

THE CONCEPT OF STRATEGIC CULTURE IN SECURITY STUDIES

¹Sura Raad Khalil

¹Assistant Lecturer, Department of International Studies, College of Political Science, PhD Student in International Studies University of Baghdad,

¹sora.raad1201a@copolicy.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Abstract: Strategic culture has become a central concept in the field of security studies and international relations. It reflects the set of values, beliefs, and historical perceptions that guide a state's policies in security, defense, and foreign policy. The concept is used to explain how decision-makers think about the use of force, approaches to deterrence, the identification of threats and the ways of responding to them.

Keywords: Strategic culture, security studies, identity, national security.

Introduction

The concept of *strategic culture* is relatively modern. It was used for the first time in the 1970s by the American political specialist Jack Snyder when he attempted to explain the Soviet nuclear strategy during the Cold War in light of the prevailing beliefs of the Soviet elite regarding geopolitics. After Snyder, a series of efforts were made to further develop the concept, shifting attention to the role of dominant cultural orientations and popular attitudes in shaping national security policies. It moved beyond the traditional understanding of security and defense policies pursued by states, and transcended the earlier focus on elite perceptions of geopolitics and national security. The emphasis, instead, was placed on the wider societal views and public visions concerning the national interests of the state.

Significance of the Study

Understanding the concept of strategic culture is of great importance for policymakers, researchers, and analysts, since it provides causal explanations for the recurring patterns of state behavior.

Research Problem

Building on the afore mentioned point, the present study attempts to touch upon the following questions: *What is strategic culture? What are the successive generations of its development? What are the related concepts? How does strategic culture intersect with security studies?*

Research Hypothesis

Understanding strategic culture guides us to understand and clarify public opinion and collective perceptions of the world, the regional order, and a state's foreign and defense policy. Strategic culture thus serves as a bridge between material explanations of state behavior and those that focus on its non-material dimensions.

Methodology

This study employs two main approaches:

- The historical method: drawing on descriptive accounts of the evolution of the phenomenon in order to trace the transformations it has undergone.
- The descriptive method: examining the phenomenon as it stands by organizing and classifying relevant information.

Structure of the Study

In light of the study's hypothesis and research problem, the structure is divided into two main sections. The first section examines the essence of strategic culture. The second section explores strategic culture within the field of security studies.

Section One: The Essence of Strategic Culture

I- The roots of strategic culture lie in studies of political and social culture as well as in diplomatic and military history. Early explorations of national character studies, which appeared between the 1940s and 1950s, represented the first serious attempts to link the broad notion of culture—including language, religion, customs, and traditions—to the behavior of states. However, these studies did not handle the relationship between culture and state behavior from a political perspective, but rather from an anthropological one. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz defined culture as a historical pattern of meaning-making expressed through inherited concepts, serving as the basis for communication and the development of knowledge and attitudes toward life.

In 1977, Jack Snyder expanded on these earlier ideas by refining the notion of strategic culture. Similarly, Ken Booth (Abu Saleh, 2009) defined it as a set of values, traditions, attitudes, behavioral patterns, customs, symbols, achievements, and particular modes of adaptation to the environment and problem-solving by a nation, taking into account sources of threat and the capacity to use force. Snyder applied this framework to explain why Soviet behavior in relation to nuclear capabilities diverged from U.S. expectations. He argued that differences in the development of American and Soviet nuclear forces stemmed primarily from organizational, historical, and political contexts contrast alongside technological constraints.

Ian Johnston further described strategic culture as a collection of influential ideas shaping behavioral choices. This environment consists of rules, assumptions, and expectations that impose varying degrees of order on individuals and groups in relation to their shared social, organizational, or political surroundings. Johnston also emphasized the importance of military influence and overarching strategic doctrine in studying culture.

Snyder, moreover, challenged the prevailing realist models of his time, which focused solely on material power. He recognized that analysis had to address the cultural environment of a nation in order to understand how nuclear strategy was formulated. This repositioned the dominant cultural framework of a state or region at the core of strategic research and analysis. Accordingly, Snyder defined strategic culture as “a set of ideas, emotional responses, and habitual patterns of behavior taken into account by members of a society when formulating nuclear strategy.

According to Carnes Lord, there are six factors that shape *strategic culture* (García Fernández et al., 2004). These include: geographic position, military history, international relations, political ideology, civil–military relations, military technology, and a number of additional variables and subcultures that play a central role in explaining strategic decisions (Bayliss et al., 2001).

