutions as well as of the private sector entities important for the national security. Special operations intended for unauthorized access to the strategic databases, misinformation and manipulation of mass consciousness are also threatening. Parties' concerned attempts to distort the national image by means of systemic slander campaigns also present a particular threat for young democracies.

There is still the threat of the emergence of new or the escalation of the smoldering inter-ethnic and international conflicts in our country's environs. In this context, "unfreezing" the conflicts in Transnistria and Caucasus is extremely dangerous for us due to Ukraine's location in the immediate proximity to the regions where most of these threats come from.

Mass migration from poor and undeveloped countries further remains a serious challenge to Ukraine. Evolution of illegal schemes of displacement and trafficking in human beings contributes to migration pressure.

An adequate response to the present-day challenges and threats under the conditions of Ukraine's gradual entering into the world economic and political system and its domestic transformation requires the shaping of a substantially new national security system. It will have to meet the scope of the existing threats, and be efficiently integrated into the global and regional security system as its integral part.

Ukraine's security environment: changes and trends

One can observe the trends in Ukraine's surrounding area that potentially appear as the sources of threats to the national security.

According to experts, the essence of the regional security environment around Ukraine has become more complicated, which has been caused by different factors, most important of which can be defined as follows:

- Accelerated shaping of "spheres of influence" or "geopolitical zones of responsibility" accompanied by a growing conflict potential, dissemination of conflict (including armed) provoking practice, increased diverse external influences in the region, including reconnaissance and subversive activities; threatening with preventive use of armed force by individual states beyond their borders;
- Further escalation of conflicts (including "frozen" ones) in the Black Sea-Caspian Sea region, the internal instability in many countries of the region, lack of perspectives and common vision of regional integration processes;
- Increased militarization of the region, growing foreign military presence and deployment of new weapons systems of non-regional players in the countries of the region;
- Unresolved issues related to the legal regulation of interstate borders, delimitation of the exclusive maritime economic zones and the continental

shelf, as well as the national and cultural rights of ethnic minorities that could revive territorial claims issues in the regional agenda⁴.

Sensible transformations of the U.S. geo-strategic guidelines and NATO policy in the post-soviet area, due to which the security “load” of their relations with Ukraine has been significantly reduced; as well as processes of globalization, other international transformations, growing new security challenges and threats directly or indirectly influence the Ukraine’s positioning in the European security system, and the nature and substance of the security cooperation in the region.

Firstly, NATO expansion to the East has actually frozen in the last few years. The fact that Russia rapidly coped with NATO and EU criticism after the brief war with Georgia, viewed by the Euro-Atlantic community as a manifestation of the Kremlin’s imperial ambitions and a return to the spheres of influence policy in Europe and in the post-soviet area, was an important indicator. In particular, the West appeared to be unprepared to grant practicable security guarantees to Georgia.

Russia, in turn, made effective use of Europe’s energy dependence in order to form certain “energy groupings” within the EU, favorable to its influence. In fact, it managed to persuade a number of influential NATO and EU members that Georgia’s as well as Ukraine’s eventual obtaining of NATO membership posed a direct threat to Russia’s national security and were a source of future problems for the Alliance itself. Moscow also demonstrated its readiness to resolutely counteract this process. It was not only the use of military force against Georgia that served as a warning but also symmetric recognition of South Ossetia’s and Abkhazia’s independence in response to the recognition of Kosovo’s independence by the West.

Secondly, changes in the U.S. Administration security priorities under Obama have affected the European and regional security in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and the Black Sea Region (BSR). The current U.S. President under the existing conditions of the global financial and economic crisis and the stockpiling of unsettled complicated issues, inherited from the previous administration, reconsidered his predecessor’s policy towards the optimization of costs and results in international policy, focusing its at-

⁴ “Modernization of Ukraine – our strategic choice”, annual address of the President of Ukraine to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, Draft National Security Strategy of Ukraine: Ukraine in a changing world. 2011, http://www.president.gov.ua/docs/Poslannya_sborka.pdf (accessed November 2, 2011)

tention on the Middle East, as well as on the adjustment of the global and regional balances.

U.S.-Russian relations have also gained priority since both sides have faced the necessity of easing tensions in bilateral relations, searching for mutually acceptable balances and improving cooperation through the “reset” process. Washington has come to a clear understanding that the United States has limited resources to proceed with George W. Bush’s democracy expansion policy and maintain the U.S.’ overloaded geopolitical agenda (Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea etc.).

Thirdly, the 08/08/08 war between Russia and Georgia revealed that the U.S., NATO and the EU were unwilling to aggravate military and political relations with Russia in the post-soviet area. It appeared that there was no consensus within the Euro-Atlantic community concerning the strategy of relations with Russia or concerning the NATO and EU eastward expansion.

At the same time American and Western European decision-makers are increasingly realizing the danger to the Euro-Atlantic community’s strategic interests originating from the Middle East, as well as from the dynamic growth of China’s military and global power. The U.S. and Western Europe need to cooperate with Russia to address these issues was demonstrated by the resumption of the NATO-Russia Council as well as the EU’s unblocking and successful completion of the Nord Stream pipeline (against in fact stalled EU-initiated Nabucco project).

Fourthly, Russia has taken advantage of the U.S., NATO and EU interest towards partnership building and is seeking to strengthen its influence in Europe, attempting to develop its own global and regional system of balances. By the example of the Russia-Georgia war Moscow demonstrated to the West that the latter should consider the Russian interests whereas it is able to defend its strategic interests by force. At the same time, Russia is trying to press the Euro-Atlantic community concerning the necessity of the European security parameters revision towards a more liberal model, which has to enhance Russia’s role and status accordingly. In fact, the Kremlin demands the veto power at the Euro-Atlantic club of states’ decision-making table.

President Medvedev’s initiative concerning a new European Security Treaty establishing an indivisible security area from Vancouver to Vladivostok, which, according to Moscow, will draw the line to the “Cold War”, is a logical continuation of Russia’s policy towards occupying a fitting place in the region. However, it has not gone much further than discussions yet. The next step has turned out to be too difficult for the parties concerned.

Having approached the point of maximum convergence on the issues, whose resolution was what actually “reset” had been launched for, Russia and the West started to diverge from each other once again. Most characteristically: the U.S. did not abandon the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system in Europe, having only adjusted its approaches, while Russia declared the concept of “Eurasian Union” as a key element of Vladimir Putin’s foreign policy program. In turn, the “Arab Spring” exposed the compelling differences of values and ideologies demonstrated in reaction to these events from both sides.

Fifthly, one should mention that the strengthening role of such regional players as Poland, Romania, Turkey de facto have modified inter-regional relations and have begun to considerably influence the European security regional agenda. At the same time, growing rivalry for regional leadership within the existing global framework can be noticed.

For example, Romania’s NATO and EU membership has only stirred up some Romanian politicians’ feelings concerning the revanchist “Great Romania” ideology, an expansion in the direction of Moldova and in the Black Sea area. Predictably, these sentiments are fuelled in the light of BMD interceptor missiles and appropriate U.S. military and civilian personnel deployment⁵ on the Romanian soil in addition to the already existing U.S. military presence, threatening with growing conflict potential Ukraine-Romania relations. Under these conditions, Ukraine objectively will not be able to defend its national interests effectively enough relying solely upon the mechanisms of cooperation with NATO, the EU and the U.S. as long as Bucharest has institutional and strategic advantages in all three directions.

Poland, one of the most important strategic partners of Ukraine, is increasingly gaining credibility and weight not only in Europe but also worldwide. It is facilitated first of all by its achievements in economy (against the background of many countries’ falling economies due to the economic crisis its achievements are particularly impressive) and foreign policy. Poland assertively and with good reason claims status as a leading regional center of power projecting its capabilities especially in the eastern direction.

Ukrainian-Polish understanding of and reconciliation with the complexities of the past, reached during the last decades; Warsaw’s ambition to help

⁵ U.S. Department of State Fact Sheet: U.S.-Romania Missile Defense Agreement, U.S. Department of State Office of the Spokesperson, September 13, 2011, <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2011/09/20110913135719su0.7217022.html#axzz1dVzwOBwu> (accessed November 12, 2011)

bring Ukraine as close as possible to the EU; joint projects in the economic and energy spheres – all have determined Poland’s special role for our country and have created a reliable basis for further cooperation.

Turkey’s position is being strengthened in the region with the help of its own experience of modernization through modern versatile development techniques where emphasis is put on regional economic interests, and the power of private capital.

The increased activity of Turkey in the international arena was “sanctioned” by the Western allies to fulfill two functions: to be a stronghold of the West in its penetration into geo-strategically important regions and to be a buffer, “which prevents expansion of radical Islamic fundamentalism and extremism⁶.”

Motives for Ukraine’s rapprochement with Turkey appear quite reasonable. Turkey is a key country for Ukraine and the natural partner to the south. The country is not only a powerful regional player in the political and security field, but also is a huge market and economy that is developing dynamically. However, the duality of the situation is that in some important areas Ukraine and Turkey can be both partners and competitors as their interests and capabilities intersect.

Ukraine in fact has found itself all alone in front of the challenges of enormous international transformations (*first of all dynamic processes of establishing informal geopolitical and geo-economic groupings, increasing competition around the geopolitics of energy transportation corridors, emergence of new regional leaders with their own agenda*). It seems that the world’s leading players (the U.S., NATO and the EU) have lost or have been reviewing their strategic interest in it at least in the medium term.

The Black Sea Region: a security dimension for Ukraine

In general, the world’s transformation into a more conflict generating area and the increased confrontation in regions previously considered as relatively stable, have led to the formation of closer regional alliances.

In the post-bipolar world, the geopolitical and geo-economic situation in the Black Sea Region has undergone dramatic change. This has not only attracted the attention of international players, but also raised a challenge to

⁶ Vorotnyuk, M., Turkish Euro-Atlantic Policy: Lessons for Ukraine, Strategic Priorities, #3. – 2007

the new independent states to develop an effective regional policy on a background of a complex state building process.

Different transition dynamics within these countries, the complicated ethno-political components of the region, its geopolitical location and many other factors cause considerable conflict potential for the region. Thus, the countries of the region face a difficult task to adapt to new realities, to achieve and maintain cooperative interaction, despite the existing destabilizing factors⁷.

For Ukraine, the urgency of these issues is obvious, since in order to ensure the Ukrainian national interests in the Black Sea Region all these processes must be taken into account. This includes primarily the development of friendly dialogue with key countries in the region and external players present here.

Since Romania's and Bulgaria's accession in 2007, the European Union is no longer an external but a key internal player in the Black Sea Region. Similarly, their joining NATO in 2004 resulted in the strengthening of the North Atlantic Alliance's presence in the region.

The changing role of Russia and its relations with other regional players have caused a major geopolitical transformation herein. An objective decrease of Russia's role in the Black Sea Region after the Cold War has limited the leverage of its influence. Despite this, Moscow continues to regard the region as a sphere of its strategic interests. This is shown in its efforts to preserve its influence on the political processes in the neighboring countries as well as in its energy policy which is used as an instrument of pressure.

Key disputes of modern international relations have unfolded around energy resources – their fields, routes and means of transportation. Consequently ensuring energy security has become a cornerstone of foreign policy. Therefore, the Black Sea Region, rich in energy reserves and with an extensive transport network, is at the forefront of world politics and has become a major sphere of the strategic interests of the great powers.

The worldwide trend of extremist and separatist aggravation has not bypassed this region either.

The geopolitical transformations mentioned above have changed the strategic environment in the region and complicated the configuration of forces

⁷ Vorotnyuk, M., Ukraine and Turkey in the Context of Geopolitical Transformations in the Black Sea Region, Strategic Priorities, #1 – 2009

and alliances. Countries of the region face a difficult task adapting to new realities and developing an effective foreign policy.

The indefinitely delayed NATO membership for Georgia, the non-alignment declared by Ukraine and the neutrality of Moldova show the diversity of the security paradigms and the heterogeneity of the political-security environment of the Black Sea Region, which lies on the watershed between the prosperous West and the problematic East. While the CEE region is largely homogeneous in this context and in fact represents the core of countries that have implemented a successful European project, and is sought by those who currently remain outside the EU expansion plans, the BSR is characterized by the dominance of corruption, organized crime, intensive traffic in persons, illicit drugs and arms trafficking, fully deserving its definition as a “criminal hub”.

Along the perimeter of the Black Sea there are a number of so-called “**frozen**” conflicts and hot spots that might at any moment destabilize the situation in the region and beyond. Moreover, except the Transnistria conflict the rest of them pertain to important existing energy supply routes or are associated with future ambitious energy transportation projects.

Solution of the **Nagorno-Karabakh conflict** depends on the joint good will and understanding between Moscow, Ankara, Baku and Yerevan. Against the background of a long muscle flexing on both sides of the border, there is still a threat of escalation or “unfreezing” the conflict. Concerned with prospects of increased Turkish influence in the Caucasus and the need for dialogue with Baku as opposed to steps forward between Ankara and Yerevan, Moscow has undertaken active efforts in recent years in order to reach an understanding at the highest level and to define an eventual framework for the settlement. Nevertheless, the lack of practical achievements and Moscow’s inability to bring both parties of the conflict to tangible agreement have resulted in another round of rapprochement between Baku and Ankara marked with the signing of a new natural gas delivery deal⁸. However, the gas supply issues in Moscow-Baku and Moscow-Ankara relations require separate consideration.

As objective analysis shows, **Abkhazia** and **South Ossetia** have become cut off from Georgia for an indefinite period. It is difficult to imagine a more or less likely scenario of their de facto return under Georgia’s sovereignty

⁸ Cutler, R.M., Dr., Azerbaijan, Turkey signs gas delivery deal, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central_Asia/MJ28Ag01.html (accessed October 26, 2011)

in the foreseeable future. Russian intervention and its recognition of their independence and its military presence have fixed a “post-2008” situation unrecognized by the international community, reducing at the same time the possibility of a new major armed confrontation.

The Transnistrian conflict is so to speak the most “frozen” among the rest of the region’s ones but also, according to many, the most promising in terms of a possible peaceful solution. However, a lot will depend on the development of internal processes, both in the Transnistria and in Moldova in general, as well as in Russia, which has the most powerful leverage on the situation in the unrecognized Transnistrian Moldovan Republic. Optimistic expectations have been associated with increased attention from the EU, which is interested in the resolution of disputes on its borders for the continuation of “success stories”, as well as with the newly-elected Transnistrian leader whose promising declarations and ambitions have revived the hope for building lasting and goal-oriented dialogue between the both banks of Dniester.

Russia’s military presence in Georgia and Moldova, which in itself changes the balance of power and creates obstacles for reaching compromises, deserves special attention. In the case of Moldova’s Transnistrian region, Russian military presence contradicts commitments Russia made at the 1999 Istanbul OSCE summit, to withdraw by 2002. The presence of the Russian troops in Georgia’s breakaway regions – Abkhazia and South Ossetia after the 2008 war is not regulated by any internationally recognized agreements at all.

In addition to the above-mentioned conflicts, one should not forget about the ongoing terrorist threat and tensions in the Russian North Caucasus and the Kurdish issue in Turkey, which escalated again during the summer-autumn of 2011.

Implementation of the United States’ plans to deploy elements of missile defense in Poland, Romania and Turkey is extremely urgent and potentially stressful not only to regional but also to global security. Lack of progress in negotiations between the U.S. and Russia concerning missile defense in Europe as well as the inability to resolve the existing contradictions may lead to radical political and military decisions by the Russian leadership⁹. This may occur as the Kremlin’s response to Washington’s anti-missile plans, which,

⁹ Lavrov, S., Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, “Evening News” (Serbia), November 1, 2011, http://www.mid.ru/bdcomp/brp_4.nsf/2fee282eb6df40e643256999005e6e8c/c54fd02dab0948654425793b0038181d!OpenDocument (accessed November 5, 2011)

according to Moscow, testify to the U.S. intentions to jeopardize the strategic stability in the world to their advantage. In particular, it was already announced that there is a possibility of Russia's withdrawal from the New START treaty¹⁰ if the deployment process of missile defense in Europe becomes "irreversible", providing for Russia's reservations to the Treaty made at the signing of new START¹¹. However, such steps looked more like pre-election rhetoric which needs to be clarified after the new President of Russia comes to power.

The newly-approved Russian 2011-2020 weapons program, the development of new and the modernization of existing intercontinental ballistic missiles (land-based and submarine-launched), the development of air and space defenses including missile attack early warning systems, the announced development and introduction of advanced missile defense penetration means, the drawing up of measures for disabling the missile defense system data and its command and control systems¹², etc. have all displayed Russia's reaction to the ongoing implementation of U.S.-NATO missile shield plans¹³.

