STRATEGIC CULTURE AS A FRAMEWORK FOR STUDYING CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Dušan B. Kesić[1]

Abstract: Classic theory of civil-military relations was mostly limited to empirical-descriptive studies, while theoretical starting point of such studies was rudimentary. The end of the Cold War brought about new challenges and questions, causing the need for theoretic grounds and expansion of research agenda of civil-military relations. Consequently, the subject of this paper encompasses the overview of the evolution of the theoretical framework and research agenda of civil-military relations, starting from the classical theory towards theoretical paradigms of the constructivists. The primary objective of the paper is to establish theoretical grounds of civil-military relations on the principles of Constructivism and strategic culture, as a fruitful analytical framework for the study of those relations as a dependent variable. In this paper, the method used is the overview of academic literature to achieve a systematic insight into relevant theoretical positions of the author which thematise strategic culture and civil-military relations on the principles of Constructivism. Two basic perspectives of strategic culture study have been singled out that determine the way of shaping those relations as a dependent variable. In concrete terms, civil-military relations can be analysed as a product of unique ideational elements of national culture, tradition and history of a nation, and as a product of discursive practices of political and military elites. Overall, the study of strategic culture enables overcoming anachronistic perspective of civil-military relations, offering and innovative theoretical and analytical framework that enables opening research agenda for new questions and subjects.

Key words: c*ivil-military relations, strategic culture, constructivism, ideational elements, discourse.*

---

[1] University of Belgrade, Faculty of Security Studies, Belgrade, Rebublic of Serbia, e-mail: dusan.kesic@fb.bg.ac.rs, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6895-0254

II/33

Introduction

The interpretation of the primary role of armed forces in a state has not significantly changed observed from the first forms of organised social communities in the ancient times, over the Middle Ages to the modern age. Hence, the first ideas about a state included the military as unavoidable vital element that guarantees security and survival. The thematisation of the conjunction of civilian and military spheres, as noticed by Feaver (Feaver, 1999), has been present for thousands of years, but modern academic thought finds the origin of this issue in the period that preceded the Second World War, when the first papers dedicated to anti-militarism appeared. Feaver links the second wave of research to the initial phase of the Cold War, when it was necessary to reconcile the need for the existence of permanent and big standing force with traditional apprehension of Americans regarding the threat to freedom that such armed force represented. Huntington (2004) successfully reconciled this dissension; his monograph "The Soldier and the State" outlined the guidelines for overcoming this problem and laid theoretical foundations for civil-military relations. The backbone of his viewpoint is the issue of civil control, which he observes through the prism of the relationship of power between civilian and military groups. The Huntington's viewpoint decidedly shaped the study of civil-military relations both during the Cold War and in the years that followed its end (Feaver, 2003). However, over the course of time, the Hungtington's immeasurable contribution became a hindrance to theoretical evolution of the field of civil-military relations.

As the post-Cold War world brought about new challenges in international relations that bore no particular similarities to the paradigm of the superpowers' balance of powers, the opening of new issues necessarily ensued in the field of civil-military relations as well. In that regard, revitalisation of interest in the field of civil-military relations ensued in the last decade of 20th century. Bland (1999) points out that the end of the Cold War has opened numerous questions that directly or indirectly encroached upon the area of civil-military relations. For example, the creation of new democratic states in the eastern and central Europe, continuous problems with the establishment of civil control over armed forces in numerous states, and the aspiration of the United States of America to impose democratic norms all over the world, including omnipresent doubts in the effectiveness of the civil control at internal plane. However, Bland underlines that many scientists and makers of political decisions were taken aback by the fact that theoretical grounds that they could use as assistance in providing answers to the said questions were rather feeble or almost non-existent. Therefore, the challenges of the post-Cold War world underscored the need to establish a theoretical framework of civil-military relations that would create preconditions for a step forward towards the expansion of research agenda.

An important support to such step forward is the constructivist paradigm, which provides more than necessary theoretical stronghold for the analysis of all burning issues that elude the horizon of classical theory. As Foster (2002) notices, this paradigm enables the creation of a new perspective and the expansion of research agenda of civil-military relations. Within this new research agenda, the issue of civil control is not the subject of exclusive researchers' interest. Having in mind the previously said, the

subject of this paper is the overview of the evolution of the theoretical framework and research agenda of civil-military relations, starting from the classical theory towards theoretical paradigms of the constructivists. The representation of the evolution of theoretical principles of civil-military relations guides the achievement of the primary aim of this paper which is the establishment of civil-military relations on the principles of constructivism and strategic culture, as a fruitful analytical framework for the study of civil-military relations as a dependent variable. In this paper, the method used is the overview of academic literature to achieve a systemic insight into relevant theoretical positions of the author which thematise strategic culture and civil-military relations on the principles of Constructivism.

