

**Józef M. Fiszer\***

**POLICY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC  
OF GERMANY TOWARD RUSSIA  
IN THE MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER:  
ITS OBJECTIVES, TASKS AND CONSEQUENCES  
FOR EUROPE\*\***

INTRODUCTION

Our reflections are devoted to Germany and Poland, their foreign policy, the place and role on the international arena today and in the future multipolar world order. We also think about the evolution of the international scene and the new international order scenarios, and potential alliances that may be formed and function within that new (future) international system.

At present, we witness the formation of that new multipolar and multi-civilizational international system. It is the result of the collapse of the Yalta-Potsdam order and globalisation, which cause unprecedented changes on the international arena. In connection with that, it is very difficult to give the right diagnosis today, and what is even more difficult, make an objective forecast on the future of the world, its ultimate shape and international security. Apart from that, the world, Europe, America, the European Union and NATO, i.e. the most important components of the international system so far, still remain in the financial and economic crisis shadow. This crisis revealed the exhaustion of the principles and forms on which the present political, social

---

\* Józef M. Fiszer – Professor, PhD, Lazarski University in Warsaw, Faculty of Economics and Management, [fiszer@isppan.waw.pl](mailto:fiszer@isppan.waw.pl)

\*\* Artykuł powstał w ramach projektu o nazwie „Niemcy i Polska w wielobiegunowym łańdźie międzynarodowym. Strategiczna wizja i potencjalne sojusze” (nr projektu 00340/2015/KJ) współfinansowanego przez Fundację Współpracy Polsko-Niemieckiej.

and economic order is based, determined by a liberal democratic system, in particular its current form, i.e. neoliberalism. It is also an announcement of changes approaching in the geopolitical and geo-economic pattern, mainly determined by the hegemony of the United States in the world so far.

The changes are accompanied by discussions and disputes among researchers and politicians on the present, transitional and future international order, and on the security of Europe and the whole world. Questions are asked about the Euro-Atlantic system in the multipolar international order and opportunities and threats to Europe and the United States, the European Union and NATO in the conditions of continuous globalisation and a growing position of China, India, Russia and Brazil in the world. Trying to answer them, experts and politicians formulate many interesting but controversial theories, theses and hypotheses. Most of them assume that in the perspective of 20–30 years, a new multipolar world order will develop and besides the United States, the emerging superpowers led by China, India and Russia will play a key role. It is assumed that the Euro-Atlantic system will continue to be the guarantor of international security and the United States, the European Union and NATO will play the main roles in it. It is emphasised that the United States will remain the world political, military and economic superpower but its hegemony will be gradually fading<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, however, the role of America in the world, not only the political, but also even the civilizational one, is questioned and criticised. There are theories on the superpower decline and criticism of its domestic and foreign policy both in the USA and abroad. The United States' role of a hegemon is predicted to change into the role of a *global driver* and it is assumed that the power of China and India will continue to rise and the importance of Russia in the world will decrease<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> P.D. Williams, *Security Studies. An Introduction*, Routledge, London & New York 2012; S. Koziej, *Między piekłem a rajem. Szare bezpieczeństwo na progu XXI wieku [Between hell and paradise: grey security at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2006; J.W. Müller, *Wo Europa endet? Ungarn, Brüssel und das Schicksal der liberalen Demokratie [Where does Europe end? Hungary, Brussels and the future of liberal democracy]*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2013.

<sup>2</sup> See L.W. Zacher, *Przyszłość w świetle prognoz światowych u progu XXI wieku [Future in the light of global forecasts at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, "Polska 2000 Plus", no. 1, 2001; F. Fukuyama, *Budowanie państwa. Władza i ład międzynarodowy w XXI wieku [State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, Polish translation by J. Serwański, Wydawnictwo REBIS, Poznań 2005; J. Wallerstein, *Koniec świata jaki znamy [The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century]*, Polish translation by M. Gilewicz [et al.], Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2004;

The article aims to make an attempt to present the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany (FDR) towards Russia and its role in the future multipolar world, especially with regard to international peace and security. Moreover, I intend to present the premises of this policy and answer the questions concerning its aims and consequences for Germany, Russia and Europe, inter alia, whether or not a new Treaty of Rapallo is going to take place and whether or not Russia and Germany will try to play a dominant role in Europe. It is not an easy task if one takes into account a complex situation in the world and a difficult political, social and economic situation of contemporary Russia, as well as the amount of tasks that that country must carry out in order to become a modern, strong, efficiently managed, democratic and peaceful superpower. In this process, Russia can get help from Germany, which already today is an unquestioned leader in Europe and plays more and more important role in the world. As Almut Moeller, an expert in political science and Head of the European Council of Foreign Relations (SCFR), writes:

“Germany is perceived in the European Union as a guarantor of stabilisation. German government is trusted. Foreign Affairs Minister Steinmeier and Chancellor Merkel are realistic politicians. (...) Angela Merkel is influential and Vladimir Putin feels that, and he would like Russia to take a seat at the same table with other superpowers, and Germany is such a power in Europe at present”<sup>3</sup>.

On the other hand, however, there are fears, especially in Poland, that too far-reaching cooperation between Germany and Russia may be harmful to Europe, its security and international peace. The history of Europe and the world shows that the relations between Germany and Russia always used to be an essential part of it and they also had mainly negative consequences for Poland. Poland, because of its geopolitical location, was forced to implement a policy based on the theory of ‘two enemies’ and to look for allies among the Anglo-Saxon states and France in order to ensure its security. Germany and Russia did not treat Poland as a potential partner but thought it to be an enemy and wanted to annihilate it. As a result, both states that wanted to dominate Europe looked for agreements above Poland and cooperated at Poland’s expense, which in practice led to partitions, annexation and

---

Z. Brzeziński, *Wybór – dominacja czy przywództwo [The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership]*, Polish translation by B. Pietrzyk, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2004.

<sup>3</sup> M. Matzke, *Nowa rola Niemiec: mediator i gwarant stabilności [New role of Germany: a mediator and a guarantor of stability]*, [www.dw.com/pl/nowa-rola-niemiec--mediator-i-gwarant-stabilności](http://www.dw.com/pl/nowa-rola-niemiec--mediator-i-gwarant-stabilności)

occupation in the period 1939–1945. The agreement between Stalin and Hitler signed on 23 August 1939, which led to the Second World War and the new division of Europe, became a symbol of Germany and Russia's anti-Polish policy. The system that came into being in Europe and the world after World War II came down to the history of international relations as Yalta-Potsdam order and, besides the United States, the Soviet Union was its main pillar. Germany, which was divided into two states, and Poland and other East-Central European states, which found they were in the sphere of Soviet influence, became the victims of the system. The division of Europe and the world lasted until 1989–1991 and ended in the collapse of communism, the German reunification in 1990 and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The main thesis of the article is the opinion that the way to a new, probably multipolar world order is still very long and that Germany, remembering history and its tragic experience, will not return to the policy of cooperation with Russia, whose aim is a new division of Europe and the world. In my opinion, Germany remembers the past and will remain a democratic state and an important link in the Euro-Atlantic system. Moreover, I believe that Russia will become a democratic and peaceful state. It will take place when it releases itself from Vladimir Putin's rule. Unfortunately, it will not take place soon according to many researchers and experts. Not until there is an economic disaster and an outburst of social dissatisfaction in Russia; only then Vladimir Putin will be forced to leave the political scene.

Here, I would like to emphasise that the role of Poland and the FRG in the collapse of the bipolar system and the end of the Cold War in Europe, and thus in the world, was enormous. Poland and Germany were essential links in the Yalta-Potsdam order and at the same time its victims, and they felt they had been wronged by the Soviet Union. Obviously, the situation in both states was different, but the bipolar order was imposed on them, unwanted and limiting their sovereignty, activeness and role on the international arena. Thus, both Poland and the FRG were interested in dismantling the Soviet Union and its collapse. The FRG pursued German reunification and Poland wanted to release itself from the Soviet domination and become a fully sovereign and democratic state, and return to free Europe.

