



ULBS

Universitatea "Lucian Blaga" din Sibiu



Interdisciplinary Doctoral School
Doctoral field: Philology

ABSTRACT

THE POWER OF LANGUAGE AND THE LANGUAGE OF POWER

A critical discourse analysis of power dynamics
in NATO military discourse

PhD candidate:

ISABELA ANDA DRAGOMIR

Scientific coordinator:

Professor Dr. habil. **SILVIA FLOREA**



Contents of thesis.....	2
Abstract	
INTRODUCTION.....	5
<i>Background</i>	5
<i>Research aim, questions, and hypotheses</i>	6
<i>Methodology</i>	8
<i>Corpus</i>	9
OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS.....	11
CONCLUSIONS.....	19
<i>NATO@70 and beyond</i>	30
Key words.....	33
References.....	34

ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xxxiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. BACKGROUND	1
1.2. RESEARCH AIM, QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES	2
1.3. OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS	6
2. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING MILITARY COMMUNICATION	9
2.1. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORY AND METHOD	10
2.1.1. CDA – an overview	10
2.1.2. The “critical” dimension	14
2.1.3. Discourse, text and context	15
2.1.4. Three interdisciplinary approaches	18
2.2. MILITARY COMMUNICATION	21
2.2.1. Communication in the military organization	21
2.2.1.1. External influences	22
2.2.1.2. Sociological aspects	23
2.2.1.3. Psychological factors	24
2.2.2. Linguistic aspects of military communication	26
2.3. AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE CDA OF MILITARY COMMUNICATION	30
2.3.1 The concept of intertextuality	31
2.3.2 Examining language in context	33
3. IDEOLOGY, DISCOURSE AND POWER	39

3.1. FROM IDEOLOGY TO DISCOURSE	39
3.1.1. Defining ideology	40
3.1.2. The social-cognitive function of ideology	41
3.1.3. Structures of ideology and structures of discourse	43
3.1.4. Ideology and discourse processing	45
3.1.5. Ideologies as vehicles of power	47
3.2. NATO IDEOLOGY AND DISCOURSE	51
3.2.1. Professional ideology and military values	51
3.2.2. NATO ideology and doctrine	54
3.2.3. Evolution of NATO's doctrine	56
3.2.4. Discursive representations of NATO's doctrine.....	58
3.2.4.1. The Washington Treaty.....	59
3.2.4.2. The Strategic Concepts.....	62
3.3.1. Frameworks of power	71
3.3.2. Dimensions, aspects and sources of power – towards an integrative framework.....	76
4. REPRESENTATIONS OF POWER DYNAMICS IN NATO MILITARY DISCOURSE	93
4.1. BUILDING THE CORPUS	93
4.1.1. Corpus-related issues	94
4.1.2. Selecting the corpus	95
4.1.3. Sampling	96
4.2. A FLEXIBLE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	98
4.2.1. The qualitative approach	100
4.2.1.1. The social environment – NATO as an organization	102
4.2.1.2. The cognitive level – strategy as ideology	104
4.2.1.3. The discursive construction.....	109
4.2.1.3.1. Morphosyntactic elements	109

4.2.1.3.2. The military lexicon.....	110
4.2.1.3.3. The semantics of military discourse	113
4.2.2. The quantitative analysis.....	117
4.2.2.1. The model.....	117
4.2.2.2. The method.....	118
4.2.2.3. The indices	120
4.3. DIACHRONIC REPRESENTATIONS OF POWER DYNAMICS – A QUANTITATIVE APPROACH	124
5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	133
5.1. DISCURSIVE PATTERNS OF POWER RELATIONS	133
5.1.1. Integrative power – the discourse of unity.....	135
5.1.1.1. The internal multipolar balance.....	137
5.1.1.2. The external bipolar balance	161
5.1.2. Adversarial power relations – the discourse of opposition.....	183
5.1.2.1. The internal multipolar balance.....	184
5.1.2.2. The external bipolar balance	203
5.1.3. The discourse of U.S. predominant power.....	225
5.2. DRAWING IT ALL TOGETHER – THE RHETORIC OF POWER DYNAMICS IN NATO’S IDEOLOGICAL EVOLUTION	246
5.2.1. The social-cognitive interface.....	246
5.2.2. The discursive construction	252
5.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	257
WORKS CITED.....	260
BIBLIOGRAPHY	275



THE POWER OF LANGUAGE AND THE LANGUAGE OF POWER

A critical discourse analysis of power dynamics in NATO military discourse

INTRODUCTION

Background

Since the dawn of modern history, maintaining a power balance as an underlying condition for international order has been one of the most constantly pursued endeavors of humanity. Starting with the ancient Trojan War and ending with the contemporary “war on terror”, leaders all over the world, in isolation or alliance, have struggled to uphold power and play a determining role in keeping a power balance that would serve national and global interests and secure international peace and prosperity.

Against a continuously changing environment, one feature that is constant throughout recorded history is the formation of alliances, tasked with the well-defined role of pursuing goals that individual states cannot achieve on their own. Maintaining international order and keeping a global power balance while securing peace and stability is one endeavor traditionally undertaken by alliances. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) makes no exception.

The challenges that NATO (in its dimension as community of powers) has faced throughout its evolution have reshaped the concept of “balance of power” and replaced it with the more appropriate concept of “power dynamics”, so as to illustrate the continuous tendency to slide away from the notion of even distribution of power and express rather the endless shifting and regroupings of power within the Alliance. As a consequence, the “balance of power” has become a respectable and indeed indispensable part of the diplomatic lexicon, but the real object of scientific contemplation should be the concept of “power dynamics”.

Although language is not power, it encodes power. Power is embedded in the ideological workings of language and ideology is invested at all levels of language. When exploring language in the context of NATO discourse – defined here as official policies and positions assumed in text and talk at the level of the Alliance’s different planning groups, councils and committees – the investigation starts from the premise that the discussions and debates that create official documents occur against a background where forces in agreement or opposition

generate meaning negotiations between social actors invested with power, conventionally related to topics pertaining to military strategies and politics and manifested away from the public view. Nevertheless, the resulting policies are reified in open, official documents, which are invested with the role of making sense of the world and of constructing social actions in relation to everyday realities. As a result, the discourse analysis includes historical, social, cognitive, and linguistic explorations of texts, interactions and practices at local, institutional, and societal level.

Research aim, questions and hypotheses

This paper aims to discover a pattern in power dynamics at the NATO level and to confirm this pattern. I argue that, in NATO discourse, the dynamics of power manifest in a multi-layered framework. First of all, there is a level of opposition that characterizes the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, then between NATO and the Warsaw Pact states, and, after the end of the Cold War, between NATO and Russia, as well as between NATO and other state or non-state actors on the international scene. I have framed it as *external bipolar balance*, and I claim that it is typified by a specific pattern of power dynamics, primarily substantiated by ideological opposition. Secondly, there is opposition at the level of NATO as an organization, generated by the conceptual polarization between the member states in terms of doctrine and strategic concepts. I discuss this type of relations in terms of an *internal multipolar balance* framework, anchor it on the background of NATO's ideological evolution and analyze it from the perspective of the challenges brought to the American leadership in NATO (by what I characterize as medium powers within the Alliance: the United Kingdom, France and Germany) and of the dynamics of the relations between these powers. Such an approach has proven extremely helpful in locating the patterns of power most prevalent in NATO military discourse. Accordingly, of the varieties of power typically deployed in discourse, I have selected three emergent types on which to base the ideological-driven analysis: adversarial, integrative and predominant power.

The research question that draws all these premises together is framed as follows. **How are power dynamics operationalized through language in NATO discourse?** Given the complexity of the framework in which power dynamics are examined, the main research question has been detailed into three secondary research questions:

SRQ1: What kind of power rhetoric is employed to ensure cooperation both within the Alliance and with external actors?

SRQ2: How is internal and external opposition materialized in NATO military discourse?

SRQ3: What kind of discursive patterns of power does the United States use in order to assert its (pre)dominant role in NATO?

In order to address these research questions, I have formulated three hypotheses that frame the notion of power and thematize the linguistic investigation:

1. The rhetoric of integrative power has kept the Alliance coherent and cohesive under the umbrella of common values, granting the success of NATO's enduring role in international security. The validity of this assertion has been explored by looking at discourse strands of integrative power, in the framework of external bipolar relations and of NATO's internal structure.

2. NATO is the most powerful alliance in history and, in addition to action, it has fought opposition through the use of language. This hypothesis has been evaluated through an analysis of discursive manifestations of adversarial power relations in both the external bipolar balance and the internal multipolar balance frameworks.

3. When the internal power balance tilts, it does so in favor of the United States, in virtue of its predominance in NATO. The hypothesis that the United States has a predominant role in NATO rests on the discursive materialization of three types of power: referent, expert and legitimate.

In order to offer a more comprehensive account of how power dynamics are represented in NATO discourse, I have also conducted a quantitative research, aimed at validating the qualitative analysis and at supplementing it with statistically reliable and generalizable results. Approached from a statistical entry point, the main research question generated a fourth secondary interrogation:

SRQ4: How are the concepts of integrative and adversarial power linguistically operationalized in NATO discourse between 1949 and 2018?

The theory that informs this supplementary investigation produced a fourth work hypothesis:

4. The operationalization of the concepts of integrative and adversarial power has suffered discursive modifications visible in NATO documents produced during the Cold War and in the years after the end of the Cold War.

Methodology

The link between language and power provides the point of departure for the elaboration of a systemic method of interpretation. For the qualitative analysis, the methodology used in this paper relies heavily on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an investigative approach aimed at analyzing the causes and effects of different social and political issues, by offering a detailed account of the relationships that exist between text, talk, society, power and ultimately ideology. Military policies, as the main object of investigation, can be better understood by analyzing the various issues of a community, as well as the language and the texts that express them.

A flexible paradigm of analysis, CDA involves a shift of perspective. Language is no longer seen as an abstract construct, but becomes an instrument that carries the meaning of what is being said under specific historical, social and political conditions. This particular methodology has been selected with the aim of systematically exploring interconnections between discursive practices, events and texts, and wider social organizational structures, the relations within and outside them and the processes associated with them. A further investigation will also reveal how such practices, events and texts are ideologically molded by relations of power and power dynamics. In addition to describing the relationship between texts, interactions and social practices, CDA is used here to understand the structure of discourse practices and then combine description and interpretation in order to explain why and how power dynamics and the discourses associated with them are constituted and manifested the way they are. Starting from the premise that discourse is socially constructed as well as socially conditioned, the main task of the present paper becomes one of understanding and revealing the social dynamics that are generated by mainstream ideology and power relations and propagated through the use of written texts.

The methodology used for the quantitative analysis stems from the investigative framework proposed by ReaderBench¹ and is based on a corpus-assisted discourse analysis that follows a number of analytical steps and depends on the automated application of specific indices.

