



FOREIGN POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE DISCOURSE HELD ON FEBRUARY 5, 2015 IN THE POLISH PARLIAMENT. PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

POLITYKA ZAGRANICZNA UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ W ŚWIETLE
DYSKUSJI Z 5 LUTEGO 2015 R. W SEJMIE RP.
ANALIZA DYSKURSU PARLAMENTARNEGO

*Krzysztof Cebul**

— ABSTRACT —

The article analyses contents of speeches of parliament members in Sejm of the Republic of Poland during the parliamentary discussion of February 5th, 2015 over the information for Sejm and Senat of the Republic of Poland on Poland's participation in the works of the EU between July and December 2014. The purpose of the analysis of the parliamentary discourse was to indicate differences and similarities in opinions of the representatives of major political powers in Poland within the scope of assessment of the foreign policy of the European Union. The analysis shows mainly lack of coherence in the foreign policy of the EU and existence of clear, firm division at the level of assessment of role/meaning of Poland in the given area of activity.

Keywords: parliamentary discourse, political divisions, foreign policy of the EU, conflict in Ukraine, economic development, EU security

— ABSTRAKT —

Artykuł stanowi analizę treści wystąpień posłów w Sejmie RP podczas sejmowej dyskusji z 5 lutego 2015 r. nad informacją dla Sejmu i Senatu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej o udziale Rzeczypospolitej w pracach UE w okresie lipiec–grudzień 2014 r. Celem analizy dyskursu parlamentarnego było wskazanie na podobieństwa i różnice postaw przedstawicieli głównych sił politycznych w Polsce w zakresie ocen polityki zagranicznej Unii Europejskiej. Autor ukazuje przede wszystkim brak spójności w polityce zagranicznej UE oraz istnienie wyraźnego, trwałego podziału na poziomie ocen roli/znaczenia Polski we wskazanym obszarze aktywności.

Słowa kluczowe: dyskurs parlamentarny, podziały polityczne, polityka zagraniczna UE, konflikt na Ukrainie, rozwój gospodarczy, bezpieczeństwo UE

* Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Institute of Political Science.

INTRODUCTION

Politics is an inherent aspect of human behavior (Dahl, Stinebrickner, 2007, p. 43). It concentrates on influencing, which makes it practically ubiquitous in interpersonal relations (Dahl, Stinebrickner, 2007, p. 49). Due to that, organization systems are permanently connected to political dimension which shapes them. The possibility of analyzing the political dimension opens possibilities of perception of structure and function of systems. This rather general diagnosis also concerns functioning of the European Union, as integration processes in Europe, both from historical and contemporary point of view, are characterized by three properties distinguished by advantage of political component. First of all – their genesis is definitely political, not economic. Second of all – they have mainly political, not economic targets. Third of all – they depend on precise ideological factor or on combination of different factors, which are viable in the given moment (Kik, 1992, p. 5). Economic, political, military, legal, and social problems join in the process of integration. However, the political component remains decisive, which results in creation of the common decision making mechanism of the participating states and mechanisms of exchange and regulation of activities among them (Łastawski, 2004, p. 17). The level of analysis specifying both possibilities and borders of the research is constituted by a text being a stenographic record of speeches given by parliament members during the discussion held on February 5th, 2015 over the information for Sejm and Senat of the Republic of Poland on Poland's participation in the works of the EU between July and December 2014¹ (Informacja dla Sejmu i Senatu, 2014). The analysis covers speeches – 7 units; questions, rectifications, and answers – 10 units (see Table 1). A special code was assigned to each unit/speech of the parliamentary discussion in order to facilitate identification of speakers and localization of their speeches within the schedule of the debate (see Table 2)².

¹ 7th term of office, sitting no. 86 on 05.02.2015.

² The codes are composed of three elements. The first one indicates a role of the speaker: SSinMFA – Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; RC – Reporter for the Commission; L&J – Law and Justice; CP – Civic Platform; PPP – Polish People's Party; YM – Your Movement; DLA – Democratic Left Alliance. The second one informs about the kind of the statement: S – speech; Q – question; A – answer; R – rectification. The third element of the record enables identification of each statement in the schedule of the debate. For example: L&J-Q2 – the 2nd question asked by a parliament member of the Parliamentary Club of Law and Justice during the debate; CP-S1 – 1st speech made by a parliament member of the Parliamentary Club of Civic Platform. The table does not include smaller

Table 1. Number of speeches in the parliament discussion (by speakers/clubs)