\* \* \*

After the collapse of the communist system in Europe, there was an opinion that the biggest threats for international stability in the political sphere, the prosperity of the capitalist system in the economic sphere and

the development of open society had disappeared forever. Communism had compromised itself in all these spheres although the economic sphere had been decisive for its collapse because the all-powerful state system resulted in pitiful conditions in comparison with the market system in the West<sup>4</sup>. The situation created conducive conditions for not only uncritical implementation of extreme market economy models but also a revelation of pressure in the mature market economies to minimise the role of the state in the development of economic processes. The pressure had already found a theoretical background in the form of the neoliberal doctrine. Surprisingly for the international community, after over thirty years' domination of the doctrine, in the conditions of rapid development of globalisation, the present economic and financial crisis revealed the full scale of new threats not only to the stability and development of the world economy but also to particular states and the whole capitalist system as well as the international order. In the majority of countries today, the income inequality is increasing and the citizens' mistrust of the state is growing with it. Thus, the state is getting weaker and has fewer and fewer possibilities of halting the growth of inequalities causing further decrease in social trust and the erosion of rationality in politics.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, there was a good moment in history when the United States together with the European Union could become an unquestioned world leader of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, the opportunity was wasted because the United States did not intend to follow the *primus inter pares* principle and pursued the position of the only super-actor on the global scene, which was especially evident at the time of George W. Bush's presidency. At the same time, the United States was trapped in domestic and foreign debt. The enormous indebtedness in China, which exceeded 1.5 trillion dollars, was especially dangerous because it could initiate the United States bankruptcy proceeding at any time. Moreover, the American democracy is becoming lame and the system of presidential power is less and less efficient both in the domestic and foreign policy. On the other hand, Europe with the European Union as a leader is also becoming weaker and weaker because it cannot cope with the mega-crisis that is composed of the financial-economic crisis, the axiology crisis, the integration crisis, the immigration crisis and the Brexit crisis. I have no doubts that Brexit will weaken the European Union

<sup>4</sup> R. Cameron, L. Neal, *Historia gospodarcza świata. Od paleoitu do czasów najnowszych [A Concise Economic History of the World: From Palaeolithic Times to the Present]*, Polish translation by H. Lisiecka-Michalska, M. Kluźniak, Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 2004, pp. 427–433.

and hamper integration processes in Europe. There is no doubt that only the strong European Union can be a world partner to the United States, which maintains and develops material and spiritual strengths of the Euro-Atlantic Community. Weak Europe with the weak European Union, and thus the weak Euro-Atlantic Community, will not be a co-author of a new, democratic and multi-civilizational global order<sup>5</sup>.

Therefore, Zbigniew Brzeziński is right to write in his book significantly entitled *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*:

“Only America that is dynamic and is implementing a well thought-out strategy together with the uniting Europe may cooperate in favour of the greater and more lively West capable of playing a responsible role of a partner for the East that is growing in power and becoming more and more confident. Otherwise, it is possible that the West, which is geopolitically divided and focuses on itself, will plunge into a historical decline that will make it similar to humiliated and helpless China of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the East, on the other hand, there may be a temptation to repeat the disastrous trial of strength between the states of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Europe”<sup>6</sup>.

\* \* \*

Making reference to the theory of hegemonic cycles, we can say that the current world is at the stage of delegitimising the position of the United States on the international arena<sup>7</sup>. At that stage, the game of changing the world paradigm from a unipolar to a multipolar one is not played openly and the potential rivals of the hegemon to date (the United States), i.e. the emerging powers with the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and Russia as leaders, on the one hand, are trying to benefit from the still existing system of powers, and on the other hand to undermine it. In addition, they are doing it in a more or less camouflaged way, under such banners as sustainable development, peaceful cooperation, multilateralism and world security,

<sup>5</sup> T.G. Ash, *Free World: America, Europe and the Surprising Future of the West*, Random House, New York 2010; A. Kukliński, K. Pawłowski (ed.), *The Atlantic Community. The Titanic of the XXI Century?*, Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu – National Louis University, Nowy Sącz 2010.

<sup>6</sup> Z. Brzeziński, *Strategiczna wizja. Ameryka a kryzys globalnej potęgi [Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power]*, Polish translation by K. Skoneczny, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2013, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> See G. Modelski, *The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation-State*, “Comparative Studies in Society and History” 1978, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 213–236; G. Modelski, W.R. Thompson, *Leading Sectors and World Powers: The Co-evolution of Global Economics and Politics*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia 1966, pp. 128–136; R. Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1983.

and in reality they are striving for undermining the post-Cold War order of powers in the world. They pursue the delegitimisation of the United States and its position on the international arena by resorting to the so-called non-violent resistance strategy. It includes e.g. criticism of the United States' policy in the international organisations, forming anti-American coalitions and revealing its weaknesses. The United States allies, e.g. France, the FRG and Turkey, as well as Russia, sometimes support these actions, which was clearly exemplified by their stand on the civil war in Libya or the four years' long civil war in Syria<sup>8</sup>.

The Federal Republic of Germany is an especially flagrant example of such anti-American attitudes and behaviour. It was against the US military intervention in Iraq in 2003 and in 2011, like China, India, Brazil and Russia, abstained from voting on the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 on the situation in Libya<sup>9</sup>.

One can risk a statement that the German government also wanted to manifest its power and that it has a different opinion on the international security issues than its allies (in particular the United States) do, and show that the FRG is able to carry out its own independent foreign policy on a global scale<sup>10</sup>.

Here, it is worth adding that the FRG officially emphasises that it still is the United States' faithful ally and the North Atlantic Treaty is a guarantor of its security. Inter alia, after the parliamentary election in 2009 and the formation of the CDU/CSU–FDP government, signing their coalition agreement on 26 October 2009, the representatives of the three parties emphasised that the German foreign policy priorities are:

- strengthening the transatlantic cooperation,
- cooperating more closely with Russia within the frame of international structures,

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Zdanowski, *Bliski Wschód 2011: bunt czy rewolucja? [Middle East 2011: rebellion or revolution?]*, Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM, Kraków 2011, pp. 191–203; Y. Al. Haj Saleh, *Die Revolution in Syrien [Revolution in Syria]*, „Neue Gesellschaft Frankfurter Hefte” 2012, no. 9, pp. 12–16.

<sup>9</sup> The Resolution was adopted on 17 March 2012. See [http://www.un.org/News/Press/doc/2011/sc\\_10200.doc.htm](http://www.un.org/News/Press/doc/2011/sc_10200.doc.htm). Also see: M. Soja, *Stosunki UE–NATO w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa europejskiego i obrony na przełomie XX i XXI wieku [EU–NATO relations in the field of European security and defence at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2011, pp. 209–216.

<sup>10</sup> P. Sasnal, *Kryzys w Libii, a reakcje społeczności międzynarodowej [Crisis in Libya and international community's reaction]*, “Biuletyn PISM” 2011, no. 20, p. 2.

- making the participation of the Bundeswehr dependent on the UN, the EU or NATO mandate,
- deepening cooperation with Poland<sup>11</sup>.

A month later, Chancellor Angela Merkel in her *expose* presented in the Bundestag also emphasised that the new government's aims are, in the field of domestic policy: getting out of the economic recession, and in the field of foreign policy: freedom, peace and security, prosperity for everyone and social progress<sup>12</sup>.

Therefore, an American expert and well-known specialist in political science, George Friedman, is probably right to state in his book devoted to changes in the international powers' relations and threats to the new world order that in the decades to come, Germany and Russia, and not the emerging powers with China as a leader, will constitute the biggest threats to the United States and the world<sup>13</sup>. He emphasises that the relations between the United States and Germany have deteriorated mainly because of the financial crisis and the American war in Iraq, and that:

“the Americans have serious problems with the Russians, and the Germans distance themselves from their attempts to stop Russia. (...) In the years to come, the relations between America and Russia and Germany will be changing and we should expect a considerable movement here. Regardless of public opinion, the increased presence of Russia in the East of Europe endangers American interests. (...) The more will America be concerned about the position of Russia, the bigger will the distance be between it and Germany. (...) All these manoeuvres are first of all aimed at avoiding a war and next at halting the rapprochement between Russia and Germany, which might endanger the American hegemony in the decades to come”<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> *Wachstum. Bildung. Zusammenhalt, der Koalitionvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und FDP, 17 Legislaturperiode [Growth. Education. CDU, CSU and FDP coalition agreement. 17th Bundestag]*, Berlin 2009; *CDU podpisało umowę koalicyjną z FDP [CDU signed a coalition agreement with FDP]*, “Wprost”, 26 October 2009, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup> M. Zawilska-Florczuk, *Nowy rząd RFN: integracja i edukacja zamiast wielkich reform [New government of the FRG: integration and education instead of a great reform]*, Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich, Warszawa 2011, [www.osw.waw.pl/pl](http://www.osw.waw.pl/pl).

<sup>13</sup> G. Friedman, *Następna dekada. Gdzie byliśmy i dokąd zmierzamy [The Next Decade: What the World Will Look Like]*, Polish translation by M. Wyrwas-Wiśniewska, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2012. Also compare J. Żakowski, *Ameryka wraca do domu. Wywiad z George'em Friedmanem, amerykańskim politologiem, właścicielem prywatnej agencji wywiadowczej, o nadmiernym znaczeniu Niemiec w Europie i militarnych obowiązkach Polski [America comes back home: an interview with George Friedman, an American political science researcher and owner of a private intelligence agency about the excessive importance of Germany in Europe and military duties of Poland]*, “Polityka”, 29 October – 6 November 2012, pp. 4–46.

