

## FORCE DEMONSTRATION AND FORCE THREATENING - WAYS OF COMMUNICATION AMONG STATES AND GROUPS OF STATES

Mihail ORZEAȚĂ<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor, PhD, Apollonia University of Iasi, Romania  
Corresponding author: morzeata@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

Force demonstration is usually organized as a military parade. Military exhibition, military test of different weapon systems, military live exercises and military interventions are among other types of force demonstrations.

Force demonstration is a multipurpose action. One of the most common purposes of force demonstration is to send a message to international community about organizers' military potential and possible consequences in case one of the international actors would like to engage in a military confrontation against organizers. Another purpose is to offer for transactions military technology.

Despite the official documents' content referring to principles for international relations, threaten to force is quite often used for solving disputes among states.

It is too sad that many people and especially communities' leaders had forgotten that violence gives birth to violence.

**Keywords:** *force demonstration, force threatening, weapon systems, military confrontation, weapons, military exhibition/inventions, to engage, warfare means, strategies.*

### **1. FORCE DEMONSTRATION**

Force demonstration is a non-verbal way of communication which warns potential or declared opponent of the possible consequences if they try to enter into conflict with the organizing demonstration of force. At the same time, force demonstration can be seen as a way to test the ability of the one who organizes it to get what it aims at, namely to show what it can, in certain circumstances, in order to persuade and to prove its credibility. The aims of that who organizes (those who organize) force demonstrations can be implied (without naming some international) "actor" or can be explicit (specified in official

documents and statements such as security strategies, military strategies, the defense white papers etc..). In other words, force demonstration is a visible part and a hidden<sup>1</sup> one, which can be understood only by experts who have been monitoring (studying) international relations between/among the states of the world for many years.

The most commonly used ways to show force demonstrations are military parades, exhibitions of military equipment, tests with the latest warfare means, real military exercises and the small military actions (interventions) against other international "actors".

#### **1.1. THE MILITARY PARADES**

The military parades are held usually at events of great importance in the life of a community such as National Day, the Victory Day in a major war for the organizer nation (state), Independence Day etc. In addition to the stated purpose of the celebration of an event, military parades have the purpose, usually implicitly, to show the domestic and international public opinion the military force of the organizing state, and also the economic and financial<sup>2</sup> capacity to achieve and sustain such a force in a potential military confrontation. F the domestic public opinion, the military parades have the purpose to stimulate the national pride and the patriotic spirit to strengthen the cohesion of the nation, especially in the situation of tense situations in relations with another state, as it happens in North Korea, for example<sup>3</sup>.



Source: Radcliffe, Austin, "Things Organized Neatly", <http://thingsorganizedneatly.tumblr.com/post/49946707815/north-korea-military-parade>, accessed on 10.02.2014.

## 1.2. EXHIBITIONS FOR MILITARY EQUIPMENT

The organizers of exhibitions (fairs) for military equipment aim through such activities at more than one purposes. The same as with the military parades, one of the purposes is implicit and consists in demonstrating the economic, technological<sup>4</sup>, financial and military strength of the organizers. Another purpose is the commercial one and it consists in concluding as many sale contracts as possible of certain types of military equipment, weapons, ammunition, management means and systems, communications, surveillance, search, etc..

The most modern military equipment exhibitions are complex events that integrate static exhibition of parts offered for sale by presenting their actual performance through photos, brochures, films or actual demonstrations (especially for aircraft) or simulated (video PC games, trainers and trainajoars etc.).



Source: SITDEF - 2013 International Defense Technology & Exhibition Prevention of Natural Disaster, 15-19 May 2013 Lima, Peru, [http://www.armyrecognition.com/sitdef\\_2013\\_defense\\_technology\\_exhibition\\_daily\\_news\\_coverage\\_report\\_pictures\\_photo\\_video.html](http://www.armyrecognition.com/sitdef_2013_defense_technology_exhibition_daily_news_coverage_report_pictures_photo_video.html), consulted on 10.02.2014.

## 1.3. REAL TESTS OF WARFARE MEANS AND TECHNIQUE

The moment when the technique prototypes and the warfare means have completed the development program and can be introduced in series production, the production companies (the states) announce the conduction of tests inviting representatives of the media, of some potential buyers - usually states - with the undeclared purpose to show force demonstration and one suggested or explicitly conveyed to transact sale and purchase contracts.

