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Abstract

This dissertation is trying to analyze the past and the present of the formation of alliances between political subjects, cities-states in the past and states at present time. In global scene alliances and international organizations, in general, are having significant role such as United Nations (UN), North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in the present and League of Nations, Warsaw Pack and Delian League in the past.

Correspondingly, this essay attempts to answer the following question: What is more valuable into an alliance, democratic values or hegemonic state?

The methodology used for this dissertation is mainly qualitative research. Many primary sources are used, mainly Ancient Greek writers from the original documents, in ancient Greek. In addition, many secondary sources are used.

The first part of the essay (chapter 1 and 2) are setting the framework. In chapter 1 we are referring to method and methodology which follow in the dissertation, setting the research questions. In second chapter we are providing essential information about the formation of alliance and the meaning of democracy applicable to this essay.

In the second part (chapters 3 and 4) the two case – studies are examined and analysing the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances (chapter 3) and in chapter 4, we examine the role of superpower state in the alliance, providing historical examples.

Finally, in chapter 5 after a short synopsis, we reach to useful conclusions and answer the main question of the essay.

In this essay we will refer many times in democratic values and democracy. We are referring in the western democratic states which consist mainly of European states and the states in North America. The idea of democracy is based in the idea of freedom. But, persons and states must have enhanced the meaning of social justice and equality so as not to leave freedom to become impunity. Democratic values are achievement of human being and our civilization and as such it must be respected by everyone.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The working title chosen for this dissertation is a question and this is: What is more valuable into an alliance, democratic values or hegemonic state?

The topic is the formation of alliances and if democracy unites different states under the same values and interests and helps the cooperation among the allies in the sector of collective defence and security. Two cases will be examined. One from the ancient world, the Delian League, and another from the modern world, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

In this dissertation two basics issues will be examined. First, what is the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances, and second, what is the role of superpower state in the alliance.

So, the dissertation consists of two parts. The first part is the theoretical framework. In the first part will be presented the theoretical tools that we are consider in our study, in order to present, delineate and evaluate the two cases in the second part of the essay.

The first part consists of two chapters. The method and the methodology will be presented, and we will set up the research questions. Additionally, a short briefing about the meaning of alliance and the types of alliance in international politics will be delivered. Finally, we are focusing on democracy and who it is defined the democracy among nations.

The second part is the more interesting and demanding part of the essay. In chapter three we examine the primary question of what is the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances? We present historical examples from Delian League and from NATO. Additionally, in chapter four, we will try to delineate the role and the behaviour of the hegemonic power/super power state into an alliance. While in chapter five we will try to summarize the whole story and to reach to some useful conclusions.

The aim is to examine, from one hand, whether democracy and the acceptance of the same principles and values can formulate the suitable environment in order for an alliance to be established, so as to be able to fulfil the purposes of the alliance, what was democracy’s contribution to that and finally, and more important, to ensure the success and the long lasting of the alliance. On the other hand, we will analyze
the role and the behavior of the hegemonic state into an alliance. How the most powerful state try to take advantages from the formation of the alliance.

According to Acemoglu & Robinson¹, we are living in an inequality world and the roots of this inequality are based in the process of industrialization and technological changes which took place in the nineteenth century. So, some states, basically in Europe and North America, achieved to be developed politically and economically. In our essay will focus on these countries and their formations of alliances.

In order to clarify some definitions from the scratch of this dissertation, when we refer to “hegemony” is defined as a specific form of leadership. It means the situation in which a powerful state (superpower), determines, more or less, the foreign policy of other smaller and weaker states². Its existence and continuity depend, on the one hand, on the power recourses, will and strategic competence and, on the other hand, on the basically voluntary allegiance of a group of follower-states which share significant interests and are governed by similar political systems³.

The term “Great Power” refers to a state which has excessively high power ratios at all levels (diplomatic, military, economic, political, technological) compared to other states, with the result that the power of this state, and mainly the military and the political will to use this military power, gives him the comparative advantage of competition with other states and the ability to oppose a serious struggle in a totalitarian war against the other great powers⁴.

1.2 Method and Methodology

1.2.1 Method

This research is clearly a case-study and will be used for it qualitative research methods. Specifically, will be used intrinsic case study and instrumental case study method. The case study focuses on a particular organization and the research interest emerged from the need for the researcher to learn as much as possible about the subject case. The research looks at two historical cases with one goal in mind. The goal is to find the role of democracy in both cases and to answer clearly in the two basic research questions described below.

The subject of this thesis, in International Affairs, combines politics and history. But, as Gould mentioned “we must learn to think about politics historically, and history politically”.

Case studies always have high possibility of bias because the data collection is totally up to the judgment of the researcher. In an attempt to avoid this, the author will make an effort to use multiple sources and to focus on using the established theories in any criticism and outcome of conclusions.

Stake asserts that the role of the interpreter (the person who evaluates the sources) is the most important. The interpreter is the one who undertakes clarification and in-depth insight into the descriptions and varied interpretations he collects, so that after he has elaborated them based on his own conceptions, he will deliver them enriched to the audiences (the readers of the final research). In other words, the interpreter offers to the reader’s material to make their own interpretations.

---

1.2.2 Methodology

This thesis is a qualitative, multiple cases study. As all types of research, a two-cases study has both strengths and weaknesses and is not without its critics who have stated that, we cannot generalize from two cases, therefore, the two-cases study cannot contribute to scientific development and that cases study is most useful for generating hypotheses, whereas other methods are more suitable for hypotheses testing and theory building. But as Toshkov explains, this method is commonly used in political sciences, and is helpful in contributing to the understanding of processes and decision-making within various kinds of organizational and political structures.

Remenyi advises that two case studies allow the researcher to indulge in some comparative analysis (using both similarities and differences) which can produce some useful insights into the nature of the circumstances being studied.

Yin makes clear that case study is “an all-encompassing method” and also points out several rationales for choosing a case study design. Those applying to this case study include that it describes a case which is representative and therefore should have an informative value.

Assessments of Athenian democracy with modern criteria and modern democracies with the Athenians criteria do not fall into the sphere of political science. A scientific approach and comparison require a precise recording and interpretation of their similarities and differences. But each case will be handled as unique and it will be fully respected.

The aim is to look at the cases as an instance for a theoretically defined class of events; analysing the motivation behind actions by doing an in-depth study in order to draw wider conclusions.

---

10 Bent Flyvbjerg. 2006. “Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research,” Qualitative Inquiry 12, no.2
This study does not aim to explain individually historical events, but rather to the point possible, to generalize beyond the data, by examining cases to demonstrate a more general theoretical proposition. In what has been termed a hypothesis-generating case study\textsuperscript{17}; the author will look and analyse the structure, the scope, the means and capabilities of each alliance and finally to examine and analyse historical examples of the international behaviour of the alliance. We will focus on the alliance internal decision-making process in each alliance/league and how democratic it was (or it was not) in specific historical examples. We will also put emphasis on the behavior and the role of the leading state of the alliance – league.

As we mentioned before, this dissertation is a qualitative cases study essay. We will consider that one city–state in the ancient world accepted the same democratic value and principles when this is proved by its behaviour and is fully documented in ancient references. While, we will consider that one state in modern world accept the same democratic values and principles if the state declared the acceptance and it has signed the official treaty document that form the alliance. For example the NATO Treaty, that is presented in Annex A.

This methodological choice, although it ultimately assesses the theoretical framework chosen in this paper, it does not put other IR theories aside, but the author puts emphasis on realism and shelter theory. We choose to focus on these two theories because we consider that these theories can shed light in both sides of the same issue. The behavior of the superpower can be seen through realistic consideration explaining the conditions of balance of power and the security dilemma. On the other hand, the behavior and motivations of small states in order to form alliances can be explained through shelter theory.

\textsuperscript{17} Levy, Jack S. 2008. "Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference".
1.3 Research questions

We had to narrow our research and to focus on specific aspects in order not to widen our thesis. So, we will try to answer to the following two basic questions:

❖ What is the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances?
❖ What is the role of the superpower in the alliance?

Surely, a lot of secondary questions must be elaborated, such as the followings:

- How do states organize an alliance?
- What values must be accepted among allies?
- Do we have historical examples for successful alliances?
- Do we have historical examples of unsuccessful alliances?
- How an alliance was organized in the past and how it is organized nowadays?

Having clarify the method and methodology that we have been followed in order to accomplish this dissertation, we will continue setting up the theoretical framework, providing useful definitions for the terms alliance and democracy.
Chapter 2 – Theoretical Framework

2.1 The meaning of Alliance in the International Relations

Alliance\(^\text{18}\) is a group of countries, political parties, or people who have agreed to work together because of shared interests or aims. According to the international law, Alliance\(^\text{19}\) is a contract, treaty or league between two sovereigns or states, made to insure their safety and common defence.

Why the states want to participate in alliances? The formation of alliances based in the principles of realism theory. Kanag\(^\text{20}\) supports the idea of Thucydides, from 5o century BC that nations end up going to war out of “fear, honour, and interest”.

Walt stated that states form alliances primarily to balance against external threats\(^\text{21}\). In International Relations it is basic the balance of power theory. Theoretically, all the states-nations are equal, but there is the inherent “inequality of nations”\(^\text{22}\) which is result of the global state system as we present in table 1.