<sup>14</sup> G. Friedman, *Następna dekada... [The Next Decade...]*, pp. 204–205. Also compare: E. Lucas, *Nowa zimna wojna. Jak Kreml zagraża Rosji i Zachodowi [New Cold War:*

Today, not only the political and economic relations between Germany and Russia are becoming closer, but also the perception and image of Russia in Germany and of Germany in Russia are changing. Negative stereotypes of Russia and the Russians were very popular with the German community. They had been shaped for ages and strengthened by the propaganda of the Cold War period. After the German reunification, in the 1990s, the media in Germany depicted Russia as a country sinking in chaos and poverty, and after Vladimir Putin came to power, he was accused of authoritarian inclinations and imperial ambitions. The anti-Russian campaign escalated after the outbreak of the Russian-Georgian war in 2008, when the media in the FRG supported the Georgian version of the conflict. On the other hand, the image of Germany among the Russians is positive. Unlike the United States, which the majority of the Russians traditionally perceive as a political and economic adversary, the FRG is presented in the Russian media as a model of a friendly and reliable economic partner<sup>15</sup>.

\* \* \*

For years, Russia has been trying to use the weakened hegemony of the United States in the world in order to strengthen its own geostrategic position in the new international order. It is trying to push the United States and NATO away from the Russian border and the post-Soviet region. It is against NATO enlargement and its troops deployment in its former satellites' territory. Its strategic aim is also to weaken the transatlantic links. Russia considers NATO to be a weak organisation, which overestimates its possibilities. It accuses NATO of wicked aims and striving for political and military domination over the world. The factors that influenced the cooling of the NATO's relations with Russia were, inter alia, the already mentioned

---

*Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West*], Polish translation by J. Stawski, Dom Wydawniczy REBIS, Poznań 2008; C. Ochmann, *Przyszłość Partnerstwa Wschodniego z niemieckiej perspektywy [Future of Eastern Partnership from German perspective]*, "Biuletyn Niemiecki" 2010, no. 6; S. Żerko, *Niemiecka polityka wobec Rosji: kontynuacja mimo wszystko [German policy towards Russia: continuation in spite of everything]*, "Biuletyn Instytutu Zachodniego" 2012, no. 104; A. Drzewicki, *Współczesny wymiar stosunków niemiecko-rosyjskich [Contemporary dimension of German-Russian relations]*, "Biuletyn Niemiecki" 2012, no. 26.

<sup>15</sup> G. Gromadzki, J. Kucharczyk, *Ludzie – Historia – Polityka. Polska i Niemcy w oczach Rosjan [People – History – Politics: Poland and Germany in the eyes of the Russians]*, Instytut Spraw Publicznych, 2012, <http://fwpn.org.pl> (accessed: 3 February 2013); G. Kuczyński, *Strategia Rosji wobec Zachodu [Russia's strategy towards the West]*, "Bezpieczeństwo Narodowe" 2009, no. 9–10.

Russian-Georgian war in August 2008<sup>16</sup> and then the Russian-Ukrainian war<sup>17</sup>. As Ronald D. Asmus writes:

“The Russian-Georgian war of August 2008 was a little war that shook the world. Its outbreak shocked the western states immersed in cheerful satisfaction as they were convinced that wars in Europe were a matter of the past. (...) The war questioned the relations between the West and Russia – the state, which many politicians regarded as difficult to cooperate with but few assessed as able to launch a military offensive against one of its neighbours. But what is probably most important, the above-mentioned war violated the very basic principles of the new security policy in Europe, and a big question mark hung over its future. As a result, the small war shook the foundation of the belief that democracy and the spirit of mutual cooperation won an ultimate victory in Europe after the iron curtain had fallen down, and thinking in geopolitical categories of the spheres of influence leading to conflicts and bloodshed was mothballed”<sup>18</sup>.

The new NATO strategy adopted in Lisbon on 19 November 2010 was to ultimately end the post-Cold War epoch and show the Europeans and Americans that the Treaty was still necessary. It was not only to stop its erosion but also strengthen its position in the new international order coming into being. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, an identity crisis started within the Alliance and disputes over what to do with NATO accompanied it. The countries of the former Soviet block, inter alia Poland, still wanted it to be a strong defender against Moscow, but Western Europe did not notice any threat of aggression on the Old Continent. On the other hand, the Americans strove for changing NATO into a tool for supporting wars outside the Treaty territory – such as in Afghanistan and Iraq. In addition, there was a lack of a uniform opinion on how strong American defence guarantees Europe needs and how NATO and American troops deployed in Europe are to strengthen them. This was accompanied by fears that the Alliance might gradually change into a toothless intergovernmental organisation similar to the OSCE, and America will cooperate with allies volunteering from outside the Treaty. This was the character of George W. Bush administration’s plans of missile defence system in Poland and the Czech Republic criticised by many

<sup>16</sup> For more on the topic see: R.D. Asmus, *Mała wojna, która wstrząsnęła światem. Gruzja, Rosja i przyszłość Zachodu [A Little War That Shook the World: Georgia, Russia, and the Future of the World]*, Polish translation by J. Tokarski, Fundacja Res Publica im. Henryka Rzewzkiego, Warszawa 2010; G. Kuczyński, *Strategia Rosji... [Russia's strategy...]*, p. 157.

<sup>17</sup> J.M. Fiszer, *Zadania i cele polityki zagranicznej Władimira Putina [Tasks and aims of Vladimir Putin's foreign policy]*, “Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna” 2016, no. 1(52), pp. 167–201.

<sup>18</sup> R.D. Asmus, *Mała wojna... [A Little War...]*, p. 373.

western countries and Russia. The summit in Lisbon and the then adopted strategy of the Alliance were to strengthen the Euro-Atlantic system and prepare it for the fight against such new threats as cyber-war or international terrorism. Barack Obama, who was present at the NATO summit in Lisbon, emphasised that for America, political and military relations with Europe are of key importance. One of the main aims of the Lisbon summit was also an attempt to work out new rules of cooperation with Russia, which was also the subject matter of the NATO Council and Russia meeting, in which the then President Dmitry Medvedev participated. Unfortunately, the aim has not been achieved because Russia has not officially withdrawn accusation that the planned missile defence system might weaken its defence potential<sup>19</sup>.

It is worth mentioning that the Americans still have in their possession the biggest military potential in the world, and their military spending in 2011 exceeded \$700 billion. It was five times more than the spending in China, which is second in this respect. Russia (which spent \$64 billion) and Germany (which spent \$43 billion) were among the ten states in the world that had the biggest spending for military purposes in 2011. The situation was similar in 2012 and in the following years. In addition, Vladimir Putin announced that in the next ten years Russia would spend as much as \$770 billion for the modernisation of the army, and today he emphasises that Russia is getting armed and will. There will be no withdrawal from the plan<sup>20</sup>. He is aware that the public see the Russian army as a pillar of the state's power and a foundation of the state's authority, *de facto* his rule, which is more and authoritarian<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> T. Bielecki, *NATO na początku XXI wieku [NATO at the beginning of the 21st century]*, "Gazeta Wyborcza", 19 November 2010, p. 10; *Active Engagement, Moderne Demence...*, pp. 17–31; K. Żukrowska (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo Międzynarodowe [International security]*, Ius At Tax, Warszawa 2011.

<sup>20</sup> Nakłady na zbrojenia opracowane przez Szwedzki Instytut Badań nad Pokojem [Spending on armament developed by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute] (SIPRI): [www.sipri.org](http://www.sipri.org). 2011 and 2012, also: U. Beck, *Das deutsche Europa [German Europe]*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2013 published in Polish: U. Beck, *Niemiecka Europa. Nowe krajobrazy władzy pod znakiem kryzysu [German Europe: New landscapes of power in crisis]*, Polish translation by R. Formuszewicz, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2013; A. Ścios, *Rosja – imperium czy potęga mitu [Russia – an empire or the power of a myth]*, 21 March 2013, <http://bezdekkretu.blogspot.com/2013/03/rosja-imperium-czy-potega-mitu-html>

<sup>21</sup> A. Politkowskaya, *Rosja Putina [Putin's Russia]*, Polish translation by T. Korecki, Wydawnictwo Studio Emka, Warszawa 2005, p. 39; J. Topolski, *Sila militarna w poli-*

Vladimir Putin also re-established the power of the security service and expands control over many fields of social life step by step. During his third term, he must authenticate his victory and regain the masses' support. That is why, in order to regain social mandate, Putin creates himself the nation's leader. He focuses his efforts on the supporters of strong-arm rule, and his power unites the society. At the same time, he consistently strives to strengthen the position of Russia as a world superpower on the international arena. He canvasses influence in Europe, Asia, Middle East and Latin America<sup>22</sup>. More and more often, he emphasises the fact that Russia has nuclear weapons and declares readiness to use them in case other measures to ensure the state's security are exhausted. On his demand, the State Duma of the Russian Federation amended the Act on defence on 23 October 2009 and extended president's competences to use armed forces abroad. Moreover, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence has become the key element of the Russian defence policy indispensable for maintaining the status of a state power balancing the weakness of conventional forces. Because of that, the issue of maintaining and improving the nuclear potential of Russia was given the highest priority<sup>23</sup>. This bears witness to the statement that Putin accepts the possibility of using military power as an essential tool of implementing Russia's foreign policy, especially within the boundaries of the former Soviet Union<sup>24</sup>.