NUMBER OF SPEECHES IN THE PARLIAMENT DISCUSSION (BY SPEAKERS/CLUBS)	
SPEECHES	
Rafał Trzaskowski – Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1
Agnieszka Pomaska – Reporter for the Commission of Foreign Affairs	1
Parliamentary Club of Civic Platform	1
Parliamentary Club of Law and Justice	1
Parliamentary Club of the Polish People's Party	1
Deputies' Club of the Democratic Left Alliance	1
Deputies' Club of Your Movement	1
In total	7
QUESTIONS	
Parliamentary Club of Civic Platform	4
Parliamentary Club of Law and Justice	2
Deputies' Club of the Democratic Left Alliance	1
In total	7
RECTIFICATIONS	
Parliamentary Club of Law and Justice	1
In total	1
ANSWERS	
Rafał Trzaskowski – Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs	1
Agnieszka Pomaska – Reporter for the Commission of Foreign Affairs	1
In total	2
In the aggregate	17

Source: Informacja dla Sejmu i Senatu, 2014.

The subject scope of analysis is constituted by language behavior of politicians. Identifying traits building the images presented by the politicians during the parliamentary discussion is to enable meanings of the language of politics to be determined (indirectly also its functions). The purpose of the analysis is to recreate the spectrums of meaning, construction of narration structures of which the discourse is composed, within the frames of the said debate, in relation to the

units within the frames of particular statements. However, they were separated for the needs of the research.

following levels: (1) manners of perceiving the European Union (EU) by Polish parliament members, vision of the EU (including visions, opinions on Polish place/position/function in the EU); and (2) directions, visions, opinions concerning: perspectives for development of the EU, priorities of common foreign policy. Execution of so defined target allows to demonstrate the important component of the political system of the European Union – the level of the EU member state, Poland, and more precisely the Polish opinion – foreign policy vectors, which independently of their content proclaim peculiar political bond within the frames of this system (Draus, 1999, p. 37), even considering only the fact that the Union itself is a point of reference for politicians' reflection. This direction conditions the selection of parliamentary discourse analyses, because these are the political parties that influence the activity of the EU institutions (Wojtaszczyk, 2006, p. 18). Taking that into consideration, learning about their opinions allows to show the position of Poland in the EU – in the relation dimension. Due to the place where the discourse appeared it is deemed proper to perform the analysis using the politolinguistic approach combining rhetoric, political science, and linguistics (Reisigl, 2011, p. 153).

The next part of the paper (Methodological Assumptions) shows that the cognitive value of the parliamentary discourse has some limits. Shortly speaking, the limits are reduced to the following question: to what degree verbal declarations influence political practice, do they have causative power and possibilities to create reality? This problem approach leads to the next question: what kind of knowledge is gained by a researcher using the discourse approach to examine the reality?

The main accusation that may arise here concerns independence of discourse analysis. It may be assumed that pieces of language phenomenon themselves are kinds of appearances enriching our knowledge of the world, but basing explanation of political actions on them may be an abuse. The key question here seems to be: what kind of relation (if existing) connects the language reality with political practice or practice in general?

For the needs of this paper, which is shown in details in the further part of it, it is assumed that such a relation exists. However, changing the language level into practice is not disturbance free, including abandonment of the given direction and change. Why to examine discourse behaviors at all? It seems that limits of cognition process themselves, minor or major inaccuracy may not constitute an argument in the area of social sciences, due to the fact that tools used by representatives of these sciences are not precise and mainly because possibility to learn variable and multidimensional social reality is very limited.

METHODOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Taking into consideration the fact that the research concentrates mainly on language practices – those characteristic to parliamentary debates – it should be considered that its results may not constitute a convincing (conclusive) explanation of the process of making and executing decisions. It is because the place where the communication processes appear constitutes limits itself. The context of this situation gives the speeches a unique, official character. Supposing that decisions are made in a different place, it should be deemed that their conditions are also different. The context of the situation is different and so is the discourse. Nevertheless, crossing the borders of the language as assumed by the politolinguistic approach requires a researcher to find points of reference that will enable explanation of acts of speech (Cebul, 2013, p. 155). That is the reason for which the assumption that language behaviors provide researchers with information (even if they are not precise) on performed or potential activities and, what is especially important, on appraisal area relating to these activities, is legit. Language is a tool used to evaluate, for example due to the fact that it includes a whole range of means useful to make appraisal (Bartmiński, 2003, p. 65). Additionally, assuming that a representative congregation represents real political situation and not theoretical independence (Crick, 2004, p. 82), it is the language of politics (parliamentary discourse) being a carrier of values that seems to open quite wide possibilities of explaining in relation to the level of political practice. Two conditions have to appear for the term “discourse”, in relation to statements made in a parliament, to be used. First of all, statements/rejoinders should be created in one course of language behavior. Second of all, they must be accompanied by identical communication situation. A parliamentary debate meets these conditions. So discourse is a sequence of language behaviors connected by a subject, a target, and a way the speech is shaped. The common subject, manner, and target constitute condition and are conditioned by the style, kind of speech, and communication situation (Laskowska, 2004, p. 13–14).