¹ ReaderBench is a text processing framework relying on advanced Natural Language Processing techniques that encompass a wide range of text analysis modules available in a variety of languages, including English, French, Romanian, and Dutch. In the opinion of its creators, ReaderBench is the only open-source multilingual textual analysis solution that provides unified access to more than 200 textual complexity indices including: surface, syntactic, morphological, semantic, and discourse specific factors, alongside cohesion metrics derived from specific lexicalized ontologies and semantic models. (Source: ReaderBench: A Multi-lingual Framework for Analyzing Text Complexity. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319474819_ReaderBench_A_Multi-lingual_Framework_for_Analyzing_Text_Complexity [accessed 28 August 2018]).

Corpus

The majority of the analyzed documents have been retrieved from NATO's online archives. The selection of the corpus was based on several criteria: the time span chosen for the analysis (70 years), the comprehensive collection of documents (over 1000), the size and accessibility of the archives (some of which are outdated or contain missing links), and the topical variety of the texts (over 25 thematic categories and more than 150 topics).

Both the qualitative and the quantitative analysis have adopted an intertextual reading of the materials, which focused on how texts relate to other texts by simultaneously constructing legitimacy for discursive re-presentation and re-interpretation. I have dedicated much of the research to identifying patterns among different interventions across a timeline, and therefore intertextuality here allows for a better documentation of how different discourses of power relate to each other.

The empirical material used as basis for the analysis is primarily composed of NATO official documents resulted from 114 Ministerial Meetings (63 at the level of the Ministers of Defence and 51 at the level of Foreign Ministers) and 30 Summits, which occurred between 1949 and 2018. I chose to investigate this type of texts in an attempt to locate specific communicative events through which official actors use language to express power. The timeframe that covers the studied material starts with the Washington Treaty, the document that reified the military ideology of the emerging military organization that became the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 and ends in the present, with the latest NATO Summit, in July 2018. The timespan covered is of almost seventy years, an extensive period which has yielded a collection of approximately 1000 documents, in the form of Strategic Concepts, Final Communiqués, Declarations, Statements, Plans, Basic Texts, Official Texts etc.

All the identified documents have been manually introduced in a table containing the temporal and spatial references of the communicative event (date and place of the Summits and Ministerial Meetings) and a list of all the public texts produced on these occasions, with the official title of the documents and a hyperlink that traces them back to the virtual space where they were originally published (NATO's official site/online archives).

Secondary data is composed of a number of 100 speeches, addresses, statements, press conferences and articles, collected from mainstream newspapers and magazines (*Chicago Tribune*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, *The Economist*, *The New York Times*, *Foreign Policy*, *Foreign Affairs*, *International Affairs*, *International Herald Tribune*) or official sources such as the Department of State Bulletins (DOSB), Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) or United States Information Service (USIS). Although these texts

are not necessarily analyzed using a methodical discourse analysis framework, they were used as references and discussed with the aim of reflecting and clarifying the historical, political and social context that generated the discourses in the main corpus.

However, given the magnitude of the collection of both primary and secondary source documents, I have selected only texts that emerged as relevant for the analysis of power dynamics. Starting from the premise that context is of paramount importance, especially when conducting a three-level critical discourse analysis (social, cognitive, and linguistic), I have first established key events on the timeline and supplemented the diachronic approach with the synchronicity generated by simultaneous discourses.

The relevant examples were selected on the basis of topical categories, assembled after running keyword searches and extracting sets of key items that occurred with a relevant frequency. From these categories, pertinent samples have been carefully chosen in relation to the social, political and historical context which generated them and used in the paper so as to illustrate the patterns that constitute the common thread in each type of discourse. These emerged as belonging to three categories of power relations: adversarial, integrative and predominant, exemplified in as many discourse strands.

More specifically, for the qualitative analysis, the discourse of power relations investigated in this chapter has been exemplified in detail by a sample of 70 primary sources, drawn from a comprehensive collection of 76 documents published after Summits and 606 official texts resulted from Ministerial Meetings. The specific discourses have been collected in multiple “discourse strands”, each branching out into topical threads, subsequently analyzed as specific subcorpora, composed of the discourses they are part of or linked to thematically. The discourse of unity is constructed on the concept of integrative or relational power; the discourse of opposition illustrates the dynamics of adversarial power relations; the discourse strand of U.S. predominant power pivots on manifestations of America’s referent, expert and legitimate power in NATO discourse. Each discourse strand is then split off in a number of topical threads, assembled on thematic and lexical bases, yielding 32 examples for the discourse strand of unity, 30 discourse samples for the discourse strand of opposition, and 33 illustrative documents for the discourse strand of U.S. predominant power (primary sources and secondary data). The discourse strands have been treated as separate communicative entities; however, they are often invested with more than one type of power relations. Furthermore, the topical threads overlap at times, meaning that themes such as nuclear issues, NATO enlargement, or terrorism have been approached from distinctive positions of power, either adversarial or integrative, or both.

Although the corpus is monogeneric, the quantitative investigation was aimed at offering a contrastive comparison of the manner in which the concepts of integrative and adversarial power were lexically and semantically operationalized before and after the end of the Cold War, a moment that is considered a cornerstone in the ideological evolution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The quantitative analysis pivots on the study of integrative and adversarial power. In the case of the two types of power under examination, the discourses were again categorized on a timeline, according to two time periods: 1949-1990 and 1991-2018. The application of these criteria generated a corpus of 184 texts: 106 documents for integrative power (40 before and 66 after the end of the Cold War) and 78 documents for adversarial power (41 pre- and 37 post-Cold War).

Overview of the chapters

This thesis examines the problem of power as a construct in communicative theories and the way in which it relates to and is constituted by NATO discourse. By way of an extended example, it investigates the way in which the dynamics of three types of power (integrative, adversarial and predominant) impact on social, political, and military relationships between the members of the North Atlantic Organization and between the Alliance and external actors. The linguistic examination is grounded on the use of critical discourse analysis, discussed both as theory and as a method, unfolding from general to particular, from abstract conceptualizations to empirical discussions throughout the five chapters of the paper.

Chapter I functions as the introductory part of the thesis, anchoring the topic of power and power dynamics in the broader (military) context in which NATO is the pivotal security organization whose linguistic evolution is analyzed throughout the paper. The introductory chapter also announces the central research question, which is subsequently deconstructed into several qualitative and quantitative secondary research questions and their corresponding work hypotheses.

Chapter II advances a theoretical discussion of CDA, the method selected for the linguistic investigation of the targeted NATO discourses. The relevance of this method is grounded on theories and models of representation stemming from renowned experts' outstanding contributions in the field of discourse analysis. Starting from Norman Fairclough's dialectical-relational approach, focused on language, ideology and power, moving through Teun A. Van Dijk's three-dimensional socio-cognitive discourse analysis which

incorporates discourse, socio-cognition, and social analysis, and adding the final touch by employing Ruth Wodak's historical perspective, the second chapter discusses the implications of using CDA as a critical tool for studying discourse, text and context. The object of investigation, i.e. military communication, is given a broad definition, typified by organizational practices and also by specific linguistic features, all of which are continuously transforming under the challenging developments of the current security environment. Accelerating towards a clear and specific linguistic analysis of the targeted discourse, this chapter also proposes a theoretical framework for the CDA of military communication, informed by the convergence of intertextuality, criticality, and ideology.

The theoretical merit of this chapter is the proposition of a flexible analytical framework to be applied to the investigation of military discourse in particular. I have advanced a hybrid model of CDA, resulted from the triangulation of the three approaches detailed at the beginning of this chapter. I strongly believe that it would prove relevant for this study to analyze military discourses which promote (new) values, beliefs, attitudes and ideologies, which underpin and explicate the importance, role and purpose of the military organization, against the socio-political background of the events that generate them. The discovered salient features of the discourses have been intertwined in the form of discourse strands, organized around a nexus of collective ideological stereotypes that have been dissected from a diachronic perspective, with the aim of identifying the characteristics of simultaneous discourses, while paralleling their similarities and differences. The method proposed here synchronically and diachronically integrated Wodak's historical approach into Fairclough's three-dimensional analytical framework that marries text, talk and discourse under the umbrella of social practice. Complementary to these methods, the application of Van Dijk's analysis of macrostructures, formal structures, local meanings, local discourse forms, specific linguistic realizations, and context has forayed deeper into the layers of the military discourse, trying to identify the relevant elements defining the relationship between cognition and discourse. The findings of the investigation have subsequently been interpreted in terms of Van Dijk's sociocognitive theory of social representations, in an attempt to identify the concepts, ideas, attitudes, beliefs, and images that are prevalent in military discourse from the perspective of ideology and which are relevant for locating specific instances illustrating the dynamics of power within the military organization.

Chapter III conceptualizes the most important elements of the nexus that espouses ideology, power and discourse. The theory of ideology put forward here is articulated on the basis of a structured approach connecting discourse and power, represented as elements of the

same social construct. Approached from a tripartite perspective, the notion of “ideology” is interpreted from cognitive, social and discursive angles, a triangulation that converges towards a multidisciplinary delineation of the term.

One of the most essential attributes of this chapter is the establishment of a conceptual bridge between ideologies and power, mainly underpinned by the Gramscian theory which inherently locates power in ideology. I postulate that this theory explicitly applies to the military organization, seen as the locus of the legitimate manifestation of hegemonic power. As essential elements of the ideology specific to the military as a community of practice, power relations and power dynamics are inherited in virtue of the organizational culture, as an unchallenged status-quo which identifies the military institution, and are non-judgmentally absorbed by means of informal and formal education (military high schools, academies, workplace environment, society, mass media, family).

Based on Foucault’s (1980) description of power, which, in the author’s view, “must be analyzed as something which circulates [... and] is never localized here and there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization.” (p. 96), the second section of this chapter channels the overarching theorization of the ideology of power towards its manifestations at the level of NATO as an organization. The link between NATO ideology and discourse has been analyzed in detail, with particular emphasis on the manner in which the Alliance’s doctrine has been operationalized in the language of the most important NATO documents: The Washington Treaty, the Alliance’s founding document; and the seven Strategic Concepts that cover the three distinct periods that required the adaptation of the Alliance’s strategic thinking during the Cold War period, in the immediate post-Cold War period and after 9/11.

In order to better explain and locate the ideology of power within the framework of NATO, this chapter has examined different dimensions of power, as historically defined in specialized literature, and achieved an informed transition from the general ideology of power to specific representations of power in NATO discourse. Different dimensions, aspects and sources of power have been identified at the intersection between military ideology and discourse: Kenneth Boulding’s three-dimensional model of threat, love and exchange power; Justin Anderson’s and Jeffrey Larsen’s approach to power as deterrence, a concept widely embraced by NATO’s nuclear strategic concept; Machiavelli’s extreme view of power as violence; John R.P. French’s and Bertram Raven’s epistemological dimension which places knowledge at the core of power, with its subsequent derivations into legitimate, referent and expert power, an

extremely relevant taxonomy for the deconstruction of military policies and prescribed strategies and also one that accounts for the United States' pivotal role within the Alliance.

The theoretical discussions of the different types of power analyzed in this chapter provided both the context and the conceptual instruments for the identification of three particular types of power whose manifestations are illustrative for the dynamics influencing and generating either the cohesion or the division of the North Atlantic Organization: integrative, adversarial, and predominant.

