



Bartłomiej Różycki¹

Geoffrey Lefebvre²

November 11 under two flags: a comparative analysis of officials' speeches on World War I end commemorations in Poland and France

SUMMARY The article compares dominant attitudes regarding November 11 in Poland and France. In both states, this date, which is related to the end of World War I and the restoration of the independence of Poland in 1918, constitutes a public holiday. However, the character of commemorations differs significantly, indicating various perspectives on history and principal values represented by Polish and French societies. It is essential to understand these differences, as these reverse concepts may constitute an obstacle in reaching a complete understanding and strengthening cooperation based on commitment and mutual respect. The research is conducted by analyzing the officials' speeches on selected November 11 commemorations, as they represent the official perception of the event, promoted by state institutions.

KEYWORDS France, Poland, memory studies, World War I, November 11, commemorations, officials' speeches

Every nation has its history, but if they share some elements, does it serve better mutual understanding or rather contribute to disagreements and strengthen negative stereotypes? The answer obviously depends on the state of relations, as in antagonism, every historical aspect may be used as a tool for advocating for

1 Bartłomiej Różycki, Ph. D., Faculty of Political Science and Security Studies, Nicolaus Copernicus University, e-mail: b.rozycki@umk.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-3670-6828.

2 Geoffrey Lefebvre, MA, Ph.D. Student, Doctoral School of Social Sciences – Academia Rerum Socialium, Nicolaus Copernicus University, e-mail: g.lefebvre@doktorant.umk.pl, ORCID: 0009-0004-1827-9422.

one's rights and justifying actions taken against the opponent. This question is, however, more interesting regarding states that share common goals and treat each other like partners. Yet, different historical experiences and developed sensibilities become obstacles to reaching full collaboration. This can constitute an intriguing subject for memory studies, as its analysis may advance agreement based on mutual respect and understanding.

In this paper, we intend to step in this direction by analyzing Polish and French commemorations of the same date – November 11, 1918 – which is celebrated in an institutionalized way in both states, yet is treated very differently. This divergence is particularly interesting due to the growing cooperation between these states. The amount of shared goals and interests pushes them towards tighter cooperation and considering each other as strategic allies, which has been emphasized in the recently signed Treaty of Nancy (Olech, 2025; Souverbie, 2025). On the other hand, the topic discussed in this paper indicates different perspectives they present towards various aspects of their identity, including their relation to the past. Exploring these differences and explaining their origins would foster mutual comprehension and prevent possible misunderstandings, which would hamper their collaboration. As such, it may also encourage policymakers to consider their partners' different sensibilities and values, facilitating dialogue and joint efforts.

The importance of national celebrations

National celebrations form a crucial element of mnemonic tools. The celebration of a national day

involves a symbolic dimension, namely, the usually state-led creation of cultural emblems, symbols and rituals as well as the (re)writing of 'national' history [...] national days invite citizens to remember, re-enact and re-define the national past and aim to enhance their emotional attachment to the nation-state (Lentz, 2013, p. 208).

The form and content of the celebrations reflect and strengthen collective representations of the nation, forming a bond based on shared heritage and values. "National ceremonies express the deeper aspects and meanings of the nation, provide comfort and anchorage, and raise awareness of 'who we are' and 'where we are from'", they become "holders of state-institutionalised practices with

references to the community, its mythology, and symbolism” (Elgenius, 2007, pp. 68–69).

Due to their nature, national days are celebrated regularly on set dates; they can be considered political rituals, which constitute “symbolic behavior socially normalized and repetitive” (Kertzer, 2010, p. 21). While these rituals recall events from the past, they are not meant purely to commemorate them. “Ritual is not about recalling the original situation, but about its re-actualization to co-create reality” (Rekść, 2013, p. 73). Such rituals are an essential element of politics due to their communicative aspect, as “politics should be practiced in part as a kind of ceremonial communication, adapted to the requirements of the ceremony as well as the requirements of communication” (Rothenbuhler, 2003, p. 126). The celebrations may be therefore subjected to the interests of actors that take part in the political competition. Still, it doesn’t necessarily mean that competing actors create opposing celebration forms. Certain aspects of remembering the past constitute an approach shared by the whole nation. The concept of mnemonic hegemony explains to us that the presence of counter-memory and subcultures of memory in public discourse may vary, as their success “greatly depends on the social audibility and power of the voices that promote it” (Molden, 2016, p. 140). In many aspects, we can speak about the uniformization of the symbolic elites’ discourse, which may be confronted by a counter-memory promoted by other political actors.

