

Tomasz Pugacewicz

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6267-5105>

Jagiellonian University

Foreign Policy Analysis in Post-Cold War Poland: History, Teaching, Institutions, Westernization, and Theoretical Approaches¹

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to characterize Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) in post-Cold War Poland. The scope of this text is limited to FPA, understood as empirical research utilizing foreign policy theories by taking into account factors at the domestic level. “Polish FPA” is defined as research conducted by scholars employed in Poland. The text focuses on five aspects of Polish FPA: (1) historical context, (2) the teaching covering this subject, (3) the development of institutions doing research on foreign policy, (4) adaptation of ideas from global (mainly Western) science (in fact, westernization), and (5) the most important publications analyzing foreign policy and applying theoretical approaches. The paper is a response to the existing research gap as, so far, no work has been prepared strictly on the FPA’s development in post-Cold War Poland. The weaknesses of the existing literature on this subject are its (1) selectivity, (2) focus on mainstream international relations theories and (3) sketchiness.

Keywords: Foreign Policy Analysis, foreign policy theories, Poland, Central Europe, historiography

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the shape of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) in post-Cold War Poland. The scope of this text is limited to foreign policy studies understood as empirical research (i.e. focused on answering the question “how is it?”) and using foreign policy theory to answer this question, taking

¹ The author would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments. The research was financed by a grant from the Polish National Science Centre (NCN) for the project titled “Between Center and Periphery: A Comparison of Ludwik Ehrlich’s Theoretical Concepts with American-British International Relations in the First Half of the Twentieth Century” (no. 2017/26/D/HS5/00801).

into account the pertinent factors at the domestic level². In the context of this limitation, it should be stated that foreign policy studies are understood around the world in many different ways. It could, among others, denote empirical studies using foreign policy concepts but not focused on domestic factors and utilizing variables from e.g. international level (such as e.g. structural realism). Foreign policy studies can also mean empirical research, but of an inductive nature and excluding the (conscious) use of theoretical concepts (in fact, atheoretical studies, e.g. historical one). Finally, foreign policy studies may not be empirical at all, but normative one (those answer the question “how should it be?”). In this last type, studies on foreign policy may concern individual cases (“how should a decision-maker behave in a given situation based on specific norms?”) or take the form of general concepts that determine the behavior of decision-makers (the so-called normative theory of international relations, based on the concepts of political philosophy).

In the context of the above considerations on various types of foreign policy studies, it should be noted that their broad definition (as empirical and normative research) is characteristic of European science (see e.g. Carlsnaes and Guzzini, 2011; cf. Hadfield and Hudson, 2015, pp. 139–167). In American academia, dominated by a positivist philosophy of science (metatheory), it has become common to use the term “Foreign Policy Analysis” to describe empirical studies using theoretical concepts (see e.g. Hudson, 2014, pp. 9–10, 16–17). It seems that in the initial period of the development of FPA in the USA, it was mainly associated with foreign policy decision-making (FPDM) (see e.g. Mintz and Sofrin, 2018) and integrative approaches, taking into account factors from many levels of analysis, both domestic and international (see e.g. the Comparative Foreign Policy [CFP] project developed on the basis of the ideas of James Rosenau described in Lantis and Beasley, 2018, p. 187). One might get the impression that in recent years, the process of broadening FPA in the USA to include mainstream international relations theories has progressed (e.g. see chapters on mainstream international relations theories in Thies, 2018). Simultaneously, these typical international relations theories see the driving forces of foreign policy at various levels of analysis (e.g. structural realism focuses on the international level, while liberalism, constructivism or Marxism at the domestic one).

Research in the field of foreign policy in Poland was for many years far from Western (both European and American) concepts and could hardly be referred to as FPA.³ However, in recent years, the process of not only the assimilation of

² Due to the extensive development of European Studies in Poland, it was necessary to adopt in this paper the narrowing assumption that foreign policy is understood as a feature only of states.

³ In the Polish academic literature, the term “foreign policy studies” (Polish: “studia nad polityką zagraniczną”) has been present for some time (see e.g. Pugacewicz, 2017, pp. 20–26; Pugacewicz, 2019, pp. 59–86). The alternative name – “foreign policy research” (Polish: “badanie polityki

the achievements of Western science but also their creative use has been discernible in this area, which means that current research in Poland could be described as FPA as understood by Western scholars, especially European (and in a lesser sense American). Due to the fact that FPA is institutionally connected in Poland with International Relations (IR) and Political Science, it will be analyzed in the light of these research fields.

For the purposes of this article, “Polish FPA” is understood as research conducted by scholars employed in Poland. Thus, two other “Polish FPA” types (to some degree overlapping) are not included in this paper. Firstly, the article does not concern only studies on the foreign policy of the Polish state, which can be carried out both in Poland and outside Poland. Secondly, the text does not deal with “Polish FPA” understood as a contribution or a specific approach of Polish researchers to foreign policy.⁴

It would be impossible to convey the entire complexity of the Polish FPA understood in this way in a single paper, so the following text focuses only on five issues: (1) historical context, (2) the shape of the teaching programs covering this subject, (3) the development of institutions dealing with foreign policy, (4) interactions of Polish FPA with the global (mainly Western) science and (5) the most important publications analyzing foreign policy.

This text is a response to an existing research gap as to date no work focused strictly on FPA in post-Cold War Poland has been prepared. This situation is not only due to the specificity of Polish FPA but also a part of the broader problem of IR developed in Poland, which for a long time was not interested in its own history (only sporadically there were texts summarizing the current state of development of IR or FPA in Poland, see e.g. Symonides, 1973, pp. 193–206 and 1978, pp. 11–22; Pastusiak, 1978, pp. 299–318; Kuźniar, 1991, pp. 93–106 and 1995, pp. 69–90; Czaputowicz, 2012, pp. 196–212). The situation has only changed in this respect in the last decade. The beginning of this was the slow reception of the so-called historiographic turn in Western IR from the 1990s (see, e.g., Filary, 2010, pp. 345–374; Pawłuszko, 2011, pp. 117–140)⁵ and the institutionalization of the IR in Poland. The first dis-

zagranicznej”) – is used by Halizak (2015, pp. 9–36; 2016a, pp. 11–38 and 2018a, pp. 13–52). Many other researchers simply use the term “foreign policy analysis” (Polish: “analiza polityki zagranicznej”) to describe Polish studies on foreign policy. Cf. with the idea of “Analysis of Foreign Policy” (AFP) developed by Hadfield and Hudson (2015, pp. 139–167) as a specific type of this kind of studies in Europe.

⁴ The concept of three ways of understanding “Polish FPA” – as (1) studies on Polish foreign policy (regardless of the place of practicing), (2) foreign policy studies carried out only in Poland (as it is understood in this paper) and (3) a Poland-specific approach to foreign policy – is built on how the following authors propose we should understand the term “Asian International Relations”: Ling and Chen, 2018, p. 134.

⁵ The historiography turn, occurring in the 1990s in Western Political Science, was adopted in Poland at the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011; in English see: Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2015, pp. 357–382).

cussion on this subject was prompted in 2011 by the inaugural convention of the newly established Polish International Studies Association (Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych, PTSM). In its aftermath were the first publications on the history of IR in interwar Poland (Pugacewicz, 2010, pp. 133–143 and 2011, pp. 173–202, see also: 2018, pp. 231–266 and 2020, pp. 147–176). In 2015 in Polish and in 2017 in English, a groundbreaking work on the history of IR in Poland was published (Czaputowicz, Ławniczak and Wojciuk, 2015; Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017). Subsequent works on the history of IR in Poland were written by Edward Halizak (2016b, pp. 119–132 and 2020) and Marek Cichocki (2018, pp. 217–229 and 2020, pp. 283–306). During this period, first sketchy analyses of the history of FPA in Poland appeared (Pawłuszko, 2016, pp. 77–79; Pawłuszko, 2018, pp. 340–341; Halizak, 2018a, pp. 20–22), including a comparative study of the Western and Polish analysis of foreign policy (Pugacewicz, 2019, pp. 78–86). The weaknesses of all the above publications has been their (1) selectivity (e.g. Halizak, 2016b, pp. 119–132 wrote about the post-Cold War period, and Pugacewicz, 2010, pp. 133–143 and 2011, pp. 173–202 about the interwar period), (2) focus on mainstream theories of international relations (e.g. Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017) or (3) sketchiness (e.g. Pawłuszko, 2016, pp. 77–79; Halizak, 2018a, pp. 20–22; Pugacewicz, 2019, pp. 78–86).