One of the basic values that states are usually expected to uphold is national security. Many states also enter into alliances with other states to increase their national security. To ensure that no great power state succeeds in achieving a hegemonic position of overall domination. It is also necessary to construct and maintain a balance of power related basically in military capabilities and resources. One of the most fundamental values of IR is obviously national security.

In twentieth century and in particular after the First World War, the League of Nations (1920–1946) was the first attempt to organize an international peace organization. The underlying philosophy of the League was the principle of collective security which meant that the international community had a duty to intervene in internationals conflicts\(^\text{23}\).

In the 1950s in Western Europe a process of regional integration was getting under way. This “integration” refers to international cooperation among states

\(^{18}\) Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus

\(^{19}\) https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/alliance retrieved 10th September 2019


regarding trade, investment and capital transfers, providing mutual advantages and benefits. During 1950s and 1960s Western Europe and Japan developed mass-consumption welfare states, as the United States had done already before the Second World War. The development has as a consequence a higher level of trade, communication and cultural exchange across boarder. So, many trade alliances established in that period.

Nowadays there are a lot of types of alliances. The author will focus on defence alliances.

Several scholarly articles exist trying to analyze how do states choose their friends\textsuperscript{24}. Models\textsuperscript{25} noticed that alliance is so key term of International Relations and alliances have very significant and important role in the international environment. In the same mood, Friedman, Bladen, Rosen\textsuperscript{26} agree that alliances are the central feature of international political life. Morgenthau\textsuperscript{27} also characterized alliances as the necessary function of the balance of power operating in a multiple state system. Holsti\textsuperscript{28} goes further the idea of the alliance stated that alliances are apparently a universal component of relations between political units, irrespective of time and place. Niou, Ordeshook\textsuperscript{29} points out that alliances and coalitions among the weak states to defend themselves from the strong have been the typical method for preserving the balance of power in international relations. Waltz\textsuperscript{30} stated that smaller and weaker states will have a tendency to align themselves with great powers in order to preserve their maximum autonomy. He also mentioned that alliances mainly are defensive and are driven by fear.

It is remarkable that Thucydides, four centuries B.C. and Waltz in twentieth century reached in the same conclusion, that alliances are driven by fear.

\textsuperscript{26} Friedman, Bladen, Rosen. 1970. “Alliance in International Politics”
\textsuperscript{28} Holsti, Hopmann. Sullivan 1973. “Unity and Disintegration in International Alliances”
\textsuperscript{30} Waltz, K. N. 1993. “The Emerging Structure of International Politics"
According to neorealist Mearsheimer\(^{31}\), the anarchic structure of the international system has two principal consequences. First, trust among states is a very difficult issue. Second, each state is fully responsible to guarantee its own survival since no other state is willing to provide its security. After the end of Cold War the world become more complex and uncertain, the global instability and insecurity is sharply increased. As a reaction to this new condition, as Keohane\(^{32}\) stated, a high level of institutionalization significantly reduces the destabilizing effects of multipolar anarchic international system. Alliances and other types of institutions make up for lack of trust between states. They do that by providing a flow of information among their member states, which consequently are much less in the dark about what other states are doing and why. Alliances and institutions thus become more transparent and help reduce member states’ fear of each other. It is necessary to highlight that according to Thucydides fear was the real caution of the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta. In addition, institutions provide a forum for negotiation between states, providing continuity and a sense of stability, helping a climate of trust and reliability to be created among member states\(^{33}\).

Surely, present-day IR scholars agree on one hand that international institutions can make cooperation between states easier and far more likely. But on the other hand, they do not claim that such institutions can by themselves guarantee a qualitative transformation of IR, from a “jungle” to a “zoo”.

2.1.1. Alliance and Small States

According to Thorhallsson, Steinsson and Lake\(^{34}\), small states have the tendency to “subordinate themselves to dominant states”. So, small states have two courses of action, either to try to align with threatening powers (bandwagoning) or to try to join alliances in order to balance against powerful actors (balancing). Traditional IR theories support that the international system is anarchic and as a consequence small states are expected to behave in such two ways. Small states are forced to form


alliances with super power states in order to obtain greater levels of security\textsuperscript{35}. Bilateral or multilateral can be the formatted alliances, they can include both super power states and small states. Lake\textsuperscript{36} supported that willingly small states subordinate themselves to other powerful states in order to obtain more secure, more protection and basically to increase the feeling that small state is not alone but it is a part of a group of states with common moral values and interests. In each alliance there is an hierarchy between the member states. And there are some hierarchical relations among the states. Lake also argued that small states can benefit from hierarchical relations in three ways: enhancing security and national sovereignty, defining internal and external property rights reducing risks of potential conflicts, and finally setting patterns of international behaviour and international law.

Alliances can be either defensive or offensive, intended to attack to a third party or aimed at defending its members in case of they are attacked. Alliances such as NATO which is a defensive alliance have a significant institutionalized character with a formal collective defence commitment. When a small state is joining in the alliance can take advantages in two aspects. First, small states can influence on planning and executing particular foreign policy issues of the alliance. Secondly small states can take advantage of the alliance international status beyond neutrality or non-alignment in regards in relations with other non-alliance member states. Basically, small states are joining alliances in order to increase their security, to protect themselves from possible adversaries and to increase international and regional stability. When a small state belongs to an alliance also allows access to the consultation structure of the alliance and increases the possibilities of gaining political support and military assistance from super power states or other major power partners\textsuperscript{37}. There is also another aspect; alliances can also help with burden sharing by pooling resources that small states usually does not have the specific capability.

Each formation of alliance among states is a promise and produces a relation, an interaction. Each relation between two states is a bidirectional relation and it leads to “self-restraints” and they accept in some predetermined actions. So, the anarchic

\textsuperscript{35} Rothstein, R. 1969. “Alliances and Small Powers”
\textsuperscript{36} Lake, David. 2009. “Hierarchy in International Relations”
\textsuperscript{37} Shou, A., Brundtland, A. O. 1971. “Small State in International Relations”
international environment becomes more democratic, more polite and the international law is valid and acceptable.

2.1.2. Alliance and Great Powers

The post-Second World War era is characterized by an increase in the number of international organizations and their responsibilities. This improvement stems from the growing need of states to coordinate their policies and multiply their profits by overcoming problems collective action on issues requiring international cooperation and coordination. Ikenberry characterizes the Western order to have “constitutional characteristics”, trying to describe the structure of institutions and open polities. This kind of organization presents two main points. First, constrain the Great Powers and second providing the “voice opportunities” in the small states.

The winner states of Second World War trying to implement their incentives had to create a legitimate political order. In this “new order” the international institutions had to play a key role. This “institutional development” took place in four steps.

- Immediately after World War II, there was a group of states with huge power asymmetries. United States had to persuade the weaker states that it would not abandon or dominate them. So, United States engaged in “Strategic Restraint”.

- International institutions adopted firm procedures and predictable course of actions. The Western post-war order was so stable and mutually acceptable because it was founded in institutional ways.

- It was created a confident climate between Europe, Japan and United States. The allies’ states remained within the order and operated according to the rules and institutions. United States was a benign and acceptable ally due to the fact that it was an open democracy with transparent procedures.

- While time goes by, the Western order had actually become more stable because the rules and institutions had embedded in the wider structures of politics and society.

---

Institutions are potentially capable under specific circumstances of locking states into stable and continuous relations that place some limits on the exercise of state power mitigating the insecurities and shifting power balances. United States achieved to convert its favourable post-war power position into a durable order that commanded the allegiance of the other states within. A legitimate political order is one in which its states member willingly participate and agree with the overall orientation of the system. States believe and accept the rules and the principles, and they abide them as their own. In short, the United States agrees to operate within an institutionalized political frame and in return its partners agree to be willing participants in this new world order. Hegemonic power invests in the future.

There is also a different point of view. Great power states know that there are periods of prosperity and periods of decline of their preponderance. Through the institutionalized construction of political system, they could influence the whole process to form the new uprising circumstances and the new super power that will appear in the near future.

The constitution as Ikenberry states, sets limits on the use of power and this serves to reduce the implications of winning and losing within the political system. So, it is a win – win deal.

---

2.2 Democracy

Many meanings attach to the word democracy. The word democracy is simply, in the Greek, *demos* (the many, the majority) and *kratos*, meaning rule. Plato in his dialogues denounces democracy as being the political system in which the rule of opinion over knowledge. Only those with philosophical knowledge of the real nature of things were fit to rule.

Freedom (*eleutheria*), in any type, was and it still is the fundamental democratic ideal. *Eleutheria* can be seen as both the political liberty of each free citizen of the city-state, but it was also the obligation, to participate in decision-making process. It was also the private liberty of each citizen to live in more or less as one pleased. The freedom to speak and to think freely was the most important liberty. It includes the freedom to speak out for the common good in the public assemblies and freedom to speak as one chose in the privacy of the home. Equality was prized, but it was legal and political equality, not economic. There was also the collective freedom of the city itself from conquest by other cities.

The meaning of freedom includes the personal, social and political freedom. But, democracy and freedom has a precondition, culture. Democratic political system has as an obligation the cultured citizens. Jacqueline de Romily stated “Democracy is the power of the citizens. All the powers derive from the people and are applicable by the people. But people must have culture of political morality”. One citizen's rights stop where the rights of another citizen begin. It is necessary each person to have enhanced social consciousness and to be “self-restrained” so as to be first priority the common profit instead to personal profit.