The most significant concepts of strategic culture can be summarized as in the following:

- 1- Culture in its various forms: general, strategic and military is of vital importance. Cultural modes of thought provide the lenses through which both friends and enemies are understood. Ken Booth pointed out that separating strategic studies from area studies amounts, in general, to an unproductive and hollow approach. Hence, the neglect of area studies has been one of the major criticisms leveled against strategists.
- 2- Experience has shown that emerging theories on strategic culture can sometimes overreach their intended scope. Unfortunately, there is no consensus between the

pressing need to fabricate a contextual theory of culture and the dominant trend of treating cultural issues as secondary in understanding strategic culture. While this issue may appear less significant for theoretical debates, it becomes vital in practical application, especially given the benefits expected from theory in guiding practice.

Cultural awareness, though it does not provide a cure for all strategic problems and dilemmas, can be a decisive factor in the success—or failure—of policy and strategy. Strategic culture is not static; it changes in response to deep-rooted factors embedded in local perceptions of historical experience and the geopolitical context of a society. These factors explain why a particular community embraces one form of strategic culture rather than another, or why its strategic culture has taken its present form. Recognizing the need for change, especially in light of challenges posed by adversaries, necessarily drives strategic transformation. Yet some scholars argue that such change will encounter considerable resistance (Deng, 1998).

strategic culture may fail to secure broad support. This becomes evident when security and military officials recognize the complexity of the issue, and when political and security leaders feel a sense of frustration at the formidable obstacles that hinder prudent efforts to apply cultural insights to strategy and policy.

II- Generations of Strategic Culture

According to Ian Johnston, there are three generations of strategic culture scholars:

- 1- The first generation: Snyder was one of the early academics who discussed the importance of strategic culture. She defines strategic culture as the ideas that shape the emotional responses and habitual behavioral patterns of members of a local community, which influence national strategy with respect to nuclear strategy. Ian Johnston states that strategic culture is the ideas that influence behavioral choices. This milieu consists of 'norms of assumptions that impose a degree of command over the individual and group concepts of their relationship to their shared social, organizational, or political environment.' Johnston also notes the importance of military influence and grand strategic doctrine in the study of culture (Al-Alwan, 2017). During the 1980s and 1990s, the study of strategic culture advanced significantly, and subsequently led to the study of many other security issues. Much of the work produced by the first generation lacked the necessary coherence and methodological rigor. In addition, the puzzle between strategic culture and behavior was not resolved, and this was one of the topics explored by the second generation of strategy theorists.
- 2- The second generation of scholars contributed to the field of study by exploiting important independent intellectual variables. They added new elements to the discussion, providing a distinct insight into this strategic culture. Many scholars of the second generation during the 1980s and 1990s, before starting the initial field of nuclear research, were engaged with the study of culture, as many security issues developed. This made the ideas of the first generation lack a great deal of necessary coherence and methodological rigor. Moreover, they did not solve the puzzle of the relationship between strategic culture and behavior. This was one of the topics investigated by the second generation of strategy theorists. These scholars expanded the field of strategic study by adding new elements to the discussion, giving a distinct idea of this strategic culture. For example, Longhurst Carey considered strategic culture to be “a distinctive set of beliefs, attitudes, and practices related to the use of force, which are collective and gradually emerge over time, through a unique historical process that may be long-lasting. There is a strategic culture that is constant over time, although it is not a permanent or fixed feature. It is shaped and influenced by formative

periods and can change.” It attempts to understand the impact of deep-rooted values and beliefs when it comes to making decisions on security issues in general. Collective ideas and values about the use of force are important foundational factors in designing and implementing state security policies. Longhurst Carey identifies three main components of strategic culture.

- 3- The third generation of scholars, however, adopted a cautious stance to avoid determinism, explicitly adhering to competitive theory, structural realism and bureaucratic organizational models. Optimal strategies can vary radically depending on the purpose for which they were developed. It is important to note that this generation of scholars, by presenting culture to decision-makers with a limited set of options, acts as a lens, each of which changes in appearance and effectiveness under different choices. This leaves room for other complementary factors to influence the state's behavior and vision (Darwish, 1999).