Historical context

Even before the outbreak of World War I, Poles living in the territories occupied by Russia and Austria-Hungary, as well as in exile, developed concepts of international relations (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 42–50) and related ideas of foreign policy. However, only the return of independence in 1918 allows us to speak of Polish FPA in line with the assumptions adopted in this paper.

The liberal approach occupied a dominant position in the International Relations developed at universities in interwar Poland (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 6, 52; Pugacewicz, 2018, pp. 231–266; Cichocki, 2018, pp. 217–229; Pugacewicz, 2020, pp. 147–176; Cichocki, 2020, pp. 283–306; Pugacewicz, 2021). In the field of foreign policy studies, this approach clearly drew attention to the role of domestic factors (individual leaders, interest groups or public opinion) in shaping the foreign policy of states. A symbol of this type of approach were the concepts of the founder of the interwar Diplomatic Center in Lviv (Redzik, 2006, pp. 121–149; Pugacewicz, 2011, pp. 187–195), Ludwik Ehrlich (see a summary of his thinking from that period in his post-war work from 1947).

At the same time, in the second half of the 1930s, voices of journalists adopting a realist approach to international relations gained popularity in the public

debate in Poland (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 6, 53–55; Pugacewicz 2022a). These concepts emphasized the need to expand the armed forces and assumed that the goal of the state was to strive for its own might that would ensure a balance of power. An example of such work is the monograph by Adolf Bocheński “Między Niemcami a Rosją” (“Between Germany and Russia”, 1937), using the balance of power concept to identify guidelines for Polish foreign policy.

The joint invasion of Poland by the Third German Reich and the Soviet Union in 1939 interrupted the development of Polish IR, including foreign policy studies. Some researchers were murdered by the Soviet and German occupiers while others left for a life in exile. After the removal of the German forces in the final phase of the World War II by the armed forces of the Soviet Union coming from the east, the remaining cadres in the second half of the 1940s began recreating the interwar IR. However, the return of liberalism and realism in post-war Poland turned out to be impossible due to the Stalinization of Poland. At the level of science, this meant the introduction of a monopoly of communist ideology and the censorship of all other theoretical approaches (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, pp. 58–65; Pugacewicz, 2011, pp. 198–200; Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 63–65).

FPA in communist Poland can be divided into three periods consisting of two identical phases (compare other periodizations: Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 63–64). In each of these periods, there were restrictions to the freedom to conduct research in the first phase, including a strict subordination to state authority and reduced contacts with the Western world. In the second phase, a (partial) liberalization of the state authorities’ policy took place, which enabled (limited to varying degrees) freedom of research and contact with the Western world. The first period lasted from the turn of the 1940s and 1950s to the end of the 1960s and covers the Stalinization era of the 1940s and 1950s and liberalization from the mid-1950s to the end of the 1960s. The second period covers the period from the late 1960s to the end of the 1970s and includes the restriction of scientific freedom in the late 1960s and the liberalization of the 1970s. Finally, the third period covers the period from the beginning of the 1980s to the end of the 1980s and includes the re-restriction of scientific freedom in the early 1980s and the (limited) liberalization of the second half of the 1980s.

After Stalinization there was a noticeable development in foreign policy studies in each of the three periods in the liberalization phase, going beyond the simplified application of Marxism-Leninism and drawing on Western ideas. In the liberalization phase of the first period, i.a. influenced by the first trips to the United States (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, p. 68; Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 65; Halizak, 2020, p. 14), the reception of Western concepts of IR, including foreign policy (Pastusiak, 1965a, pp. 145–157 and 1965b, pp. 94–99), began. It was then that calls were made for the establishment of the

autonomous IR (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 66; Haliżak, 2020, pp. 14–15) and the development of foreign policy research in Poland (Pawłuszko, 2018, p. 320 [footnote 1]). In the liberal phase of the second period, under the influence of concepts drawn from the West, attempts were made to institutionalize IR in Poland (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 65–72; Haliżak, 2020, pp. 10–16). In the field of foreign policy studies, this was manifested in the first publications on foreign policy theories (Symonides and Pałyga, 1978; see also: Pietraś, 1977, pp. 143–149), reviews of the state of development of foreign policy literature in Poland (Symonides, 1978, pp. 11–22, see also 1973, pp. 193–206; cf. Pastusiak, 1978, pp. 315–317), as well as the first translations of Western publications into Polish (Pastusiak, 1977b). Among specific theories, game theory (e.g. Weres, 1972, pp. 184–203; 1982) and role theory (Sadowski, 1976) were of interest. Although the 1980s as a whole are identified in Poland with the stagnation in the IR (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 74, 89), in the case of foreign policy studies in the second half of the last decade of communism, positive changes could be observed. At that time, many works on theoretical concepts of foreign policy were published (Cziomer and Pietraś, 1986; Soroka, 1987; Kostecki, 1988; Sałajczyk, 1988, pp. 63–79) and attempts were made to apply those ideas in empirical analysis, e.g. on West Germany (e.g. Cziomer, 1987; see also: Sulowski, 1981).

Foreign Policy Analysis teaching in post-Cold War Poland

At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, the international and internal situation of Poland changed. At the international level, a powerful neighbor emerged to the west in the form of a united Germany while the Soviet Union in the east split into smaller states. As a result, the Big Brother from the east lost control of the foreign and domestic policy of Central European countries, including Poland. At the domestic level, a political transformation took place, as a result of which the dictatorship of the communist party was removed and a republican system based on rivalry between multiple parties was introduced.

The transformations at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s led to the end of the treatment of didactics in the field of Political Science, including FPA, as a tool for the indoctrination of students in terms of ensuring their support for the ideology and domination of the ruling party. This had two significant consequences. In the first place, this meant the end of a compulsory course on Political Science for students of all faculties (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, p. 135), which had been functioning (under different names) since the time of Stalinism. Secondly, the state's control over the ideas conveyed within specific study programs (e.g. Political Science) also disappeared.

An expression of the latter tendency was the pioneering launch in 1991 of a 5-year MA studies in International Relations at the established in 1976 Institute of International Relations of the University of Warsaw. In other centers, the “international relations” specialization within Political Science was most often introduced first, and only with time a separate study program in IR was launched. For example, a separate program in IR was only introduced at the Jagiellonian University in 1999 (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, pp. 89, 94). An analysis of the data available to the public from the five largest universities (Jagiellonian University, University of Warsaw, University of Wrocław, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań and UMCS in Lublin) shows that those institutions offer courses on the foreign policy of Poland, the European Union and selected great powers (e.g. USA, China, Russia) and one course on foreign policy theory.

The first two decades of post-Cold War Poland were associated with the dynamic development of teaching in the field of Political Science (often with a specialization in international relations) and International Relations itself. It was the result of the educational boom in Poland at that time and the popularity of those studies themselves among students (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 87). Between the beginning of the 1990s and the end of the first decade of the 21st century, the number of students in International Relations programs increased more than tenfold, from approximately 3,500 to 45,000 (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, p. 283). As a result, universities conducting those types of programs began accepting a significant number of students, and universities that previously did not offer such opportunities developed their teaching offer in this field. In the effect, the process of expanding the institutional base for teaching students in these fields continued, as more departments and institutes of Political Science and International Relations were established. The negative consequence of this process was teaching staff shortage, which meant that one employee taught at several universities and had less time for scientific research (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 87).

The increase in the number of programs in which students were educated in the field of FPA resulted in demand for a particular type of textbook. For most of the post-Cold War period, the textbook strictly on foreign policy was a collective volume prepared by a team of researchers from the University of Warsaw. It was originally published in 1992 and entitled “Polityka zagraniczna państwa” (“State’s Foreign Policy”) and edited by Józef Kukułka and Ryszard Zięba. It contains a chapter on decision-making in foreign policy, based on the leading figures of American and British FPA from the 1950s onwards (Sałajczyk, 1992, pp. 113–135). After Kukułka’s death, a publication edited only by Zięba, with changed authors’ and the title “Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa” (“Introduction to the Theory of State’s Foreign Policy”) was prepared (2004, reprinted in: 2007 and 2009). The chapter on decision-making was this time written by Renata Włoch (2004, pp. 99–115). It is noteworthy that a separate chapter

in this publication was devoted to the concept of role theory (Bielecka, 2004, pp. 177–199). Another foreign policy textbook – “Polityka zagraniczna: aktorzy, potencjały, strategie” (“Foreign Policy: Actors, Power, Strategies”) – was published only in 2011 and edited by Teras Łoś-Nowak. It contains an introductory chapter on foreign policy concepts referring to both the domestic and international levels (Łoś-Nowak, 2011, pp. 17–41).

