



Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca
Facultatea de Studii Europene
Şcoala Doctorală „Paradigma europeană”

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

A Narrative Deconstruction of NATO in the 21st Century

- summary -

Coordonator
Conf. Dr. Habil. SERGIU MIŞCOIU

Student:
CLAUDIU ALEXANDRU BOLCU

- Noiembrie 2015 -
CLUJ-NAPOCA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Why so much emphasis on Theories?	14
Part 1 – Theoretical incursions.....	17
Chapter 1: Realism	17
Introduction	17
The incipient theory.....	18
Classical incursions	21
New Realism	23
Sub-theories, approaches, strands.....	26
Realism and NATO	32
Chapter 2: Constructivism	35
Introduction	35
The English School.....	36
IR constructivism.....	38
Guiding ideas, principles	42
Opposing views	49
Constructivism and NATO.....	50
Chapter 3: Discourse Theory	53
Introduction	53
The incipient stage.....	55
One step forward	56
Beyond structuralism.....	60
Brief discussions.....	65
Discourse theory and NATO	69
Part 2: Methodology	70
Chapter 4: Linking theory to analysis.....	70
Method versus methodology	70
Narrative analysis	82
The Genealogical Method	85
Discourse analysis	88
Source selection.....	95
Part 3: Historical incursions: NATO’s formation, the Cold War years and beyond.....	99
Chapter 5: Setting the stage	99
The birth of an Alliance...or something more	101
Chapter 6: The Post-Cold-War Era.....	113

Part 4: NATO in the 21st Century	137
Chapter 7: Going Global.....	137
Selecting the New Identity: Global NATO	156
Identities challenged: Afghanistan	176
Identity challenged: The Russo-Georgian Conflict	183
Chapter 8: Re-stating the identity	189
Fulfilling the desiderate	196
Conclusions.....	214
References.....	219

Key words: nato, narrative analysis, 21st century, IR theories, genealogy, discourse, history

Executive summary

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization represents one of the most popular and enduring international organizations of our time. Its versatility and expansion have triggered constant interest within political sciences and other related fields, especially since, after the Cold War, the Organization transformed dramatically, becoming something much more than a simple defensive military Alliance (the conventional image attributed to it). This revealed the fact that power and interests might not just be the essential elements that define an international entity such as NATO, with identity, values or beliefs playing an equally, if not a more important role. Consequently, as NATO began a new journey, slowly expanding beyond the North Atlantic arena, it became increasingly clear that the Organization holds a very important identity component, which enables it to play a multitude of roles in the international environment. This idea became certified along with the 21st century, when NATO actually transformed into a global entity, capable of handling a wide variety of missions and operations. In this sense, the present thesis plans to investigate the way in which the Alliance reached this global level, with a particular focus on the identity component attached to this rise. More specifically, the starting premise of this research is NATO’s “pluri-identitarian” nature, governed by the alternation of two main identities which have been with the Alliance

ever since its inception: military organization (predominant throughout the Cold War) and security community (employed after the fall of the Berlin Wall). Naturally, these formative identities would overlap from time to time, but the argument that this research brings forth is that the Alliance usually employed them in response to international events, promoting the image that it considered would best aid the Organization in securing its interests. Under this logic, the two identities (one more aggressive and the other more retained) would rarely have the chance to intersect as far as their projection was concerned, since they were either directed towards different audiences (usually internal versus external) or one of them was simply left somewhere in the background, as it did not serve the Organization in a meaningful way with regard to a certain time period or a certain context.

However, in the 21st century, these two identities actually clashed, being subsequently used in parallel, as they were both seen as serving important purposes for the Alliance at the same time. The interesting thing about this parallel projection is that NATO actually employed one identity in order to satisfy the interests attached to the other, simply because the former was preferred by international audiences. In more clear terms, the wager of this thesis is actually to demonstrate that, in the 21st century, NATO pursued its material interests (the military image) through a normative, identity-related tactic (the communitarian/altruistic image) in an attempt to gain global legitimacy for its actions and behavior (the communitarian/altruistic image), so that it could better defend its members (the military image).

Consequently, when it comes to identifying such underlining motives, one would require an intricate analytical apparatus, reason for which, the present thesis proposes an equally complex theoretical and methodological approach, aimed at uncovering, not only the shift between one identity projection to the other, but also the factors that determined this shift and the overall context that made it possible. As a result, the thesis builds on two approaches, realism and constructivism, which were thought to best fit NATO's dual imagery. In this sense, the theories are used in order to construct NATO's identity and intentions, revealing the Alliance's two dominant historical selves (defensive alliance and security community). However, since the thesis also plans to unearth the 21st century struggles between these two

images, discourse theory is employed as well, being aimed at pointing out the exact motivations of the Alliance when opting for an identity or another, while at the same time scrutinizing what NATO is delivering and presenting to both internal and external audiences. This unusual theoretical approach represents the second wager of the thesis, which is also aimed at revealing how various, even antithetic theories may be used in a complementary manner in order to provide a more profound understanding of a subject matter. In short, the secondary purpose of the thesis is that of proving that political theories are not mutually exclusive, but mutually constitutive.

