

CHAPTER 12

Political expertise in Poland in the field of foreign policy

Speaking in the broadest terms, how expert circles shape Poland's foreign policy depends on the condition of the academic field of foreign relations, state policy towards the expert community, institutional capacity, as well as the intellectual acumen of researchers. Theoretical knowledge enhances the understanding of international processes and developments, enables both articulation and championing of the state's interests internationally and makes its foreign policy more effective, while making references to familiar authors, literature and concepts fosters communication between experts, researchers, and diplomats from various countries. The strong position of researchers from a given country in the field of foreign relations helps shape the perception of global policy issues in a way that is convergent with the country's interests. Academic circles generate ideas which affect the way in which the states' interests are understood and how their role in the global arena is perceived.

International relations, just like political science generally, was heavily politicized during the era of the People's Republic of Poland (PRL). At best, theoretical discussions that took place in the West were known to a small circle of specialists, while the major theoretical works had not been translated into Polish. The teaching of foreign relations in Poland should have placed greater emphasis on theory and methodology; it should also have provided analytical tools. Scholarship is an area where changes take place slowly. However, in the recent years, Polish scholarship has begun to steadily close the gap. The young generation of researchers is taking advantage of opportunities to study abroad. Also, the situation where a practical approach took precedence over theoretical reflection, which until recently prevailed in Poland, is now changing, with the Polish aca-

demic community debating issues of methodology and epistemology in the field of foreign relations¹.

One of the questions asked in recent surveys on the state of the discipline of foreign relations concerned the role of academics in the policymaking process. According to the majority of respondents, they should be creators of knowledge for policymakers and act as informal advisors and mentors. Very few respondents said that academics should never get involved in policymaking².

The increased demand for expert knowledge has resulted from changes in the hierarchy of issues in the field of foreign policy and its reach beyond traditionally understood diplomacy. The way in which foreign policy is carried out is affected by the expansion of its topical scope as it now embraces new issues such as climatic change, raw materials security, combating poverty, economy, energy, human rights, interpretation of history, technology, demography, migrations, and the labor market³. These changes in scope call for wider involvement of experts and acquisition of knowledge from a variety of sources.

The range of actors is also expanding: ministries of foreign affairs are losing their monopoly to carry out foreign policy. More and more tasks are now carried out by other departments and institutions of the state which are involved in decision-making processes. Similarly, new actors, including non-state entities and NGOs, are engaged in the pursuit of foreign policy. More and more matters need to be agreed multilaterally, especially within the European Union. We are witnessing the growing role of public diplomacy, “historical politics”, and promotion abroad of the state and its image. International expert groups form epistemic communities which shape the way in which international reality is perceived by policymakers. They often prepare draft versions of international legislation, which are later endorsed by governments (such as those relating to environmental protection or the use of mines). This in turn creates demand for broad specialist knowledge, up-to-date information, expertise from various sources, and sound management of knowledge.

¹ For more information see: *Teoretyczne i metodologiczne wyzwania badań politologicznych w Polsce*, A. Antoszewski, A. Dumala, B. Krauz-Mozer, K. Radzik (eds), Lublin 2009.

² R. Jordan, D. Maliniak, A. Oakes, S. Peterson, M.J. Tierny, *One Discipline or Many? TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in Ten Countries*, Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project, The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, The College of William and Mary Williamsburg, Virginia, February 2009, p. 60.

³ R. Jordan, D. Maliniak, A. Oakes, S. Peterson, M.J. Tierny, *One Discipline or Many?*, 80–84. Many researchers opt for reducing defence expenditure by their governments. For instance, in the US, 64% of scholars would like to curb defense spending, 30% would like to maintain it at the existing level and 6% want to increase it.

1. Policymakers, advisors, experts and their roles

Policymaking can be imagined as a game played at three levels. At the lowest level, we have an interplay of interests in which politicians and parliamentarians are involved. The highest level pertains to the sphere of values, vision, ethics, public discourse, ideological debate – which give meaning to political activity, whereas the intermediate level refers to the sphere of policy making and proposing solutions, in which expert communities are engaged⁴.