For NATO, relational power can be defined as one's ability to influence specific bilateral or multilateral relationships. The dynamics of relational power as manifested in NATO discourse can be seen as a concert of forces which serve several purposes:

- ✓ They shape and control the security environment both within NATO and outside it;
- ✓ They generate a unified vision of common values and security objectives;
- ✓ They maintain and nurture internal and external cohesion.

I may assert that, in the context of our analysis, adversarial power would translate as opposing attitudes and viewpoints and the legitimacy of such manifestations inside the Alliance (between members states who have often displayed antagonistic stances before reaching consensus) and, more explicitly, between NATO and external entities, in such contexts where the Alliance has opposed the courses of action taken by different states or actors (the USSR, Russia, terrorist organizations).

The discussion about predominant power can start from an axiomatic principle: the greater the basis for power, the greater the power. This theory could explain the source of the United States' status as a superpower worldwide and leading power in the Alliance. Especially in regards to NATO and the United States, legitimate, expert and referent power are the broadest in range. They function so as to endorse the influence of the North Atlantic Organization in relation to other security institutions, but also to fundament the authority exercised by the United States within the Alliance. Finally, the more legitimate the source of power, the less resistance it produces. This hypothesis accounts for the Americans' being at the leadership of the Alliance since its early history, prescribing doctrine and fixing strategies and concepts both in discourse and in practice, while the other NATO powers followed their lead. However, throughout the history of the Alliance, the leadership of the United States has often been challenged, and it is this opposition that has generated the dynamic and fluctuant pattern of relations between NATO member countries.

By and large, this chapter was dedicated to articulating a theory of ideology in relation to the notion of discourse, approached from cognitive, social and linguistic perspectives. It also sought to offer a clear conceptualization of the notion of power, and to adapt the general theories about power to the specificities of NATO as a military organization.

Chapter IV is composed of three distinct sections that converge towards a rich and ample linguistic analysis of NATO power discourses. It encompasses a discussion of the corpus and the issues related to selecting and sampling, and specifically defines the analytical framework that has informed both the qualitative and the quantitative analysis, with particular emphasis on the method and the instruments used during both the critical and the statistical investigation.

The second section of this chapter reiterates the importance of a systemic and flexible method of analyzing military discourse. The multidimensional approach used for the selection and location of the discourse of power in NATO official communication was initially drawn from Van Dijk's three-level framework that connects ideologies and language from the socio-cognitive perspective. The first level is a socially-anchored investigation of the organizational structures within NATO (members, governments, ministries, and NATO committees: the Nuclear Planning Group, the Defense Planning Committee, and the North Atlantic Council), the dynamics of their interaction (consensus, opposition, hegemony, predominance) and the shared characteristics (identity, tasks, goals, norms, positions, resources); the second level – strategy as ideology – is a cognitive-driven exploration of the values (unity, solidarity, partnership, cooperation) and the ideologies of the military organization; finally, the third level is dedicated to the discursive analysis of military documents, by investigating specific structures of text and talk (syntactic constructions, semantic structures, pragmatics, formal and informal patterns, logic and composition of the discourse).

The section dedicated to the diachronic analysis of military discourse aims to supplement the critical interpretation by providing statistically reliable and generalizable results. Designed as a cohesion-based discourse analysis, the chosen model is based on the ReaderBench multilingual framework and facilitated the identification of the textual interconnection that enabled the selection of discourse strands constructed on the basis of topical and semantic coherence at various levels. The model functions on the basis of a multi-layered approach consisting of three types of nodes: a central node (the document that represents the entire reading material); blocks (a generic entity that can reflect paragraphs from the initial text); and sentences, the main units of analysis, seen as collections of words

and grammatical structures obtained after the initial processing. This model proved relevant for the quantitative investigations in virtue of its focus on topic-based coherence. Topics, identified as being the key concepts relevant for the discourse, are essential in facilitating a general perspective on the cognitive interface, but also in observing emerging points of interest or shifts of focus within discourse threads. The extraction of the topics from a specific discourse is underpinned by different elements of the analysis and is conducted at different levels (the entire document or separate paragraphs). The relevance of the concepts inherent in the analyzed discourse is discovered by identifying semantic similarities at the level of paragraphs or fragments of text (local coherence) or throughout the entire document (global coherence).

For the present quantitative analysis, more than 800 complexity indices, including all word-list indices, were generated using ReaderBench framework. The most relevant are:

- ✓ *surface indices*, measuring the form of the text (word length, paragraph length and sentence length, measured in terms of number of characters, words or unique words; number of sentences and paragraphs; number of commas per sentence and paragraph; number of unique content words per sentence and paragraph; word entropy. The underlying assumption for the interpretation of this category is that the more diverse concepts a text contains, the more complex the text is;
- ✓ *syntactic and morphologic indices*, calculated at word and sentence level, which analyzed the morphological values of words (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs, conjunctions, prepositions) and the types of dependencies that typify their relation. An increased number of specific semantic dependencies or a higher maximum depth indicate a more complex discourse structure, yielding increased textual complexity;
- ✓ *word complexity indices*, focusing on the complexity of words at document, paragraph and sentence levels, analyzed according to various individual word complexity measures (mean syllable count per word: longer, more complex words tend to be perceived as being more difficult; mean polysemy count per word: words with multiple senses are more difficult and require more contextual information for disambiguation; average and maximum distance within the hypernym tree to the ontology root: more general words are closer to the root, whereas more specific words tend to have a longer path; differences between the inflected form, the lemma and the stem: words with longer prefixes and suffixes tend to be more complex).

- ✓ *semantic cohesion indices*, mostly focusing on the usage of diverse types of connectives and transitions (temporal, addition, contrast, opposition, condition, concession, reason and purpose, cause and effect etc.), on the complexity and length of lexical chains, and on different layers of cohesion (inter-/intra- paragraphs, paragraph-document, start-middle, middle-end, start-end). These indices were extremely instrumental in identifying and explaining interconnection, intertextuality, consistency and uniformity of ideas, notions, concepts and cognitive elements that characterize discourse strands and validate their categorization;
- ✓ *entity-density features*, measuring the manner in which the number of entities within a text influences the cognitive resources needed for their understanding. Named entities introduce conceptual information required for contextualizing the content of a document. Computing counts of unique or repeated entities helps evaluate the degree of comprehensibility of a text, given that the larger the number of unique entities (per paragraph or sentence), the more complex the text is.

In sum, chapter IV offers an ample and comprehensive investigation of NATO discourse and a better understanding of the manner in which language can become a tool for the expression of power and of how discourses can be constructed to express ideologies and doctrines that ultimately shape and reflect social and political realities.

Under the heading “Results and Discussions”, Chapter V is the most comprehensive portion of the entire paper and embodies the contribution I aspire to bring to the (so-far limited) investigations of NATO discourse. It mainly pivots around a rich and ample linguistic analysis of NATO power discourses and draws together the discoveries of the qualitative and the quantitative investigation, with particular emphasis on the rhetoric of power dynamics throughout NATO’s ideological evolution from two perspectives: social-cognitive and discursive. It also connects back to the introductory part of the paper through the validation of the research hypotheses, while emphasizing the dimension of NATO’s power discourse as a relevant example of institutional communication.

Integrated within Wodak’s historical approach, the undertaken analysis was centered on a two-directional timeline that has scrutinized military discourse both synchronically and diachronically (Reisigl and Wodak 2009). Following the concept of “context” proposed by Rheindorf and Wodak (2017), I have considered: (1) the immediate language or text and the internal co-text (specific NATO documents, Final Communiqués from Ministerial Meetings and Summits); (2) the intertextual and interdiscursive link between utterances, texts, and

discourses (reformulations, recontextualizations); (3) the external social and political variables that create the specific situational context (the chronology of events); and (4) the larger sociopolitical and historical context in which the discursive practices are rooted and to which they are connected (the evolution of NATO's ideology and strategies throughout the 70 years).

The practical section of the chapter is dedicated to the discussion generated by the analysis of power dynamics in military discourse and is aimed at locating, identifying, explaining discursive patterns of power relations, by discovering intertextual references that validate the existence of a communicative pattern representative for these discourses. The analytical approach discussed in this section focuses on lexicalizations of the concepts of opposition, unity, and dominance and singles out the intertextual connections that condense discursive materializations of power dynamics. A summary of the historical, political, and social context that generated the investigated documents is interlocked with a linguistic analysis of the identified discourse strands.

This section looks at three patterns of power, embedded in three types of discourses: adversarial – the discourse of opposition, integrative – the discourse of unity, and dominant – the discourse of U.S. predominance. The first two types of power and the discourse associated with them were analyzed from two perspectives: the multipolarity typifying the relations between the members of the Alliance and the bipolarity opposing NATO and external actors. The third type of power attributed to the United States' predominance in NATO is discussed through the lens of the American unilateralism and multilateralism, as reflected in U.S. external policies, and implicitly, in its discourse and position within the Alliance.

The discussion of the qualitative analysis starts with a summary of the historical context in which the investigated documents were issued as strands in the discourse of power, then provides a description of their more immediate context and finally explains and interprets the language deployed in the formulation of the texts. This methodological *mélange* allows tracing the salient features of discourse along a chronological evolution of relevant events and the communicative instruments associated with them. The conceptual analysis is supplemented by a language-focused investigation aimed at exploring the manner in which the syntactic, morphological, lexical, and semantic fields of power have changed in a particular type of discourse during the investigated period. I have chosen to conduct a context-sensitive analysis due to the fact that such an approach strongly relies on the multilayered representation and definition of context, whose understanding is essential in decoding the effect of varying sociopolitical conditions (the immediate and historical context)

on the dynamics of power relations, illustrated through a comprehensive examination of appropriate texts.

The final thoughts of the entire thesis predict more challenging developments in the future of the Alliance and open new avenues for further linguistic forays into NATO documents, which are, beyond any shred of doubt, generous enough to generate additional stimulating results worth examining by linguists and not only.

CONCLUSIONS

The approach undertaken in this paper was informed by a three-level analysis of NATO official documents, grounded in the examination of the social, cognitive and linguistic levels of discourse, with stress on the relationship between language and power.

The socio-cognitive interface

The critical investigation of NATO discourses from a social and cognitive perspective has allowed for the identification of several distinct periods in the Alliance's evolution, each characterized by specific – sometimes different and other times overlapping – power dynamics.

In its early years (1949-1955), the U.S.-European partnership that the newly emerged NATO represented was not so much about shared values, but mostly based on an edgy dependence on a superpower, as the war devastated countries of Western Europe were largely reliant on the United States in terms of both economic and military security. It is only in the next decade that the notions of “community”, “partnership” and “functional cooperation” will be employed so as to help the transatlantic nations converge towards one another.

Between 1956-1966, a rigid application of the concept of interdependence, by which the United States assumed expert power and attempted to dictate the terms of partnership and responsibility produced the opposite effect. It resulted in the alienation of France and the loss of a powerful actor to support U.S. political and strategic conceptions across the Alliance. Kennedy's plan for the establishment of an integrated Atlantic Community under U.S. leadership proved incompatible with the initially declared postwar U.S. objective of a strong and united Western Europe. As a consequence, the strict emphasis on the rhetoric of unity limited the United States' ability to exert its sanctional power on intractable allies and offered the European nations a chance to assert their own will and interests, thus challenging the dynamics of power instituted by the Americans in their favor.