Obviously, in order to support such an ambitious theoretical endeavor, one would need to benefit from an equally ambitious methodological structure which could best reflect the practical applicability of this pluri-theoretical approach. In this regard, the thesis would require a clear definition of the appropriate methods that would deliver such a result and therefore would need to employ an overarching methodology aimed at tying these methods together and connecting them to the theoretical underpinnings of the study as a whole. Thus, due to the context-based nature of the thesis, analyticism was selected as the most suitable methodological variant (based on a methodological categorization by Peter Thaddeus Jackson¹), which eased the way into selecting the appropriate research methods. In this regard, the contextuality of the thesis also revealed that an already existent analytical framework was difficult to employ, reason for which I built the study's own methodological outline, using narrative analysis, genealogy and discourse analysis, all methods fitting in with both the reasoning of the paper and its theoretical postulates. In practical terms, narrative analysis is employed in order to reveal NATO's inception and the reasons behind its identity-related development, the genealogical method focuses on explaining the Alliance's inherent nature all the way through to the 21st century, generally designating contextual attributes and other potential courses of action which did not materialize, while discourse analysis is aimed at revealing the Organization's post-9/11 identity projection and struggles.

¹ See Jackson, Patrick-Thaddeus, (2011), *The Conduct of Inquiry: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, Routledge, New York;

These methods also help explain why 9/11 may be considered such an important benchmark for the Alliance and how its unexpected and global nature determined NATO to engage in one of its most fundamental transformation processes in history. In this regard, the terrorist attacks revealed a new, unpredictable international threat to the Organization, somewhat inviting NATO to re-enter the power politics arena, an arena which the Alliance had decided to exit upon the Cold War and especially after the global waves of criticism received for its forceful Kosovo intervention. Therefore, properly responding to 9/11 was an extremely intricate task for the Alliance, since countering this new global threat meant that NATO would have to become global as well (so that it could deter any potential threat before it actually reaches Alliance territories). However, such a strategy would have entailed international legitimacy, which NATO did not have. Thus, as pressures were mounting from various sides (some NATO members supported an aggressive stance regardless of the consequences, while others were advocating for a more retained approach), the Alliance's two dominant selves clashed, producing a rift between Alliance members. With the help of discourse analysis I have identified this dispute as a discursive struggle between NATO's materialistic self and its normative/communitarian identity. Although each discourse had its moments, eventually, after the increasing public contestation and condemnation of forceful international interventions (see the U.S intervention in Afghanistan and subsequently Iraq), the Alliance realized that it would have been extremely difficult to achieve its goals if it acted as a military, interest-oriented entity, an approach not easily "legitimizable" on the international arena. Consequently, NATO understood that the only way it could secure its primordial material needs (survival and safety) was by taking on the widely accepted role of a normative institution, acting on behalf of the international community, an idea which may have provided the Organization with a certain possibility of actually fulfilling its material desiderates as well. The reasoning behind this strategy was very simple: if the Alliance was to acquire global legitimacy and influence, based on its altruistic conduct, it would be able or it would be better equipped in handling any potential peril, regardless of where they stemmed from (and thus counter terrorism, NATO's new found enemy of the 21st century, before it could threaten and reach Alliance borders).

Consequently, building on its constructivist, value and identity oriented self, NATO engaged in a discursive quest of forging a new global identity - that of a soft-core actor interested in protecting and serving the interests and needs of the international community. In order to construct this image NATO utilized various means, ranging from discursive portrayals (predominantly through summit declarations, which consistently perfected ties with an increasing number of countries from all across the globe, but also through the issuing of a special document – the Comprehensive Political Guidance - aimed at certifying the Alliance’s global transformation), to practical actions aimed at asserting on one hand that NATO is able to conduct a broad range of missions and on second hand that these broad range of missions are primarily conceived in not in order to service not only the Alliance, but others as well: peacekeeping operations in Afghanistan, in Iraq and civilian support in Germany (2006 World Cup), Pakistan (2005 earthquake) and the U.S.(2005 hurricane Katrina) among others.

In this sense, in spite of certain drawbacks on account of the unexpected lengthening of the Afghanistan mission, and also NATO’s timid response to Russia’s aggression in Georgia, NATO was balanced enough to not engage with its critics and to steadily pursue its purposes. As a result, NATO’s successful Libya operation seemed to have sealed the Alliance’s legitimacy (aided also by previous smaller scale missions highlighted above), revealing a level-headed organization, not only willing, but also capable of aiding those in need, regardless of their origin and culture. Since this achievement, NATO has been awfully quiet, contempt with its position, in spite of increasing global rumor in Syria, Bahrain and most recently Ukraine. However, unless the Alliance sees a potential threat to its integrity coming from such regions it is very unlikely to act (this is why so far the Ukraine crisis is the one to which NATO acted most vigorously, condemning and issuing measures against Russia, the identified aggressor – from suspending the NATO-Russia council to increasing its maritime, terrestrial and aerial presence in the Black Sea). If there is going to be another large scale operation performed by the Alliance, this needs to be very carefully prepared, as history revealed to NATO that a small erroneous move may dismantle its entire internal and/or international credibility within weeks or even days. As such, all the moves that the Alliance is going to make in the near future are likely to be small scale, probably in connection to a very

accessible situation, one which would guarantee both success and lack of criticism. Until then, NATO is expected to act discursively in a quite bold manner, in an attempt to constantly reemphasize its global position and capabilities, as can already be seen from the post-Libya documents launched by the Alliance, namely the declarations from the Chicago summit (2012) and the Wales summit (2014) respectively. Both documents portray a confident Organization who presents itself as a gatekeeper of global security, insisting that the interests of the Alliance coincide with the interests of the international community and that reliance on NATO guarantees security and safety for all peace-loving entities. Thus, in summing up, we can argue that NATO might have just gone full circle since its formation, in becoming a military defendant of democracy freedom and peace, with the only amendment that it is now performing this role not only for a small group of western states in the face of communism (and the USSR), but for the entire planet, against any potential peril that might arise.