The policy maker, the advisor and the expert make up a kind of a triangle in foreign policy. Policymakers are active in the political arena and take part in decision making at the central level of the state. The group of policymakers includes politicians, especially those occupying government posts and parliamentarians, and senior civil servants. The state's foreign policy often reflects the preferences of internal state elites and interest groups as a first priority, and only then articulates the strategic interests of the state.

Policymakers undergo two kinds of socialization: (1) transnational – when they internalize international norms which define expectations concerning appropriate conduct of states, and (2) social – when they internalize norms of behavior embraced by the citizens of a given country. Expert communities form epistemic communities which establish the norms and standards in both these spheres and decide what actions are appropriate in specific situations. Norms give shape to the political culture and affect international politics and relations between countries⁵.

The expert and the advisor have dissimilar roles; the former is politically neutral and analyzes information regardless of the political context, whereas the latter has both a political and expert function, identifies with the political agenda, is an activist with linkages with political circles, and has direct contacts with the policymakers. Here, political culture plays an important role, as does politicians' ability to make use of advice offered. The advisor acts as an intermediary between the policymakers and the experts and has the task of transforming expert knowledge into political recommendations. He should also be able to decide what type of expert knowledge is needed in a given situation and to order suitable materials⁶.

Effective advice depends on the substantive quality of expertise and on whether it meets scholarly standards. It is also essential to gain politicians' trust and to have knowledge of the decision-making process so as to be able to react

⁴ W. Smoczyński, *Myslą i rządzą*, "Polityka" 40 October 3, 2009, pp. 38–43.

⁵ P.M. Haas, *Introduction. Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, "International Organization" 1992, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 1–35.

⁶ Cf. R. Stemplowski, *Wprowadzenie do analizy polityki zagranicznej*, second edition, vol. 1, Warsaw 2007, pp. 281–282.

at the right moment and propose solutions. Consulting should focus on those problems which are pertinent for the country and those which may emerge in the future. Advisors often think along similar lines as policymakers. They gain knowledge from experts and on this basis draft strategies, forecasts, and recommendations for actions formulated in clear, intelligible language. They convert the knowledge obtained from experts into political messages and also write speeches. Direct political advisors act as mini-think tanks for policymakers. They take part in debates (and sometimes initiate them), identify core problems, recommend solutions, and discuss them with experts⁷.

Smaller states employ a higher proportion of academics in government and official positions than larger states, which is explained by a relatively smaller pool of specialists in foreign relations. There is also a correlation between the prevalent paradigm and the number of experts working for the government; in countries where realism is more valued and the propensity to employ academics for the needs of the government is greater⁸.

2. The tasks of political cabinets

Advisors work directly for politicians as well as for political parties and parliamentary factions in the Sejm. They are also employed in the political cabinets of individual ministers. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, ministers “direct a particular branch of government administration or perform tasks allocated to them by the Prime Minister”⁹. Such wording emphasizes the political responsibility of ministers for the state of affairs in a given sphere, and not for the carrying out of administrative tasks. For that reason, a minister should control the program, budget, legislative, and personnel activity of his ministry. In carrying out these tasks, a minister is assisted by his deputies and the political cabinet as well as civil servants¹⁰.

According to constitutional principles, the aim of the civil service corps is to ensure the professional, diligent, impartial and politically neutral discharge of the state’s obligations. Civil servants should obey the instructions of those cur-

⁷ A. Kwiatkowska-Drożdż, *Doradztwo w zakresie polityki zagranicznej RFN*, in: *Doradztwo w polityce zagranicznej RFN – inspiracje dla Polski*, Warsaw 2008, p. 6.

⁸ R. Jordan, D. Maliniak, A. Oakes, S. Peterson, M.J. Tierny, *One Discipline or Many?*, p. 62.

⁹ Art. 149 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, “Dziennik Ustaw” 1997, no. 78 item 483.

¹⁰ Cf. J. Czaputowicz, *The Civil Service in Poland – between Politicization and Professionalization*, “The Polish Yearbook of Civil Service” 2005, 44–45; J. Czaputowicz, *Poland*, in: S. James (ed), *Political Advisors and Civil Servants in European Countries*, SIGMA Papers no. 38, Paris 2007, pp. 34–41.

rently in power, but are also expected to serve the interests of the state and act in accordance with the principles of democratic society (loyalty towards the constitution and the government, impartiality and professional integrity, professionalism, political neutrality)¹¹.