Section Two: Related Concepts to Strategic Culture

I- Culture

Culture is understood as a form of social behavior that reflects the character of human communities and encompasses both material and non-material dimensions of human practices: social, materialistic and moral. Cultural variation between states arises from the uniqueness of each nation's geography and historical trajectory. Culture, therefore, has acquired multiple meanings, but it consistently forms the foundation upon which societies are built. The British anthropologist Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917) defines culture and civilization as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Ali, 2017). From this definition, several key elements of culture can be identified:

- The social dimension of human life, encompassing shared beliefs and values.
- The acquired nature of culture: it is learned from one's society and environment rather than inherited biologically.

Culture is characterized by a collective dimension, as it is conveyed across societies through fascination, diversity, and colonialism as a set of values, traditions, attitudes, patterns of behavior, customs, symbols, achievements, and specific ways of adapting to the environment and solving problems specific to the nation, taking into account sources of threat and the ability to use force. The underlying reason behind the Soviet Union's behavior, towards possessing nuclear capabilities, that is different from the expectations of the United States of America, is related to the concept of strategic culture, where the difference in the development of American and Soviet nuclear capabilities is primarily due to differences in organizational, historical, and political contexts, along with technological constraints. Ian Johnston defines strategic culture as: “the ideas that influence behavioral choices.” This milieu consists of “the rules of assumption that is supposed to impose a degree of order on individuals and the group's concepts of its relationship to its shared social, organizational, or political environment.” Johnston touched upon the importance of military influence and grand strategic doctrine in the study of culture. Claude Lévi-Strauss defines culture as a set of symbolic systems, led by language, mating rules, economic relations, art, science, and religion. All of these definitions aim to express some aspects of natural and social truth, and more than that, to express the relations by which each of these two truths is related to the other, and those by which the symbolic systems themselves are related to each other (Dennis Koch. 2007, p. 3). Lévi-Strauss also links culture to the symbolic systems of society, such as language, religion, art, science, and all social relations that arise between individuals. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), during a world conference held in Mexico in 1982, defined culture as: “All

the distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or social group, including arts, literature, and lifestyles, as well as fundamental human rights, value systems, traditions, and beliefs." The organization emphasized that cultural identity is a protection of traditions, history, and the moral and spiritual values passed down by previous generations. Culture is everything that distinguishes one people from another. Therefore, cultural diversity within societies must be respected through dialogue and mutual cooperation. In general, culture can be said to be the set of customs, traditions, and values acquired within a society over time, and is subject to change and development across generations.

II- Identity

The German sociologist Max Weber defines identity as the sense of a group's common origin, expressed outwardly through symbols, rituals, customs, and shared cultural heritage. Such identity preserves its vitality through myths, values, and traditions. More broadly, identity is used in sociology and psychology to describe a person's sense of self and belonging—whether religious, national, or ethnic—and the ways in which individuals express their individuality in relation to groups (Barr, 2010).

Identity can therefore be defined as the totality of traits that distinguish one entity—whether a person, group, or nation—from others. It is dynamic, with certain elements becoming more salient at different times (Ali, 2012:224). It may refer to personal characteristics or traits such as name, age, nationality, birthplace, or to collective dimensions such as national or ethnic identity. Identity can highlight shared features—race, gender, class, religion, or culture—that unify members of a group.

Scholars also distinguish between innate/original aspects of identity and those that are constructed/selected, spanning both personal and social dimensions. Some consider identity difficult to define precisely in practice, while others argue that it functions as both a concept and an ideology, rooted in established systems of values that shape intellectual and moral orientations (Abdullah Belqaziz, 1999, p. 29).

III- National Security (Amended through, 2010)

Although the term *national security* gained prominence after the Second World War, its roots extend back to the seventeenth century, particularly following the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), which established the foundations of the nation-state. The Cold War provided the framework in which theoretical approaches and institutional structures surrounding national security took shape. Concepts such as containment, deterrence, balance of power, and peaceful coexistence dominated this era, aimed at ensuring security, stability, and the avoidance of the devastating wars of the early twentieth century.

Academic and research institutions soon conducted studies on national security, its sources, foundations, and protective measures. These included university institutes, research centers, specialized journals, and government agencies. The U.S. National Security Council (NSC) exemplifies such institutions. The Council reflected Walter Lippmann's definition of national security as a state's ability to preserve its safety without sacrificing legitimate interests to avoid war, and to defend those interests if war becomes unavoidable (Trager & Kronenberg, 1973, pp. 35–36).