References

Books or book chapters:

1. Acharya, Amitav (2009) *Constructing a Security Community in South Eastern Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*, 2nd Edition, Routledge, New York, United States;
2. Adler, Emanuel, (2002) “Constructivism in International Relations”, in Carlsnaes, Walter; Risse, Thomas; Simmons, Beth, A. (eds), *Handbook of International Relations*, Thousand Oaks: Sage;
3. Adler, Emanuel, (2005), *Communitarian International Relations: The Epistemic Foundations of International Relations*, Routledge, New York;
4. Adler, Emanuel, Michael, Barnett; “Security Communities”, *part of Cambridge Studies in International Relations*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom;

5. Alderson, Kai; Hurrell, Andrew (eds.), (2012). *Hedley Bull on International Society*, Houndmills: Macmillan, United States.
6. Althusser, Louis, (1971), "Ideology and ideological state apparatuses", in Louis Althusser *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New Left Books, London;
7. Keohane, Robert, O. Nye, Joseph, S.; Hoffman, Stanley (eds), (1993), *International Institutions and State Strategies in Europe: 1989-1991*, Harvard University Press, United States;
8. Ashforth, B.E; Mael, F.A (1996) "Organizational identity and strategy as a context for the individual", in P. Shrivastava, A.S. Huff; J.E. Dutton (Series Eds) & J.A.C Baum & J.E Dutton (vol. Ed) *Advances in Strategic management: vol 13 the embeddedness of strategy* Greenwich CT; JAI Press, London, UK;
9. Arend, Anthony, (1999), *Legal Rules and International Society*, Oxford University Press, New York;
10. Barrett, Michelle, (1991), "Ideology, politics, hegemony: from Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe", in M. Barrett: *The Politics of Truth. From Marx to Foucault*. Polity Press, Cambridge;
11. Andreas, Behnke, *NATO's Security Discourse after the Cold War: Representing the West*, Routledge, New York;
12. Berger, L. Peter; Luckman, Thomas, (1991), *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Penguin University Books; Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England;
13. Bolcu, Claudiu, (2014), "NATO in the 21st Century: Spreading Democracy through Security and Assuring Security through Democracy - A Critical Perspective" in Naumescu, Valentin (ed.) *Democracy and Security in the 21st Century*, Cambridge Scholars, United Kingdom; pp. 317-343;
14. Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), (2002), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
15. Bhaskar, Roy, (1975), *A Realist Theory of Science*, Verso, United Kingdom;

16. Browning, Christopher, (2008), *Constructivism, Narrative and Foreign Policy Analysis: A Case Study of Finland*, Peter Lang, Switzerland;
17. Bucchi, Massimiano, (2004) *Science in society: an introduction to the social studies of science*, translation by Adrian Belton, Routledge, London;
18. Burr, Vivien, (1995), *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, Sage Publications, London ;
19. Butler, Karina, Z., (2011), *A Critical Humanitarian Approach*, Palgrave MacMillan, United Kingdom ;
20. Buzan, Barry, (2014), *An Introduction to the English School of International Relations*, Polity Press, United Kingdom;
21. Carr, Haller Edward, (1964) ,*The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939*, Harper Perennial, New York ;
22. Cederman, Lars-Erik, (ed) (2001), *Constructing Europe's Identity: the external dimension*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, United Kingdom;
23. Chouliaraki, Lilie; Fairclough, Norman (1999) , *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press;
24. Christopher, Warren (1998), *In the Stream of History: Shaping Foreign Policy for a New Era*, Stanford University Press;
25. Clifford, Michael, (2001), *Political Genealogy after Foucault: Savage Identities*, Routledge, United Kingdom ;
26. Cox, Michael, (2002), "Meanings of victory: American Power after the Towers", in Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
27. Crockatt, Richard, (2003), *America Embattled: September 11, Anti-Americanism and the Global Order*, Routledge, London & New York;
28. Deutch et al. (1957), *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton University Press, United States;

29. Dunne, Timothy; Brian, C. Schmidt, (2001), "Realism", in Baylis, Jon; Smith, Steve (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford, United Kingdom; pp. 141-161;
30. Fairclough, Norman, (1992) , *Discourse and Social Change*, Blackwell Publishing, United Kingdom;
31. Fairclough, Norman, (1995), *Media Discourse*, Edward Arnold, London;
32. Fairclough Norman; Ruth Wodak, (1997), "Critical Discourse Analysis" in Then A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies 2 (A Multidisciplinary Introduction)*, Sage, London, United Kingdom; pp. 258-284
33. Fierke, Karin M., (1997), "Changing Worlds of Security",.in Keith Krause, Michael C. Williams (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, University of Minnesota Press; United States
34. Fierke, Karin, M., (2007), "Constructivism", in Smith, Steve; Kurki, Milja; Dunne, Tim (eds.), *International Relations theories: discipline and diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press;
35. Finnemore, Martha, (1996), *National Interest in International Society*, Cornell University Press, United States;
36. Finnemore, Martha, (2003), *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press;
37. Foucault, Michel, (1972) , *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Pantheon Books, United States;
38. Foucault, Michel, (1980), *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, Pantheon Books;
39. Foucault, Michel, (1981), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York;
40. Foucault, Michel, (1984), "What is Enlightenment?", in Paul Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York;
41. Foucault, Michel, (2003) , *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*, The New Press, New York;