The most spectacular and important tests of this kind are those that run real shooting and bombing in polygons with weapons installed on manned and unmanned aircraft, on tanks and armored personnel carriers on autocannon and other mobile equipment called transport platforms of artillery and reactive weapons. These tests are aimed at informing the participants, of domestic public opinion and the international community about the accuracy, the target effect and ability to breakdown (avoid) the jamming and air defense of a simulated opponent.

One way to use real tests, especially their reflection in the media and in public opinion is offered by India and Pakistan. When India successfully conducted several missile tests in the projected missile defense system in Pakistan they were debating solutions on how to break the "India anti-ballistic shield"<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, Indian media headlined "Our anti-ballistics is better than China's"<sup>6</sup>, "India targets China's satellites"<sup>7</sup> or it would mention the system capabilities to intercept Pakistan's Ghauri and Shaheen-3 missiles and the Chinese Dongfeng-21 missiles respectively<sup>8</sup>.



Source: "China Confirms Hypersonic Missile Carrier Test", Voice of America, 15.01.2014, <http://www.voanews.com/context/reu-china-confirms-hypersonic-missile-carrier-test/1830606.html>, accessed on 12.02.2014.

#### **1.4. REAL MILITARY EXERCISES**

Through real military exercises the organizers seek training, training and / or testing the ability of the participating military structures to perform various missions that they may have in case of actual military confrontation. The purpose of such undeclared and implicit of such exercises is to warn the potential or declared opponents of the consequences of getting into conflict with the organizer (s) of the exercises. Real military exercises are also called "real war games" and are complex events both in space, time scale and number of participants ("players") and the phases (stages) of deployment. Usually, the exercises are preceded by the participating technical exhibitions. The exercises use the means of fighting real targets and those who attend are invited to check (find) the accuracy and the effect on targets (objectives). Unlike actual testing the means and the combat technique during the exercises they also check (experiment, test) the conceptions of fulfillment of various types of missions by echelons (military structures) of tactical, operational and strategic level.

Real military exercises have the strongest effect on those in the audience and subsequently on the domestic public opinion and the international community. A good example in this respect is the military exercises conducted by Russia in July 2013, with the participation of about 160,000 soldiers from all categories of

military forces, followed the strategic exercise of 30 October 2013, the launching of many more RS-12M Topol ballistic missile from the space center at Plesetsk, of a number of RV-20 Voevoda missiles from the space center at Domborovski and of ballistic missile from the submarines of the Northern Fleet and the Pacific Fleet. Some of the rockets were launched at targets located in the eastern Kamchatka peninsula, others to targets located in Astrakhan polygon. The missiles launched to Astrakhan polygon were intercepted and destroyed by the ground-air missiles S-300 and S-400. Although Russian officials said the exercises were planned in advance, Western commentators consider a surprise and a signal to China and Japan<sup>9</sup>. I think that the U.S. was primarily targeted. As an argument to support my statement I would only present the statement of President Putin, on strengthening the Russian strategic and deterrent capabilities, in response to U.S. President Obama to eliminate nuclear weapons in the arsenals of states. On that occasion, the Russian president said that his country is developing a new generation of missiles - R-26M - which can not be stopped by U.S. anti-missile shield<sup>10</sup>.

Often real military exercises cause escalating arms race regionally and even globally. Sometimes the real military exercises are a disguised pretext for mobilizing and increasing the operational capacity of the armed forces, followed by military interventions (aggression). Georgia-South Ossetia war and the intervention of the Russian Federation to South Ossetia in August 2008 is one of the most relevant examples. Russia has conducted large-scale military exercises in the period 5 to 12 July 2008 under the code name "*Caucasus Frontier 2008*"<sup>11</sup>. Georgia-US joint military exercises were conducted under the codename "Immediate Response" in the period 15 to 31 July 2008, followed by the Georgian military intervention in South Ossetia on the night of 7/8 August 2008 and then that of Russia on August 8, 2008<sup>12</sup>.

On North Korea's threats to use nuclear weapons against U.S. bases in Japan and South Korea, the three countries have conducted a complex military exercise in autumn 2013, which was followed by new threats on North Korea behalf<sup>13</sup>.



Source: Miyajima, Shigeki, „N. Korea warns of counter-attack on US warship”, France Press, 10.11.2013, <http://www.rappler.com/world/regions/asia-pacific/41116-north-korea-warning-joint-military-exercises>, accessed on 12.02.2014.