The role of the Black Sea Region as the current and potential energy bridge between the EU and the East conditions its importance and reinforces geo-economic and geopolitical competition. In practice, this translates into competition of existing and planned pipelines routes and their filling sources. Given the reduction of U.S. influence in the region, the differences between the EU member states, the dossier of unresolved interstate and ethnic conflicts in the Caucasus and the Middle East, Russia has maintained a dominant position skillfully speculating on the tensions between the key

¹⁰ Ozerov, V., Head of the State Duma of the Russian Federation Defence and Security Committee, November 1, 2011, http://ria.ru/defense_safety/20111101/477538882.html

¹¹ 1. Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (New START), signed April 4, 2010, entered into force February 5, 2011

2. Statement of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation "Concerning the Position of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on the Issues of Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms", January 25, 2011, <http://duma.consultant.ru/page.aspx?1543983> (accessed November 5, 2011)

3. Statement of the Russian Federation on Missile Defence, April 4, 2010, http://news.kremlin.ru/ref_notes/511 (accessed November 5, 2011)

¹² Statement by the President of Russia Dmitry Medvedev in connection with the situation concerning the NATO countries' missile defence system in Europe, November 23, 2011, <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/3115> (accessed November 24, 2011)

¹³ Kazimirov, V., The Kremlin warns that Moscow's patience has its limits, November 25, 2011, http://en.rian.ru/international_affairs/20111125/169028065.html (accessed December 2, 2011)

regional players, using the resource dependence of European consumers and its own control over the supply infrastructure.

Naturally, Turkey has significant potential to become the “energy hub” for Europe. Cooperation with Azerbaijan and the recent agreement on gas deliveries from the “Shah Deniz” field (project “Shah Deniz-2”) underpin these ambitions. However, Ankara’s opportunities are also limited due to complicated regional context.

Experts note that the major regional challenges are the need for further profound political and economic reforms, worrisome demographic and migration trends, existing conflict zones, severe competition in the energy sphere, widespread organized crime, human and drugs trafficking and illicit arms trade¹⁴. However, the Baltic Sea-Black Sea axis represents a space where ideas of democracy and good governance have better prospects, and therefore a distribution potential to the South and East.

A successful scenario for the region should provide a final implementation of the European idea, i.e. the reunification of the region as a part of United Europe with a corresponding increase of Europe’s own chances for continued success and the strengthening of its position as a global player.

The security environment of the Black Sea Region is directly subjected to the strategic balance between Russia and the West (EU-NATO-U.S.) in their efforts to promote their competitive interests within the region. Unfortunately, in the absence of effective European agendas, able to meet the requirements of very different regional players, there is little chance of a change in Russia’s vision and strategic approaches for the Black Sea Region.

The second largest player in the region – Turkey, will remain in a position of controversial symbiosis between its Euro-Atlantic identity and its growing affinity towards classical imperial-style nationalism aimed at expansion of its influence in the Middle East, Caucasus and Central Asia.

Prior to the Russian-Georgian war, there was a strong tendency towards integration of the region into the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. However, the sharp differences between the European capitals, the active policy of Moscow, as well as Ukraine’s declaration of “non-alignment” hampered the process.

¹⁴ Khara, O., *Emerging Security Architecture of the Black Sea Region*, Seaford House Paper, Royal College of Defence Studies, UK, 2010, <http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/ABF5EDBE-BE57-4C8E-AAD7-824413534371/0/SHP2010KHARA.pdf> (accessed November 12, 2011)

Thereby, under the circumstances of the uncertain future of the Euro-Atlantic and European vectors, with the accumulation of common problems there is a growing need for new regional security architecture, which in cooperation with the EU, NATO and the U.S. could face the challenges and use available opportunities for the benefit of all.

Key elements of Ukraine's security policy

Implementing its European integration ambitions Ukraine should take into account the international reality that has formed. Its own security policy should be developed based on the current tendencies in this sphere.

In particular, Ukraine remains under the growing pressure of differently directed centers of influence. However, in the post-bipolar framework the situation is much more complicated than in the 90's – a time when there was a choice between the East and West. First of all, it is determined by the logic of contradictions between Russia and the EU, and Russia and the U.S. that is fundamentally different now.

It is practically impossible for Ukraine to ensure its security in the modern world entirely alone. The current state of its economy, finances, Armed Forces and other components of the security sector does not allow for the fulfilling of this task effectively.

Taking into account its declared non-aligned status, Ukraine's perspectives of entering a not imaginary but effective European security system should be linked first of all to the Common Security and Defence Policy with its military component as well as with further expansion of its conflict settlement activity area beyond Europe. Whereas this policy is considered complementary to NATO, though not duplicating it, the EU is developing not only as a "soft" but also as a "hard power".

Implementing its EU integration policy, and maintaining and developing cooperation with NATO, Ukraine has to exert efforts in order to take part in shaping new regional and pan-European balances of power able to include deterrent capabilities concerning old as well as new threats and challenges.

Under present conditions, Ukraine urgently needs at least unequivocal security assurances if not clear legal guarantees from the U.S. and other key partners in the West including NATO and the EU as international bodies as well as from Russia, in the context of an elaboration of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum and other international security instruments concerning

Ukraine. The best possible outcome can be seen as concluding a network of bilateral legally binding agreements guaranteeing certain actions by the UN Security Council member-states and other contracting parties in case of armed aggression against Ukraine or any other kind of hostile action from any state against Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and security. Ukraine fully deserves to obtain such assurances, first of all because of it being the one and only country in history which voluntarily abandoned its nuclear potential.

Responding to contemporary challenges and threats in terms of Ukraine's integration into the global economic and political system requires the formation of a new system of national security. It should match the scale of the threats, and be effectively integrated into the systems of international and regional security. At the same time, fundamental principles of human rights and rule of law remain especially important for a democratic state.

As was stated by the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich, the situation concerning the international security regimes, which have provided strategic stability for decades, has deteriorated recently. According to the head of state, the influence of international security institutions, notably the UN and OSCE, needs to be strengthened, while the days when security issues were solved based on regional blocs and alliances are now over. Under these conditions, the importance of global mechanisms of coordinating different countries' positions and developing common approaches to tackle the problems of modernity is objectively growing. Therefore, a new, more effective mechanism of international cooperation that guarantees each country's security – from East to West – is needed¹⁵.

Conclusions

1. In the short- and medium-term, in order to create better security conditions in its neighborhood, Ukraine's foreign and security policy should focus on the following areas:

- Persistent advancement of the European integration agenda bringing our country closer to the European standards in all spheres as well as

¹⁵ President of Ukraine Speech at the 8th Yalta European Strategy Annual Meeting, September 06, 2011, <http://www.president.gov.ua/news/21215.html> (accessed November 11, 2011)

reinforced cooperation with NATO as technically beneficial and based on commonly shared values;

- Maintaining a high level of Ukrainian-Polish cooperation, particularly in the context of European integration, as well as with other European partners;
- Resolution of the Ukrainian-Romanian relations issues based on good neighborliness and finding mutually acceptable compromises;
- Active participation in the Transnistrian settlement in order to protect national interests in any possible scenarios of its evolution;
- Building constructive and equitable relations with Russia;
- Developing a strategic partnership with Turkey;
- Completion of the legal regulation of a state borders regime;
- Promoting national interests, both political and economic, in the Caucasus and the Middle East;
- Ensuring dialogue with the world's leading nations whose interests are present in this region.

2. Dynamic changes associated with globalization have created new challenges and threats. Regional security policy should take account of these global changes, while the system of regional security should respond appropriately and flexibly to new challenges and threats.

3. One of the most important features of the present that requires special attention is the shift of the center of gravity from the classic threats (including armed invasion) to atypical (asymmetric) threats originating from non-state entities.

4. Intensification of the struggle for natural resources has become a real and growing security challenge at global and regional levels.

5. The interests of the most powerful states, relations between which have not yet acquired a lasting positive character, are objectively present in the Black Sea-Caspian Sea region, complicating the formation of a security architecture at the regional level.

6. One of the important strategic goals of the security policy of Ukraine is to obtain legally binding guarantees from nuclear powers for certain actions in case of armed aggression against Ukraine or any other kind of hostile action from any state against Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and security.

7. Indisputable respect for the fundamental principles of human rights and rule of law has become especially important with the development of Ukraine's national security system.

Bibliography

1. Cutler, R.M., Azerbaijan, Turkey Signs Gas Delivery Deal, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central_Asia/MJ28Ag01.html
2. Horbulin, V., Security of Ukraine 2010, http://uf.org.ua/books/1758494_bezpeka%202010.pdf
3. Kazimirov, V., The Kremlin Warns That Moscow's Patience Has Its Limits, November 25, 2011, http://en.rian.ru/international_affairs/20111125/169028065.html
4. Kearns, I., Beyond the United Kingdom: Trends in the Other Nuclear Armed States, Discussion Paper 1 of the BASIC Trident Commission, 2011, <http://www.basicint.org/sites/default/files/commission-briefing1.pdf>
5. Khara, O., Emerging Security Architecture of the Black Sea Region, Seaford House Paper, Royal College of Defence Studies, UK, 2010, <http://www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/ABF5EDBE-BE57-4C8E-AAD7-824413534371/0/SHP-2010KHARA.pdf>
6. U.S. Department of State Fact Sheet: U.S.-Romania Missile Defense Agreement, U.S. Department of State Office of the Spokesperson, September 13, 2011
7. Vorotnyuk, M., Turkish Euro-Atlantic Policy: Lessons for Ukraine, Strategic Priorities, #3 – 2007
8. Vorotnyuk, M., Ukraine and Turkey in the Context of Geopolitical Transformations in the Black Sea Region, Strategic Priorities, #1 – 2009

EURO 2012 Security as a Joint Task of Poland and Ukraine – A Challenge for National and International Security Systems

KRZYSZTOF LIEDEL

*Deputy Director, Department of Legal and Non-Military Affairs,
National Security Bureau*

PAULINA PIASECKA

*Head of the Unit for Public Safety,
Department of Legal and Non-Military Affairs,
National Security Bureau*

This article is dedicated to issues of organization of security and hosting the UEFA European Football Championships EURO 2012. A difficult security environment and challenges associated with both internal and external threats mean that the organization of mass sporting events on the scale of EURO 2012 is a complex undertaking. It requires careful preparation and attention to detail. The main objective of this article is to present the Polish vision for the security of the tournament, specifically the bodies responsible for its protection, and to point out the main undertakings within this area. A particular point of interest will be the application of the Polish-Ukrainian cooperation. It is essential to ensure the safety of such an event, which is international in its nature (organized in two countries, participation of teams representing 16 countries, and the participation of supporters from many countries both inside and outside Europe).

The preparations of both Ukraine and Poland concerning the organization and security of EURO 2012 are well advanced¹. The two nations have engaged the appropriate organizational structures, legal foundations, divisions and resources necessary to carry out this enormous venture. Support has also been offered by prominent institutions and international organizations.

¹ This article was written at the turn of 2011/2012, during a process of change within the organization of public administration in Poland; this overview may eventually lead to a change in responsibilities for the execution of certain tasks under the organization of EURO 2012.

The most important threats existing to the security of the tournament and the safety of its participants can be identified as terrorism, crime (including organized crime), cybercrime, illegal migration, hooligan incidents and natural/technological disasters.

The international dimension of the event is of particular concern in the context of these risks. Even under the normal functioning of each state the security systems of both Poland and Ukraine are vulnerable to those risks. Therefore, it is understandable to undertake a number of challenges in terms of strengthening these systems in time for EURO 2012. This will be a time when in addition to their own interests and citizens in their own states, the states organizers will be responsible for organizing events which will include projects on the territory of two countries, with the participation of teams representing 16 different nations, and also with the participation of fans from many European countries and beyond. It is important to remember that among the fans will not only be “ordinary citizens”. Heads of state and government officials will also be present which may also add to the challenge. It will require an increase in the number of necessary security measures and forces.

Responsible bodies and institutions

The Prime Minister has entrusted the Minister of Sport and Tourism with the task of initiating, coordinating and conducting all activities necessary for the preparation and organization of EURO 2012. The Ministry has established a specific Euro 2012 Office. It is responsible for all matters relating to preparations for the hosting of the tournament. Programs are implemented with the cooperation of two Treasury Companies – The National Sports Centre and PL.2012².

The security preparations of the finals of the EURO 2012 tournament are the responsibility of the following entities³:

- Ministry of Interior (MSW),
- National Coordinator of the Company PL.2012,
- Safety and Security Coordinators in host cities,

² Portal of the Ministry of Sport and Tourism of the Republic of Poland, <http://msport.gov.pl/euro-2012> (accessed 23 January 2012)

³ Integrated Security Concept of UEFA EURO 2012™ WARSAW, p. 10, <http://uefaeuro2012.um.warszawa.pl/sites/euro2012.um.warszawa.pl/files/ZKB.pdf> (accessed 23 January 2012)

- Manager of Safety and Security for the Company POLAND EURO 2012.

The Ministry of Interior is responsible for coordinating the work of all other ministries and central offices, which are involved in preparation for the tournament and carry out tasks in their areas of responsibility. These institutions fulfill tasks within the appropriate fields. The main task of the Internal Security Agency in relation to the security of EURO 2012 is the prevention of terrorist threats. The Ministry of Defence is responsible for the security of sea borders and the nation's airspace. The Military Police will also provide support to the Police. The efficient and effective functioning of the national health service and rescue services remains the task of the Ministry of Health. The Ministry of Infrastructure (whose duties in this respect are likely to be taken over by the Ministry of Transport, Construction and Maritime Affairs after the changes in the organization of the Polish government) is responsible for tasks associated with the preparation of transport infrastructure⁴. Other departments are to deal with selected issues within their competence. The Ministry of Finance will coordinate the work of the Customs Service. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall conduct the activities associated with the visa procedures. Finally the Ministry of Justice is responsible for the functioning of the courts during EURO 2012, especially concerning the changes introduced by new laws on safety of mass events. The Government Security Centre (RCB) is the national center for crisis management.

The body responsible for coordinating the preparations in the area of security appointed on 12th May 2010 is the UEFA EURO 2012 Committee for Safety and Security⁵. The committee's task is "Coordination of the activities of Government bodies, including their interaction with Local Authorities and other entities, to ensure the safety and security of the UEFA European Football Championship EURO 2012."⁶ The Committee⁷ can be headed by the Secretary of State or the Undersecretary of State assigned by the Ministry of Interior. The head will be assisted by the Secretary of State or

⁴ Ibid, p. 11

⁵ Regulation No. 33 of the Prime Minister of 12 May 2010 for the UEFA EURO 2012 Committee for safety and Security http://bip.kprm.gov.pl/palm/kpr/13/280/Komitet_do_spraw_Bezpieczenstwa_Mistrzostw_Europy_w_Pilce_Nozonej_UEFA_EURO_2012.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

⁶ Ibid

⁷ Ibid

the Undersecretary of State from the Ministry of Sport and Tourism. Other members include:

- a) One representative, with the rank of Secretary of State or Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the Minister of Finance, Minister of Infrastructure, Minister of National Defence, Minister of Justice, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Minister of Health,
- b) Secretariat of the Chancellery of the Prime Minister,
- c) The Head of the Internal Security Agency,
- d) The Attorney General,
- e) The Commander in Chief of the State Fire Service,
- f) The Commander in Chief of Police,
- g) The Commander in Chief of the Border Guards,
- h) The Head of the Government Protection Bureau,
- i) The Head of the Customs Service,
- j) The Commander in Chief of the Military Police,
- k) The Director of the Government Centre for Security,
- l) The Governors of Lower Silesia, Lublin, Mazowieckie, Podkarpackie, Pomerania, and Wielkopolska Voivodeships.

Tadeusz Zygmunt has been appointed as the representative of UEFA EURO 2012 Committee for Safety and Security. The head of the Committee invites representatives of host cities, and a representative of the Company PL.2012 to participate in the work of the committee with rights of a member. In advisory roles within the Committee the head might invite: a representative of the Polish President, a representative of the Polish Football Association, a representative of POLAND EURO 2012, a representative of Ukraine (if the subject of the Committee's work relates to matters concerning Ukraine), a representative of UEFA (if the subject of the Committees work concerns issues requiring UEFA's cooperation), or any other parties whose knowledge and experience could be useful in carrying out the tasks of the Committee.

Key security projects

Tasks in the area of safety and security for EURO 2012 are the subject of one of eight strategic programs that are in place for the overall preparation of the tournament. Safety related tasks belong to the fourth program, which concerns coordination to ensure the safe conditions for the conduct of the tournament (personal and public safety / medical care and rescue).

The activities carried out under the program include⁸:

- Coordination of the development and implementation of an Integrated Safety and Security Concept in areas agreed with UEFA,
- Coordination of the development of a plan to create a network of fixed and mobile “Fans Embassies” for the duration of the tournament,
- Developing a plan and coordinating the creation of supporter coaching centers for fans of local football teams – the name of the project is “Fans Together”,
- Coordination and implementation of the organizational structure within the area of medical care,
- Coordination and emergency medical services within all official UEFA EURO 2012™ sites,
- Coordination of medical emergencies and rescue services,
- Coordination of the preparation of designated hospitals,
- Coordination of Primary and Specialist outpatient medical care,
- Coordination of sanitary-epidemiological safety and public health,
- Preparation in the case of a mass incident,
- Coordination of the preparation of an information strategy in the field of medical care and rescue,
- Coordination of standardized preparation for Fan Zones and public areas for spectators to watch matches.