The social communication processes’ analysis described in the above manner makes it possible to explain mechanisms shaping interactions and ways of conscious reciprocal influence of partners (Małycka, 2003, p. 7). Even if due to cautiousness communication is defined as partly conscious process, it is coordination of common social activity enabling the most comfortable conditions of its survival that remains its target (Awdziejew, Habrajska, 2010, p. 7). Obviously

it needs to be underlined that it remains true under the condition of capturing the context in which the above mentioned behaviors appear.

Therefore, for the needs of the analysis the cognitive dimension of the research is not limited to the level of language and meaning of each code and the relations among them. This is since the political discourse is an event conditioned by a political system and at the same time combining its verbal and non-verbal meaning (Rittel, 2005, p. 24). Due to that, the context of the analyzed speeches should be looked into, which is tantamount to attempting to look into and understand the specific political reality.

Table 2. Schedule of the parliament discussion

SPEAKER	CODE
SPEECHES	
Rafał Trzaskowski (SSinMFA)	SSinMFA-S1
Agnieszka Pomaska (CP)	RC-S1
Andrzej Gałązewski (CP)	CP-S1
Arkadiusz Czartoryski (L&J)	L&J-S1
Andrzej Sztorc (PPP)	PPP-S1
Witold Klepacz (DLA)	DLA-S1
Maciej Wydrzyński (YM)	YM-S1
QUESTIONS	
Jan Kulas (CP)	CP-Q1
Joanna Bobowska (CP)	CP-Q2
Marcin Świącicki (CP)	CP-Q3
Maria Nowak (L&J)	L&J-Q1
Tadeusz Iwiński (DLA)	DLA-Q1
Stanisław Pięta (L&J)	L&J-Q2
ANSWER	
Rafał Trzaskowski (MFA)	MFA-A1
RECTIFICATION	
Arkadiusz Czartoryski (L&J)	L&J-R1
ANSWER	
Agnieszka Pomaska (CP)	RC-A1
QUESTION NOT ASKED	
Elżbieta Achinger (CP)	CP-Q4

Source: Informacja dla Sejmu i Senatu, 2014.

CONTEXT/CONDITIONS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE IN THE DEBATE HELD ON FEBRUARY 5TH, 2015

444 parliament members participated in the voting on acceptance of the complete draft of resolution on Poland's participation in the works of the EU between July and December 2014. 260 voted for, 151 voted against, 33 abstained, 15 did not vote (see Table 3) (Głosowanie nad przyjęciem w całości projektu uchwały, 2014).

Table 3. Detailed results of voting on acceptance of the complete draft of resolution on Poland's participation in the works of the EU between July and December 2014

DETAILED RESULTS OF VOTING						
Club/Deputies' group	Number of members	Voted	For	Against	Abstained	Not voted
Parliamentary Club of Civic Platform	202	199	199	-	-	3
Parliamentary Club of Law and Justice	132	127	-	127	-	5
Parliamentary Club of the Polish People's Party	38	36	36	-	-	2
Deputies' Club of the Democratic Left Alliance	34	32	2	1	29	2
Independent	20	19	7	8	4	1
Parliamentary Club of Fair Poland	15	15	-	15	-	-
Deputies' Club of Your Movement	15	13	13	-	-	2
Deputies' Club Security and Economy	3	3	3	-	-	-

Source: Głosowanie nad przyjęciem w całości projektu uchwały, 2014.

The context of the analyzed speeches, having contentious character of parliamentary discussion, should be deemed important (but not exclusive) for the said analysis. It is about the relation between the administration in power and the opposition, which generates a specific way of presenting arguments. For example, statements of opposition members very often join presentation of specific matters with thesis on government's incompetence. Due to that, statement that political argument is a condition of different narrations would be the easiest explanation. If such an explanation was accepted, different points of view should be simply considered equal. This direction constitutes clear limitation in further research of conditions. Therefore seeking firm reference points for the positions stated

during the discussion, other impacts should be consulted (apart from this way of interpretation), including divisions over the field of discussion (understood in wider context of relations) observable among parliamentary groups. It should be pointed here that opinions on the European Union and the place of Poland in the EU significantly influence perception and statements expressed by politicians.

