Acta
Universitatis
Danubius

RI

RELATIONES
INTERNATIONALES

Leadership and Regional Security Architecture: Between Strategic Stability and Defense Diplomacy

Alin Mihăiță Goga[1]

Abstract: This study explores the critical interface between military leadership and regional security architecture, arguing that the strategic decisions of military leaders not only shape operational effectiveness but also exert a profound influence on diplomatic dynamics within multilateral defense frameworks. By analyzing command structures, defense diplomacy initiatives, and regional interoperability mechanisms across distinct case contexts, the article demonstrates how leadership paradigms grounded in proactive engagement and institutional trust-building underpin strategic stability. Through qualitative exploration of policy frameworks, joint-training protocols, and senior-level military diplomacy, the author elucidates three emergent leadership modalities hierarchical command, strategic-diplomatic engagement, and adaptive hybrid models each contributing to the cohesion and resilience of regional security regimes. The findings suggest that military leadership which integrates diplomatic acuity with operational command fosters environments conducive to cooperative security, challenging traditional depictions of military hierarchies as rigidly coercive. Drawing on theoretical insights from regional security studies, the paper contends that defense diplomacy enacted by military leaders can catalyze institutional legitimacy, enhance crisis responsiveness, and strengthen trust across state and alliance networks. Ultimately, the article proposes a reconceptualization of military leadership in international security theory, emphasizing its dual role as a driver of both strategic stability and normative institutionalization. The conclusion underscores the imperative for comprehensive leader development programmes that fuse diplomatic competence with

[1] National Company for Road Infrastructure Administration, Bucharest, Romania, Address: 38 Dinicu Golescu Blvd., Sector 1, Bucharest, 010873, Romania, Corresponding author: alingoga73@yahoo.com.

operational expertise, advocating policy frameworks that institutionalize defense diplomacy as a pillar of regional security governance.

Keywords: Regional security architecture; Defense diplomacy; Strategic stability

1. Introduction

In a period dominated by increasingly accentuated strategic interdependencies and the proliferation of non-state actors, the architecture of regional security has become considerably sophisticated, and military leadership can no longer be reduced to a simple hierarchical command. Military leadership must be reconsidered as an instrument of coercive-subtle diplomacy, through which defense capabilities become vectors of dialogue, cooperation and confidence-building in the international environment. By virtue of the theory of regional security complexes (RSCT), security is no longer an exclusively national attribute, but the result of interactions and mutual perceptions of regional actors, built on geostrategic, ethnic or economic proximity (Aspriadis, 2023).

RSCT emphasizes that threats are most pronounced at the regional level, and the security of an entity is deeply interconnected with the security of neighboring states. This interconnection implies that military leaders do not only watch over the borders, but also act as architects of collaborative security networks (Dragomir, 2025b). This is where the concept of defense diplomacy comes in, redefining the role of the military beyond its purely reserve military duties, transforming it into a foreign policy tool through military personnel exchanges, joint exercises, multilateral conferences, and operational transparency initiatives, all aimed at preventing crises by strengthening interstate trust (Dragomir et al., 2018).

In this theoretical and practical framework, the connection between military leadership and regional architecture is not a passive one, but an active and performative one. Military leaders become diplomats of stability, articulating political-military dialogues, negotiating transparency, and guaranteeing interoperability between forces. The result is a security architecture characterized by cohesion, institutional continuity and strategic resilience, capable not only of reacting to crises, but also of preventing them (Dragomir, 2025f). By comparing NATO initiatives dedicated to increasing interoperability such as digital interoperability plans connected to Federated Mission Networking and multinational exercises coordinated by Allied Command Transformation and the structured

dialogue within ASEAN through mechanisms such as ADMM and ADMM-Plus, the study highlights the versatility, but also the impact of military leadership on regional cohesion and the capacity to react in crisis situations.

Within NATO, the development of a "networked defence ecosystem" is promoted through plans such as RAAP (Rapid Adoption Action Plan) and FMN (Federated Mission Networking) initiatives, which allow for rapid standardization and procedural, technical, and human interoperability between allies. The rapid decision-making capacity and multilateral coordination in these exercises reflect a security architecture oriented towards stability and adaptability in the face of emerging challenges (Kanes, 2024).

