

FROM ALLIANCE BUILDING TO STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF DEFENCE DIPLOMACY

FAIQ HASSAN KHALID

frana82@gmail.com

PhD Candidate in the Department of International Relations, University of Karachi (Pakistan). His research interests include defence diplomacy, foreign policy and related issues in the global south and north.

NAEEM AHMED

naeem@uok.edu.pk

Associate Professor, Chairman, Department of International Relations, University of Karachi (Pakistan).

Abstract

Defence diplomacy within the sphere of statecraft is experiencing rapid growth due to the geopolitical and geo-economic interests of rising power blocs around the world. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive historical background of significant activities undertaken in modern defence diplomacy. The central research question explores how the activities in defence diplomacy have shaped the landscape of international relations. It is found that defence diplomacy activities like military exchanges, exercises and cooperation with roots in antiquity, have continuously adapted to shape history and remain relevant in today's complex international relations.

Keywords

Defence diplomacy, interoperability, joint military exercise, Defence Attaché, Defence cooperation agreements.

Resumo

A diplomacia de defesa, no âmbito da esfera do Estado, está a registar um rápido crescimento devido aos interesses geopolíticos e geoeconómicos dos blocos de potências emergentes em todo o mundo. O presente artigo tem por objetivo fornecer um contexto histórico abrangente das atividades significativas realizadas no quadro da diplomacia de defesa moderna. A questão central da investigação explora a forma como as atividades de diplomacia de defesa moldaram o panorama das relações internacionais. Verifica-se que estas atividades, como os intercâmbios militares, os exercícios e a cooperação, com raízes na antiguidade, adaptaram-se continuamente para moldar a história e continuam a ser relevantes nas complexas relações internacionais de hoje.

Palavras-chave

Diplomacia da defesa, interoperabilidade, exercício militar conjunto, adido de defesa, acordos de cooperação no domínio da defesa.



How to cite this article

Khalid, Faiq Hassan & Ahmed, Naeem (2024). From Alliance Building to Strategic Partnerships: a Historical Analysis of Defence Diplomacy. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. VOL 15, N^o.1, May-October, pp. 3-20. DOI <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.15.1.1>

Article received on March 14, 2023, and accepted for publication on October 30, 2023.





FROM ALLIANCE BUILDING TO STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS: A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF DEFENCE DIPLOMACY

FAIQ HASSAN KHALID

NAEEM AHMED

1. Introduction

States resort to their traditional diplomacy to achieve foreign policy goals. This traditional diplomacy carries out its work under some fixed principles, norms, traditions, and laws, which are recognized by all states. The primary goal of traditional diplomacy includes peaceful coexistence, conflict prevention, peacemaking efforts and the protection of economic and trade interests. If states add a few more goals in their foreign policy, such as security and defence-related matters and support traditional diplomatic staff with one or more uniformed people, who are associated with the country's defence institutions and conduct diplomacy, then it will be termed as defence diplomacy. In simple words, it can be said that the achievement of national foreign policy objectives through the peaceful employment of defence resources and capabilities in international politics is considered defence diplomacy (Drab, 2018).

Alliance building is the purposeful and strategic formation of cooperative connections between two or more nations to achieve common aims or reduce perceived dangers in the dynamic field of international affairs. Such alliances take many forms, including formal treaties with specific military obligations and informal understandings based on shared economic and strategic interests such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, European Union, BRICS, an informal grouping of emerging economies. Security dialogues and contacts at the highest level, economic prosperity, pursuing strategic goals, ideological alignments, joint military exercises and signing of treaties are all important parts of alliance formation. It is this significant motive that alliance-building has become a key instrument for governments to handle problems and pursue goals in the changing fabric of international relations. These collaborations are motivated at their heart by a shared understanding of interests, where states' interests are being converged on concerns of security, economic development, or ideological congruence. Alliances, which are often codified through treaties, usually include a commitment to mutual defence, ensuring rapid and decisive action against common dangers.

Strategic partnerships also provide a more adaptable framework for collaboration across broader sectors such as trade, technological advancement, and other important



uncertainties. While alliances prioritize military and security-related cooperation, partnerships offer a wide range of collaboration encompassing economic, environmental, and technological areas and allow for a more multifaceted strategy that also leverages the combined resources of participating states for mutual gain. This complicated interplay between alliance and partnership enables states to navigate a difficult global landscape while ensuring both immediate security and pursuing shared prosperity.

As for the origins of the concept of defence diplomacy, according to Koerner Wolfgang, it originated as a systematic notion after the end of the Cold War, when the British Ministry of Defence, in the name of security sector reforms, began to help states seceding from the Soviet Union in 1991 (Koerner, 2006). One goal of this assistance was to have a peaceful environment of international security.

Although alliance building and strategic partnerships are often seen as critical parts of defence diplomacy, however, to understand the various dimensions of this relationship, we argue that specific initiatives and selected key activities performed under the umbrella of defence diplomacy, need to be examined in historical terms. By doing so, we may show how their origins extend beyond the defined idea of defence diplomacy itself.

Defence diplomacy can involve a range of goals and activities, so it can be considered a multitasking process. These activities include military exchanges and training programs, as well as using military assets to support foreign policy-related matters. Defence diplomacy also involves using military presence and capabilities to deter potential adversaries and promote stability in a region (Forster, 2004). The primary goal of defence diplomacy is to use military resources to support and advance diplomatic goals, rather than only for military purposes.