Potential threats to national security include hostile actions by other states (military or cyberattacks), violent non-state actors (terrorism), organized crime (drug cartels), and natural disasters (floods, earthquakes). Broader systemic factors—such as climate change, economic inequality, marginalization, and political exclusion—also undermine security. As a result, national security encompasses multiple dimensions: economic,

energy, physical, environmental, food, border, and cyber security. Each of these is closely linked to the components of national power.

Increasingly, governments frame their security policies within National Security Strategies. By 2017, countries such as Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States had adopted such frameworks. Some states also appoint a National Security Advisor or establish a National Security Council, tasked with advising heads of state, preparing both short- and long-term strategies, and coordinating emergency plans. India, for instance, established its NSC in November 1998 (Wolfers, 1962, p. 150).

Despite differences in national approaches—some prioritizing non-military measures to address systemic insecurities—coercive power, especially military force, continues to dominate. Military capabilities have expanded from traditional land and naval power to include air, space, cyber, and psychological domains. Such capabilities can serve both defensive and offensive purposes, from protecting national security to pursuing territorial conquest.

While widely used, the term “*national security*” carries different meanings for different audiences. Traditionally, it was defined narrowly as protection from external attack, equated with military defense against military threats. This view, however, has proven overly restrictive. National security extends well beyond the mobilization and use of armed forces. Indeed, history provides many examples where arms races weakened rather than strengthened security. Military power, while crucial, is but one component of national security (Hoiback, 2013, p. 26).

IV- Security Doctrine

It is of great importance to decision-makers and political leaders as it serves as a guide to their decision-making at the domestic and international levels. Security doctrine is the organizing principles that help statesmen identify their country's geopolitical interests, and shape the ability to interact with sources of threats and challenges, whether primary or secondary, at all levels: local, regional, and international, at the short, medium, and long-term levels. It also helps identify the variables required to confront threats. Security doctrine is linked to the national security of the state, and therefore represents a vision that defines the methodology by which the state approaches its security. Accordingly, it is usually the reference for theoretical propositions adopted by decision-makers to achieve interests and goals and identify the dangers and challenges facing the state. Hence, it is a guide to the state's challenge to preserve its existence, interests, and objectives in the face of all dangers, threats, and challenges lurking at the local, regional, and international levels. New threats have led to a clear shift in the security doctrine of states, represented by changes in military doctrines and national security theories. States work on a unified political decision-making process, which guides dealing with challenges and threats; they develop security and modern defense methods that rely primarily and fundamentally on the role of information technology, raising the level of combat readiness, methods of organizing armed forces, and enhancing the quality of leadership (Gharaham Ayfanz, 2004).

We note that states with weak institutions, such as the countries of the South, suffer from a weakness in formulating a clear strategy for their security doctrine after the emergence of new, unconventional threats that have swept the world following the tremendous development in the field of technology and knowledge. The magnitude of the challenges is great and has become a threat to the state's existence. Among the most prominent of these challenges is the phenomenon of extremism and cross-border terrorism. The extremism we are witnessing today, while it is true that it wears a religious guise, is in reality an accumulation of numerous factors, including political, economic, social, cultural, and other factors, which have caused extremism to grow. The

consequences of not dealing with it have led to an increase in its intensity and the creation of a fragmented society divided into multiple closed cantons, which, along with the escalation of conflicts, has led to the emergence and growth of sectarianism, reaching the point of approaching and spreading the phenomenon of terrorism.

V - Security Strategy.

Security strategy is a set of plans that includes a set of legitimate objectives and legal, scientific, and practical means to confront existing criminal phenomena that possess some or all of the characteristics of a security crisis, to prevent similar criminal events and phenomena, and to address their local, regional, and international causes on realistic and decisive scientific grounds, in accordance with a sound preventive and criminal policy adopted by the state (Kerry Longhurst, 2018).

VI- National Security.

National security implies the protection of citizens and individuals residing within the state's territory. It is also defined as the use of security measures to maintain the proper flow of daily life, preventing any crises that could cause harm to the human and material components of society (ayef Al-Rodhan (ayef Al-Rodhan, 2015).