The division into political and bureaucratic spheres in the Polish state administration is reflected in the 1996 law on the organization and mode of operation of the Council of Ministers and the scope of the ministers' operation¹². It was underpinned by the conviction that, for efficient functioning of the administration, the functions of political administration ("for governance") and that of executive administration should be separated, as along with the procedures used for hiring the relevant personnel¹³. Under the law, each minister has a political cabinet in his ministry. The political "team" consists of the minister and his deputies who act on his behalf in managing the public administration division of the ministry and represent him in Parliament, as well as political advisors.

The competences of political cabinets are laid down in the internal regulations of individual ministries. The duties of the Political Cabinet of the Prime Minister include offering political and thematic advice as well as organizing the Prime Minister's contacts. Ministerial cabinets, as a rule, focus on the core tasks of a given ministry, formulate strategy, seek and select information needed for proper decision-making and closely cooperate with the secretaries and undersecretaries of state and officials. The basic principle is collaboration between the political and bureaucratic spheres for the professional execution of government tasks. The advisory role should not be confused with the decision-making role.

The weakness of political cabinets can be explained by their poor staffing¹⁴. On top of that, party cronies who have not made it into parliament are frequently employed as advisors. Some objections are also raised about the blurring of the boundaries between the roles of politicians and officials, when political advisors assume the competences of their superiors and try to influence the bureaucratic sphere. As a rule, ministers refer people with the best qualifications to managerial posts in the administrative section of the ministry.

¹¹ For more information see: J. Czaputowicz, *Przemiany modelu służby cywilnej w Polsce*, in: B. Kudrycka, B.G. Peters, P.J. Suwaj, *Nauka administracji*, Warsaw 2009, pp. 457–462.

¹² Act of 8 August 1996 on the organisation and mode of operation of the Council of Ministers and the scope of the ministers' operation, "Dziennik Ustaw" 1999 no. 82, item 929.

¹³ M. Kulesza, A. Barbasiewicz, *Functions of Political Cabinets*, "The Polish Yearbook of Civil Service" 2002, p. 37. For more information on relations between politicians and civil servants in other countries see: D. Bach-Golecka, *The Civil Service and Political Authority in Government Administration*, "The Polish Yearbook of Civil Service" 2005.

¹⁴ The number of positions in political cabinets decreased in the first half of the 2000s. from 82 to 46, which brought savings of some PLN 1.8 million. Cf. *Raport z realizacji „Programu uporzędkowania i ograniczenia wydatków publicznych”*, Council of Ministers, Warsaw, May 2005.

3. Functions of analysis centers

Analysis centers serve as interfaces between the world of academia and the world of politics. Their task is to provide knowledge for making informed decisions through the selection of information and making such information available to policymakers at the right time. They identify problems, warn against potential dangers, and come up with ideas on how to prevent them. They propose new solutions and draft scenarios of action. They also legitimize a given foreign policy to the general public. A political decision that is supported by scholarly analysis is more shielded against political attacks.

Another task of analytical institutions is to initiate debate on various aspects of foreign policy. Broad discussion builds consensus, and aims to get foreign policy principles internalized by policymakers, officials and the public at large. Centers of expertise could also become a platform for the development of alternative programs for the opposition. They are increasingly evaluated not by their product – the number of publications and reports – but by their actual influence, pushing through a specific policy change or introducing new legislation. Relying too heavily on donors carries the risk of losing independence, which in turn may mean losing credibility with politicians and in the eyes of the public.

Analysis centers act as independent voices that translate academic research into a language that is understood by both politicians and the general public¹⁵. In order to discharge their tasks properly, such centers must have an established reputation and authority, as well as legitimacy accorded by scholarly reliability. Access to the political sphere hinges on the quality of the reports that they prepare¹⁶. In addition to that, expert centers run training programs on various aspects of foreign policy for the employees of the chancelleries of the Sejm and the Senate. At the end of the day, the effectiveness of the operations of expert centers in the sphere of foreign policy is the outcome of political culture, institutional capacity – which includes efficiency of management and sound personnel selection – and adequate material resources from state and private sources. How this potential is used depends on the perceptual capacity of the government and the attitudes of officials¹⁷.