The years between 1967-1975 were characterized by the pursuit of a policy of *détente*, which only succeeded to undercut the very rationale behind the creation of NATO and, instead of installing harmony and concord within the Alliance, opened the door for divergent attitudes among the member states. With the advantages of a *détente* policy notwithstanding, the rhetoric of NATO would return, in the next decade, to the initial ideological agenda that has opposed East and West and further polarized the two worlds by depicting the Soviets as the personification of evil and the Alliance as the embodiment of human values, an organization embarked in a never-ending crusade against communism.

Between 1976-1985, the conceptual focus of the Alliance shifted from its initial purpose – protection against the Soviet invasion – to issues such as arms race, peace movement and engagement in areas beyond NATO's primary range of action. The preceding period of *détente* had broken the Iron Curtain and effaced the previously clear distinction between East and West. In the absence of a real enemy in the East, and while rhetoric struggled hard to create an adversary with the help of the vehement lexicon of the Anglo-American discourse, NATO's cohesion seemed to have been weakened. In an attempt to solve this apparent crisis, the Alliance invigorated itself conceptually, posing into a peace movement, an ideological diversion meant to redirect public attention away from the arms buildup. NATO also assumed a cooperative dimension, acting as a forum for consultation fostering a collective approach to out-of-area issues. Unity was still brittle, but the balance of power within the Alliance was restored. With Mikhail Gorbachev assuming power in the Soviet Union in March 1985, NATO was now faced with an ideological dilemma. This new leader, in Margaret Thatcher's words, seemed a man with whom the West could do business and established himself as a determined reformer who sought not confrontation, but cooperation. This conceptual change challenged the dynamics of power in Europe and in NATO in the following decade.

The decade 1986-1996 is typified by the end of the Cold War. Since inception, NATO was endowed with the ideological power and values of the West. Before the Cold War, and under U.S. guidance, NATO strove to promote a conception of pan-European security inherently linked to the interests of the Americans to act as a counterattraction to the communist ideology. Although the end of the Cold War anticipated the configuration of a continent no longer split by ideological confrontation, it did not automatically generate an era of peace and stability. Despite of the fact that the security environment in Western Europe improved drastically, the collapse of communism unbridled new dynamics in some areas of post-Cold War Eastern Europe. Nationalist conflicts, ethnic rivalries, and territorial disputes resurfaced, creating enclaves of violence and instability in the states of the former Soviet

Union and Yugoslavia. Throughout these happenings, the Alliance demonstrated its remarkable power by perpetuating and reinventing itself through rhetoric and new conceptions. The following events showed that for NATO, the United States and the member states who invested the Alliance with their loyalty and trust, there was life after threat.

Although in the late 1990s NATO was able to address a wide specter of initiatives, ranging from adopting a new Strategic Concept tailored to enable out-of-area actions, to enhancing partnership through a continuous enlargement plan, the Alliance seemed to lack cohesion and constancy in the years between 1997 and 2000. With Russia and China opposing the Kosovo intervention, the allies had to bend to these two countries' wishes and intervene in the absence of a UNSC mandate. This move opened the debate for legitimacy and started to shape a new paradigm of humanitarian actions, which was slowly replacing the law of nations with a new model of collective security grounded on the idea of individual rights. The two schools of thought which opposed the European allies – who were strong believers in the idea that coalitions must be steered by shared principles and have UN support – and the U.S. – believing that coalitions are guided by risk-related interests and therefore not limited by principles – finally reached a compromising view in the formulation of the 1999 Strategic Concept. Bluntly put, NATO had to adapt to a new coalition model or perish. With the Americans at the lead, the Alliance started to implement the change, while confronting an emergent competitor – the EU – which, for many actors on the European political scene, was a more fitting instrument for the implementations of the new sorts of security missions.

The events in the period 2001-2009 showcased NATO as a renewed Alliance that accepted the transatlantic bargain between the European allies and the United States. According to this design, NATO became an instrument for the Europeans to help them build on the ability to cooperate with the United States and obtain improved capabilities. However, the configuration of the international scene as set by external events, particularly located and related to the Middle East proved divisive for the member states of the Alliance. The argument is grounded in a combination of geopolitical and social factors that made Europe politically, religiously and demographically vulnerable and exposed in ways that the United States was not. Hence, Europeans were in their right to reject a possible gradual Islamization of Europe.

Throughout the discussed period, there were several cases when the allied countries were in agreement and where points of view converged despite the sometimes-edgy political relations. Nonetheless, there were some points on which NATO members disagreed, but, as long as the two sides of the Atlantic did not directly harm each other's interest, it was only

natural that they had different standpoints regarding the purpose of the Alliance, especially given that the new NATO was built on two pillars: one ideological - an abstract sense of collective fate, and the other one practical - a concrete sense of what needed to be done. While the ideology was commonly accepted and shared among the members of the Alliance, the practical part was what generated most disagreements. Despite the ebbs and flows characterizing the relations between the allies during this period, the most important take away from the Alliance's experiences is the concept of "unity in flexibility", which allowed different allies to provide military assistance at various levels of engagement and in different geographical settings. It is noteworthy to mention that the allies were willing to reach an understanding, thus preventing the Alliance from breaking apart at a crucial moment. The ideological "glue" binding the allies together was the belief that "Muslim totalitarianism" generated a "war between liberalism and the apocalyptic and phantasmagorical movements that have risen up against civilization since the calamities of the First World War" (Berman 2003:183).

The period after 2010 until the present is delineated by two strategic landmarks: the latest Strategic Concept (Lisbon, 2010) and the recent NATO Summit (Brussels, 2018). The reconfiguration of NATO's doctrine in 2010 was aimed at adapting the Alliance to an ever-evolving security environment, while remaining faithful to the traditional values and strategic objectives: collective defense, crisis management and cooperative security.

However, as the world is experiencing a power transition from a unipolar to a multipolar order, characterized not so much by "the decline of the West" but by "the rise of the Rest", the new configuration of international diplomacy has transformed the existing institutions of global governance into irrelevant institutions. Against this background, NATO's relevancy is increasingly questioned while Europe is making attempts to disengage from the western part of the Atlantic Treaty Organization. The constitution of an EU army, the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), has already been agreed upon by 25 (of the 28) European Union member states whose vote is motivated by the need to reduce Europe's traditional reliance on NATO. While the extent of the EU military cooperation remains unclear, PESCO's initial purpose is to create a framework for increased collaboration and more efficient spending of military funds in Europe. The initiative has generated a split between Europe and the United States, and while France and Germany show total support for a European army, NATO itself considers that PESCO will strengthen the Alliance and might even prove beneficial for the Americans. Future developments in the balance of global and European power will definitely shed some light on the uncertainties generated by this debated initiative.

Outside NATO's traditional framework, the balance of power was radically shaken by the 2014 Russian annexation of Crimea. This move resulted in the dissolution of the NATO-Russian Council and in the freezing of all open cooperation mechanisms between NATO and Russia. Russia's annexation of the Crimean Peninsula was labeled "illegal and illegitimate" by the Alliance, a characterization that has remained valid until now. All practical civilian and military cooperation between NATO and Russia is currently suspended and the subsequent evolutions of the tense situation between the two countries have prompted security experts and politicians to fear a return to the Cold War. The apprehensions regarding the re-emergence of tensions between the two super powers are also fueled by President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the INF Treaty signed between Gorbachev and Reagan in 1987.

In what concerns the U.S. predominant power in NATO, it is cogent to conclude that the preponderant American influence does not mean and has never meant that the United States is able to put forward and push through any proposal, however unpopular or implausible. As an equal member of the Alliance, the United States needs support for its position, which materializes during consultations with the other allies. In virtue of the values NATO stands for, decisions have to be unanimous and there is no room for dissension in the Alliance's rhetoric. This practice is even more crucial as it represents the backbone that sustains the cohesion and effectiveness of NATO. The Alliance has traditionally served as an instrument for consultation and for the development of a common approach to deal with matters of international security and the discourse produced by and associated with the Alliance has always been framed so as to express clear ideas, realistic objectives, achievable missions and ultimately a strong image of NATO as an international organization. Despite the many internal ebbs and flows in the Alliance's development, NATO's usefulness has not been hindered. It continues to provide reassurance, to serve as a provider of services for the "coalition of the willing" and become a "legitimizer" for such coalitions in the absence of a UN mandate.

The analyzed discourses have demonstrated that, in its seventy years of history, NATO has ideologically evolved into an alliance "at two levels". In the background, we have seen the traditional rhetoric of the 1949: a general commitment to the core values of the Alliance: mutual assistance, common defense, collective security. In the foreground, and increasingly visible nowadays, we are dealing with an enlarged and looser NATO, serving as a broad framework for occasional joint action but more often for the "coalition of the willing". Regardless of the many facets the organization might have taken during its evolution, one aspect remains undisputed: NATO has created something better than just a "balance of

power”. It succeeded to create a “community of powers” composed of like-minded states pursuing common goals: collective defense and cooperative security. Woodrow Wilson’s attempt to create a balance of power system in the form of the League of Nations in the aftermath of WWI may have failed at the time due to a number of reasons, but I postulate that the essential cause was the lack of unity and coherence, albeit not ideological, but definitely discursive. What NATO has achieved throughout its evolution and despite the numerous crises it has undergone is largely due, as this paper has attempted to demonstrate, to the power of language and to the rhetoric of unity and relational power that have glued the whole of the Euro-Atlantic community around a common security culture. Concepts such as “dividing lines”, “buffer zone” or “spheres of influence” have one by one been debunked and sent to the dustbin of history while NATO emerged as an increasingly strong and unified alliance. Following the same ideological thread set up by the United Nations back in 1943, NATO has reshaped the international configuration and transformed it into the world Cordell Hull had imagined seventy six years ago, a world where “there will be no longer need for spheres of influence, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests” (344).

The discursive construction

The critical discourse analysis studied three distinct discourse strands encapsulating different dynamics of power relations (integrative, adversarial and predominant). The examination was first and foremost a qualitative approach mainly focused on what makes the discourses powerful rather than on what linguistic features characterize them. The linguistic breakdown of the targeted discourses was conducted with the help of automated statistical analyses aimed at describing NATO discourse in a more measurable and quantifiable manner.

The analytical framework that informed the investigation of NATO official documents was based on a dual approach that applied both a diachronic and a synchronic examination of the discourses of power within the historical, social and political context that generated them. Moreover, frequent references to values, norms and beliefs characteristic to NATO as an organization helped recreate the theoretical nexus which espouses ideology, power and discourse and facilitated an applicative interpretation of language structures and choices within this framework. For a more structured deconstruction of discourses and subdiscourses, each strand was disjointed into topical threads which collected textual references under thematic clusters.