There is no doubt that commemorative rituals enforce certain perceptions of the events among their participants. But what happens when a specific commemoration is shared among various nations, but their dominant perception differs? Are they capable of reaching a consensus? Comparative studies on memory are still an area that requires deeper exploration; therefore, we intend to propose a perspective that confronts two understandings of a historical date in Poland and France. This article uses a singular event to demonstrate this topic, with the potential of expanding toward other aspects of different attitudes regarding the past.

As celebrations of historical anniversaries usually comprise a wide range of activities, we decided to focus on one aspect directly related to the national character of the events: the official speeches delivered by the highest-ranking state officials. Due to their role, the discourse of political leaders may be considered the official stance of state institutions. Therefore, we employ the research method of content analysis, where we study the selected speeches in terms of their substance, tone, and references to current and historical events. This approach

may also, however, constitute certain limitations, as depending on the support for certain politicians, other political actors, and a large portion of society may contest their position. Because of that, our analysis also includes the context in which the speeches were delivered to demonstrate which aspects constitute a shared characteristic and which should be perceived as traits of only particular political actors. Our sources comprise the official channels, such as web pages of state institutions and political leaders, their social media profiles, and media coverage of the related events.

As the sample of our analysis, we explore speeches delivered on two occasions: the 100th anniversary of the commemorated events in 2018, which could contribute to giving this date a particular significance, and 2024, which is the latest instalment of these celebrations, and which incidentally was concurrent with similar circumstances in both states: while the same politicians held the head of state office as in 2018 (Andrzej Duda and Emmanuel Macron), for the first time they were facing a government formed after parliamentary elections which resulted with their political party lose their long-term dominant position. These circumstances make the selection of analyzed speeches particularly interesting, as we can also observe how the impact of political competition affects the discourse regarding past events.

The history of the November 11 commemorations

Immediately after 1918, November 11 became the core date of national celebrations in Poland, although it was formally designated as a national day only in 1937. Significantly, this day was associated mostly not with the end of World War I but with the appointment of Józef Piłsudski as the supreme commander, authorized to delegate the first national government after the partition era, which justified considering this date the Independence Day. In the whole interwar period, it served as one of the most important Polish national celebrations. It was later suppressed by the communist regime, but with its crisis in the 1980s was restored again as the national day (Zaremba, 2001, p. 393; Main, 2004, pp. 67–70; Korzeniewski, 2010, pp. 98–99; Osęka, 2010, pp. 7–9).

The celebrations of Independence Day are associated with a specific location. As “the ceremonies not only create national time but also bring into being national space” (N’Guessan, Lentz, & Gabriel, 2017, p. 687), the site of celebrations plays a significant role in defining the event’s character. In Poland, they are related to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Warsaw, erected in the interwar

period. Although the dedication of this monument extends to the broader military struggle of Polish soldiers throughout the ages, it is also strongly related to the events of 1918. The fact that the square where it is located has been dedicated to Józef Piłsudski, the main character of these times, strengthens this bond (Osęka, 2010, pp. 125–128).

In France, November 11 was initially established as a public holiday by the law of October 24, 1922, dedicated to commemorating victory and peace. A date was chosen in reference to the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918, in Rethondes (Oise) between the Allies and Germany (Museum of the Armistice, 2015). However, since the promulgation of law n° 2012-273 of February 28, 2012, relating to commemoration and national reconciliation, November 11 has been expanded to establish a national day of homage to all those who died for France, whatever the wars or conflicts in which they fell (Légifrance, 2012). This evolution, in the memorial dimension of this date, is explained by several factors, particularly the many conflicts in which France has been engaged since then. Therefore, this new law aims to respond to new needs that France is facing, that is, to establish new forms of national memory linked to the latest conflicts it has been able to face. November 11 thus becomes a pivotal day, centralizing tributes around an emblematic date and avoiding the multiplication of less frequent commemorations.

The most iconic ceremony occurs in the capital, next to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier under the Arc de Triomphe and includes several systematic elements: laying of a wreath, rekindling of the flame, a minute of silence, and the national anthem. While these celebrations are performed in the presence of the President of the Republic, his speech is not compulsory and is delivered only occasionally. Additionally, the Prime Minister can step into this role, which was part of the unusual way the ritual was performed in 2024.