The Integrated Safety and Security Concept forms the basis of the activities carried out in Poland to ensure the security of the event, and was developed by the Safety and Security Committee. The main objective for its creation was to identify all areas, responsibilities and actions to be carried out by each and every party in order to ensure maximum safety and security of all sports and social events that take place within the framework of EURO 2012. The first version of the UEFA Concept presented in June 2009 had to be revised as it was not considered satisfactory. The main challenges identified in the Integrated Safety and Security Concept of EURO 2012 include: the preparation of infrastructure of stadiums, the introduction of high standards of safety management at the stadiums, the development and implementation of a new quality of policing along with event safety information

⁸ Report on the implementation of EURO 2012 and the activities carried out concerning the implementation of Polish preparations for the European Championship finals tournament EURO 2012™ (December 2010 – June 2011), the portal of the Ministry of Sport and Tourism of the Republic of Poland (accessed 23 January 2012)

services at football matches, testing of solutions in tournament conditions, prevention of crime (including organized crime) and hooligan incidents, as well as improving the sporting culture (through the implementation of social programs)⁹.

The key players responsible for the security of the tournament and the implementation of projects that make up the Safety and Security Program for UEFA EURO 2012 are¹⁰:

- The Ministry of Interior and Administration – responsible for ensuring safety and security within the territory of Poland and the protection of its borders,
- The Polish Football Association and its Company POLAND EURO 2012 – responsible for safety and security at stadiums and at other Official UEFA sites,
- Host cities – whose task is the creation of welcoming public spaces and “Fan Zones”,
- The Treasury Company PL.2012, established by the Ministry of Sport and Tourism – responsible for the coordination of all activities.

All projects carried out for the safety of the tournament lead to the implementation of the basic motto “Have fun – feel safe”.

The achievement of this not only involves the members of the Safety and Security Committee of EURO 2012. Another important party needed is the Security Council for Sports Events which was appointed by the Prime Minister in September 2008¹¹. The Council is a subsidiary body of the Prime Minister. Its tasks include the coordination of projects aimed at preventing acts of violence and an inter-institutional approach to safety. This forms a platform for cooperation between administrations, including the police, communities and sports fans. The Council also takes the responsibility for the implementation of prevention programs, developing procedures for cooperation, performing initiatives related to security, and for the cooperation with the Standing Committee of the Council of Europe for Security at sporting events.

Additional institution that should also be mentioned is the International Advisory and Evaluation Team for Euro 2012 Security set up by Adam

⁹ Information Material MSWiA in the possession of DPiBP (National Security Bureau).

¹⁰ PL.2012 portal, <http://www.2012.org.pl/pl/organizacja/bezpieczenstwo/zintegrowana-koncepcja-bezpieczenstwa.html> (accessed 23 January 2012)

¹¹ Portal Infor.pl, http://samarzad.infor.pl/zadania/sport_i_turystyka/artykuly/500172,mswia_przygotowania_do_euro_2012.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

Rapacki in January 2010¹². The main task of this body is to carry out the analysis process concerning the progress of Polish Security of EURO 2012. This type of body has also been established in other countries that have carried out the task of organization of sports events of a similar nature.

In addition to analyzed bodies of a coordinating and advisory capacity, important tasks in the preparation of EURO 2012 security services are implemented by various Polish institutions, in particular those belonging to the Ministry of Interior. The fundamental task in the area of public order, safety and security will be implemented by the Polish Police, based on a philosophy of the Chief of Police, known as the “3xT” – (Troska, Tolerancja, Tłumienie) Care, Tolerance and Suppression¹³:

- **Care** – concerns the activities of Police officers during EURO 2012. It conveys a servicing role for supporters, which should be expressed by taking care of them (the task also includes informing fans of the adopted communication and safety solutions, law enforcement, assistance, and possible difficulties – especially to fans from outside of Poland)

- **Tolerance** – it involves the treatment of fans (mostly in city streets) in a understanding manner and to take into account the specific atmosphere of the tournament. This moves away from responding strictly to minor misdemeanors and to show more tolerance while trying to establish dialogue with supporters

- **Suppression** – as a last resort, Police prevention subunits act quickly and decisively. Their task is the precise intervention as and when needed (e.g. mass public disorder). Involving the detention of people when deemed necessary for breaking the law and for acts of aggressive. This is to be followed by the withdrawal of forces and restoring order.

There are many specific tasks to be performed by the Police during Euro 2012 which include¹⁴:

- The checking of the stadiums for explosive devices before handing over the stadium to the UEFA administration. Also prior to each match;

¹² Portal Board of Security for sporting Events, http://rada.bis.gov.pl/portal/rbi/397/1394/Czlonkowie_Miedzynarodowego_Zespolu__DoradczcoOceniajaco_ds_Bezpieczenstwa_EURO_2.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

¹³ Portal National Information Point for Sporting Events, Polish Police, http://kpk.policja.gov.pl/portal/kpk/33/220/Przygotowania_polskiej_Policji_do_Euro_2012.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

¹⁴ Proceedings of the national conference on safety at Polish sports arenas, Bydgoszcz 2011, the presentation by Michał Listkiewicz, <http://www.bezpiecznestadiony.eu/images/Michal-Listkiewicz.pdf>

- The search of vehicles for explosive devices entering the territory of the stadium on match days;
- Integrated management of security at the stadium with the presence of the Commander and the Deputy Commander of Police operations in the Command Position at the stadium;
- The presence of “friendly” uniformed police officers at the stadium;
- Integrated cooperation with the safety and information services;
- The presence of so-called “Spotters” in and around the stadium;
- The presence of riot units in the immediate vicinity of the stadium.

A significant portion of these tasks will be implemented in cooperation with the Border Guard due to the fact that EURO 2012 is an international event. Organizing the effective yet safe movement of people across the borders of Poland during this period will be one of the most important conditions for the success of the whole event. Among the tasks carried out by the Police and Border Guard those deserving attention in particular are¹⁵:

- Joint use of available resources to control the roads leading from the border patrol stations, securing trains carrying fans and the protection of transport hubs;
- Monitoring the movement of groups of supporters, as well as persons who may pose a threat to public order and safety;
- Joint ventures, training, simulations and exercises associated with the restoration of security and public order.

The tasks carried out independently by the Border Guard, whose implementation will be necessary during the EURO 2012 include¹⁶:

- Checking of organized groups with lanes dedicated to this purpose and new border crossing points;
- Preventing the entry of undesirable persons who may pose a threat to public order and safety;
- Controlling security of international traffic, especially air traffic, in order to exclude the possibility of terrorist attacks;
- Supporting the activities of organizational units of the Border Guard in separate sections of the state borders by allocating additional forces and resources.

¹⁵ Ministry of Interior portal, http://www.msw.gov.pl/portal/pl/378/4617/REALIZACJA_ZADAN_PRZEZ_STRAZ_GRANICZNA_W_RAMACH_EURO_2012.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

¹⁶ *ibid*

Activities in the legal area

An important element of the efforts to secure EURO 2012 was also to revise the Polish Act on safety of mass events. The amendment, which entered into force on 12 November 2011, supplemented the Law with a new section entitled “Ensuring security in connection with the organization of the UEFA EURO 2012 Finals Tournament”. The Act contains provisions on the specific powers of the Police in relation to the tournament, as well as other provisions covering other public safety services, such as the Border Guards, State Fire Service, and the Government Protection Bureau.

Among the major changes introduced by the amendment it should be noted that on this basis Police may search, receive, collect, process, check and use information, including personal data about persons posing a threat to public order and safety. They can also operate outside the Republic of Poland, where there is a reasonable assumption that the persons will stay on Polish territory. Other data obtained or processed by other bodies, departments and state institutions, also as a result of preliminary investigation, reconnaissance, and data generated or processed by law enforcement agencies of other countries can also be used by Polish Police, even without the knowledge and consent of the data subject¹⁷.

The amendment also contains provisions under which, in the case of people who are prohibited access to mass events, the court may order the convicted person an obligation to remain (for the duration of certain mass events) in a particular place of residence. In particular cases, the court may decide that after the period of sentence expires, he will be obliged to appear (for the duration of certain mass events) in a Police organizational unit or in a location specified by the Commander of the County, District or Municipal Police which is relevant to where the offender resides. The obligation can be summoned for a period of 6 months to 3 years, however not exceeding the period of sentence of the offenders ban from mass events¹⁸.

New rules also apply to the principles of selling, serving and consuming alcoholic beverages. The sale, serving and consuming of alcoholic beverages containing not more than 3.5 per cent of alcohol during mass events (with the exception of high-risk events) is permitted. This can only take place in designated places and be conducted by entities which have a license. The

¹⁷ Act of 31 August 2011 amending the Law on safety of mass events and some other acts, Coll. Laws 2011, No. 217, item. 1280

¹⁸ *ibid*

amendment also extends to the Club bans – they will also apply to mass events conducted with the participation of the hosts team played outside its usual premises, i.e. away games¹⁹.

A further provision of the amendment is the possibility of a decision to discontinue an event in case of failure by the organizer to meet the conditions specified in the permit. Also, the ability to prohibit the conduct of mass events (with audience participation) throughout a facility or any of its sectors (by the Governor of the Voivodeship in the case of a negative safety assessment). Additionally, to present the Governor of Voivodeship with the possibility to stop a mass event in the case that its further progression may endanger the life or health of participants and the actions of the organizer are insufficient to ensure safety²⁰.

Polish-Ukrainian Cooperation

The cooperation of Poland and Ukraine is an extremely important element in ensuring the safety of the tournament. This was initiated in March 2008 with the signing of an agreement between the Government of the Republic of Poland and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on the cooperation in organizing the finals of EURO 2012.

Cooperation in the area of security for EURO 2012 between Poland and Ukraine is also based on:

- A declaration of 21 January 2008 for cooperation on the safety of the UEFA European Football Championship Finals Tournament EURO 2012 by the Minister of Internal Affairs and Administration of the Republic of Poland and the Minister of Internal Affairs of Ukraine;
- The Polish-Ukrainian cooperation in the concept of safety and security of EURO 2012;
- Common guarantees and commitments made in the tender related to the organization of EURO 2012.

¹⁹ Ibid

²⁰ Portal National Information Point for Mass Events, http://kpk.policja.gov.pl/portal/kpk/10/1016/Nowelizacja_ustawy_o_bezpieczenstwie_impresz_masowych.html?search=369389305 (accessed 23 January 2012)

A Polish-Ukrainian Road Map was signed in September 2010, clearly defining areas of cooperation in the framework of preparations for EURO 2012.

The key areas of Polish-Ukrainian²¹ cooperation include: transport links between Poland and Ukraine (air, road and rail), social responsibility (Corporate Social Responsibility Program to develop trilateral cooperation between Poland, Ukraine and UEFA), working with supporters and the work of volunteers in public spaces, coordination of medical support during EURO 2012, cooperation in the field of information, cooperation in terms of image, cooperation of advertising, cooperation of tourism and recreation, safety coordination during EURO 2012 in both Host Nations, and cooperation in the fields of economy and investment²².

International support²³

Security of mass events is a challenge not only for individual countries. Evidence of this can be seen in the European Union research program, “Coordinating National Research Programmes on Security During Major Events in Europe” – EU-SEC²⁴. This program aims to coordinate the corresponding National-level programs that are implemented in different Member States. Among the first members were: Austria (Ministry of Internal Affairs), United Kingdom (Metropolitan Police), Netherlands (Ministry of Justice), Germany (Police Academy), Finland (Ministry of Interior – Police Department), Italy (Ministry of Internal Affairs), Ireland (Police), Spain (Ministry of Internal Affairs), Portugal (Ministry of Internal Affairs), and France (Directorate General of National Police).

In addition to the EU Member States, the European Commission and EUROPOL (European Police Office) are other important players. EU-SEC is a major research project undertaken by the Inter-regional Institute on Crime and Justice of the United Nations in the field of European Securi-

²¹ Portal PL.2012, <http://www.2012.org.pl/pl/euro-2012/wspolpraca-z-ukraina/razem-tworzymy-euro.html> (accessed 23 January 2012)

²² Ibid

²³ Liedel K., Piasecka P., Przygotowanie systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa do organizacji EURO 2012 (Preparation of the state security system for EURO 2012) in: *Bezpieczeństwo Mistrzostw Europy w Piłce Nożnej EURO 2012 (Security UEFA European Football Championship EURO 2012)*, ed. by Liedel K., Piasecka P., Warsaw 2011

²⁴ Full information on the subject of the program is available at <http://www.eu-sec.org>

ty and Counter Terrorism. The program is funded by the EU Directorate General for Research under the ERA-NET.

Europol is preparing an analysis of the risks during the European football championships at the request of Polish authorities. This analysis is used to prepare the respective forces, as well as the concept of direct security for EURO 2012. Moreover, Polish police will use the European database of stadium bans²⁵.

The organizers of EURO 2012 are supported not only by European institutions. On a global level support is offered by the International Criminal Police Organisation, Interpol. The meeting of Polish and Ukrainian Police with representatives of Interpol took place on March 23, 2011. It was primarily designed to familiarize the parties with the current state of security preparations for EURO 2012 and identify areas of cooperation²⁶. The General Secretariat of Interpol presented the tools and services of the Organization, which can be used to improve security during EURO 2012. These include: secure access to Interpol's global communications system I-24 / 7, access to their databases, and the use of the Interpol Major Event Support Team IM-ESTA²⁷. The Interpol General Secretariat also presented the general shape of risk analysis, which can be executed by the appropriate unit, at the request of the State concerned, before events of great importance. Additionally the Interpol General Secretariat presented technical solutions, which would allow the access to Interpol databases for the Polish Border Guard.

Summary

The organization of EURO 2012 in cooperation with Ukraine is one of the biggest challenges facing Poland since the end of the Cold War. This is a landmark event not only because of its enormity and character, but also due to the nature of threats facing the Polish security systems.

It should be noted that in an era of asymmetric threats and new dangers from a variety of sources, the state is faced with unique requirements in

²⁵ PAP, <http://www.2012euro.pap.pl/aktualnosci/news,2419,europol-przygotowuje-analize-ryzykana-turniej.html> (accessed 23 January 2012)

²⁶ Information material on the portal of the Polish Police Headquarters, source: http://www.policja.pl/palm/pol/1/64230/Przygotowania_do_EURO_2012__wspolpraca_miedzynarodowa.html (accessed 23 January 2012)

²⁷ *ibid*

the area of diagnosis and prevention. To build a 100 per cent safe security system securing the state and its citizens is a challenge even in conditions that are not accompanied by an increase in risk factors. The organization of EURO 2012 undoubtedly provides an increase in these risks. Developing appropriate solutions to organizational and operational logistics is a complicated process. This is especially true in the situation where security is to be implemented in circumstances that are incomparably more complex. Protective security measures during the finals tournament will apply not only to the state, its citizens, foreign participants and the entire infrastructure, but also will be implemented in a period of a temporary increase in the number of people residing within the State.

All the more complex issues of the correct functioning of safety systems should be emphasized, as well as mechanisms in multilateral and bilateral cooperation. It will be impossible to guarantee the success of the EURO 2012 finals tournament without their proper functioning – and thus to ensure full success in the undertaking of this project, not only in the dimension of organization or sports, but also in the area of security.

Bibliography

1. Act of 31 August 2011 amending the Law on safety of mass events and some other acts, Coll. Laws 2011, No. 217, item. 1280th
2. Hand-outs posted on the Police Headquarters site, source: http://www.policja.pl/palm/pol/1/64230/Przygotowania_do_EURO_2012__wspolpraca_miedzynarodowa.html
3. Infor.pl portal, http://samorzad.infor.pl/sektor/zadania/sport_i_turystyka/artykuly/500172,mswia_przygotowania_do_euro_2012.html
4. Liedel K., Piasecka P., Przygotowanie systemu bezpieczeństwa państwa do organizacji EURO 2012 (Preparation of the state security system for EURO 2012) in: *Bezpieczeństwo Mistrzostw w Piłce Nożnej EURO 2012*, ed. by Liedel K., Piasecka P., Warsaw 2011
5. National Information Point portal for Mass Events, http://kpk.policja.gov.pl/portal/kpk/10/1016/Nowelizacja_ustawy_o_bezpieczenstwie_impres_masowych.html?search=369389305
6. PAP, <http://www.2012euro.pap.pl/aktualnosci/news,2419,europol-przygotowuje-analize-ryzyka-na-turniej.html>
7. PL.2012 portal, <http://www.2012.org.pl/pl/euro-2012/wspolpraca-z-ukraina/razem-tworzymy-euro.html>

8. PL.2012 portal, <http://www.2012.org.pl/pl/organizacja/bezpieczenstwo/zintegrowana-koncepcja-bezpieczenstwa.html>
9. Portal of the Ministry of Sport and Tourism of the Republic of Poland, <http://msport.gov.pl/euro-2012>
10. Portal of the City of Warsaw, <http://uefaeuro2012.um.warszawa.pl/sites/euro2012.um.warszawa.pl/files/ZKB.pdf>
11. Portal of the Ministry of Interior, http://www.msw.gov.pl/portal/pl/378/4617/REALIZACJA_ZADAN_PRZEZ_STRAZ_GRANICZNA_W_RAMACH_EURO_2012.html
12. Portal of the National Information Point Sports Events Committee of the Polish Police, http://kpk.policja.gov.pl/portal/kpk/33/220/Przygotowania_polskiej_Policji_do_Euro_2012.html
13. Proceedings of the national conference on safety at Polish sports arenas, Bydgoszcz 2011, presentation by Michał Listkiewicz, <http://www.bezpiecznstadiony.eu/images/Michal-Listkiewicz.pdf>
14. Regulation No. 33 of the Prime Minister of 12 May 2010 on the Safety Committee for the UEFA European Football Championship EURO 2012, http://bip.kprm.gov.pl/palm/kpr/13/280/Komitet_do_spraw_Bezpieczenstwa_Mistrzostw_Europy_w_Pilce_Nozonej_UEFA_EURO_2012.html
15. Report on the implementation of Euro 2012 and of activity relating to the implementation of Polish preparations for the European Championships final tournament in the Football Championship EURO 2012™ (December 2010 – June 2011), the portal of the Ministry of Sport and Tourism of the Republic of Poland
16. Security Council portal for Sports Events, http://rada.bis.gov.pl/portal/rbi/397/1394/Czlonkowie_Miedzynarodowego_Zespolu_DoradczoOceniajaco_ds_Bezpieczenstwa_EURO_2.html

Security Challenges and Ukrainian-Polish Cooperation in the Organization of the EURO 2012

VIKTOR SOLOVIOV¹

*Head of Branch for Internal Threats,
Expertise and Analytical Department,
National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine*

This paper analyzes coordination activities of state agencies involved in the preparation and holding of the European Championship 2012 finals in Ukraine, the national regulatory framework that governs the security and safety during this event. The exogenous and endogenous factors that potentially contain a threat to the national security of Ukraine and a possible threat for the championship are determined as well. Security measures jointly developed and undertaken by the Republic of Poland and Ukraine in preparation for EURO 2012 are reviewed. In particular, it covers aspects such as creating a system for the rapid punishment of football hooligans, the functioning of the Ukrainian-Polish border, anti-terrorist security and others.