Simultaneously, many textbooks by Polish authors published at that time and concerning IR in general contained a separate part or an entire chapter on foreign policy (e.g. Pietraś, 1993a, pp. 51–66; Łoś-Nowak, 2000, pp. 185–231; Cziomer and Zyblikiewicz, 2001, pp. 106–123). Most often, however, only the definition, conditions, goals, and methods of implementing foreign policy were discussed, with little space devoted to theoretical issues. For example, the first textbook of this type, edited by Łoś-Nowak in 1993, only generally mentions the “decision-making method” and theoretical concepts focused on factors influencing foreign policy by Q. Wright and R.C. Snyder. Slightly more attention was paid to role theory and the theory of foreign policy adaptation to changes at the international level by Rosenau (Pietraś, 1993b, pp. 20–38). Few more concepts were presented in the first Polish textbooks on international relations theories by Łoś-Nowak (1999, pp. 36–37) and Kukułka (2000, pp. 108, 110). The monograph by Czaputowicz on international relations theories (2007), while groundbreaking for the development of IR in Poland, also had a limited influence in this respect. Only two pages refer to the “bureaucratic paradigm” about the influence of domestic issues on foreign policy (2007, pp. 130–132; cf. with introduction on domestic level of analysis in new edition: 2022, pp. 22–24 and 34).

The situation in the field of foreign policy textbooks improved at the turn of the first and second decades of the 21st century, when a number of Western textbooks on IR were translated into Polish (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 98). Karen Mingst’s textbook discusses the models of decision-making in foreign policy (2006, pp. 124–131) as well as the influence of the power elite and public opinion on foreign policy (2006, pp. 139–160). In 2008, a translation of the “Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology” was published, containing a chapter by Jack S. Levy on “Political Psychology and Foreign Policy” (2008, pp. 229–253). In 2012, a translation of the fourth edition of the “Introduction to International Relations” by R. Jackson and G. Sørensen was published, with a separate chapter on foreign policy.

The institutionalization of Foreign Policy Analysis in post-Cold War Poland

When it comes to the institutional background of IR or, specifically, FPA in post-Cold War Poland, dynamic changes also took place here at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s.

In the first place, the dissolution of a number of state institutions occurred. By 1990, the Central Methodological Center for Studies in Political Sciences (Centralny Ośrodek Metodyczny dla Studiów z Nauk Politycznych, COM SNP), the Institute of Political Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAN), and the Institute of Socialist Countries of PAN either ceased their activity or were dissolved (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, p. 135). Yet, the most important step in this direction was the dissolution of the governmental Polish Institute of International Affairs (Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, PISM) in 1993 (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, pp. 86–97).

The second institutional trend was the establishment of completely new units dealing with studies on international relations, including foreign policy. Due to the fact that during the communist period, the possibility of independent thinking about the Soviet Union and its foreign policy was limited, an urgent need to establish an analytical institution in this field emerged. For this purpose, as early as 1990, the governmental Center for Eastern Studies was created in Warsaw (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 152). Also in 1990, the Institute of Political Studies of PAN (*O instytucie*) was organized. Since 1992, this institute has been publishing the journal “*Studia Polityczne*” (“Political Studies”). Another example of a “new” institution is the new Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) established (formally) in 1996 (in fact in 1999) with a new staff (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 87). In 2005, PISM returned to publishing “*Sprawy Międzynarodowe*” (“International Affairs”) and did so until 2017 (from 2018, the journal was handed over to PAN) (*O czasopiśmie*). Moreover, from 2001 to 2012 and again from 2016, PISM has published the “*Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*” (“Polish Diplomatic Review”).

The establishment of private think tanks dealing with foreign policy has also become an important element of the transformation. Some of them were established thanks to foreign funds, such as Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego (The Stefan Batory Foundation) founded in 1988 with the funds of the Hungarian-born American financier George Soros (*O nas*) or the Polish office of the German Konrad Adenauer Foundation (*O nas*) established in 1989. Other institutions of this type were created as domestic initiatives (although often with Western financial support), such as Fundacja Instytut Studiów Strategicznych (The Foundation of the Institute of Strategic Studies) in 1993 in Kraków (*O instytucie*) or

Fundacja Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych (The Center for International Studies Foundation) in 1996 in Warsaw (*Misja*).

At the same time, institutions related to teaching (and research) in the field of IR, including FPA, were expanded. In some cases, the Warsaw route was duplicated and a separate institute was established for this purpose. For example, at the University of Wrocław, after starting education in the field of IR, the Institute of International Relations was established in 2000 (*Główna*). In other cases, classes and research were carried out within existing institutes or departments of Political Science. An example in this respect can be the Institute of Political Sciences of the Jagiellonian University, which, after launching the International Relations program in 1999, changed its name to the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations (Krauz-Mozer, Borowiec and Ścigaj, 2011, pp. 88–91).

Another important event significant for the development of FPA in post-Cold War Poland, was the establishment in 2008 of the Polish International Studies Association, PTSM (*Historia*). The PTSM made FPA more dynamic in Poland by initiating the reception of theoretical concepts. The thematic conferences organized by this association and the resulting collective volumes encouraged the exploration of Western ideas in this regard. Two conventions were particularly important. In 2012, a conference devoted to the levels of analysis was held, and a year later a post-conference publication on this subject was published, with a chapter (in Polish) on “Poziomy analizy polityki zagranicznej” (“Levels of Analysis in FPA”) (Kostecki, 2013, pp. 39–53). In 2016, a conference on foreign policy research was held, which resulted in three volumes of collective works on theoretical aspects of foreign policy and the activities of particular countries in this field (Pietrasiak, Ciesielska-Klikowska and Kosmynka, 2017; Matera et al., 2017; Halizak, 2018c). The main volume includes, among others, two chapters by Halizak on the definition of foreign policy and “models” of foreign policy (2018a, pp. 13–52, 2018b, pp. 65–92), as well as a chapter by Marek Pietraś on FPA in the context of evolving IR (2018, pp. 165–207). The “Foreign Policy Research Section” (*Sekcje*) has been operating at the PTSM since 2016. And in 2018, a PTSM seminar was held in Krakow on the current state and future of FPA (*Studia nad polityką zagraniczną...*).

The reception of Western FPA concepts in post-Cold War Poland

The transformation at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s also meant the end of restrictions in terms of contacts with the Western world, which not only made it possible to get acquainted with Western concepts, but also to apply them freely in their own research on Western countries and the Polish state. A manifestation

of this was, among others, the freedom to travel to the West and invite Western researchers to Poland. Another hallmark of this process was the freedom of access to Western literature and the possibility to publish translations of Western thinkers of IR and FPA in Poland.

In practice, the aforementioned reception of Western concepts of IR did not concern foreign policy theories for a long time, but only the main theories of international relations. This is perfectly demonstrated by the translations of Western scholars of international relations published in Poland. In the first wave, current IR publications popular in the West (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 93) by realists (Kissinger, 1996 [1994]), liberals (Fukuyama, 1996 [1992], 2005 [2004], 2006 [2006]; Nye 2007 [2004]) or scholars such as Samuel P. Huntington (1998 [1996]) and Immanuel Wallerstein (2007 [2004]) were translated. Zbigniew Brzeziński was a special figure here, as his main work from the 1990s was not the only one translated (1998 [1997]), but – due to his Polish roots and presence in the Polish public debate – he was earlier (e.g. 1987 [1986]) and later (e.g. 2004 [2004]) the most frequently translated in Polish Western expert on international relations. In the second wave, the backlog was made up and key publications (often from several decades ago) on international relations theories were translated, including constructivists (Wendt, 2008 [1999]), classical realists (Morgenthau 2010 [1985]), neorealists (Waltz 2010 [1979]) or the English school (Buzan, Little, 2011 [2000]). Additionally, an earlier translation of Raymond Aron's work could also be included in this wave (1995 [1962]).

Only the third wave of translations – although heterogeneous – brought about some changes regarding FPA. On the one hand, this wave of translations still focused on the works of realists: Halford J. Mackinder (2017 [1919]), John J. Mearsheimer (2019 [2001], 2021 [2018]), Edward H. Carr (2021 [1939]), Henry Kissinger (2022 [1957]), but also in a critical way (Guzzini 2017 [1998]). On the other hand, due to the activities undertaken by Hanna Schreiber and Anna Wojciuk, two anthologies of key readings on IR were published. The first volume, covering texts published prior to 1989, includes translations of excerpts from the publications by Rosenau (2018 [1966], pp. 133–151), Graham T. Allison (2018 [1971], pp. 152–165) and Robert Jervis (2018 [1976], pp. 196–209). In the second volume, covering works published after 1989, a translation of almost the entire programming paper by V.M. Hudson at the opening of the first issue of the 'Foreign Policy Analysis' journal in 2005 (2022, pp. 445–479) was published.