To present a historical analysis, we shaped a foundation by creating a purpose-built table of activities within the scope of defence diplomacy. A historical comparison of the activities involved has been offered. Hence, the authors suggest a research question: *What is the historical evolution and enduring significance of the top four activities in defence diplomacy, and how have these activities shaped the landscape of international relations over time?"*

2. Literature Review

The material on defence diplomacy is extensive. But we find no particular writing about its evolution or its historical context. Most of the writings on defence diplomacy have discussed either the activities carried out under the realm of defence diplomacy; or the significance of such activities to attain the foreign policy objectives. The highly cited work has been presented by Andrew Cottey & Anthony Forster who have mentioned various activities and described them as military cooperation and assistance. It is also held that the appointment of a defence attaché, an important part of defence diplomacy, emerged as part of nineteenth-century European diplomacy. The authors have acknowledged ten actions, which the countries perform mutually, as defence diplomacy activities which include; bilateral and multilateral contacts between senior military and civilian defence officials, the appointment of defence attaches to foreign countries, bilateral defence cooperation agreements, training of foreign military and civilian defence personnel,



provision of expertise and advice on the democratic control of armed forces, defence management and military technical areas, contacts and exchanges between military personnel and units, and ship visits, placement of military or civilian personnel in partner countries defence ministries or armed forces, deployment of training teams, provision of military equipment and other material aid, and bilateral or multilateral military exercises for training purposes (Forster, 2004). These activities can be carried out by the army, navy and air force of a state, under the auspices of its Ministry of Defence. Apart from this, defence cooperation has also been kept in this context and it happens between two countries.

A different view on defence diplomacy, arguing it as an investment in relationships and a means to create strategic partnerships, is emphasized by John, notably through military exercises to foster mutual understanding and military collaboration (Blaxland, 2014). For this, the author provides an example, of when Thailand showed willingness for Australia's support, on East Timor. The author argues that Australia's position on the East Timor crisis would not have succeeded if it had not been for decades of Australia's cooperation with Thailand in the shape of exchanges, partnerships, and bilateral military exercises. Therefore, effects like bilateral and short-term military engagement and cooperation in aid projects are reasons for strengthening measures through defence diplomacy.

Juan Emilio traces the origins of defence diplomacy to the classic military diplomacy that has been practised since ancient times and was revived in the Napoleonic era. He notes that the concept of defence diplomacy remained largely unchanged until the end of the Cold War, focusing primarily on military relations within the classic military field (Cheyre, 2013). Juan also highlights that the 1990s marked the dawn of a new era in international affairs, characterized by complex interdependence, the rise of new global actors, and the emergence of public diplomacy. These developments paved the way for a new conception of defence diplomacy as an expression of network diplomacy, linking the implementation of foreign policy objectives to those of the defence sector. Juan underscores the potential of defence diplomacy to be a valuable instrument of statecraft when managed effectively, leveraging both soft and hard power dimensions on any given issue.

Gregory considers that defence diplomacy is a strategic use of soft power to integrate conceptual paradigms. This indicates that states use defence diplomacy to influence other countries' perceptions of security issues, thereby furthering their strategic objectives. In addition, he presents a new concept of defence diplomacy based on how states pursue their interests in the global arena. This improved explanation eliminates the historical conceptual uncertainty around the term, providing a clearer understanding of how defence diplomacy functions as an instrument of statecraft (Winger, 2014). The author claims that the study of defence diplomacy is still in its initial stages, demanding additional scholarly research to uncover its complex uses and measure its success. This emphasizes the continued need for more research to fully understand the complexities of defence diplomacy and its multidimensional role in international relations.

Cooperation to form alliances and create partnerships is a specific part of broader forms of security cooperation around the world. Its notable structures are the Shangri-La dialogue, the Rim of the Pacific Exercise (RIMPAC), the annual meeting of defence ministers of ten ASEAN countries and its dialogue partner countries i.e., ASEAN Defence Ministers Meetings (ADMM), Western Pacific Naval Symposium (WPNS), small bilateral



efforts and bilateral military-to-military contacts (Bisley, 2014). The most important advantages of defence diplomacy, according to the author, are its potential to deliver, and then it can reduce stress and is helpful in crisis management. Second, it gives the benefit of improving the flow of information and enhancing mutual understanding of states' capabilities, interests, and red lines. Third is the ability to improve the strategic environment by fostering personal connections between senior defence officials through high levels of trust and joint communication.

In international affairs, diplomacy is how countries advance their national interests. If diplomacy fails, the same interests are achieved through force. In terms of national security, diplomacy is a soft power, while the military is a hard power (Leahy, 2014). In the current rapidly changing international situation, this difference is not so clear today. This is the reason defence diplomacy is proving to be a beneficial way of achieving national interests less than conflict.

Table 1

Sr	Activities under the ambit of defence diplomacy
	Defence & Military Officials' Bilateral/multilateral contacts
	Defence attaches
	Joint military exercises
	Defence cooperation agreements, provision of military equipment, MoUs, treatise
	Sub Activities
	Interoperability among all branches of armed forces
	Education and military training
	United Nations Peacekeeping operations
	Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations, Search and rescue operations
	Participation in events organized by military institutions, conferences, parades and (tattoos, is a new trend and on the rise, the UK termed it cultural defence diplomacy).