The ongoing process of transformation of the European Union can be described as deepening integration. However, in order to keep judgment prudent, it seems to be a better measure to look at this complex and impossible to interpret process in categories of seeking a safe level of organizational efficiency, that is capacity to adapt (understood as readiness to face both internal and external challenges).

Parliament members treat the EU as a functional environment. For them, the European Union is a particular instrument of execution of Polish foreign policy. Poland is thought of in reference to the Union and in relation with the Union. It is about a Union context of the Polish policy – Poland is in some sense entangled in the European integration. Such a situation is a result of democratic character of the European integration, which allows identification of each entity. Democracy in the EU has its own procedural, representative and participation space (Wojtaszczyk, 2012, p. 13). It should be underlined here that this diagnosis is only an assertion of the existing state of matters and is deprived of any element of judgment.

In order to open a wider context of the discourse in the discussion held on February 5th, 2015 over the information for Sejm and Senat of the Republic of Poland on Poland's participation in the works of the EU between July and December 2014, conclusions of the analysis of the debate of March 20th, 2013 over the information of the Minister of Foreign Affairs on basis of Polish foreign policy in 2013 will be auxiliary used. It will allow more profound interpretation of the positions presented during the discussion of February 5th, 2015, as assessment of the European Union and Polish place in the EU are not clearly expressed. The division in the area of judgment of government's activity appeared to be the leading issue in the arguments. Undoubtedly the discussion of February 5th, 2015, as any other parliamentary discussion, was a dispute between a governing coalition and opposition. However perceiving this discussion only from the perspective of the said division can significantly limit the analysis. To avoid such reduction, it is worth to mention the said debate. It will allow the context to be shown more clearly as it draws one more crucial axis of parliamentary disputes – judgment of the integration process.

There are two viewpoints to be mentioned considering assessment of consequences of the integration process, which were raised during the debate on March 20th, 2015. The governing coalition of Civic Platform (CP) and Polish People's Party (PPP) together with the opposition parties: Democratic Left Alliance (DLA) and Your Movement (YM) treat the ongoing integration process as reinforcement of the Union and Poland at the same time. For these parties the deepening integration is not contrary to Poland gaining bigger influence on the decisions made within the European Union. It also does not limit Poland in reaching its own goals. These parties, however, do not accept these goals without conditions. Polish interests are not the only category. The parliament members of the above mentioned parties seem to accept the necessity of growth of responsibility and costs as a particular regulator within this scope. Gaining stability at the Union level constitutes a goal for them, with Poland being a part of the involvement. A different point of view is presented by Law and Justice (L&J) and Solidary Poland (SP), indicating that deepening the integration, increase of interdependence leads mainly to deterioration of the international position of Poland. From their perspective, the European Union should rather remain outside of Polish matters. While it is a significant entity, it still remains to be secondary. These parties concentrate more on particularisms in the European Union and they assume the perspective of variety of different national states' interests and necessity of rather strong and sometimes ruthless competition. In general, it should be assumed the process of European integration is described by the participants of the debate as increase (guarantee) or as decrease (destabilization) of the level of security of the Polish state. CP, PPP, DLA, and YM seem to perceive interests of the Union more as a peculiar but still diverse, at the same time fully underlining the role of conciliatory way of making decisions. In order to describe positions of L&J and SP, the category of decisional independence is more proper. According to it, the European Union should remain, in their opinion, somehow "outside" Polish affairs (Cebul, 2015, p. 168–169).

It should be pointed out that there are no preconditions confirming that this division is out-of-date in the discussion of February 5th, 2015. The discussion on the previously described matters does not organize the discourse, but the elements of it become more visible. A vision of conciliatory and concordant Union is raised. It can be seen in statements SSinMFA-S1, RC-S1, and CP-S1 when their authors talk about the necessity to keep a consistent line of the EU in the case of the conflict in Ukraine. There is also acceptance of the need for

more efficient governing of the Union, deepening the integration on the political level. Confirmation of this direction is visible in statement DLA-S1: "Before the end of the reorganization process of the Union, after the election, Italy had much time to promote their vision of European revival and to influence the direction of key initiatives taken at the beginning of the new term of office mainly in the economic field. These goals were expressed by the slogan [...] 'fresh start'. It was to highlight the intention of taking Italian presidency out of purely technical management and making the European Union presidency clearly political. It was also the aim of promoting a federal character of the European Union".

In the light of the analyzed discussion, the European Union, despite of clear presence of critical opinions (distance), for the parliament members is a synonym of security. This observation confirms the thesis that security, which scope is still expanding, is a key category enabling understanding of modern international affairs (Kostecki, 2012, p. 17). It is the European Union where they see the functional area that creates, or relatively can create after implementation of reforms, instrumentation for effective activity, which is a tool to shape the security policy – countering threats.