42. Fukuyama, Francis, (2002), "History and September 11", in Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
43. Gee, James Paul, (1999), *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*, Routledge, London ;
44. George, Jim, (1994), *Discourse of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations*, Lynne Reiner, Boulder, United States;
45. Gillingham, John R; Heller, Francis Howard, (eds) (1992), *NATO: the founding of the alliance and the integration of Europe*, St. Martin's Press, New York, United States;
46. Goldgeier, James M., (1999), *Not Whether but When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO*, Brookings, Washington, D.C;
47. Gray, Collin, (2002), "World Politics as Usual after September 11: Realism Vindicated" in Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
48. Grieco, Joseph M., (1990), *Cooperation Among Nations. Europe, American and Non-Tariff Barriers of Trade*, Ithaca University Press, United States;
49. Hallams, Ellen, Luca Ratti and Benjamin Zyla, (2013), "Introduction – A New Paradigm for NATO?" in Ellen Hallams, Luca Ratti and Benjamin Zyla (eds.), *NATO beyond 9/11: The Transformation of the Atlantic Alliance*, Palgrave; United Kingdom
50. Halliday, Fred, (2002), 'A New Global Configuration?', in Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
51. Herța, Laura Maria, (2012), *De la relațiile româno-sârbe la relațiile româno-iugoslave. Interpretări constructiviste (From Romanian-Serbian relations to Romanian-Yugoslav Relations. Constructivist Interpretations)*, EFES, Cluj-Napoca;
52. Hollis, Martin, (1994), *The philosophy of Social Science : An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom;
53. Jackson, Patrick-Thaddeus, (2011), *The Conduct of Inquiry: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, Routledge, New York;
54. Jackson, Robert, Sorensen, Georg, (2007), *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press, New York;

55. Jørgensen, M.W., and L.J. Philips, (2002), *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd ;
56. Kagan, Robert, (2003), *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York ;
57. Katzenstein, Peter J., Jepperson Roland, L.; Wendt, Alexander, (1996), ‘Norms, Identity and Culture in National Security’, in Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia Press, New York;
58. Kaufman, Joyce, (2002), “NATO After the Cold War,” in Howard M. Hensel, *The United States and Europe: Policy Imperatives in a Globalizing World*, Ashgate Publishing, United Kingdom ;
59. Keohane, O. Robert, (2002), ‘The Public Delegation of Terrorism and Coalition Politics’ in Booth, Ken, Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
60. Kratochwil, Friedrich, (1989), *Rules, Norms and Decisions: On the conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom ;
61. Kvale, Steinar, (1992), “Postmodern Psychology. A Contradiction in Terms?” in Steinar Kvale (Ed.), *Psychology and Postmodernism: Inquiries in Social Construction* , Sage Publications, London ;
62. Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe, (1985), *Hegemony and Social Strategy*, Verso, London ;
63. Laclau, Ernesto, (1990), *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Times*, Verso, London;
64. Laclau, Ernesto, (1993) *The Return of the Political*, Verso, London, 1993 ;
65. Lamy, Steven, (2001), “Contemporary mainstream approaches: Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism”, in Baylis, John; Smith, Steve (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford, United Kingdom; pp. 161-182;
66. Machiavelli, Niccolo, (1958) *The Prince*, translated by W.K. Marriot, 1958, retrieved 12th of August 2015, from <http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince.pdf>;

67. Mearsheimer, John, (2001), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, W.W. Norton & Company, United States;
68. Mearsheimer, John, (2007), "Structural Realism", in Dunne, Tim; Kurki, Milja; Smith, Steve, *International Relations Theories*, New York: Oxford University Press;
69. Milliken, Jennifer, (1999) , "Intervention and Identity: Reconstructing the West in Korea", in De Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, Raymond Duval, *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, University of Minnesota Press, United States ;
70. Mișcoiu, Sergiu, Claudiu Bolcu, (2015), "The Altruistic (Universalist) Veil: Legitimizing Militarism through a Cosmopolitan Approach" in Caraus T., Pârvu C, Lazea D. (eds.) - *Cosmopolitanism without Foundations*, Zeta Books, Romania, pp. 233-254;
71. Mișcoiu, Sergiu , (2007), "Câteva răspunsuri la întrebarea De ce a avut succes socio-constructivismul ca teorie a relațiilor internaționale? (A few answers to the question: Why did socio-constructivism have success as an IR theory?) " in Ruxandra Ivan (coord.), *Direcții principale în studiul relațiilor internaționale în România (Main directions in the study of International Relations in Romania)*, Iași, Ed. Polirom; pp. 81-101.
72. Mișcoiu, Sergiu; Mecea, Mihaela; Bolcu, Claudiu, (2013), *Elements for an Introduction in International Relations Theory*, EFES, Cluj-Napoca ;
73. Morgenthau, Hans; Thompson, Kenneth, (1985), *Politics Among Nations*, 6th edition, New York: McGraw-Hill;
74. Navari, Cornelia, (2008), "Liberalism", in Williams, Paul, D. (ed), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, Routledge, United States;
75. Neuman, B. Iver, (2011), 'European Identity, EU Expansion and the Integration Exclusion Nexus', in Cederman, Lars-Erik, *Constructing Europe's Identity: the external dimension*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London, UK;
76. Onuf, Nicholas, (1989), *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press ;