The democratic ideal was clearly described at the Periclean Oratio, the speech of Pericles to his fellow Athenians extolling their democracy as recounted by Thucydides in his History of the Peloponnesian War. Pericles stressed «*We are free and tolerant in our private lives, but in public affairs we keep to the law. This is because it commands our deep respect…*».

---

40 Plato “Politeia” in ancient Greek. Book VIII, 555b
41 Ibid 557b
42 Thucydides. “History of the Peloponnesian War” B: 37
We must highlight that Pericles notes “we keep to the law”. It is self-evident that there can be no liberty for anyone without a common accepted social order. But the Greek concept of “law” will seem strange and different to us. They did not believe that obedience to law followed from consent given after open public discussion and debate.

We must provide additional information about how ancient Athenians understood the term of “law”. According to Plato⁴⁴, the criterion of the common acceptance of a law of the whole political community is just as important as the criterion of law and the public interest. In other words, the public opinion of the city is called law.

For the ancient Greek spirit, there is no room either for authoritarianism or for arbitrariness in establishing those laws. Whether one citizen express an opinion and propose a law, even if he is the most virtuous and the best of all, his proposal will not be adopted if the majority of community members do not agree that it is in their interest to accept it⁴⁵. So, the law is an agreement and a treaty of the citizens, since its establishment is done by «συμπάσης τῆς πόλεως» "whole the city", that is from the whole, civil society itself, not from one, few or a part of citizens. Hence Demosthenes⁴⁶ appoints law as the mutual agreement between members of the city for how to live somebody in it.

In order to get involved all the citizens in the administration of the city cumbersome numbers of tens of thousands of participants had to be entitled producing too many meetings and frequent rotation of offices. We now call this kind of democracy “direct democracy”, as contrasted to our “representative democracy”, when all most of us do is vote for representatives every four or five years. Theirs was that has been called a “face-to-face society”. Indeed, they did not believe that democracy was possible except in relatively small cities-states, where everyone knew intimately what was going on. Aristotle⁴⁷ even said that a city should be no longer than that the voice of Stentor, the herald could be heard from one side of the city to the other, nor longer than that every citizen could know the character of every other citizen.

---

⁴⁴ Platon, Laws A 644d
⁴⁵ Aristotle. 1885. “Politics” in ancient Greek. C 1280b
⁴⁶ Demosthenes, Against Aristogiton A 16
According to Aristotle, democracy meant the rule of many, but all too often degenerated into anarchy. A state was infinitely stronger if law rulers were trusted by the citizens, if they could communicate with them by free public debate, and at best they had emerged from the same pole of citizens of the city-state. But a state needed educated elite who possessed a kind of practical wisdom that was a mixture of education and experience. So, democracy was an essential element in good government but by itself was unlikely to yield good government, not impossible but very difficult.

In addition, Aristotle believes that democracies can decline. The quality of democratic decisions and the democratic process was in close relationship with the quality and ethos of the leaders. But the whole electorate involved in the decision-making process can make far better decisions than it would be if there were a limited number of decision-makers.

The definition of democracy which will be used for the research is provided by John Gastil, who defines democracy in the following terms:

“Democracy connotes wide-ranging liberty, including the freedom to decide one’s own course in life and the right to play an equal role in forging a common destiny. Democracy means social and civil equality and a rejection of discrimination and prejudice. Democracy embraces the notion of pluralism and cultural diversity. It welcomes a wide range of perspectives and lifestyles, moving different social groups towards peaceful coexistence or respectful integration. Democracy represents the ideal of a cohesive community of people living and working together and finding fair, non-violent ways to reconcile conflicts. In sum, democracy embodies all three elements of the famous French Revolutionary slogan (liberty, equality, fraternity).”

The author will examine the democracy as a value and a basic principle for the building equal international relations between states - nations. The internal organization and structure of each case study will be examined further.

48 Aristotle “The Athenian Constitution” in ancient Greek
Numerous scholarly articles exist on democracy. Vander Hook\textsuperscript{51} stated that it is commonly agreed that democracy includes two basic principles: freedom and equality. Beckman\textsuperscript{52} highlighted that democracy carries the promise of bestowing political power on everyone. Pearson\textsuperscript{53} provides a further dimension of definition of democracy stated that democracy must be kept strong – with a strength that is not only military and economic, but also intellectual and moral. As far as the Athenian Democracy is concerned, Thorley\textsuperscript{54} characterized it as “the prelude of democracy” and Canevaro & Gray\textsuperscript{55} point out that the Athenian democratic culture shaped contemporary political thinking and action.

The meaning of democracy in international relations is slightly different from the meaning in domestic political scene. The fundamental principles of democracy are\textsuperscript{56}:

- The popular sovereignty
- The equality of civil rights
- The human rights
- The separation of powers

The Athenian democracy is recognized as the oldest democracy in the world and that ideas revived in western culture and in particular during the French revolution and the USA constitution, have contributed to the formation of modern democracies.\textsuperscript{57}

By the term "democratic values" are described the values of liberty and equality as are expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and the system of political reforms which introduced by the Athenian leader Cleisthenes in 507 B.C. The author puts emphasis on these particular sources


\textsuperscript{56} Inter-Parliamentary Union. 1998. “Democracy: Its Principles and Achievement”.

because the case-studies are from ancient world – where Athens had a significant role - and from the modern world – where the United States of America are playing an important role.

Nowadays, the majority of citizens, in the modern societies all over the world, would not tolerate living in a state that suppresses freedom and dialogue other than democratic. Today more than 50% of the world's population lives under the conditions of a representative democracy.58

The author really agrees with Reinhold Niebuhr’s opinion that “Man’s inclination to justice makes democracy possible, but man’s capacity for injustice makes democracy necessary”.59

2.2.1. Democracy among nations

We analyze the definition of democracy and we present the conditions of modern democracies, but it was always a question mark in the author’s mind, what kind of democracy can be formed among nations/states in order to establish an alliance?

Gould60 proposes the cosmopolitan democracy, which is a type of democracy with moral principles among nations. Democratic theory with its joint requirements of self-determination, on the one hand and human rights and justice, on the other, seems to break down when extended to the domain of international relations. For here, the principle of self-determination as the self-determination of nations would appear to require the recognition of state sovereignty and thus the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of any state by another.

By contrast, the principles of human rights and of justice would seem to require intervention in the affairs of other states when such rights are violated, and such intervention would seem to violate the right of self-determination of nations and the sovereignty of states. Thus, whereas in the context of a single state, the democratic principles – that is, self-determination in accordance with the decision of a majority of the people is bounded by the requirement not to infringe on the basic rights of any

individual – in international relations, this compatibility does not appear to obtain and a different theory seems to be required.

This problem has given rise to two conflicting positions in the philosophy of international relations, each emphasizing one of these fundamental principles of democracy. The first, which emphasizes the right of self-determination of nations, has been called the “autonomy of states”. The second view, which emphasizes on international law and justice in IR and puts in first priority the human rights, has been called “cosmopolitan view”. These two conflicting views are based in the traditional political philosophy, which held that relations among nations are not subject to moral principles. The ground for this position is that nations stand to each other in a state of nature, in which each nation is sovereign and subject to no higher law. At most, morality among nations was held to consist in the upholding of international agreements or treaties and the observance of the rules of war.

It was a dream of Woodrow Wilson, President of USA in 1917, who had also been a political science professor. His main mission was to bring democratic values to Western Europe and from there to the rest of the world. In his address to Congress Asking for Declaration of War in 1917, he quoted “The world must be made safe for democracy”61. This means that first priority for the states is the security of their territory, to ensure their sovereign and later to improve their internal political system to a democratic one. In addition, Wilson’s vision was the transformation of the international political system and the relations among states from a “jungle” of chaotic power politics to a “zoo”62 of regulated and peaceful relations.

We must accept that the democratic world is expanding. Approximately, 60% of the whole countries in the world have democratic political system63. Being democratic has become a pre-requisite for countries to join international organizations such as the European Union64 and other institutions such as NATO strengthen democratic procedures. In addition, one of the goals of the United Nations is to foster

democratic institutions and values in all the countries around the globe. As a consequence, the growing number of democratic countries should naturally lead to more democratic international organizations. In the process of the evolution of political - social systems during the centuries, democratic values are universally accepted and desired by the citizens. There are certainly problems, obstacles and setbacks. But the overall direction is positive for the wider prevalence of democratic values at the global level.

Having formulate the appropriate theoretical framework, in the next chapter we will analyze the first research question regarding the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances? We will examine the two case-studies, Delian League from the past and NATO from present time.

---


Chapter 3 – Cases study: Delian League, NATO

3.1 Delian League

The Delian League (477 BC – 409 BC) was a political and military alliance of approximately 150 ancient Greek independent cities – states, under the supervision of Athens.

The independent cities - states which were part of the Delian League, it is presented in the next map.

![Picture 1: Members of Delian League](image-url)
3.1.1 General Information

The majority of the information for the Delian League is extracted from the first books of Thucydides “History of the Peloponnesian War”, the Athenian Constitution of Aristotle and from the Plutarch, the Lives of Aristides, Themistocles and Kimon.

The Persian Wars were fought in the first half of the 5th century BC between the Greeks and the Persians. As a result of Persian imperialism, the Greek cities - states decided to form a defence coalition in order to support each other and to protect their freedom and sovereignty.

In that period, the most powerful military city-state was Sparta. All the Greek cities – states wanted to support the common effort and as it was obvious Sparta would undertake the leadership. The willingness of the Greeks cities changed because Pausanias (the king of Sparta) began to behave violently to the Greek city-states, mainly the Ionians and others who had recently been freed from the Pausanias' domination.