Classical School of Civil-Military Relations

The classical school of civil-military relations, established in the Cold War period, takes armed forces as the subject of its research, i.e. the problem of the strengthening of their power and political involvement. Accordingly, the central significance within the classical school of civil-military relations is attached to the issue of the way in which civil control was established (Matei, 2012). Assuming political power by armed forces happens as a consistent pattern in the history and, consequently, represents the basic problem of civil-military relations (Feaver, 1999). The civil control concept has been recognised as the solution to the said problems, inherent in the classical school of civil-military relations. As Huntington states, the basic issue of civil control encompasses the consideration of the way of reducing the military power in a society. He links the achievement of this goal to the differentiation of concepts of subjective and objective civil control. While subjective civil control implies the maximisation of power of civilian groups in relation to military ones, the objective civil control achieves the decrease in political military power through the professionalisation of military personnel making it politically sterile and neutral (Huntington, 2004: 91-93). Travis (2017) states that the influence of the concept of objective control on the theory and practice of civil-military relations is reflected in the fact that it is still used as one of fundamental landmarks in the establishment of such relations for political and military leaders. Hence, though Huntington has encouraged more general thematisation of civil-military relations, his viewpoint concurrently contributed to the reduction of research agenda solely to the issue of civil control.

Classical theories of civil-military relations have set a research agenda that was mostly focused on empirical studies, which served as the basis for generalisations with minimal theoretical principles and viewpoints that would serve as starting points for such analysis. Foster points out that reasons of the lack of theoretical grounds for civil-military relations should be looked in the works of the pioneers in this field, and in a limited interest in theoretical issues among key stakeholders - armed forces, makers of political decisions and analysts. Because of that, the research agenda of civil-military relations has been reduced to the issues of power, armed forces and structures through which this power struggle takes place (Foster, 2002). Namely, Huntington's viewpoint hinders the theoretical progress even today, and the cause of that is the reduction of the research agenda to a narrow field of civil control of armed forces (Bru-

neau, 2012). Consequently, the initial contribution of the Huntington's viewpoint has, over the course of time, became a burden to civil-military relations, since his followers consistently followed his principles without trying to make more than necessary steps forward listening to the "rhythm" of other social sciences. Notwithstanding the fact that the theoretical framework of the classical school was rudimentary, Feaver points to the significance of the theoretical approach to civil-military relations, which implies singling out independent and dependent variables that influence the area of those relations (Feaver, 1999). Therefore, the theoretical approach to civil-military relations in fact embodies the attempts to outline theoretical principles that would enable the expansion of the research agenda and a fruitful analysis of data gathered through empirical studies.

Civil-Military Relations and Constructivism

The end of the Cold War has brought about new problems and challenges to the field of civil-military relations, that were impossible to solve relying on the classical theory rich in theoretically indifferent studies. Hence, the primary problem of civil-military relations is reflected in the lack of theoretical grounds, and a wrong direction of the research agenda, especially in the period following the end of the Cold War when descriptions were researchers' principal objective. The construction of a new research agenda in the field of civil-military relations, according to Foster, dictates the contextualisation of the field within political science, international relations and sociological theories. In this process, the author attaches significance to critical theory and constructivism, believing that their principles could offer a new perspective of civil-military relations and a rich analytical framework (Foster, 2002). As regards concepts and research issues that occupied the new research agenda, one notices the expansion of interest beyond the sphere of civil control, and a greater number of actors who take over the role in influencing civil-military relations (media, civil society, legislative bodies, etc.) (Croissant, Kuhen, 2011). Speaking about potential constructivist turn within civil-military relations, Lambert (2011) believes that it is early to speak about such fundamental changes, and that the new research agenda is favourable for a step forward towards research goals that overcome mere understanding of these relations. Therefore, in the last decade of 20th century, civil-military relations were confronted with new theoretical paradigms, among which constructivism is singled out as an innovative theoretical foothold, whose principles enable the expansion of the research agenda to include new questions, actors and elements.

The contribution of constructivism is mainly observed in the return of culture and identity to the centre of research agenda of the science on international relations. Constructivism rejects the rationalistic notion of human nature, emphasising the importance of normative (ideational) and material structures, as well as the significance of doers (states) in shaping their interests and behaviours. The last, founding principle of constructivism implies mutual constituting of doers (for example states) and structures (for example an international system) (Price & Reuss-Smit, 1998). Hence, the constructivists assume that a structure that encompasses a system unifies material and cultural elements. Analysing the role of ideas and interest in international poli-

tics, Wendt (1996) points out that these are equally important phenomena, given that power and interests owe their effect to the ideas that have shaped and defined them. Overall, he stresses the priority of international elements (social structures) in shaping international policy, or identities of states, their interest and behaviour.