Dimensions of National Security: National security, to achieve the concept of comprehensive security, relies on the following dimensions:

- The military dimension: This dimension relies on the role of the army and police forces in providing national security against any attacks or threats planned by external international entities.
- The economist dimension is to absorb any economic crisis, given the potential for negative impacts on national security. Therefore, the state seeks to find appropriate solutions to the economic problems it faces, especially those affecting the basic needs of individuals.
- The political dimension complements the military dimension by preserving the state's sovereignty over its territory and protecting it from any external interference that could lead to control its internal security. The political dimension also relies on providing equality and human rights for individuals within the state to maintain its stability and prevent any internal crises that could result in negative consequences that may impact national security.
- The ideological dimension contributes to strengthening citizens' sense of belonging to their homeland by providing them with social protection from any attacks or crimes within the environment in which they live. Therefore, the ideological dimension is linked to all means.

Third Section: Strategic Culture and Security Studies

I- Security Studies

Security studies, as a field of knowledge, attempts to examine the deep roots of the security phenomenon. Therefore, it is concerned with understanding general theoretical issues such as the causes of war and alliances. It also includes policy-oriented research. Regarding the military policy problems facing states in particular, international violence and external threats to state security, particularly the causes and prevention of war and strategic issues, have been the focus of the field's scholarship. The effects of war have received less attention. Defining the scope of security studies precisely is difficult. Stephen Walt has pointed out that the intellectual boundaries of the field are fluid. Consequently, any effort to define the precise scope of security studies is arbitrary. Nevertheless, the central concern of security studies remains easy to define: the phenomenon of war. Security studies claim that conflicts between states is always a possibility, and therefore the use of force has far-reaching effects on states and societies.

From this perspective, security studies can be defined as "the study of the threat, use, and control of military force" (Kranse, 1998, pp. 125-136).

Security studies thus uncover the conditions that make the use of force more likely and the ways in which this use affects individuals, societies, and states. They also uncover the specific policies adopted by states to prepare for, protect against, or engage in war. Security studies were thus established as a subfield of international relations concerned with clarifying the concept of security and its application for foreign policy and its impact on the structures and processes of global politics (Kerry Longhurs, 201). During the Cold War, security studies were narrowly defined in terms of military security issues, and were deeply oriented toward politics. They overlapped to a large extent with strategic studies. The post-Cold War system changed all these assumptions and expanded the structure of security studies' agenda beyond what traditionalists would call "high politics" to include what is called "low politics" of the economy and the environment.

II- The Emergence of Security Studies:

Security studies, as a specialization in the field of international relations, emerged in the period following the end of World War II, the 1950s, specifically after the outbreak of the Cold War between the Eastern and Western blocs. The term "security" has been used in various political ideas and literature throughout various historical eras. From the twelfth century to the late twentieth century, the concept of security was closely linked to the military aspect. Most countries strived to maximize their military power to ensure their security and survival from all deliberate threats, including attempts at external subjugation or the authorization of their presence by another country, terrorist organizations, or other armed groups. However, in the mid-1980s and early 1990s, the concept of security was no longer limited to the concept of defending a country's territory against external invasion, protecting its borders, and defending national sovereignty. Rather, the concept of security expanded to include other aspects. These are transformations at the level of values, perceptions, and actors. In his book, "Society, State, Fear," Barry Buzan argues that security is not limited to the security of states alone, but must extend beyond them to include the security of human societies. He argues that it is unreasonable to focus on the state as the unit of analysis and on military capabilities as a means of achieving security. He presents a study encompassing several aspects of human security, including military, political, economic, social, and environmental aspects. International transformations and circumstances, in light of the international security reality, paved the way for the development of security studies. Among the most important of these transformations are (Saad, 2024, p. 1810):

- Economic transformations, manifested in the trend toward building development models based on a market economy and openness to the outside world.
- Value transformations (added value), with which theories emerged that attempted to offer a new perspective, such as the democratic peace theory, the end of history theory, the clash of civilizations theory, and the cosmopolitan theory.

Accordingly, it can be said that the negative repercussions of industrialization on the environment and the emergence of new challenges threatening human existence have created a new international security situation that differs from that of the 1960s and 1970s. Many paradoxes have also emerged. While major regional economic blocs such as the European Union and ASEAN began to form, the nation-state began to face the risk of internal disintegration.

III- The Relationship Between Strategic Culture and Security Studies

The origins of the relationship between cultural studies and national security strategies date back to the 1940s and 1950s, with what are known as "national character studies."