As illustrated in the undertaken analysis, the three examined discourse strands contain linguistic manifestations of unity, opposition and predominance. They condense and reiterate similar or opposing ideological stances; they generate and galvanize a wide range of moral values; they proliferate an abundance of linguistic elements in support for or against ideolegemes like “common values”, “human rights”, “collective security”, “cooperative defense”, or, contrarily, “terrorism”, “threat”, “crimes”, “criminal acts”, and so forth.

The analysis revealed several key moments on the timeline of events where the discourse strands intersect, indicating that the official policies over nuclear issues, enlargement, or terrorism, are indeed connected in various meaningful ways. The different frames illustrating unity and opposition have not yielded an equivalent quantity of relevant samples, with the former being far more discursively populated than the latter. However, the disparity of results whose abundance favors an extensive analysis of discourses of unity to the detriment of the more limited instances of discursive manifestations of adversarial power supports the symbolic (and discursive) value attributed to consensus and cooperation within the Alliance, contrary to the narrow emphasis placed on expressions of opposition, albeit its rather implicit existence.

The present linguistic analysis traced the presence of semantic variations that distinguish the three types of discourses of power. Despite subtle differences, mainly consisting of re-lexicalizations of constantly used concepts, all examined NATO documents share a number of commonalities. First of all, they are typified by an unpretentious and straightforward syntax. Complicated structures are avoided, sentences are typically simple and there are only few occasions when relations of subordination are used as a syntactic linchpin in the structuration of longer paragraphs. Secondly, an examination of verb semantics illustrate powerful attitudes and beliefs, most frequently embedded in predicative constructions containing modal auxiliaries (e.g. “must”, “should”, “have to”) or communicated through the use of performative speech acts endowed with illocutionary and perlocutionary force to express necessity (e.g. “stress the need”, “urge”), volition and decision (repetitions of the modal value of “will”, “are determined”, “reiterate their determination”, “are resolved”), rejection and condemnation (e.g. “reject”, “condemn”), congratulations (e.g. “express our appreciation”, “applaud”, “salute”) or warnings (e.g. “must not”, “should not”). The dynamics of these formulations support the assessment that the Alliance is a living organism, a dynamic entity constantly concerned with transmitting powerful pro-active messages to both allies and adversaries and relentlessly exercising authority through the use of language to duplicate the use of military might.

In what concerns the dynamics of adversarial power, the analysis of NATO public documents has not yielded fruitful results. This is due to the fact that, although opposition existed and was manifested on different occasions by the allies, it was mainly conceptual and not discursively framed. Given the fact that the Alliance bases its strategic decisions on consensus, the conclusion is that NATO documents do not contain explicit linguistically formulated references to the various manifestations of adversarial power exercised by the member countries during NATO's history. As disclosed by the research, opposition remains primarily contextual and I argue that it is illustrated by the dynamics of power relations – in terms of attitudes, reactions and positions – rather than by any mechanism that is language-related. However, I have tried to fill this gap by looking at political discourses that illustrate the various reactions of NATO member countries officials in the context of the identified issues of opposition. While the political discourses employed as examples do not belong to the primary corpus of investigation, they have been selected as secondary sources, in the hope that they transpire conceptual antagonism through language.

In sum, the qualitative analysis realistically answered the main research question in that it identified discursive patterns of power relations and power dynamics in NATO official documents. The invalidation of the secondary research question targeting materializations of adversarial power relations and the conclusion that there are few discursive manifestations thereof actually supports the first hypothesis. NATO is, indeed, an enduring alliance whose seventy-year validity is, in addition to its ability to transform, adapt, and reconfigure in the face of new challenges, largely due to the power of the language utilized in reifying relational power through the discourse of unity. The rhetoric of integrative power has kept the Alliance coherent and cohesive under the umbrella of common values, granting the success of NATO's enduring role in international security. In what concerns the manifestations of U.S. predominant power and its leading role in NATO, the validation of the third hypothesis does not come as a surprise. When the internal power balance tilts, it does so in favor of the United States, in virtue of its predominance in NATO. The innovative finding here is not the conclusion that the United States has a predominant role in NATO; but that it is enforced, among other things, by the discursive materialization of three types of power: referent, expert and legitimate.

Since the object of analysis is a form of institutionalized discourse which is subordinated to a composition structure and fixed conventions, it was only natural that the corpus be subjected to a quantitative investigation that offered a more in-depth description of the targeted documents. To this aim, the research also focused on a detailed statistical study

conducted so as to compare NATO discourses between 1949 and 2018 in regard to what makes their writing style specific.

The complexity indices detailed in Chapter IV reflect the variables that were essentially different between subjects. The results expose statistically interesting and significant differences in terms of the degree of word elaboration (length and polysemy count), the number of unique verbs per paragraph, the Age of Acquisition (AoA) score per paragraph, as well as the number of words within multiple lists, per such as: Means GI (words denoting methods, acts or objects utilized to attain goals), Academ GI (words related to academic, intellectual or educational matters), Space GI (references to spatial dimensions), Virtue GI (culturally-defined virtues, values, goals) etc.

In time, some differences were observed between the integrative and adversarial discourses based on the words lists extracted from the GI dictionary. The average number of words from list Means GI used in integrative discourses has increased over the years, while in adversarial discourse fewer words regarding motivation for goals' attaining were used. Such dynamics are indicative of a more specific focus placed on the power of cooperation and coordination between NATO member states in what regards their shared utilization of resources and methods to attain common goals. As predicted, NATO's discourse is characterized by an exponential augmentation of linguistic references to cooperative defense and shared responsibility for peace and security as the Alliance has grown and expanded over time. Conversely, adversarial type documents registered lower reference to shared practices and common objectives, given that this motivational discourse is rather unifying and relates to integrative power and not to discourses that target confrontational power relations.

Words related to academic field, intellectual or educational matters (Academ GI), have declined drastically in integrative discourses after 1991. This might be interpreted as a powerful indication that NATO considered the public of its discourses had received enough education in terms of abstract concepts and values related to security, stability and cooperation throughout the 41 years since the foundation of the Alliance. After 1991, the focus shifted on more practical procedures (especially mentioned in the Strategic Concepts) and hands-on measures that would stabilize the fluid post-Cold War environment. Nevertheless, the adversarial discourses started to use more words related to this category over the years, and, although the increase was not high, it directs to a valid belief that countries situated outside the traditional NATO framework needed to be educated about what the Alliance represents in order to better understand its role and relevance for global security. This linguistic manifestation of referent and expert power is directly correlated with the

increased use of words indicating a knowledge of location and spatial relationships in integrative discourses (Space GI list) which pinpoint specific nations and countries as recipients of NATO's integrative power. The increase is mainly located in the discourses after 1991, when the Alliance sought to expand its area of operations towards Eastern Europe (the ex-Communist bloc), the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

As expected, integrative discourses use more words related to virtue, with an increased occurrence over the years, especially after 1991, when the linguistic expression of common principles, ideals, and beliefs typifying the Alliance registered a surge that testifies for the importance of the core values promoted by NATO (Virtue GI list). Language makes visible the evolution of the Alliance from interdependence, to community, then to partnership; from collective defense to integrated defense; from increased cooperation to international cooperation. In contrast with the discourse of unity, adversarial power discourses do not use so many words that indicate an assessment of moral approval or good wealth. The focus here is more on how to discourage detrimental behavior through military actions while the attitude implicit in the text of the documents emanates disapproval and condemnation of different terrorist acts.

At the beginning of the analyzed period (1949-1990) both the discourses of unity and those of opposition used approximately the same number the words referring to emphasis in terms of frequency, causality, validity or accuracy. Over the years, these two types of discourses go in completely opposite directions: while the integrative discourses started using more and more words from overstated list, their usage in adversarial discourses began to reduce drastically (Ovrst GI list).

As predicted, words indicating power, control or authority were abundantly employed in the two types of discourses, with an increase in both over time (Strong GI list). We can observe that the growth of strong words became more accelerated in integrative discourses after 1991, while the adversarial discourses registered a very slow progress. This discrepancy can be attributed to the changes of power dynamics that manifested after the end of the Cold War. Multiple references to control and authority are used in the discourse of unity as a conceptual glue relating the existence of the Alliance to its enduring role for the preservation of peace and stability. Especially after 9/11, when the global security environment was radically transformed and reshaped by the surge of terrorism, the language of the official documents needed to produce a stronger impact both within and outside the Alliance.

A high variance was observed between the two types of discourses concerning the use of words that express quantity, including also numbers (Quan GI list). While in the integrative

discourses these types of words started to be more and more used, in adversarial discourses their number decreased. In practical terms, this difference can be translated, for instance, by the accent placed by NATO, at different time periods, on the specific quantities of conventional and nuclear capabilities, whose numbers oscillated from period to period, depending on the various treaties the Alliance was involved in (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – 1968, Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty – 1987, Mutual Balanced Force Reduction – 1973-1989, Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe – 1990, Arms Trade Treaty – 2014 etc.)

Words belonging to the fields of economy, commerce, industry, or business, including collectivities, roles, and references to money were used in both adversarial and integrative discourses, with a rapid growth for integrative discourses, and an easy growth for adversarial discourses (Econ GI). The usage of such words attests NATO's increased implication in economic assistance programs both within and outside the Alliance and the enlarged number of activities and list of recipients over the years, and especially after 1991.

In addition to using various word lists to analyze the dynamics of lexical properties in NATO, the statistical analysis has revealed other features that differentiate between the two types of discourses. For instance, the number of unique verbs per paragraph increased over time in both adversarial and integrative discourses, allowing for an interpretation related to the significance placed on speech acts and on transmitting attitudes and standpoints. The occurrence of verbs of opinion, of positive or negative appreciation, injunction verbs, verbs of demanding and verbs of enunciative modality has registered an increased frequency especially in the discourse of opposition, where an accelerated and high growth was identified. In addition to their semantic value, these verbs contribute to the structural complexity and elaboration of adversarial discourses, where the manifestation of power is more concentrated on expressing the Alliance's condemning and disapproving attitude towards its adversaries and their deeds.

The AoA (Age of Acquisition) score illustrates the complexity of words in relation to the age at which they are acquired. During the first analyzed period, adversarial discourses used more complex words, but their complexity decreased over the years, ending with the employment of simple words in 2018. NATO realized that pretentious language may not be effective when communication has to be straightforward and clear and gradually gave up using complex abstract notions by 2018. Conversely, the complexity of words increased in the case of integrative discourses, which were formulated in simpler terms in 1949, but become

more and more elaborate, in direct correlation with the complexity of the topics NATO needed to address in its discourses of unity.

The cohesion and coherence indices reveal a slow and steady evolution of the adversarial discourse throughout the period, while the integrative discourses recorded a radical boost since 1949. The visible evolution in the language of unity accounts for a more organized discourse characterized by a more efficient use of linking devices, connectives and subordination mechanisms, which offer the more recent NATO texts a better local and global coherence, and ultimately optimized comprehension and readability.