President Vladimir Putin practically implements what is laid down in the new "Russian Federation's National Security Strategy until 2020", signed by President Dmitry Medvedev on 12 May 2009, which substituted for the

---

*tyce zagranicznej Federacji Rosyjskiej [Military power in the Russian Federation's foreign policy]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2004.

- <sup>22</sup> S. Bieleń, *Polityka zagraniczna Rosji [Russia's foreign policy]*, Wydawnictwo Difin, Warszawa 2008, pp. 19–21; M. Raś, *Ewolucja polityki zagranicznej Rosji wobec Stanów Zjednoczonych i Europy Zachodniej w latach 1991–2001 [Evolution of Russia's foreign policy towards the United States and Western Europe in the period 1991–2001]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2005, pp. 157–158; B. Skulska, *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w regionie Azji i Pacyfiku [International security in the region of Asia and the Pacific]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław 2010, p. 68.
- <sup>23</sup> M. de Haas, *Medvedev's Security Policy: A Provisional Assessment*, "Russian Analytical Digest" 2009, no. 62, pp. 4–9.
- <sup>24</sup> A. Jaroszewicz, *Konsekwencje wojny w Gruzji dla stosunków Rosji z państwami obszaru WNP [Consequences of the war in Georgia for Russia's relations with the CIS states]*, "Tydzień na Wschodzie", 19 August 2008, p. 1; T. Olszański, *Duma zwiększyła uprawnienia prezydenta do użycia wojska za granicą [The Duma strengthened the presidential power to use troops abroad]*, "Tydzień na Wschodzie", 28 October 2009, p. 4.

former conception of national security of Russia until 2000. The document emphasises that Russia's national security defence capacity mainly depends on the country's economic potential. However, what drew the attention of the international community was a statement that approves of the possible use of force in order to obtain access to natural raw materials resources. As Piotr Żochowski rightly notices:

“Despite the appearance of a methodologically organised document, the text of the strategy is not coherent and tries to incorporate all the fields of political, social and economic life of the Russian Federation in the security context. It is a description of the Russian power elites' experience, expectations and ambitions rather than a document constituting a security policy. Unlike the former Conception of 2000, which focused on Russia's foreign policy, the new strategy emphasises a domestic security policy. The preservative sense and the language of “The Security Strategy” confirm that power elites nurture the vision of Russia as a superpower whose position depends on the results of the competition with the West. The document presents the division of the world into enemies and allies, where a dialogue with Russia may be successful only if the interests it declares are taken into account”<sup>25</sup>.

The strategy, which was to guarantee that Russia will return to the international arena and will have a status of a global player in the new multipolar world order, presents factors that have negative influence on international security, including, inter alia, the negative NATO and the United States policy and a possibility of an outbreak of a military conflict to obtain control over energy resources in Central Asia and the Arctic<sup>26</sup>. The discussed strategy also constituted a basis for the new “Conception of the Russian Federation's foreign policy”, also adopted on Vladimir Putin's order on 12 February 2013<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> P. Żochowski, *Nowa Strategia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Federacji Rosyjskiej [New Russian Federation's National Security Strategy]*, “Tydzień na Wschodzie”, 20 May 2009, p. 1.

<sup>26</sup> A. Curanović, *Aktywność Federacji Rosyjskiej w regionie Arktyki w kontekście rywalizacji mocarstw [Russian Federation's activeness in the Arctic region in the context of superpowers rivalry]*, Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, Lublin 2010, pp. 14–17; *Russia's New Arctic Strategy: The Foundation of Russian Federation Policy in the Arctic until 2020 and Beyond*, 18 September 2008, pp. 98–105; A. Cohen, *Russia in the Arctic: Challenges to U.S. Energy and Geopolitics in the High North*, [in:] S.J. Blank (ed.), *Russia in the Arctic*, U.S. Army War College Press, Carlisle 2011, p. 19.

<sup>27</sup> *Koncepcja polityki zagranicznej Rosji [Conception of Russia's foreign policy]*, Russian Federation's President's official website: [www.kremlin.ru](http://www.kremlin.ru); D. Palikanow, *Rosja: nowa koncepcja polityki zagranicznej stawia na B. ZSRR [Russia: the new conception of foreign policy promotes the former USSR]*, “Kommersant”, 14 December 2012.

Interestingly, President Putin emphasised that this new conception of Russia's foreign policy accentuates new forms and methods of foreign services' work, inter alia, economic diplomacy and soft power, i.e. the state's ability to find allies and gain influence in the world thanks to the attractiveness of the country's own culture, ideology and policy. And the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sergey Lavrov, added that the new:

“conception of foreign policy formulated a clear and coherent system of opinions focused on solving more and more complex problems of the contemporary world”<sup>28</sup>.

According to Lavrov, in the period 2013–2015, Russia will be implementing its foreign policy in a multi-vector way and its main aim is to integrate the states in the post-Soviet area. Interestingly enough, the second priority of the conception of Russia's foreign policy is cooperation with the European Union, with which Russia wants to establish common market and cooperate for the benefit of international security, because today Russia as well as the whole western world face similar challenges and threats generated by radical Islamism and the growth of Asian powers. The document points at Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and France as Russia's most important EU partners, with whom Russia has strong cooperation links in the field of raw materials and energy. Next, the conception envisages cooperation with the United States, but the strategic partnership postulate disappeared and the main emphasis was placed on the development of economic cooperation, which should constitute a solid foundation for further Russian-American relations<sup>29</sup>.

What was presented above clearly indicates that the current weakening of the West's position constitutes favourable conditions for communication and cooperation with Russia. But the necessary requirements for that include: the recognition of the Russian 'specificity' in the sphere of values and non-interference into Russia's domestic policy, the coordination of activities for the benefit of international security following the principle of a 'concert of powers': Russia, the European Union and the United States, opening the European Union to Russian economic and social penetration (visas), the neutralisation of NATO and the recognition of the Russian sphere of influence within the territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

<sup>28</sup> S.W. Lavrov, *Filozofia polityki zagranicznej Rosji [Russia's foreign policy philosophy]*, “Miedzunarodnaja Żyzn” 2013, no. 3, p. 13

<sup>29</sup> W. Radkiewicz, *Koncepcja polityki zagranicznej Federacji Rosyjskiej [Conception of the Russian Federation's foreign policy]*, “Tydzień na Wschodzie”, 20 February 2013, pp. 1–3.

*The Russian Federation's National Security Strategy until 2020*, which was discussed above, was modified on 1 July 2014 as a result of the Russian-Ukrainian war<sup>30</sup>. It reflects an assertive foreign policy implemented by Vladimir Putin that aims to regain the status of a world superpower by Russia and to maintain control over its sphere of influence, which is also connected with access to raw materials and their transit. In this context, Ukraine is an important strategic area placed in the sphere of Moscow's geopolitical influence given high priority.

\* \* \*

The years 2013–2014 and in particular the dramatic events in Ukraine, the Middle East and North Africa, the war in Syria, the formation of the Islamic State as well as the annexation of Crimea by Russia made Europe and the world realise that 'the end of history', i.e. the end of the history of the world dominated by ideological conflicts, in which people believed after the collapse of the Berlin wall, the collapse of communism in Europe, the German reunification and the collapse of the Soviet Union, was only an illusion<sup>31</sup>. The theories on the victory of the neoliberal form of democracy in the world propagated in the West have not come true. Triumphalism and hope for 'forever peace' have ended, and trust in gradual and unavoidable democratisation of successive states and societies have been substantially weakened. They have also shown low effectiveness of many states' foreign policy, inter alia Ukraine's policy consisting in 'balancing' between Russia and the European Union. In the light of the dramatic events in Kiev, Crimea and Donbas, as well as in Syria and Iraq, and after the terrorist attacks in Paris and Nice, many weaknesses of the European Union have become evident and its prestige in the world has diminished. Today, twelve years after the great Eastern enlargement of the EU, peace and security in Europe and the world are really endangered. The phenomena and processes that evoke fears include, in particular: undermining the reliability of disarmament agreements, including those concerning non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; maintaining power by authoritarian regimes and lingering of confrontational attitudes; non-compliance with international law, democratic standards, human rights and the rights of ethnic and religious minorities;

<sup>30</sup> K. Świder, *Kultura strategiczna Rosji w świetle rosyjskich koncepcji i strategii bezpieczeństwa narodowego [Russia's strategic culture in the light of Russian national security conceptions and strategies]*, "Studia Polityczne" 2016, no. 2(42), pp. 24–25.