Undoubtedly, it is the lack of a project alternative to the EU that determines acceptance of this approach. On the other hand, appreciation of the EU potential is visible in international relations. The differences in opinions and visions presented by Polish politicians are results of a wider process going on in the European Union. Variability, as a permanent trait of the system of the Union, is on one hand determined by a lack of balance inside the system caused by continued rebuilding of the integration structure. On the other hand, it derives from the necessity to adjust the system to changes in international relations (Czachór, 2008, p. 31). Since the European integration is a process, changes are a part of it.

ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN THE PARLIAMENTARY DISCUSSION OF FEBRUARY 5TH, 2015

Main strands being a part of the foreign policy of the EU which are worth explaining, are: (1) the conflict in Ukraine; (2) economic development and building competition; (3) personal changes in the EU institutions; (4) energy security; (5) the EU security including migration policy and fighting terrorism.

THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE

The conflict in Ukraine is an event showing difficulties in reaching common ground within the EU. It shows the power of particularisms. However the experience of this incompatibility of interests does not impair, as shown before, the confidence that the EU should “speak as one” (SSinMFA-S1, RC-S1, CP-S1). This assumption remains an important element of the vision of the integration process for CP: “the most important thing is that the voice of the European Union on what is happening in the east Ukraine was clear, strong, sole, and united” (SSinMFA-S1). The author of the cited speech specifies activities towards developing a common statement by the EU as “absolute priority of the Polish government” and to confirm the efficiency of its activity, the author names coherent steps made by the EU: tightening, in 2014, the economic sanctions against Russia, visa and financial sanctions against the representatives of separatists responsible for organizing elections in parts of Ukraine seized by the rebellion, and also tightening restrictive measures within the frames of the policy of not recognizing the annexation of Crimea (SSinMFA-S1). A similar message is passed in the speech RC-S1, however it also touches on the problem of significant diversification on the level of positions of the EU member states on the conflict in Ukraine: “the Italian presidency, like the whole European Union, has faced external challenges related to the Ukrainian crisis. In spite of numerous differences in opinions and discussions, the Union was able to keep reasonably unitary statements including the one on sanctions against Russia”. The requirement of reaching a common ground as a particular condition of efficient functioning of the EU is also confirmed by the statement CP-S1. It also shows, in similar way to statement RC-S1, a major disagreement at the level of opinions of each member state of the EU on the conflict in Ukraine, especially indicating the opinion of the Visegrad Group member states, which is “different” from the Polish one: “During the Italian presidency a unitary statement of the member states on imposing sanctions on Russia was successfully developed and some member states were successfully convinced to help Ukraine within the field of gas supply. It was so valuable due to the fact that in the beginning the Italian administration and some member states were not eager to engage in the case of Russian participation in military actions in Ukraine” – CP-S1.

In statement CP-S1, as in statement SSinMFA-S1, the author underlines that the change of the stance of the presidency was influenced – *inter alia* – by the “firm attitude of Poland”. However, strong differences appear among the parlia-

ment groups in the aspect of judging Polish role in execution of the Eastern policy. Different assessment was presented in the speech DLA-S1: "We expect the Polish government to engage even more, to be more active in the area mentioned in the basis of Italian presidency, but also within the scope of solutions to political problems. We are worried by the fact that Poland was excluded from the peace talks concerning Ukraine. So also in this area a possibility of taking a new political initiative that would include Poland should be sought". The clearest opinion contrary to the assessment formed by the governing party is included in statement L&J-S1: "it is a total disaster as far as Polish diplomacy is concerned. Everything happens without Polish participation. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs, Radosław Sikorski, was not invited to join his peers of Germany, France, Russia, and Ukraine negotiating solutions to the conflict. The first of these meetings was held in Berlin and is now called a Normandy form. But Poland is not there. Poland is simply not there. [...] it also moved to NATO level". In this context, the author of the speech also mentions the meeting of the President of the USA, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the German Chancellor, the President of Italy, and the President of France with the President of Ukraine, in which Poland did not participate, assessing it as: "completely disastrous situations" (L&J-S1). The above arguments are additionally enhanced by the accusation of lack of action plan from the Polish government: "it can be seen that even the Belarusian president is more successful, as the meetings are held in Belarus. [...] minister Katarzyna Pełczyńska-Nałęcz was in the European Union Commission and we asked her last year in July if Poland had any plan, our, original one, with which we can go to Brussels and to Ukraine and show that according to that plan, the talks could start. At that time the answers of the minister could be summarized in the following way: 'we are waiting for opinions of those big players.' [...] Today the minister is an ambassador in Moscow, which means that we did not have and we still do not have any plan and because of that, we are totally excluded from these talks. And sitting at this table we could at least ask the Italians if they could hold the sales of Iveco armored vehicles to Russia, which vehicles they sell and they do not want to sell them to Ukraine or they mark some talks literally at the same time. Unfortunately, we do not have such plan and it is a failure, total failure" (L&J-S1). Next to these divergent assessments it should be qualified as natural that the statement PPP-S1 signaled the necessity of supporting Ukraine and YM-S1 presented Polish engagement in Eastern policy as duty since they did not relate to judgment of actions of the Polish government.