77. Pevehouse, Jon, C. Goldstein, Joshua S. (2008) *International Relations*, 8th Edition, Longman Publishers, New York;
78. Reus-Smit, Christian, (2001), "Constructivism", in Burchill, Scott; Devetak, Richard Linklater, Andrew; Paterson, Matthew; Reus-Smit Christian; True, Jacqui (eds), *Theories of International Relations*, 2nd edition, Palgrave, New York;
79. Ringmar, Erik, (1996) *Identity, Interest and Action: A Cultural Explanation of Sweden's Intervention in the Thirty Years War*, Cambridge University Press, New York;
80. Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1996), "Collective identity in a democratic community: The case of NATO", in Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia Press, New York pp. 357-399;
81. Rose, Gilian, (2012) , *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*, Sage Publications, London ;
82. Rorty, Richard, (1989), *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom ;
83. Schimmelfennig, Frank (2001) ' Liberal Identity and Postnationalist Inclusion: The eastern Enlargement of the European Union' in Cederman, Lars-Erik, *Constructing Europe's Identity: the external dimension*, Lynne Reinner Publishers, London, UK;
84. Shearman, Peter, Sussex, Mathew (eds), (2004), *European Security After 9/11*, Ashgate Publishing, England;
85. Sismondo, Sergio (2004) *An Introduction to Science and Technology Studies*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, United Kingdom;
86. Smith, Steve, (2001), "Reflectivist and Constructivist Approaches to International Relations", in Baylis, Jon; Smith, Steve (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford, United Kingdom;
87. Thucydides, (1836), *History of the Peloponnesian War*, translation by William Smith, retrieved 24th of September 2015, from <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.hx5mfj;view=1up;seq=11>;
88. Titscher, Stefan; Meyer, Michael; Wodak, Ruth and Vetter, Eva, (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London, United Kingdom;

89. Torfing, Jacob; David Howarth, (2005), (eds.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics Identity, Policy and Governance*, Palgrave, United Kingdom;
90. Torfing, Jacob, (2005), “Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges” in Torfing Jacob, David Howarth, (eds.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics Identity, Policy and Governance*, Palgrave, United Kingdom;
91. Van Dijk, Teun A. (2001) “Critical Discourse Analysis”, in Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Blackwell Publishing, United States;
92. Wallace, Hellen, William Wallace, Mark Pollack, (2005), *Policy Making in the European Union*, Oxford University Press, 5th Edition
93. Wallerstein, Immanuel, (2003), *The Decline of American Power*, The New Press, New York, United States;
94. Waltz, Kenneth, (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York;
95. Waltz, Kenneth (2002), ‘The Continuity of International Politics’, in Booth, Ken Dunne; Tim, (eds), *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order*, Palgrave, London;
96. Weaver, Ole, “European Integration and Security: Analysing French and German Discourses on State, Nation, and Europe” in D. Howarth, J. Torfing (eds.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics*, Palgrave ; pp. 33-67;
97. Weber, Max, (1995), *Simulating Sovereignty: Intervention, the State, and Symbolic Exchange*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press ;
98. Wendt, Alexander, (1999), *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom;
99. Wight, Colin, (2006), *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom ;
100. Woods, Nagaire, “International Political Economy in an Age of Globalization”, in Baylis, Jon; Smith, Steve (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford, United Kingdom;
101. Žižek, Slavoj, (1989), *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Verso Books, United Kingdom ;

Academic Articles:

1. Adler, Emanuel (1997) "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations*, No. 3, September; pp. 319-363;
2. Adler, Emanuel, (2008) "The spread of security communities: communities of practice, self-restraint and NATO's post-cold war transformation", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.14 , Nr. 2 ; pp. 195-230;
3. Albright, Madeleine, (November/December 1998), "The Testing of American Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 6;
4. Appiah Kwame, Anthony, (Spring, 1997) "Cosmopolitan Patriots", *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 617-639;
5. Atkinson, Carol, (2006) "Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972-200", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 509-537;
6. Baer, Daniel, (January 2011), "The Ultimate Sacrifice and the Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention", *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 1;
7. Barany, Zoltan, (2009), "NATO at Sixty" *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 20, Number 2; pp. 108-122;
8. Barnett, Michael, Finnemore, Martha, (Autumn, 1999) 'The Politics, Power and Pathologies of International Organizations', *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 699-732;
9. Bolcu, Claudiu, (2012) "Global NATO: An Identity Based Account of the Alliance in the 21st Century", *Romanian Review of International Studies*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 17-46;
10. Blank, Stephen, (2008), "What Comes After the Russo-Georgian War? What's at Stake in the CIS", *American Foreign Policy Interests*, Vol. 30, No. 6, pp. 379-391;
11. Brzezinski, Ian, (November 2009) , "Lessons from Libya: NATO Alliance Remains Relevant", *National Defense*;

12. Buzan, Barry, (2001), "The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3;
13. Ciuta, Felix, (2002), "The End(s) of NATO: Security, Strategic Action and Narrative Transformation", *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 23, No. 1; pp. 35-62;
14. Chesterman, Simon, (2011), "Leading from Behind': The Responsibility to Protect, the Obama Doctrine and Humanitarian Intervention after Libya", *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 25, No.3;
15. De Nevers, Renee, (Spring, 2007), "NATO's International Security Role in the Terrorist Era", *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 34-66;
16. Daalder, Ivo, "After the Strategic Concept: Towards a NATO version 3.0", *DIIS Report*, No. 6;
17. Fierke, Karin M. (2004), "World or Worlds? The Analysis of Content and Discourse", *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1; pp. 36-39;
18. Finnemore, Martha; Sikkink Kathryn, (2001) "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Programme in International Relations and Comparative Politics", *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 4; pp. 391-416;
19. Flockhart, Trine, (2010), *NATO and the (Re)constitution of Role: "Self", "We" and "Other"*, *DIIS Report*, No. 4;
20. Flockhart, Trine, Kristensen Kristian Soby, (2008) "NATO and Global Partnerships: To Be Global or To Act Globally", *DIIS Report*, No. 7;
21. Foucault, Michel, (1993), "About the Beginnings of the Hermeneutics of the Self: Two Lectures at Dartmouth", *Political Theory*, 1993, Vol. 21, No. 1; pp. 198-227;
22. Frost, Michael, (2013), "Discourse Stu Likes Discourse Theory. An analysis of meaning in The Simpsons as it relates to democracy", retrieved 13th of January 2014, from <http://www.snpp.com/other/papers/mf2.paper.html>;
23. Gallis, Paul (Fall 2007), "NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance", *CRS Report*, August 22nd; retrieved 14th of June 2015, from http://connections-qj.org/system/files/06.3.02_gallis.pdf;