These studies were conducted by sociologists and cultural anthropologists working during World War II for the Foreign Morale Analysis Section of the US War Office. Their goal was to produce studies on the national character of the Axis powers, particularly Germany and Japan. Immediately after World War II, the nuclear concerns of the Cold War pushed the study of culture and its impact on national security to the background, with rational explanations such as deterrence theory coming to the fore. This latter theory was inspired by economics: the two superpowers were believed to be homogeneous rational actors, and their actions were motivated by rational choice (Abdulsada, Ali, 2025, p. 1).

Strategic culture was first introduced into the field of security studies in the 1870s. Coming to terms with the effects of "ethnocentrism" on American strategic thought, Jack Snyder, writing for the Rand Corporation, warned of the dangers of assuming that if the Soviets had the same set of values and beliefs as American strategic thought, the Soviets would be playing "the same nuclear war game as the United States," like a "general game." Drawing on rational actor models and game-theoretic modeling, Snyder encouraged a form of Soviet analysis of behavior and strategic thinking that could take more into account the Soviets' own historical experiences of war and shape Moscow's views on contemporary security issues. He later argued that the unique Soviet strategic culture developed through a particular historical process, shaping the perceptions through which strategic issues were viewed by Soviet decision-makers. This Soviet strategic culture, Snyder argued, was passed on to subsequent generations of policymakers through socialization. It influenced policy by setting the parameters of national debates and thus guiding policy choices. The advancement of the concept and its incorporation into the core of security studies led to the nuclear research agenda. Analysis of advanced strategic culture in the 1970s and 1980s was driven primarily by concern about misunderstandings and distortions in superpower relations, particularly with regard to nuclear strategy. In 1979, Ken Booth sought to alert strategists to "the ambiguity of culture and its distorting effects on strategy making and studying." Echoing Snyder's ideas, Booth argued that better strategies would only result if assumptions were based on the replacement of a "rational" strategic man with those based on nationalism. Along the same lines, Colin Gray equated strategic culture with the concept of "national style" in a comparison between the United States and the Soviet Union, because the existing pattern of temporary equilibria within the internal and external systems required a rational style to determine important priorities and perceive risks (Saad, 2024, p. 1810). Undoubtedly, studies in the 1970s reached a wave of culturally inspired challenges to the prevailing modes of analysis that emerged after the end of the Cold War. During this period, there was considerable interest in the concept of strategic culture, with analysts tending to overemphasize the usefulness of the concept without sufficient accompanying insights into the methodology and actual functioning of the relationship between political behavior and strategic culture. They also tended to make sweeping statements about periods, chronologically, rather than identifying specific formative periods and sources of strategic culture. However, this first wave of strategic culture analysis was significant because it began to question dominant analytical patterns and raise some important questions about the sources of state behavior in the security sphere. Subsequently, between 1989 and 1990, writings on strategic culture emerged as an important tool, and its impact became multidimensional and significant, particularly at the level of decision-makers who claim to exercise high-level government policy (Abdulsada, Ali, 2025, p. 1). Building on the work of the 1970s and 1980s, which sought to address many of the problems associated with the concept, this study was notable.

In general, the study of the relationship between national culture and strategy remained modest during the Cold War. Renewed interest in the impact of cultural specificities on security has found a better forum for discussion in the post-Cold War international system, which has been freed from the monopoly of realist and neorealist theory. Therefore, many researchers propose using different levels of analysis to better understand the concept of strategic culture.

Conclusion:

A state's strategic culture influences the formulation of its security doctrine, as it represents the sum of opinions and beliefs. The principles that constitute a system of thought regarding the issue of security in the state, and the security doctrine acquires great importance for security policy in guiding the decisions of leaders, as it describes the state in its internal and external dimensions. Accordingly, the relationship between security doctrine and foreign policy arose, as the security doctrine essentially represents constitutional or even moral principles and frameworks that determine the direction of political leaders in their foreign policy. It constitutes the geopolitical definition of the state's interests and provides the state's security actors with a coherent theoretical framework of ideas that helps achieve the state's goals in the field of its national security.