Source: Purpose-built table created by the authors during the literature review

It is argued that the activities above, from serial 1 to 4 give a systematic form to defence diplomacy. These are the basic actions and features through which states conduct mutual defence diplomacy. Sub-activities are the results and outcomes of the above four activities. A historical analysis of the top four activities from the above table will be presented to argue the research question.

3. Defence & Military Officials Bilateral/Multilateral Contacts

Military and defence officials have long engaged in bilateral and multilateral contacts to achieve diplomatic goals and promote international security. Bilateral contacts refer to interactions between two countries, while multilateral contacts involve two countries. Because of such engagements, military and strategic alliances are formed. These are formal agreements between two or more countries to provide mutual defence against external threats. Defence and military professionals' bilateral and multilateral interactions are significant because they facilitate diplomatic communication and



government collaboration. These encounters are critical to defence diplomacy, enhancing mutual understanding, trust, and strategic partnerships. Bilateral connections also allow governments to engage in direct discussions, exchange perspectives on security-related matters, and explore mutually beneficial endeavors. Multilateral contacts, on the other hand, are frequently held within the context of international forums and alliances, and they help to build collective policies and actions to address common security challenges and threats. These activities strengthen military-to-military partnerships and play an important role in developing larger diplomatic relations.

3.1 Genealogy

Ancient civilizations have a long history of bilateral and multilateral interactions between armed forces. For instance, city-states like Athens and Sparta, joined forces in Ancient Greece to coordinate military actions and for mutual defences (Martine, 2013). Athens and Sparta's alliance against Persia during the Greco-Persian Wars is a well-known instance of bilateral cooperation. In Ancient Greece, the Delian League, led by Athens and the Peloponnesian League, led by Sparta represented multilateral alliances (Larsen, 1940). Military alliances were also formed between various city-states, tribes, and kingdoms in ancient Rome, for instance, in the First Macedonian War, 215-205 BCE (Bunson, 2014). During the Middle Ages, military alliances were formed between feudal lords and monarchs to defend against invaders and to expand their territories. Military alliances and interactions between nations have evolved more formally and institutionally in recent history (Clausewitz, 1950).

In the years leading to World War I, many military alliances between European nations were formed, including the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. The 20th century saw the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949, which is a military alliance of several North American and European countries that was formed as a response to the threat of Soviet expansion during the Cold War. Since its end, NATO has expanded its mission beyond collective defence to include crisis management operations. This includes peacekeeping missions, peacebuilding activities and interventions to prevent or stop conflicts. Since 1999 the Kosovo Force (KFOR) in Kosovo and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan from 2003 to 2014 was a NATO-led alliance aimed at stabilizing the country and supporting the Afghan government in building a secure and democratic state (NATO, 2023). While not formal allies, Australia, New Zealand and the US security treaty (ANZUS) and NATO also collaborate. Beyond participating in large-scale military exercises like Talisman Sabre and Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC), they also share intelligence and develop joint training programs. This cooperation extends to regional security concerns, especially in the Indo-Pacific.

While the end of the Cold War saw a surge in UN peacekeeping operations, the UN emerged as a central player in peacekeeping, alongside regional organizations like the African Union and multilateral alliances like NATO. The UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) established in 2011 to support and protect civilians in South Sudan and the UN Interim force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) since 1978 face varied degrees of success, grappling with challenges. Such peacekeeping efforts are carried out through UN Security Council resolutions, which play a key role in shaping international security policy as well



as peacekeeping efforts (UN, 2023). So, it can be assumed that bilateral and multilateral contacts between military forces have a long history and existed for centuries, but it has become more formalized and institutionalized in the modern day. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Australia, New Zealand, and United States Security Treaty (ANZUS) are a few prominent examples.

4. Defence Attaché

A defence attaché is a military officer assigned to a foreign embassy or consulate to represent their country's defence interests and military capabilities. Defence attachés are typically responsible for promoting military-to-military relationships and cooperation with the host country, as well as providing information about the military capabilities and intentions of their own country. They may also be responsible for coordinating military exchanges and training programs, and for providing help and support to their country's military personnel who are stationed abroad (Masland & Radway, 1957). Defence attachés often work closely with their country's embassy staff and with the military officials of the host country to meet their goals.

Moreover, he also gathers intelligence while serving as a diplomatic representative of his country, but as globalization progresses, more complex technology emerges, and Attaches' role and scope are also becoming more complex. This role is the name of any nation's ability to know what kind and how much important information they can get about another country.

Furthermore, states spend a lot of capital on the training, deployment, etc. of defence attachés, and this is the reason their performance and capabilities are closely monitored. It is difficult to estimate the value of the Attaché system, especially in terms of efficiency when countries are spending their resources on them. One thing is certain many actions assigned to the defence attachés prove to be beneficial for the achievement of foreign policy goals. Because of the desire to achieve great power, the acquisition of strategic intelligence has become very important. Timely assessment of the war capability of foreign governments or countries is now becoming a guarantee of survival and security for the country. The reason for this is that at no other time in the history of civilization did a man have such great abilities to destroy his fellow man as they do today (Vagts, 1967).