Analytical institutions can be divided into academic centers, centers which carry out commissioned studies, centers promoting particular policies (advocacy

¹⁵ J.G. McGann (ed), *Think Tanks and Policy Advice in the US: Academics, Advisors and Advocates*, Abingdon-New York 2007.

¹⁶ J. Pedersen, *Ideas, Think Tanks, Commissions, and Global Politics*, in: T. Ramesh, A.F. Cooper, J. English, *International Commission and the Power of Ideas*, Tokyo 2005, p. 271. To read more about experiences in social policy see: D. Stone, *Think Tanks. Global Lesson-Drawing and Networking Social Policy Ideas*, "Global Social Policy" 2001, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 338–360.

¹⁷ Cf. R. Stemplowski, *Wprowadzenie do analizy polityki zagranicznej*, p. 286.

institutions) and centers affiliated with political parties¹⁸. As a rule, academic centers have freedom to define their scope of activities, while centers carrying out commissioned studies as a rule have programs defined by the commissioning institution. The function of centers affiliated with political parties is to disseminate specific concepts. In this case, their credibility depends on their effectiveness in communicating ideas and influencing the political agenda¹⁹.

Expert institutions affect the way in which individual problems in foreign policy are perceived. People react to events not on the basis of empirical facts but on the basis of their image of those facts, shaped by convictions and beliefs. In the sphere of international relations, different images clash, and communication processes take place which are frequently fraught with misunderstanding²⁰.

Special meaning is given to personal contacts between experts and policymakers. Policymakers prefer oral communication, and like to acquire knowledge through debriefing or face-to-face contacts. On the other hand, written texts should offer an overall picture and present forecasts, development scenarios, and recommendations. Other possible forms of contact include critical reviews of political agendas and strategies.

Experts and policymakers use various forms of communication, such as: 1) *ad hoc* advice, based on personal acquaintance and complete trust; 2) debates organized by analytical institutions with the participation of both policymakers and experts, including those concerning legislative work; 3) round table meetings, regular briefings, and brainstorming sessions on new problems, and 4) "policy breakfasts", i.e. morning meetings of politicians and experts. Direct contacts with experts allow politicians to consult with them about their decisions and obtain professional knowledge needed to make informed decisions. On the other hand, experts gain knowledge which can help them understand the mechanisms underpinning the decision-making process²¹.

The opinions of experts shape both the debate and options for action in foreign policy, although their recommendations are not always acted upon. According to foreign relations experts, economists and lawyers exert a stronger influence on a state's policy²². The transfer of knowledge and ideas internationally leads to an isomorphism of individual national policies, foreign policy included. One topic

¹⁸ R. Kent Weaver, J.C. McGann, *Think Tanks and Civil Societies in a Time of Change*, in: R. Kent Weaver, J.C. McGann, *Think Tanks and Civil Societies*, New Brunswick 2000, pp. 1–35.

¹⁹ J. Pedersen, *Ideas, Think Tanks, Commissions...*, p. 271.

²⁰ G. Fisher, *Mindsets: The Role of Culture and Perception in International Relations* Yarmouth 1997, pp. 4–5. For more information see: Y.I. Vertzberger, *The World in Their Minds: Information Processing, Cognition and Perception in Foreign Policy Decision-Making*, Stanford 1990.

²¹ A. Kwiatkowska-Drożdż, *Doradztwo w zakresie polityki...*, pp. 11–12.

²² R. Jordan, D. Maliniak, A. Oakes, S. Peterson, M.J. Tierny, *One Discipline or Many?*, pp. 62–63.

for research should certainly be the impact of expert communities on the harmonization of foreign policies of the EU Member States. Historical institutionalism suggests that policymakers have a limited time frame for operations and cannot prevent inadvertent consequences of their actions. Their possibilities to choose between options tend to be limited by earlier decisions which in many cases the states concerned would not have made if only they had the knowledge they have now.