References:

- 10- Abdul Razzaq Eid, 1999, Muhammad Abdul Jabbar, Democracy between Secularism and Peace. Beirut: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Mu'aser, 1st ed, p. 29.-
- 11- Abdullah Belqaziz, 1989, Arab National Security ,Cairo: Egyptian General Book Authority.
- 12- Frank Trager and Philip Kronenberg, 1973, National Security and American Society (Kansas: Kansas University Press, p35-36.
- 13- Harald Hoiback, , 2013, Understanding Military Doctrine, A multidisciplinary approach, Cass Military Studies, Routledge, London-New York, p 26.
- 14- Peter Chapman, 2015, Military Doctrine: A Reference Guide, translated by Talat Al-Shaib, National Center for Translation, Egyptian National Library, First Edition, vol. 17.
- 15- gharaham ayfanz, 2004, jifri nuyinham, qamus binghiwin lilealaqat alduwliati, dibi, tarjamat markaz alkhalij lilabhathi.
- 16- Frank Trager and Philip Kronenberg (eds.), National Security and American Society (Kansas: Kansas University Press, 1973
- 17- Salim Qassoum, New Trends in Security Studies: A Study of the Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations. United Arab Emirates: Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research.
- 18- Kerry Longhurst, 2018, On strategic culture “·In book: Germany and the use of force. July: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327127183_On_strategic_culture
- 1-Abu Saleh, Muhammad Hussein, 2009, National Strategic Planning, 4th edition, .Hebron.
- 2- García Fernández, Jorge Juan, Clayton, Jess H. & Hopley, 2004,Christopher, A Student's Guide to European Integration, The Press, The System of Government.
- 20- ayef Al-Rodhan,” Strategic Culture and Pragmatic National Interest.” Globalpolicyjournal, 22 July 2015: <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/22/07/2015/strategic-culture-and-pragmatic-national-interest>.

- 21- Kranse, (1998). The orizing Security,K. StateFormation and the " Third World " in the post-cold-war world » .Review of international Studies, vol 24 ,pp 125-136.
- 22- Tamara Kadim Manati1 , Saad Obaid Alwan, 2024,Transformations of the World Order after the Corona Pandemic COVID-19: The Role of Culture, Science, and the Environment, JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH,p1810.
- 23- Inass Abdulsada Ali,2025, RESHAPING THE WORLD, RETHINKING ACTORS: THE ROLE OF SUB-STATE ACTORS IN FOREIGN RELATIONS, Journal of International Studies, Vol. 21, Number 1 (April) 2025, p1.
- 3- Deng, Yong , 1998, the Chinese conception of national interests in International Relations , the china Quarterly , no.154 .
- 4- Ali, Salim Kata, 2017, New Chinese Diplomacy and National Security Requirements, Future Center for Strategic Studies.
- 5- Bayliss, John and Smith, Steve, 2001, "The Globalization of World Politics," Oxford University Press.
- 6- Al-Alwan, Muhammad, 2017, The Milestones of New Chinese Strategic Thought, The Chinese Dream as a Model, University of Ibn Zahr Agadir, Morocco.
- 7- Darwish, Issa, 1999, Pillars of Strategy in the Service of National Security, Journal of Political Thought, No. 4, 5, Second Year, Damascus Arab Writers Union.
- 8- Barr Michael, 2010 Mythe et réalité du soft power de la Chine ». L'émergence de la Chine et ses impacts.Études internationales ,Volume 41, numéro 4, décembre.
- 9- Ali Abdel Raouf Ali,2012. Social Integration between the Identity Dilemma and the Globalization Trap: Challenges and Transformations of Contemporary Gulf Urbanization: The Dialectics of Social Integration and State and Nation-Building in the Arab World. Beirut: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies,p224.

AUTHOR'S GUARANTEE FORM CONCERNING WORK PRESENTED FOR PUBLICATION

AUTHOR(S): _____

guarantee(s) that the
article _____

(hereinafter referred to as 'Work'), presented for the periodical publication in **Lex localis - Journal of Local Self-Government**, is an original work and

- it was written by the Author(s) indicated in the Work;
- the material of the Work was not published in any other publications;
- the material of the Work is not and will not be presented for publication to any other publications;
- the Work does not contain statements, which do not correspond to reality, or material, which may infringe upon the intellectual property rights of another person or legal entity, and upon the conditions and requirements of sponsors or providers of financial support;
- all references used in the Work are indicated and, to the extent the Work incorporates text passages, figures, data or other material from the works of others, the undersigned has obtained any necessary permissions;

- undertakes to indemnify and hold harmless Institute for Local Self-Government Maribor from any damage or expense that may arise in the event of a breach of any of the guarantees set forth above;
- do(es) not object to the spread of the Work by all means of distribution.