In Ukraine there are three main focal state structures (see Figure 1) tasked with questions of preparation of the UEFA EURO 2012 finals in Ukraine (hereinafter – EURO 2012), namely:

1) The Committee for the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Football Championship 2012 as an advisory body to the President of Ukraine, which was established to ensure consistent implementation of measures for immediate improvement of the preparation and holding in Ukraine EURO 2012 in accordance with the President of Ukraine Decree dated 2 April 2010, No. 470/2010. The Committee is composed of heads of the central authorities involved in EURO 2012, including the Ministries of Defence, and Internal Affairs, the State Border Guard Service and the Security Service of Ukraine. The Committee is headed by the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich.

¹ E-mail address: vms@rainbow.gov.ua, tel.: +38 044 255 0537

Fig. 1. Scheme of coordination of state agencies in preparation of EURO 2012 in Ukraine



2) The National Agency for the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Football Championship 2012 and the implementation of infrastructure projects (created under the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Resolution of 7 April 2010, No. 298) – the central authority, which is guided by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, represented by the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine.

The tasks of the Agency include:

- a) promoting the development and implementation of state policy and normative regulation of the preparation and implementation of infrastructure projects;
- b) taking measures to coordinate the activities of central and local authorities during the preparation and implementation of infrastructure projects.

3) Interagency Coordination Staff on safety and security – a subsidiary body under the President of Ukraine (established on 10 December 2010 in accordance with the Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 1117/2010), which is charged with promoting optimization for law enforcement authorities, local government organizations, coordination of their activities to

ensure safety and security during the preparation and holding in Ukraine of EURO 2012. The composition of the Staff includes representatives of relevant central executive bodies and authorities, and its head is O.S. Birsan – First Deputy Chairman of the National Agency for the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Championship 2012.

The Interagency Coordination Staff on safety and security and the Staff of international cooperation and coordination of security measures for the preparation and holding in Ukraine of EURO 2012 have an important coordinating role. The priority of the current system of special activities and law enforcement agencies of Ukraine is to provide the comfortable and safe conduct of the EURO 2012 finals. Practical measures of coordinating anti-terrorism efforts both at a national and at an international level include a series of anti-terrorism trainings for possible scenarios of hypothetical terrorist attacks on transport facilities and sports infrastructure of EURO 2012, and on diplomatic missions accredited in Ukraine.

At a meeting of the Staff, which took place in July 2011 with the participation of the President of Ukraine, the issue of security in the fan zone during EURO 2012 was reviewed, especially, the problem of suspicious persons, distribution of functions and powers of the security subjects, and the issue of medical support. Also, air security and the potential creation of the Center for police cooperation was discussed. The Head of the Staff Alexander Birsan informed about regulatory support for EURO 2012: adopted by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine a Law on the Security and Public Order during Mass Sports and Recreational Activities, the revision of the Concept of Safety and Security of EURO 2012, and the drafting of the Comprehensive Action Plan on security in the course of tournament organization.

It should be noted that **according to UEFA requirements, responsibility for safety and security during the EURO 2012 in Ukraine** is borne by the **Ukrainian government**. Its leadership and comprehensive support is essential to ensure the safe conduct of the event, and coordination and integrity is an essential element of safety and security. Directly related to safety and security during the European Championship in 2012 will be seven ministries and departments of Ukraine, namely: the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Internal Affairs, Defense, Health, Emergency, the State Border Guards Service, the Security Service.

In order to optimize international cooperation and coordination of security measures during the EURO 2012, at a meeting of the *National Security and*

Defence Council of Ukraine on 17 November 2010 it was decided to establish an **international agency dedicated to coordinating security measures**.

The Decree of the President of Ukraine of 10 March 2011, No. 278/2011 established the **Staff of international cooperation and coordination of security measures for the preparation and holding of the finals of the European Championship 2012** as a subsidiary body to the President of Ukraine. The Staff's working body is the Antiterrorist Center of the Security Service of Ukraine, which will ensure fulfillment of the staff's assignments.

The main legal acts, which regulate issues of safety and security during EURO 2012 include, first of all, the **Integrated Concept of security and safety during the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Championship 2012**, which was approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine in November 2009 to implement the commitments in accordance with the recommendations of the UEFA. Not only government measures are covered with their provisions, but the algorithm of actions of all non-governmental entities as well.

To accomplish the Concepts:

- A system of security measures at the national and regional level was formed;
- The duties and responsible for planning and implementing security measures and ensuring public order, taken by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Emergency, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Transport Service, the Customs Service and other government agencies and local authorities and agencies in host cities were defined;
- Plans for large-scale comprehensive studies of prevention of disasters and terrorist acts were prepared and implemented;
- The concept of medical support, which is determined in terms of the main ways of providing medical care during the championship in the host cities and the routes of movement, was adopted, as well as medical assistance during emergencies.

The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Decree of 14 April 2010, No. 357 approved the **State Program for the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Championship 2012**, which outlined the tasks of ensuring public order, personal security, anti-terrorism and the creation of modern systems to assist in emergency situations. The above-mentioned tasks are being implemented through sectorial programs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Security Service of Ukraine.

Despite a series of legislative regulations on the preparation and holding of EURO 2012, established relevant coordinating committees, staffs and other structures, the challenges and problematic aspects in the safety and security of the event, of course, exist. *Threats of exogenous origin for EURO 2012*, in particular, and international security in general, include: international terrorism and organized crime, weapons of mass destruction, illegal migration, escalation and intensification of interstate and civil conflicts, which cover newly-created countries all over the world. Currently, Ukraine is a subject of increasing interest for international criminal groups, particularly in the field of money laundering, illegal migration, human trafficking, weapons, hazardous materials, and drugs (The Security Service of Ukraine, 2011).

The main endogenous factor in Ukraine, which negatively affects the preparation and holding of EURO 2012, is the strengthening of the diverse geopolitical influences that destabilize the security environment and threaten national security. Some criminal deeds of resonant character, which occurred in early 2011, indicate a high probability of the intensification of subversive attitudes in society, and the manifestations of political extremism and terrorism. According to the Security Service of Ukraine's data, in 2010, 135 cases with signs of a terrorist nature have been revealed (The Security Service of Ukraine, 2011).

The situation in Ukraine, as in the whole world, is developing dynamically: the closer to EURO 2012, the more new factors of terrorist threats may arise, while the old may lose their relevance.

A potential factor in the aggravation of the socio-political situation is the criminal groups organized on a national basis, which can be used by certain socio-political forces, international extremist organizations to follow their own interests in Ukraine. These problems are likely to cause aggravation of the socio-political situation in the country, which is especially dangerous on the eve of and during the holding in Ukraine of EURO 2012.

According to the leading international intelligence agencies, the threat of committing a terrorist act during the large-scale sporting events such as the Olympics, the World Cup and the EURO Finals has grown three times more serious. The danger of preparation and implementation of terrorist plans are enhanced by specific features of the event: a large number of potential "targets", the relative ease of access to them, the possibility to obtain wide publicity for their actions and their motivations, and so on. The situation also may be complicated by a wide range of targeted methods of influence, suitable for use by terrorist groups: from the direct use of weapons,

Fig. 2. Main challenges of security and safety in preparation for EURO 2012 in Ukraine



causing explosions, acts of arson that are accompanied by taking hostages to causing panic on the stands, fans' unpredictable actions, and in the worst case – the destruction of the technical structures, the audience stands, etc. (the Security Service of Ukraine, 2011).

According to NATO experts, challenges to security and safety in preparation for EURO 2012 in Ukraine, which should be given special attention as to their resolution or mitigation, also should include (see Figure 2):

(1) the language barrier – the vast majority of representatives of public authorities of Ukraine, law enforcement agencies involved in the preparation and holding of EURO 2012 do not possess sufficient command of foreign languages, which complicates the exchange of information, being the key component of ensuring safety and security;

(2) a need to significantly enhance interagency coordination of Ukrainian state bodies, which will provide security during EURO 2012.

In June 2011 at NATO Headquarters (Brussels, Belgium), a regular meeting of the Joint Working Group Ukraine-NATO was held, devoted to discussing the security aspects of preparation and holding in Ukraine of EURO 2012 as well as options for possible assistance of the Alliance to Ukraine in this area. The Chair of the meeting, B. San, Deputy Head of the Department of Defence Policy and Planning, NATO International Secretariat, stressed that the Alliance strongly welcomed the efforts of the Ukrainian side, aimed at ensuring adequate security during the finals of EURO 2012 in Ukraine. Representatives of NATO countries (Poland, Czech Republic, UK, U.S., Spain, Turkey) expressed significant interest and willingness for NATO to support Ukraine's efforts in the successful preparation and holding of EURO 2012. In particular, the representative of Turkey

noted the successful continuation of cooperation with Ukraine on an exchange program – the Air Situation Data that will promote air safety during EURO 2012. The representative of the UK as the host country of the Olympic Games in 2012, put forward a proposal to establish cooperation and exchange of experiences in evaluating and responding to potential threats and challenges during these big events.

Summing up the meeting, Mr. B. San stressed that one of the objectives of the meeting was to demonstrate to the Alliance capitals NATO's interest in providing comprehensive assistance to Ukraine to address the security aspects of the preparation and holding of EURO 2012. This is consistent with the goals of a practical NATO-Ukraine partnership. The NATO Secretary General has already given orders to implement the relevant measures.

On 1 July 2011 Poland took the EU presidency, which opened for Ukraine additional possibilities for closer dialogue and cooperation with the Union's safety and security bodies. The joint preparation for EURO 2012 in accordance with the roadmap of Ukrainian-Polish cooperation is considered an important step to strengthen the strategic partnership, a further development of interregional cooperation.

Cooperation with Poland on security for EURO 2012 is based on the Declaration of cooperation in ensuring security at EURO 2012 in the framework of the Ukrainian-Polish Committee for preparation and holding of EURO 2012 and the relevant intergovernmental working group, which includes representatives of governmental structures. In September 2009, the Security Service of Ukraine and the Polish Internal Security Agency (ABW) signed bilateral agreements on cooperation in the framework of which the anti-terrorist cooperation between the agencies was developed, plans for joint preventive counterterrorism exercises were created and an exchange of relevant information was made. The Embassy of Poland in Ukraine has a Liaison Officer (Representative of the Ministry of Interior). A similar position was created at the Embassy of Ukraine in Poland (replaced by a representative of the Security Service of Ukraine). Such steps are explained by the necessity for coordinated efforts between the Polish side and representatives of other foreign diplomatic missions in Ukraine, in order to establish an effective exchange of preventive information within the Staff of the international security during the EURO finals in Ukraine under the President of Ukraine, the working body at the SBU.

Ukraine and Poland are cooperating in creating a system for the rapid punishment of football hooligans during EURO 2012. In 2010 in Istanbul

at a conference of justice ministers of the Council of Europe, the Ministers of Justice of Ukraine and Poland respectively agreed on the content of 3 agreements which were signed in Poland in early 2011, namely:

- Memorandum of cooperation between the two ministries;
- Agreement on legal assistance in civil and criminal matters;
- Agreement on the use of bilingual applications for legal aid in civil cases.

The Polish Sejm in late July 2011 amended the law on security of large-scale events, according to which it introduced electronic monitoring of football hooligans and permitted the use of alcoholic beverages at sporting events, including EURO 2012. The amendments include the introduction of monitoring of hooligans with electronic bracelets. Polish MPs also made an amendment under which the apprehended violators should be tried in the stadiums, and the hearing will be conducted via video conferencing. It also envisions a comprehensive system for identification of spectators. Penalties for false anonymous messages on bombs will become more severe.

A number of practical measures of cooperation between Ukraine and Poland in this area were taken, including:

- Ukrainian specialists participated in a NATO seminar on protection against weapons of mass destruction during major public events, held on 24-26 January 2011 in Poland;
- A teaching project commenced in April 2011, which is a joint venture of UEFA's stadiums and security unit and partners with pan-European Think Tank on Policing Football. The program is aimed at professionals who are responsible for the security during EURO 2012. The commencement was marked by two five-days training programs that took place in London. Ukraine and Poland participated in this event with more than 50 police officers and security specialists in the stadiums to host EURO 2012. Project participants have been explained that they play a key role in implementing the principles of safety in continental competition that will take place this summer. Participants represented all the host cities of the tournament – Ukrainian Donetsk, Lviv, Kyiv and Kharkiv and Polish Gdansk, Poznan, Warsaw and Wroclaw. The main idea of this project is to improve the safety and to combat signs of violence in European football.

Special attention has been paid to the **anti-terrorist security aspects of EURO 2012**. In September 2010 a Joint Action Plan (Road Map) on the preparation and holding of EURO 2012, elaborated at a meeting of the Polish-Ukrainian Committee on the preparation and holding of EURO

2012, was implemented by Ukraine and Poland. Cooperation on operative information with the Internal Security Agency of the Republic of Poland (ABW) on anti-terrorism security at EURO 2012 is provided by the Antiterrorist Center for the Security Service of Ukraine, as well as liaison officer at the Embassy of Ukraine to Poland.

In this context, the work of a two-way communication channel between the anti-terrorist centers in both countries is organized. A separate section for accumulating and processing information received from the ABW on the anti-terrorism is to be created in automated systems for the information processing (ASOD) of the Security Service of Ukraine.

Since 2009, joint exercises on terrorism issues have been held at different venues including the International airport "Borispol", "Offside-2010" in Warsaw, "Donbass-Antiterror" in Donetsk. In addition, similar exercises are regularly conducted at EURO 2012 Ukrainian sites. More than 20 were held in 2011 alone.

The current organizational structure of the national system to combat terrorism in Ukraine has been in place for over 10 years. Legislation defines seven subjects that are directly engaged in the fight against terrorism, where the Security Service is the main body, and an additional 11 subjects may be involved in activities related to preventing, detecting and suppressing terrorist activity. Subjects that are directly engaged in combating terrorism are closely connected in their daily work. Besides that representatives of the Ministries of the Internal Affairs, Defence, State Border Service and other agencies, as well as the Security Service, are part of the Interagency Coordinating Committee of the Anti-Terrorist Center and ATC coordination groups at the regional bodies of the Security Service, they actively participate in all important activities carried out under the auspices of the Anti-Terrorist Center (the Security Service of Ukraine, 2011).

Together with their Polish colleagues Ukrainian experts pay serious attention to strengthening counter-terrorism cooperation with the security structures of NATO and the European Union. To this end, in June 2011 a group of NATO experts came to Ukraine for the presentation of the SBU Concept of complex anti-terrorism measures during EURO 2012. Representatives of the Security Service took part in the EU Working Group on Terrorism (Brussels).

In order to coordinate security during EURO 2012, the Center of the operation with the total budget of around 5 million Euros will be created near Warsaw. More than 170 representatives of various law enforcement agencies

from all countries participating in the tournament will work at this Center during the tournament.

In addition, during EURO 2012 in Poland a counter-terrorism group of police snipers will operate. Several dozens of such specialists will be prepared in order to ensure the safety of spectators and guests of the tournament. Polish police have already begun their training, and one of the stages of preparation was a friendly match between the national football teams of Poland and Germany, held on 6 September in Gdańsk.

It is also worth noting that the U.S. Army will help Polish NATO allies to enhance security at the European Championship in 2012. In this context, in July 2011 "Peaceful Skies" exercises were held, with the participation of California National Guard F-16 fighters together with Polish F-16s. These studies were part of Poland's preparations to ensure the safety of Euro 2012.

Analysis of potentially dangerous terroristic factors that under certain conditions may contribute to the preparation and realization of terrorist acts in the country during EURO 2012, advances to law enforcement and intelligence authorities of Ukraine a clear algorithm for testing interaction of the Ministries of the Internal Affairs, Security, Health and the Department of State Protection at 63 official sites of EURO 2012, with maintenance personnel at the appropriate level of combat readiness and resources. The fundamental principle of anti-terrorism security at official venues is the principle of dynamic risk assessment, under which security parameters are determined according to the situation at a particular site. According to these data a system of organizational measures has been created for each object and included in the "Safety Passports".