As regards (social) identity of states, Wendt notes that they are ontologically conditioned by the relationship with the Other. More precisely, he believes that social identities are grounded on characteristics that a state (Self) attaches to other states (the Other), thus identifying itself with them. This type of identity reflects a process of mutual construction of doers (states) and structures (international system). Namely, Wendt states that a corporate identity of a state, which originates in the field of internal policy, defined by social identity of states, emerges from a system and position that the state assigns to itself within it (Wendt, 1996). Because of giving priority to social structures at the level of international system in building state identity, Wendt's constructivism was designated as "systemic". Criticising his viewpoint Hopf (2002) points out works of representatives of constructivism which emphasise the significance of the domain of internal policy in shaping state identity. An example of such approach within constructivist paradigm Hoph finds in Katzenstein's (Peter J. Katzenstein) monograph, which stresses the importance of cultural elements, norms and identity in the field of national security.

Viewpoints of authors who emphasise the influence of the domain of internal policy on the shaping of state identity have laid foundations of "modern" constructivism. The difference between systemic and modern constructivists lies in the fact that the first stress the significance of international environment (international system) for the shaping of state identity, while the latter give priority to internal cultural environment (Jackson, Sørensen, 2003). Elaborating on this division within constructivist camps, Farrell (2002) designates certain representatives of modern constructivism by term "the culturalists" implying that they take the domain of internal policy as the subject of their analysis, as a social structure striving to deduce specific beliefs about the use of force that are reproduced through military institutions. Among the culturalists, Farrell especially singles out Snyder (Jack Snyder), Gray (Colin S. Gray) and Katzenstein. Therefore, the modern constructivism stresses the significance of ideational elements from national level for the construction and shaping of state identity. On the grounds of such principles, a group of authors founded their studies on a concept of strategic culture, striving to identify a characteristic set of ideational elements that shape nation's approach to the use of power, war and policy of national security. An integral segment of this set of ideational elements consists of beliefs, notions and positions on the role and place of the military in a state. Having that in mind, modern constructivism and the concept of strategic culture based on modern constructivism represent a fruitful research programme of civil-military relations.

Apart from a "moderate" and modern constructivism, the studies of strategic culture have found their foothold even within "firm" constructivism, which is, mostly, linked to the works of poststructuralists. For example, Hansen (2006) points out that poststructuralists imply that identity of states, and of other collectivities, is conditioned by discursive practices of political subjects used for the presentation and implementation of foreign policy. Glenn (2009) stresses that, unlike the studies of strategic culture

founded on moderate constructivism, poststructural concept underlines the role of doers (i.e. political and military elites) and their instrumental use of discourse depending on a concrete situation. Poststructuralists emphasise the need of doers to continuously reaffirm the boundaries of the politically legitimate on the basis of available cultural resources. Accordingly, research into strategic culture from the viewpoint of poststructuralism place to the centre of attention the manner of shaping historical narratives, national myths and symbols for the purpose of constructing a discourse that will serve the foreign policy of the state. The fruitfulness of the discourse in the field of civil-military relations is visible in the possibility to reconstruct the founding assumptions which structure political discourses and enable certain decisions and political endeavours. Also, the application of discourse analysis to an event or more general discourse on the role of the military in politics, could help in reviewing certain concepts withing different theoretical paradigms (Freistein, 2011). Having everything previously stated in mind, constructivism offers an appropriate theoretical framework for the study of civil-military relations since it acknowledges a set of ideational elements and discursive practices that determine the approach to the policy of national security, whose integral components include beliefs, notions and positions on the role of armed forces in a state.

Strategic Culture and Civil-Military Relations

During '80s of 20th century, at the height of the Cold War, Jack Snyder pointed to the need to approach the analysis of Soviet nuclear doctrine from a perspective that would acknowledge distinctive elements of their culture, history and tradition that had shaped their strategic thought. According to Snyder, the consideration of Soviet positions on nuclear weapons demands the analysis of intellectual history of the Soviet strategic thought, and the organisational and political framework of defence decision-making. Over time, the said elements have formed a unified set of positions, beliefs and behaviour patterns immanent in Soviet strategic thought that determines their analysis and responses to strategic dilemmas and challenges. The stability and vitality of the given positions, beliefs, and behaviour patterns in relation to the nuclear strategy, Snyder designates by the phrase "strategic culture" (Snyder, 1977). Therefore, the original concept of strategic culture implies the existence of a stable set of positions and beliefs that shape strategic thought and they are manifested through a unique nations' approach to warfare. From the perspective of civil-military relations, it is significant that the integral segment of the set of ideational elements that shape the approach to the use of force consists of beliefs and positions on the role of the military in a state. Starting from their predominance in the matters of strategic though and defence decision-making, key actors where strategic culture is observed are political and military elites. Their positions and beliefs about strategic issues are an outcome of a unique mental instrumentarium which has ripened from the entirety of historical experience and tradition of organisational and political structure.

