Defence Diplomacy in the Long War
Beyond the Aiguillette

Patrick Blannin

Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

July 2018

Faculty of Society and Design
Dr Stuart Murray and Dr R. James Ferguson
To the best of my knowledge and belief the thesis entitled: **Defence Diplomacy in the Long War: Beyond the Aiguillette**, represents my own work and contains no material which has been previously submitted for a degree or diploma at this University or any other institution, except where due acknowledgement is made.

**Signature:**

[Signature]

**Date:** 22 December 2017
Research Outputs and publications during Candidature

Peer Reviewed Publications

‘Improving Regional Interoperability through an Indo-Pacific Joint Multinational Training Command and Readiness Center’, Counter Terrorism Trends and Analysis, ICPVTR Singapore (June 2018).


Presented and Published Conference Abstracts/Proof of Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Common Abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situating The Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale, Structure and Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 1  DEFENCE DIPLOMACY: WHY IT WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Diplomacy: The Basics</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Foundations of Defence Diplomacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances: the role of Trust, Representation, Credibility &amp; Emotion</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrence &amp; Coercion</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caveats &amp; Influence</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Interests or Coalitions of Convenience?</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Command: Operationalizing Trust &amp; Reputation</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defence Diplomacy: Unconventional Warfare &amp; COIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconventional Warfare</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COIN: an evolving concept</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 2  DEFENCE DIPLOMACY THEORY INTO PRACTICE: HOW IT WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Militarization of U.S. Foreign Policy</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun-Toting Diplomats</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking Down Barriers to Civ/Mil Cooperation &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3  METRICS, FORECASTS & FINAL THOUGHTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasts</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Thoughts</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References                                                                 | 90   |
APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Does Complexity Lead to Uncertainty? A Critique
Appendix 2: Policy, Strategy & Tactics
Appendix 3: Tools of Defence Diplomacy: FMA, SFA, FID and Train & Assist (TA3E)
Appendix 4: The ideal warrior diplomat: The POLAD and the SOF Operator
Appendix 5: The Privatization of Defence Diplomacy: Risks and Rewards
Appendix 6: Alternate State Diplomacy in the Long War

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1  How CA Contributes to STABOPS & COIN                              69
Figure 2  Warrior Diplomats Supporting Decision-Making Across the Spectrum    69
Figure 3  Illustrating Policy Strategy & Tactics and the Risk Assessment Process Appendix 2
Figure 4  Illustrating the Strategic & Tactical ‘Reach’ of the POLAD           Appendix 4
Figure 5  Contractor Demographics 2008-2017                                  Appendix 5
Figure 6  Comparing U.S. Troops & Contractors numbers                        Appendix 5

Word Count 51,600 (including Appendices of 19,800)

KEY WORDS

Defence diplomacy, Coalition, Counterinsurgency, Cooperation, Coordination,
Relationship building, Trust

THESIS QUESTION

When viewed through the lens of the militarization of U.S. foreign policy, does contemporary defence diplomacy legitimize the role of warrior diplomats, generate a net gain in global diplomatic engagement, and yield strategic and tactical advantages in COIN?
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Abstract

This thesis investigates the theory and practice of defence diplomacy, a term synonymous with traditional, state-centric diplomacy. Defence diplomacy commonly invokes images of a member of the armed services (man or woman) in full dress uniform among a sea of civilians within an embassy in a foreign country. These people are called Defense Attaché's (DATT). Despite being a regular feature of diplomatic relations between countries, little is known. The DATT is attached by the sending state he or she represents to an embassy or consulate and charged with the primary responsibility of advising the ambassador on relevant military issues within the host nation (HN). They also serve as a staff contact and liaison within the embassy for military issues, as well as observing and reporting on military developments (Intelligence) in the host country. A distinguishing feature of the DATT, an invaluable ‘link’ in the information chain for the relevant state, is the aiguillette: braided gilded cords worn to distinguish special and senior appointees from senior officers.

This exegesis, Defence Diplomacy: Beyond the Aiguillette provides a comprehensive theoretical and practical review of this understudied yet important and evolving role. It argues that contemporary defence diplomacy is much broader and deeper than this common perception. The misconception is due in part, to a lack of theoretical grounding in analyses to date, which are predominately focused on practice; the ‘who’ and ‘what’ as opposed to the ‘how’ and ‘why’. A revised theory of defence diplomacy based on a strong theoretical foundation not only addresses the ‘why’ question, it also enables a comprehensive assessment of contemporary defence diplomacy, the ‘how’. In practice, defence diplomacy is conducted across the civilian and military (civ/mil) spectrum, well beyond the simple secondment of military personnel to an embassy. This research project is pursuant to confirming whether: empowered by the militarization of U.S. foreign policy, does contemporary defence diplomacy legitimize the role of warrior diplomats, generate a net gain in global diplomatic engagement, and yield strategic and tactical advantages in counterinsurgency (COIN)?

This document is an adjunct to the Defence Diplomacy in the Long War (Blannin, 2017) research monograph. The monograph evaluates whether long-term operational, institutional, and national security benefits occur when the military, the most kinetic institution of the state, integrates and operationalises its diplomatic capacity in pursuit of its foreign policy objectives. It’s a bi-modal document, and its alloyed components are firstly pursuant to the doctorate’s three-part research question. Secondly, it introduces and discusses its research framework: the key questions, the theories, and the multi-disciplinary scope of the project, whilst also ‘telling the story of the research: its motivations, objectives, methods, its findings, as well as further reinforcing its original
contribution to the field. Structurally, this paper consists of: a) an introduction which identifies the genesis of its argument as well as the scale and scope of the research; b) a section which situates the thesis within the theoretical concepts which underpin the research; c) a section which tests the hypotheses in a practical context; d) and finally a concluding section which identifies and explains a suite of metrics which support its hypotheses.

This document complements *Defence Diplomacy in the Long War* and represents an integral component of the doctoral research project. However, the numerous practical examples which accompany the theoretical appraisal, notably the detailed assessment of the political advisor and special operations forces personnel, means *Defence Diplomacy in the Long War: Beyond the Aiguillette* can be read as an independent, comprehensive audit of defence diplomacy.
AOR/OE – Area of operations/Operating environment
C2 – Command and control
CA – Civil affairs officer
Civ/mil – civil (civilian personnel in particular, as well as civil agencies) and military
CJCS - Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS – Joint Chiefs of Staff)
COIN – Counterinsurgency
CT – Counterterrorism
DoD – Defense Department (U.S.)
DOTMLPF-P - Doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership/education, personnel, facilities
and policy
EBA – Evidence based assessment
GIRoA - Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan
FSO – Foreign Service Officer
HN – Host nation
Mil/Mil – military to military
MOOTW -Military operations other than war
MOE – Measure of effectiveness
PME - Professional military education
POLAD – Political advisor
SECDEF – Secretary of Defence (U.S.)
SFA – Security force assistance
SOF – Special operations forces
State – State Department (U.S.)
TA3E – Train, Advise, Assist, Accompany and Equip
WoG – Whole-of-Government
U.S. – United States of America
USG – United States Government