In the above context, it is not surprising that in the Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) survey from 2014, Polish researchers identified people associated with liberalism (J.S. Nye – 39.5% of respondents, Robert O. Keohane – 24.6%, F. Fukuyama – 23.7%, Andrew Moravcsik – 10.5%), realism (K.N. Waltz – 28.1%, J.J. Mearsheimer – 10.5% and H. Morgenthau – 8.8%), constructivism (A. Wendt – 36.0%) or figures such as Samuel Huntington (29.8%) and

Barry Buzan (12.3%) as the most influencing International Relations (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 136). As can be seen, no representatives of the Western FPA were recognized in Polish IR in the first 25 years after Poland's transformation.

Although the availability of English-language publications (whether in paper or electronic version) in the collections of Polish universities is now increasing, the importance of translations in the development of research and teaching in the field of FPA in Poland cannot be underestimated. Despite the expansion of the book collection of some Polish universities (mainly the largest ones), many of them still suffer from a lack of funds for the purchase of literature. This is particularly acute not only in the case of current literature, but also in the shortcomings – resulting from the separation of Polish academia from the West during the Cold War – in the field of fundamental works for the development of the FPA from the second half of the 20th century. The lack of translations also seriously hampers the conduct of FPA's courses, as the knowledge of academic English among students varies greatly, and the Polish literature on the subject lacks an established terminology.

Theoretical concepts of Foreign Policy Analysis in post-Cold War Poland

When analyzing the publications in Poland from the last 30 years in the field of FPA in terms of their theoretical perspective, they can be divided into five groups, i.e. concerning (1) factors from many levels of analysis (not only domestic) in the spirit of eclecticism, (2) integration of factors from the international and domestic level, (3) factors from the domestic level only, (4) analysis of empirical reality using theoretical concepts and (5) empirical works that ignore theoretical issues (the so-called atheoretical texts).

The first type of theoretical work in the field of FPA concerns broadly understood theories of foreign policy, which – in an eclectic way – not only capture variables at the domestic level, but also at others, including international one. In this case factors from different levels of analysis are treated equally. The editors of the first textbooks on foreign policy (Kukułka and Zięba, 1992; Zięba 2004, 2007 and 2009; Łoś-Nowak, 2011, pp. 17–41) clearly represented such a concept of foreign policy. This broad understanding is also presented by Halizak in a series of his papers (2015, pp. 9–36 and 2016a, pp. 11–38) and in the introductory chapters to the collective volume of the PTSM (2018a, pp. 13–52 and 2018b, pp. 65–92). In the same volume, Marek Pietraś (2018, pp. 165–207) adopts a similar perspective. Adriana Dudek (2016, pp. 39–70) also highlighted the usefulness of theoretical eclecticism in analyzing foreign policy. Also, the first director

of the post-Cold War PISM (1999–2004), R. Stemplowski, in subsequent editions of his leading publication (2004, 2006, 2007, 2013, 2015 and 2021) – which is an original textbook for an analyst of Polish foreign policy – makes a short review of not only publications in the field of FPA, but also theories of international relations. Additionally, Pawłuszko, in his literature review, draws attention to theoretical concepts relating to variables from different levels (2016, pp. 77–90). The same author uses realism, liberalism, and constructivism to interpret Poland's foreign policy in this volume (2022). Leading researchers still (or originally) associated with the University of Warsaw and studying Poland's post-Cold War foreign policy also seem to take the perspective of various theories of international relations, such as realism, liberalism, or constructivism, in their publications (Kuźniar, 2009; Zając, 2016; Zięba, 2020; Bieleń, 2021).

In the context of this (eclectic) type of FPA, the strong presence in post-Cold War Poland of works related to role theory should be mentioned (Pawłuszko, 2016, pp. 79, 83; Pawłuszko, 2018, p. 341). During the transformation at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, Z. J. Pietraś first published a work on theoretical aspects of international roles (1989a) and then attempted to characterize the international roles of the People's Republic of China (1990a). In the aforementioned 2004 foreign policy textbook, a chapter dedicated to international roles was published (Bielecka, 2004, pp. 177–199). In 2013, a monograph on the international roles of France (Drygiel) and two years later on the international roles of the Arctic states (Łuszczuk, 2015) were published. In 2015, Justyna Zając published a chapter on “theory of international roles” (pp. 127–148) in the textbook on IR theories. Finally, in 2022, a work in English of a Polish university employee focused on role theory and Russia was published (Strycharz, 2022 is based on a doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Edinburgh). The previously mentioned Zając (2016, pp. xiii–xviii) and Zięba (2020, pp. 8, 255–280) also refer to the role theory.

Another example of a theoretical foreign policy concept popular in post-Cold War Poland (and one which takes many levels of analysis into account at the same time) is the theory of adaptation by Rosenau. At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, this approach was promoted by Z.J. Pietraś in a number of his publications (1989b; 1990b; 1990c) and collective work on this subject edited together with Andrzej Dumala (1990). At the end of the 1990s, Łoś-Nowak used this theory to analyze Poland's foreign policy towards the European Union (see e.g. 1998). In 2006, M. Kosienkowski published a monograph on how post-Cold War Russia adapted to the independence of the Baltic states. In 2015, Drygiel prepared a chapter on this concept as part of a collective work on theories of international relations (2015, pp. 177–196).

The second group of theoretical approaches to foreign policy in post-Cold War Poland concerns publications that do not assume an eclectic approach (which equally takes into account concepts from many levels of analysis), but focus on

attempts to integrate specific theories based on factors from different levels of analysis. A leading figure in Poland in this respect is Magdalena Kozub-Karkut, whose interests in the relations between theories of international relations and foreign policy (2016a, pp. 33–50; 2018, pp. 215–250) and theoretical pluralism (2016b, pp. 69–85; 2019a, pp. 25–40) have been fully expressed in her publications on neo-classical realism (2014, pp. 43–54; 2019b, pp. 201–227; 2020). Her interest in the synthesis of international relations theories (2016b, pp. 69–85) resulted in a work on the synthesis of two-level game concept and role theory (2022). Proposals for building models of behavior in foreign policy based on classical and neoclassical realism are developed by Mateusz Filary-Szczepanik (2022). Marcin Kaczmarek (2015, pp. 13–27) has also shown an interest in neoclassical realism, but mainly as a theory of international relations. Pawłuszko (2020, pp. 79–101) introduced Polish researchers to the poliheuristic theory of decision making, which is perceived as a form of specific integration of the domestic level with the international level factors.

Finally, the third group of such publications in post-Cold War Poland is FPA based on theoretical concepts only taking domestic factors into account. The first papers of this type were of a review nature and were published by Sałajczyk (1992, pp. 113–135), Włoch (2004, 2007 and 2009, pp. 99–115), Jerzy Ciechański (2006, pp. 27–48) and partly by Błażej Sajduk (2009, pp. 59–86). In 2011, S. Sulowski (pp. 293–308) characterized foreign policy decision making as a specific form of public policy. In 2014a, Kaczmarek developed concept on relationship between internal power distribution in Russia and that country's foreign policy (pp. 383–409). In 2017, a monograph was published by Pugacewicz presenting five models of decision-making in USA foreign policy based on the concept of the decisional unit (see the review by Pawłuszko, 2018).

The fourth group consists of empirical studies that apply foreign policy theories referring to the domestic level. The first publications of this type concerned the analysis of the general decision-making processes of great powers such as Russia (Kaczmarek, 2012, pp. 3–17; 2014b, pp. 317–328), the USA (Grabowski, 2012, pp. 69–111) and Turkey (Wódka, 2012). At the same time, studies on single theories began to appear such as the CNN Effect (Nowak, 2011, pp. 269–284) or issues of public opinion in specific cases (Szyja, 2016, pp. 149–165). Ciechański (2014, pp. 263–278; 2016; 2017, pp. 321–346) used the concepts of the influence of biological factors to analyze specific politicians. On the other hand, Anna Umińska-Woroniecka (2017, pp. 131–148; 2018, pp. 271–293) analyzed the foreign policy of the UK using the operational code. M. Lisińska, in her study on the political beliefs of the military dictatorship in Cold War Argentina, also referred to FPA (2019, p. 6). Pugacewicz utilized the Bureaucratic Politics Model and the Advisory System Framework for the analysis of USA foreign policy towards the Caspian Sea region (2022b). Three female researchers from Poland have used the theories of foreign policy to analyze the Polish case. The first is

Agnieszka Orzelska-Stączek, who applied groupthinking (2015, pp. 129–147) and Allison's models (2017). Allison's models II and III were also used by Dudek to analyze Poland's foreign policy in the 1990s (2019, see her earlier works on the impact of domestic political transformation on Poland's foreign policy: 2011, pp. 29–45; 2012 and 2014, pp. 91–99). In this volume, Umińska-Woronecka (2022) uses Leadership Trait Analysis to analyze foreign policy decision-making by Polish leaders on the invasion of Iraq.