The main goal of the quantitative analysis was to demonstrate that the operationalization of the concepts of integrative and adversarial power has suffered discursive modifications visible in NATO documents produced during the Cold War and in the years after the end of the Cold War. The findings of the critical discourse analysis conducted earlier in this chapter offered an explanation of the reason why these changes occurred and located them on the Alliance's historical, social and political timeline. Paralleled with the exhaustive qualitative analysis, the diachronic examination of NATO discourses offers a broad image of the evolution of the language employed by the Alliance and explains the dynamics of power as illustrated in integrative and adversarial discourses. As internal and external power dynamics intertwine with the evolution of the Alliance and ultimately shape its development, discourse adapts, adjusts, alters, diversifies or evolves, revealing a direct and active relation between language, power and ideology.

NATO@70 and beyond

One of the stated research objectives was to demonstrate that NATO's enduring purpose and function has remained valid in the seventy years of the Alliance's existence largely due to the galvanizing power of language. Despite the many internal and external crises that challenged the Alliance's *raison d'être* to the point of virtually nullifying it, NATO has remained a coherent security institution able to encourage shared attitudes and responses within an organization otherwise typified by heterogeneity and energetic interactions between its members.

However, the present security environment is undoubtedly unpredictable and extremely fluid. In this context, NATO faces a double jeopardy: a disparity in the power balance within the Alliance (due to the PESCO initiative, for example) and the re-emergence of bigger threats outside its borders (the risk of nuclear war with Russia to the east, the open door for

China's implication in a potential arm race, the large-scale migration and terrorist initiatives flowing in from the south – Middle East and Africa, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the increase in cyber-attacks or the various environmental challenges that bear security implications). The dynamics of power will remain as active as ever, with unpredictable consequences that will impact the position of the United States in NATO, the unity of the Alliance on the brink of the rising tensions with Russia, and the solidarity of a Europe who is slowly but surely detaching from the Americans.

Based on the geo-strategic configurations of the future, some scenarios are worth investigating both from a social-cognitive and from a discursive perspective. I expect a wider range of inter and intra-alliance behavior. Within the Alliance, the collective dynamics might display variations. Depending on the outside forces acting on the organization, the allies might either choose to act in unison (if faced with an external threat, e.g. Russia or China) or split in divergent directions (if some support the status quo while others seek revision). However, if the division is deep, there will be a fracture inside the Alliance (e.g. U.S. versus Europe); if the rupture is modest, the Alliance might find a way to accommodate divergence and embrace new mechanisms of cooperation (e.g. the PESCO initiative). It will be extremely interesting to analyze the language by which NATO will materialize these changes of attitude and behavior, both internally and externally. Such scenarios create a fertile ground for the manifestation of power relations, hierarchization, leadership, predominance, consensus and adversity. The discourses of power could be further taxonomized into textual strands depending on the relations generated by the new power dynamics: alliance, concert, coalition, each being distinguished by specific features and linguistic devices. This new approach might shed more light into the mechanisms of any organization, from the perspective of the interaction between internal and external actors.

Further investigations into the realm of NATO discourse can reveal new dimensions of military language. In virtue of its context-related specificity, critical discourse analysis is relevant at any given time, for any given situation, on any given type of discourse or institution. Further explorations of the function of language and discourse enables change: individual and/or collective, positive and constructive, pro-active and dynamic transformations of once traditional epistemological positions, concepts and procedures. Qualitative and quantitative studies of the language could disrupt longstanding notions of power and locate new patterns and dynamics; or at least, such practices may validate the already identified ones. Either way, there is enough room for creativity and innovation, even

if military language has traditionally been perceived as fairly limited, extremely technical, impenetrably coded, and often boring.

The present investigation of NATO discourse from the perspective of power dynamics commends itself in virtue of its contributing efforts to the deliberation over the future of the Alliance. The two fault lines in this dispute run between two schools of thought: one group who believes that the Alliance has become irrelevant and predict a bleak future for NATO; the other who still thinks that NATO has a meaningful future. My study aligns with the latter in that it tried to demonstrate why and how NATO has endured and will continue to do so.

KEY WORDS



Military discourse, language, communication, power, power dynamics, balance of power, NATO, Washington Treaty, Strategic Concepts, Cold War, terrorism, alliance, doctrine, strategy, ideology, discourse, text, context, Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Historical Approach, linguistic analysis, qualitative approach, quantitative analysis, intertextuality, social-cognitive approach, integrative, unity, adversarial, opposition, predominant, external bipolar balance, internal multipolar balance, community, values.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Justin V., et al. *Extended Deterrence and Allied Assurance: Key Concepts and Current Challenges for U.S. Policy*. USAF Institute for National Security Studies, 2013.
- Angelakis, Tom. "Russian Elites' Perception of NATO Expansion: The Military, Foreign Ministry and Duma." Briefing Paper no. 11, May 1997, International Security Information Service Europe.
- Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. The Penguin Press, 1970.
- Ashton, Nigel J. *Kennedy, Macmillan and the Cold War: The Irony of Interdependence*. Palgrave, 2002.
- Baldwin, David A. "Power and Social Exchange." *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 72, 1978, pp. 1229-1242.
- Barker, Chris and Galasinski, Darius. *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. Sage, 2001.
- Bellenger, Lionel. *Le talent de communiquer*. Nathan Publishing House, 1989.
- Berman, Paul. *Terror and Liberalism*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- Biber, Douglas. "Corpus-based and Corpus-driven Analyses of Language Variation and Use." *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, edited by Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 159-191.
- Blommaert, Jan. *Discourse (Key Topics in Sociolinguistics)*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Bloor, Meriel and Bloor, Thomas. *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. An Introduction*. Hodder Arnold, 2007.
- Boulding, Kenneth. *Three Faces of Power*. Sage Publications, 1989.
- Buckely, Edgar. "Invoking Article 5." *NATO Review*, 2006, www.nato.int/docu/review/2004/Interpreting-Istanbul/Refining-NATO-role-terrorism/EN/index.htm. Accessed 12 May 2018.
- Buteux, Paul. *Strategy, Doctrine, and the Politics of Alliance: Theatre Nuclear Force Modernization NATO*. Westview Press, 1983.
- Carpenter, Ted G., editor. *NATO's Empty Victory: A Postmortem on the Balkan War*. CATO Institute, 2000.
- Chertoff, Michael. "The Ideology of Terrorism: Radicalism Revisited." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, vol. XV, no. 1, 2008, pp. 11-20.
- Chifu, Iulian, et al. *The Russian Georgian War: A Trilateral Cognitive Institutional Approach of the Crisis Decision-Making Process*. Curtea Veche Publishing House, 2009.
- Chilton, Paul. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2004.
- Chouliaraki, Lili and Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse in Late Modernity*, vol. 2. Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Clegg, Stewart R. *Frameworks of Power*. Sage Publications, 1989.
- Collins, Brian J. *NATO. A Guide to the Issues*. Praeger, 2011.
- Cook, Guy. *Discourse*. Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Daalder, Ivo. H. and Lindsay, James. M. *Bush's Foreign-Policy Strategy: Is the Revolution Over?*, 14 Oct. 2005, www.brookings.edu/opinions/bushs-foreign-policy-strategy-is-the-revolution-over/. Accessed 22 February 2018.
- Daldal, Asli. "Power and Ideology in Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A Comparative Analysis." *Review of History and Political Science*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2014, pp. 149-167.
- Dascălu, Mihai. *Analyzing Discourse and Text Complexity for Learning and Collaborating*. Springer, 2014.

- Dascălu, Mihai, et al. "ReaderBench: A Multi-lingual Framework for Analyzing Text Complexity." EC-TEL 2017, LNCS 10474, edited by Élise Lavoué et al., 2017, pp. 495–499. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-66610-5_48.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Analyzing Discourse: Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge, 2003.
- . "Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 9, issue 6, 1985, pp. 739–763.
- . *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Addison Wesley, 1995.
- . *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press, 1992.
- . "Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* vol.4, no. 2, 2000, pp. 163–195.
- . *Language and power*. Pearson Education, 2001.
- Fairclough, Norman and Wodak, Ruth. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by Teun A. Van Dijk, vol. 2, Sage Publications, 1997, pp. 258-284.
- Festinger, Leon. "Informal Social Communication." *Psychological Review*, vol. 57, 1950, pp. 271-282.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power and Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Pantheon Books, 1980.
- . "Subject and power." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 4, 1982, pp. 777-795.
- Gamble, Teri K. and Gamble, Michael. *Communication works*. McGraw-Hill, 2013.
- Gervasi, Vincenzo and Ambriola, Vincenzo. "Quantitative Assessment of Textual Complexity." *Complexity in Language and Text*, edited by Merlini L. Barbaresi, Plus, 2002, pp. 197–228.
- Ghadessy, Mohsen, editor. *Registers of Written English: Situational Factors and Linguistic Features*. Pinter Publishers, 1988.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1992). *Prison Notebooks*, vol. 1. Translated by Joseph A. Buttigieg. Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Grosser, Alfred. *The Western Alliance: European-American Relations Since 1945*. Continuum Publishing Group, 1980.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *Erkenntnis und Interesse*. Suhrkamp, 1977.
- Halliday, Michael A.K. "Dimensions of Discourse Analysis: Grammar." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 2: Dimensions of Discourse. Academic Press, 1985, pp. 29-56.
- Henderson, Nicholas. *The Birth of NATO*. Westview Press, 1983.
- Hidalgo Tenorio, Encarnacion. "Critical Discourse Analysis, an Overview." *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2011, pp. 183-209, <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/658/609>. Accessed 21 August 2016.
- Jenkins, Peter. *Mrs. Thatcher's Revolution: The Ending of the Socialist Era*. Cape, 1987.
- Judt, Tony. *A History of Europe Since 1945*. Penguin Books, 2005.
- Kahn, Herman. *On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios*. Praeger, 1965.
- Keller, Bill. "Does not Play Well with Others." *New York Times*, 22 Jun 2003.
- Krings, Hermann et al. *Handbuch philosophischer Grundbegriffe*. Kosel, 1973.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Lieven, Anatol. "Russian opposition to NATO expansion." *The World Today*, vol. 51, no. 10, 1995, pp. 196-199.
- Linell, Per. "Discourse Across Boundaries: On Recontextualizations and the Blending of Voices in Professional Discourse." *Text*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1998, pp. 143-157.
- Lukes, Steven. *Power: A Radical View*. Macmillan, 1974.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. Everyman, 1958.
- Marcus, Solomon. *Comunicarea internațională ca sursă de conflicte*. Political Publishing House, 1985.