There were also three main reasons that Sparta decided not to undertake the leadership of the common effort of the Greek cities against Persians' invasions.

- In Spartan society a large proportion of the inhabitants were slaves (Elots). So, Spartans have always been reluctant to campaign away from their region (Peloponnese) because of the internal danger they faced from the Elots. The rule of Sparta was not democratic and the regime of Sparta had no internal legitimacy.

- Sparta and Ionian cities-states had nothing in common. On the other hand, Athens and Ionian cities had the same origin (the region of Minor Asia).

- The way of life in Sparta was very austere. Spartans had learned to live without many comfort and goods and in all their life they were preparing to fight for their city. And to serve in the army. So, in their mentality the level of ambition regarding the way of their life was very low and very specific. They were preparing to die for their city – state. Additionally, they did not want

---

68 Ibid D: 41
69 Ibid A: 2, A: 95
70 Xenophon. 1993. "Λακεδαιμινίων Πολιτεία (Lacedaemon Constitution)"
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luxurious items, personal amenities and to have much money. It is famous the motto “Spartan way of life”\textsuperscript{71}.

### 3.1.2 Structure of Delian League

Having a look in the map of Delian league, easily we can reach to an obvious conclusion. The majority of the cities-states which were member of the league were cities very close to the sea or islands. So, the main communication and transportation way was by the sea through ships and vessels. The movement of goods and products was by the sea. That period the main naval force in the region was Athens.

So, the leadership of the Delian League “a priori” was taken by Athens. Thucydides in book A.95 stated “They (Spartans) desired to be rid of the Persian war, conceiving the Athenians to be sufficient leaders and at that time their friends”. In this context Thucydides concentrates the reasons that lead Sparta not to be the leader of the coalition forces against Persians, as we mentioned in the previous paragraph. In addition, Pritchard\textsuperscript{72} stated that “Ancient Athens was the leading political, military, economical and cultural innovator of its age”.

Thus, after the suggestion of Aristides\textsuperscript{73}, the Delian League was formed in 478 BC in Delos Island. It is useful to stress that Delos Island, in ancient times, was the most famous and the most sacred of all the islands because, according to legend\textsuperscript{74}, there was the birthplace of Apollo-Helios, god of daylight and Artemis-Moon, goddess of the night light. For the Greeks the Light was always the most precious good. There was one more reason that Delos was selected. The island was located in the central Aegean Sea\textsuperscript{75} and it was in the middle of the distance between Athens and the Greek cities in Asia Minor\textsuperscript{76}.

\textsuperscript{72} Pritchard M. David. 2015. “Democracy and war in Ancient Athens and today”. Page 140
\textsuperscript{73} Ancient Athenian statesman and according to Herodotus “the best and most honorable man in Athens”.
\textsuperscript{76} Bowra C. M. 1971. “Periclean Athens”. Page 26
The establishment of Delian League had as excuse the intention of Greeks cities to take revenge from Persians for all the disasters and catastrophe that they are suffered during Persians wars. But main intention was to sustain their independency and to liberate the Greek cities that were under Persian domination. Initially 140 cities-states participated in Delian League.

All members of Delian League had one vote at the plenary conference, which convened once a year in Delos Island, specifically inside the temple of Apollo. Each city – member had the obligation to contribute to the share fund either with money either with troops (vessels). So, Delian league was a very important naval force in the region. The common fund was established in Delos Island.

Precondition for all Leagues’ members was to support a common offensive and defensive policy and therefore all members of the alliance swore that would have the same enemies and friends.

Historians identify two periods in the Delian League’s existence. The first period is from 478 BC till 454 BC the treasure of the League was established in Delos Island and the annual general assembly of League’s members convened. The second period from 454 BC till 404 BC was the period that the treasure of the League transferred in Athens, all the decision received in Athens and in general the Delian League was transformed to the Athenian Empire.

3.1.3 How democratic was Delian League?

The maximum of Delian League’s influence was in 467 BC, when Cimon, leader of Athens, won the Persians on the Eurymedonta (Ευρυμέδοντα) river of Pamphylia. It was a crucial victory for the Delian League over the Persians. Afterwards, Athens was free to establish its empire. Naval forces of Delian League controlled and dominated the Aegean Sea. The League’s territory had become Athenian territory and all the Athenian colonies and new cities – states had become as military, and more
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80 Ibid A: 96 – 97, Aristotle 23, 4 - 5
specific naval, bases. In this period, cities-states that participated in Delian League were estimated to 400.

The structure of Delian League in the first period, from 478 till 454 BC, we can say that it was according to democratic principles of equality and state sovereignty. All the independent cities-states were formally equal. Each state had one vote in the plenary section of annual Delian League Conference in Delos Island. In addition, each city-state could maintain its autonomy and the participation in the League was on volunteer basis. There was no official mechanism to coerce states to participate in the Delian League. The political system of the allies’ city-state which formed the Delian League was mainly democratic.

On the other hand, it was obvious that Athens, which had the stronger naval power, had the capabilities to influence other cities-states and to dominate the League. All the League’s members recognized Athens as the leading power. So, the member city-states of Delian League recognized Athens as the super power of the age. In addition, Athens had the privilege to plan and execute war operations of the League, but the autonomy of the cities was fully guaranteed. The inspiration of democratic Athens had seeded in the rule of Delian League. Pritchard characteristically stated “There is a strong case that democracy was a major reason for this success”.

In the framework of Delian League, the behaviour of the Athenians to other small member-states, started to become “tyranny”, selfish and arrogant. Some cites – states reacted to Athens’ decisions and tried not to participate in the League’s campaign. Some cities – states, such as Naxos and Thassos, rebelled against the Athenians’ will. Kimon, the leader of Athens, trying to sustain the status quo into
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86 Pritchard M. David. 2015. “Democracy and war in Ancient Athens and today”. Page 140
88 Pritchard M. David. 2015. “Democracy and war in Ancient Athens and today”. Page 140
89 Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” B:63
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League, took the decision to force violently the rebelled cities –states to conform to the Athens’ decision. Admittedly, it is obvious, that no city-state could leave the League without the will of the Athenians and it was common believe among the League members’ that the hegemony of Athens was no longer welcome and favorable\textsuperscript{92}. The autonomy of the cities-states had been virtually abolished, and the Delian League had become an instrument for the imposition of Pan-Hellenic Athenian hegemony.\textsuperscript{93}

In 454 BC the young powerful man of Athens, Pericles, decided to transfer the common fund of the League from Delos Island to the Acropolis of Athens. This was a symbolic movement, trying to spread to all League’s members firstly, that Athens was economical the most powerful member and secondly, the decisions would be made only by Athens\textsuperscript{94}. The relocation of League’s treasury to Athens marks a turning point at which many historians stop referring to Delian League but to Athenian Empire\textsuperscript{95}. As a consequence, the annual conference in Delos Island never convened again and the taxes for the cities – states were set by the Athenian Assembly. For first time, in Athens organized the office of “Treasurers to the Greeks”\textsuperscript{96} (in Greek Ελληνοταμίες) that were responsible to collect the Delian League member’s contribution in money.

Another, very characteristic movement that Athens made, trying to establish its hegemonic position, was the imposition of Athens’ currency\textsuperscript{97} on allied cities\textsuperscript{98} (449 BC). In order to describe the Athenian point of view regarding Delian League we must characteristically mention that in their inscriptions Athenians used the phrase “the cities which the Athenians rule”\textsuperscript{99}.

In 449 BC the so-called Peace of Callias is signed between Athens and the Persian king. This effectively puts an end to the Greek-Persian wars. The main term

\textsuperscript{92} Ibid A:99
\textsuperscript{94} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:143
\textsuperscript{96} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A: 96
\textsuperscript{97} Meiggs R. & Lewis D. 1969. „A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the Fifth Century BC“ Vol 1. Page 45
of peace obliges the Persians to recognize the autonomy of the Greek cities. So, the Delian League’s context had no longer any reason to exist, since the war against the Persians had ended\textsuperscript{100}. But in reality, the threat of the Persian invasion had been diminished long time ago.

The effect of internal democratic political system of Athens was reflected in the foreign affairs. The Athenian general Cleon stated that “For through your own mutual security and openness, you imagine the same also in your confederates”\textsuperscript{101}. In this phrase of famous Athenian general evaporates the idea that Athens had respected the democratic values in their relations with the other allies’ cities - states.

Vey briefly, we can highlight that Athenians’ policy exploit the advantages of Delian League by itself in order to form and sustain Athens’ present and domination in the Aegean Sea, controlling all the naval ways. Major reason for this success was democracy. Pritchard stated that “Athens transformed ancient warfare and became one of the ancient world’s superpower”\textsuperscript{102}. New ideas demonstrated and “fresh air” blown on human brain. On the one hand, the new ideas of democracy and freedom were in place. On the other hand, Athenians in the frame of Delian League, achieved to maximize their own freedom by restricting the freedom of other Greek cities – states\textsuperscript{103}.

Each political scientist must have the appropriate tools and methods in order to evaluate a political formation. We will examine how democratic was the Delian League and we are planning to use the method of criteria.

According to Dahl\textsuperscript{104} the criteria for a democratic process can be summarized as follow:

- Effective participation. All the states - members of the alliance must have equal and effective opportunities for notifying their point of views to all the other states – members, prior to an alliance policy and decision is adopted.