### 1.5. MILITARY INTERVENTION AS FORCE DEMONSTRATIONS

Often, force demonstrations through military parades, exhibitions of technique, tests and military exercises are not enough to achieve the real effects expected and then the escalation by recourse to the highest level of demonstrations of force is used - military intervention. This way of action is not only to transmit signals to the community or state that is subject to military aggression but also to other countries in the geographical region where the state (community) is situated on which the intervention is run, or even to the international community as a whole.

Examples are numerous in history. Among the best known Soviet interventions would include East Germany in 1953<sup>14</sup> and Hungary in 1956<sup>15</sup> to stop changing communist regimes in those countries with democratic systems and out from under the Kremlin guardianship. With a similar purpose was also orchestrated the military intervention of the Warsaw Pact States, except Romania, in Czechoslovakia (1968) to quell the “Prague Spring” and to give substance to the theory of “limited sovereignty” (the so-called Brezhnev doctrine ).<sup>16</sup> After the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact (1990) and the USSR (1991), the Russian Federation included in its military strategy the objective of protecting the population in post-Soviet Russia, including the use of military force, if necessary. This objective is a manifestation of the geopolitical theory “the near abroad” through which Russia intimates the world that it wants to maintain its influence in the former USSR states. During 7/8

to 13 August 2008, Russia intervened in the conflict between Georgia and its breakaway province - South Ossetia – from South Ossetian side<sup>16</sup>, at the request of the rebel province leadership, both to prevent its reintegration into Georgia and to stop the pro-Western orientation of leadership in Tbilisi.



Source: Friedman, George, “The Russo - Georgian War and the balance of Power”, *Geopolitical Weekly*, August 12, 2008, <http://www.startfor.com/weekly/rucco-georgian-war-and-balance-power#top>, accessed on 01.08.2013.

In general the military interventions are the work of powerful states (global or regional great powers) or groups of states (alliances, coalitions) against smaller states, who will not pursue the requirements of the states or groups of states which organize the military intervention. This “modus operandi” is part of the U.S. intervention in Nicaragua, Haiti and Grenada, located in Central America and considered to be under the influence of Washington<sup>17</sup>.



Map 2:  
**US Military and CIA Interventions since World War II**  
 ■ targeted countries    ★ US bombings    — US government assassination plots  
 Source: William Blum, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Intervention Since World War II, 2004 and Rogue State, 2005.* (<http://www.killinghope.org/>)  
 Copyright © 2010 by Richard D. Vogel at [combatingglobalization.com](http://combatingglobalization.com)  
 Permission to copy granted.

Smaller scale military intervention of Turkey in Cyprus conducted in 1974 by the Turkish community on the island, followed by the proclamation of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and Turkey all forces in Iraq intervened several times against Iraqi Kurds and the Kurds refugees in Turkey to prevent the formation of an independent Kurdish state. On the Kurdistan matter, the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan said: "Turkey will not tolerate the establishment of an independent Kurdish state in northern Iraq"<sup>19</sup>. Turkey's economic development (which has propelled it into the so-called "world government" - G-20) and its military force, considered one of the most important in the Near and Middle East associated with Prime Minister Erdogan's ambitions to become the leader of Muslim states<sup>20</sup>, are the foundations of a hegemonic policies in the area, manifested by threats against Syria<sup>21</sup>.

Although NATO military intervention in Serbia and Kosovo in 1999 had the stated aim to stop ethnic cleansing and protection of the civilian population against the aggression of Serb paramilitary forces and the interior ministry forces of the regime in Belgrade, this action had also an declared purpose - to demonstrate the world and the Russian Federation of the Alliance. This second objective is clear from the opinion of former U.S. State Secretary, Albright Madeleine in conversation with his English peer, in which he said that NATO must enable the UN and Russia to decide or to condition the NATO actions<sup>22</sup>.

"Under the umbrella" or the implicit consent of a / some major power(s) other states too have used the limited military intervention to support their strategic interests. This includes Israel's actions in June 7, 1981<sup>23</sup> when it destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor in Tammuz / Osirak, the actions in the summer of 1982 respectively when it invaded Lebanon<sup>24</sup> to expel Palestinian refugees from Cisjordania/ the West Bank and Gaza Strip. After the outbreak of the civil war in Syria, Israel has not declared support for the Syrian opposition but its aircrafts hit several targets of the Assad regime, including in 2013, considered as elements of infrastructure of the development program for mass weapons destruction<sup>25</sup>, that is deposits and

missile systems S-300 imported from Russia and located near the port of Latakia<sup>26</sup>.