4.1 Genealogy

In Roman history, military personnel were used for the special purpose of espionage. Frontinus (40-103 AD) included espionage as an instruction among other services in the work of an officer (Erdkamp, 2011). It is also mentioned that when Scipio sent Caius Lilius to the camp of Syphax under the pretext of the embassy, he took many military officers with him in the disguise of his domestic servants and gathered expert soldiers. In this way, the task of appointing generals to diplomatic posts in 17th-century Persia began so diplomatic reports could be checked. There are many mentions of appointing Generals as Ambassadors by Napoleon (Freke, 1854). Due to their historically strong role, most European powers had also employed military officers as foreign representatives by the mid-nineteenth century. The official nomination and regular



position and name were given in 1857. In the same way, the United States came out of the period of isolation and in 1888 officially started appointing military attachés (Kupchan, 2020).

5. Joint Military Exercises: Enhancing Interoperability and International Relations

It refers to a large-scale activity in which more than one country exercises its military capabilities under an explicit purpose at a specific location by mutual consent. These are training exercises that involve military staff and equipment to practice and improve military skills and capabilities. These exercises can take place at various levels, ranging from small unit-level training to large-scale and multinational exercises involving the participation of multiple countries (Clem, 2018). Such exercises have a variety of objectives, which include improvement in the readiness and capabilities of military forces, testing of new types of equipment and tactics, and demonstration of military strength to deter potential adversaries. They are also used to build and strengthen relationships with allies and partners, and to foster cooperation and interoperability between military forces. Military exercises can take many forms, including field training exercises, which involve live-fire ranges and simulated battlefield conditions, and computer-simulated exercises, which use advanced computer technology to simulate military operations. They also include a range of activities, such as air, land, and sea drills, as well as cyber and space operations (Caton, 2018). Joint Military Exercises (JME) are an important part of maintaining the readiness and effectiveness of military forces and are a critical part of national defence strategies. They also serve as a signal for military opponents by showing the level of unity between the forces involved and their ability to coordinate. In this way, without actual combat, the army gets a good idea of what the effects of a possible war would be and will the strategy be correct and so on (Levy J. S., 1998). Defence policymakers get first-hand information on several issues such as scenario preparation, analysis, training for wartime decisions, the consequences of possible decisions taken during the war, and mobility can also be reiterated. According to a 2021 study, joint military exercises conducted within a defined alliance have the potential to deter adversaries without creating moral hazard (Dylan R. K., 2022). The reverse can also happen, and it can lead to an increase in conflicts, but this is extremely rare (Dylan R. K., 2021).

JME's promote brotherhood, and camaraderie among the forces involved. Along with expressing the spirit of goodwill, it can also show the soft power, culture, language, customs and lifestyle of the nation. The professional skills of the staff emerge through exercises. It is a fact that the effectiveness of any defence equipment can be known only because of the skill of the person using it. This is the reason for weapons manufacturing companies and countries, such exercises, where equipment is also tested, are an advertisement of their advanced technology and equipment. If we talk about the implications, the subtlest aspects that are part of the war strategy can be decoded and many things can be revealed (Sukin, 2020).

Military exercises often involve the participation of multiple countries and military forces, which lets them practice and improve their ability to work together and coordinate their



efforts. This is important for making sure military forces can effectively run together in multinational operations. Similarly, military exercises help to build and strengthen relationships between countries, particularly when they involve the contribution of multiple nations. This can foster greater cooperation and understanding between military forces, and help to promote regional stability and security. Another important feature of JME is deterrence. It is argued that military exercises are an important tool for improving the readiness and capabilities of military forces and for building and strengthening relationships with allies and partners.

5.1 Genealogy

The history of military exercises can be traced back to earlier civilizations. For instance, Greek city-states like Athens and Sparta engaged in regular phalanx training in ancient Greece to practice battle and test out new tactics and techniques (Martin, 2013). This involved synchronized marches, manoeuvres, and weapon drills which helped to improve discipline, cohesion and effectiveness in battle. To increase cooperation and interoperability, the Roman military conducted joint exercises with allied tribes and kingdoms in antiquity (Southern, 2007). To increase their armies' readiness and coordination, feudal lords and kings also remained engaged in combined military drills during the Middle Ages, the medieval warfare often involved the combined forces of multiple lords and kings. These forces held regular "war games" and tournaments which served as military training.

Persia has a rich and ancient military history, with training procedures evolving. Achaemenid army (550-330 BCE) relied largely on mounted archers called Aspeis and Dastana, who were trained in mounted archery, riding and battle tactics (Archer & Ferris, 2002). Foot troops, sometimes recruited from conquered lands were trained in spear and swordsmanship, shield formations and marching drills. Persian soldiers were known for their strict discipline and steadfast loyalty to the king. Strict obedience, physical exercise and shared meals were used in training to establish these ideals.

6. Defence Cooperation Agreements

The Defence Cooperation Agreements (DCAs) are formal agreements between countries that set a framework for military cooperation and collaboration. These agreements cover a wide range of activities, including the exchange of military personnel and equipment, joint training and exercises, sharing military technology and information, alliance against common threats and military assistance. The DCAs help states in the achievement of several important foreign policy objectives which include, strengthening military relationships, improvement of military capabilities, enhancing interoperability and promoting regional stability (Kinne, 2018).