<sup>31</sup> F. Fukuyama, *Koniec historii [The End of History]*, Polish translation by T. Bieroń, M. Wichrowski, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1996.

escalating international terrorism and organised crime. Pope Francis also expressed that in July 2016 saying:

“The world has lost peace. The best word to describe what is happening in the world is the word ‘war’. Do not be afraid to say that truth – the world is in the state of war”<sup>32</sup>.

Despite many problems and threats, however, the world slowly evolves in a multipolar and multi-civilizational direction, but the way to that new world order is still very long. But what raises concern is the fact that the role of the EU and the West in general on the international arena is getting less important. The West is losing its economic, political, demographic and moral foundations and, as a result, it stops being a model of development for the world. Social and organisational movements and political parties that are against European integration processes are becoming more and more active in Europe today. There are movements and parties representing such directions of political thought as socialism, anarchism and nationalism among them. The latest one has become the subject matter of lively political debates among the politicians representing mainstream parties. It has also become an element of programmes of populist organisations. Nationalism has also become the basis of political parties’ manifestos, which set directions of anti-EU political thought and their postulates often gain approval of the electorate disappointed with the integration policy<sup>33</sup>.

Despite many problems, the European Union still has the potential to become an active entity in the Euro-Atlantic system and the new world order. It must, however, gradually deepen, widen and improve its political and economic system (maybe in the direction towards federalism) in order to become a global player from the geo-economic as well as geopolitical point of view.

Unfortunately, it is clear that the West, after the financial-economic crisis of 2008–2013 and diplomatic prestige failures, and in case of the United States also military ones (in Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria), lost its way. Unable to find it in the face of currently occurring changes in the world order and remaining on the defensive against the BRIC countries, has chosen Russia as its rival and is trying to push it to the periphery of global politics. At the same time,

<sup>32</sup> O. Szpunar, A. Gurgul, P. Figurski, *Franciszek w Krakowie [Francis in Cracow]*, “Gazeta Wyborcza”, 28 July 2016, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup> M. Kosman, P. Malendowicz, *Głos polskich i niemieckich nacjonalistów w debacie na temat integracji europejskiej [The voice of Polish and German nationalists in the debate on the European integration]*, “Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej” 2015, no. 9, p. 215.

Russia under Vladimir Putin's rule is becoming stronger and takes active part in global games, which is reflected today in its military operations in Ukraine and Syria. Simultaneously, Russia is threatening with nuclear weapons and demands that the sanctions imposed on it for the war with Ukraine are lifted. It also demands compensation for the loss resulting from the sanctions as well as its own countersanctions, which closed its market for the products from the countries that had imposed restrictions on Russia. Vladimir Putin is simply seeking another conflict that would muster the nation's support for him and show the Russians that this is their country that dictates its will to the world. That is why, in spite of everything, it is necessary to talk to Russia and not isolate it on the international arena as it makes it undertake aggressive action, of which the war with Ukraine is the best example and which can lead to a new cold war in international relations or even the third world war<sup>34</sup>.

At the same time, it is necessary to do everything to make NATO and the EU active entities on the international arena and help them play a significant role in the development of a new international order, in which Europe and the United States should be its main pillars. To achieve that, unity and cooperation of all member states of the European Union and NATO, especially the FRG and France, is necessary. Further cooperation between the EU and the United States as well as between the EU and NATO is also necessary. If it is not intensified, the Euro-Atlantic system will lose its importance and will stop being a guarantor of security in the West. In the face of the bankruptcy of the EU's eastern policy, it is necessary to work out a new form of cooperation and the EU and NATO's policy towards Russia and adopt a new and far-sighted transatlantic strategy towards this country<sup>35</sup>.

The West, i.e. the United States, NATO and the European Union, does not want to tease Russia, which is the greatest aggressor and has violated all norms of international law, and *de facto* leaves Ukraine alone, at the mercy of Vladimir Putin, who is trying to dismantle the post-Cold War order, which is very unjust from Russia's point of view because it pushes it away onto

---

<sup>34</sup> R. Zięba, *Międzynarodowe implikacje kryzysu ukraińskiego [International implications of the Ukrainian crisis]*, "Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations" 2014, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 39–40. Also: R. Kuźniar, *Europa i porządek międzynarodowy [Europe and international order]*, [in:] *ibidem*, pp. 41–56; B. Góralczyk (ed.), *Unia Europejska jako aktor na scenie globalnej. Razem czy osobno? [The European Union as an actor on the global stage: Together or alone?]*, Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2014.

<sup>35</sup> A. Krzemiński, *Niemcy na huśtawce [Germany on the wing]*, "Polityka", 30 July – 5 August 2014, pp. 43–45.

a position of a regional power. The PRC, which formally is for a peaceful multipolar and multi-civilisation world order, also demonstrated a very strange, ambivalent attitude towards the Russian-Ukrainian war. In practice, however, international conflicts that weaken the West or Russia help China strengthen its position on the international arena. And this is Ukraine, which is to play an important role in Vladimir Putin's plans to re-establish Russia's position as the world superpower<sup>36</sup>.

The above warnings finally resulted in the awakening of NATO, which at the Warsaw summit in summer 2016 decided to deploy four battalions on the eastern flank and entered an agreement with the European Union, in which the two organisations committed themselves to coordinating military exercises to defend against hybrid attacks and to developing rules of cooperation in case of such crises. The President of the United States emphasised during the summit that he was implementing his promises of 4 June 2014. Namely, after the Russian aggression against Ukraine, when making a speech in Warsaw on 4 June 2014, he said that Poland and the Baltic States would never be alone. Then, for the first time, some contingents of the US Army (at the beginning, an airborne company) and other NATO states were allocated in Poland and the Baltic States. Now, a decision has been taken on "permanent rotation presence" of four battalion groups (of 1,000 soldiers each) in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia until 2017. Moreover, it was also announced that an armoured brigade would be deployed on the eastern flank of NATO, and its command would be based in Poland. These decisions certainly are increasing the security of Europe, which is endangered by Russia's imperial attempts<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> J.M. Fiszer, *Geopolityczne i geoekonomiczne aspekty europeizacji Ukrainy i jej perspektywy [Geopolitical and geo-economic aspects of Europeanisation of Ukraine and its prospects]*, [in:] J. Tymanowski, J. Karwacka, J. Bryl (ed.), *Procesy europeizacji Ukrainy w wybranych obszarach [Processes of Ukraine Europeanization in selected areas]*, BHZ "Nacjonalna Akademia Uprawlenija", Kijów-Warszawa 2016, pp. 15–39; R. Kuźniar, *Ukraine – Europe's hic Rhodus, hic salta*, [in:] B.J. Góralczyk (ed.), *European Union on the Global Scene: United or Irrelevant?*, Centre for Europe, University of Warsaw 2015, pp. 63–85; K. Świder, *Rosyjska świadomość geopolityczna a Ukrainai i Białorus po rozpadzie Związku Radzieckiego [Russian geopolitical conscience versus Ukraine and Belarus after the collapse of the Soviet Union]*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, Warszawa 2015, pp. 181–249.

<sup>37</sup> P. Wroński, *Rosja już mniej groźna. Przebudzenie NATO [Russia is less dangerous now. NATO's awakening]*, "Gazeta Wyborcza", 11 July 2016, p. 1; T. Bielecki, M. Zawadzki, *Unia i NATO postanowiły się wzmocnić [EU and NATO decided to strengthen]*, "Gazeta Wyborcza", 9–10 July 2016, p. 3.

\* \* \*

Russia has been experiencing a recession for two years now: 2015 ended with a negative balance (-3.7%) and in 2016 the GDP was expected to decrease by another 1.3%. Moreover, active but very expensive Russia's involvement in military conflicts in Ukraine (Donbas) and in Syria have been diverting attention from the necessary reforms and modernisation, also outside the army, which is the pillar of Vladimir Putin's rule. The Russian Federation is not in possession of modern industry and its economy is based on trade (sale) in raw materials, especially oil and gas, which generates 52% of the budget revenues and accounts for 70% of the country's export. The economy is anachronistic and, what is more, its budget and the citizens' income are shrinking. According to the international Monetary Fund, as a result of the western sanctions imposed two years ago (in 2014) and its own reaction to them, Russian economy annually loses ca. 1.5% of the GDP. Moreover, the Kremlin must prepare the economy for the approaching end of oil and gas era. According to estimations, only 15 years are left until the exhaustion of the profitable resources. Herman Gref, the President of Sberbank and former Minister of Economy, presented a similar forecast. In his opinion, Russia will run out of the so-called mono-products, i.e. oil and gas, in the period 2028–2032<sup>38</sup>.