\textsuperscript{100} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A: 89
\textsuperscript{101} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” C:37
\textsuperscript{102} Pritchard M. David. 2015. “Democracy and war in Ancient Athens and today”. Page 140
\textsuperscript{103} Roberts J. W. 1998. “City of Sokrates: An Introduction to Classical Athens” 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ed. Page 85
♦ Voting equality. All the states - members must have the opportunity to vote according to the internal decision-making procedure of the alliance and all votes must be counted as equal.

♦ Enlightened understanding. Each state – member must have equal and effective opportunities for knowing about the relevant alternative policies and their consequences.

♦ Control of the agenda. The states – members must have the exclusive ability to decide how and what matters are to be included on the agenda. So, the democratic process is never ended and the policies of the alliance are always open to change if the states – members of the alliance accept it.

In this thesis we can accept that these criteria are eligible and valid for the formation of an alliance.

As far as effective participation is concerned, League in the first period of its existence, was democratic. Each city – state participated in the general assembly, which took place once a year in Delos Island105. Unfortunately, after its first decades of Delian League’s existence, Athens decided the cancelation of the annual general assembly of the League and all the decisions and policies decided exclusively by Athens106. Surely, the second period of the League we can not characterized as democratic.

For the second criterion about voting equality, each city – state had one vote in the general assembly and each vote had the same importance and validity107. This sentence describes the situation in the first period of Delian League, which can be characterized as democratic. The second period, when the general assembly never convened again, and all the decision was made exclusively by Athens108, there was no room for voting and this criterion did not accomplished. Surely the second period of league regarding this criterion was not democratic.

Regarding enlightened understanding when the general assembly of the League convened in Delos Island, each city – state had the opportunity to get

informed, to discuss, to analyze advantages and disadvantages of each policy and each suggestion\textsuperscript{109}. The final decision was a result of negotiation and compromise. It was a very democratic procedure. On the other hand, when Athens decided, firstly, to transfer the “headquarter” of the League from Delos Island to Athens, and secondly, to cancel the annual general assembly of the members of the League, it was very difficult, even if it was impossible, for the others city – states which are far away from Athens to get informed and much more to discuss\textsuperscript{110} with the Athenians the alternative policies and their consequences. Admittedly this period was not democratic.

The forth criterion “control of the agenda” is in close relation and coordination with the third criterion. League in the first period of its existence, was democratic. Each city – state participated in the general assembly and had the capability to propose some issue in order to be included on the agenda of discussion\textsuperscript{111}. Unfortunately, after its first decades of Delian League’s existence, Athens decided the cancelation of the annual general assembly of the League and all the matters and issues were exclusively included on the agenda by Athens\textsuperscript{112}. Surely, the second period of the League we can not characterized as democratic.

In conclusion, the four criteria of Dahl\textsuperscript{113} are accomplished in the first period of Delian League and the whole process can be characterized as democratic. Unfortunately, in the second period of League none of the Dahl’s criteria are accomplished and the whole situation can not be determined as democracy.

\textsuperscript{109} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:96
\textsuperscript{110} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:99
\textsuperscript{111} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:97
\textsuperscript{112} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:99
3.2 NATO

3.2.1 General Information

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), also known as the North Atlantic Alliance, was established in 1949 for creating an Intergovernmental Military Alliance. In Annex A it is presented the original document of NATO Treaty.

NATO is the most successful example of multinational organization\(^{114}\). This year NATO completes 70 years, from the second half of twentieth century till the dawn of twenty first century. NATO itself divides the whole period in three phases. The first phase is till the end of Cold War (1991), the second phase till the 11\(^{th}\) September 2001 and the third phase till today. The basic factor for the successful duration of NATO is its ability to be transformed. Basically, NATO starts its existence as a military defense alliance in order to response to an emerging threat (Soviet Union), during the Cold War. After the historical collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, NATO has increasingly begun to emphasize its political and diplomatic functions, rather than just its purely military ones\(^{115}\).

\(^{114}\) Effective multilateralism: how NATO adapts to meet changing security challenges Keynote address by NATO Deputy Secretary General Rose Gottemoeller, Chatham House, London. Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_142021.htm?selectedLocale=en

\(^{115}\) The consultation process and Article 4. Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49187.htm
3.2.2 Structure of NATO

The most important factors in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are the member-states. Twenty-nine states participate in the organization from two contingents (Europe and North America).

**Picture 1: Map of the NATO member-states**

In the table 1 is presented the NATO member-states in alphabetic order with the year of introduce to NATO in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM (1949)</td>
<td>HUNGARY (1999)</td>
<td>PORTUGAL (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK (1949)</td>
<td>LUXEMBOURG (1949)</td>
<td>TURKEY (1952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE (1949)</td>
<td>NETHERLANDS (1949)</td>
<td>THE UNITED STATES (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY (1955)</td>
<td>NORWAY (1949)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: NATO member-states in alphabetic order
The structure of NATO consists of three basic pillars\textsuperscript{116} – the civilian structure, the military structure\textsuperscript{117} and different other organizations and agencies.\textsuperscript{118}

- **The civilian structure\textsuperscript{119}**

  It consists of the NATO Headquarters (HQ) in Brussels, permanent representatives, national delegations and international staff. The top international civil servant in the Alliance is the Secretary General. Nowadays, Jens Stoltenberg occupies this important position.

  The North Atlantic Council (NAC) is the principal political decision-making body within NATO. It brings together high-level representatives of each member country to discuss policy or operational questions requiring collective decisions. In short, it provides a forum for wide-ranging consultation between members on all issues affecting their peace and security, where each member state has its representatives. The Council meets at least every week – at the level of permanent representatives and at least twice a year at the level of ministers of foreign affairs. Also, three times a year at the level of ministers of defence. Occasionally there is required a participation of prime ministers and heads of state and government – that is a summit level. The last NATO summit was held in September 2014 in Wales.

  In North Atlantic Council, each member - state participates on an equal basis, while state sovereignty is fully accepted. The principle of consensual decision-making process, within the Council but also at the lowest level of the organization, highlights the central role played by the member - states. They are the states that participate in the processes, consult, agree and ultimately decide and are actively involved in any decision-making process of NATO.

\textsuperscript{116} Prague Student Summit 2015 “What is NATO? Background Report”. Available at: amo.cz
\textsuperscript{117} First Session of the North Atlantic Council - (Terms of Reference and Organisation). 17 Sep 1949
\textsuperscript{118} https://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html retrieved December 5, 2019
\textsuperscript{119} https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/structure.htm#CS retrieved December 5, 2019
The military structure\textsuperscript{120}

The military structure consists of the International Military Staff, Allied Command Operations (ACO), Allied Command Transformation (ACT), and other NATO command and staff organizations.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{civil_military_structure.png}
\caption{Civil and military structure of NATO}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item Different other organizations and agencies\textsuperscript{121}
\end{itemize}

NATO has established many organizations and agencies with very specific role and capabilities, such as NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA), NATO Communications and Information Agency (NCI), NATO accredited Centers of Excellence (CoE).

As a result, NATO functions as a transnational international regional organization where its constituent member states retain their sovereignty, act unanimously on the principle of consensus, and act collectively.

\textsuperscript{120} \url{https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/structure.htm#MS} retrieved December 5, 2019
\textsuperscript{121} \url{https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/structure.htm#OA} retrieved December 5, 2019
3.2.3 How democratic is NATO?

We can say that NATO, structurally, is a very democratic organization, having in mind the meaning of democracy according to the ancient Athens. In NATO all the decisions are taken by consensus. All the members of the alliance must agree to the proposals in order to become NATO official decision or at least not to have a strong objection. In addition, each member has the authority to veto decisions and to block the decision-making process of the board. According to article 1 of NATO treaty (Annex A), it is fully recognized that all state members are equal and each member of NATO has one vote.\(^\text{122}\)

Another point that highlights the democratic procedures of NATO is that according to NATO regulations when an UN mandate requires a NATO mission there is the process of Force Generation. In this process the Operational Commander (military staff) requires the necessary resources from the 29 nations in order to be able to fulfill his mission. Each nation can provide resources till the half of the requirement. This means that nations must participate equally in the Force Generation process.\(^\text{123}\) NATO supports the multinationality and expresses his willingness to contribute as much nations as possible. The United States probably has the capability to provide all the resources which are necessary to the Operational Commander, but NATO deny that offer and it prefers multinationality. This is another characteristic of NATO democratic structure and organization.

NATO as a democratic organization tries to “expand” democracy. The historical collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 and the parallel emergence of independent states in Central and Eastern Europe, members of the previous Warsaw Pact, became an ideal justification for NATO expansion to the East, delivering the idea of promoting and protecting democracy.\(^\text{124}\)

NATO has internally democratic procedures and norms.\(^\text{125}\) Also, it has the ability may not spread democracy, but it is perfectly plausible that membership would

\(^{122}\) [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm) retrieved December 5, 2019

\(^{123}\) [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50316.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50316.htm) retrieved December 5, 2019

\(^{124}\) Pevehouse C. Jon. 2007. “Democracy from Above: Regional Organizations and Democratization”. Page 1

strengthen it\textsuperscript{126}. The NATO’s Membership Action Plans\textsuperscript{127} and other NATO initiatives and programs are good instruments for providing the know-how and the best practices to these countries. NATO historically has been proved more reliable organizations than other international organizations\textsuperscript{128}.