24. Gergen, Kenneth, (1985), "The social constructionist movement in modern social psychology", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 40, No. 3, March; pp. 266–275;
25. Giannakos, Symeon, A. (2007), "NATO after 9/11: An Alliance in Continuing Decline", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No.3, Summer, pp. 104-106, Rev. of Rupp, Richard, (2006) *An Alliance in Continuing Decline*, Palgrave, New York;
26. Gilpin, Robert, (1998), "Theory of Hegemonic War", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 14, No.4; pp.591-613;
27. Gheciu, Alexandra, (2005), "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization? NATO and the 'New Europe'", *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 4; pp. 973-1012;
28. Glaser, Charles, (Summer, 1993), "Why NATO is Still the Best: Future Security Arrangements for Europe", *International Security*, Vol. 18, No.1, pp 5-50;
29. Grieco, Joseph, M., (Summer, 1998) , "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism", *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No.3, pp. 485-507;
30. Guzzini, Stefano, (2003), "Constructivism and the role of institutions in International Relations", *DIIS Report*;
31. Guzzini, Stefano, (2010) "Power Analysis: Encyclopedia Entry", *DIIS Working Paper*, No. 34;
32. Hamilton, Daniel, Barry Charles, Binnendijk Hans; Flanagan Stephen, Smith Julianne; Townsend James; (February, 2009), "Alliance Reborn: An Atlantic Compact for the 21st Century", *The Washington NATO Project*; retrieved 14th of August 2015, from [http://www.voltairenet.org/IMG/pdf/Atlantic Alliance Reborn.pdf](http://www.voltairenet.org/IMG/pdf/Atlantic_Alliance_Reborn.pdf)
33. Hehir, Aidan, (2009), "NATO's 'Humanitarian Intervention' in Kosovo: Legal Precedent or Aberration?", *Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 3, No.2;
34. Hoffman, Mark (1987), "Critical Theory and the Inter-paradigm Debate", *Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 231-250;
35. Hopf, Ted, (Summer, 1998), 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory', *International Security*, Vol. 23, No.1, pp. 171-200;

36. Jackson, Patrick T., (2003), "Defending the West: Occidentalism and the formation of NATO", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol.11, No.3, pp. 223-252;
37. Jervis, Robert, (1978), "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma", *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2; pp. 186–214;
38. Joenniemi, Pertti (2010), "The Georgian-Russian Conflict: A Turning Point?" *DIIS Working Paper*, No. 2;
39. Karabelias, Gerassmos (2009), "The Military Institution, Ataturk's Principles and Turkey's Sisyphean Quest for Democracy", *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 45, No.1, pp. 57-69;
40. Karacasulu, Nilufer; Uzgoren, Elif (Summer – Autumn 2007), "Explaining Social Constructivist Contributions to Security Studies", *Perceptions*, pp. 27-48;
41. Keohane, O. Robert; Martin, L. Lisa (Summer 1995), "The Promise of Institutional Theory" *International Security*, Vol. 20, No.1, pp.39-51;
42. Legro, Jeffrey; Moravcsik, Andrew (1999), "Is Anybody Still a Realist?", *International Organization*, Vol. 24, No.2, Fall; pp. 5-55;
43. Light, Mathew; (2010) "The Russo-Georgian War of 2008: A Conflict Announced in Advance?" *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 62, No. 9, pp 1579-1582;
44. Lugar, Richard G., (2002), "Redefining NATO's mission: Preventing WMD Terrorism" *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 3; pp. 7-13;
45. Lupovici Amir, (2011), "Methodologizing Constructivism: Modifying Methods and Criteria" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, CHICAGO, USA, March 3rd 2007*, retrieved March 13th 2015, from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p181246_index.html;
46. McCalla, Robert B. (Summer, 1996), "NATO's persistence after the Cold War", *International Organization*, Vol. 50, No.3; pp. 445-475;
47. McCoubrey, Hilaire, (1999), "Kosovo, NATO and Humanitarian Law", *International Relation*, Vol. 14, No. 5; pp. 184-206;
48. Mearsheimer, John (1994/1995), "The false promise of international institutions", *International Security*, Vol. 9 , No.3, pp. 5-49;

49. Mearsheimer, John, (1995), “A Realist Reply”, *International Security*, No. 20, pp. 82-93;
50. Mérand, Frédéric, “Pierre Bourdieu and the Birth of European Defense”, *Security Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 342— 374;
51. Michaels, Jeffrey H., (December, 2011) , “NATO after Libya”, *The RUSI Journal*, Vol. 156, No.6; pp.56-51;
52. Milliken, Jennifer, (1999), “The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.5, No.2 ; pp. 225-254;
53. Moravcsik, Andrew, (1999), “Is Something Rotten in the State of Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol.6, No.4, pp. 669-681;
54. Morelli, Vincent, Belkin Paul, (2009), “NATO in Afghanistan: A Test of the Transatlantic Alliance”, *CRS Report*, February 3rd; retrieved 24th of September 2012, from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33627.pdf>
55. Mouffe, Chantal (2008), “Critique as Counter-Hegemonic Intervention”, *Transversal multilingual webjournal*, Vienna: European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies, retrieved 24th of January 2015, from : <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0808/mouffe/en/print>;
56. Ness, Gayl D.; Brechin, Steven R., (Spring 1988), “Bridging the Gap: International Organizations as organizations”, *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 245-273;
57. Pattison, James, (2011) , “The Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention in Libya”, *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 25, No.3; pp. 271-277;
58. Peterson, John, (2004), “America as a European Power: The End of Empire by Integration?”, *International Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp. 613-629;
59. Pipe, Kennedy Caroline, Nicholas, Rengger, “Apocalypse now? Continuities or disjunctions in world politics after 9/11”, *International Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 3 ; pp. 539–552;
60. Pouliot, Vincent, (2007) “‘Subjectivism’: Toward a Constructivist Methodology”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 51, 359–384 ;