Officials' speeches in Poland

President Andrzej Duda's speech (Duda, 2018) on the 100th anniversary was traditionally delivered in the symbolic location of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Duda focused on the attributes of Polish statehood as symbols that strengthen the nation's unity. He referred to the national flag and anthem, tradition, language, and culture "which had grown from the 1052 years of Christianity". In direct reference to the celebrated events, he mentioned several distinctive political figures from that time, commonly described as the Fathers

of Independence (*Ojcowie Niepodległości*). These included Piłsudski and several other figures from various parts of the political spectrum. Duda collectively praised their efforts but highlighted their willingness to cooperate and even resign from their personal ambitions for the greater good. Apart from the events related to the restoration of independence, Duda also referred briefly to two further events related to its loss: the occupation of Poland during World War II and the communist regime under Soviet auspices that followed. He honoured those who resisted the external forces in open fight or underground activism, praising their efforts as vital for contemporary possibilities to celebrate Polish independence.

The idealized image of national unity, together with previously mentioned symbols of Polishness, was utilized to make a call for maintaining this unity contemporarily, so the patriotic inspirations from the past would motivate the construction of a “sovereign, independent and wealthy Poland – where people can simply live normally and peacefully. Poland, which is secure, with an efficient army, active, well-operating alliances, and friendly foreign forces that train and station on our territory”. Despite mentioning these aspects of contemporary international politics, Duda wasn’t precise in his thoughts. This vagueness wasn’t an omission and can be considered intended, as the true motivation of Duda’s speech seemed to refer to internal issues. Calls for unity referred to the political opposition against Duda and the Law and Justice government. Critiques condemned decisions related to the reform of the judiciary system and nominations of certain judges, calling on European institutions to intervene against acts that were considered contrary to EU regulations. Duda’s calls for unity may be regarded as an instrument for fighting these tendencies, promoting national unity as an essential value that should be respected regardless of internal conflicts. In this way, his intention could have been to limit the intensity of criticism against his rules or at least show his political opponents in a bad light.

The circumstances of the 2024 presidential speech (Duda, 2024) were different. During Duda’s double term, it was the first time since 2015 that he was forced to cohabitate with a government formed by opposite parties. His references to the present times had to be expressed differently. Duda again started his speech with references to the leading political figures from 1918. He referred to the sacrifices made by generations of Poles during the 123 years of lack of an independent Polish state, including several uprisings, facing repressions, and institutional and diplomatic work, which finally had an effect at the end of World War I. He stated the importance of Polish sovereign statehood for maintaining

balance in Europe, indicating that its fall in 1939 led to another even more catastrophic conflict, and looking even further, the liquidation of the Soviet-dependent communist regime in 1989 was an essential aspect of ending the Cold War.

The only foreign international actor praised in Duda's speech for favouring and supporting Polish efforts was the United States. The Polish president had mentioned twice Woodrow Wilson's 14-point plan for a postwar peace settlement, which included the establishment of sovereign Poland. Also, when referring to the Cold War era, Duda indicated the two greatest supporters of the Solidarity movement, Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II. These examples of American support for the interests of Poland were used as an excuse for references to contemporary politics, where Duda again mentioned the security aspects in front of the reemerging Russian imperialism and claimed that the security of the region once more depended on the support of the USA. The President declared, presumably in the name of the whole nation, that "we are grateful to our allies – the consecutive Presidents of the United States – that they come here [...] and resolutely repeat their statements about the security guarantees". He emphasized commitment towards international law and sovereignty and determined support towards Ukraine's fight for independence and reinstating borders in 2014. Referring to the catastrophe of 1939, when Poland was technically and politically unprepared for defense, he insisted that Poland was responsible for its own safety. Still, he yet again emphasized the necessity of relying on Euro-Atlantic cooperation. He despised the concept of Europe being capable of guaranteeing its safety on its own. References to various security initiatives in which Poland is involved – NATO, the Bucharest Nine, and the Three Seas – hinted at Duda's mistrust in the capability of a security project that would comprise the whole European Union, including Western countries. He praised Poland for being at the forefront regarding military expenditures per state, with over 4 percent of GDP dedicated to strengthening defense. Yet again, referring to history, he argued that the fall of communism was possible due to the firm stance of NATO, whose all members respected the importance of proper military expenditure.