The application of an integrated approach in combating terrorism during EURO 2012 best suits the complex nature of terrorist threats and the diverse nature of their possible indications. International experience in preparing and carrying out large-scale sporting events suggests that the principle of dynamic risk assessment of terrorist acts is in accordance with the real situation at a particular site and allows for the planning and implementing of the necessary and sufficient capabilities to ensure security. Accordingly, a systematic approach to combating terrorism guarantees the implementation of complex tasks in priority areas of counter-terrorism, among which are:

- Intelligence and information support (monitoring of the actual situation and trends in terrorist activities at national, regional and global levels and early identification of threats of a terrorist nature, a situational

analysis of the risks of committing acts of terrorism during the sporting event);

- Observation of airspace, enforcement of restrictions on air traffic and air defense;
- Protection of public order and designated facilities – stadiums, hotels, teams, team training grounds, hotels transfer, UEFA headquarters, regional accreditation centers and points of tickets exchange for fans and teams, accreditation and media centers in the stadiums;
- Strengthening of border controls;
- Performance of ground and air transportation in the interest of law enforcement;
- Providing health support;
- Providing expert advice and technical assistance on ensuring radiological, chemical and biological protection in case of emergencies;
- Allocation of personnel and vehicles necessary to support the police in escorting or protecting persons in respect of which protection is carried out.

Analysis of problems with anti-terrorism security of EURO 2012 indicates that the effective implementation of these measures is impossible without optimization of international cooperation, particularly with Europol, Interpol, the NATO Office of Security, and law enforcement agencies of individual states. Interaction in the preparation for EURO 2012 between Ukraine and the Republic of Poland is based on an agreement of cooperation concluded in 2008 between the Government of Ukraine and the Government of the Republic of Poland to organize the finals of this tournament. In a joint declaration of the Presidents of Ukraine and Poland on strengthening cooperation in preparation for EURO 2012, a common understanding of the importance of such sport tournaments was underlined, which is also a medium-term political project, having exclusive political, economic, humanitarian and image value for both states. Among the priorities of Ukrainian-Polish cooperation in preparation for EURO 2012 are the development of sports, transport, hotel, tourism, telecommunications infrastructure, establishing cooperation and creating favorable conditions for attracting investment resources, the intensification of social and cultural cooperation by organizing joint PR events, the construction of additional checkpoints and the restoration of joint customs control at the Ukrainian-Polish border, liberalization of the border crossing routine by citizens of Ukraine and Poland for the period

of the preparation and holding of EURO 2012, and the development and implementation of unified safety standards in Poland and Ukraine.

Currently, there is a permanent Ukrainian-Polish intergovernmental Group on the Security of EURO 2012, which is working on common approaches to the preparation of telecommunications networks for the championship, including a counterterrorist center between the two countries. To increase the efficiency of joint counter-terrorism between the Security Service of Ukraine and Poland's Internal Security Agency there is a direct channel of informing about possible terrorist threats. In Ukraine the Headquarters of the international cooperation and coordination of security measures on the preparation and holding of EURO 2012 was created, the main tasks of which are: to ensure international cooperation in combating terrorism to prevent, combat and minimize the consequences of terrorism indicated during the preparation and holding in Ukraine of the finals of the European Championship in 2012; to improve coordination of anti-terrorism security; the prompt informing of the President of Ukraine of the level of terrorist threats in Ukraine during the preparation and conduct of the Championship. An example of the fruitful cooperation between the intelligence of the two countries is in their joint participation in anti-terrorism exercises "Off-side 2010" in Poland, "Safe Haven" organized by the Ukrainian Ministry of Defence, "Donbas-Antiterror-2011", as well as training provided for police officers in Poland and Ukraine to exchange experiences on traffic management during EURO 2012, security in the stadiums and fan zones, etc. (Gutsal MG, 2011).

An important role in the context of EURO 2012 is played by the **issues of the functioning of the Ukrainian-Polish border**, which is reflected in the Plan of joint actions between Senior Border Officers of Ukraine and Poland. The plan was successfully implemented, in particular, on the Ukrainian-Polish border, joint action has been taken: coordinating control procedures and technology at checkpoints, the introduction of joint analysis of risks and threats in the field of cross-border crime in the security context of EURO 2012, the improvement of information exchange, furthering cooperation in combating organized crime and personnel training. The successful implementation of planned activities is facilitated by the traditional atmosphere of mutual trust at the Ukrainian-Polish border, established and maintained through professional activities of the Senior Border Officers of Ukraine and Poland.

In April and May 2011 under a joint initiative of the border and customs services of Poland, the *Concept of border and customs control in a single place*

by Ukrainian and Polish services during the European Football Championship EURO 2012 was developed and later positively received by the Ukrainian side. The purpose of the Concept is to increase the capacity of checkpoints on the Ukrainian-Polish border for road traffic by reducing the time to cross the border. It envisions border and customs control in a single place by Ukrainian and Polish services in the following points: Shegyni – Medica, Krakivets – Korchova, Rava-Ruska – Hrebenne, Yagodin – Dorohusk. Monitoring will be carried out in a single place with 2 options: on a regular basis (within one month and temporarily, depending on the dynamics of traffic).

Ukrainian service officers will carry out tasks at the checkpoints Yagodin – Dorohusk based on the infrastructure of the crossing point, and at the rest of the checkpoints – in temporary control pavilions (based on mobile containers). Thus, the Ukrainian border and customs authorities will carry out official activities, using their own mobile communication systems. Training conducted in the third quarter of 2011 in selected points, confirmed the effectiveness of such control.

At the end of EURO 2012 an analysis of the effectiveness of joint control will be made in order to study its effect on increasing the capacity of border checkpoints, as well as providing comfort for people who travel. The positive results of such cooperation will be an important argument for the need to create legal grounds (relevant amendments to the Code of Schengen borders) for establishing joint checkpoints in both states. To date, the respective authorities along with the Polish side have carried out practical measures for their implementation. In particular, during September and October in the international crossing points for road traffic interstate training of joint registration of vehicles and persons took place.

It is expected that during EURO 2012 Poland will introduce a simplified procedure of Schengen visas issued to Ukrainian citizens who have tickets for football matches. Ukraine received appropriate confirmation during the seminar in Warsaw, which took place in early October 2011 and was devoted to the interaction of the consular services of all member states during large-scale sports events using the example of EURO 2012. During the seminar, a presentation was made concerning the measures taken by Ukraine and Poland at legislative, security, logistics and other levels for the success of EURO 2012 .

At present, the necessary management decisions are being taken and respective authorities are performing practical measures for their implementation. Joint efforts will ensure the effective functioning of the Ukrainian-

Polish border and create all necessary conditions for its comfortable crossing by the participants and guests of the EURO 2012 finals.

Bibliography

1. Gutsalo, M.G., The Challenges of Security and the Ukrainian-Polish Cooperation during the Finals of European Championship 2012, 2011
2. The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Decree (2010a) on Approval of the State Program for the Preparation and Holding in Ukraine of European Championship 2012 Finals, dated April 14, No. 357
3. The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Decree (2010b) on Measures to Improve the Management Preparation and Holding in Ukraine of the Championship 2012 Finals, dated April 7, No. 298
4. The Decree of the President of Ukraine (2010a) on the Committee for the Preparation and Holding in Ukraine of the European Championship 2012 Finals, dated April 2, No. 470/2010
5. The Decree of the President of Ukraine (2010b) on the Interdepartmental Coordinating Staff on Safety and Security, dated December 10, No. 1117/2010
6. The Decree of the President of Ukraine (2011c) on the Staff of International Cooperation and Coordination of Security Measures for the Preparation and Holding of the European Championship 2012 Finals, dated March 10, No. 278/2011
7. The Security Service of Ukraine, During Euro 2012 the Number of Terrorist Threats will Triple, http://www.sbu.gov.ua/sbu/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=108646&cat_id=108653 (accessed: 8 November 2011)

Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland in International Operations – Legal Grounds, Strategic Considerations, and Practical Implementation

PAWEŁ PIETRZAK

Deputy Director,

Department of Strategic Analysis,

National Security Bureau

Armed conflicts are still a means of resolving disputes in international relations. They have both internal (within the state, although impacting their external environment) and external dimensions. Furthermore, they are initiated for a variety of reasons (including political, territorial, ethnic, religious, economic, and others). This requires the international community to take a number of actions (including military ones) to their overcome and diffuse conflicts. It also requires to take part in the later undertakings of stabilization and reconstruction of post-conflict regions. Poland takes part in these activities. Polish troops have participated continuously in international operations since 1953. However, the nature and type of tasks performed by the Polish military contingents over the years have changed. This article will present the legal bases for the participation of the Polish armed forces in operations outside the country. It will consider the aims and objectives of strategic actions in international operations. Conclusively, it will present the practical dimension of the involvement, including the missions already completed and those currently being conducted.

Legal grounds

The deployment of Polish armed forces in missions outside the country is governed by the Act dated 17 December 1998, concerning the principles of the use or stay of Polish armed forces outside the country (Journal of Laws No. 162, position 1117, as amended). The legislation specifies two forms of engagement of the Polish Armed Forces outside the country – **use** and **stay**. Article 2 of the Act specifies that the use of armed forces outside

the country means the presence of military units outside its borders to participate in:

- a) Military conflicts or to strengthen the forces of the country and its allies,
- b) Peacekeeping missions,
- c) Action to prevent acts of terrorism and their consequences.

While the stay of armed forces outside the country allows the presence of military units outside its borders to participate in:

- a) Training and military exercises,
- b) Rescue, search or humanitarian issues,
- c) Representative undertakings.

Most importantly, the law outlines and governs the decision making process for the deployment of Polish military contingents participating in missions outside its borders. It takes into account essentially the power of the President of the Republic of Poland, and that of the Council of Ministers. In accordance with Article 3 of the Act, the use of military units outside the country is to be decided upon by the President of the Republic of Poland, at the request of the Council of Ministers – in the case of planned involvement of Polish Armed Forces in armed conflict, to support allies, or in peacekeeping missions. Alternatively, at the request of the Prime Minister – in the case of planned involvement of the Polish Armed Forces in actions to prevent acts of terrorism or their consequences. The decision specifies: the size of the contingency, the duration of its use, and the territory of its operation.

It should be noted that Parliament only has negligible involvement in this process. Article 3 Point 2 of the Act indicates that Marshals of the Sejm (Lower House of Polish Parliament) and Senate should immediately be informed of the President's decision. The Act does not require approval of the Sejm for the engagement of Armed Forces. It even doesn't require the opinion of Parliament in this matter.

The decision-making solutions outlined in the Act have both advantages and disadvantages concerning the participation of armed forces in international operations.

Undoubtedly, the main advantage is the ability to quickly carry out the whole process. Preparation and acceptance of the proposal by the Council of Ministers, and on this basis, the issue of an appropriate decision by the President of the Republic of Poland may be achieved efficiently, in a short time. An example of such action can be seen in the recent process of extending the presence of the Polish Military Contingent in the European Union

mission EUFOR, in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The application to the President to extend the use of the Polish Military Contingent in the European Union Military Operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Kosovo and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, for the period from 21 November 2010 to 18 November 2011, was passed by the Council of Ministers on 9 November 2010¹. The relevant decision was signed by the President of Poland on 19 November 2010, and published the same day (the Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland of 2010, No. 87 item 1016). The entire decision making process took 10 days. During that time a number of bureaucratic procedures, required by Polish law, were followed:

1. The Council of Ministers accepts at a meeting (although in some cases it could be in the form of a circular) the application of extension from the National Defence Minister.
2. The acceptance of the application by the Council of Ministers is sent (with the signature of the Prime Minister) to the President.
3. On the basis of the application to the Council of Ministers, the Chancellery of the President agrees and draws up a draft decision. Selected organizational units of the Chancellery of the President (including the Legal and Legislative Office) participate in this process, along with the National Security Bureau.
4. A draft decision is developed and sent to the Chancellery of the Prime Minister, to be submitted to the Prime Minister to countersign.
5. The Prime Minister countersigns the draft decision.
6. The countersigned draft decision is again referred to the President's Chancellery in order for it to be submitted for the signature of the President.
7. The President of the Republic of Poland signs the decision.
8. The signed decision is sent to the Prime Minister's Office in order to have it published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland (MP).
9. The decision is published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland.

The actual time of the publication of the decision in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Poland is of particular importance. Upon announcement the decision comes into force, which is stated in the last paragraph of each decision.

¹ http://www.premier.gov.pl/rzad/decyzje_rzadu/decyzje_z_dnia/date:20101109/

Another positive element introduced by the Act of 17 December 1998, concerning the principles of use or stay of the Polish Armed Forces outside the country, was the authorization of the President's decision-making process. This was particularly appropriate as in accordance with Article 126 Point 2 of the Constitution, the President stands guard over the sovereignty and security of the state and the inviolability and integrity of its territory. Also, on the basis of Article 134 Point 1, the President is the Supreme Commander of the Polish Armed Forces. These two points put the President in a special position when it comes to matters related to security of the country and the Armed Forces of the Republic of Poland. As a result of this, it is required and understandable to include the President in the decision-making process. The legal solution should be created to require the President to issue the relevant decisions. It is crucial to determine the mutual interdependence of the President and the Council of Ministers in deciding whether to use the Polish Armed Forces in operations outside the country. The whole process becomes more objective and transparent, yet contains an element of peer review. The President alone cannot issue a decision. The President acts at the request of the Council of Ministers. The latter, on the other hand, must take into account the standpoint of the President in formulating their proposals.

The present Act has replaced the earlier practice of deploying the Polish Armed Forces to participate in missions outside the country, only on the decision of the Council of Ministers². The legal ground when restricted only to the decision of the Council of Ministers was deemed inadequate. It failed to involve other executive and legislative structures.

However, the Act contains a number of shortcomings. A particularly prominent failing is the lack of the need to obtain consent, or even the opinion, of the Sejm for the involvement of Polish armed forces in missions. It could be indicated that the requirement of approval or opinion of the Sejm could lengthen the decision-making process. The process would then also depend, for example, on the parliamentary timetable. One could only imagine a situation in which the decision for the involvement of the Polish

² It should be noted that in 1998 an episode was enforced, intended solely for the validity of the 1998 Act of 19 February 1998 on the Principles of Using the Armed Forces outside the Republic of Poland in 1998, Polish law, as it was said in the justification was "a result of the special situation caused by the response to Resolution 678 of the Security Council of the United Nations and accepted by representatives of the Council of Ministers of the occurrence of the United States of America on a possible intervention in the Persian Gulf."

Armed Forces would not be taken due to a recess of parliament. In a case where time plays a significant role, there could be a situation where the deployment of forces would not be executed on time. Hypothetically, the situation could arise where there could be a need for the involvement of the EU Battle Group, under which Poland serves as a framework nation (for example the Weimar Battle Group, which will be fully operational from the beginning of 2013). The lack of approval or opinion of the Sejm would make it impossible to carry out the operation. These problems can be solved by including in the Acts the requirement of the Sejm to urgently assemble to gain consent or opinion.

It should be noted that the inclusion of Polish Parliament in the decision making process is especially desirable in the situations where the terms of the involvement of the Polish armed forces are in the operations of war. As pointed out by Stanisław Koziej “for the operation of a direct war, there is even a constitutional duty for Parliament to participate in decision-making”³. It would be worth revising current rules for military operations to enable the opinion of the Sejm to be sought prior to the President and government coming to a decision on the issue of war. In practice, this refers to the case where it intends to send the Armed Forces as subordinates to international (allied or coalition) command, without imposing any restriction on the scale, nature, time and place of their use (as is now taking place in Afghanistan)⁴.

A classic example illustrating this problem was the involvement of the Polish Military Contingent in operations of a “coalition of the willing” led by the United States. Its objective was to overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq. This operation had a purely military character. The legal grounds for the Polish Military Contingent’s participation in this operation was the Decision of the President of Poland, dated 17 March 2003. It concerned the use of the Polish Military Contingent (in the composition of the Joint Multinational Operations Forces of the International Coalition) deployed in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of Bahrain and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, State of Qatar, State of Kuwait and the Republic of Iraq and in the Persian Gulf, Red Sea and Indian Ocean (MP 2003 No. 14 item 200). In the President’s Decision, justification to undertake

³ Koziej, S., *Wojsko za granicą tylko za zgodą Sejmu* (Armed Forces to Go Abroad Only With the Acceptance of the Sejm), in: *Rzeczpospolita*, 14.09.2009

⁴ as above

the operation is shown in the UN Security Council Resolution 1441 and related earlier resolutions. It is worth noting, there is still a dispute, among experts of international law, whether the resolution was sufficient enough to justify the military action in this operation. It remains ambiguous whether the operation against the Saddam Hussein regime had the appropriate international mandate. Therefore, it should have been even more desirable to obtain the consent or opinion of the Sejm concerning the deployment of the Polish Military Contingent for the military operation⁵. On the eve of the commencement of operations in Iraq, the Sejm did hold a debate on the issue. However, the position presented by delegates was not binding.

The problem of financing the participation of Polish military contingents in missions outside the country should also be considered.