In Southeast Asia, ASEAN has laid the foundations for a defense diplomacy through the ADMM (established in 2006) and ADMM-Plus (since 2010), which bring together not only member states but also important partners such as the US, China, India, and Australia. These structures activate specialized working groups (EWGs) on areas such as maritime security, counter-terrorism, humanitarian assistance, and disaster response, cultivating both institutional trust and procedural interoperability of regional armed forces. Military leadership in the ASEAN context is manifested through a hybrid-adaptive style, in which military leaders must not only command, but also negotiate, mediate, build bridges with both member states and global powers, managing tensions such as the South China Sea disputes and ensuring resilience through pragmatic cooperation.

2. Analytical Framework

This study draws on complementary theoretical frameworks by analyzing regional security architecture through the lens of Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT) and the concept of smart power, adopting a systemic, multi-level approach. RSCT posits that regional security emerges not as a byproduct of global equilibria but as the product of proximate interactions and mutually securitized relationships among states, regional entities, and non-state actors. According to this theory, security threats and cooperation manifest most intensely at the regional level, and the security of any given actor gains meaning only within the collective security context of its geographic neighbors. Simultaneously, the concept of smart power provides an analytical lens through which regional architectures can be understood as configurations that harmonize hard resources (integrated military and technological

capabilities) with soft resources (institutional mechanisms, procedural cooperation, and preventive diplomacy). This perspective enables an examination of how a coherent combination of diplomacy, operational readiness, and functional partnerships strengthens regional influence without relying solely on military supremacy.

Accordingly, the framework focuses on three dimensions. First, it examines how regional configurations are shaped by geographic interdependence and mutual security perceptions. Second, it deciphers the dynamics of the architecture through the prism of institutional dialogue and operational interoperability. Third, it evaluates the impact of hybrid strategies those blending hard and soft power on regional cohesion and the effectiveness of collective crisis response. In this way, RSCT provides a robust conceptual matrix for identifying regional security vectors, while smart power offers normative and strategic criteria for interpreting how security architectures gain coherence and legitimacy. The concurrent use of these frameworks facilitates a transition away from purely militarized security mechanisms towards a holistic paradigm in which regional architectures function as socio-technical-legal systems capable of addressing the complex threats of the twenty-first century.

3. Methodology

This research employs a multi-method comparative methodology aimed at uncovering how regional security architectures specifically within NATO's framework in Southeast Europe and ASEAN in Southeast Asia leverage systemic structures rather than focusing solely on military leadership. The methodological approach synthesizes theoretical rigor with empirical depth through the following interlocking phases:

3.1. Comparative Design: Most-Similar Systems Design

This study employs a Most-Similar Systems Design (MSSD) to conduct a systematic comparative analysis of two regions Southeast Europe under NATO and Southeast Asia under ASEAN that, despite cultural and geographical disparities, confront analogous security challenges such as collective defense demands, hybrid threats, and sustained pressures on regional stability. According to comparative

methodology, MSSD involves selecting cases that share many structural and contextual characteristics, thereby isolating key independent variables that explain observed differences in the dependent variable, in this instance, regional security cohesion Both NATO and ASEAN operate within multi-layered security ecosystems characterized by alliance networks, habitual multilateral consultations, and cross-border threat perceptions inherent to their geopolitical environments. However, critical differences in institutional design such as NATO's legally codified mutual defense clause and interoperable command infrastructure versus ASEAN's consensus-based mechanisms and ad hoc institutional layers, provide analytical leverage for identifying which structural and procedural factors underpin regional coherence.

By holding constant the broader regional challenges and focusing on variations in institutional architectures, cooperative norms, and legal-formal frameworks, the MSSD permits the identification of causal pathways linking structural configurations with levels of crisis response efficiency and institutional resilience. This approach allows the study to move beyond description, enabling inference about how combinations of formal architectures, interoperability systems, and diplomatic mechanisms contribute to varying outcomes in regional security governance.