- McGrory, Mary. "Pit-stop Presidency." *Washington Post*, 27 Oct. 2002.
- Messana, Bernard. "Rapport Armée-Nation dans la perspective de la professionnalisation. Réflexions d'un observateur candide." *Le Casoar*, no. 159, 2000.
- Oddo, John. *Intertextuality and the 24-hour News Cycle: A Day in the Rhetorical Life of Colin Powell's U.N. Address*. Michigan State University Press, 2014.
- Parsons, Talcott. "On the Concept of Political Power." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 107, no. 3, 1963, pp. 232-262.
- Ploae-Hanganu, Mariana. *Terminologia și limba comună (Pentru o bază de date terminologice)*. Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1992.
- Porter, James E. "Intertextuality and the Discourse Community." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1986, pp. 34-47.
- Potter, Jonathan. "Discourse Analysis and Discursive Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology: Expanding Perspectives in Methodology and Design*, edited by Paul M. Camic et al., American Psychological Association, 2003, pp. 73-94.
- Rogers, Rebecca, editor. *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2004.
- Rotaru, Nicolae. *Comunicarea în organizațiile militare*. Tritonic Publishing House, 2005.
- Sadan, Elisheva. *Theory and Practice of People-Focused Social Solutions*. Hakibbutz Hamenchad Publishers, 1997.
- Stoddart, Mark C.J. "Ideology, Hegemony, Discourse: A Critical Review of Theories of Knowledge and Power." *Social Thought and Research*, vol. 28, 2007, pp. 191-225. DOI:10.17161/STR.1808.5226.
- Taylor, Stephanie. "Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research." *Discourse as a Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by Margaret Wetherell et al., Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 5-48.
- Thies, Wallace. *Why NATO Endures*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Thomas, Ian. *The Promise of Alliance: NATO and the Political Imagination*. Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1997.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, et al., Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference Online, 2003a, pp. 352-371.
- . "Critical Discourse Studies. A Sociocognitive Approach." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, Sage, 2009, pp. 62-86.
- . "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis." *Language and Peace*, edited by Christian Schäffner and Anita Wenden, Darmouth Publishing, 1995a, pp. 17-33.
- . "The Discourse-knowledge Interface". *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, edited by Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003b, pp. 85-110.
- . "Discourse Semantics and Ideology." *Discourse and Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1995b, pp. 243-289.
- . "Ideology and Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2006, pp. 115-140.
- . "Ideological Discourse Analysis." *New Courant*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1995c, pp. 135-161.
- . "Politics, Ideology, and Discourse." *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 9. Pergamon Press, 2004, pp. 728-740.
- . "Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power." *Annals of the International Communication Association*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1989, pp. 18-59. DOI.org/10.1080/23808985.1989.11678711.
- . *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. Longman, 1977.

- Van Dijk, Teun A. and Kintsch Walter. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. Academic Press, 1983.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. *Thought and Language*. Newly revised, translated and edited by Alex Kozulin, M.I.T Press, 1986.
- Wang, Yuan and Guo, Minghe. "A Short Analysis of Discourse Coherence." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2014, pp. 460-465. DOI:10.4304/jltr.5.2.460-465
- Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Weiss, Gilbert and Wodak, Ruth, editors. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Widdowson, Henry G. *Text, Context, Pretext. Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell, 2004.
- Wodak, Ruth. "Does Sociolinguistics Need Social Theory? New Perspectives on Critical Discourse Analysis." Keynote address SS2000, Bristol, 27 April 2000, www.univie.ac.at/linguistics/forschung/wittgenstein/unemploy/handoutbristol11.htm. Accessed 13 Oct. 2016.
- Wodak, Ruth and Ludwig, Christoph. *Challenges in a Changing World*. Passagen Verlag, 1999.
- Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael. "Critical Discourse Analysis. History, Agenda and Methodology." *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 2nd ed., edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, Sage Publications, 2009, pp. 1-33.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. *Politics and Vision*. Little, Brown, 1960.
- Yost, David. *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.
- Zakaria, Fareed. *The post-American World*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2009.

SECONDARY DATA

- Acheson, Dean. "The North Atlantic Pact: Collective Defense and the Preservation of Peace, Security and Freedom in the North Atlantic Community." *Department of State Bulletin*, 27 Mar 1949.
- . "Address to Congress." *Department of State Bulletin*, 12 Jun. 1950.
- . "Address to Congress." *Department of State Bulletin*, 1 Oct. 1951.
- . "Address to Congress." *Department of State Bulletin*, 5 Jan. 1953.
- Albright, Madeleine. "Enlarging NATO." *The Economist*, 15 Feb 1997a.
- . Prepared Statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, 23 Apr. 1997b, <https://1997-2001.state.gov/statements/970423.html>. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- . Prepared Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The debate on NATO enlargement. U.S. Government Printing Office, 7 Oct. 1997c, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-105shrg46832/html/CHRG-105shrg46832.htm>. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- . Press conference at NATO Headquarters, <https://1997-2001.state.gov/statements/1998/981208b.html>. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- Blair, Tony. Speech at NATO's 50th Anniversary, 8 Mar 1999. 12 January 2018, <http://www.ukpol.co.uk/tony-blair-1999-speech-at-natos-50th-anniversary/>. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- Boniface, Pascal. "Le débat français sur l'élargissement de l'Otan." *Relations Internationales et Stratégiques* 27, Autumn 1997.
- Bush, George. Remarks at the Rome NATO Summit, 8 Oct. 1991. European Wireless File. USIS, U.S. Embassy, London.

- . "The Future of Europe", remarks at the commencement ceremony at Boston University, 21 May 1989. Department of State Bulletin, 17 Jul. 1989.
- Bush, George W. "Independence Day Speech", 4 Jul. 2003, <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/07/20030704-1.html>. Accessed 23 February 2018.
- . News conference, 14 Nov. 2001, www.nytimes.com/2001/11/14/world/bush-putin-summit-2-presidents-words-new-relationship-moves-antiterrorism.html. Accessed 16 April 2018.
- Bush, George W. and Dietrich, John W. *The George W. Bush Foreign Policy Reader: Presidential Speeches and Commentary*. M.E. Sharpe, 2005.
- Carter, John. Report to the American People, 2 Feb. 1977, transcript of radio and television broadcast. Department of State Bulletin, 28 Feb. 1977.
- . Remarks at the opening ceremonies of the North Atlantic Council Summit Meeting in Washington, 30 May 1970. Department of State Bulletin, 1 Jul. 1978.
- Charette, Hervé de. Press Conference after the North Atlantic Council Meeting. *Propos sur la Défense* 40, 30 May 1995.
- Clinton, William. "News Conference." Transcript in *Washington Post*, 8 Mar. 1997, p. A11.
- . "Remarks at the Close of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization 50th Anniversary Summit." In *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: William J. Clinton, 1999*.
- Cohen, William. Prepared Statement before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Department of State Bulletin, 27 Apr. 1997.
- De Hoop Scheffer, Jan. "NATO's Istanbul Summit: New Mission, New Means". Speech by NATO Secretary General at the Royal United Services Institute, London, 18 June 2004.
- Dulles, Allen W. Address before the National Association of Manufacturers, 64th Congress of American Industry, 4 Dec. 1959, http://infoshare1.princeton.edu/libraries/firestone/rbsc/mudd/online_ex/adulles/adulles_text.html. Accessed 20 April 2018.
- Dulles, John F. "Address at the Annual Luncheon for the Associated Press, 1953." Department of State Bulletin, 30 Apr. 1956.
- . "Statement on the Sixth Anniversary of NATO." Department of State Bulletin, 25 Apr. 1955.
- Eagleburger, Lawrence S. "The Challenge of the European Landscape in the 1990s". Statement before the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 22 Jun. 1989, www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-8139861/challenge-european-landscape-1990s.html. Accessed 5 November 2017.
- Eyal, Jonathan. "NATO's Enlargement: Anatomy of a Decision". *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)*, vol. 73, no. 4, Oct. 1997, pp. 695-719.
- "France upbraids US as simplistic". *International Herald Tribune*, 7 Feb. 2002, pp. 1-4. *Hansard*, 13 December 1979, col. 1542.
- Havel, Vaclav. "NATO's Quality of Life." *New York Times*, 13 May 1997, p. A21.
- Helms, Jesse. United States Senate. Committee of Foreign Relations. *The Debate on NATO Enlargement*. US Government printing Office, 1998.
- Hoagland, Jim. "Gorbachev on Tour." *Washington Post*, 11 Oct. 1996, p. A21.
- Holbrooke, Richard. "America, a European Power." *Foreign Affairs*, Mar./Apr. 1995. pp. 41-42. *House of Common Debates, Canada*, 1984/4.
- Humphrey, Hubert. Address to the NAC, 1 May 1967. Department of State Bulletin, May 1967.
- Hull, Cordell. Address to joint meeting of both Houses of Congress, 20 Nov. 1943. Department of State Bulletin, vol. 9, no. 230, Nov. 1943.
- Iklé, Fred. "How to Ruin NATO." *New York Times*, 11 Jan. 1995, p. A21.

- Kagan, Robert. "Multilateralism: American Style." *Washington Post*, 13 Sept. 2002, <https://carnegieendowment.org/2002/09/13/multilateralism-american-style-pub-1065>. Accessed 17 September 2017.
- Kennan, George. "A Fateful Error." *New York Times*, 5 Feb. 1997, p. A23.
- Kennedy, John F. "President Pledges U.S. Support of NATO." *Department of State Bulletin*, 6 Mar. 1961.
- Kissinger, Henry. "NATO: Make it Stronger, Make it Larger." *Washington Post*, 14 Jan. 1997, p. A15.
- Kohl, Helmut. "Statement to the Bundestag", 21 Nov. 1983. *Bulletin* 7, 20 Dec. 1983, pp. 7-9.
- . "Ten-point program for overcoming the division of Germany and Europe, 28 Nov. 1989. *Bulletin des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung (Bulletin of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government)*, 29 Nov. 1989, reprinted, edited by Volker Gransow and Konrad Jarausch. *Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik*, pp. 101-104.
- Lord Ismay, Hastings L. *NATO, the First Five Years 1949-1954*. NATO archives online.
- Lukin, Vladimir. "Izvestiya." In *Foreign Broadcast Information Service/Central Eurasia, Daily Report*, 12 May 1995, p. 22-23.
- Marshall, George. "Speech at Harvard University", 5 Jun. 1947, <http://www.oecd.org/general/themarshallplanspeechatharvarduniversity5june1947.htm>. Accessed 25 October 2017.
- Mauroy, Pierre. "France and Western Security." *NATO Review*, vol.5, 1983 p. 23-25.
- Odom, William E. "History Tells Us the Alliance Should Grow." *Washington Post*, 6 Jul 1997, p. C3.
- Reagan, Ronald. Remarks to Officers of the Department of State and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), 14 Oct. 1986. *Department of State Bulletin*, December 1986.
- . Speech to American Evangelical Leaders, 8 Mar. 1983. *Department of State Bulletin*, April 1983.
- Robertson, George. "NATO after September 11th". Speech to the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, 30 Jan. 2002, www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020131a.htm. Accessed 6 February 2018.
- . Speech at the Moscow's Diplomatic Academy, 22 Nov. 2001, www.nato.int/docu/speech/2001/s011122a.htm. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- Rocard, Michel. "Otan: attention, danger!" *L'Express*, 13 Mar. 1997, p. 94-95.
- Rodman, Peter. "Four More for NATO." *Washington Post*, 13 Dec. 1994, p. A27.
- Roth, William. "Report on the new NATO." *Christian Science Monitor*, 15 Oct. 1988, p. 21-23.
- Rutten, Maartje. "From St. Malo to Nice: European Defence: Core Documents". *Institute for Security Studies of Western European Union*, May 2001.
- Rumsfeld, Donald. H. "Prepared remarks at the North Atlantic Council (NAC-D)", 7 Jun. 2001, Brussels.
- . "Transforming the Military," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 81, no. 3, 2002, pp. 20-32.
- Rühe, Volker. Speech to the Yomiuri International Economic Society, Tokyo, 28 May 1997.
- . *The New NATO*. Lecture at John Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, American Institution for Contemporary German Studies, Washington D.C, 30 Apr. 1996.
- Schmidt, Helmut. "Report on the State of the Union, address before the Bundestag on 20 March 1980". *Bulletin* 4, 25 Mar. 1982.
- Schmitt, Eric. "Senate Reject Bid to Create a NATO Unit to Resolve Conflicts." *New York Times*, 29 Apr. 1998a, p. A14.
- . "Senators Reject Bid to Limit Costs of Enlarging NATO." *New York Times*, 30 Apr. 1998b, p. A14.