Law Article 9 Clause 1 Point 3 – indicates that the Council of Ministers needs to define a detailed set of rules and procedures for the financing of the preparation and operation of military units. This should also include the provisions on public finances.

The Council of Ministers' decision concerning this, dated 8 April 2008, indicates in Clause 2 that the expenses associated with the preparation and operation of military units outside the country are financed from the budget of the Ministry of National Defence (Journal of Laws of 2008, No. 62 item 389). Therefore, when there is a need for a decision on the participation of Polish military contingents in international operations (which was not previously planned or outlined in the annual defense budget), the funds for the implementation of the mission must be generated from savings in other areas of the defense budget. In general, as a result of this, it is at the expense of funding for the technical modernization of the Polish armed forces. This in turn creates a slowdown in the technical modernization process. This factor should be taken into account considering that the Polish armed forces technologically lag behind to NATO's top military forces. It would be a more appropriate solution to create a separate state budget to cover the expenditure related to the involvement of Polish military contingents (and also other contingents – e.g. Police), for operations outside the country. In this case the defense budget, particularly the modernization budget, would be relieved and free from the possibility of the emergence of unexpected

⁵ More information about the legal basis for the involvement of Polish troops in Iraq can be found in the analysis prepared by the Bureau of Research of the Chancellery of the Sejm: Mróz, M., *Podstawy prawne obecności polskiego kontyngentu wojskowego w Iraku* (The Legal Basis for the Presence of Polish Troops in Iraq), October 2004, No. 1069.

expenses. Additionally, policy makers would need to consider the financial aspect when deciding on the time and scale of involvement.

Strategic objectives

A Strategy for the participation of the Polish armed forces in international operations was adopted by the Council of Ministers at a meeting on 13 January 2009⁶. This was at the request of the Minister of National Defence. The adoption of the Strategy reflects an intention to define clear strategic objectives that Poland should strive to achieve through the forces' participation in such operations.

Accordingly, the Strategy assumes that the top priority when deciding to participate in an international operation will have an institutional factor. The operations conducted by NATO and the European Union explicitly have priority. As a result, Poland will become increasingly important within both organizations. At the same time, the Strategy indicates that the decision to participate in an international operation does not require authorization in the form of a UN Security Council mandate (although this authorization should be desirable).

The optimal level of commitment of Polish armed forces outside the country at any one time is also written in the Strategy. This ranges between 3,200 and 3,800 soldiers and military personnel. This number allows the achievement of specific objectives, yet should have no negative impact on maintaining adequate levels of defense capability for the state.

Indicated in the Strategy the main objectives of the Polish armed forces participation in international operations are:

- Defense of national interests against external threats (through the elimination of sources of crises, and the diffusion of conflicts), which are both near and far from the strategic surroundings of the Republic of Poland;
- Building a stable security environment;
- Reinforcing the institutions and organizations of international security;
- Fulfillment of allied commitments by strengthening bilateral and multilateral military, and non-military cooperation with allies, coalition members, and partners; and

⁶ Strategy text: www.koziej.pl/files/Strategia_misji.doc

- Prevention of humanitarian disasters and the containment of human rights violations.

Importantly, the Strategy indicates the need for a comprehensive approach to international missions. In order to achieve its objectives, in particular missions, only military involvement is deemed insufficient. It must be supplemented, in parallel, with political, economic or social activities. Defence Minister Bogdan Klich, pointed this out on the eve of the document's acceptance, "Strategy is to be a road map, which sets out the course of the Polish commitment"⁷.

The earlier practice of Polish involvement in international operations was not based on clearly defined principles. Often decisions were the result of current policies, and they were ad hoc rather than being based on strategic interests. Stanisław Koziej pointed out that the Strategy of the commitment of Polish armed forces in international operations should not be a one-off document. It should form an important part of a broader military strategy⁸. Although a new National Security Strategy was accepted in 2007, such document has yet to be prepared.

Doubts arise concerning the expressed priority of participation of the Polish armed forces in missions led by NATO and the European Union. The missions of these organizations do not translate directly to the implementation of Polish national interests, and strategic objectives. It is idealistic to presume that other members would match the Polish contribution and participation in NATO and EU missions. Other allied countries are realistic when making decisions concerning their involvement (or lack of involvement) in a given mission, not idealistic.

Subsequently, it can be seen in practice that the principles embodied in the Strategy for the participation of the Polish armed forces in international operations (following just 3 years' existence) have often been overlooked. For example, in this time NATO (March to October 2011) successfully carried out the operation "Unified Protector" in Libya. Poland provided only political support to the mission. It decided against taking direct part, for which it was openly criticized by the U.S. Secretary of Defense, during the meeting

⁷ <http://wiadomosci.dziennik.pl/wydarzenia/artykuly/135325,nie-chcemy-byc-tylko-tu-gdzie-pozwala-onz.html>

⁸ Koziej, S., Nowa strategia MON – stawianie wozu przed koniem (New Strategy of the Ministry of National Defence – Putting the Cart Before the Horse), <http://wiadomosci.wp.pl/kat,1342,title,Nowa-strategia-MON---stawianie-wozu-przed-koniem,wid,10721919,wiadomosc.html>

of NATO Defence Ministers, held on 8-9 June 2011 in Brussels⁹. Similarly, Poland has decided not to participate in the Anti-Piracy Naval Operation off the coast of Somalia, led by the European Union. Even though this takes place in the same waters as the main marine transport route linking Europe and China.

Practical Implementation

Since 1953 the Polish Armed Forces have been permanently engaged in international operations. Polish soldiers have performed tasks in approximately 70 international missions. Over a period of more than 69 years, almost 100,000 soldiers have served. All along the Polish involvement has evolved significantly. The following section will discuss only a selection of those missions. This is due to the wide variety of roles undertaken. Those missions that are discussed below illustrate the evolution of the Polish approach to its involvement in international operations.

Czesław Marcinkowski highlights 6 consecutive, clearly defined stages of Polish armed forces participation in international missions (operations)¹⁰:

- Stage One (1953-1975) – Polish Army officers participated in the International Control Commissions (Indochina region);
- Stage Two (1975-1990) – the first compact units of the Polish Army, in particular logistics units, were involved in peacekeeping missions (operations) in the Middle East;
- Stage Three (1991-1992) – for the first time, units of the Polish Army formed part of the peacekeeping operations contingent established on the basis of Chapter VII of the UN Charter;
- Stage Four (since 1992) – the commencement of participation of Polish representatives (including Police) in OSCE and EU peacekeeping missions (operations);
- Stage Five (1995-1999) – participation of operational units of the Polish Army, and Police contingents, in support of peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina (IFOR and SFOR);

⁹ Spiegel, P., Gates Criticizes Five Allies over Libya, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/042c1152-91ee-11e0-b8c1-00144feab49a.html#axzz1ldvc7UG7>

¹⁰ Marcinkowski, C., *Istota i ewolucja misji pokojowych ONZ (The Nature and Evolution of UN Peacekeeping Missions)*, in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, pp. 18-19

- Stage Six (since 2000) – the wide ranging participation of Polish Army units and Police forces in a variety of peacekeeping missions (operations), including counter-terrorism.

Taking into account the criteria of the nature of the tasks and those tasks performed, Krzysztof Gaj and Janusz Zuziak distinguish between three groups in which Polish armed forces have been involved¹¹. These groups of missions are:

- a) Observation;
- b) Logistics;
- c) Operational.

It seems that this classification is more reasonable since the strict splitting of the involvement of Polish military contingents into various stages should be treated conventionally. The different stages overlap and merge.

Korean Peninsula

The beginning of Polish involvement in international operations after World War II, dates back to 1953. Poland at that time was invited to form the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea (NNSC). The commission consisted of four countries: two appointed by the Commander of the Korean People's Army and the Commander of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army – Poland and Czechoslovakia, and two designated by the Force Commander of the United Nations – Switzerland and Sweden¹². The Commission set up 20 inspection groups, each of which consisted of at least four officers from each country (the number always needed equal). In the period 1953-1955 these groups were the most active. In 1956 their activities were suspended. Initially, the Polish mission included 300 soldiers. However, with the reduction in capability of the inspection groups, and the subsequent suspension of their activities, the number of Polish personnel was reduced. From 1961, the Polish part of the Commission had consisted of about 10 soldiers. Following the democratic changes in Poland at the turn of 1989/1990, North Korea deemed that Poland had lost its neutral status, and forced

¹¹ Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* (Polish Army in International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)), in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, p. 21

¹² Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* (Polish Army in International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)), in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, p. 25

the final withdrawal of Polish personnel from the Commission¹³. According to the Veterans Association of United Nations Peacekeeping Missions a total of 1,065 Poles were involved in the activities of the NNSC¹⁴.

Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia

Further involvement of Polish troops abroad was connected to the operation of the International Commission for Supervision and Control (ICSC) in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia (1954-1975). It should be noted that the ICSC in Vietnam, operated until 1973. Polish soldiers served together with soldiers from India and Canada. On the basis of the 1954 Paris agreements, the ICSC was replaced by the International Commission of Control and Supervision (ICCS), which operated only in South Vietnam. The committee included representatives of Poland, Indonesia, Hungary and Canada. However, Canada in 1973 withdrew its contingent, which was replaced by representatives of Iran.

Saigon was seized on 30 April 1975 as a result of the offensive communist forces. They subsequently took the entire territory of South Vietnam. This resulted in the total defeat of one of the parties and brought an end to the ICCS (the defeat of one of the parties removed the basis of the continuation of the mission). Those who participated in the Commission withdrew its personnel. In total there were 1,928 Polish representatives who participated in the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. In the International Commission of Control and Supervision in South Vietnam, 650 Polish representatives participated¹⁵.

Nigeria

In the years 1968-1970 five Polish observers took part in the activities of the International Observer Group in Nigeria. The activities of this international commission differed from the previous missions in that the Nigerian government requested the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, as well as the governments (of Poland, Canada, Sweden and the UK)

¹³ Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* (Polish Army in International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)), in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, p. 29

¹⁴ *Stowarzyszenie Kombatantów Misji Pokojowych ONZ, Polacy w służbie pokoju 1953-2003* (Veterans Association of United Nations Peacekeeping Missions, Poles in Peacekeeping 1953-2003), p. 6

¹⁵ *Stowarzyszenie Kombatantów Misji Pokojowych ONZ, Polacy w służbie pokoju 1953-2003* (Veterans Association of United Nations Peacekeeping Missions, Poles in Peacekeeping 1953-2003), p. 6

to direct the observers to investigate allegations of Nigerian secessionists, in the Republic of Biafra. The secessionists accused the government of genocide and mass murder. Inspections by the observers did not confirm the accusations. The Commission helped to restore stability and peace in Nigeria¹⁶.

Middle East

A new stage of Polish operations outside the country was the engagement in the Middle East. Contingents of Polish troops were sent to the region. In 1973, the Polish Contingent co-founded the United Nations Emergency Force II (UNEF II). It was established under UN Security Council Resolution No. 340, with the task of monitoring the ceasefire between Egypt and Israel¹⁷. The mission of UNEF II was implemented between 1973 and 1979 and 11,699 soldiers served within the framework¹⁸. A peace agreement was signed at Camp David between Israel and Egypt on 18 September 1978, and finalized on 26 March 1979 in Washington. This peace treaty settled relations between the two countries. This allowed the possibility for the elimination of the mandate of UNEF II, which took place in 1979. An important point in the context of Polish involvement in the frameworks of UNEF II, was that the Polish Contingent (together with Canada) was asked by the UN to take over the logistical tasks. This over time has become the Polish specialty in military activities in the Middle East. The Polish contingent took on the responsibility for carrying out engineering tasks, transportation and tasks related to medical protection¹⁹.

Similar logistic tasks (and also operational tasks) have been fulfilled by Polish troops under successive United Nations missions conducted in the Middle East. Since 1974 the tasks of observation, patrol, and logistics have been carried out by the Polish Military Contingent in the Golan Heights working within the frameworks of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Forces (UNDOF). These forces were established by Resolution No.

¹⁶ Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* (Polish Army in International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)), in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, pp. 41-44

¹⁷ Wider information on the mandate of UNEF II operations, its background and statistics are on the UN website: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unefii.htm>

¹⁸ Veterans Association of United Nations Peacekeeping Missions, *Poles in Peacekeeping 1953-2003*, p. 6

¹⁹ Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* (Polish Army in International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)), in: *Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy* No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011, p. 45

350 of the UN Security Council with the task of supervising the observance of the ceasefire between Syria and Israel²⁰. The mission of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was established in March 1978, following Resolutions 425 and 426 of the UN Security Council²¹. Since 1992 Polish soldiers have performed the roles of medical support, logistical support and engineering missions. The UNDOF mission from 1974 to 2009 was served by almost 13,000 Polish soldiers. In the UNIFIL mission from 1992 to 2009, over 10,000 Polish soldiers participated. Based upon the previously discussed Strategy for the participation of the Polish Armed Forces in international operations, Poland decided in 2009 to withdraw its military contingents from both missions.

It has become apparent that this decision was not fully thought out. The withdrawal of Polish military contingents of UNIFIL and UNDOF operations did not lead to substantial savings for the defense budget. The participation of Polish troops in UN missions was financed primarily from the UN budget. The withdrawal weakened the prominent position of Polish troops in the Middle East and as a result, weakened Poland's influence within the structures of the UN²². It should be noted that 10 years earlier, in 1999 (data as at 31 January 1999) Poland maintained the biggest contingent (1,039 men) of all countries participating in UN missions²³.

UNIFIL and UNDOF missions provided an important platform to gain experience for Polish soldiers and officers. Polish officers, in the framework of these missions, for the first time in history served as commanders of international missions. General Franciszek Gągor was the Commander of UNDOF from 2003-2004 and in 1995-1997 the UNIFIL mission was commanded by General Stanisław Woźniak.

The Balkans

The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Eastern Bloc contributed to the evolution of international operations. Consequently this changed

²⁰ Wider information on the mandate of UNDOF operations, can be found at <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/undof/index.shtml>

²¹ Wider information on the mandate of UNIFIL operations, can be found at <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/index.shtml>

²² Koziej, S., Przykre skutki braku strategii wojskowej (Unpleasant consequences of non-military strategy), <http://wiadomosci.wp.pl/title,S-Koziej-przykre-skutki-braku-strategii-wojskowej,wid,11074569,wiadomosc.html>

²³ A summary of numbers of soldiers involved in UN missions, broken down by country is available at http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml

the nature of the Polish involvement within them. Irena Popiuk-Rysinska indicates that the operations of the Cold War period (so-called first-generation operations) were passive, mono-functional (focused on observing and monitoring ceasefires), military, and consensual. In the post-Cold War period a new generation of peacekeeping operations emerged. They actively pursued mandates which are multi-functional (combining elements of prevention, monitoring, controlling or diffusion of conflicts and the creation of conditions for sustainable peace), non-consensual and with civil-military relations²⁴.

At the turn of 1989/1990 an important region in the involvement of Polish military contingents became the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Polish military contingents were involved in the many missions in the Balkans and began to take on typical operational measures associated with peacemaking, the guarantee of stability and security, and later in supporting the post-conflict reconstruction process. The contingents were involved in the mission of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), between 1992 and 1995 in the former Yugoslavia. Similar activities were associated to the activities of the Polish Military Contingent in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the IFOR mission (later renamed SFOR), and after the transfer of command by NATO to the European Union – in the mission EUFOR ALTHEA. Currently, according to the decision of the President, up to 50 soldiers and military personnel serve in this mission. Following a significant improvement in the security of the region Operation ALTHEA is slowly winding down. Similarly, active operational involvement of Polish troops took place in the KFOR mission in Kosovo. It is important to note, as part of the KFOR mission, Polish and Ukrainian soldiers conduct the activities. In the framework of the mission a joint military unit along with the Polish-Ukrainian peacekeeping battalion (POLUKRBAT) was formed to lead the mission from 2000 to 2010. Currently, in Kosovo in the operations of KFOR the Polish military contingent makes up a force of 300 soldiers and military personnel.

Iraq

A particularly important moment in the activities of Polish Military Contingents in international missions was the military operation in Iraq. Poland took part in the volatile phase of the conflict, which had the objective to

²⁴ Popiuk-Rysinska, I., *Ewolucja operacji pokojowych Narodów Zjednoczonych po zimnej wojnie* (The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations after the Cold War) in *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, No. 1-2/2003, pp. 10-15

overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime (previously mentioned). Later, following the cessation of military hostilities, Poland accepted the proposal from the United States to become part of the multinational stabilization force in Iraq. It took over command of the Multinational Division responsible for maintaining the stability of one of the four zones (central-south) of which Iraq was divided into. Under Polish command on 3 September 2003 the Multinational Division Center-South, took over responsibility for protecting five of Iraq's provinces: Babil, Wasit, Najaf, Al-Qadisiyah and Karbala. The division was made up of 8,500 soldiers from 22 different countries. Poland had the largest contingent of 2,500 troops, along with Ukraine and Spain. When the Multinational Division Central-South was formed, this was the first time in which such a large group of soldiers of other countries served under Polish command. As pointed out by Stanisław Koziej, thanks to its involvement, "Poland decided to be in the group of countries that have the will to take on new challenges. Undoubtedly, the military has gained many benefits. It has learned how to command a large group of multinational troops in practice, under difficult operating conditions. Poland is now in the top league of world countries with such experience and operational values."²⁵ The stabilized character of the mission evolved over time from stabilization training. Then training and advisory (although due to the deterioration of the operational situation, during the ninth and tenth changeover, it returned to the stabilization character of the mission, while maintaining the involvement of training and advice). The region of responsibility was reduced. The number of countries participating in the activities of the multinational division decreased. Also, the number of personnel involved in the Polish contingent decreased. Finally, on 4 October 2008 the formal termination of the Polish Military Contingent in Iraq took place and the last soldiers returned to the country on 28 October 2008. Only a small number remained in Iraq (approx. 20 people) to form the Polish Military Contingent in the composition of the NATO training mission – Iraq (NTM-I). At the end of 2011, NATO decided to finish conducting the training mission. The Polish soldiers who were involved were withdrawn, and returned to Poland.