Copyright terms are indicated in the Republic of Slovenia Copyright and Related Rights Act.

In the event the above Work is not accepted and is not published in the Publication or is withdrawn by the Author(s) before acceptance by the Publication, this guarantee form becomes null and void, and the submitted Work is not returned to the Author(s).

Hereby signing this form the Author(s) confirm(s) that the information presented above is correct and undertake(s) to abide by the guarantees and obligations given above:

References:

- 1- Abdul Razzaq Eid, 1999, Muhammad Abdul Jabbar, Democracy between Secularism and Peace. Beirut: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Mu'aser, 1st ed, p. 29.-
- 2- Abdullah Belqaziz, 1989, Arab National Security ,Cairo: Egyptian General Book Authority.
- 3- Frank Trager and Philip Kronenberg, 1973, National Security and American Society (Kansas: Kansas University Press, p35-36.
- 4- Harald Hoiback, , 2013, Understanding Military Doctrine, A multidisciplinary approach, Cass Military Studies, Routledge, London-New York, p 26.
- 5- Peter Chapman, 2015, Military Doctrine: A Reference Guide, translated by Talat Al-Shaib, National Center for Translation, Egyptian National Library, First Edition, vol. 17.
- 6- gharaham ayfanz, 2004, jifri nuyinham, qamus binghiwin lilealaqat alduwliati, dibi, tarjamat markaz alkhaliy lilabhathi.
- 7- Frank Trager and Philip Kronenberg (eds.), National Security and American Society (Kansas: Kansas University Press, 1973
- 8- Salim Qassoum, New Trends in Security Studies: A Study of the Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations. United Arab Emirates: Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research.
- 9- Kerry Longhurst, 2018, On strategic culture “-In book: Germany and the use of force. July: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327127183_On_strategic_culture
- 10-Abu Saleh, Muhammad Hussein, 2009, National Strategic Planning, 4th edition, .Hebron.
- 11- García Fernández, Jorge Juan, Clayton, Jess H. & Hopley, 2004,Christopher, A Student's Guide to European Integration, The Press, The System of Government.
- 12- ayef Al-Rodhan,” Strategic Culture and Pragmatic National Interest.” Globalpolicyjournal, 22 July 2015: <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/22/07/2015/strategic-culture-and-pragmatic-national-interest>.
- 13- Kranse, (1998). The orizing Security,K. StateFormation and the " Third World " in the post-cold-war world » .Review of international Studies, vol 24 ,pp 125-136.
- 14- Tamara Kadim Manati1 , Saad Obaid Alwan, 2024,Transformations of the World Order after the Corona Pandemic COVID-19: The Role of Culture, Science, and the Environment, JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH,p1810.

- 15- Inass Abdulsada Ali,2025, RESHAPING THE WORLD, RETHINKING ACTORS: THE ROLE OF SUB-STATE ACTORS IN FOREIGN RELATIONS, Journal of International Studies, Vol. 21, Number 1 (April) 2025, p1.
- 16- Deng, Yong , 1998, the Chinese conception of national interests in International Relations , the china Quarterly , no.154 .
- 17-Ali, Salim Kata, 2017, New Chinese Diplomacy and National Security Requirements, Future Center for Strategic Studies
- 18- Bayliss, John and Smith, Steve, 2001, "The Globalization of World Politics," Oxford University Press.
- 19- Al-Alwan, Muhammad, 2017, The Milestones of New Chinese Strategic Thought, The Chinese Dream as a Model, University of Ibn Zahr Agadir, Morocco.
- 20- Darwish, Issa, 1999, Pillars of Strategy in the Service of National Security, Journal of Political Thought, No. 4, 5, Second Year, Damascus Arab Writers Union.
- 21- Barr Michael, 2010 Mythe et réalité du soft power de la Chine ». L'émergence de la Chine et ses impacts.Études internationales ,Volume 41, numéro 4, décembre.
- 22 - Ali Abdel Raouf Ali,2012. Social Integration between the Identity Dilemma and the Globalization Trap: Challenges and Transformations of Contemporary Gulf Urbanization: The Dialectics of Social Integration and State and Nation-Building in the Arab World. Beirut: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies,p224.