## **2. FORCE THREATENING**

---

The range of international relations based on power, the threat of force use, is repudiated both by the leaders of the states and the international governmental and nongovernmental organizations. In practice, however, force threatening is used quite often, both explicitly and informally (masked, hinting at).

If the military intervention is largely a practice of powerful states, force threatening is widely used both by individuals and groups of individuals belonging to extremist and terrorist organizations and states and groups of states (alliances, coalitions).

If the threat of former Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein in 1990 to attack the U.S., but not with an army of individual warriors<sup>27</sup>, was not considered credible after the 2001 terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers in New York and the Pentagon<sup>28</sup>, followed by the Madrid (2003), London (2005), Moscow (2008)<sup>29</sup>, Volgograd (2013)<sup>30</sup> and other targets around the world, any such threat causes intense protection reactions. The impact of terrorist attacks is amplified by the media in pursuit of sensational news and the choice of targets (moments, events, personalities) by the attacker. The most recent example is offered by the threats of the terrorist and extremist organizations in the North Caucasus which were trying to "torpedo" the smooth running of the Olympic Games in Sochi (Russia) by threatening to attack some national delegations of athletes<sup>31</sup>.

In 2013, a leader of the Iranian Republican Guards threatened with World War III<sup>32</sup> if the U.S. attack military and civilian targets of the Syrian regime of President Bashar al-Assad after using chemical weapons (sarin) in the confrontation between the Syrian government forces and the opposition rebels<sup>33</sup>.

As a matter of fact, the Iranian leaders have often come forth with threats to Western countries, especially the U.S., because their country was subjected to several rounds of economic sanctions for the decision to develop

nuclear weapons production programs. The aggressive rhetoric of ayatollah Ali Khamenei<sup>34</sup>, the supreme religious leader of the Islamic regime in Tehran and the former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad<sup>35</sup> generated tensions that seemed to lead to large-scale military confrontation between the Western countries and Iran.



Source: Thomas, Michael, "Obama threatens Iran with military force yet again", 17.09.2013, <http://stateoftheunion2012.com/?php=2118>, accessed on 12.02.2014.

Realizing that it is becoming increasingly isolated, including the community of Islam, the Iranian leadership has "embraced" the Palestinian cause and adopted an aggressive anti-Israel attitude hoping that this will attract on their side the other Muslim states.

Calls to destroy Israel<sup>36</sup> and to fight on all fronts against Israel and the U.S., launched by the religious leaders and the lay people of Iran have strained the international relations and prompted similar reactions from the leaders of the U.S. and the Hebrew State<sup>37</sup>. The Israelis declare, periodically, the option for the unilateral military intervention against Iran aimed at the destruction of the infrastructure elements of Persian nuclear program.



Source: Daily Mail Reporter and Associated Press Reporter, „Defense Secretary Leon Panetta threatens Iran with military strike if it develops nuclear weapons... but Israel says the promise of force aren't

enough", *mailOnline*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2182210/In-Israel-Leon-Panetta-threatens-Iran-military-strike-nuclear-weapons.html>, accessed on 10.02.2014

Rouhani, the new Iranian president said in his speech to the UN General Assembly in September 2013, that he wants direct talks with the U.S. to suspend the country's embargo. He said he had a mandate from over 70% of the country's parliament to make this move, that Iran does not want to obtain nuclear weapons and calls on the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna to resume the inspections of its nuclear facilities.

After hearing the opinion of the Iranian President, concerning the relations with the U.S. and the giving up on the military nuclear program, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said, in his turn, during the UN General Assembly works that Rouhani is a "wolf in sheep's clothing" and that he must not be believed by the international community which must maintain pressure on the Islamic regime in Tehran until it gives up the nuclear program.<sup>38</sup>

Neither in other areas of the world the situation is no better in terms of security. In Europe, the U.S. and then NATO decision to achieve a antiballistic shield with interceptors in Poland and radar in the Czech Republic and Romania and prompted the Russian leadership to threaten with installing medium-range missiles in the Kaliningrad enclave and the introduction of location coordinates of NATO antiballistic system in the memory of routing systems of Russian ground-ground missiles<sup>39</sup>. In the Far East, China unilaterally instituted a mandatory identification area of all aircraft evolving into an important part of the East China Sea. The area includes the Senkaku Islands (Japanese name) - Diaoyu (Chinese name) being a cause of dispute between China and Japan. The area determined by China overlaps with that of Japan and Taiwan, prompting the Japanese reaction, reflected in the flight of military aircraft in that space. The Japanese action was followed by the Chinese threats with serious consequences, including military confrontation in that airspace if the Japanese military planes continue to violate the flight rules in the mentioned area<sup>40</sup>.