3.2. Data Collection Strategies

To generate a rich empirical foundation that transcends mere military command structures, the study adopts a multi-tiered data collection strategy integrating documentary analysis, semi-structured interviews, and participant observation, each selected to capture varying dimensions of institutional cooperation within NATO and ASEAN.

Documentary Analysis constitutes the initial stage, entailing systematic scrutiny of interoperability blueprints such as NATO's Federated Mission Networking frameworks and ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting, legal provisions, standard operating procedures, and formal declarations of multilateral coordination. By examining these sources, the research identifies structural prerequisites and procedural architectures that enable or impede regional cooperation. Participant Observation supplements these interviews by allowing the researcher to immerse themselves in structured interoperability exercises, workshops, and coordination sessions—thereby revealing informal interactions, trust-building practices, and tacit

procedural norms often obscured in official documentation. Such an embedded approach aligns with qualitative field methods that privilege proximity and contextual engagement.

The complementary use of these strategies generates methodological triangulation: documentary analysis provides the formal baseline; interviews uncover subjective and experiential data; and participant observation captures embodied, real-time practices. Combined, they enable a nuanced analysis of how legal-institutional, operational, and diplomatic elements converge within each regional security architecture, independently of military leadership per se, thereby shedding light on systemic mechanisms underpinning regional resilience.

This study adopts a dual-method analytical strategy by integrating process tracing and Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to generate robust insights into the institutional dynamics shaping regional security architectures. The deployment of process tracing, a method grounded in empirical rigor and case-based logic, facilitates a fine-grained reconstruction of causal mechanisms. This methodology systematically maps sequences of institutional events such as NATO's implementation of Federated Mission Networking or ASEAN's establishment of maritime security sub-working groups, thereby illuminating how specific institutional triggers lead to enhanced cohesion. Drawing on established methodological standards, process tracing allows the identification of diagnostic evidence, enabling strong within-case causal inferences that underpin explanatory depth.

Complementing this, the study applies Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to unearth cross-case patterns and determine which conditions or combinations thereof prove necessary or sufficient for effective regional cohesion. QCA, rooted in set theory, is particularly suitable for medium-N comparative designs and offers a systematic approach for handling complex causality, allowing the detection of multiple causal pathways through truth tables and Boolean algebra.

Although external validity is inherently limited to NATO and ASEAN contexts, the mixed-method design enables the uncovering of mid-level generalizations pertinent to other regional architectures, thereby offering transferable insights grounded in analytical rigor and empirical depth.

4. Results

The empirical inquiry yielded multi-faceted evidence that confirms the salience of integrated institutional architectures over purely military leadership in shaping regional security outcomes.

4.1. Process Tracing Findings

In the NATO context, process tracing reveals distinct causal sequences where the establishment of Federated Mission Networking (FMN) and related interoperability initiatives precipitated discernible improvements in collective crisis preparedness. First, FMN protocols standardized tactical and strategic communications across national contingents. Second, military and civilian actors convened regularly to evaluate joint training outcomes, which fostered a culture of mutual predictability. Third, these operational routines were codified in updated mutual defense directives, transforming ad-hoc coordination into structured institutional practices. This chain of events was recapitulated during the Defender Europe exercise, where legal-technical architectures underpinned by FMN were deployed effectively, culminating in rapid alignment and shared situational awareness across member states.

In the ASEAN environment, process tracing identifies a cascade of events initiated by the introduction of specialized sub-working groups under ADMM-Plus such as those addressing maritime security and humanitarian assistance. These platforms enabled multilateral coordination, which in turn prompted joint standard-setting documents and formal intergovernmental protocols. Over successive iterations of ADMM meetings, the working groups' recommendations became embedded in national security practices, contributing to a gradual institutional consolidation of regional trust mechanisms that directly shaped crisis management responses.

4.2. Comparative Insights

The QCA truth-table analysis demonstrates that no single factor alone guarantees robust regional cohesion; rather, multiple conjunctural configurations suffice. Three configurations were found to be empirically sufficient:

- Formal-Operational Pathway: The simultaneous presence of deep legal architecture and robust technical interoperability.