The DCAs also help to improve the capabilities and readiness of military forces which is important for developing countries, as they have limited financial and other resources and need to rely on external support to modernize and improve their defence capabilities. In the same way, DCAs let military forces of different countries work together effectively by improving their ability to run together in an environment other than war. This is also



very important for developing countries that intend to participate in peacekeeping or other international missions under the auspices of the United Nations or any other formal international coalition.

In recent years, DCAs have become an efficient tool among states to address their common defence threats, border problems and internal security challenges, such as terrorism, piracy, and other transnational maritime threats. Developing countries are already vulnerable to these threats and benefit from this cooperation with other countries to address them. The opportunities for collaboration and innovation help military forces of states to learn from each other and share best practices and access to new markets and technologies, providing the opportunity to countries willing to share or sell military equipment and technology as part of the agreement (Swedish Defence research agency, 2019).

Defence cooperation agreements are also useful for economic gains as well. These have the potential to attract investment and support from other states which may include the coproduction of military equipment, arsenals, and training, again this is crucial for developing countries without many resources to invest in their military-industrial or manufacturing capabilities and seek cooperation at international level to strengthen their defence.

6.1 Genealogy

Defence cooperation partnerships have a long history. Although the structure and complexity of these agreements have evolved throughout time, the basic concept of many groups working together for mutual defence predates recorded history. In Ancient Mesopotamia, city-states such as Lagash and Ur formed alliances in reaction to common challenges, which likely included mutual military support. Treaties and pledges, frequently invoking deities to confer binding authority, helped to strengthen the consolidation of these accords (Richardson, 2012).

In Egypt, Pharaohs formed alliances with neighbouring countries to combat nomadic tribes and rival powers, with documented examples of cooperative military operations and troop transfers reaching back to the New Kingdom period (Langdon & Gardiner, 1920). During the Persian Wars in ancient Greece, city-states formed intricate alliances, with Athens leading a maritime confederacy against the invading Persian Empire. This concerted endeavor, which featured shared military resources and coordinated plans, demonstrated the effectiveness of the collective defence. In ancient Rome, regular treaty engagements with allies and client states required military assistance during times of crisis. The Roman army incorporated auxiliary troops from conquered countries, resulting in a diversified and multicultural force (Phang, 2011). Examining the historical foundations of such accords provides essential insights into their current significance and potential.



7. Concluding Analysis

There is an increasing need for defence diplomacy to promote collaboration between the global north and the global south. Within this framework, defence diplomacy emerges as a critical tool for promoting international peace and security, increasing communication, and encouraging state collaboration. Its application not only reduces the likelihood of conflict but also contributes to the development of trust and understanding among governments. Defence diplomacy continues to be a dynamic force in navigating the changing global scene. The entire essence of diplomacy is changing; the emergence of new technology, notably the influence of social media, creates new communication channels.

This transition involves diplomacy's adaptation to new forms and organizations. It necessitates the integration of a variety of statecraft tools to effectively traverse and address these difficulties. Against this backdrop, the historical evolution and enduring significance of bilateral and multilateral contacts between defence and military officials, assignments of defence attaches, joint military exercises, defence cooperation agreements, and the establishment of Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) for military equipment provision and treaties all play a role in shaping the ever-evolving landscape of international relations.

Defence diplomacy, which consists of some important activities, has an old history. The historical evolution of defence diplomacy activities, encompassing military exchanges and training programs, joint military exercises, and cooperation in various fields of mutual interest, reveals a persistent and dynamic engagement that predates contemporary international relations. Military exchanges, serving as conduits for knowledge transfer and fostering relationships between nations, have been traced back to ancient civilizations, which show their enduring importance in building alliances and helping with understanding. Joint military exercises, a cornerstone of defence diplomacy, have evolved from traditional manoeuvres to complex multinational operations. Historical instances, such as joint military exercises during the World Wars, underscore the enduring significance of collaborative military training in enhancing interoperability and promoting collective security. Additionally, cooperation in fields like technology exchange and tactics has roots in historical alliances, showcasing the continuing nature of multifaceted defence diplomacy activities. These defence diplomacy activities, shaped by geopolitical shifts and technological advancements, have played pivotal roles in alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and strategic partnerships, leaving an indelible mark on the international relations landscape. Their historical continuity underscores their adaptability and relevance, illustrating how they have consistently contributed to shaping diplomatic interactions, enhancing security, and fostering stability across different epochs. In modern times it has become more organized and institutionalized. Today, defence diplomacy has evolved to encompass a wider range of activities, including joint military exercises of bilateral and multilateral level, humanitarian missions, and peacekeeping operations. As technology continues to transform the way militaries operate and interact, the future of defence diplomacy is likely to see even more innovative approaches, such as the use of artificial intelligence in strengthening military-to-military interactions and greater cooperation between military and civilian agencies. The challenges and opportunities of defence diplomacy will continue to be shaped by



broader geopolitical trends and global security challenges, such as rising nationalism, regional conflicts, and the ongoing threat of terrorism.