A historical example of the democratic procedures in NATO is the inability of the US to invade Iraq in February 2003 (Second Gulf War) under the NATO umbrella as the NAC did not reach the required consensus and after hard consultations with the Military Committee. Thus, the American leadership succeeded in accomplishing its national interests in the Gulf region by overthrowing Saddam Hussein’s regime through the creation of a Coalition of the willing. The military intervention was a blatant violation of the United Nations Charter\textsuperscript{129}, but it does not in any way affect NATO itself.

In order to examine, how democratic is NATO, we will follow the same procedure as we did in paragraph 3.1.3 regarding the criteria for a democratic process.

As far as effective participation is concerned, each state – member of NATO represents in North Atlantic Council (NAC) by one representative\textsuperscript{130}. In addition in the whole political and military structure of NATO every day many Working Groups and meetings take place and in all these for a representatives from 29 states- members participate and have the opportunity and the capability to express their point of view to all the others members of the alliance\textsuperscript{131} prior to an alliance policy and final decision is adopted. Additionally, at least two times a year the Presidents and Prime Ministers Committee of NATO members convenes. Admittedly, NATO is a democratic alliance in all level of horizontal and vertical structure.

For the second criterion about voting equality, it is clearly stated in article 10 of North Atlantic Treaty that all the parties have the opportunity to vote and each state – member has one vote. In addition, all NATO decisions are made by consensus\textsuperscript{132}.

\textsuperscript{126} Waterman Harvey, Zagorcheva Dessie and Reiter Dan. 2001. “NATO and Democracy”. Page 225

\textsuperscript{127} https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_37356.htm

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid Pages 226, 230

\textsuperscript{129} https://ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Second_Gulf_War

\textsuperscript{130}National delegations on NATO. Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49205.htm

\textsuperscript{131} The North Atlantic Treaty. Washington D.C. 4 April 1949. Article 2, 4 and 9

\textsuperscript{132} https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49178.htm
This procedure is truly democratic with the ancient Athens meaning of democracy\(^{133}\), because all the member of the alliance participate in the decision-making process and they can express their opinions and finally all the decisions are after discussion and consultation among the allies states.

Regarding enlightened understanding, NATO is organized in three basic pillars\(^ {134}\), as we mentioned before. There is not only vertical coordination among member states but also horizontal coordination. This has as a result each member to be fully aware, in a very early stage, about the alternative policies, the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal and of course the consequences. Surely, it is a democratic procedure which has as a scope not to surprise any member state of the alliance. On the contrary, the fruitful discussion and proposals from each member are more than welcome and the final scope is the best decision.

The forth criterion “control of the agenda” is in close relation and coordination with the third criterion. In such a long-lasting and important organization as NATO the internal procedures are complex and time-consuming. The principle of “bottom – up” is in place and is valid. The agenda of a NATO leaders meeting is prepared months ago by the relevant delegations and working groups, and it is open\(^ {135}\) to any suggestion and proposal and any member – state can propose a new matter to be added. Admittedly, the forth criterion is accomplished and the process is democratic.

In conclusion, the four criteria of Dahl\(^ {136}\) are accomplished and the whole process in NATO can be characterized as democratic.

NATO is the best example of a modern defensive alliance which was established in response to an emerging threat. Small European states saw it as the main security guarantee able to balance against a potential adversary (USSR). Based on common interests and values NATO unites 29 member states, of which one third are small states. NATO is a highly institutionalized framework with a collective defence commitment providing countries with clear benefits of membership. In this regard,


\[^ {134}\] Prague Student Summit 2015 “What is NATO? Background Report”. Available at: amo.cz


NATO was seen by small states as both a potentially stronger power to balance against the adversary and as a platform to advance their international status\textsuperscript{137}.

Having analyzed, hopefully, in the previous chapter the first research question regarding the meaning of democracy as a value among the alliances? We will continue in the next chapter trying to analyze the second research question regarding the role of the superpower state in the alliance? We will examine historical examples not only from the ancient history but also from the history of 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

Chapter 4 – The role of the hegemonic power into an alliance

Firstly, we will try to define the meaning of hegemonic power. According to Jackson & Sorensen\(^\text{138}\), “hegemony” means the enforcement of influence and power by a leading power over other states. Adam Watson\(^\text{139}\) states that “hegemony” means the situation in which a powerful state, either of the whole international system or in a regional sub-system, determines, more or less, the foreign policy of other smaller states. Consequently, a “hegemonic power” is a state that is powerful enough to dominate politically or economically in all other smaller states\(^\text{140}\).

4.1 The role of Athens in the Delian League

Athens, through its long history, carried the message of its culture throughout the world through its democracy, institutions, commerce and its imposing buildings. There was a blossom of culture focused on the development of arts and civilization, not only internally but also externally. The democratic political system allowed the Assembly of citizens to make decisions, both internally issues, as well as foreign policy issues. Democracy and the participation on decision making process have a strong relation with the need for extroversion and communication with other states, not only with the other Greek states, but also with cultures and states in the entire Mediterranean region. The commercial trade and the strong naval forces contributed to Athens’ development as a very significant economic centre in the South East Mediterranean Sea\(^\text{141}\).

In the first years of Delian League existence, Athenians, accepting the role of the leading power of the Greek city-states\(^\text{142}\), focused to the conflict against Persians. They considered themselves to be the “first among equals”. Athens' primacy was unquestionable, but it also treated the other smaller cities-states as equals. Proof of this behaviour was that Athens fully complied with the Delian League status. That


were, the annual assembly in Delos, equality in the decision-making process and common funds were established in Apollo temple in Delos.\textsuperscript{143}

In the first years of Delian League Athenians had the leadership and as Thucydides stated the allies were independent. All the cities – states participated in the decision-making process and reached to the final decisions\textsuperscript{144}.

During the passage of time, the circumstances and the conditions changed. Characteristic is the quote of Thucydides “… the Athenians both assured their government over the confederates and also much enlarged their own particular wealth,”\textsuperscript{145}

The first ally city – state which tries to revolt against Athens was Naxos Island. Then the hegemon Athens showed its “true face”. Naxos was siege by the Athenian naval forces and by violence it deprived of its free state\textsuperscript{146}.

Another example of the hegemonic behavior of Athens was the conflict with Thasos. Athenian had under siege two years Thasos. Finally, Thasos defeated, demolished the defense walls around city - state, surrendered the Thasians fleet and paid war compensations to Athens\textsuperscript{147}. Surely, this is not a friendship behavior between two equal and independent cities – states.

Athens also tried to colonize some very strategic areas such as Ennea Hodoi or Nine Ways. Now this area is well known as Amphipolis. Athenians sent ten thousand settlers of their own citizens with other allies’ citizens to establish colonial community\textsuperscript{148} so as to control the crossroad. It is obvious that Athens had as a first priority to support its own interests. So, Athens “used” his leading position in the Delian League as a “vehicle” to promote exclusively its own interests and not the common good for the League and League’s interests. In the Athenians mind the interests of the League were totally the same with the interests of Athens. There was no space for other second class city – state. There was only the domination of Athens.

Additionally, Athens used Delian League as a “vehicle” to export the political system of democracy and culture and to increase trade and business with other states.

\textsuperscript{143} Thucydides. 2011. “History of the Peloponnesian War” A:96
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In many cases Athens tried to influence the political system of other city–state, supporting the democratic leader and the democratic party of the city, such as in Samos\textsuperscript{149}. It was a common belief that democratic cities have more in common and they are having better coordination and cooperation\textsuperscript{150}. In this way, Athens increased its influence and supported its interests\textsuperscript{151}. Elements of imperialism and hegemon behaviour are included in Athens' tactics of interfering in the internal processes of other cities-states\textsuperscript{152}.

The Athenians, creating their naval empire, wished to rule over the entire territory of the Greek world in the South East Mediterranean Sea. Athens' financial and political imperialism was the result of the control of the sea routes and the creation of new markets from other Greek cities-states. This was because the Athenians provided military protection to the rest Greek cities-states against the Persians into the frame of Delian League\textsuperscript{153}. We must have in our mind the morphology and the topography of the Greek area. There are two parts of land, right and left, from the Aegean Sea and there are also many small or bigger islands alongside the sea. This whole picture can lead us to the conclusion that Aegean Sea was a “close” Sea\textsuperscript{154}.

Athenians had the naval forces and also, they had the extroversion mentality\textsuperscript{155}. So, they announced their willing to support other cities-states. The city that controls maritime transportation, controls the trade and the transportation of goods and resources, and thus controls the whole economic activity.

From the above mentioned, it can be seen that international relations are formed mainly by interest. Therefore, Athens' intention was to be the leading city–state the Greek “world” not only in terms of expansion, but also in economic terms by extracting raw materials and trading with those cities-states.

Admittedly, Athens’ effort was not only to increase the economic impact from trade with other cities-states but also to influence these cities. This was the “soft
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power” of Athenian hegemony, which combined the strategy of economic expansion and financial control.

In the internal affairs of Athens, democratic process and freedom gave to the people an active role in the decision-making process. A wider spectrum of citizens was politically active\textsuperscript{156}. The increasing incomes from the allies’ cities – states provided Athens with additional capabilities. So, Athenians had the revenues to employ vast number of citizens as soldiers and sailors. In ancient Athens we meet the organization of professional army. The professional military personnel were more eager to participate in campaigns, better – trained. Each trained crew of a vessel could work collectively to make their warship an offensive weapon\textsuperscript{157}.