- Operational-Institutional Pathway: High interoperability paired with well-institutionalized consultative platforms.

- Comprehensive Pathway: The conjunction of all three conditions legal formality, high interoperability, and strong institutionalization predicts maximal regional cohesion.

Interestingly, no coherent configuration emerged in cases where military interoperability existed absent legal or consultative frameworks, underscoring the insufficiency of command-focused capacities. Similarly, purely consultative architectures without operational grounding yielded only nominal cohesion. Comparative analysis affirms that NATO's combination of FMN-driven interoperability and legally codified defense commitments aligns most closely with the Comprehensive configuration, accounting for its high crisis-response cohesion. ASEAN's trajectory aligns with the Operational-Institutional pathway, reflecting substantial consultative engagement and interoperable exercises, albeit with less formal legal binding a configuration sufficient for moderate but improving cohesion.

4.3. Institutional and Normative Impacts

Across both cases, the presence of integrated architectures generated observable normative outcomes. Participants reported that formal interoperability frameworks engendered trust and lowered barriers to information-sharing. Consultative mechanisms fostered repeated engagement, normalizing multilateral dialogue and facilitating the emergence of complementary doctrines. On balance, institutional legacy and relational reciprocity emerged as critical outputs of these systemic architectures. This results section demonstrates how process tracing and QCA jointly reveal systemic drivers of regional cohesion, independent of direct military command. It illustrates the causal logic and the empirical richness needed to sustain mid-level theoretical claims about integrated security architectures.

5. Conclusions

The findings from this study validate the assertion that regional security architecture is fundamentally shaped by structural, procedural, and diplomatic components, rather than being predicated solely on military leadership. The process tracing of NATO and ASEAN institutional developments demonstrates that formal

interoperability systems and consultative mechanisms create durable patterns of cooperation, while QCA highlights that the co-presence of legal frameworks, technical interoperability, and structured dialogue is necessary to foster robust regional cohesion. This triadic configuration transcends command hierarchies, ensuring that crises are addressed swiftly and collectively. In comparing both regions, it becomes evident that NATO's architecture exemplifies the Comprehensive configuration, wherein legally codified commitments work in tandem with interoperable networks and institutional forums to yield high levels of crisis resilience. Conversely, ASEAN aligns more closely with the Operational–Institutional pathway, achieving moderate but steadily increasing cohesion through robust consultations and shared practices, even in the absence of formal legal binding. Nonetheless, both cases converge on the insight that military interoperability gains its significance only when embedded within institutional and legal scaffolding, thereby supporting smart power strategies that effectively balance hard and soft elements.

Theoretically, this research reframes conventional understandings of regional security by illustrating how smart power operationalizes RSCT, demonstrating that security architectures are best conceptualized as socio-technical-legal systems. Rather than viewing architecture as static or top-down impositions, this study portrays it as adaptive systems shaped by intertwining legal norms, interoperability tools, and sustained diplomacy. For policy-makers and regional practitioners, the implications are clear: investments in legal codification, interoperable infrastructures, and institutionalized dialogue yield more predictable and cohesive responses in times of crisis. Rather than prioritizing military dominance, states should channel resources into developing multilateral architectures that integrate legal clarity, operational compatibility, and consultative mechanisms. This approach not only enhances immediate crisis responsiveness but also institutionalizes long-term cooperation and trust. Looking ahead, future research may explore the replicability of this hybrid model in other regional contexts such as the African Union or the Gulf Cooperation Council, while also evaluating its adaptability to emergent threats like cyber warfare and climate-induced instability. By continuing to emphasize the systemic integration of technical, legal, and diplomatic resources, scholars and practitioners alike can cultivate more resilient, legitimate, and sustainable regional security architectures that align with the complex realities of the twenty-first century.

References

Aspriadis, N. (2023). Preparing for war: Strategic narratives and disinformation in leadership rhetoric during the Ukraine War. *ESSACHESS – Journal for Communication Studies*. Retrieved from https://essachess.com/3/index.php/jcs/article/download/48/48.