For years, Vladimir Putin has been announcing the modernisation of Russia, including a departure from the economy based on energy raw materials, but little has been done in this area so far. In the meantime, the situation in Russia is getting worse day by day. The Russians are suffering the economic crisis. According to the latest poll conducted by an independent polling organisation, the Levada Center, as many as 80% of the Russians suffer the worsening economic situation in the country. Most of them believe that the crisis in Russia will continue for at least a few years. Only 5% of the respondents have not noticed the price increase. The rest say that prices of different goods and services have increased by 15–100% over the last years<sup>39</sup>.

The war with Ukraine and participation in the civil war in Syria led Russia to the brink of economic collapse. Putin, apart from Syria's President Bashar al-Assad, has already lost most of his influential allies. In Europe, except for Belgrade and Budapest, nobody maintains close contact with him. Even China treats Russia purely pragmatically and stays in closer contact with

<sup>38</sup> *Kończy się ropa naftowa w Rosji [Russia is running out of oil]*, "Rzeczpospolita", 5 October 2016, p. B 9.

<sup>39</sup> *R. Szosy, Sytuacja się pogarsza, ale car nic o tym nie wie [The situation is worsening but the tsar doesn't know about it]*, "Rzeczpospolita", 28 September 2016, p. A12.

Washington, Berlin and Paris than with Moscow. According to Masha Gessen, the author of the book *The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin*<sup>40</sup>, the regime in the Kremlin has already reached the third and final stage. This is the most dangerous one – it is characterised by unpredicted turns and aggression. It can last a few years but not necessarily. The author says that the first stage of Putin’s rule took only five years, until 2005. This was the time when the democratic reforms of the 1990s were cancelled. Putin took control over the media and in fact he also abolished free elections. The second stage covering the years 2005–2012 was a period of Russia’s political stagnation. The third stage has taken two years now, i.e. since 2014, and the war against Ukraine or rather for Ukraine and Russia’s overt participation in the war in Syria dominate it<sup>41</sup>.

By the way, the first period, i.e. from 1999 to 2005, was the time of close cooperation between Vladimir Putin and German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder. A social democrat (Schröder) and a post-communist (Putin) turned to be pragmatic and used a similar language to speak about the supremacy of national interests over the interests of the world or Europe. Thanks to that they tailored very good relations based on partnership. The cooperation between the FRG and Russia as well as the West and Russia accelerated then. The initial lack of trust and reservation of the West about the financial crisis and a deficit of democracy in Russia, the conflict in Kosovo and the Chechen War changed into a process of institutionalisation of political, military and economic cooperation. Military cooperation and close relations between Russia and NATO, including Russian and German openness towards the enlargement of NATO structures and the European Union were very important for both states as well as Poland, because thanks to that, Poland joined NATO on 12 March 1999 and the European Union on 1 March 2004<sup>42</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> M. Gessen, *Putin. Człowiek bez twarzy [The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin]*, Polish translation by J. Szajkowska, M. Witkowska, Pruszyński i S-ka, Warszawa 2012.

<sup>41</sup> Ł. Wojcik, *Więzień Kremla [The Kremlin prisoner]*, “Polityka”, 1–6 January 2015, pp. 22–24.

<sup>42</sup> M.M. Kosman, *Polityka RFN wobec ZSRR/Rosji w latach 1989–2009 [FRG’s policy towards the USSR/Russia in the period 1989–2009]*, pp. 319–415; J.M. Fiszer, *Władimir Putin jako „fenomenalny” przywódca Rosji [Vladimir Putin as a phenomenal Russia’s leader]*, “Stosunki Międzynarodowe – Zeszyty Naukowe”, Uczelnia Vistula w Warszawie, 2011, no. 26, pp. 7–25; J. Kiwerska, B. Koszel, M. Tomczak, S. Żerko, *Polityka zagraniczna zjednoczonych Niemiec [Reunited Germany’s foreign policy]*, Instytut Zachodni, Poznań 2011.

Germany's influence on Russia's temperate attitude towards the above-mentioned issues is unquestionable. Plans to cooperate in the field of armaments, joint exercises and training staff were important elements of cooperation in the area of security and military issues. The joint German-Russian exercises in August 2002 were the first ones since the interwar period and were symbolic. Other agreements were signed too, e.g. agreements on the fight against criminality, treaties on legal assistance in criminal matters and extradition of 2001, a protocol on the cooperation between border guards of February 2003 and agreements on visa facilitation promoting selected categories of travellers. But the office of the Coordinator of German-Russian Intersocietal Cooperation established at the beginning of 2003 was the main element of social dialogue<sup>43</sup>.

In the period 2003–2005, the German-Russian cooperation was deepened, especially in the energy sector, which mainly resulted in the agreement on laying North European Gas Pipeline (Nord Stream) and aroused opposition in whole Europe, not only Poland and other states of East Central Europe. The agreement was presented as a proof that, in foreign policy, a narrow national interest, and not the European one, motivates Germany. Actually, the new gas pipeline, bypassing transit countries (Ukraine and Belarus), ensured greater security for supplies to German consumers and was a response to the future increase in demand for gas in the whole energy consumption in the FRG in connection with the decision planned by Gerhard Schröder's government to stop producing nuclear energy<sup>44</sup>.

In the last several months of Schröder's government, the Russian-German relations showed far-reaching conformity of interests and assessment of major international issues, although they did not lack differences of opinion. However, when they occurred, the good relations between the two leaders

---

<sup>43</sup> For more on the FRG-Russia's cooperation in the period 1998–2005 see: M.M. Kosman, *Polityka RFN wobec ZSRR/Rosji...* [*FRG's policy towards the USSR/Russia...*], pp. 365–385; K. Miszczyk, *Polityka zagraniczna, bezpieczeństwa i obrony koalicji rządowej SPD-Sojusz 90/Zieloni w okresie 1998–2005* [*Foreign security and defence policy of the government coalition SPD-Alliance '90/The Greens in the period 1998–2005*], Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA, Warszawa 2012; A. Stent, *Rusland*, [in:] S. Schmidt, G. Hellmann, R. Wolf (ed.), *Handbuch zur deutschen Außenpolitik* [*Germany's foreign policy handbook*], VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2007, pp. 443–444; *Stosunki Rosja – Niemcy w latach 1998–2005* [*Russian-German relations in the period 1998–2005*], Raport OSW i CSM, Warszawa, February 2006.

<sup>44</sup> A. Cianciara, *Gospodarcze uwarunkowania polityki wschodniej Niemiec i Francji* [*Economic conditions of Germany and France's eastern policy*], "Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna" 2014, no. 2(45), pp. 202–203.

let them ease tension, as e.g. in connection with the Orange Revolution in Ukraine or the Baltic States enlargement of NATO. The fact that in 2005, before the end of Schröder's term, the two leaders met eight times indicates the intensity of contacts between them. Thanks to Schröder and German social democrats, the axiological factor in the FRG's policy towards Russia weakened and it was demonstrated in practice in the lack of the Chancellor's criticism of the deficit of democracy in Russia's domestic policy. The opposition to the United States' unilateral foreign policy was another important element strengthening German-Russian cooperation.

\* \* \*

After the successive snap parliamentary election in 2005, when Gerhard Schröder lost, Angela Merkel became new Chancellor of the FRG. She comes from the former GDR and has tasted the life in the communist countries of East Central Europe<sup>45</sup>. Jadwiga Kiwerska highlights that:

“Angela Merkel was a new kind of German political leader. She represented the third post-war generation, which was not emotionally bound with the pro-Americanism of the 1950s and 1960s as Kohl's generation, but was also not shaped by the passions of 1968, including the strong anti-Americanism as in the case of Schröder and Fischer. (...) She was convinced that the improvement of the relations with the USA was in the interest of Germany and to that end she was ready to act. She understood that it would serve to strengthen the transatlantic system that constituted an important element of international order. But most of all, she wanted to contribute to a change of anti-American sentiments in Germany”<sup>46</sup>.