61. Price, Hyde, Adrian (2008), "A Tragic Actor? A Realist Perspective on 'Ethical Power Europe'", *International Affairs*, Vol. 84, No.1; pp. 29-44
62. Reiter, Dan, (2001), "Why NATO Enlargement does not spread democracy" *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 41-67;
63. Roudik, Peter. "Russian Federation: Legal Aspects of War in Georgia". *Library of Congress*; retrieved 11th of March 2012, from <http://www.loc.gov/law/help/russian-georgia-war.php>;
64. Ruggie, John, (1998), "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 855-885.
65. Rynning, Sten; Ringsmose Jens, (2009), "Come Home NATO?: The Atlantic Alliance's New Strategic Concept", *DIIS Report*, No. 4;
66. Sands, Phillippe, "American Unilateralism", *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)*, Vol. 96, March 13-16th ; pp.85-94;
67. Schimmelfennig, Frank (1998), "NATO enlargement: A Constructivist Explanation", *Security Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 198 - 234;
68. Schmidt, John R. (Winter, 2006-2007), "Last Alliance Standing? NATO After 9/11" *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No.1, pp. 93-106;
69. Steinfels, Margaret O'Brian, (2011) , "Hazardous Means: Libya and the Ambiguity of Humanitarian Intervention", *Commonweal*, 17th of June ;
70. Stephen, Krasner, (1976), "State Power and the Structure of International Trade," *World Politics*, Vol. 28, No. 3; pp. 317-347;
71. Suganami, Hidemi, (1983), "The Structure of Institutionalism. An Anatomy of British Mainstream International Relations", *International Relations*, Vol. 7, No.5 ; pp. 2363-2381;
72. Takle, Marianne, (2000), "NATO's Two Strategies and the Legitimization Challenge: The Baltic States, Germany and NATO's Policies in the Border Zone", *International Peace Research Institute*, Oslo ;

73. Thruelsen, Peter, D. (2007), "NATO in Afghanistan: What Lessons Are We Learning and Are We Willing to Adjust?", *DIIS Report*, No. 14;
74. Wallander, Celeste, A. (Autumn, 2000) "Institutional Assets and Adaptability: NATO after the Cold War", *International Organization* Vol. 54, No., pp. 705–735;
75. Walt, Stephen, (1985), "Alliance Formation and Balance of World Power" in *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 4; pp. 3-43;
76. Waltz, Kenneth (Fall, 1993), "The Emerging Structure of International Politics", *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 47-79;
77. Waltz, N. Kenneth, (Summer, 2000), "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *International Security*, Vol.25, No.1; pp. 3-43;
78. Webber, Mark, (2009), "NATO: The United States, Transformation and the War in Afghanistan", *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 11, No.1, pp. 46-63;
79. Wendt, Alexander (Spring, 1992), "Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics", *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No.2; 391-425;
80. Wendt, Alexander (1994), "Collective Identity Formation and the Domestic Politics", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 2; pp. 384-396;
81. Wendt, Alexander, (2003) , "Why a World State is Inevitable" in *European Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.9, No.4 ; pp. 491-542;
82. Williams, Michael C.; Neumann, Iver, N., (2000), "From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia and the Power of Identity", *Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 ; pp. 357-387;
83. Williams, Michael C., (2001), "The Discipline of the Democratic Peace: Kant, Liberalism, and the Social Construction of Security Communities", *European Journal of International Relations* Vol. 7, No. 4 ; 525–553;
84. Williams, Ellen, (2008), "Out of Area and Very Much in Business? NATO, the U.S., and the Post-9/11 International Security Environment", *Comparative Strategy*, No. 27, pp. 65-78;

85. Wolff, Andrew, T. (2009), “The structural and political crisis of NATO transformation”, *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, Vol. 7, No.4, pp. 476-492;

Official Documents:

1. NATO (1949), *The North Atlantic Treaty*, Washington D.C., 4th of April, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm;
2. NATO (1957), *Overall Strategic Concept for the Defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Area*, retrieved 18th of January 2015, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/stratdoc/eng/a570523a.pdf>;
3. NATO (1990), *London Declaration*, retrieved 23rd of June, 2014, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b900706a.htm>;
4. NATO, (1991) , *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept: Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council*, Washington D.C., retrieved 16th of May, 2011, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm;
5. NATO (1999), *The Alliance’s Strategic Concept: Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council*, Washington D.C., 24th of April, retrieved, 16th of May 2011, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm;
6. NATO (2002), “Prague Summit Declaration: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council”, 21st of November, Prague, Czech Republic, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-127e.htm>;
7. NATO (2002), “Report on the Comprehensive Review of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and Partnership for Peace”, retrieved 15th of September 2015, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_19548.htm?
8. NATO (2004), “Istanbul Declaration: Our Security in a New Era. Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council”, 28th of