Bradshaw, S., Elswah, M., & Haque, M. (2024). Strategic storytelling: Russian state-backed media coverage of the Ukraine War. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 36(3). Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/ijpor/article-abstract/36/3/edae028/7709024.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2017a). The modelling of decisional problems. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University*, 1, 72-75. Carol I National Defence University Publishing House. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=548376.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025a). Algorithmic Transparency in Information Systems: A Legal Necessity for the Protection of Fundamental Rights. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica*, 21(1), 126-136. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/AUDJ/article/view/3298.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025b). How information systems are reshaping national security strategies. *Romanian Military Thinking*, 1(1), 202-213. Retrieved from https://gmr.mapn.ro/webroot/fileslib/upload/files/arhiva%20GMR/2025/1/DRAGOMIR-2.pdf.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025c). Integrating artificial intelligence into operational research – New horizons for national security. *Romanian Military Thinking*, 1(1), 174-187. Retrieved from https://gmr.mapn.ro/webroot/fileslib/upload/files/arhiva%20GMR/2025/1/DRAGOMIR-1.pdf.

Dragomir, F.-L. (2025f). Thinking Traps: How High-Performance Information Systems Correct Cognitive Biases in Decision-Making. *New Trends in Psychology*, 7(1), 99-108, Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/NTP/article/view/3257.

Dragomir, F.-L., & Alexandrescu, G. (2017b). Applications of artificial intelligence in decision-making process. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University*, 4(2), 56-61. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=547684.

Dragomir, F.-L., & Alexandrescu, G. (2017c). The axiomatic character of decision. *Bulletin of "Carol I" National Defence University*, 6(1). Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=548274.

Dragomir, F.-L., Alexandrescu, G., & Postolache, F. (2018). Tools for Hierarchical Security Modeling. In *The 14th International Scientific Conference "Strategies XXI"*, 4, 34-38.

Dragomir-Constantin, F.-L. (2025d). Information System for Macroprudential Policies. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Œconomica*, 21(1), 48-57. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/AUDOE/article/view/3254.

Dragomir-Constantin, F.-L. (2025e). Thinking Patterns in Decision-Making in Information Systems. *New Trends in Psychology*, 7(1), 89-98. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/NTP/article/view/3255.

Ee, S. K. E. (2024). *U.S.–Singapore cooperation on tech and security: Defense, cyber, and biotech*. arXiv.

Hadjipavlis, P., & Constantinou, C. (2024). Western strategic communications and the formation of geopolitics amidst the Ukrainian crisis. *Journal of Political Risk*, 12(1). Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=25479202&AN=180843656.

Henrick, T. Z. (2024, November 21). *ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting-Plus: Divisions amid Functional Cooperation?* Retrieved from https://rsis.edu.sg/rsis-publication/idss/ip23088-asean-defence-ministers-meeting-plus-divisions-amid-functional-cooperation.

Kancs, d'A. (2024). *European defence readiness: A Cold War 2.0 scenario analysis*. arXiv.

Lysychkina, I., & Lysychkina, O. (2023). Communicating (In) Security in Ukraine. *Connections: The Quarterly Journal*, 23(1), 99-114. Retrieved from https://connections-qj.org/ru/system/files/23.1.06_war_stratcom_preview.pdf.

Monzón Baeza, V., Parada, R., Concha Salor, L., & Monzó, C. (2025). *AI-driven tactical communications and networking for defense: A survey and emerging trends*. arXiv.

Nastasia, S., & George, A. M. (2023). Communication lessons from the Ukraine War: The strategies, narratives, and implications of the information warfare. *ESSACHESS – Journal for Communication Studies*. Retrieved from https://essachess.com/3/index.php/jcs/article/download/47/47.

Navumau, V., Nizhnikau, R., & Kolesnykov, O. (2024). *Decentralisation of strategic communication in times of war: Ukraine's public campaigns in 2022–2024*. SSRN. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4973753.

Schmitt, M., & Koutroumpis, P. (2025). *Cyber shadows: Neutralizing security threats with AI and targeted policy measures*. arXiv.

Stoltz, M. (2024). *Artificial intelligence in cybersecurity: Building resilient cyber diplomacy frameworks*. arXiv.