To evaluate which aspects of the narrative represent the Polish mnemonic hegemony and not only view of a particular actor, these speeches need to be confronted with acts of political figures that represent other perspectives. In 2018, due to the Law and Justice party (PiS) having obtained complete control over both legislative and executive power in Poland, it is difficult to identify a speech of another politician who would hold a public office at the state level and represent a different political group than Duda. The closest act from that date that

would correspond to the presidential speech was the one given by Donald Tusk, the then President of the European Council, without holding any public office in Poland (Council of the European Union, 2018). In his discourse addressed to the participants of an NGO event, Tusk recalled participating in an illegal celebration of the 60th anniversary under communism and wondered whether it was possible to reclaim the sovereign Polish state through another “marvelous coincidence” as he described the events of 1918. He emphasized that the restitution of the Polish state was possible due to both external circumstances related to World War I and the Polish politicians’ capacity to utilize this opportunity and prioritize this unifying goal instead of particular differences. As Duda, Tusk mentioned Piłsudski in the first place before several other figures representative of the political spectrum of that time. He then compared this situation to the events related to the end of the Cold War, mentioning the central Polish figures of that time (including Lech Wałęsa and John Paul II), but contrary to Duda, not emphasizing the role of the United States or any other foreign politician. Moreover, concerning the contemporary situation at the moment of giving the speech, he referred to the first term of Donald Trump as a challenge for security due to his hesitant approach towards strengthening the European Union. In further parts of his discourse, he insisted on the necessity of Poland playing a significant role in European security policies and the danger of anti-European tendencies in this regard, pointing directly to several exclamations of PiS politicians.

In 2024, the government, in opposition to Duda and the former PiS government, didn’t organize their celebrations of Independence Day. Instead, multiple dispersed initiatives were taken by various representatives of the parties that formed the coalition. Some of these events were directly related to the commemoration of political figures of 1918 and focused on those most closely ideologically related. In particular, the politicians of the Left honored socialists who had engaged in pro-independence activities since the beginning of the 20th century, and they combined calls for sovereign Poland with a political program of a social state (Lewica, 2024). Other events, focused more on the commemorations of the military pro-independence struggle as well as the praise of the contemporary Polish army, were led by the Ministry of Defense (MON, 2024). As the Prime Minister, Donald Tusk only addressed the topic briefly on social media, emphasizing the contemporary challenges of safeguarding Polish sovereignty (Tusk, 2024). At the same time, the Marshal of the Sejm focused in his speech on the value of national unity despite political differences, especially in turbulent

times of unrest in the region (Onet, 2024). All in all, the governmental discourse about Independence Day combined commemoration of past events with present challenges for security, but was quite vague, pluralist, and didn't involve firm statements related to contemporary politics.

It contrasts however with a regular grassroots initiative, organized in Warsaw every year since 2006, that represents counter-memory to the elite's discourse: the Independence Marches, which gather groups attracted by slogans of national homogeneity, the defense of conservative values, fear of over-progressive ideologies and immigration. Praising the Polish heroic past, as well as the conviction that the Christianity is the pillar of Polish identity, constitutes the dominant message of these manifestations (Kotwas & Kubik, 2019; Tomaszewicz, 2020; Zalewski, 2020; Różycki, 2022).

Officials' speeches in France

President Emmanuel Macron delivered a speech on the 100th anniversary of the Armistice in the historically charged context, redefined in 2012 by its expanded dimension. The speech traditionally took place at the foot of the Arc de Triomphe (Champs-Élysées, Paris), where the flame of the unknown soldier burns. It was an emotionally charged speech, which combined homage to the dead, reflection on the past, and a political message for the future (Élysée, 2018). However, 2018 marked the centenary of the armistice and pushed the French President to refer mainly to this historic event and its consequences for Europe. He evoked the moments preceding the armistice, commemorated those who died for France, from anonymous people like Corporal Pierre Sellier to committed writers and intellectuals (Apollinaire, Cendrars, Péguy, Alain-Fournier, etc.). Through this enumeration, the speech brought to life the diversity of those involved, emphasizing that France, in this war, was defended by men from all social backgrounds, from rural areas or the bourgeoisie, but also from all national origins, mentioning, in particular, the soldiers who came from the colonies and the volunteers from other European countries "because France represented, for them, everything that was beautiful in the world." Macron also mentioned the last dead of the First World War, Augustin Trébuchon, to recall the absurdity of war's final moments. Similarly, the figure of Captain Charles de Gaulle, a national hero of the Second World War, then unknown, was mentioned to highlight the fate of certain fighters who became significant figures in history. Macron recalled the absurdity of this fratricidal war, where "Europe

nearly committed suicide". He paid tribute to the deaths of all the combatants of whatever nationality who had been caught up in a spiral of unstoppable violence. The figures of the scale of the tragedy were recalled: 10 million dead, 6 million wounded, 3 million widows, 6 million orphans, millions of civilian victims, 1 billion shells fired on French soil alone. This numerical dimension accentuates the impact of the tragedy and reinforces the call for collective memory.