Afghanistan

Currently the main focus of involvement of Polish military contingents is the in mission of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), in

²⁵ Koziej, S., *Iracka lekcja (Lessons of Iraq)*, Polska Zbrojna, No. 48/2008, p. 28

Afghanistan. Poland initially did not participate in the ISAF operation (established in December 2001), it focusing on the activities carried out in parallel as part of the Operation Enduring Freedom (launched in October 2001, after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon). Poland joined the operation in March 2002, with a force of about 120 soldiers. This situation lasted until 2007 when, under the pressure of NATO allies, Poland increased its quota of soldiers to 1,200 under the entire command of ISAF. In subsequent years, the quota increased to the 2,600 troops (in 2010 and 2011).

By 2008, the Polish Military Contingent forces in Afghanistan were spread over several provinces. To maximize the effect of its involvement Poland decided to concentrate all its forces in the Ghazni province. In parallel it was decided to take over the responsibility for security of the province which is located in a difficult area of eastern Afghanistan (assuming such responsibility took place on 30 October 2008).

It is worth pointing out that three Ukrainian Doctors served in the Polish military contingents in Afghanistan, which complemented the latter due to the Poles' shortcomings in medical service.

The process of transfer of responsibility to local authorities has commenced due to the commitments made during the NATO summit in Lisbon in November 2010, together with the decision for the termination of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan until 2014. In adapting to these decisions, Poland has its own strategy for its engagement in the Afghanistan operation. The gradual reduction of the quota of Polish troops commenced late 2011. Currently, in accordance with the applicable decision of the President, 2,500 troops and military personnel are present in Afghanistan. There will also be change to the nature of the mission, from stabilization to training and advisory. The complete termination of the Polish Military Contingent in Afghanistan is scheduled for the end of 2014.

Conclusion

The involvement of Polish military contingents in missions outside the country is the expression of responsibility and accountability of Poland in the international arena. Poland has become a "provider" rather than "consumer" of security. This commitment brings with it particular benefits in the military sphere. It allows gaining experience in conducting real

operations. It directs the process of technical modernization of armament and military equipment, and on the basis of experience it perfects processes and training programs. However, in particular it has created a change in mentality of Polish soldiers and officers.

The involvement of Polish military contingents should be used for the benefit in other areas, particularly in political and economic life. The first involves a shift in the thinking about international operations. They are currently perceived through a prism of purely military operations. A new comprehensive approach is needed which takes into account non-military factors and components of operations.

The Polish Armed Forces have paid for their deployments in missions abroad with the blood of its soldiers. Together, these operations have claimed the lives of 112 Polish soldiers and military personnel.

Bibliography

1. Gaj, K., Zuziak, J., *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach pokojowych (1953-2011)* [Polish Army International Peacekeeping Missions (1953-2011)], „Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy”, No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011
2. Koziej, S., *Iracka lekcja* [Lesson of Iraq], „Polska Zbrojna”, No. 48/2008
3. Koziej, S., *Nowa strategia MON – stawianie wozu przed koniem* [New Strategy MON (Ministry of National Defence) – Putting the Cart Before the Horse], <http://wiadomosci.wp.pl/title,Nowa-strategia-MON-stawianie-wozu-przed-koniem,wid,10721919,wiadomosc.html?ticaid=1e19e>
4. Koziej, S., *Wojsko za granicę tylko za zgodą Sejmu* [Armed Forces to Go Abroad Only With the Acceptance of the Sejm], „Rzeczpospolita”, September 14, 2009
5. Marcinkowski, C., *Istota i ewolucja misji pokojowych ONZ* [The Nature and Evolution of UN Peacekeeping Missions], „Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy”, No. 5 (238), Warsaw 2011
6. Mróz, M., *Podstawy prawne obecności polskiego kontyngentu wojskowego w Iraku* [The Legal Basis for the Presence of Polish Troops in Iraq] Bureau of Research, Chancellery of the Sejm, October 2004, No. 1069
7. Popiuk-Rysińska, I., *Ewolucja operacji pokojowych Narodów Zjednoczonych po zimnej wojnie* [The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations after the Cold War], *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, No. 1-2/2003
8. Spiegel, P., *Gates Criticizes Five Allies over Libya*, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/042c1152-91ee-11e0-b8c1-00144feab49a.html#axzz1ldvc7UG7>

Participation of the Armed Forces in the International Operations

VLADIMIR POLISCHUK¹

*Head of Branch for Security Sector Problems,
Expertise and Analytical Department,
National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine*

Having proclaimed its non-aligned status, Ukraine became a new kind of participant of the European geopolitical scene. This study aims at describing how the peacebuilding process was understood and implemented in the past and how it is applied today. It also provides detailed description of the participation of Ukrainian military and civilian personnel in peacekeeping missions around the world describing it from the political and technical perspective. The author also projects the future Ukrainian contribution to those missions.

Ukraine is an active participant in United Nations efforts on maintaining international peace and security. During twenty years of independence, over 34 thousand Ukrainian soldiers and police officers have carried out a peacekeeping mission in more than twenty operations under the UN mandate.

Ukraine is a committed supporter of UN peacekeeping reform to strengthen its capacity and eliminate the existing shortcomings.

Priority attention should be paid to ensure air mobility of UN peacekeeping operations, and improve the legal protection of “blue helmets”².

President of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich

The proclamation by Ukraine in July 2010 of its non-aligned status led to the appearance of a fundamentally new geopolitical player in the European continent. Although this policy excludes the participation of Ukraine in military–political alliances and significantly reduces the possibility of using armed forces in “external fields”, but also it defines “... the priority of participation in the implementation and development of European security, continuation of a constructive partnership with NATO, as well as

¹ E-mail address: pvg@rainbow.gov.ua, tel.: +38 044 255 0568

² Speech by President of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich at the General Debate of the 66th session of UN General Assembly, <http://www.president.gov.ua/news/21273.html>

other military-political blocs on all issues of mutual interest ...” senior officials have repeatedly insisted that the new security strategy should not cause withdrawal or passivity in all possible formats of national security – Ukraine is interested in preserving and enhancing the positive achievements of cooperation in the security field with foreign countries, international organizations and associations. From this point of view, active participation of the Ukrainian State in peacemaking is a traditional policy, to the development of which much attention will be paid.

However, this contribution to global and regional stability, in our opinion, should not be limited to purely technological aspects of peacekeeping and requires consideration of a wider range of factors such as analysis of current conflict trends, reviewing of scientific assessments of the peacekeeping phenomenon, identifying major peacekeeping formats, making forecasts of further development of these activities, etc.

Peacekeeping – an external dimension

Modern peacemaking is the product of (and, to some extent, one of the features of) the so-called Yalta-Potsdam (bipolar) system of international relations. But this specified world order format has ceased to exist with the collapse of the Soviet Union. After 1991 there have been many international meetings, which created many of the universal instruments but their implementation has not formed a new self-sufficient consensus – various subjects of security relations constantly accused each other of selectivity, double standards and imbalances in interpretation of international obligations. In practice, this caused the erosion of many legal and moral standards in the second half of the twentieth century, such as the inviolability of borders and territory, the right of peoples to self-determination, inviolability of inalienable human rights and so on. Therefore, in our opinion, the reduction of consistency and growth of situativity in international relations is the first factor that has made a significant impact on the further development of the phenomenon of peacekeeping.

The second factor is defined by the discussion that unfolded around the crisis of the institution of the state as a form of human communities’ self-organization, which is also a consequence of the post-bipolar development, since absence of clear universal rules stimulates an identity crisis. Many countries are unable to provide traditional public functions, such

as a monopoly on violence/coercion; provision of such services as education, health, infrastructure, ensuring political order. At this stage, it is not just about putting into circulation the concept of state disability – currently three groups are classified (weak, failing and failed/collapsed) and some 60 countries³ have already been rated by their degree of disability. In addition, a broad debate goes on about the optimization of the state that finds expression in modernization and reformist discourse, which is declared by officials of certain states. The last essential element that provides the review of the place and role of the state in existence in society, is a number of recent trends such as the rapid growth of the Earth's population, increasing importance of religious and ethnic factors in international relations, the lack of a sustainable balance between the development processes of globalization and the actualization of national identities (especially – in the multi-ethnic countries) and more.

The third factor that impacts the peacekeeping is constant national security doctrine reviewing. Since the end of World War II theoretical researches in this area developed constantly under different political schools, such as realist, constructivist, peace studies, human security, critical studies, etc. In practice, this meant a change of emphasis in such fundamental categories as power (where “hard” military components are supplemented by “soft” impacts), subjectivity (variations in the triangle “state-interstate-non-state”), the degree of rationality/anarchism and so on. Phenomena of conflict in international relations evolved – first of all, the phenomenon of war, which currently has a tendency to localization, minimization and support of military action by non-military means (information and economic). Inner-state military conflicts have become the main source of violence and instability. The number of so-called “new challenges, risks and threats” is constantly growing – nowadays traditional terrorism, transnational organized crime and drug trafficking can already be complemented by “currency wars” and “passport expansions.”

Although in recent years the regulatory and institutional capacities changed radically, the question of their adequacy and effectiveness in ensuring security remains open.

³ See, for example, „List of countries by Failed States Index”, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_Failed_States_Index or „Failed States Index 2011”, <http://www.fundforpeace.org/global/library/cr-11-14-fs-failedstatesindex2011-1106q.pdf>

The main features of the peacekeeping evolution

Fundamental changes in the global security environment have led to the evolution of peacekeeping, which is supplemented by such – often equivalent and interchangeable – concepts like “peace enforcement”, “peacebuilding”, “humanitarian intervention” and “responsibility to protect”.

We opine that, one of the most important was the concept of peacebuilding. The appearance of this term is associated with the activities of the UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who in his “Agenda for Peace” spoke about creating a new environment, not only relating to termination of hostilities but with methods of traditional peacekeeping⁴.

The idea was promoted by politicians and scholars. Regarding a definition of peacebuilding goals the majority agreed with Boutros-Ghali, that priority should be given to the prevention of recurrence of conflict – in the discussion on “negative peace” the absence of armed conflict was supplemented by “positive peace”, which meant establishment of a public dialogue, the transformation of values and restoration of the rule of law.

Such important aspects as peacebuilding strategy and related activities were also researched actively. “Minimalists”⁵ believe that peacebuilding refers to the root causes of conflict, which is an anticipated event and could be monitored by peaceful means. In contrast “maximalists”⁶ believe that peacebuilding strategy should be aimed at the neutralization of the political will of the conflicting parties to use violence.

Peacebuilding-related activities should be aimed at changing the position of the principles of the key conflict stakeholders, which includes the priority of economic development and the protection of the inalienable rights of man and the citizen.

In contrast to traditional peacekeeping, some changes to the chronological aspects of peacebuilding have been made – primarily through pre-

⁴ Boutros-Ghali, B., *An Agenda for Peace*, 2nd edn, New York: United Nations, 1995

⁵ Cockell, J., *Conceptualising Peacebuilding: Human Security and Sustainable Peace*, in: M. Pugh (ed.) *Regeneration of War-Torn Societies*, London: Macmillan, 2000, pp. 15-34; Doyle, M. and Sambanis, N., *International Peacebuilding: a Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis*, *American Political Science Review* 94, 2000, pp. 779-802; Cousens, E., Introduction, in: E. Cousens and C. Kumar, with K. Wermester (eds.) *Peacebuilding as Politics: Cultivating Peace in Fragile Societies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001, pp. 1-20

⁶ Most, B. and Starr, H., *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1989

ventive diplomacy, which must precede critical outbreaks of violence⁷. In addition, peacebuilding takes place after the failure of preventive actions and traditional peacekeeping. In general, the entire conflict period coverage is the only difference between the peacekeeping and post-conflict peace settlement.

In terms of participants, external parties play a major or even exclusive role in peacebuilding processes⁸. External forces' involvement is often based on primarily altruistic motives that contain a specific ideological load – promotion of liberal values, protection of democracy, development of capitalist relations, etc.)

Mr. Boutros-Ghali⁹ drew attention to the need to consider the nature of conflict: inter- or intrastate. Practice shows that peacebuilding has a place in cases when public disputes develop into civil war, a significant inter-ethnic conflict or even into degradation of the state.

In the context of evaluating the appearance of peacebuilding causes, it is possible now to distinguish two interrelated approaches. First – the normative – based on the fact that liberal ideology is the driving force of the peacebuilding operations¹⁰. Promoting democracy and opening national markets represent attempts to transform some states so that they become peaceful and productive members of the international community. From this point of view peacebuilding is understood as a set of measures aimed at the peaceful settlement of conflicts. “Normativity” consists in the possibility of a global liberal consensus only after the end of the Cold War.

The other approach generally recognizes global democratization as a key element, but places greater emphasis on the importance of international humanitarian law. In accordance with this concept “transformation priorities” have been made, which consist of increasing the value of individual and human rights as far as the legitimacy of government action towards its citizens and a simultaneous decrease in the value of state sovereignty¹¹. In practice,

⁷ Lund, M., *Preventing Violent Conflicts: A Strategy for Preventive Diplomacy*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996

⁸ Pugh, M., Introduction: The Ownership of Regeneration and Peacebuilding, in: M. Pugh (ed.) *Regeneration of War-Torn Societies*, London: Macmillan, 2000, pp. 1-12

⁹ Boutros-Ghali, B., *An Agenda for Peace*. 2nd edn. New York: United Nations, 1995

¹⁰ Paris, R., *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004

¹¹ Talentino, A., One Step Forward, One Step Back: The Development of Peacebuilding as Concept and Strategy, *Journal of Conflict Studies* 25, 2004, pp. 33-60; Finnemore, M., *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003

this was manifested in the appearance of so-called “humanitarian intervention” by which the international community (often – only part of it) has been trying to stop the violent actions of some governments against their people.

Humanitarian intervention can overcome typical operational shortcomings of traditional UN peacekeeping, such as:

- Occasionally inadequate supplies of resources and doctrinal support (preparation and training of personnel, logistics, lack of heavy weapons and equipment, etc.);
- Organizational gaps and lengthiness in time between the crises and the reactions;
- Weak support from intelligence;
- Excessive competition between military and non-governmental participants of peacekeeping operations.

At the same time, it should be noted that the concept of “humanitarian intervention” from the positions of universal international law has ambiguous justification (unlike the UN traditional peacekeeping, which is clearly resolved in the Charter of this Organization). In our opinion, in this case we can talk more about its political, ethical or moralistic nature. For this reason, this concept of peacekeeping is the most discussed.

New trends in peacekeeping formats

It is clear that all the innovations in peacekeeping are associated with certain international organizations and associations, whose authority and role in the global world processes largely determine the universal legitimacy of conducted peacekeeping operations. The most important modern contributors to peacekeeping are the UN, NATO and the EU. However, in our opinion, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) deserves special attention, because its activity in the area of peacekeeping has some unique characteristics.

In our opinion, OSCE operations impact on the phenomenon of peacekeeping in two interrelated directions. The first is the formation of standards and ideology of regional security, which is reflected in: territorial and functional universality of the Organization’s competence, the ten principles of the Helsinki Final Act 1975, declaring cooperation as a fundamental principle of relations, indivisibility of security, and more. From this perspective, we can talk about further development of some platform supporting the UN.

The second concerns peacekeeping. Historically, among the three Organization's "baskets", the biggest attention was paid to the development of the humanitarian component. Another feature is the preference for peacekeeping related tasks, such as border patrolling or verification work. The third feature of the OSCE involvement in peacekeeping operations can be considered a specialization in post-conflict rehabilitation (thus the term "post-conflict" does not involve a formal separation of such components as "conflict management", "conflict resolution" and "rehabilitation activities").

Key aspects of post-conflict rehabilitation of the OSCE are:

- Military stabilization through promoting confidence and security building measures;
- Assistance in the disarmament executed by parties to the conflict;
- Restoring democratic governance;
- Restoring the rule of law;
- Assistance in the recovery mechanisms of democratic elections.

In general, considering the criterion of a realization format (contributing organization, priorities of peacekeeping activities and observance of legal procedures), at least three stable types of peacekeeping can be distinguished:

- Universal (UN);
- Cooperative (OSCE);
- Collective (NATO and the EU).

In our opinion, now a ground has been forming for "allied" peacekeeping, which is associated with humanitarian interventions held usually by situational (ad hoc) state alliances. To this group can also be imputed the intention of forming a Collective Security Treaty Organization to develop future peacekeeping activities already stated and partially implemented at a regulatory and institutional level.