And one of her biographers said that she had some features of a sphinx. She is inscrutable, she says very little about her past and not eagerly. The Polish roots of her grandfather, who changed his surname from Kaźmierczak to Kasner in the 1930s, were among her secrets for a long time. Angela Merkel awakens extreme emotions among the Germans and European politicians, as well as in Poland, where she was voted the most popular foreign politician for the fifth time in the OBOP opinion poll in 2012. Her former victories were in 2006, 2007, 2010 and 2011<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> A. Stępin, *Angela Merkel. Cesarzowa Europy [Angela Merkel: Empress of Europe]*, Wydawca Agora SA, Warszawa 2014.

<sup>46</sup> See J. Kiwerska, *Niemcy we wspólnocie transatlantyckiej [Germany in the transatlantic commonwealth]*, [in:] J. Kiwerska, B. Koszel, M. Tomczyk, S. Żerko, *Polityka zagraniczna zjednoczonych Niemiec... [Reunited Germany's foreign policy...]*, p. 242.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 9. Also: B.T. Wieliński, *Mutti jest tylko jedna [Mutti is only one]*, “Wysokie Obcasy”, 21 September 2013, pp. 11–17.

The government formed by Angela Merkel in 2005, the so-called great coalition CDU/CSU-SPD, undertook a successful attempt to bring back Adenauer's principles to the German foreign policy: the Atlantic orientation and a refusal to choose between Washington and Paris. It is true that the appointment of Frank-Walter Steinmeier, formerly a close collaborator of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, as Vice Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs posed a threat of maintaining foreign policy characteristic of the coalition SPD-The Greens. And this is what happened but only to a small extent<sup>48</sup>.

Taking chancellor's office by Angela Merkel was conducive to depersonalisation of Moscow-Berlin relations established by Gerhard Schröder, whose relations with Vladimir Putin went far beyond official contacts. Moreover, Merkel strove to rectify transatlantic relations impaired when Schröder was in power and to take into account the interests of the Central European states in relations with Moscow. However, the coalition partner, Vice Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Chief of Staff of the Chancellery in Schröder's government, was in favour of the maintenance of a pro-Russian policy. This pragmatic attitude, marginalising the issue of a democratic deficit in Russia, mainly amounted to the exposure of such areas of cooperation as energy relations and international security. It was approved of first of all by France, Italy or Spain and criticised by Central European members of the European Union, including Poland, and the United Kingdom and Denmark.

In general, Angela Merkel did not manage to surmount the most painful consequences of Schröder's government's decisions, inter alia, to re-establish the allies' trust in Germany and to overcome the crisis in the European policy. Germany regained the position of a reliable and loyal partner of the United States and an active member of the European Union. It became a strong link in the Euro-Atlantic system, which is a guarantor of security in Europe, including Poland<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>48</sup> M.M. Kosman, *Polityka RFN wobec ZSRR/Rosji w latach 1989–2009... [FRG's policy towards the USSR/Russia...]*, pp. 417–492; J. Franzke, *Wertepolitik versus Realpolitik. Die Russlandpolitik der Regierung Merkel/Steinmeier*, "Welt Trends" 2009, no. 67, pp. 93–98.

<sup>49</sup> J. Kiwerska, *Niemcy we wspólnocie transatlantyckiej [Germany in the transatlantic commonwealth]*, [in:] J. Kiwerska, B. Koszel, M. Tomczak, S. Zerko, *Polityka zagraniczna zjednoczonych Niemiec... [Reunited Germany's foreign policy...]*, pp. 230–255; L.N. Bowers (ed.), *German Foreign and Security Policy*, New York 2009.

## CONCLUSIONS

The above-mentioned second and third stage of Vladimir Putin's rule in Russia in fact fall on the time when Angela Merkel also was in power and led to the cooling of political relations between Russia and Germany, but until 2014 the economic and trade relations developed dynamically. It was the Russian-Ukrainian war and the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2015 that changed this state of things. The FRG unequivocally condemned Russian aggression against Ukraine and declared for economic sanctions, which are for Russia, as I already mentioned, more and more painful and weaken Vladimir Putin's rule. At all costs he wants to remain in power until the next presidential election in 2018 and blames the West for the growing crisis. Prior to that, in autumn 2017, there will be a parliamentary election in the FRG and today it is difficult to predict the result. The position of CDU/CSU and Angela Merkel in particular is getting weaker because she is blamed for the immigration crisis and uncontrolled inflow of 1.5 million immigrants to Germany in the period 2014–2016. In the FRG today, one can hear opinions, also expressed by the competitive SPD, that sanctions imposed on Russia should be lifted and economic cooperation re-established to be as profitable for the two parties, and especially for Germany, as it had been in the past.

Supporting Ukraine, however, the European Union and its member states led by Germany made mistakes both in their strategy and its implementation, which is busily used by Russia. Too much energy was spared on the so-called Minsk process, which failed in spite of German efforts. The war in Ukraine is continued. Over 10,000 Ukrainian soldiers were killed and Ukraine is becoming a ruined country today. At the same time, a lack of unity and solidarity is getting more and more flagrant among the European Union states, because some of them make their economic links with Russia a higher priority than the support for Ukraine. There is also a clear regional division of the EU member states as far as their readiness to support Ukraine is concerned. While the states of the North and the East of the EU are active in supporting Ukrainian transformation, the states of the South and the West show less and less commitment. The lack of balance between those two groups undermines the European idea of solidarity and cohesion, and thus limits the efficiency of the EU as a political player. At the same time, it is not conducive to the development of a new, multipolar and multi-civilizational international system. The process resulting from the Yalta-Potsdam order and globalisation has been hampered in the last years. Due to that, it is difficult to make an accurate prediction about the future of the world and its ultimate shape as well as international security.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ash T.G., *Free World: America, Europe and the Surprising Future of the West*, Random House, New York 2010.
- Asmus R.D., *Mała wojna, która wstrząsnęła światem. Gruzja, Rosja i przyszłość Zachodu [A Little War That Shook the World: Georgia, Russia, and the Future of the World]*, Polish translation by J. Tokarski, Fundacja Res Publica im. Henryka Rzewzkowskiego, Warszawa 2010.
- Beck U., *Das deutsche Europa [German Europe]*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2013.
- Beck U., *Niemiecka Europa. Nowe krajobrazy władzy pod znakiem kryzysu [German Europe: New landscapes of power in crisis]*, Polish translation by R. Formuszewicz, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2013.
- Bieleń S., *Polityka zagraniczna Rosji [Russia's foreign policy]*, Wydawnictwo Difin, Warszawa 2008.
- Bowers L.N. (ed.), *German Foreign and Security Policy*, New York 2009.
- Brzeziński Z., *Wybór – dominacja czy przywództwo [The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership]*, Polish translation by B. Pietrzyk, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2004.
- Brzeziński Z., *Strategiczna wizja. Ameryka a kryzys globalnej potęgi [Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power]*, Polish translation by K. Skoneczny, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2013.
- Cameron R., Neal L., *Historia gospodarcza świata. Od paleoitu do czasów najnowszych [A Concise Economic History of the World: From Palaeolithic Times to the Present]*, Polish translation by H. Lisiecka-Michalska, M. Kluźniak, Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 2004.
- Cohen, A., *Russia in the Arctic: Challenges to U.S Energy and Geopolitics in the High North*, [in:] S.J. Blank (ed.), *Russia in the Arctic*, U.S. Army War College Press, Carlisle 2011.
- Curanović A., *Aktywność Federacji Rosyjskiej w regionie Arktyki w kontekście rywalizacji mocarstw [Russian Federation's activeness in the Arctic region in the context of superpowers rivalry]*, Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, Lublin 2010.
- Fiszer J.M., *Zadania i cele polityki zagranicznej Władimira Putina [Tasks and aims of Vladimir Putin's foreign policy]*, "Myśl Ekonomiczna i Polityczna" 2016, no. 1(52).
- Fiszer J.M., *Geopolityczne i geoekonomiczne aspekty europeizacji Ukrainy i jej perspektywy [Geopolitical and geo-economic aspects of Europeanisation of Ukraine ad its prospects]*, [in:] J. Tymanowski, J. Karwacka, J. Bryl (ed.),