The speech was not limited to the evocation of the past but insisted on the deep and lasting consequences of the conflict. Macron recalled that the end of the fighting had not immediately meant peace: conflicts had continued in the East (notably during the Russian Civil War and the Soviet-Polish War), and the physical and psychological wounds had marked an entire generation, favoring the emergence of nationalism leading to the Second World War. One of the key moments of the speech lay in the opposition between patriotism and nationalism. Macron explicitly denounced nationalism as a betrayal of patriotism, stating that: "Patriotism is the exact opposite of nationalism: nationalism is its betrayal", insisting on the fact that the greatness of a nation lies in its moral values. This very political passage was a message addressed to the international community present that day, particularly to certain leaders adept at identity withdrawal, notably Donald Trump, and Vladimir Putin (*France24*, 2018). To emphasize this point, Macron declared, "Here, today, people of the entire world, on this sacred slab, the tomb of our Unknown Soldier, this anonymous 'Poilu' symbol of all those who died for the fatherland, see so many of your leaders gathered together!", giving a universal dimension to the French unknown soldier as being the symbol of soldiers from all over the world who died for vain causes.

The speech concluded with a call for cooperation and multilateralism. The European Union and the United Nations were cited as the fruits of the lessons learned from past wars. NATO was, however, not mentioned due in particular to the presence of the Russian President but also to the desire to insist on the peaceful dimension of the speech. Macron urged nations to maintain these efforts to avoid the mistakes of the past being repeated. He also highlighted the new challenges facing the world: global warming, poverty, inequality, ideological manipulation, and the rise of extremism. He concluded with the words: "Long live peace between peoples and between states! Long live the free nations of the world! Long live friendship between people!"

Macron's speech combines emotion and politics. He didn't just honor the dead of the Great War but drew a lesson from it for the present and the future. He warned against nationalist temptations and insisted on the importance

of multilateralism and international cooperation. Through its construction, it oscillated between a historical narrative, a tribute to the victims, and a message of political warning, thus making this commemoration a moment of commitment for the future. Macron is also faithful to French ideals, wanting to be a nation with universal values (Roche, 2000). He tried throughout the speech to position France as an ideal, bringing hope to the whole world and fighting obscurantism. One can also find Macron's deep attachment to European construction, respect for international law, and multilateralism. In addition to the French tradition of claiming to speak to the entire world, this international dimension was also explained by the presence of many foreign leaders.

Compared to its predecessors, the 2018 speech stands out for its committed tone and call for vigilance in the face of contemporary dangers. Where François Hollande in 2014 favoured a more consensual and memorial approach, Macron made this commemoration and the presence of foreign leaders an opportunity to promote his political ideals. Also, since 2018, the commemorations of November 11 have continued to evolve. In 2021, Macron was content to pay tribute to the heroes of freedom who have fallen over the years. More recent speeches reflected the political difficulties that Emmanuel Macron faced; in 2022, a short speech was given by Sébastien Lecornu, Minister of the Armed Forces, and Patricia Mirallès, Secretary of State for Veterans and Remembrance.

The statement by Prime Minister Michel Barnier at the inauguration of the trench at the Great War Museum in Meaux (Seine-et-Marne) on November 11, 2024 (Barnier, 2024), was different in many aspects. First, this speech didn't occur at the Arc de Triomphe, where the usual annual commemorations are held. The anniversary occurred in a complex political context, where Barnier became a cohabitation Prime Minister, meaning he was not part of the presidential majority. Emmanuel Macron, President of the Republic weakened by this cohabitation, didn't deliver a speech that year. The fact that the Prime Minister spoke officially was part of a political tradition according to which, in the event of cohabitation, the Prime Minister focuses on France's domestic policy. In contrast, the President of the Republic concentrates mainly on foreign affairs (Article 20 of the Constitution of the Fifth Republic provides that it is the Government, and not the President of the Republic, who "determines and conducts the nation's policy"; Conseil Constitutionnel, 2021).