Source: Gandhara, Tan, "Japan, China and those Damn Islands", 29.11.2014, <http://gandhara.co.uk/2013/11/29/japan-china-and-those-damn-islands/>, accessed on 21.01.2014.

On the Korean peninsula after the bellicose episode in 2013 when the communist regime in Pyongyang threatened to use military force against South Korea and the U.S.<sup>41</sup>, the tension rises again in the area. This time, Kim Jong-un and the North Korea leadership threaten retaliation both the U.S. and South Korea in response to the large-scale military exercises conducted by the U.S. and the South Koreans, exercises that the North Korean leader considers a preamble for a possible military intervention against his country<sup>42</sup>.

In Southeast Asia, between India and Pakistan, there is in almost permanent conflict since 1947, during which there had been more than one direct armed confrontations (1947, 1965, 1971, 1998) all won by India, and other "hot" episodes such as the terrorist attacks on Mumbai, those on Parliament in New Delhi on 13 December 2001<sup>43</sup> and the attempted assassination of the Prime Minister of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Farook Abdullah (May 2002) and the murder of over 30 people (most were women and children) under Indian military camp of Kalucha<sup>44</sup>. After every terrorist attack on targets in India or Kashmir, mutual accusations and threats raise tension almost to the point of direct military confrontation, prompting the intervention of the international community to reduce the intensity of fears of a devastating nuclear war.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

The communication between states and groups of states is done on channels and in different ways. The choice of communication depends on many factors among which the most important are the national interest, balance of power between states and the context in which the communication takes place.

Although repudiated in documents and official statements, the nonverbal communication between states through force demonstrations and threats of use of force is a fairly common practice. In this context, the course towards relaxation and democratization of international relations is altered by the emphasis on the use of force in the relations between states.

It is worrying that isolated individuals and groups of individuals choose the path of increasingly extremist terrorist actions and to promote their interests and to impose their views in relation with the communities they belong to, *de jure*, but not also as political and religious guidance.

It is also worrying that the people, especially the human community leaders, forget or neglect the lessons of history, especially that violence breeds violence.

#### Endnotes

1. Keith Rogers, "Quiet Arms Race continues, retired CIA officer says", *Las Vegas Review Journal* (March 17, 2013), <http://www.reviewjournal.com/news/military/quiet-arms-race-continues-retired-cia-officer-says>, accessed on 02.10.2013.
2. Byron King, "The Hidden Arms Race", *Daily Reckoning* (September 11, 2013), <http://dailyreckoning.com/the-hidden-arms-race>, accessed on 04.10.2013.
3. Lucy Williamson, "Military might on show in N Korea on war anniversary", *BBC*, 27.07.2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-23474614>, accessed on 08.02.2014.
4. Clayton, Mark, "The new cyber arms race", *The Christian Science Monitor* (March 7, 2013), <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2011/0307/the-new-cyber-arms-race>, accessed on 30.09.2013.
5. Usman, Ansari, "Pakistan Seeks to Counter Indian AB M Defenses", *Defense News* (March 21, 2011), <http://www.defensenews.com/article/20110321/>