It is a fact that throughout modern history, the change from historical alliance formation to contemporary strategic alliances in defence diplomacy has had a substantial impact on governments' ability to achieve their national aims and interests. This progress has seen a shift away from rigid and static partnerships and toward more flexible, collaborative, and nuanced methods. Strategic defence diplomacy alliances have proven useful in resolving multidimensional global concerns, encouraging information sharing, and responding to non-traditional security threats. Governments have improved their ability to handle geopolitical challenges by adjusting to this changing landscape, ensuring a more effective pursuit of national goals and interests on the international stage.

The global community encounters complex and multidimensional problems that no single state or institution can manage alone. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the collective vulnerability of governments, demanding coordinated measures on both internal and foreign fronts. The implications go beyond health crises; challenges like terrorism, the widespread influence of the Internet, and the inexorable march of modernization have changed the global security landscape. Combating international terrorism, for example, is no longer an individual's job, but rather a shared concern that transcends national and organizational boundaries.

References

- Archer, C., & Ferris, J. (2002). *World History of Warfare*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Bisley, N. (2014). *The possibilities and limits of defence diplomacy in Asia*. Canberra: ANU strategic and defence studies center. Retrieved from https://sdsc.bellschool.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/2016-03/cog_17_web.pdf
- Blaxland, J. (2014). *Defending defence diplomacy*. Canberra: Strategic & Defence Studies Centre Australian National University. Retrieved from https://sdsc.bellschool.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/2016-03/cog_17_web.pdf
- Boulding, K. E. (1977). Twelve friendly quarrels with Johan Galtung. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(5), 75-86.
- Buhaug, H., Cederman, L.-E., & Gleditsch, K. S. (2014). Square Pegs in Round Holes: Inequalities, Grievances, and Civil War. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58, 418-431.
- Bunson, M. (2014). *Encyclopedia of the roman empire*. Facts on file incorporated .
- Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cabrera, I. (2016). Conflicto armado, criminalidad y violencia en la frontera colombo-panameña: elementos críticos para buscar una transición. In A. Molano, *Fronteras en Colombia como zonas estratégicas: análisis y perspectivas* (p. 221). Bogotá: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung - Instituto de Ciencia Política "Hernán Echavarría Olózaga".



- Caton, J. L. (2018). *The land space and cyberspace nexus evolution of the oldest military operations in the newest military domain*. Pennsylvania: US Army war college. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep17662>
- Charters, S. P. (1983). War Games and Military History. *Journal of contemporary history*, 567-582. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/260304>
- Cheyre, J. E. (2013). Defence Diplomacy. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (pp. 369-382). Oxford University Press.
- Clausewitz, C. v. (1950). *On War*. Infantry journal press.
- Clem, R. (2018). Military excercises as geopolitical messaging in the NATO Russia dynamic. *The strategist*, 130-143. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.26153/tsw/865>
- Collective, C. (2006, December). Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto. *Security Dialogue*, 37, 443-487. doi:10.1177/0967010606073085
- Collier, P. (2004). El desafío global de los conflictos locales. *The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank*, 39.
- Collier, P., Hoeffler, A., & Rohner, D. (2009). Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 61, 1-27.
- DCAF. (2007). *Defence attaches*. Geneva: Geneva centre for the democratic control of armed forces. Retrieved from <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/38583/dcaf-backgroundunder-defence-attaches.pdf>
- Doyle, M. (2005). Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace. *The American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 463-466. doi:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30038953>
- Doyle, M. W. (1983, Summer). Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 12(3), 205-235.
- Doyle, M. W. (1986, December). Liberalism and World Politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1151-1169.
- Drab, L. (2018). Defence Diplomacy an important tool for the implementation of foreign policy and security of the state. *Security & Defence Quarterly*, 57-71. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.5152>
- Durkheim, E. (2001). *Las reglas del método sociológico*. México D.C.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Dylan, R. K. (2021). Deterrence and restraint do joint military excercises escalate conflict. *journal of conflict resolution*, 84-151. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/002200272111023147>
- Dylan, R. K. (2022). Deterrence and Restraint: Do Joint Military Excercises Escalate Conflict? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3-31.
- Eck, K. (2008). An Overview and Typology of Conflict Data: The Advantages of Data Diversity. In M. Kauffmann, *Building and Using Datasets on Armed Conflicts* (pp. 29-40). Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- El Espectador. (2016, Diciembre 14). Así son los cinco jefes de las Farc que se declararon en disidencia. *El Espectador*. Retrieved from <http://www.elespectador.com/noticias/judicial/asi-son-los-cinco-jefes-de-farc-se-declararon-disidenci-articulo-670457>
- El Espectador. (2016, Diciembre 16). ONU advierte de vacío de poder en zonas que abandonan las Farc. *El Espectador*. Retrieved from



<http://www.elespectador.com/noticias/paz/onu-advierte-de-vacio-de-poder-zonas-abandonan-farc-articulo-670697>

Elwert, G. (2003). Intervention on markets of violence. In J. Koehler, & C. Zürcher, *Potentials of Disorder: Explaining Conflict and Stability in the Caucasus and in the Former Yugoslavia* (pp. 219-242). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Erdkamp, P. (2011). *A companion to the roman army*. Wiley.