On the contrary, Athenians were also eager to demonstrate their “hard power”. Taking advantage from their strong naval forces and their military capabilities, they did not lose the opportunity to use their “hard power” if their words were not enough to persuade the opposing city such as Thassos and Naxos Islands\textsuperscript{158}.

4.1.1 Historical Examples

A very characteristic example in IR and modern political history is the phenomenon which was first used by US Senator William Fulbright in his 1967 book "The Arrogance of Power"\textsuperscript{159}. The legendary dialogue of Milos and Athenians saved by Thucydides in his History (E 85-113), which took place in March 416 BC on a small island of Cyclades, in Milos, between the Athenian sieges and the besieged Milos.

While the so-called Nice Peace was still valid, the peace treaty that had been signed between the Athenians and the Spartans in 421 BC for fifty years, the Athenians blinded by their great economic and naval power – against the terms of this treaty and violating any legal and moral notion - attempted to force Milos to join to Delian League. Milos, was defended the right to remain strictly neutral.

In March 416 BC, the Athenians, without any serious cause, appeared on Milos with a very strong military force, aiming to blackmail Milos to abandon their neutrality and join the Delian League. The dialogue between Milos and Athens is a classic
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example of amorality and cynicism at the level of IR, and above all a monument to the arrogance of power but also of idealistic values in it. Very significant is the quote of Thucydides (E: 89) “But out of those things which we both of us do really think, let us go through with that which is feasible, both you and we knowing that in human disputation justice is then only agreed on when the necessity is equal; whereas they that have odds of power exact as much as they can, and the weak yield to such conditions as they can get.”

Of course, these "negotiations" came to a deadlock - as the Athenians preserved their demands, and the Milos, on the other hand, chose to remain neutral. The result was that the Athenians besieged them and eventually enslaved Milos.

We must recognize that the Athenians’ morality has nothing to do with the ethos (έθος) as Aristotle determined. After centuries of evolution, human being has been able to transcend the “law of the jungle”, where the strongest prevail, and to form a moral and legal framework governed by dignity, equality and justice. This context was overrun by the Athenians by restoring the “law of the jungle”. In the conflict between Athens and Sparta there was no room for neutrality. So, Milos had to decide if she supports Athens or Sparta.

The Athens’ practice and behaviour could be justified as stemming from the spirit of Athenian democracy. Pericles stated in his funeral oration, “Our public men have, besides politics, their private affairs to attend to, and our ordinary citizens, though occupied with the pursuits of industry, are still fair judges of public matters; for, unlike any other nation, regarding him who takes no part in these duties not as unambitious but as useless”. As a consequence, Athenians did not accept that there is a city-state that did not have an opinion. It has to support either Athens or Sparta, neutrality is not an acceptable position. With the ancient Athens’ meaning of democracy, the participation of all the citizens of the city in the decision-making process was mandatory. The city needs the opinion of all the citizens. The citizens also must have the ethos and arête, in order to take wisdom decisions.

---
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It is truly surprising when we realize how little human nature has changed in the last twenty-three centuries\textsuperscript{164}. The fundamental elements of human being that Aristotle described in 340 BC are still valid. In this frame we can remember George Bush (Junior), President of USA, after the attack on 11 Sep 2001, stated “You are either with us or against us”.\textsuperscript{165}

The behaviour of the Athenians can be seen in the light of realism theory and in particular Neorealism\textsuperscript{166}. The Athenians react in this way to the Melians because of their position in the international system. Athens was the new super power in the region. If they had not forced Milos to comply with their wishes, they might have left room for further challenge to Athenian leadership by other small cities-states. So, Athens was obliged to impose its will with any cost.

Similarly, Melians’ desire for neutrality and the lack of a decision to join to an alliance did not allow them to maintain their territorial integrity supported by other allied cities-states, but at critical times they were hopelessly alone against the powerful Athens. The result of the confrontation was obvious considering the balance of power.

\textbf{4.2 The role of USA in NATO}

The history of United States begins in the 18th century, (1776) with the Declaration of Independence and few years later, the Constitution of the United States (1787) and Bill of Rights (1791) have been signed. After the American civil war and mainly in the 20th century, the US, having abandoned the isolating policy, is deeply involved in the political affairs worldwide. Their involvement is started by their participation in the First World War. Since then, the US has been displaying hegemonic behaviour, usually against dictatorial and authoritarian regimes.

Second World War put an end to American isolation. United States takes on a responsibility for creating a liberal world market economy after the war. Firstly, there was no other post-war power to perform that global capitalist role and secondly, United States demonstrate their willingness to take on this responsibility. The United States has employed its military power to provide security to Western Europe against the Soviet threat. That situation has given the United States influence in Europe in other
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areas, such as trade policies, culture etc. The provision of military security thus paves the way for leverage in economic areas. So, the alliance – NATO – operated as a “vehicle” for United States for penetration and influence not only in military but basically in economic domains, in Western Europe\textsuperscript{167}. Surely, this was not the original purpose of NATO.

According to International Political Economy scholars, in particular, mercantilism, a hegemon, a dominant military and economic power, is necessary for the creation and full development of a liberal world market economy, because in the absence of such a power, liberal rules cannot be enforced around the world. That is the theory of hegemonic stability\textsuperscript{168}.

Two very important expansion of NATO was on 1999 and 2004. In particular, in 1999 the former “enemies” – Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary – older member of Warsaw Pact, achieved to be accepted in the western democratic and capitalism club of states, NATO. The second expansion, in 2004, was the most crowded. Seven countries – Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia and the three Baltic states, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania – participated in NATO structure. United States through NATO tried to “export” democracy in order to transform the former Warsaw Pact countries into modern, transparent and financial friendly states.\textsuperscript{169}

United States became super power due to open pluralistic political system\textsuperscript{170} and high level of democratic society. The democratic principles are embedded in the US’s domestic frame, so they insist in the same principles for the creation of international organization such as NATO\textsuperscript{171}.

United States hegemony is reluctant, open and highly institutionalized. All these characteristics have helped to facilitate a rather stable and durable political order and this is the investment in the future. In addition, US prefer to maximize the duration of
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the alliance, creating the favourable circumstances of “self-restrain”\textsuperscript{172} vs the absolute hegemonic and arrogant behaviour to the allied states.

### 4.2.1 Historical Examples

We will examine the policy of USA in two historical examples in the same region, the First Gulf War in 1990 and the Second Gulf War in 2003.

In summer of 1990 the Iraqi authorities’ decided to invade in Kuwait. The United States appealed to United Nations (Security Council), which issued a series of Resolutions (660 – 678), demanding that Iraq withdraw its forces from Kuwait. In addition, Resolution 678\textsuperscript{173} empowered states to use “all necessary means” to force Iraq out of Kuwait territory. So, the United States formulated coalition forces from many western states in order to fulfill the UN Resolution. The whole operation is known as “Desert Storm”. In a few days, army and air allied forces managed to destroy most of Iraq's military infrastructure and liberated Kuwait. Then, the President of the USA (George H. W. Bush) declared the end of the First Gulf War. President Bush answering in a journalist’s question\textsuperscript{174} “Why coalition forces stopped their advance to contact and did not invade in Bagdad?” he answered three reasons:

- He wanted to keep coalition forces alive
- He did not want to have more human victims
- The order from UN was only to liberate Kuwait and nothing more.

The posture of President Bush was to respect the allied states and not to proceed in actions that do not fully support by all the members of coalition forces. In addition, United States’ attitude shows that they respect the value of human life. Finally, the United Nation Resolutions clearly stated the limits of military efforts and define the desired end-state of the whole operation.
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The general direction of United State’s foreign policy regarding Kuwait was according to United Nation mandate, trying to maintain the international peace and providing the appropriate conditions for a safe and secure environment. In general, the United States supported legitimacy and finally gained in credibility and morality.

The Second Gulf War started on March 20, 2003, when a coalition of countries, basically the United States and Great Britain, invaded Iraq. The excuse was that Iraqi authorities had developed or was in the final steps of the process of developing chemical weapons and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441 (8 November 2002) stated that Iraq government was in material breach of the ceasefire terms and conditions of Resolution 687. The Resolution 1441\textsuperscript{175} never mentioned an invasion or violates actions. It only required Iraqi authorities to allow and support inspections by the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency).

Many realistic scholars such as John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt\textsuperscript{176}, had warned the government of George Bush Junior, that the invasion in Iraq was an “unnecessary war”. But the United States administration authorities believed that this “preventive war” was the best solution to block Saddam Hussein attempts to develop chemical weapons and WMD.

On May 1\textsuperscript{st} 2003, President Bush Junior declared the end of the war in Iraq\textsuperscript{177}. Unfortunately, US army forces remained in Iraq territory for many years, suffering from many casualties, spending billions of US dollars, engaged in conflicts, losing the “hearts and minds”\textsuperscript{178} of local citizens\textsuperscript{179}. In mid-term and long-term horizon, the US invasion in Iraq had three main results:

- Failed to expand democracy in a dictator regime
- The allied countries lost the trust in the United States leadership\textsuperscript{180}
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• The present of US army forces increased the uncertainty in Iraq political scene, leading to emerge fundamental parties such as ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria).

The applicable policy of "nation building" in Iraq\textsuperscript{181}, consists of the attempt to create a new one state structures and institutions. This policy had no effect on Iraqi society, which had deep political and religious frictions and differences among its members.