- DEFEAT06/103210303/Pakistan-Seeks-to-Counter-Indian-ABM-Defenses/, accessed on 23.08.2012.
6. Uninthan, Sundeep, "Our anti-ballistic missile programme better than China", *India Today*, February 10, 2010, [http://indiatoday.indiatoday.in/story/Our+anti-ballistic+missile+programme+better+han-China:DRDO/1/83424.html](http://indiatoday.indiatoday.in/story/Our+anti-ballistic+missile+programme+better+than-China:DRDO/1/83424.html), accessed on 23.08.2012.
  7. Brown, Peter J., "India Targets China's Satellites", *Asia Times* (January 22, 2010), <http://www.atimes.com//South-Asia/LADf01.html>, accessed on 23.08.2012.
  8. Shukia, Ajai, "New Delhi could have anti-missile shield by 2014", *Business Standard* (August 29, 2011), <http://www.business-standard.com/India/new-delhi-could-have-anti-missile-shield-by-2014/447350/>, accessed on 23.08.2012.
  9. Zachary, Keck, "Russia conducts Surprise Nuclear Readiness Drill", *The Diplomat* (31.10.2013), <http://thediplomat.com/2013/10/russia-conducts-surprise-nuclear-readiness-drill/>, accessed on 20.11.2013.
  10. *Idem*.
  11. Chossudovsky, Michel, "War in the Caucasus: Toward a Broader Russia-US Military Confrontation?" *Global Research* (10.08.2008), <http://www.globalresearch.ca/wat-in-the-caucasus-toward-a-btoader-us-russia-military-confrontation/9788>, accessed on 08.02.2014.
  12. Chossudovsky, Michel, "The Eurasian Corridor: Pipeline Geopolitics and the New Cold War", *Global Research* (22.08.2008), <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-urasian-corridor-pipeline-geopolitics-and-the-new-cold-war/9907>, accessed on 02.02.2014.
  13. Miyajima, Shigeki, "N. Korea warns of counter-attack on US warship", Agenția France Press (10.11.2013), <http://www.rappler.com/world/regions/asia-pacific/41116-north-korea-warning-joint-military-exercises>, accessed on 12.02.2014.
  14. Soulet, Jean-Francois, *Istoria Europei de Est de la al doilea război mondial până în prezent*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2008, pp. 94-95.
  15. Frucht, Richard, editor, *Encyclopedia of Eastern Europe, from the Congress of Vienna to the Fall of Communism*, Garland Publishing Inc., New York and London, 2000, pp. 333-334.
  16. Duroselle, Jean-Baptiste and Kaspi, André, *Istoria relațiilor internaționale*, vol. 2, Științe Sociale și Politice Publishing House, București, 2006, p. 192.
  17. Friedman, George, "The Russo - Georgian War and the balance of Power", *Geopolitical Weekly* (August 12, 2008), <http://www.startfor.com/weekly/russo-georgian-war-and-balance-power#top>, accessed on 01.08.2013.
  18. Brooks, Jamies, "Fighting in Panama - Latin America: US Denounced by Nations Touchy About Intervention", *The New York Times* (21.12.1989), <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/12/21/world/fighting-panama-latin-america-us-denounced-by-nations-touchy-about-intervention.htm>, accessed on 07.02.2014.
  19. *Strategic Survey 2003/2004*, National Defense University, Washington DC, USA, 2004, p. 148.
  20. "Turkey and its neighbors: A reset? New tone in Turkey's foreign policy", *The Economist* (09.11.2013), <http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21589494-new-tone-turkeys-foreign-policy-reset>, accessed on 21.11.2013.
  21. "Turkey launches military exercises near Syrian border", *Reuters* (6 mai 2013), <http://news.yahoo.com/turkey-launces-military-exercises-near-syrian-border-125410487.html>, accessed on 06 mai 2013.
  22. Albright, Madeleine, *Doamna secretar de stat. Memorii*, Rao Publishing House, București, 2008, pp. 557-576.
  23. Correll, John T., "Air Strike at Osirak", *Air Force Magazine* (April 2012), <http://www.airforcemag.com/MagazineArchive/Pages/2012/April%202012/0412osirak.aspx>, accessed on 05.02.2014.
  24. Katz, Joseph E., *Israel's Invasion of Lebanon, Operation Peace for the Galilee*, PLO in Lebanon, Rafael Israeli Publishing House, London 1983, <http://eretzyisroel.org/~samuel/lebanonwar.html>, accessed on 08.02.2014.
  25. Laub, Karin and Federman, Josef, "Israeli airstrikes on Syria prompt threat anger", *Associated Press* (May 06, 2013), <http://news.yahoo.com/israeli-airstrikus-syria-prompt-threat-anger-212205572.html>, accessed on 06 mai 2013.
  26. Rogin, Josh and Lake, Eli, "U.S. Intelligence Confirms Latest Israeli Strike Inside Syria", *The Daily Beast*, (July 16, 2013), <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/07/16/u-s-intelligence-confirms-latest-israeli-strike-inside-syria.html>, accessed on 14.10.2013.
  27. Salinger, Pierre and Laurent, Eric, *Război în Golf, dosarul secret*, Tinerama Publishing House, București, 1991, p. 47.
  28. Chiesa, Giulietto, *Zero: de ce versiunea oficială despre atacul de la 11 septembrie este un fals*, Litera Internațional Publishing House, București, 2008, pp. 7-25.
  29. Sturmer, Michael, *Putin și noua Rusie*, Litera Internațional Publishing House, București, 2009, p. 55.
  30. Rogozin, Leonid, "Volgograd train station rocked by suicide bombing", *The Guardian* (30.12.2013), <http://www.theguardian.com/World/2013/dec/29/volgograd-train-station-suicide-bombing>, accessed on 04.02.2014.
  31. Kersey, Eileen, "Death toll in Volgograd increases, Sochi safety fears", *Digital Journal* (02.01.2014), <http://digitaljournal.com/news/world/death-toll-in-volgograd-bombings-increases-sochi-safety-fears/article/364990>, accessed on 04.02.2014.