Barnier's speech differed from that of Macron. Barnier's approach was more nationalistic and focused on the combatants and their bravery. His speech had a more patriotic and less internationalized dimension. It evoked the importance

of remembering and commemorating the soldiers of the First World War, particularly those of the Battle of the Marne. Barnier emphasized the tragedy and courage of the soldiers who fought to save France, evoking their dedication and courage in the face of tough conditions. He focused particularly on the “Miracle of the Marne” event in 1914, where, after terrible setbacks, French troops, under the leadership of General Joffre, had succeeded in repelling the German invasion. According to Barnier, this victory was not due to chance but to a collective act of incredible courage, notably by French, British, and colonial soldiers. He cited emblematic figures such as Maurice Genevoix, a war writer and poet, who had encouraged his comrades never to give in to fear and to continue fighting despite losses.

The minister emphasized that, just as then, it is crucial today to face challenges collectively. He highlighted the importance of solidarity and individual and collective commitment. Barnier recalled that during the war, this solidarity had been embodied by actions such as civilian aid, including the emblematic intervention of Paris taxis that transported soldiers to the front. He also mentioned the role of women who participated in the war effort, whether in factories or on the fields.

Concerning contemporary matters, Barnier addressed the current challenges facing France and Europe, including climate change, social inequality, and geopolitical threats. He drew a parallel between the 1914 war and the current situation in Ukraine, emphasizing that, although war seems distant, France had to remain vigilant in the face of the dangers that could affect Europe, particularly regarding security and stability. Barnier also evoked the importance of the European Union, born from the ashes of war, as a guarantee of lasting peace. He recalled the ideal of Robert Schuman, one of Europe’s founding fathers, who proposed in 1950 a plan to avoid future conflicts. Barnier emphasized that although Europe was not perfect, it had guaranteed peace for more than 70 years. He called for the protection and strengthening of this European project, particularly in facing current challenges. Finally, Barnier sent a message of solidarity and commitment to young people, encouraging them to invest in the future of their country and Europe, while emphasizing that European unity remains essential in the face of global challenges. Barnier insisted on rallying together and forming a common front. This rhetoric echoed the instability his government was facing and would lead to a motion of censure by Parliament a few weeks later.

Conclusions

All in all, the November 11 commemorations indicate different national sensibilities and values in Poland and France, resulting from the two nations’ different historical experiences. The most relevant contrasts are presented in the table below. They indicate the risk of disagreement, which may affect not only this singular historical date, but also perception of other events, like Polish perspective on the French attitude towards German attack on Poland in 1939, a topic that deserves detailed analysis in a different study. However, the observed differences don’t constitute an obstacle impossible to overcome, which would denote the existence of contradictory goals. They can even be treated as an opportunity to learn from each other’s experiences to forge a safer, more peaceful future. The policymakers should be encouraged to understand and respect these differences for more successful and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Table 1. The dominating aspects of speeches delivered by state leaders in France and Poland on November 11

	France	Poland
Attitude towards the end of WWI	ambivalent: taking pity on the victims, highlighting the absurdity of war, which resulted in the emergence of new tensions and nationalisms that would eventually lead to WWII	enthusiastic: “a marvelous coincidence,” praising elites for their great success in restoring national freedom
Other historical events mentioned	international tensions: the results of the dissolution of empires after WWI, unsuccessful peace initiatives that led to WWII, the Cold War	Polish independence struggle: 19th-century uprisings, resistance during WWII and under the communist regime
Contemporary challenges linked with the WWI end commemoration	nationalism, extremism and populism; terrorism and climate change; the importance of EU peace and security cooperation	reemerging Russian imperialism, the necessity of supporting Ukraine and strengthening its own defensive capabilities

	France	Poland
Other states and politicians mentioned	Germany, in the context of reconciliation, required for the successful European project	Germany and USSR/Russia mentioned in a negative context – as past or present (in the case of Russia) offenders to peace; USA praised as a reliable ally
Shared and dividing aspects of commemorations in both states	shared: European project, strong multilateralism; measured stance towards Russia (dialogue over confrontation), focus on social solidarity (inclusion on various social groups, shared moral values) dividing: degree of praising the glory of military victory, debates on colonial memory	shared: national interest that concentrates on independence and security; firm pro-NATO and anti-Russian attitude; focus on national solidarity (cooperation for national interest despite political differences), religious connotations (oriented around John Paul II) dividing: focus on either the European or Atlantic dimension of security policy

Source: own work.

References

Barnier, M. (2024, November 11). Déclaration de M. Michel Barnier, Premier ministre, sur la Grande Guerre lors de l’inauguration de la tranchée du musée de la Grande Guerre, Meaux (Seine-et-Marne) le 11 novembre 2024. *Vie publique*. <https://www.vie-publique.fr/discours/296145-michel-barnier-11112024-inauguration-tranchee-musee-grande-guerre-meaux> (accessed: 30.03.2025).