The failure of the United States to deploy NATO structures and forces has demonstrated the refusal of major European political and military power states such as Germany and France to join to the Coalition of the Willing. The position of common European citizen against United States foreign policy, in the period just before the second gulf war, was tragic. According to Time magazine poll, 84% of Europeans citizens recognized the United States policy as the main threat in the international peace\textsuperscript{182}.

The international coalition who invaded in Iraq and the America-led military forces which stayed in Iraq in order to train the Iraqi new military forces lead the country has become something close to a failed state\textsuperscript{183}. Under these conditions the fundamentalists paramilitary forces were possible to find the appropriate conditions in order to emerge. Surely, low level of educated people, religious and poor conditions was the suitable basement for the appearance of ISIS\textsuperscript{184}.

Having analyzed, hopefully, in the previous chapter the second research question regarding the role of the superpower state in the alliance? We will finish this dissertation reaching in useful conclusions and answering the main question “What is more valuable into an alliance, democratic values or hegemonic states?".

\textsuperscript{182} International Herald Tribune 1-2 February 2003
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Chapter 5 – Conclusions

5.1 Synopsis

Initially, in 1600s the state system was mainly in Europe, a European state system. In 1700s, after the discovery of North America, the system became a Western state system. In the next century, other states embodied in the existing system such as South America and Japan and the system starts to become a globalizing system. Finally in 1900s with the addition of Asia, Africa, Caribbean and Pacific states the system became a global system.

According to Jackson, Sorensen\textsuperscript{185} the global state system consists of:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
5 Great Powers & USA, Russia, China, Britain, France \\
\hline
Approx. 30 highly substantial states: & Europe, N. America, Japan \\
\hline
Approx. 75 moderately substantial states: & Asia and Latin America \\
\hline
Approx. 90 insubstantial quasi-states: & Africa, Asia, Caribbean, Pacific \\
\hline
Numerous unrecognized territorial political systems submerged in existing states & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The global state system}
\end{table}

Author chooses this global state system, because it is better categorized the states according to power criteria.

With the formation of international organizations, mainly after the Second World War, the international state system starts to become more stable. It was an attempt to transform the anarchic international system from “jungle” to “zoo”.

Regarding the IR theories, author puts emphasis on realism and shelter theory. Realism theory explains better the behavior of Super Power states through the balance of power and the security dilemma. On the other hand, the behavior and motivations of small states in order to form alliances can be explained better through Shelter theory.

5.2 Conclusions

The majority of citizens, in the modern societies all over the world, would not tolerate living in a state that suppresses freedom and dialogue other than democratic. Today more than 50% of the world’s population lives under the conditions of a representative democracy\textsuperscript{186}. Democratic political system provides the guaranty that the human rights and basic individual freedom are respectful, and it has gain also moral advantage. In the process of the evolution of political - social systems during the centuries, democratic values are universally accepted and desired by the citizens. Surely, there are certainly problems, obstacles and setbacks in some states. But the overall direction is positive for the wider prevalence of democratic values at the global level.

It is important to emphasize that the state system is not ordained by God or determined by Nature. This system has been fashioned by certain people at a certain time under certain circumstances. It is a social organization that is very successful and has demonstrated very adjustable characteristics during the past time.

In this dissertation we consider democracy as the suitable political system which creates the ideally framework for the development of political stability, social justice, financial free market conditions and right moral values. We are living in the real world and in this world there no room for utopia and perfect political systems. Democracy is not only a political system, we can consider democracy as an ideology\textsuperscript{187}.

Globalization has become a factor advancing democracy not only in the domestic conditions but also in the international regime and the international organizations and alliances. As connections between states are increasing and distances are reducing with the use of technology, some posit an increase in the flow of information and accordingly the flow of democratic ideas. However, the argument for globalization and democracy draws its causal link from increasing trade and global economic interrelationships.

The global international system has been a central institution of world politics for a very long time, and still remains so. The state system has always managed to
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adapt to significant historical changes. But nobody can be sure that it will continue to be the case in the future. Some international relations scholars believe that an international transformation, connected with growing interdependence among states (globalization) is already well under way. Democratic states form democratic international institutions. These types of ideas and values are tending to be almost universally acceptable due to globalization. At long-term period globalization promote democracy, but globalization is not a political panacea. The western advanced democracies can find more benefits of globalization, but for the early democratic states it is estimated that may take at least a generation to realize the benefits of globalization.

The international institutions have an independent influence on the probability of regime change and regime duration. This is crucial not only to dispel the critique that international institutions are epiphenomenal, but also to show that it is not the policies of one actor (superpower) within an alliance/organization that is driving the process. Here, we will borrow the idea from German philosopher Friedrich Hegel concerning thesis, antithesis and synthesis.

According to realism theory, security is probably one of the fundamental values in international relations. The basic value for a state is security that is pre-requirement in order the state to have its national sovereignty. The citizens of a country/state want to have their personal freedom. But we cannot be free unless our country is free too. The basic value for democracy is freedom. So, there is a link between the national security, national freedom, the political system of democracy and personal freedom of the inhabitants of the country. It is a tree with the roots – national security – the trunk – national freedom – and the branches are personal freedom of the citizens.

In Western democracies there are other actors besides states. War and any type of violent conflicts clearly are not on their agenda. Complex interdependence

portrays a situation that is radically different from the realist picture of international relations.

The last strand of neoliberalism presents the idea that liberal democracies enhance peace because they do not go to war against each other states. This idea has been strongly influenced by the rapid spread of democratization in the world mainly after the end of Cold War, especially in the former Soviet satellite countries in Eastern Europe which followed by the expansion of NATO.

The global interdependence among states, regarding trade, markets etc, the multipurpose institutions which are established, and democracy led to more thoroughgoing cooperation and relations among states, promoting the global coordination and peace stability.

The “secret” of success for the NATO as the longest-lasting organization must be the “strategic restraint” in which the United States engaged, reassuring allies and increasing cooperation among member states. So, United States has been able to remain at the center of a large and expanding institutionalized and legitimate political order. In the contrary, Athens in the ancient world, had not the ”wisdom” to provide privileges and autonomy in some city-states and to use “soft-power” measures such as political system, religion, culture etc so as to keep and sustain the preponderance of Athens in the Delian League. We can highlight that this disadvantage (pathogenia) was a result of the transformation of Delian League and the absent of convening annually the general assembly of the alliance. So, Athenians could not “hear” the opposing points of views from the allied cities-states and the germ of vanity had found fertile ground.

The United States having in depth studying the political system of Athens, nowadays demonstrates their “soft power” in combination with the “hard power”. So, the American way of life and the American dream is a very famous all over the world.

Another recent successful example of “strategic restraint” is Germany, within the European Union. A powerful state (4th larger economy of the world by nominal

---


GDP in 2018\textsuperscript{193} has agreed to operate within an institutionalized political process and in return, its partners agree to be willing participants.

As realism supports, the structure of the international system is still anarchic. But where institutions can be established that provide some measure of mutually binding constraints on states, and where the polities of the participating states are open democracies, the conditions exist for a settlement with constitutional characteristics.

While in domestic law, justice, ethics and legality are so important and fundamental principles for states. On International Relations, states differentiate their priorities. In their external relations, they prioritize their interests narrowly, based on self-interests and not based on international law and ethics. So, Vaclav Havel\textsuperscript{194} wrote “I have always believed, and still believe today, that the source of all the problems that surround us is the moral crisis of society and that no other crisis - economic, political or ecological - can be overcome unless society first overcomes its moral crisis.”

In conclusion, comparing the two case-studies we have to highlight that USA is respecting the democratic processes and independence of NATO member states. In other words, USA "self-limited" in favour of the longevity of the alliance and thus the US hegemonic position in the world. On the contrary, Ancient Athens we could say that it behaved arrogantly in the allied city-states, disregarding democratic processes, legitimacy and morality. Thus, it led to arbitrariness and eventually it lost its credibility and at the same time, its hegemonic position. Along with the external decline, it also led to internal decline, with a clear deterioration in the quality of democracy\textsuperscript{195} that shaped the inner framework of Athens\textsuperscript{196}.

All of this points to the fact that the answer to the question “What is more valuable into an alliance democratic values or hegemonic states?” we could say that in our modern multipolar world the importance of democratic values is more valuable
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than the hegemonic state. The difference between the power of the Great power states has diminished. The current multilevel interrelations among the states increase the possibility of democratic and peaceful coexistence.

The grateful idea of democracy comes from the idea of autonomy and self-determination of peoples. The international organizations demand coordination and cooperation among member – states. Cooperation is founded in trust and trust is easily emerged by common values and common culture. In addition, democratic process in an international organization seems to give additional legitimacy to modern political life\textsuperscript{197}.
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Annex

Annex A: The Original North Atlantic Treaty

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security.

They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty.
Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.
Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.
Article 6

For the purpose of Article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any Party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any Party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in that area of any of the Parties.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third state is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.
Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a council, in which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 6.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the states which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United
States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other
states on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time
thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together
for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then
affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the
development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the
Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace
and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may
cease to be a party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given
to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the
Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of such notice of democla-
tion.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally
authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United
States of America. True certified copies thereof will be transmitted by
that Government to the Governments of the other signatories.
In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Washington, the fourth day of April, 1949.

FOR THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM:

[Signature]

[Signature]

FOR CANADA:

[Signature]

[Signature]
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