Different opinions concerning effectiveness of Poland within the scope of influencing solution of the conflict in Ukraine can be explained in the category of political fight between the party in power and the opposition. Such an approach, however, creates a rotating diagnosis that for the opposition any activity will remain insufficient or improper, and for the governing majority – adequate and optimal. If no consideration is given to that fight, it can be seen without doubts that the Eastern matters, from the perspective of politicians, remain a test for the European Union as a security creator. One can hazard to suggest that politicians hope that the EU is, or can be, such a creator. It is a peculiar requirement for keeping a proper level of sense of security. It leads to a postulate of necessity to work on common opinion in this matter for the whole EU. The direction of this opinion should obviously be stopping Russia, which is somewhat reversing the situation in Ukraine. The creative possibilities of the European Union described in this manner seem to constitute a test of effectiveness for politicians, but mainly strong expectation of this direction of activity should mitigate a gradually increasing deficit of feeling of security.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING COMPETITION

As far as the subject of economic development discussed in the parliament is concerned, the following subjects should be deemed important from the perspective of competitiveness of the EU: establishing the European fund for investment (SSinMFA-S1, CP-S1), creating new work places (DLA-S1), support for small and medium business (DLA-S1), entering into a commercial-economic agreement between the EU and Canada (PPP-S1), entering into a free trade agreement between the EU and the USA (CP-S1). As far as subjects approached from the perspective of Polish interests are concerned, the ones to be pointed are: the Eurozone (DLA-S1), transport sector (L&J-S1), the Russian embargo (L&J-S1).

Assessments expressed by the parliament members within the scope of the mentioned issues show existence of division, which also concerns judgment of role and participation of Poland in actions taken within the EU. One side is occupied by statements SSinMFA-S1 and CP-S1. The author of the speech SSinMFA-S1 concentrates on high activity of Poland in works over the European fund for investments: “Poland took and is taking a very active part in this debate. For us the key issue was exactly to stimulate the climate for investments and

very precise solutions which influence management of this fund. Not only was Poland an active participant of this debate, but also co-initiated many solutions which were included in this draft document". Similar narration can be observed in statement CP-S1: "the minister of finance of the Polish government not later than in September last year proposed the establishment of European Investment Fund [...]. Drawing up a concept of establishing European Strategic Investment Fund was a development of the Polish initiative. Polish proposal was used here".

In speech DLA-S1, in turn, lack of any plan of Poland entering the Eurozone was criticized: "The term of presidency was also an occasion to develop a dialog with Italy over the future of the European Union, taking into consideration further integration within the Eurozone. Here and now I can repeat our negative opinion on government's actions, as the government has not set any roadmap of reaching the Euro. [...] In a longer perspective, it will also bring economic consequences". Stance DLA-S1 should be, however, treated as moderate as it does not include clear criticism and is rather formulated in the form of recommendation: "We expect the Polish government to engage even more in changes which have to be made to the functioning of the European Union, but also in solving those important problems which Europe is currently tackling". On the other hand, strong criticism of the actions of the Polish government is expressed in statement L&J-S1 concerning the situation in transport sector: "We also fail in situations related to not smaller but totally different area, that is transport. Not later than in July last year it was known that Germany, minding their own international transport market, heavy transport, had an idea of serious confrontation with truly very big, as for the European scale, transport sector in Poland. [...] Today, information that we receive suggests that the case was settled partly. The situation of the transport industry, this part of our economy, is already very hard due to Russian embargo and the EU member states protecting their markets". In this statement, raising the problem of internal competition in the EU is worth attention. Apart from positions of different member states regarding the conflict in Ukraine, this is another area in which the power of particularism can be seen.