Conseil Constitutionnel (2021, October 1). *Comment la Constitution organise-t-elle la cohabitation?* <https://www.conseil-constitutionnel.fr/la-constitution/comment-la-constitution-organise-t-elle-la-cohabitation> (accessed: 30.03.2025).

Council of the European Union (2018, November 10). Speech by President Donald Tusk, November 11, 2018: “Poland and Europe, Two Anniversaries, Two Lessons. *European Council*. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/pl/press/press-releases/2018/11/10/speech-by-president-donald-tusk-november-11-2018-poland-and-europe-two-anniversaries-two-lessons> (accessed: 30.03.2025).

Duda, A. (2018, November 11). „Jestem przekonany, że pod biało-czerwonym sztandarem jest miejsce dla każdego z nas”. Prezydent.pl. <https://www.prezydent.pl/aktualnosci/wypowiedzi-prezydenta-rp/wystapienia/jestem-przekonany-ze-pod-bialo-czerwonym-sztandarem-jest-miejsce-dla-kazdego-z-nas,3776> (accessed: 30.03.2025).

- Duda, A. (2024, November 11). Narodowe Święto Niepodległości. Wystąpienie Prezydenta RP. Prezydent.pl. <https://www.prezydent.pl/aktualnosci/wypowiedzi-prezydenta-rp/wystapienia/narodowe-swieto-niepodleglosci-wystapienie-prezydenta-rp,93931> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Elgenius, G. (2007). The Appeal of Nationhood: Celebrating and Commemorating the Nation. In: M. Young, E. Zuelow, & A. Sturm (eds.), *Nationalism in a Global Era: The Persistence of Nations* (pp. 68–81). London: Routledge.
- Élysée (2018, November 12). *Speech by President of the Republic Emmanuel Macron at the International Ceremony of the Centenary of the Armistice of November 11, 1918, at the Arc de Triomphe*. <https://www.elysee.fr/emmanuel-macron/2018/11/12/discours-du-president-de-la-republique-emmanuel-macron-a-la-ceremonie-internationale-du-centenaire-de-larmistice-du-11-novembre-1918-a-larc-de-triomphe> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- France24 (2018, October 23). *Trump, Putin, Meet in Paris for the Armistice Commemoration*. <https://www.france24.com/fr/20181023-trump-poutine-rencontre-paris-11-novembre-commemorations-armistice-guerre> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Kertzer, D.I. (2010). *Rytuał, polityka, władza*. Trans. Z. Simbierowicz. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Volumen.
- Korzeniewski, B. (2010). *Transformacja pamięci: przewartościowania w pamięci przeszłości a wybrane aspekty funkcjonowania dyskursu publicznego o przeszłości w Polsce po 1989 roku*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskiego Towarzystwa Przyjaciół Nauk.
- Kotwas, M., & Kubik, J. (2019). Symbolic Thickening of Public Culture and the Rise of Right-Wing Populism in Poland. *East European Politics and Societies*, 33(2), 435–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325419826691>
- Légifrance (2012). *LOI n° 2012-273 du 28 février 2012 fixant au 11 novembre la commémoration de tous les morts pour la France*. [https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000025413468#:~:text=LOI%20n%C2%B0%202012%2D273,la%20France%20\(1\)%20%2D%20L%C3%A9gifrance](https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000025413468#:~:text=LOI%20n%C2%B0%202012%2D273,la%20France%20(1)%20%2D%20L%C3%A9gifrance) (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Lentz, C. (2013). Celebrating independence jubilees and the millennium: National days in Africa. *Nations and Nationalism*, 19(2), 208–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12016>
- Lewica (2024). *Wolność wywalczona, przyszłość budowana*. <https://lewica.org.pl/aktualnosci-radom/11267-wolnosc-wywalczona-przyszlosc-budowana-swietujmy-razem-11-listopada> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Main, I. (2004). *Trudne świętowanie. Konflikty wokół obchodów świąt państwowych i kościelnych w Lublinie (1944–1989)*. Warszawa: Trio.
- Molden, B. (2016). Resistant pasts versus mnemonic hegemony: On the power relations of collective memory. *Memory Studies*, 9(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698015596014>
- MON (2024). Contemporary Soldiers of the Polish Army Are Heirs of the Tradition of Heroes Who Fought for Independence. *Government of Poland*. <https://www.gov.pl/web/obrona-narodowa/wspolczesni-zolnierze-wojska-polskiego-sa-spadkobiercami-tradycji-bohaterow-walk-o-niepodleglosc> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Museum of the Armistice (2015). *The 1918 Armistice*. <https://www.musee-armistice-14-18.fr/comprendre-lhistoire/larmistice-1918> (accessed: 30.03.2025).