4. The development of think tanks

The notion of “think tanks” refers to their function to generate solutions (‘think’) and accumulate knowledge (‘tank’). Think tanks are analytical and expert institutions. They can be associated with specific political parties, in which case they promote a vision of foreign policy aligned with the agenda of a given party, and define ways in which political goals can be attained. They can also be apolitical entities, in which case they aim to provide unbiased, objective knowledge which can be used by all political persuasions.

There has been a dynamic growth in the number of think tanks, particularly in the 1990s. This was made possible by the information revolution which broke the state’s monopoly on information. Better and cheaper information technology, including the rise of the internet, fostered the operation of think tanks in the political sphere and increased their role in policy making. This was accompanied by a growing demand for independent expertise delivered on time, fuelled by the increasing complication of problems within individual policies. Governments were urged to improve the quality of public policies and therefore wanted to root the decision-making process in sound information and research. The process of self-organization of interest groups and non-governmental actors also played a role as these entities, which did not want to rely solely on information provided by governments, were keenly interested in the development of independent analysis and research²³. At the same time, researchers believe that the major causes which may hamper the development of think tanks include reluctance of political circles and changes in the priorities of donors who tend to favor the financing of short-term projects over the strengthening of institutional capacities²⁴.

It is estimated that the number of think tanks worldwide exceeds 5,500, of which nearly 1,800 operate in the United States, where the academic community in the sphere of foreign relations is the strongest. The first US think tank, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was set up as early as 1910. US think tanks are the largest and have the biggest budgets. For instance, the RAND

²³ J.G. McGann, *The Global “Go-To Think Tanks”*, Philadelphia 2009, pp. 46–47.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 11–12.

Corporation has a budget of US\$250 million, the Brookings Institution – \$60 million, the Heritage Foundation – \$48 million, and the Council of Foreign Relations – \$38 million.

There are over 1,500 think tanks in the European Union, with 283 in the UK, 186 in Germany, and 165 in France. The budgets of European think tanks are much smaller than those of their American counterparts, with Chatham House having a budget of \$12 million, the International Institute for Strategic Studies – \$15 million, and the Centre for European Policy Studies – \$8 million²⁵.

In Germany, the annual state budget allocation for foreign policy research and advisory activity totals 16.5 million euros. This does not include funds allocated by individual *Länder* which reach 5–8 million euros annually, and those donated by private institutions, in the range of 5–10 million euros per year. The largest such institution, the German Institute for International Security Affairs (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), which is an institution similar to the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM), has an annual budget of 10 million euros. The German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) is an independent, non-party analytical center with a research institute employing some 20 scholars. A characteristic feature of the German institutional arrangements are party foundations financed from the state budget, which also have a presence in Poland. The Konrad Adenauer, Friedrich Ebert and Heinrich Böll foundations influence the debate on Polish-German relations²⁶.

Warsaw, together with Budapest and Kiev, is one of the Central European centers in terms of the number of think tanks. With its 40 institutions of this kind, Poland is ranked 22nd in the world along with Hungary; it is surpassed e.g. by Russia, Romania and Ukraine. The best think tanks in Central Europe include: CASE – Center for Economic and Social Research (ranked 3rd), the Polish Institute of International Affairs (ranked 8th), and the Centre for International Relations (ranked 13th). PISM was also ranked 50th in the list of the best such institutions outside the United States²⁷.

5. Expert communities in Poland

In terms of the role they play in the system, analytical institutions can be divided into internal and external ones. Internal centers refer to political cabinets, the foreign affairs department in the Chancellery of the Prime Minister, and the Department of Strategy and Foreign Policy Planning of the Ministry of Foreign

²⁵ J.G. McGann, *The Global "Go-To Think Tanks"*, pp. 13, 28, 33–43.

²⁶ For more information see: M. Sus, *Doradztwo w polityce zagranicznej Polski i Niemiec. Między nauką a polityką*, Wrocław 2008.

²⁷ A. Kwiatkowska-Drożdż, *Doradztwo w zakresie polityki...*, pp. 7–8.

Affairs. External centers include academic institutions, research centers financed from the state budget, as well as non-governmental institutions. Being independent of the administration, they are in a position to analyze foreign policy in a more detached way, not directly affected by current issues.

The leading academic centers which develop the study of foreign relations include the University of Warsaw, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, the University of Wrocław, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, and Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. The National Defence University (AON) plays an important role in the sphere of security. It can be said that academic centers represent the largest and not fully utilized pool of expertise in Polish foreign policy.

