# **Appendix 1. Notes on the Epistemological Strategy, Analytical Method, and Data**

Epistemologically, we have sought to gain new insights form the parliamentary debates on the Iraq War, both in Romania and Denmark, based on an interpretative-hermeneutic strategy. This involved multiple careful readings of the full-length transcripts, and the focused selection of comments that are relevant for the justification of party voting behaviour, for why Romania and Denmark should support the US-led intervention. In addition to the analysis and interpretation of the intrinsic meaning of the speech acts, we have included assessments of the political context to evaluate the impact of the speech acts. The article draws on an epistemological understanding underpinned by a phenomenological logic, in which the meaning of the speech acts is entangled with the external reality and significant others.

We list the parliamentary debates subject to our interpretative analysis below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Date** | **Name of the vote** | **Link to the debate transcript** |
| Romania | 12.02.2003 | Parliament Decision no. 2 of 12 February 2003 on Romania's participation in the Coalition against Iraq | http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?ids=5382&idm=5&idl=2 |
| 19.06.2003 | Parliament Decision no. 15 of 19 June 2003 on the participation of Romania with units and subunits from the Ministry of National Defense in the fourth phase of stabilization and reconstruction in Iraq | http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?ids=5494&idm=2&idl=2 |
| 26.06.2003 | Parliament Decision no. 17 of 26 June 2003 on supplementing Romania's participation with special formations from the Ministry of National Defense in the stabilization and reconstruction missions in Iraq | http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?ids=5499&idm=3&idl=2 |
| 09.10.2003 | Parliament Decision no. 22 of 9 October 2003 on supplementing Romania's participation with personnel from the Ministry of National Defense in the fourth phase of stabilization and reconstruction in Iraq | http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?ids=5554&idm=3&idl=2 |
| 22.12.2008 | Parliament Decision no. 32/2008 on the continuation of Romania's participation with units and subunits from the Ministry of Defense in the stabilization of the Republic of Iraq | <http://www.cameradeputatilor.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?ids=6564&idm=8&idl=2> |
| Denmark | 21.03.2003 | B118Dansk militær deltagelse i en multinational indsats i Irak | https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20021/beslutningsforslag/B118/index.htm |
| 15.05.2003 | B165Dansk militær deltagelse i en multinational sikringsstyrke i Irak | https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20021/beslutningsforslag/B165/index.htm |
| 10.10.2003 | B1Styrkelse af det danske bidrag til den multinationale sikringsstyrke i Irak | https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20031/beslutningsforslag/B1/index.htm |
| 2.12.2003 | B56Fortsat dansk bidrag til den multinationale sikringsstyrke i Irak | https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20031/beslutningsforslag/B56/index.htm |
| 02.06.2004 | B123 Fortsat dansk bidrag til en multinational sikringsstyrke i Irak | https://www.folketingstidende.dk/samling/20031/beslutningsforslag/B213/index.htm |
| 25.11.2004 | B42 Fortsat dansk bidrag til en multinational sikringsstyrke i Irak | <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20041/beslutningsforslag/b42/index.htm> |
| 31.05.2005 | B89Fortsat dansk bidrag til en multinational sikringsstyrke i Irak | <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20042/beslutningsforslag/b89/index.htm> |
| 26.01.2006 | B63Fortsat dansk bidrag til en multinational sikringsstyrke i Irak | <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20051/beslutningsforslag/b63/index.htm> |
| 30.05.2006 | B63Videreførelse af et dansk bidrag til den multinationale sikringsstyrke m.v. i Irak og om, at danske militære styrker stilles til rådighed for FN's bistandsmission til Irak | <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20051/beslutningsforslag/b139/index.htm> |
| 01.06.2007 | B162Det danske bidrag i Irak til den multinationale sikringsstyrke m.v. | <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20061/beslutningsforslag/b162/index.htm> |

The analysis of the speeches took place in Romanian, Danish, and English. For both countries, the debates in February and March 2003 provided the central data for our analysis, while the others are included for context. In addition to parliamentary debates, we also used Danish and Romanian news sources.

**Comparative case studies**

For this article, we employ Denmark and Romania as comparative case studies. Comparative foreign policy originates in the behavioural research programme in social sciences (e.g., Easton 1953; Lipset 1960). Drawing on the ‘comparative method’, a comparative case study design has a particular utility for knowledge because it can enable the development of middle-range theories (He and Feng 2023), with higher levels of validity. Our study is middle range in the sense that it begins with an empirical phenomenon (junior allies’ decisions to participate in multinational military operations) and uses it as a starting point for general statements (on political debates on the constitutive and functional roles of the state), which are then confronted with the empirical data in two cases (Denmark and Romania’s decision to participate in the Iraq War).

Especially in the IR discipline, the comparative method can help to advance the theoretical understanding of foreign policy-making (Lantis and Beasley 2017). In this article, we apply a modified account of Mill’s cross-case method of difference (Mill 1862). Based on the data, we understand the two countries as junior allies – i.e., taking part in a multilateral military operation without being the one in command; a junior partner is ‘any state whose contribution is not the most important in military (number of troops deployed) or political (leadership) terms’ (Schmitt 2018: 6). Denmark and Romania are similar cases in the sense that both countries have a strong pro-Atlanticist security policy, emphasize a combination of NATO multilateralism and bilateral relations with the United States, and view deployment of troops as a cornerstone in their security policies.[[1]](#footnote-1) They are nonetheless different in terms of ontological and material security. This combination of similar attributes and variation on the political space for decision making allows us to unpack how party politics matter in junior allies’ decisions to engage in multinational military operations through an analysis of political parties’ expressions of ‘good state’ and ‘good ally’ roles, and good and bad ‘others’.
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1. See the PDVD database (Wagner et al. 2022) for the two countries’ troop contributions to external missions since 1990. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)