32. Burleigh, Michael, "Could Syria ignite World War III? That's the terrifying question as the hatred between two Muslim ideologies sucks in the world superpowers", *Daily Mail online* (13.06.2013), <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article/-2341340/Could-Syria-ignite-World-War-3-Thats-terrifying-question-hatred-Muslim-ideologies-sucks-worlds-superpowers.html>, accessed on 22.11.2013.
33. Schofield, Matthew, "New analysis of rocket used in Syria chemical attack undercuts US claims", *McClatchy DC* (15.01.2014), <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2014/01/15/214656/new-analysis-of-rocket-used-in.html>, accessed on 08.02.2014.
34. Keinon Herb and Praszczuk, Joana, "Khamenei: Zionist regime will disappear from map", *The Jerusalem Post* (August 15), 2012, <http://www.jpost.com/Iranianthreat/news/article.aspx?id=281366>, accessed on 24.08.2012.
35. Keinon, Herb and Praszczuk, Joana, "Ahmadinejad: Zionist regime insult to all humanity", *The Jerusalem Post* (August 17, 2012), <http://www.jpost.com/Iranianthreat/news/article.aspx?id=281617>, accessed on 24.08.2012.
36. "Syria war to cause Israel destruction: IRGC", *Alalam* (29.08.2013), <http://en.alalam.ir/news/151031>, accessed on 22.11.2013.
37. Daily Mail Reporter and Associated Press Reporter, *Defense Secretary Leon Panetta threatens Iran with military strike if it develops nuclear weapons... but Israel says the promise of force aren't enough*, *mailOnline*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2182210/In-Israel-Leon-Panetta-threatens-Iran-military-strike-nuclear-weapons.html>, accessed on 10.02.2014.
38. Connolly, Kevin, "Israel PM calls Iran leader 'wolf in sheep's clothing'", *BBC News* (02.10.2013), <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-24354169>, accessed on 10.10.2013.
39. Akulov, Andrei, "The Deployment of Russia's Tactical Missiles in Response to US-NATO Threats", *Global Research* (24.12.2013), <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-deployment-of-russias-tactical-misiles-in-response-to-us-nato-threats/>, accessed on 04.02.2014.
40. Blanchard, Ben and Rampton, Roberta, "China scrambles jets to new defense zone, eyes US, Japan flights", *Reuters* (29.11.2013), <http://www.reuters.com/article20a-patrol-idUSBRE9AR0OM20131129>, accessed on 29.11.2013.
41. Ryall, Julian, "North Korea threatens nuclear attack on US bases in Japan", *The Telegraph* (21.02.2013), <http://www.thetelegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/9945546/North-Korea-threatens-nuclear-attack-on-us-bases-in-Japan.html>, accessed on 02.02.2014.
42. "North Korean leader warns of nuclear disaster, threatens US", *The Sydney Morning Herald* (01.01.2014), <http://www.smh.com.au/world/north-korean-leader-warns-of-nuclear-disaster-threatens-us-20140101-hr79a.html>, accessed on 02.02.2014.
43. Wallace, Paul, *Terrorism and the Indo-Pakistan-U.S. Triangle*, apud George Cristian Maior, Larry Watts, coordinators, *Globalization of civil-military relations: Democratization, reform and security*, Enciclopedia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002, p. 637.
44. Thackrah, John Richard, *Military Conflict since 1945*, Routledge, London and New York, 2009, p. 135.