- N'Guessan, K., Lentz, C., & Gabriel, M.-C. (2017). Performing the national territory: The geography of national-day celebrations. *Nations and Nationalism*, 23(4), 686–706. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12332>
- Olech, A. (2025). *Premium Treaty? France, Poland, and the Game of Interests*. <https://defence24.com/geopolitics/premium-treaty-france-poland-and-the-game-of-interests> (accessed: 16.05.2025).
- Onet (2024, November 12). *Tak przywitali Szymona Hołownię na Marszu Niepodległości. „Wycie, obelgi, rechot”*. <https://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kraj/tak-przywitali-szymona-holownie-na-marszu-niepodleglosci-pokazal-nagranie/srjbj68> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Oseka, P. (2010). *Mydlenie oczu: przypadki propagandy w Polsce*. Kraków: Znak.
- Rekść, M. (2013). *Mity narodowe i ich rola w kreowaniu polityki na przykładzie państw byłej Jugosławii*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Roche, J.-J. (2000). La France et l'Universel. In: J. Fernandez, & J.-V. Holeindre (réd.), *Annuaire Français de Relations Internationales*, (vol. 1, pp. 390–406). Bruxelles: Bruylant.
- Rothenbuhler, E.W. (2003). *Komunikacja rytualna. Od rozmowy codziennej do ceremonii medialnej*. Trans. J. Barański. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Różycki, B. (2022). National homogeneity as the component of far-right populism in Poland. *La Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest*, 53(2), 121–149. <https://doi.org/10.3917/receol.533.0121>
- Souverbie, L. (2025, May 16). *Treaty of Nancy: Towards a strategic and security reinforcement of Franco-Polish relations?* Institut de relations internationales et stratégiques. <https://www.iris-france.org/traite-de-nancy-vers-un-renforcement-strategique-et-securitaire-des-relations-franco-polonaises> (accessed: 20.05.2025)
- Tomasiewicz, J. (2020). Konfederacja – polska nowa prawica między tradycją a nowoczesnością. *Studia Politicae Universitatis Silesiensis*, 30, 7–32. <https://doi.org/10.31261/SPUS.11379>
- Tusk, D. (2024). Facebook profile of Donald Tusk. <https://www.facebook.com/donaldtusk/posts/pfbid0b75x2ifkVjPPWrZnBPLvFLfAtbMQA1gBwkWhKzMbtTGWbJCBxXgesKmNnoVWZAXl?rclid=wREY2wco7hgA9HQP#> (accessed: 30.03.2025).
- Zalewski, F. (2020). Les Marches de l'Indépendance à Varsovie. Recompositions et Transformations des Droits Extrêmes Depuis les Années 2000 en Pologne. *Cultures & Conflits*, 117, 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.4000/conflits.21432>
- Zaremba, M. (2001). *Komunizm, legitymizacja, nacjonalizm. Nacjonalistyczna legitymizacja władzy komunistycznej w Polsce*. Warszawa: Trio.

11 listopada pod dwiema flagami: analiza porównawcza oficjalnych przemówień upamiętniających koniec I wojny światowej w Polsce i Francji

STRESZCZENIE Niniejszy artykuł zestawia ze sobą postawy odnoszące się do obchodów 11 listopada w Polsce i we Francji. Data ta, wiążąca się z końcem I wojny światowej oraz odzyskaniem przez Polskę niepodległości w 1918 r., w obu krajach stanowi święto państwowe. Jednak charakter uroczystości jest odmienny, co wskazuje na różne postrzeganie historii oraz najważniejszych wartości w polskim i francuskim społeczeństwie. Zrozumienie tych różnic jest bardzo istotne, gdyż

te odmienne perspektywy mogą stanowić przeszkodę na drodze do osiągnięcia pełnego obustronnego zrozumienia i wzmocnienia współpracy opartej na zaangażowaniu i wzajemnym szacunku. Badanie opiera się na analizie oficjalnych przemówień wybranych obchodów 11 listopada, reprezentujących wizję tego wydarzenia promowaną przez instytucje państwowe.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE Francja, Polska, studia pamięcioznawcze, I wojna światowa, 11 listopada, upamiętnianie, oficjalne przemówienia

Date of submission of the article: 19.05.2025; date of acceptance of the article: 29.09.2025.