- June, Istanbul, Turkey, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-097e.htm>;
9. NATO (2006), “Riga Summit Declaration: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council”, 29th of November, Riga, Latvia, retrieved 16th of May, 2011, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2006/p06-150e.htm>;
 10. NATO (2006), *Comprehensive Political Guidance. Endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government*, Riga, Latvia, retrieved 31st of July, 2014, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b061129e.html>;
 11. NATO (2006), *Comprehensive Political Guidance. Endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government*, 29th of November, Riga, Latvia, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/basicxt/b061129e.htm>;
 12. NATO (2008), “Bucharest Summit Declaration: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council”, Bucharest, Romania, retrieved 20th of August 2015, from http://www.nato.int/cps/fr/natohq/official_texts_8443.htm?selectedLocale=en;
 13. NATO (2010), *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation’ Approved by the Heads of State and Government*, Lisbon, 19th of November, retrieved 16th of May, 2011, from <http://www.nato.int/lisbon2010/strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf>;
 14. NATO (2011), “NATO and Libya: Operation Unified Protector”, retrieved 15th of August 2014, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-EFE2027E-9021C30F/natolive/topics_71652.htm;
 15. NATO (2012), “Chicago Summit Declaration: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Chicago”, retrieved 14th of February 2015, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_87593.htm?selectedLocale=en;

16. NATO (2014), “Wales Summit Declaration: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council”, retrieved 1st of October 2015, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm;
17. NATO, (2015), *A Short History of NATO*, retrieved 12th of November 2014, from <http://www.nato.int/history/nato-history.html>;
18. North Atlantic Council, *Final Communiqué*, December 19, 1991, retrieved 11th of August 2013, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911219a.htm>;
19. United Nations Security Council, *Security Council resolution 1973 [on the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya]*, 17 March 2011, retrieved, 13th of October 2014, from <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4d885fc42.html>;

Speeches, Declarations:

1. Bush, George, (2001), “Address to a joint session of Congress and the American people”, 20th of September, Washington D.C., United States; retrieved 14th of January 2015, from <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/print/20010920-8.html>
2. Bush, George, (2001), “Speech on Building Global Coalition To Fight Terrorism”, Washington D.C., United States, 19th of September; retrieved 5th of May 2015, from <http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/pubs/fs/5889.htm>;
3. Chirac, Jacques, (2002), “Speech at the 10th Ambassadors Conference”, 29th of August, 2002, retrieved 17th of June 2014, from http://www.un.int/france/documents_anglais/020829_mae_chirac_general.htm;
4. Claes, Willy, “Speech at the National Press Club”, Washington D.C., 4th of October, retrieved 10th of January, 2015, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1995/s951004a.htm>;
5. Clinton, Bill, (2002) State of the Union Address, Jan. 25, 1994, retrieved 13th of July 2015, at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/states/docs/sou94.htm> ;

6. Rasmussen Anders, Fough, (2009), “NATO Monthly Press Conference”, 2nd of December, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_59619.htm;
7. Mamoud, Yahia,, (November 2011), “Discourse Analysis: Some Present Streams”, lecture at Lund University;
8. Meyers, Reinhart, (2013), „Realism”, *Course delivered at the Faculty of European studies, Babes-Bolyai University* ;
9. Rumsfeld, Donald, “Briefing at the Foreign Press Center”, 22nd of January, 2003 retrieved 14th of October 2014, from <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=1330>;
10. Orban, Viktor, (1999), Speech at NATO’s flag raising ceremony, 16th of March; retrieved 12th of August 2015, from <http://nato.int/docu/speech/1999/s990316c.htm>;
11. Solana, Javier, (1999) “Remarks as the Accession ceremony of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland”, 16th of March, retrieved 16th of May, 2011, from http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_27621.htm;
12. Prodi, Romano, (2004) “Might and Right”, *Speech on Enlargement* delivered at Gorizia, Piazzale della Transalpina, Trieste, 30th of April; retrieved 16th of September 2014, from http://eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_3470_en.htm;
13. Scheffer, Jaap de Hoop, (2006) , “Press-conference after the Informal meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the level of Foreign Ministers”, Sofia retrieved 13th of July 2015, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2006/s060427d.htm>;
14. Schroeder, Gerhard, (2002), in Ulrich Rippert and Peter Schwarz, “German chancellor speaks against US war vs. Iraq”, *World Socialist Website*, retrieved 20th of September 2015, from <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2002/08/iraq-a12.html>;

Newspaper Articles:

1. Golvina, Maria; Georgy, Michael, (2011), “Western warplanes, missiles hit Libyan targets”, *Reuters*, 19th of March, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/03/19/us-libya-idUSTRE7270JP20110319>;
2. Havel, Vaclav, (1997), "NATO's Quality of Life," *New York Times*, May 13, retrieved 21 October, 2015, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/13/opinion/nato-s-quality-of-life.html>;
3. Pop, Valentina, (2014), “Multi-billion losses expected from Russia sanctions”, *EU Observer*, 28th of July, retrieved 16th of October 2015, from <https://euobserver.com/economic/125118>;
4. Rippert Ulrich; Schwarz Peter, (2002), “German Chancellor Speaks Against US War Vs. Iraq”, *World Socialist Web Site (wsws.org)*, 12th of August, retrieved 16th of May 2011, from http://www.lc.unsw.edu.au/onlib/ref_elec1.html#elec8;
5. “Libya: NATO assumes control of military operation”, *BBC*, 27th of March 2011, retrieved 16th of May, 2011, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12876696>;
6. “Defense minister: NATO countries start supplying weapons to Ukraine”, *Kyiv Post*, 15 September 2014, retrieved 22nd of September 2015, from <http://www.kyivpost.com/content/ukraine/defense-minister-nato-countries-start-supplying-weapons-to-ukraine-364638.html>;
7. “US and Allies strike ISIL targets in Syria”, *Al Jazeera*, , 23rd of September 2014, retrieved 27th of August 2015, from <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2014/09/us-begins-bombing-isil-positions-syria-201492313622252650.html>