- Schultz, George. News Conference at NATO Headquarters, 9 Dec. 1988. Department of State Bulletin, February 1989.
- Shanker, Tom. "Bonn rebuffs U.S. over NATO role for Russia." *Chicago Tribune*, 10 Sept. 1994, p. 2.
- Shihab, Sophie. "La Russie veut couper court à toute nouvelle extension de l'Alliance atlantique." *Le Monde*, 26 Mar. 1997, p. 2.
- Solana, Javier. Speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 4 Mar. 1997, www.nato.int/docu/speech/1997/s970304a.htm. Accessed 28 April 2018.
- Stoltenberg, Jens. "NATO's Vital Role in the War on Terror." *The Wall Street Journal*, 25 May 2017, www.wsj.com/articles/natos-vital-role-in-the-war-on-terror-1495665078. Accessed 12 May 2018.
- Surikov, Anton. "Special Institute Staff Suggests Russia Oppose NATO and the USA". ASVAB 1017, Conflict Studies Research Center, Royal Military Academy, 1996, pp. 3-7.
- Talbott, Strobe. *The State of the Alliance. An American Perspective*, 15 Dec. 1999, <https://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1999/s991215c.htm>. Accessed 12 March 2018.
- . "Why NATO Should Grow." *New York Review of Books*, 10 Aug. 1995, www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/08/10/why-nato-should-grow/. Accessed 17 April 2018.
- "Vrai Victoire" (editorial), *La Croix*, 26 Apr. 1999.
- Weisman, Steven R. "Rice Calls on Europe to Help Building a Safer World." *New York Times*, 9 Feb. 2005, www.nytimes.com/2005/02/09/world/europe/rice-calls-on-europe-to-join-in-building-a-safer-world.html. Accessed 13 February 2018.
- Yeltsin, Boris. "Secret letter on NATO expansion", published in full in an unofficial translation in the Prague newspaper *Mlada fronta Dnes*, 2 Dec. 1993. Foreign Broadcast Information Service/Central Eurasia, Daily Report, 12 May 1995.

MILITARY DOCUMENTS

NATO official documents

- North Atlantic Treaty, Washington, 4 April 1949.
- DC 6/1 – The Strategic Concept for the Defence of the North Atlantic Area, 1 December 1949.
- DC 13 – A Report by the Military Committee on North Atlantic Treaty Organization Medium Term Plan, 1 April 1950.
- MC 3/5 – The Strategic Concept for the Defence of the North Atlantic Area, 3 December 1952.
- CM (56)138 - Directive to the NATO Military Authorities from The North Atlantic Council, 13 December 1956.
- Report of the Committee of Three on Nonmilitary Cooperation in NATO, 13 December 1956, www.nato.int/archives/committee_of_three/CT.pdf. Accessed 10 November 2017.
- MC 14/1 – A Report by the Standing Group on Strategic Guidance, 9 December 1952.
- MC 14/2 – The Overall Strategic Concept for the Defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area Organization, 23 May 1957.
- MC 48/2 – A Report by the Military Committee on Measures to Implement the Strategic Concept, 23 May 1957.
- MC 14/3 – The Overall Strategic Concept for the Defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area Organization, 16 January 1968.
- MC 48/3 – Measures to Implement the Strategic Concept for the Defence of the NATO Area, 8 December 1969.
- Nuclear Planning Group Study #46, 1974, https://cle.nps.edu/access/content/group/6a51e57f-2b0d-48b9-8f0d-1d6995a896f7/NPG_STUDY_46_ENG_NHQL28506.pdf. Accessed 10 November 2017.

NSC-68 – A Report to the National Security Council by the Executive Secretary on the United States Objectives and Programs for National Security, 14 April 1950, reproduced in Naval War College Review, May/June 1975.

NAC Press Release (2001)124, 12 September 2011, www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm. Accessed 13 March 2018.

Study on NATO Enlargement. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1995, www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24733.htm. Accessed 12 March 2018.

NAC Press Release (2001)124, Statement by the North Atlantic Council, 12 September 2001, www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm. Accessed 15 June 2018.

MC 0472/1 – Military Committee Concept for Counter-terrorism, 6 January 2016, www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2016_01/20160817_160106-mc0472-1-final.pdf. Accessed 17 February 2018.

Summit documents

Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, London, 10-11 May 1977.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Bonn, 10 June 1982.

Declaration of the NATO Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 2-3 March 1988.

“Conventional Arms Control: The Way Ahead” – Statement issued under the Authority of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 2-3 March 1988.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council (The Brussels Declaration), Brussels, 30 May 1989.

London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance: Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, London, 5- 6 July 1990.

Developments in the Soviet Union, Rome, 7-8 November 1991.

Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation, Rome, 7-8 November 1991. The Alliance’s New Strategic Concept, Rome, 7-8 November 1991.

North Atlantic Cooperation Council Statement on Dialogue, Partnership and Cooperation, Brussels, 19-20 December 1991.

Declaration of the Heads of State and Government (The Brussels Summit Declaration), Brussels, 10-11 January 1994.

Partnership for Peace: Invitation Document issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 10-11 January 1994.

Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, Paris, 27 May 1997.

Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Ukraine, Madrid, 8-9 July 1997.

An Alliance for the 21st Century, Washington Summit Communiqué issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Washington, D.C., 24 April 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., 24 April 1999.

NATO-Russia Relations: A New Quality, Rome, 28 May 2002.

Statement of the NATO-Russia Council, Rome, 28 May 2002.

Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism, Prague, 21-22 November, 2002.

Decision Sheet of the Meeting of the NATO-Russia Council at the level of Heads of State and Government, Rome, 28 May 2002.

Istanbul Summit Final Communiqué, Istanbul, 28-29 June 2004.
Policy on Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, Istanbul, 28-29 June 2004.
Declaration on Alliance Security, Strasbourg/Kehl, 3-4 April 2009.
NATO Summit Guide, Lisbon 2010.
Active Engagement, Modern Defense – Strategic Concept for the Defense and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization adopted by Heads of State and Government, Lisbon, 19 November 2010.
Summit Declaration on Defence Capabilities: Toward NATO Forces 2020, Chicago, 20 May 2012.
NATO's policy guidelines on counter-terrorism, Chicago, 21 May 2012.
Wales Summit Declaration, Wales, 4-5 September 2014.
The Wales Declaration on the Transatlantic Bond, Wales, 5 September 2014.
Warsaw Declaration on Transatlantic Security, Warsaw, 8-9 July 2016.
Brussels Declaration on Transatlantic Security and Solidarity, Brussels, 10-11 July 2018.
Brussels Summit Declaration, Brussels, 10-11 July 2018.

Ministerial meetings final communiqués

Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Paris, 13-14 December 1962.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Paris, 15-17 December 1964.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Paris, 14-16 December 1965.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Luxemburg, 13-14 June 1967.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Bonn, 30-31 May 1972.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 12-13 December 1974.
NATO Declaration on Atlantic Relations, Ottawa, 18-19 June 1974.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 11-12 December 1975.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 9-10 December 1976.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 7-8 December 1978.
Report on Future Tasks of the Alliance (Harmel Report), Paris, 13-14 December 1967.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 15-16 November 1968.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, London, 11 May 1977.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 15-16 May 1979.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, The Hague, 30-31 May, 1979.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Ankara, 25-26 June 1980.
Final Communiqué of North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 11-12 December 1980.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Rome, 4-5 May 1981.
Declaration on Terrorism, Brussels, 10 December 1981.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 9-10 December 1982.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Paris, 1-2 June 1983.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 8-9 December 1983.
Washington Statement on East-West Relations, Washington D.C., 29-31 May 1984.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 4-5 December 1984.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 13-14 December 1984.
Final Communiqué of the Nuclear Planning Group, Luxembourg, 26-27 March 1985.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 22 May 1985.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 1-2 June 1985.
Final Communiqué of the Nuclear Planning Group, Brussels, 29-30 October 1985.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 12-13 December 1985.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 22 May 1986.
Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 1-2 December 1987.
Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 9-10 December 1987.

Final Communiqué of the Nuclear Planning Group, The Hague, 27-28 October 1988.
 Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 8-9 December 1988.
 Final Communiqué of the Nuclear Planning Group, Almansil, 24-25 October 1989.
 Final Communiqué of the Defense Planning Committee, Brussels, 28-29 November 1989.
 Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 14-15 December 1989.
 Final Communiqué of the Nuclear Planning Group, Kananaskis, 9-10 May 1990.
 Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 17-18 December 1992.
 Final Communiqué issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 1-2 December 1994.
 Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Berlin, 3-4 June 1996.
 Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 10-11 December 1996.
 Final Communiqué of the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Defence Ministers Session, Brussels, 17-18 December 1996.
 Final Communiqué of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 8 December 1998.
 NATO's Response to Terrorism - Statement issued at the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 6-7 December 2001.
 Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Madrid, 3-4 June 2003.
 Declaration on Terrorism issued at the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Foreign Ministers Session, Brussels, 2 April 2004.
 NATO-Russia Action Plan on Terrorism, Brussels, 8-9 December 2004.
 Final Communiqué of the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, Brussels, 8 December 2005.
 Meeting of the NATO-Russia Council Chairman's Statement, Brussels. 14-15 June 2007.
 NATO-Russia Council Action Plan on Terrorism – Executive summary, Berlin, 14-15 April 2011.
 Statement of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, Brussels, 1-2 April 2014.
 Statement by NATO Defence Ministers on Ukraine, Brussels, 26-27 February 2014.
 Joint Statement of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, Brussels, 2 December 2014.
 Joint Statement of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, Antalya, 13-14 May 2015.

Other (non-NATO) official documents

UN Charter, San Francisco, 1945, <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>. Accessed 14 May 2018.
 The Vandenberg Resolution, U.S. Senate Resolution 293, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, 11 June 1948, www.nato.int/ebookshop/video/declassified/doc_files/Vandenberg%20resolution.pdf. Accessed 14 May 2018.
 Joint Statement on Franco-German Consultations of 4-5 February, 1980.
 European Council Summit, Cologne, 3-4 June 1999, www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/koll1_en.htm. Accessed 17 May 2018.
 National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2001.
 Ballistic Missile Defense Review Report, 1 February 2010, https://archive.defense.gov/bmdr/docs/BMDR%20as%20of%2026JAN10%200630_for%20web.pdf. Accessed 11 September 2018.