The group of expert centers financed from the state budget includes the Polish Institute of International Affairs, the Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW), the Institute for Western Affairs (IZ) in Poznań, the East-Central Europe Institute (OŚWE) in Lublin, and the Natolin European Centre.

The Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) was built from scratch in the second half of the 1990s to replace the institute that had operated earlier under the same name. The role of the Institute is to carry out interdisciplinary and comparative studies in international relations broadly understood, prepare analyses and expert studies commissioned by state institutions, train personnel and disseminate knowledge about foreign relations among the general public. The Institute maintains contacts with similar institutions abroad, runs a specialist library, and engages in large-scale publishing activity (it puts out e.g. monographs, historical documents, "Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny" bi-monthly and the "Polish Quarterly of International Affairs")²⁸. From the policymakers' perspective, PISM popularizes knowledge about foreign relations rather than acts as an advisory center for the government and public administration.

PISM mostly employs young analysts, usually before their PhD dissertations. To boost the Institute's reputation in academic and political circles, it would be advisable to hire people with a good academic standing and distinguished experts who would be valuable partners for politicians. In addition, former ambassadors could provide advisory services after they finish their service abroad. A system of several months-long internships for PISM staff in various departments of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would familiarize them with decision-making processes in foreign policy and at the end of the day would help improve the level of expertise.

²⁸ Act of 20 December 1996 on the Polish Institute of International Affairs, "Dziennik Ustaw", nr 156, item 777, Regulation of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of 30 September 2004 on granting the statute for the Polish Institute of International Affairs, "Dziennik Ustaw", nr 216, item 2205.

The Centre for Eastern Studies was established in December 1990 as a research institution financed by the Ministry of Economy. Its role is to collect information as well as monitor and analyze the socio-political situation in the region. It has the following divisions: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and the Baltic States, Caucasus and Central Asia, Central Europe, Germany, and a team dealing with Security and Defence. The Centre prepares expert studies and conducts training²⁹.

The Western Institute in Poznań specializes in Polish-German relations, and recently also in security and European integration issues. It puts out monographs, historical sources, and the quarterly “Przegląd Zachodni”. The East-Central Europe Institute in Lublin is engaged in political science and historical research on the situation in the region, and organizes conferences and symposiums. The Institute is also involved in research programs, e.g. on the history of Belarus, Lithuania, Poland and Ukraine. It publishes “Rocznik” and “Studia i Komentarze” online. From the policymakers’ perspective, the Western Institute in Poznań and the East-Central Europe Institute should have a greater focus on contemporary issues and the challenges facing Polish foreign policy in the region rather than on history.

One of the goals of the Natolin European Centre is to disseminate knowledge about European integration through scholarly and educational activity, development of European studies, training programs and research³⁰. The Centre cooperates with foreign institutions and runs its own research projects. It also prepares expert studies and publishes the quarterly *Nowa Europa*: “Przegląd Natoliński”, as well as “Analizy Natolińskie” and “Komentarze Natolińskie”.

The third group includes institutions financed from other than budgetary sources. The Center for International Relations carries out research projects and organizes international conferences. The Center for Economic and Social Research (CASE) focuses on transformation issues in Central Europe, whereas the Batory Foundation awards grants and organizes foreign policy debates. The Institute of Public Affairs also has a European program, while the “Polska w Europie” (Poland in Europe) Foundation specializes in closed debates on foreign policy issues. The Kraków-based Institute for Strategic Studies analyses international security issues. *demosEUROPA* – Centre for European Strategy is a relatively new think tank which aims to initiate debate on the challenges facing the European Union. It has been commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to coordinate the work of foreign advisors preparing Poland’s EU Presidency.

Yet another group is made up of non-governmental organizations specializing in providing foreign assistance which collaborate with the Ministry of Foreign

²⁹ Statute of the Mark Karp Centre for Eastern Studies, Annex to Regulation No. 63 of the Economy Minister dated 26 June 2006.

³⁰ Activity Report of the Natolin European Centre: January 1–December 31, 2007, Warsaw 2008, p. 2.