Forster, A. C. (2004). *Reshaping Defence Diplomacy new roles for military cooperation and assistance*. New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from [https://www.defence.lk/upload/ebooks/Reshaping%20Defence%20Diplomacy_%20New%20Roles%20for%20Military%20Cooperation%20and%20Assistance%20\(%20PDFDrive.com%20\).pdf](https://www.defence.lk/upload/ebooks/Reshaping%20Defence%20Diplomacy_%20New%20Roles%20for%20Military%20Cooperation%20and%20Assistance%20(%20PDFDrive.com%20).pdf)

Freke, W. (1854). *Englands battles by sea and land*. London: London printing and publishing company.

Fukuyama, F. (1989, Summer). The End of History. *The National Interest*, pp. 3-18.

Fundación Paz y Reconciliación. (2015). *Lo que hemos ganado*. Bogotá: Fundación Paz y Reconciliación. Retrieved from <http://www.pares.com.co/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Descargue-Informe-Completo.pdf>

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.

Galtung, J. (2008). Galtung - 50 years with peace studies. (J. Oberg, Interviewer) Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=siSLNNBCA3E>

Galtung, J. (2010). Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution: The Need for Transdisciplinarity. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 20-32. doi:10.1177/1363461510362041

García, A. (2017, Mayo 25). *La violencia ni se crea ni se destruye: Teoría general de la violencia natural, política, social y doméstica*. Retrieved from http://perso.unifr.ch/derechopenal/assets/files/tribuna/tr_20080616_20.pdf

Gates, S. (2014, March 27). Journal of Peace Research 50th Anniversary Presidential Roundtable. *ISA Conference*. Toronto, Canada.

Gleditsch, N. P. (1989). Focus On: Journal of Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 26(1), 1-5.

Gleditsch, N. P. (2008, June 3). An irreverent history of peace research. Berlin.

Gleditsch, N. P., Nordkvelle, J., & Strand, H. (2014). Peace research - Just the study of war? *Journal of Peace Research*, 145-158.

Hassan, F. (2022). United Nations counter terrorism strategy a theoretical analysis. *Journal of nautical eye and strategic studies*, 43-55.

Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A Participatory Inquiry Paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry September*, 274-294. doi:10.1177/107780049700300302

Hooker, C. A. (1987). *A Realistic Theory of Science*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Hudson, H. (2011). La violencia de la construcción de la paz neoliberal en África: analizando sus "trampas" a través de un lente de género. *Relaciones Internacionales*, 73.

Huntington, S. P. (1993, Summer). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), pp. 22-49.



- Kaldor, M. (1999). *New and old wars: organised violence in a global era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kaldor, M. (2013). In Defense of New Wars. *Stability*, 2(1), 1-16. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/sta.at>
- Keohane, R. O. (1988). International Institutions: Two Approaches. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4), 379-396. doi:10.2307/2600589
- King, G., Keohane, R., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kinne, B. J. (2018). Defence cooperation agreements and the emergence of a global security network. *International organization*, 799-837. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26569498>
- Koerner, W. (2006). *Security Sector Reform Defence Diplomacy*. Ottawa: Parliamentary Information and Research Service. Retrieved from <https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.560898/publication.html>
- Kriesberg, L. (2009). The Evolution of Conflict Resolution. In J. Bercovitch, V. A. Kremeniuk, & I. W. Zartman, *The SAGE handbook of conflict resolution* (pp. 15-32). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Kupchan, C. A. (2020). *Isolationism A history of americas efforts to shield itself from the world*. Oxford university press.
- Langdon, & Gardiner, A. (1920). The Treaty of Alliance between Hattušili, King of the Hittites, and the Pharaoh Ramesses II of EGYPT. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 179-205.
- Lapid, Y. (1989, September). The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era. *International Studies Quarterly*, 33(3), 235-254. doi:10.2307/2600457
- Larsen. (1940). The Constitution and original purpose of the Delian League. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 175-213.
- Leahy, P. (2014). *Military diplomacy*. canberra: ANU strategic and defence studies center.
- Levy, J. S. (1998). The causes of war and the conditions of peace. *Annual Review of political science*, 139-165. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.1.1.139>
- Levy, J. S. (2000). Reflections on the Scientific Study of War. In J. A. Vasquez, *What Do We Know About War?* (pp. 319-327). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Levys, J. (2011). Theories and Causes of War. In C. J. Coyne, & R. L. Mathers, *The Handbook on Political Economy of War* (pp. 13-33). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- López, M. (2011). Teorías para la paz y perspectivas ambientales del desarrollo como diálogos de imperfectos. *Luna Azul*(33), 85-96. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=321727235008>
- Martin, T. R. (2013). *Ancient greece from prehistoric to hellenistic times*. Yale University Press.
- Martine, T. R. (2013). *Ancient Greece from prehistoric to hellenistic times*. Yale University press.
- Masland, J., & Radway, L. (1957). *Soldiers and Scholars Military Education and National Policy*. Princeton University Press.