Ukrainian peacekeeping today

The question of participation of Ukrainian peacekeeping contingents and personnel is regulated by several legal acts, including:

- The Law of Ukraine on Participation in International Peacekeeping Operations (No. 613-XIV of 23 April 1999);
- The Law of Ukraine on the Procedure of Sending Armed Forces' Units to Other States (No. 1518-III of 2 March 2000);

- The Decree of the President of Ukraine on the Procedure of Consideration of the Proposals about the Participation of Ukraine in International Peacekeeping Operations (No. 153 of 1 February 2000);
- The Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on Some Questions of Maintenance of Peacekeeping Contingents and Personnel financed by Costs of State Budget (No. 401 of 30 March 2006);
- The Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on the Adoption of the Procedure of the Material, Technical and Financial Provisions of the Peacekeeping Contingent and Personnel, which Participates in International Peacekeeping Operations (No. 963 of 11 July 2002);
- The Decree of the President of Ukraine on the Adoption of the Strategy of International Peacekeeping Activity of Ukraine (No. 435 of 15 June 2009);
- The Law of Ukraine on the Ratification of the Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine Establishing a Framework for the Participation of Ukraine in the European Union Crisis Management Operations (No 137-VI of 6 March 2008) and so on.

The Strategy of international peacekeeping activities of Ukraine approved the Decree of the President of Ukraine No 435 of 15 June 2009, and defined for the first time at the state level the tasks, conditions and prospects of Ukraine's participation in international peacekeeping operations.

Considering its non-aligned foreign policy, peacekeeping activation allows Ukraine to become an influential player in international security and stability issues, deepening relationships in the defense field with key foreign partners, to promote national economic interests in the regions where operations are conducted, while enhancing the combat readiness of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and their training personnel.

Since 1992, Ukraine has directed peacekeeping and national contingents, and military and police observers, and staff officers, and has provided material and technical recourses and participated in over 20 peacekeeping operations under the auspices of the United Nations (UN peacekeeping), several OSCE peacekeeping operations, the EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the multinational forces in Kosovo (KFOR) the NATO Training Mission in Iraq, the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, the NATO antiterrorist operation "Active Endeavour" in the Mediterranean, the EU naval operation "Atalanta" to combat piracy off the Somali coast and within the joint peacekeeping forces in the security zone of the Transdnestrian region of Moldova.

In the context of the above-mentioned trends in the field of peacekeeping and the analysis of practical experience in international operations of restoration and maintaining peace and stability the following conclusions can be made:

1. Ukraine's participation in UN activities in the maintenance of international peace and security, that arises from Ukraine's commitments under the UN Charter, as well as collective efforts to ensure peace, security and stability in the formats of the OSCE, NATO and the EU have become an integral part of defending our country's national interests in the international arena and an important factor in foreign policy.

2. Involvement in peacekeeping operations, including the UN, brings powerful multidimensional positive military-political and political-economic dividends:

- Strengthening the international authority of Ukraine as a reliable, predictable and responsible partner that fulfills its international obligations;
- A practical course of European integration and development of constructive cooperation between Ukraine and NATO, as the majority of countries with which Ukraine is jointly involved in the operations are both EU and NATO members as well as strategic partners of our country;
- Creating favorable conditions and a climate for the realization of national economic and political interests in the region of operation;
- Servicemen of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine employees get valuable professional experience during participation in multinational peacekeeping and crisis management operations, and they also maintain a high combat readiness and training level;
- Additional financial resources the state budget received as compensation payments for the participation and providing peacekeeping personnel in UN missions;
- Promotion of mutually beneficial cooperation with Euro-Atlantic and European security structures;
- Promotion of reform processes of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and the transformation of the training system of the above-mentioned capabilities, the development of military infrastructure;
- Increasing the interoperability of certain capabilities and improving the expeditionary capability of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

3. Credibility, gained by Ukraine in UN peacekeeping activity, is a useful political and diplomatic leverage for defending the national interests of our

country in the UN and the Secretariat of the Organization. In particular, this factor played a significant role in Ukraine becoming a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council for the term 2000-2001, and will be a key element of our campaign during the election to the UN Security Council for the period 2016-2017.

4. During the “evolutionary selection”, Ukraine consolidated leadership positions in UN peacekeeping operations in provisional capabilities of military transport helicopters, which are a critically important element of the successful completion of UN missions mandate tasks in a number of strategically important regions. Considering the urgent need of permanent UN peacekeeping operations for this type of aircraft, the so-called “helicopter specialization” of Ukraine provides additional leverage to strengthen our country’s position in the UN. This factor has contributed to launching a joint initiative to expand the involvement of material and technical assistance from the Organization to improve the peacekeeping capacity of Ukraine (primarily, to modernize the domestic helicopters’ fleet and to train flight and technical staff, one of the elements of which should be a pilot project to restore 10 Ukrainian Mi-8T and to prepare the crew).

5. In February 1994, Ukraine declared its readiness to participate in United Nations standby arrangements to improve the UN operative system reaction to crises – the mechanism by which some of the troops, entered into the system, are in readiness in their territory and can be sent to a particular mission after the UN Secretariat’s corresponding request. Since then, Ukraine has been incorporated with the member countries of the mentioned mechanism. In August 1997 a Memorandum of understanding was signed between the UN Secretariat and Ukraine about particular resources given by our country to be disposed by the above-mentioned system (airborne-commando battalion, transport aviation squadron, a group of military observers, staff officers and military police).

6. Consolidation of our state’s status as an important contributor to UN peacekeeping activity was supported by active political and diplomatic actions:

- In 2002 the UN General Assembly approved unanimously a resolution contributed by the delegation of Ukraine, which proclaimed May 29 the International Day of Peacekeeping;
- Following Ukrainian initiative, on 7 November 2008, the UN General Assembly endorsed a Declaration on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of UN peacekeeping (almost 100 countries were co-authors);

- During its 64th session the UN General Assembly approved unanimously the initiative of Ukraine to review the system of compensation provided by the Organization to the countries supplying military helicopters to UN peacekeeping operations.

7. In accordance with its national interests, Ukraine is involved in the ongoing process of fundamental reform of the UN peacekeeping mechanism to enhance its effectiveness based on a conceptual document of the UN Secretariat “New Horizons” as an agenda of reforming the entire system of UN peacekeeping in the short and long term. Supported by the delegation of Ukraine, it is gradually implementing the recommendations of the UN Secretariat to improve interaction in the triangle of the UN Security Council – the country-contributor – the UN Secretariat, to strengthen measures of ensuring the peacekeepers’ safety, as well as for more active involvement of supplier countries in the implementation of peacekeeping operations in all phases of conducting, from planning to completing peacebuilding. As a member of the UN Security Council in 2000-2001, Ukraine took an active part in implementing a number of constructive forms of consultation and cooperation between Belarus, supplier countries and the UN Secretariat.

8. Ukraine has made a significant contribution to the international legal framework improving the ensuring of an appropriate level of protection and security of UN peacekeeping operations:

- In 1994 Ukraine initiated the development of the Convention on the Safety of UN and Associated Personnel and in July 1995 was one of the first member states to ratify it;
- During the 64th session of the UN General Assembly our state got unanimous recognition by the Member States for its call for the need to expand the rights and legal protection of the peacekeeping personnel participating UN peacekeeping missions;
- The president of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich in his speech at the general debate of the 65th session of the UN General Assembly welcomed consensus support of the Ukrainian initiative and called the UN to further improve the legal protection of “blue helmets”.

9. Organization of training in Ukraine for the international peacekeeping personnel with the assistance of the Organization’s instructors and on the basis of standardized training modules developed by the UN was allocated as a separate field of interaction Ukraine-UN. As a result of a successful international course for UN military observers at the Yavoriv Training Centre, the experts of the Organization certified a training course for

officers of multinational staffs at the National Defence Academy of Ukraine in accordance with UN standards of training.

10. At all interaction levels with the United Nations, the UN Secretariat and the permanent members of the UN Security Council, Ukraine took the issue of peacekeeping as one of the priority sites. Amid high assessments of Ukraine's contribution to UN efforts in maintaining or restoring international peace and security it is recognized that the level of Ukrainian peacekeeping troops and personnel, maintenance of weapons, technology and logistics, as well as the moral-psychological state of the personnel afford to perform effectively peacekeeping tasks. As a result, Ukraine periodically receives addresses from the UN Secretariat to expand participation in peacekeeping operations as well as regular requests from the management of field missions to the UN Secretariat about the extension of Ukrainian "blue helmets" assignments.

11. Most incidents involving Ukrainian peacekeepers happened under circumstances independent of the UN and not related to their official tasks. Analysis of losses among the personnel of Ukrainian peacekeepers (about 30 people), which Ukraine has suffered since 1992 while participating in operations of the UN peacekeeping shows that the predominant majority of them were related to the violation of safety rules and discipline and to the lack of psychological preparation of some staff members. In this context, the UN Secretariat appreciates the serious attitude and purposeful measures taken by the Ukrainian side at various levels in order to correct deficiencies.

12. Due to the involvement of Ukraine in the UN operations in different regions of the world, UN peacekeeping channels are used actively by the Ukrainian side for urgent assistance to the citizens of Ukraine that were in trouble in the areas of instability.

13. Due to the significant contribution of Ukraine to the UN peacekeeping efforts, our state is represented in the appropriate structural units of the UN Secretariat – the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support (eight members including current and former officers of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine).

Priorities for the future

As mentioned above, the active participation in peacekeeping operations is the traditional policy of Ukraine and non-aligned status won't make

a radical impact on this priority. In the near future, the attention of the government will be paid to the following areas in order to strengthen the peacekeeping capacity of Ukraine:

1. Focus on implementation of political agreements between Ukraine and the UN achieved at the highest levels relating to the geographical expansion of our country's participation in the United Nations' peacekeeping operations, primarily by sending aircraft detachments. In the short term: Ukrainian helicopter unit (four Mi-24s) to the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), the deployment of a police contingent in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), sending Ukrainian officers to a Slovak military contingent in the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).

2. Participation in peacekeeping operations and NATO missions undertaken under the UN Security Council mandate, and also examining opportunities to expand participation in EU-led operations, for financial and resource support of such participation.

3. Developing clear internal mechanisms and identifying the specific ways of implementing the Strategy of international peacekeeping activities of Ukraine approved by the Decree No. 435 of the President of Ukraine of 15 June 2009. In particular, it is proposed to take steps to review and to optimize (simplify) the internal decision-making system in the field of peacekeeping and also to improve certain legal aspects that regulate the submission and participation of Ukrainian contingents and personnel in UN peacekeeping operations and other peacebuilding collective efforts. As a result, this will narrow down the timing of the request to the UN Secretariat, the OSCE, the EU and NATO and it will also ensure readiness to deploy timely national contingents, peacekeeping personnel, and to provide material and technical resources and services.

4. Creating a system of targeted funding of international peacekeeping activities by directing revenues for participating in UN missions in the budget of the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine (regarding participation of formed police units – the budget of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine) for their intended use to provide training, maintenance and rotation of peacekeeping staff and personnel. Formation of the targeted reserve funds within the state budget for the preparation and submission of new peacekeeping troops, in case of complaints regarding the participation in the operation and the adoption of political decisions, reduced to the maximum terms of inter-agency coordination and practical implementation of relevant decisions.

5. The introduction of innovative forms of participation of Ukraine in United Nations peacekeeping activities, in particular by expanding the practice of engaging in projects initiated by our state with the intermittent support of the UN; the formation of joint multinational troop units with international partners; the deployment of Ukrainian units in fields of engineering (extraction and water treatment, infrastructure missions), medicine, mine-clearance and others; sending Ukrainian officers to the foreign contingents in UN peacekeeping operations to consolidate and expand participation in them.

6. Strengthening political and diplomatic support for the peacemaking activities of Ukraine by ensuring the active participation of our country in the relevant UN mechanisms, in particular – the Special Committee of the UN on peacekeeping, the UN General Assembly Fourth Committee (Special Political Affairs), in case of Ukraine's election to the UN Security Council for the period 2016-2017 – also in the Security Council Working Group on peacekeeping operations, the Working Group on contingent assets, and others.

7. Development of an information-image program to cover the activity of contingents and personnel of the Armed Forces of Ukraine and the staff of the Ministry of Internal Affairs within the peacekeeping operations of the UN to consolidate for Ukraine the status of active and effective contributor to international peacekeeping efforts and to strengthen the positive reputation of Ukraine in the world.

8. Improvement of the national participants' selection system in UN peacekeeping operations, in particular by raising the relevant criteria and requirements for them, including partly the physical and psychological indicators and knowledge of foreign languages, and norms of legal accountability for adherence to the UN code of conduct in order to minimize the number of disciplinary violations and the number of casualties among Ukrainian peacekeepers due to accidents.

9. Increasing dynamics of Ukraine's cooperation with the UN Secretariat in order to prepare in Ukraine international peacekeeping personnel on the basis of standardized training modules developed by the UN.

10. Expanding representation of our country in the structural units of the UN Secretariat, primarily – the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support, and in field missions.

Bibliography

1. Boutros-Ghali, B., *An Agenda for Peace*. 2nd edn, New York: United Nations 1995
2. Cockell, J., *Conceptualising Peacebuilding: Human Security and Sustainable Peace*, in: Pugh, M. (ed.), *Regeneration of War-Torn Societies*, London: Macmillan 2000
3. Cousens, E., Introduction, in: Cousens, E. and Kumar, C. with Wermester, K. (eds.), *Peacebuilding as Politics: Cultivating Peace in Fragile Societies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers 2001
4. Doyle, M. and Sambanis, N., *International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis*, *American Political Science Review* 94, 2000
5. Finnemore, M., *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 2003
6. Lund, M., *Preventing Violent Conflicts: A Strategy for Preventive Diplomacy*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press 1996
7. Most, B. and Starr, H., *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press 1989
8. Paris, R., *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004
9. Pugh, M., Introduction: The Ownership of Regeneration and Peacebuilding, in: Pugh, M. (ed.), *Regeneration of War-Torn Societies*, London: Macmillan 2000
10. Talentino, A., *One Step Forward, One Step Back: The Development of Peacebuilding as Concept and Strategy*, *Journal of Conflict Studies* 25, 2004

BIOGRAPHIES

Paweł Świeżak – analyst in the National Security Bureau since 2007 (Department of Strategic Analyses). Master's degree from Warsaw School of Economics (international economic relations, 2004). Author of publications concerning national security and international politics ("National Security" Quarterly, Portal for International Affairs, "Unia and Polska"). Areas of interest: situation in Central and Eastern Europe, Polish security policy.

Dmytro Adamenko – state expert in the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine, where he has been employed since 2006. Previously he was employed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and posted in the Ukrainian Embassy in Uzbekistan. He graduated from the Institute of International Relations of the Kyiv Shevchenko National University (2000), where he studied International Information.

Krzysztof Liedel, PhD – lawyer, PhD degree in security management area, expert on international terrorism and terrorism combating. Trainee of the National Counterterrorism Center in the USA. Former Head of the Unit for Terrorism Combating of the Public Safety Department in the Ministry of Interior and Administration of the Republic of Poland. He was lecturer and director of Terrorism Studies Center at Collegium Civitas in Warsaw. Currently he is the Deputy Director of the Department of Legal and Non-Military Affairs in the National Security Bureau.

Paulina Piasecka – graduated from the International Relations Institute, University of Warsaw. Trainee of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies. Former senior expert in the Unit for Terrorism Combating of the Public Safety Department in the Ministry of Interior and Administration of the Republic of Poland. Deputy Director for program matters of Terrorism Studies Center at Collegium Civitas, Warsaw. Currently she is the Head of the Unit of Public Safety in the Department of Legal and Non-Military Affairs in the National Security Bureau.

Viktor Mykolaiovych Soloviov – Head of the Branch for Internal Threats, Expertise and Analytical Department in the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine (NSDC). Prior to his employment in the NSDC, he was working at the Institute of Legislation of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, the National Academy of Public Administration, the Office of the President of Ukraine and as an economic crime investigator. He holds a PhD degree in Public Administration.

Paweł Pietrzak – graduated from Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Faculty of Political Science. Completed an expert course at George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies in Garmisch-Partenkirchen (Security, Stabilization, Transition and Reconstruction). He is the scholarship holder of the German Bundestag and the Humboldt University in Berlin – a half-year practice in Bureau of the Member of Bundestag – Christian Schmidt in the framework of International Parliamentary Scholarships (IPS) and the German Academic Exchange Service, the one-year study at the University of Bonn. In the National Security Bureau, he was employed as the Deputy Director of the Armed Forces Supervision Department and currently he is the Deputy Director of the Department of Strategic Analyses. Previously he was working as the General Counselor to the Undersecretary for Defence Policy in the Polish Ministry of National Defence.

Volodymyr Polischuk – Chief of Section at the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine. Previously he was, among other functions, the Military Observer, UNAVEM-III (MONUA) in Angola and the Deputy Chief Liaison Officer, HQ Sector Sarajevo, UNPROFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the Deputy Force Commander, UNIFIL, Lebanon. The graduate of the Military College of Armor, Kharkov, the USSR and the Military Academy of Armor, Moscow, the USSR as well as the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom (Managing Defence in a Democratic, Market-based Society) and the George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies (Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction), Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.

ISBN 978-83-60846-14-8