The final fifth group of FPA in post-Cold War Poland are empirical works conducted without taking into account theoretical aspects, i.e. atheoretical publications. This is a reflection of the general weakness of IR in Poland. According to an analysis of nearly a thousand scientific papers from 2007–2012 and over 300 doctoral dissertations from 2001–2012 by Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, “90.4% of the articles and 84.5% of the Ph.D. dissertations were atheoretical” (2017, pp. 111–140). Meanwhile, the subject of foreign policy is very popular among Polish scholars. Among the analyzed journals, as many as 15.7% of articles concerned “country X's foreign policy”, and 9.9% – Polish foreign policy (25.6% in total). In addition, “[a]lmost 23% of Ph.D. dissertations were foreign policy analyses of a given country” (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 121). The reference to the FPA's achievements is even wider. As many as “36% of articles and 33.4% of Ph.D. dissertations” formally declares the use of “policy analysis, usually foreign policy analysis”, although in fact they do not use the tools of FPA (Czaputowicz and Wojciuk, 2017, p. 127). As a result, in the FPA developed in post-Cold War Poland, publications of researchers analyzing empirical aspects, but without the theory, occupy a key position.

Conclusion

Interwar foreign policy studies in Poland followed the path of Western ideas. The fledgling Polish FPA in the interwar period developed based on liberal assumptions, including the concept of the state as a non-unitary actor whose national interests are the result of the decisions of individual leaders, the game of economic interest groups, or the views of the public. The situation in this respect began to change in the 1930s due to the dynamic development of FPA in Poland based on realist categories, including the pursuit of maximizing power or the balance of power. After World War II, it quickly transpired that it was impossible to continue the interwar patterns of thinking about international relations in Poland, both in the liberal and realist versions. Official research and teaching could only be carried out based on the patterns of formal Marxism. In moments of the liberalization of domestic policy by the communist authorities of Poland, the degree of Marxism monopoly was partially limited by the import of Western ideas

of FPA. This situation was observed at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s, in the 1970s, and at the end of the 1980s. At the same time, however, the restriction of freedoms by the ruling party in Poland strengthened the monopoly of Marxism in Poland. This was the case at the beginning of the 1950s, the end of the 1960s, and the beginning of the 1980s.

The global and domestic transformation at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 90s made it possible to practice FPA in Poland according to Western ideas once again. In post-Cold War Poland, an educational boom took place, which resulted in an increase in the number of students educated in foreign policy (at BAs and MAs in International Relations or attending specialized classes in Political Science programs). However, this process was not accompanied by a boom in foreign policy textbooks, and those published (both domestic and foreign) only refer to foreign policy theories to a limited extent. In response to the teaching spike, the number of academic institutions dealing with foreign policy – in the form of institutes of Political Science and International Relations – has increased. At the same time, there was a development of governmental and non-governmental think tanks (based on foreign and domestic funds) dealing with foreign policy. The additional important impulse for developing FPA in post-Cold War Poland was the establishment of the Polish International Studies Association. With regard to the reception of Western ideas - measured by the number of translations into Polish - the dominance of works in the field from international relations theories rather than foreign policy is noticeable. Only in the last five years have some changes been discernible, but they are taking place with a simultaneous increase in interest in realism.

In terms of the theoretical perspectives applied, Polish FPA can be divided into five groups, i.e., concerning (1) factors from many levels of analysis in the spirit of eclecticism (this approach predominates in textbooks and the strong position of role theory and Rosenau's adaptation theory can also be observed here), (2) integration of factors from the international and domestic level (especially discernible in the context of neoclassic realism, to a lesser extent in the case of poliheuristic theory), (3) factors only from the domestic level (limited in number and utilizing e.g. decisional unit approach), (4) analysis of empirical reality using theoretical concepts (first applied in the context of great and regional powers, but with time also used to study Polish foreign policy) and (5) empirical works that ignore theoretical issues (such studies in Polish FPA – as with the whole of Polish IR – predominate this research area).

References

- Allison, G.T. (2018 [1971]). "Istota decyzji. Wyjaśniając kubański kryzys raketowy". Trans. M. Kaczmarski. In: H. Schreiber, A. Wojciuk (eds.). *Stosunki międzynarodowe: antologia tekstów źródłowych. T. 1: Korzenie dyscypliny – do 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 152–165.
- Aron, R. (1995 [1962]). *Pokój i wojna między narodami (teoria) [Paix et guerre entre les nations]*. Trans. A. Mielczarek. Warszawa: Centrum im. Adama Smitha.
- Bielecka, M. (2004, 2007, 2009). "Role międzynarodowe państwa". In: R. Zięba (ed.). *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, pp. 177–199.
- Bieleń, S. (2021). *Turbulence in the post-Cold-War Era*. Trans. A. Sloan. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Bocheński, A. (1937). *Między Niemcami a Rosją*. Warszawa: Wyd. dwutyg. "Polityka".
- Brzeziński, Z. (1987 [1986]). *Plan gry [Game Plan]*. Trans. J. Kowalski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Głos.
- Brzeziński, Z. (1998 [1997]). *Wielka szachownica: główne cele polityki amerykańskiej [The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives]*. Trans. T. Wyżyński. Warszawa: Świat Książki.
- Brzeziński, Z. (2004). *Wybór: dominacja czy przywództwo [Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership]*. Trans. B. Pietrzyk, A. Pokojska. Kraków: Znak.
- Buzan, B., Little, R. (2011 [2000]). *Systemy międzynarodowe w historii świata [International Systems in World History]*. Trans. E. Brzozowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Carlsnaes, W., Guzzini, S. (eds.) (2011). *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Vol. 1–5. London–Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Carr, E.H. (2021 [1939]). *Kryzys dwudziestolecia 1919–1939. Wprowadzenie do badań nad stosunkami międzynarodowymi [The Twenty Years' Crisis: 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations]*. Trans. J. Sadkiewicz. Kraków: Universitas.
- Cichocki, M. (2018). "Ludwik Ehrlich wobec perspektywy nowego ładu po I wojnie światowej". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 1(54), pp. 217–229.
- Cichocki, M. (2020). "Ludwik Ehrlich i początki liberalnego internacjonalizmu w Polsce". In: P. Grzebyk, R. Tarnogórski (eds.). *Siła prawa zamiast prawa siły. Ludwik Ehrlich i jego wkład w rozwój nauki prawa międzynarodowego oraz nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, pp. 283–306.
- Ciechański, J. (2006). "Teorie podejmowania decyzji w polityce zagranicznej". *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, 1(29), pp. 27–48.
- Ciechański, J. (2014). "Woodrow Wilson w Wersalu, Franklin Delano Roosevelt w Jałcie: czynnik biologiczny w podejmowaniu decyzji w polityce zagranicznej". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 1, pp. 263–278.
- Ciechański, J. (2016). *Czynnik biologiczny w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

- Ciechański, J. (2018). "W chorobie i u władzy. Czynniki biologiczne w polityce zagranicznej". In: E.M. Haliżak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Rambler Press, pp. 321–346.
- Czaputowicz, J. (2007). *Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych: krytyka i systematyzacja*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Czaputowicz, J. (2012). "Theory or Practice? The State of International Relations in Poland". *European Political Science*, 11(2), pp. 196–212.
- Czaputowicz, J. (2022). *Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Czaputowicz, J., Ławniczak, K., Wojciuk, A. (2015). *Nauka o stosunkach międzynarodowych i studia europejskie w Polsce*. Warszawa: Scholar.
- Czaputowicz, J., Wojciuk, A. (2017). *The Study of International Relations in Poland*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cziomer, E. (1987). *Procesy decyzyjne w polityce zagranicznej na przykładzie RFN*. Lublin: UMCS.
- Cziomer, E., Pietraś, Z.J. (1986). *Teoria i praktyka decydowania w polityce zagranicznej Stanów Zjednoczonych i Republice Federalnej Niemiec*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- Cziomer, E., Zyblikiewicz, L.W. (2001). *Zarys współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, pp. 106–123.
- Drygiel, M. (2013). *Role Francji w transatlantyckim systemie bezpieczeństwa*. Warszawa: Fundacja Studiów Międzynarodowych.
- Drygiel, M. (2015). "Teoria adaptacji politycznej". In: R. Zięba, S. Bieliń, J. Zajac (eds.). *Teorie i podejścia badawcze w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 177–196.
- Dudek, A. (2011). "Transformacja a polska polityka zagraniczna". In: A. Stępień-Kuczyńska, M. Potz, M. Słowikowski (eds.). *Dialog europejski Zachód–Wschód: dwie dekady transformacji w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej 1989–2009*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, pp. 29–45.
- Dudek, A. (2012). *System decyzyjny w polityce zagranicznej Polski okresu tranzycji (1989–1992): mechanizmy, procedury i instytucje, praktyka*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Dudek, A. (2014). "Wpływ zmiany reżimu na decydowanie w polityce zagranicznej". In: J. Juchnowski, R. Wiszniewski (eds.). *Studia nad współczesnymi systemami politycznymi: księga dedykowana Profesorowi Andrzejowi Antoszewskiemu*. T. 1: *Podmioty i procesy demokratyczne*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, pp. 91–99.
- Dudek, A. (2016). "Użyteczność analitycznego eklektyzmu w badaniu stosunków Polski z Rosją". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 52(2), pp. 39–70.
- Dudek, A. (2019). *Decydowanie w polskiej polityce zagranicznej (1992–1997). Perspektywa organizacyjna i biurokratyczna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Ehrlich, L. (1947). *Wstęp do nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Kraków: Księgarnia Stefana Kamińskiego.
- Filary, M. (2010). "Wybrane problemy metodologiczne II debaty w Stosunkach Międzynarodowych". *Politeja*, 13, pp. 345–374.