- Melander, E., Pettersson, T., & Themnér, L. (2016). Organized violence, 1989-2015. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(5), 727-742.
- Mouffe, C. (1999). *El retorno de lo político. Comunidad, ciudadanía, pluralismo, democracia radical*. barcelona: Paidós.
- Muñoz, F. (2004). Paz Imperfecta. In M. López, *Enciclopedia de Paz y Conflictos* (p. 1227). Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- NATO. (2023, Jul 10). *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Retrieved from Operations and missions: Past and Present: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_52060.htm
- Oliveira, G. C. (2016). Pacifist approaches to conflict resolution: an overview of pragmatic pacifism. *JANUS.NET e-journal of International Relations*, 7(1), 3-18. doi:<http://hdl.handle.net/11144/2619>
- Palma, D. (2017). Definición del concepto de discurso político: algunas aproximaciones teórico-prácticas. In Dulfary Calderón, Gina Enciso, & Claudia Árias, *Manual de marketing político. Estrategias para una campaña exitosa* (pp. 53-73). Bogotá: Universidad Santo Tomás.
- Pearson, K. (1892). *The Grammar of Science*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.
- Pfetsch, F., & Rohloff, C. (2000). KOSIMO: A Databank on Political Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(3), 379-89.
- Phang, S. (2011). New Approaches to the Roman Army. *Recent Directions in the Military History of the Ancient World*, 44-105.
- Pureza, J. M. (2011, December). O desafio crítico dos estudos para a paz. *Relações Internacionais*(32), 5-22.
- Rabasa, Á., Boraz, S., Chalk, P., Cragin, K., Karasik, T., Moroney, J., . . . Peters, J. (2007, agosto 12). *Ungoverned territories: understanding and reducing terrorism risks*. Retrieved from RAND Corporation: <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG561>
- Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2011). *Contemporary conflict resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Reed, M. (2012, Mayo 13). *Desarrollo minero y mercados de la violencia*. Retrieved from El Colombiano: http://www.elcolombiano.com/historico/desarrollo_minero_y_mercados_de_violencia-JVEC_181778
- Revista Semana. (2016, Diciembre 17). Los disidentes de las Farc. *Revista Semana*. Retrieved from <http://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/desercion-de-cinco-mandos-medios-de-las-farc-en-el-guaviare/509760>
- Richardson, S. (2012). Early Mesopotamia: The Presumptive State. *Past & Present*, 3-49.
- Rogers, P., & Ramsbotham, O. (1999). Then and Now: Peace Research—Past and Future. *Political Studies*(47), 740–754. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00229
- Rosato, S. (2003). The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *American Political Science Review*, 97(4), 585-602.
- Russett, B., & Kramer, M. (1973). New editors for an old journal. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 17(1), 3-6.
- Serge, M. (2011). *El revés de la nación: territorios de salvajes, fronteras y tierras de nadie*. Bogotá: Universidad de los Andes.



- Sharp, G. (1971). *Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Porter Sargent Publishers.
- Singer, J. D. (1961). The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics*, 14(1), 77-92.
- Sola-Morales, S. (2014). Imaginarios sociales, procesos de identificación y comunicación mediática. *Prisma.com*(25), 3-22. Retrieved from http://revistas.ua.pt/index.php/prismacom/article/view/3044/pdf_26
- Southern, P. (2007). *The roman army a social and institutional history*. Oxford university press.
- Sukin, J. b. (2020). Joint military exercises and crisis dynamics on the korean peninsula. *journal of conflict resolution*, 855-888. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002720972180>
- Sundberg, R., & Melander, E. (2013). Introducing the UCDP Georeferenced Event Dataset. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(4), 523-532.
- Swedish Defence research agency. (2019). *Advantages and risks of regional defence cooperation*. Stockholm: SDRA. Retrieved from <https://www.foi.se/en/foi/news-and-pressroom/news/2019-04-01-advantages-and-risks-of-regional-defence-cooperation.html>
- Tan, S. S. (2016). Military Diplomacy. In *The SAGE handbook of diplomacy* (pp. 591-600). SAGE Publication .
- The Guardian. (2015, Junio 3). *El Salvador's 'most violent month': homicide rate hits record high in May*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jun/03/el-salvador-homicide-killings-gangs>
- Tromp, H. (1981). Introduction: Changing Perspectives in Peace Research. In *UNESCO Yearbook of Peace and Conflict Studies 1980*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Ulmer, W. (2010). Military Leadership into the 21st century: Another bridge too far? *The US Army War College Quarterly*, 21.
- UN. (2023). *United Nations*. Retrieved from UN Peacekeeping Operations, special political missions: <https://www.unmissions.org/>
- Vagts, A. (1967). *Military Attache*. Princeton University Press.
- Waldmann, P. (1999). Sobre la asimetría existente entre la dinámica de la violencia y la dinámica de la paz utilizando como ejemplo las guerras civiles. *Eguzkilore: Cuaderno del Instituto Vasco de Criminología*(13), 201.
- Wallensteen, P. (1973). *Structure and War. On International Relations, 1920-68*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- Waltz, K. N. (1959). *Man, the state, and war; a theoretical analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wiberg, H. (2005, Junho). Investigação para a Paz: Passado, presente e futuro. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 71, 21-42.
- Winger, G. (2014). The velvet gauntlet a theory of defense diplomacy. *What do ideas do IWM Junior visiting fellows conference. XXXIII*, pp. 1-14. Vienna: IWM. Retrieved from https://files.iwm.at/jvfc/33_10_Winger.pdf