Opinions presented in this part allow to distinguish two approaches to the meaning of economic integration for the purpose of deepening the political one. By some parties deepening economic dependences is treated as objective necessity, being a condition of increasing efficiency of the EU on international stage. Reciprocal economic dependence of states would result in unification and coherence of the EU foreign policy. However, analyzing speeches being skeptical towards execution of such direction, it is worth asking a question on the way

to perform deepening of economic dependence. The skeptical approach underlines the possibility, threat of dependency, which is equal to serious impairment or transfer of decision making functions of a state to a different level or its incorporation to a different entity. The second approach, which may be called conciliatory, assumes, as one can suppose, that the consequences of deepening dependences will be balanced for all states, which will lead to lack of aggrieved entities.

PERSONAL CHANGES IN THE EU INSTITUTIONS

As far as the spectrum of judgment concerning personal changes in the EU is concerned, a division is also visible and it is similar to the previously described one. One group is composed of statements SSinMFA-S1, CP-S1, and YM-S1: “I would like to clearly state here that Poland has succeeded in major way as the Poles hold absolutely key functions in the EU bodies” (SSinMFA-S1). A similar message is found in the speech CP-S1: “Donald Tusk was elected a new President. Being the Prime Minister of Poland for almost two terms of office he successfully led our country through the difficult time of the crisis of world finances and then European finances”, and also in the statement YM-S1: “Donald Tusk being appointed as the President of the European Council and Elżbieta Bieńkowska as the Internal Market and Services Commissioner are both very important events. It creates possibilities that can be efficiently used to create responsible and solid image of Poland as the leader of political changes in this part of Europe, which we all count on”. The opposite group contains the statement (L&J-S1): “the speakers before me, [...] paid attention to the fact [...] of election of Prime Minister Tusk for the position of the President of the European Council. [...] I started checking the history of prime ministers of France, Great Britain, German chancellors, prime ministers of Spain. What big country of the size of Poland would allow itself to accept a situation of prime minister leaving his office during the term to become the President of the European Council? This is highly ridiculous. After termination of the term of office we could really speak of positive aspects, success, but it was simply abandoning the office in one of the biggest three–four states during its term. This situation had had no precedence and is bizarre”.

ENERGY SECURITY

Two contrary positions are also presented in the area of energy security. It should be noticed that the conflict in Ukraine plays a mobilizing role. The statement SSinMFA-S1 includes a following assessment: “our priority, but also the priority of the European Union was to continue works leading to increase of energy security of the European Union and member states and, what is most important in today’s geopolitical climate, decrease of our energy dependence both in reference to electrical energy and gas. [...] All of these priorities, which are the most important for us, concerning the fact of becoming independent of gas suppliers, questions of contracts being more transparent and finally ensuring the biggest possible number of solidary mechanisms, were included in this work”. A slightly different message is passed by the statement CP-S1, which breaks away from the division stipulated before: “The conflict in Ukraine made the presidency recognize energy security of the EU as a priority of this policy. Unfortunately, the energy policy is still related to the climate policy, which in no case makes the energy security a real priority of the energy policy. [...] Polish government sought partners to make the climate policy more rational. This is extremely hard as we are a bit lonely in this war”. Nevertheless criticism of government’s actions in the area of energy security is found in the statement L&J-S1: “of course we have a total failure of such flag project proposed by Prime Minister Tusk which is the project of energy union. Vice-President of the European Commission [...] informed that in fact the energy union will not exist. If it exists, it will have a voluntary character, [...] if there are European partners who want to reach a voluntary agreement they may purchase jointly but the big ones are not interested. In that meaning, it is a failure. It is a failure as we all know that different states pay different prices for gas, and it is a failure. The government consequently avoids this subject, skips this subject and hides it, but truly it is a failure”.

The core of the role of the Union designed by Polish politicians is the dependence between the necessity to enhance the foreign dynamics of the EU expressed in confronting the ability to create order in the East and enhancing the internal potential by self-sufficiency in the area of securing strategic resources. It is worth noticing that this construction of creating the security system shows lack of additional means of executing such a strategy (apart from sanctions, which not accompanied by other instruments do not fulfill their functions and therefore do not allow reaching the set effects). A similar inconsistency, which is not noticing in

adequate manner the necessity to build a complex security system, is also visible in the case of the EU participation in the war against terrorism described below.