- Filary-Szczepanik, M.Z. (2022). "Power and Narcists – Ideal Types of States Based on Their Sources of National Power, Extraction Capability and Foreign Policy Behaviour". *Teoria Polityki*, 6, pp. 147–167.
- Fukuyama, F. (1996 [1992]). *Koniec historii [The End of History]*. Trans. T. Bieroń, M. Wichrowski. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.
- Fukuyama, F. (2005 [2004]). *Budowanie państwa: władza i ład międzynarodowy w XXI wieku [State-building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century]*. Trans. J. Serwański. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
- Fukuyama, F. (2006 [2006]). *Ameryka na rozdrożu: demokracja, władza i dziedzictwo neokonserwatyizmu [America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power and the Neoconservative Legacy]*. Trans. R. Staniecki. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
- Główna, Instytut Stosunków Międzynarodowych UW, https://web.archive.org/web/20021216111523fw_/http://www.ism.uni.wroc.pl/main.htm (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Grabowski, M. (2012). *Wiek Pacyfiku: polityka Stanów Zjednoczonych wobec regionu Azji i Pacyfiku po roku 1989*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Guzzini, S. (2017 [1998]). *Realizm w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych [Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy]*. Trans. S. Szymański. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Hadfield, A., Hudson, V.M. (2015). "North American and European Foreign Policy Analysis". In: K. Brummer, V.M. Hudson (eds.). *Foreign Policy Analysis Beyond North America*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 139–167.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2015). "Ontologia i epistemologia w badaniach polityki zagranicznej państwa". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 51(4), pp. 9–36.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2016a). "Liberalna teoria polityki zagranicznej i jej analityczne zastosowanie". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 52(2), pp. 11–38.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2016b). "Polish International Relations Studies and Posthistoriography, Disciplinary Development After the Cold War". *Revista UNISCI / UNISCI Journal*, 40, pp. 119–132.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2018a). "O istocie badania polityki zagranicznej państwa". In: E.M. Haliżak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Rambler, pp. 13–52.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2018b). "Modelowe ujęcie polityki zagranicznej państwa". In: E.M. Haliżak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Rambler, pp. 65–92.
- Haliżak, E.M. (ed.) (2018c). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Rambler Press.
- Haliżak, E.M. (2020). "Z historiografii badań stosunków międzynarodowych w Polsce: ad memoriam Profesora Bogusława Mrozka". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 56(2), pp. 9–20.
- Historia, Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych, <https://ptsm.edu.pl/historia-ptsm> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Hudson, V.M. (2014). *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hudson, V.M. (2022 [2005]). "Analiza polityki zagranicznej: teoria niejednolitego podmiotu o ograniczonej racjonalności a fundamenty nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych". Trans. T. Pugaciewicz. In: A. Wojciuk, H. Schreiber (eds.). *Stosunki międzynarodowe: antologia tekstów źródłowych. T. 2: Współczesne oblicza dyscypliny – po 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 445–479.

- Huntington, S. (1998 [1996]). *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego* [*The Clash of Civilizations*]. Trans. H. Jankowska. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Literackie Muza.
- Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2012). *Wprowadzenie do stosunków międzynarodowych: teorie i kierunki badawcze* [*Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*]. Trans. A. Czwojdrak. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Jervis, R. (2018 [1976]). “Właściwe i błędne postrzeganie w polityce międzynarodowej”. Trans. M. Pieńkowski. In: H. Schreiber, A. Wojciuk (eds.). *Stosunki międzynarodowe: antologia tekstów źródłowych. T. 1: Korzenie dyscypliny – do 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 196–209.
- Kaczmarek, M. (2012). “Domestic Sources of Russia’s China Policy”. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 59(2), pp. 3–17.
- Kaczmarek, M. (2014a). “Domestic Power Relations and Russia’s Foreign Policy”. *Demokratyzatsiya*, 22(3), pp. 383–409.
- Kaczmarek, M. (2014b). “The Role of Domestic Politics in a State’s Foreign Policy”. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 50 (2), pp. 317–328.
- Kaczmarek, M. (2015). “Realizm neoklasyczny”. In: R. Zięba, S. Bieleń, J. Zajac (eds.). *Teorie i podejścia badawcze w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 13–27.
- Kissinger, H. (2022 [1957]). *Świat przywrócony. Metternich, Castlereagh i zagadnienie pokoju 1812–1822* [*A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh and the Problem of Peace 1812–1822*]. Trans. J. Sadkiewicz. Kraków: Universitas.
- Kissinger, H. (1996 [1994]). *Dyplomacja* [*Diplomacy*]. Trans. S. Głębiński, G. Woźniak, I. Zych. Warszawa: Philip Wilson.
- Kosienkowski, M. (2006). *Strategia adaptacyjna Federacji Rosyjskiej wobec państw bałtyckich*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Grado.
- Kostecki, W. (1988). *Polityka zagraniczna: teoretyczne podstawy badań*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kostecki, W. (2013). “Poziomy analizy polityki zagranicznej”. In: M. Pietraś, E.M. Haliżak (eds.). *Poziomy analizy stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Rambler, pp. 39–53.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2014). “Realizm neoklasyczny – główne założenia i możliwości”. In: E. Haliżak, J. Czaputowicz (eds.). *Teoria realizmu w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych. Założenia i zastosowania badawcze*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Rambler, pp. 43–54.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2016a). “Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych a badanie polityki zagranicznej”. *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 52(4), pp. 33–50.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2016b). “Pomiędzy pluralizmem a teoretyczną syntezą: próby łączenia teorii stosunków międzynarodowych”. In: E. Haliżak, R. Ożarowski, A. Wróbel (eds.). *Liberalizm i neoliberalizm w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych: teoretyczny pluralizm*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Rambler, pp. 69–85.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2018). “Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych a badanie polityki zagranicznej”. In: E. Haliżak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Rambler Press, pp. 215–250.

- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2019a). "Theoretical Pluralism in International Relations: Implications for the Development of the Discipline". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 55(1), pp. 25–40.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2019b). "Neoclassical Realism and Foreign Policy Analysis: A Possible Way of Integration?". *Teoria Polityki*, 3, pp. 201–227.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2020). *Realizm neoklasyczny w perspektywie teorii stosunków międzynarodowych i polityki zagranicznej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Kozub-Karkut, M. (2022). "Towards a Theoretical Synthesis: Supplementing Two-level Games with Role Theory". *Teoria Polityki*, 6, pp. 123–146.
- Krauz-Mozer, B., Borowiec, P., Ścigaj, P. (2011). *Kim jesteś, politologu? Historia i stan dyscypliny w Polsce. T. 1*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Krauz-Mozer, B., Borowiec, P., Ścigaj, P. (2015). "The Condition and Perspectives of Polish Political Science in the Beginning of the 21st Century". In: B. Krauz-Mozer et al. (eds.). *Political Science in Europe at the Beginning of the 21st Century*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 357–382.
- Kukułka, J. (2000). *Teoria stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Kukułka, J., Zięba, R. (eds.) (1992). *Polityka zagraniczna państwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Kukułka, J., Zięba, R. (1992). "Wstęp". In: J. Kukułka, R. Zięba (eds.). *Polityka zagraniczna państwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 9–11.
- Kuźniar, R. (1991). "Znaczenie badania procesów internacjonalizacji dla rozwoju nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych". In: J. Kukułka (ed.). *Internacjonalizacja życia narodów i państw*. Warszawa: Instytut Studiów Międzynarodowych UW, pp. 93–106.
- Kuźniar, R. (1995). „Polityka zagraniczna i badania naukowe”. *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, 3, pp. 69–90.
- Kuźniar, R. (2009). *Poland's Foreign Policy after 1989*. Warszawa: Scholar.
- Lantis, J.S., Beasley, R.K. (2018). "Comparative Foreign Policy Analysis". In: C.G. Thies (ed.). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levy, J.S. (2008). "Psychologia polityczna i polityka zagraniczna". In: D.O. Sears, L. Huddy, R. Jervis (eds.). *Psychologia polityczna*. Trans. R. Andruszko. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 229–253.
- Ling, L.H.M., Chen, B. (2018). "International Relations and the Rise of Asia: A New 'Moral Imagination' for World Politics?". In: A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, N. Onuf (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. Los Angeles: SAGE, pp. 134–147.
- Lisińska, M. (2019). *Argentine Foreign Policy during the Military Dictatorship, 1976–1983. Between a Nationalist and Pragmatic Approach*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Łoś-Nowak, T. (1998). *Conceptualisation of the Adaptation Policy Model of Poland towards the European Union*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Peace Research Institute.
- Łoś-Nowak, T. (1999). *Wstęp do teorii stosunków międzynarodowych*. Poznań: Terra.
- Łoś-Nowak, T. (2000). *Stosunki międzynarodowe: teorie, systemy, uczestnicy*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

- Łoś-Nowak, T. (2011). "Polityka zagraniczna w przestrzeni teoretycznej". In: T. Łoś-Nowak (ed.). *Polityka zagraniczna: aktorzy, potencjał, strategie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Poltext, pp. 17–41.
- Łuszczuk, M. (2015). *Ewolucja ról międzynarodowych w Arktyce*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Mackinder, H.J. (2017 [1919]). *Demokratyczne ideały a rzeczywistość [Democratic Ideals and Reality]*. Trans. R. Domke. Zielona Góra: Towarzystwo Ziemi Międzyrzeckiej.
- Matera, P., Pietrasiak, M., Bania, R., Stelmach, M. (eds.) (2017). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państwa. Stany Zjednoczone, Azja Wschodnia, Bliski Wschód i Ameryka Łacińska*. Vol. 2. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Rambler Press.
- Mearsheimer, J.J. (2019 [2001]). *Tragizm polityki mocarstw [The Tragedy of Great Power Politics]*. Trans. J. Sadkiewicz. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mearsheimer, J.J. (2021 [2018]). *Wielkie złudzenie. Liberalne marzenia a rzeczywistość międzynarodowa [The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities]*. Trans. T. Biedroń. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mintz, A., Sofrin, A. (2018). "Decision Making Theories in Foreign Policy Analysis". In: C.G. Thies (ed.). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mingst, K. (2006). *Podstawy stosunków międzynarodowych [Essentials of International Relations]*. Trans. M. Habura, G. Łuczkiwicz. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Misja, Centrum Studiów Międzynarodowych, <https://csm.org.pl/misja/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Morgenthau, H.J. (2010 [1985]). *Polityka między narodami: walka o potęgę i pokój [Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace]*. Trans. R. Włoch. Warszawa: Difin.
- Nowak, E. (2011). "Relacje mediów jako czynnik interweniujący w stosunkach międzynarodowych. Koncepcja CNN effect". *Politeja*, 8(15), pp. 269–284.
- Nye, J.S. (2007). *Soft power [Soft Power]*. Trans. J. Zaborowski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- O czasopiśmie*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, <http://sprawymiedzynarodowe.waw.pl/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- O instytucie*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, <https://isppan.waw.pl/o-instytucie/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- O instytucie*, Instytut Studiów Strategicznych, <http://iss.civ.pl/o-instytucie> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- O nas*, The Stefan Batory Foundation, <https://www.batory.org.pl/o-nas/o-nas/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- O nas*, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, <https://www.kas.de/pl/web/polen/o-nas> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Orzelska-Stączek, A. (2015). "Błąd krymski' jako efekt myślenia grupowego? Polska wobec aneksji Krymu w 2014 roku". *Studia Polityczne*, 39, pp. 129–147.
- Orzelska-Stączek, A. (2017). "Działalność ministra spraw zagranicznych Stefana Mellera (31.10.2005–9.05.2006) w świetle modeli decyzyjnych G. Allisona". In: M. Pietrasiak, J. Ciesielska-Klikowska, S. Kosmyńska (eds.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państwa:*

- wymiar europejski*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Wydawnictwo Rambler.
- Pałyga, E.J., Symonides, J. (eds.) (1978). *Teoretyczne problemy polityki zagranicznej*. Warszawa: IGKR SGPiS.
- Pastusiak, L. (1965a). "Teorie stosunków międzynarodowych w Stanach Zjednoczonych". *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, 3, pp. 145–157.
- Pastusiak, L. (1965b). "O teorii stosunków międzynarodowych Profesora Quincy Wrighta". *Sprawy Międzynarodowe*, 11, pp. 94–99.
- Pastusiak, L. (1977a). "Polish Association of Political Science". *PS*, 10(3), pp. 392–396.
- Pastusiak, L. (ed.) (1977b). *Procesy decyzyjne w stosunkach międzynarodowych. Wybór tekstów politologów amerykańskich*. Warszawa: Centralny Ośrodek Metodyczny Studiów Nauk Politycznych.
- Pastusiak, L. (1978). "International Relations Studies in Poland". *International Studies Quarterly*, 22(2), pp. 299–318.
- Pawłuszko, T. (2011). "Anglosaskie źródła nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 3/4(44), pp. 117–140.
- Pawłuszko, T. (2016). "Nowe trendy badań nad polityką zagraniczną". In: R. Zięba, T. Pawłuszko (eds.). *Polityka zagraniczna Polski w zmieniającym się ładzie międzynarodowym*. Kielce: Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, pp. 77–90.
- Pawłuszko, T. (2018). "Nowa recepcja teorii polityki zagranicznej w Polsce". *Sprawy Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 71(4), pp. 339–348.
- Pawłuszko, T. (2020). "Poliheurystyczna teoria podejmowania decyzji w analizie polityki bezpieczeństwa". *Colloquium Wydziału Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych AMW*, 1, pp. 79–101.
- Pawłuszko, T. (2022). "The Foreign Policy of Poland and the Problem of Political Rationale". *Teoria Polityki*, 6, pp. 257–283.
- Pietrasiak, M., Ciesielska-Klikowska, J., Kosmynka, S. (eds.). (2017). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państwa: wymiar europejski*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Wydawnictwo Rambler.
- Pietraś, M. (2018). "Analiza polityki zagranicznej w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych". In: E.M. Halizak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Rambler, pp. 165–207.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1977). "Walory i niedostatki metody decyzyjnej". In: J. Kukułka, E.J. Pałyga (eds.). *Teoretyczne problemy stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: SGPiS, pp. 143–149.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1987). "Analiza decyzyjna w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych". In: A. Bodnar, W.J. Szczepański (eds.). *Decyzje polityczne w systemach społecznych*. Warszawa: PWN, pp. 341–355.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1989a). *Pojęcie i klasyfikacja ról międzynarodowych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1989b). *Strategie adaptacji państw do środowiska międzynarodowego, pomocnicze materiały naukowe na doroczne kursokonferencje dla wykładowców „Nauki o polityce”*. Warszawa: Centralny Ośrodek Metodyczny Studiów Nauk Politycznych.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1990a). *Międzynarodowa rola Chin*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