- Procesy europeizacji Ukrainy w wybranych obszarach [Processes of Ukraine Europeanization in selected areas]*, BHZ “Nacjonalnaja Akademia Uprawlenija”, Kiew–Warszawa 2016.
- Franzke J., *Wertepolitik versus Realpolitik. Die Russlandpolitik der Regierung Merkel/Steinmeier [Policy of values versus real policy. Merkel/Steinmeier’s government policy toward Russia]*, “Welt Trends” 2009, no. 67.
- Gessen M., *Putin. Człowiek bez twarzy [The Man Without a Face: The Unlikely Rise of Vladimir Putin]*, Polish translation by J. Szajkowska, M. Witkowska, Pruszyński i S-ka, Warszawa 2012.
- Friedman G., *Następna dekada. Gdzie byliśmy i dokąd zmierzamy [The Next Decade: What the World Will Look Like]*, Polish translation by M. Wyrwas-Wiśniewska, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2012.
- Fukuyama F., *Budowanie państwa. Władza i ład międzynarodowy w XXI wieku [State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st century]*, Polish translation by J. Serwański, Wydawnictwo REBIS, Poznań 2005.
- Fukuyama F., *Koniec historii [The End of History]*, Polish translation by T. Bieroń, M. Wichrowski, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1996.
- Gilpin R., *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1983.
- Góralczyk B. (ed.), *Unia Europejska jako aktor na scenie globalnej. Razem czy osobno? [European Union as an actor on the global scene: together or alone?]*, Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2014.
- Kiwerska J., Koszel B., Tomczak M., Żerko S., *Polityka zagraniczna zjednoczonych Niemiec [Reunited Germany’s foreign policy]*, Instytut Zachodni, Poznań 2011.
- Kosman M., Malendowicz P., *Głos polskich i niemieckich nacjonalistów w debacie na temat integracji europejskiej [The voice of Polish and German nationalists in the debate on the European integration]*, “Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej” 2015, no. 9.
- Koziej S., *Między piekłem a rajem. Szare bezpieczeństwo na progu XXI wieku [Between hell and paradise: grey security at the start of the 21st century]*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2006.
- Kukliński A., Pawłowski K. (ed.), *The Atlantic Community. The Titanic of the XXI Century?*, Wyższa Szkoła Biznesu – National Louis University, Nowy Sącz 2010.
- Kuźniar R., *Ukraine – Europe’s hic Rhodus, hic salta*, [in:] B.J. Góralczyk (ed.), *European Union on the Global Scene: United or Irrelevant?*, Centre for Europe, University of Warsaw 2015.

- Lucas E., *Nowa zimna wojna. Jak Kreml zagraża Rosji i Zachodowi [New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West]*, Polish translation by J. Stawski, Dom Wydawniczy REBIS, Poznań 2008.
- Miszczak K., *Polityka zagraniczna, bezpieczeństwa i obrony koalicji rządowej SPD-Sojusz 90/Zieloni w okresie 1998–2005 [Foreign security and defence policy of the government coalition SPD-Alliance '90/The Greens in the period 1998–2005]*, Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA, Warszawa 2012.
- Modelski G., *The Long Cycle of Global politics and the Nation-State*, "Comparative Studies in Society and History" 1978, vol. 20, no. 2.
- Modelski G., Thompson W.R., *Leading Sectors and World Powers: The Co-evolution of Global Economics and Politics*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia 1966.
- Müller J.W., *Wo Europa endet? Ungarn, Brüssel und das Schicksal der liberalen Demokratie [Where does Europe end? Hungary, Brussels and the future of liberal democracy]*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2013.
- Politkowskaja A., *Rosja Putina [Putin's Russia]*, Polish translation by T. Korecki, Wydawnictwo Studio Emka, Warszawa 2005.
- Raś M., *Ewolucja polityki zagranicznej Rosji wobec Stanów Zjednoczonych i Europy Zachodniej w latach 1991–2001 [Evolution of Russia's foreign policy towards the United States and Western Europe in the period 1991–2001]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2005.
- Skulska B., *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe w regionie Azji i Pacyfiku [International security in the region of Asia and the Pacific]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław 2010.
- Soja M., *Stosunki UE–NATO w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa europejskiego i obrony na przełomie XX i XXI wieku [EU–NATO relations in the field of European security and defence at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2011.
- Stent A., *Russland*, [in:] S. Schmidt, G. Hellmann, R. Wolf (ed.), *Handbuch zur deutschen Außenpolitik [Germany's foreign policy handbook]*, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2007.
- Stępin A., *Angela Merkel. Cesarzowa Europy [Angela Merkel: Empress of Europe]*, Wydawca Agora S.A., Warszawa 2014.
- Świder K., *Rosyjska świadomość geopolityczna a Ukraina i Białoruś (po rozpadzie Związku Radzieckiego [Russian geopolitical conscience versus Ukraine and Belarus after the collapse of the Soviet Union]*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, Warszawa 2015.
- Świder K., *Kultura strategiczna Rosji w świetle rosyjskich koncepcji i strategii bezpieczeństwa narodowego [Russia's strategic culture in the light of Rus-*

- sian national security conceptions and strategies*], "Studia Polityczne" 2016, no. 2(42).
- Wallerstein J., *Koniec świata jaki znamy [The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century]*, Polish translation by M. Gilewicz [et al.], Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2004.
- Williams P.D., *Security Studies. An Introduction*, Routledge, Londyn & New York 2012.
- Zacher L.W., *Przyszłość w świetle prognoz światowych u progu XXI wieku [Future in the light of global forecasts at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century]*, "Polska 2000 Plus", 2001, no. 1.
- Zdanowski J., *Bliski Wschód 2011: bunt czy rewolucja? [Middle East 2011: rebellion or revolution?]*, Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM, Kraków 2011.
- Zięba R., *Międzynarodowe implikacje kryzysu ukraińskiego [International implications of the Ukrainian crisis]*, "Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations" 2014, vol. 50, no. 2.
- Żukrowska K. (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo Międzynarodowe [International security]*, Ius At Tax, Warszawa 2011.

## POLICY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY TOWARD RUSSIA IN THE MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER: ITS OBJECTIVES, TASKS AND CONSEQUENCES FOR EUROPE

### Summary

The article aims to analyse the FRG's policy toward Russia at the turn of the century and to present its significance to Europe and the development of a new global order. Moreover, the author tries to answer many questions concerning premises of cooperation between Russia and Germany as well as the threats they pose to European and world peace and security, inter alia, whether there will not be another Rapallo and whether Russia and Germany will not try to play a dominant role in Europe. The main thesis of the paper is an assumption that a way to a new, probably multipolar global order is very long and that Germany, remembering its history and tragic experiences, will not return to its policy of cooperation with Russia, which aims to take control over Europe and divide it again. On the other hand, the author writes, cooperation between Germany and Russia is indispensable for the stabilisation of the situation in Europe and the development of a new democratic order in the world.

## POLITYKA RFN WOBEC ROSJI W MULTIPOLARNYM ŁADZIE GLOBALNYM: JEJ CELE, ZADANIA I KONSEKWENCJE DLA EUROPY

### Streszczenie

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest analiza polityki RFN wobec Rosji na przełomie XX i XXI wieku oraz próba pokazania ich znaczenia dla Europy i budowy nowego ładu globalnego. Ponadto autor próbuje odpowiedzieć na wiele pytań, dotyczących przesłanek współpracy Rosji i Niemiec oraz wynikających z niej zagrożeń dla pokoju i bezpieczeństwa Europy i świata. Między innymi, czy nie dojdzie w przyszłości do nowego Rapallo i czy Rosja wraz z Niemcami nie będą próbowały odgrywać dominującej roli w Europie? Tezą główną tego opracowania jest konstatacja, że droga do nowego, prawdopodobnie multipolarnego ładu globalnego jest bardzo daleka oraz, że Niemcy – pomne historii i tragicznych doświadczeń – nie powrócą już do polityki współpracy z Rosją, której celem będzie przejęcie kontroli nad Europą i jej nowy podział. Z drugiej strony – pisze autor – współpraca Niemiec i Rosji jest niezbędna dla stabilizacji sytuacji w Europie i budowy nowego, demokratycznego porządku na świecie.

## ПОЛИТИКА ФРГ В ОТНОШЕНИИ РОССИИ В УСЛОВИЯХ МУЛЬТИПОЛЯРНОГО ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО ПОРЯДКА: ЕЁ ЦЕЛИ, ЗАДАЧИ И ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ ДЛЯ ЕВРОПЫ

### Резюме

Целью настоящей статьи является анализ политики ФРГ в отношении России на рубеже XX и XXI веков, а также попытка определения её значения для Европы и организации нового глобального мирового порядка. Кроме того, автор статьи предпринимает попытку ответа на множество вопросов, касающихся предпосылок сотрудничества России и Германии и связанной с ним угрозы для мира и безопасности в Европе и мире; в частности, не приведёт ли это в будущем к новому Рапалло и не будут ли Россия с Германией предпринимать попытки принятия доминирующей роли в Европе? Главным тезисом данного исследования служит констатирование того, что до нового, по всей вероятности, мультиполярного глобального мирового порядка ещё чрезвычайно далеко; а также того, что Германия, с учётом исторического опыта и трагического прошлого, не возобновит

политику сотрудничества с Россией, которая будет стремиться принять контроль над Европой и осуществить её новый раздел. С другой стороны, как считает автор, сотрудничество Германии и России необходимо для стабилизации ситуации в Европе и организации нового демократического порядка в мире.