THE EU SECURITY INCLUDING MIGRATION POLICY AND FIGHTING TERRORISM

As far as the international security is concerned, in the field of the migration policy one statement was presented: “Italian presidency also focused on promoting European migration policy – Italy itself have the biggest problem in this area out of all European states [...] the European Union is facing problems of mass migration, which poses serious threat to security of Europe. Poland as a country which constantly gets richer is interested in regulating the EU policy of incoming immigration. The consciousness of the migration problem not being exclusively related to Italy, Greece, or Spain, but to the entire European Union rises” (DLA-S1). In the speech YM-S1, in the context of the conflict in Ukraine, attention was drawn to importance of works over common security and defense policy and a need for a wider discussion on this subject was pointed, especially in relation to the policy of progressive withdrawal of Polish forces from Afghanistan. In this speech questions about percentage participation of particular national contingents and areas of military actions that are taken into consideration as areas of common activity has appeared. In the area of international security Islamic terrorism poses threat, which is also pointed out by politicians. Speech CP-S1 states that the EU is not going to take explicit actions in this area. Conclusion may also be drawn from this message that Poland is rather not eager to play important role in this matter: “The reaction of the European Union to terror of the Islamic State was and remains careful and is limited to increase efficiency of protecting particular member states from individual terrorist acts on their territory. [...] The information from the government does not allow to draw conclusions that the EU found an adequate response to that situation at that time as no regional strategy against Syria, Iraq, and the Islamic State was settled”.

CONCLUSIONS

The above analysis enables formation of two conclusions. The first one refers to the level of efficiency of the system of the European Union in international environment. The discourse presented in the text concerning the conflict in Ukraine

and also other dimensions of the security policy of the EU confirmed (of course in the scope enabled by the level of speech analysis accepted in the research) the thesis of lack of balance between the level of development of economic and political integration and the deficit in the area of efficient instruments of political management, which significantly influences possibilities of reaching strategic goals by the European Union (Wojtaszczyk, 2011, p. 7). The second conclusion refers to assessments of the place of Poland in the structure of the European Union formed by Polish parliament members. It should be noticed that levels of dispute, which usually locate CP, PPP and often YM and DLA against L&J, range of arguments used by each party kept on a similar level (among others it concerns a manner of using a firmly critical message by L&J against CP-PPP) – which confirms existence of rather solid division. Relatively constant position of major parliamentary groups on respective problems is also confirmed by the results of voting over adopting a resolution on participation of the Republic of Poland in the works of the European Union in the period of July–December 2014 (see Table 3). If the proposal of interpretation of differences within the scope of assessment of the process of European integration presented in the text is to be applied on these observations, a permanent conflict on the Polish political stage can be seen, which may not be treated only as political competition but should be rather seen in a wider context of a system-based dispute, fundamental from the perspective of Polish *raison d'état*.

REFERENCES:

- Awdziejew, A., Habrajska, G. (2010). *Komponowanie sensu w procesie odbioru komunikatów*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo PRIMUM VERBUM.
- Bartmiński, J. (2003). Miejsce wartości w językowym obrazie świata. In: J. Bartmiński (ed.), *Język w kręgu wartości. Studia semantyczne* (p. 59–85). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Cebul, K. (2013). Praktyka instytucji reprezentacji: sejmowa dyskusja w dniu 25 lipca 2013 r. In: T. Żyro (ed.), *Reprezentacja polityczna* (p. 147–174). Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych, Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Cebul, K. (2015). Problematyka bezpieczeństwa w sejmowej debacie z 20 marca 2013 roku nad informacją ministra spraw zagranicznych o założeniach polskiej polityki zagranicznej w 2013 roku. In: W. Walkiewicz (ed.), *Wielowymiarowość bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego i zewnętrznego* (p. 164–178). Warszawa–Białystok: Szkoła Główna Gospodarstwa Wiejskiego, Wydawnictwo i Drukarnia Libra.
- Crick, B. (2004). *W obronie polityki*. Trans. by A. Waśkiewicz. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Czachór, Z. (2008). Zagrożenia międzynarodowe a przebudowa systemu działań zewnętrznych Unii Europejskiej. In: W. Malendowski (ed.), *Świat współczesny. Wyzwania, zagrożenia i współzależności w procesie budowy nowego porządku międzynarodowego* (p. 31–45). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Nauk Politycznych i Dziennikarstwa Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Dahl, R.A., Stinebrickner, B. (2007). *Współczesna analiza polityczna*. Trans. by P.M. Kazmierczak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Draus, F. (1999). *Integracja europejska a polityka. Szkice krytyczne i perspektywne*. Rzeszów: Instytut Europejskich Studiów Społecznych w Rzeszowie.
- Głosowanie nad przyjęciem w całości projektu uchwały. (2014). *Głosowanie nad przyjęciem w całości projektu uchwały w sprawie udziału Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w pracach Unii Europejskiej w okresie lipiec–grudzień 2014 r. (przewodnictwo Włoch w Radzie Unii Europejskiej), zawartego w druku nr 3044*. Retrieved from <http://www.sejm.gov.pl/Sejm7.nsf/agent>.