Affairs. They play an important role in establishing contacts with partners abroad and enhance the awareness of the Polish public concerning foreign policy and European integration issues. These organizations can play an important role in preparing Poland's EU Presidency³¹.

By law, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs cooperates with the Polish Institute of International Affairs, the Western Institute and the East-Central Europe Institute. The Ministry's Department of Strategy and Policy Planning plays a pivotal role in maintaining contacts with academic and expert circles. According to the Ministry's Statute, it: (1) takes part in the formulation of the strategy for Poland's foreign policy, (2) prepares expert studies, forecasts, and reviews of the international situation, (3) develops guidelines for Polish foreign policy and prepares the foreign minister's annual address for the Parliament, (4) initiates and coordinates analytical work, (5) maintains a dialogue with planning units in other countries, and (6) cooperates with academic centers and research institutions³².

Commissioning analyses and studies is an important tool for influencing the expert community³³. The Department of Strategy organizes monthly meetings of experts to discuss various aspects of Polish foreign policy. Ensuring fast access to information and analysis requires the development of a network of experts and databases of top specialists in individual areas – this is what other countries do.

The Department carries out planning consultations aimed to acquire information about the foreign policy of partner countries. Within the European Union, the directors of the planning departments meet twice a year, either in Brussels or in the capital of the country of the current presidency (recently Berlin, Paris, Prague). Discussions receive substantive input from the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) based in Paris. Regular meetings are also held within the framework of the Visegrád Group. Contacts between the directors of planning departments make it possible to test various ideas and concepts at the level of experts before they are articulated at the political level.

³¹ For more information see: G. Czubek (ed), *Partnerstwo dla polityki zagranicznej*, Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego, *Grupa polskich organizacji pozarządowych pracujących poza granicami kraju*, Warsaw 2002; L. Kolarska-Bobińska, J. Kucharczyk, A. Łada, E. Kaca, A. Sobańska, *Polska prezydencja w Radzie Unii Europejskiej: współpraca administracji publicznej z sektorem pozarządowym*, an expert's study prepared by the Institute of Public Affairs and commissioned by the Office of the Committee for European Integration, Warsaw 2008.

³² Statute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ordinance No. 100 of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of 28 December 2009 on granting the Statute for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

³³ See for example: *Polska polityka zagraniczna. Unia Europejska, Stany Zjednoczone, sąsiedzi*, J. Czaputowicz (ed), Warsaw 2008.

Conclusions

Expert communities can exert some influence on the quality of the foreign policy debate. Such debate is followed by the internalization of values and ideas by policymakers and the public at large and by the building of a social consensus around the key directions of Polish foreign policy. Experts not only provide analyses and propose solutions but also popularize and defend the stance of a given country in international debate. At the same time, putting out publications in other countries offers an opportunity to exert influence on the shape of international policies.

Developing external analytical potential in the sphere of foreign policy lies in the country's best interests. Currently, the pool of experts is rather small and as a result tends to be burdened with an excessive workload. The experiences of many countries indicate that to develop such an expert base state budget funding is necessary. Foreign policy analysis should also be financed from EU funds as their use is less controversial than the use of funds coming from other countries' budgets. EU-funded programs should be more strongly linked with the actual needs of Poland's foreign policy.

The activity of expert communities has value when it looks at the international situation and suggests solutions convergent with the country's interests. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs should identify issues and topics which are important for Polish foreign policy and commission expert studies and research. The research plans of the Polish Institute of International Affairs, the Western Institute and the East-Central Europe Institute should be coordinated with the priorities of Poland's foreign policy. These institutions should be more active in providing advice to policymakers rather than popularizing foreign policy among the public. Foreign policymakers should be their main target group, i.e. government politicians, parliamentarians, and senior civil servants. Similarly, a greater emphasis should be placed on the use of teamwork and interdisciplinary teams in resolving specific foreign policy issues.

In Poland – unlike in other countries – there are no analytical institutions associated with individual political orientations, which certainly does not help the quality of public debate. A good solution to address this situation would be to create a system of state budget co-financing for non-governmental expert institutions in amounts that would be sufficient to employ the minimum necessary staff and cover administrative costs. It would be easier for them to seek grants for statutory activity if they had funds for basic administration.