- Pietraś, Z.J. (1990b). *Adaptacyjność spenetrowanych systemów politycznych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1990c). *Sztuczna inteligencja w politologii: heurystyczne modelowanie procesów adaptacji politycznej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1993a). "Polityka zagraniczna państwa". In: T. Łoś-Nowak (ed.). *Współczesne stosunki międzynarodowe*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 51–66.
- Pietraś, Z.J. (1993b). "Teoria stosunków międzynarodowych". In: T. Łoś-Nowak (ed.). *Współczesne stosunki międzynarodowe*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 20–38.
- Pietraś Z.J., Dumala, A. (eds.). (1990). *Mechanizmy adaptacji politycznej państwa*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2010). "Dorobek badawczy i organizacyjny Ludwika Ehrlicha na tle rozwoju nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych w Polsce do 1950 roku". In: D. Mikućka-Wójtowicz (ed.). *Przeszłość, teraźniejszość, przyszłość: problemy badawcze młodych politologów*. Kraków: Wyd. Libron, pp. 133–143.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2011). "Ludwik Ehrlich (1889–1968) – prekursor nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych w Polsce". *Politeja*, 3(17), pp. 173–202.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2017). *Teorie polityki zagranicznej: perspektywa amerykańskiej analizy*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2018). "Nauka o stosunkach międzynarodowych w koncepcji Ludwika Ehrlicha". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 54(1), pp. 231–266.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2019). "Studia nad polityką zagraniczną z poziomu czynników krajowych. Historia rozwoju i współczesne wyzwania w nauce światowej i polskiej". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 1(55), pp. 59–86.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2020). "Koncepcja teoretyczna stosunków międzynarodowych w ujęciu Ludwika Ehrlicha z 1947 roku". In: P. Grzebyk, R. Tarnogórski (eds.). *Siła prawa zamiast prawa siły. Ludwik Ehrlich i jego wkład w rozwój nauki prawa międzynarodowego oraz nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych, pp. 147–176.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2021). "Transatlantic Network of Money and Ideas? Polish and American IR Community Cooperation in the Interwar Period". Paper presented at the International Studies Association Annual Convention, April 6th–9th, 2021.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2022a). "Central European Realist Tradition during the Interwar Period: Polish Case". Paper presented at the Central and Eastern European International Studies Association Convention, June 22th–24th, 2022, Bratislava, Slovakia.
- Pugacewicz, T. (2022b). "U.S. Decision-making on the Use of Drones before 9/11: A Case Study on UAVs Operating from Uzbekistan over Afghanistan". In: T. Pugacewicz, M. Grabowski (eds.). *Great and Small Games in Central Asia and the South Caucasus*. Berlin et al.: Peter Lang Verlag, pp. 93–126.
- Redzik, A. (2006). "Lwowska szkoła dyplomatyczna. Zarys historii Studium Dyplomatycznego przy Wydziale Prawa Uniwersytetu Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie (1930–1939)". *Polski Przegląd Dyplomatyczny*, 5(33), pp. 121–149.
- Rosenau, J. (2018 [1966]). "Preteorie i teorie polityki zagranicznej". Trans. W. Garbacz. In: H. Schreiber, A. Wojciuk (eds.). *Stosunki międzynarodowe: antologia tekstów*

- źródłowych. T. 1: *Korzenie dyscypliny – do 1989 roku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 133–151.
- Sadowski, E. (1976). “Teoria ról międzynarodowych w nauce anglosaskiej”. In: *I Sympozjum doktorantów. Rozprawy z roku akademickiego 1975/1976*. Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Sajduk, B. (2009). “Tradycyjne metody analizy polityki zagranicznej”. In: K. Szczerski (ed.). *Podmiotowość geopolityczna. Studia nad polską polityką zagraniczną*. Warszawa: KSAP, pp. 59–86.
- Sałańczyk, S. (1988). “Nurt ‘scjentystyczny’ w amerykańskiej nauce stosunków międzynarodowych”. In J. Kukułka (ed.). *Zmienność i instytucjonalizacja stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: PWN, pp. 63–79.
- Sałańczyk, S. (1992). “Podejmowanie decyzji w polityce zagranicznej państwa”. In: J. Kukułka, R. Zięba (eds.). *Polityka zagraniczna państwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 113–135.
- Sekcje*, Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych, <https://ptsm.edu.pl/sekcje-ptsm/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Soroka, P. (1987). *Teorie podejmowania decyzji w amerykańskiej nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Centralny Ośrodek Metodyczny Studiów Nauk Politycznych.
- Soroka, P. (1988). “Metodologiczne podstawy teorii decyzji w amerykańskiej nauce o polityce”. In: J. Kukułka (ed.). *Zmienność i instytucjonalizacja stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: PWN, pp. 80–94.
- Stemplowski, R. (2004). *Kształtowanie polskiej polityki zagranicznej: wstęp do analizy*. Warszawa: PISM.
- Stemplowski, R. (2006). *Wprowadzenie do analizy polityki zagranicznej RP [Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej]*. Warszawa: PISM.
- Stemplowski, R. (2007). *Wprowadzenie do analizy polityki zagranicznej RP [Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej]*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: PISM.
- Stemplowski, R. (2013). *O prowadzeniu i analizowaniu polityki państwa*. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT.
- Stemplowski, R. (2015). *Wprowadzenie do analizy polityki zagranicznej Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Stemplowski, R. (2021). *Wprowadzenie do analizy polskiej polityki zagranicznej*. Warszawa: PISM.
- Strycharz, D. (2022). *Role Theory and Russian Foreign Policy: Rolling Changes in National Role Conceptions*. New York: Routledge.
- “‘Studia nad polityką zagraniczną – obecny stan badań i perspektywy’ – relacja z seminarium”. Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych (Oddział w Krakowie), <http://krakow.ptsm.edu.pl/studia-nad-polityka-zagraniczna-obecny-stand-badani-perspektywy-relacja-z-seminarium/> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Studia Polityczne*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, <http://czasopisma.isppan.waw.pl/index.php/sp> (accessed: 30.06.2022).
- Sulowski, S. (1981). *Mechanizm podejmowania decyzji w polityce zagranicznej RFN*. Warszawa: COM SNP.
- Sulowski, S. (2011). “Decydowanie w sprawach polityki zagranicznej państwa”. In: G. Rydlewski (ed.). *Decydowanie publiczne*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, pp. 293–308.

- Symonides, J. (1978). "Kilka uwag o badaniach nad polityką zagraniczną". In: E.J. Pałyga, J. Symonides (eds.). *Teoretyczne problemy polityki zagranicznej*. Warszawa: IGKR SGPiS, pp. 11-22. [Reprint from: Symonides, J. (1978). "Kilka uwag o badaniach nad polityką zagraniczną". *Przegląd Stosunków Międzynarodowych*, (1), pp. 7-15.]
- Symonides, J. (1973). "Stan i perspektywy rozwoju badań nad współczesnymi stosunkami międzynarodowymi". *Studia Nauk Politycznych*, 1(11), pp. 193-206.
- Szyja, P. (2016). "Czy Amerykanie lubią wojnę? Opinia publiczna a polityka zagraniczna na przykładzie wojny w Iraku (2003-2008) – aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne". *Studia Polityczne*, 44, pp. 149-165.
- Thies, C.G. (ed.) (2018). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (2007 [2004]). *Analiza systemów-światów: wprowadzenie [World-systems Analysis: An Introduction]*. Trans. K. Gawlicz, M. Starnawski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Waltz, K.N. (2010 [1979]). *Struktura teorii stosunków międzynarodowych [Theory of International Politics]*. Trans. R. Włoch. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Wendt, A. (2008 [1999]). *Społeczna teoria stosunków międzynarodowych [Social Theory of International Politics]*. Trans. W. Derczyński. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Weres, L. (1972). "Amerykański model nauki o stosunkach międzynarodowych". *Przegląd Zachodni*, 1-2, pp. 184-203.
- Weres, L. (1982). *Teoria gier w amerykańskiej nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni.
- Włoch, R. (2004, 2007, 2009). "Proces decyzyjny w polityce zagranicznej państwa". In: R. Zięba (ed.). *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, pp. 99-115.
- Wódka, J. (2012). *Polityka zagraniczna Turcji. Uwarunkowania wewnętrzne oraz podmioty decyzyjne*. Warszawa: Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN and Wydawnictwo Trio.
- Umińska-Woroniecka, A. (2017). "Siła przekonań – zastosowanie kodu operacyjnego w analizie polityki zagranicznej". *Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations*, 53(1), pp. 131-148.
- Umińska-Woroniecka, A. (2018). "Siła przekonań – zastosowanie teorii kodu operacyjnego w badaniu polityki zagranicznej". In: E.M. Haliżak (ed.). *Badanie polityki zagranicznej państw*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Studiów Międzynarodowych and Rambler Press, pp. 271-293.
- Umińska-Woroniecka, A. (2022). "We were taken on the ride. Leadership Traits Analysis in the Circumstances of International Crisis – the Decision of Aleksander Kwaśniewski in the Context of Intervention in Iraq". *Teoria Polityki*, 6, pp. 215-235.
- Zajac, J. (2015). "Teoria ról międzynarodowych". In: R. Zięba, S. Bieleń, J. Zajac (eds.). *Teorie i podejścia badawcze w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 127-148.
- Zajac, J. (2016). *Poland's Security Policy: The West, Russia, and the Changing International Order*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zięba, R. (ed.) (2004, 2007, 2009). *Wstęp do teorii polityki zagranicznej państwa*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Zięba, R. (2020). *Poland's Foreign and Security Policy: Problems of Compatibility with the Changing International Order*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.