Following Snyder's viewpoint of strategic culture, Lord (1985) points out that the essence of this concept consists of fundamental principles that define the building of armed forces and goals which they serve. Accordingly, key elements of strategic

culture of a country are its geopolitical position, state of international relations, political culture and ideology, and military culture as well (military history, tradition, and education), civil-military relations and military technology. And yet, having in mind that the influence or significance of these elements for strategic culture may vary from state to state, their influence on strategic culture is not constant. Similarly to the mentioned authors, Booth (1990) also singles out political and military elites as agents of strategic culture. He believes that strategic culture shapes the approach of a nation to the issues of war and the use of force. The viewpoints of the so-called "first generation" of strategic culture studies almost uniformly perceive political and military elites as key actors. A set of ideational elements that make strategic culture is closely defined and specified by the state of civil-military relations in the form of the role of the military in the state and goals that the military should serve. In national academic literature it is possible to find a paper that affirms the applicability of strategic culture as analytical framework for the study of civil-military relations. More precisely, Veljko Blagojević in his analysis of strategic culture in Serbia starts from this very perspective, orienting himself towards the process of the creation of Serbian military, establishment of professional officer cadre, position of the military in society and its engagement (Blagojević, 2019).

After Snyder and his followers, a completely different trajectory of development of strategic culture study ensued. Klein (1984) brings a perspective of strategic culture where it is treated as a means in the hands of political elites by which they legitimise violence against alleged enemies. The legitimisation process takes place by means of public discourse, which is shaped by certain political ideology that enables the identification of situations where the engagement of the military is justified. Kupchan (1996) shares similar ideas regarding strategic culture. Hence, he states that strategic culture represents a field of national identity and self-knowledge consisting of appropriate representations and symbols. Apart from that, he equates strategic culture with propaganda of political elite, which strives to form notions and positions of the public opinion in line with its ideological concepts. Through creation and imposing strategic culture, political elites legitimise their political or military activities. In the moment when notions and positions become internationalised by the public opinion and institutionalised through the structure of political decision-making, Kupchan points out that their influence is then exerted on the notion of the proper role and mission of political leaders and military establishment. Hence, political ideologies make the base of strategic culture and they reinforce certain perspective of national identity, setting parameters of internal and foreign political activity. Discursive construction of national identity by means of political ideology encompasses defining role and missions of armed forces in a state, which, in synergy with constructed notions about enemies, legitimises the use of armed force.

As previously stated, the application of discourse analysis in the field of strategic culture study can be fruitfully transposed to the field of civil-military relations. For example, Lantis (2002) underlines that strategic culture is manifested in social elites, as subjects that operate in the direction of establishing common historical narrative. Apart from that, he stresses that the majority of authors agree that elites define the foreign policy goals instrumentally, as well as political frameworks and

guidelines in relation to challenges they face in a given moment. The works that are oriented towards the analysis of political discourse imply that strategic culture can be defined the most completely as "contractual reality" among elites. Bhiel (3013) and associates observe that strategic culture is construed, which points to the existence of contradictory currents within the society and its subcultures. The analysis of political discourse enables discovering diverse notions, positions and beliefs within a society regarding the role and position of the military in the society. At the same time, in that process, it is possible to discover key points of dispute that define political discourse regarding civil-military relations. The said studies underlined the importance of the analysis of discourse in strategic culture studies, which is reflected in the field of civil-military relations that are treated as one of dependent variables.

One of potential levels of strategic culture study, and consequently of civil-military relations, is the study of the organisational culture of the military. After the first and second generation of strategic culture studies, research done by representatives of the third generation affirms organisational culture as a sublevel of strategic culture research. An example of such study is a work done by Kier (1996), an author whose subject of research is the question of the role of internal policy and organisational culture of the military when choosing between offensive and defensive military doctrines. She finds the response to the question in the study of political-military subcultures which contain beliefs of political decision-makers about the role of armed forces in the field of internal policy. The root of such beliefs, as Kier notices, is hidden in historical experience of the nation in relation to the role of the military in the state construction process. Consequently, the author underscores that military doctrine is a result of the synergy of two factors, internal political limitations and organisational culture of the military. Such approach to strategic culture study can be somewhat recognised in the work of Starčević and Blagojević. Namely, they emphasise the contradiction of political decisions about the military neutrality of the Republic of Serbia and freezing the compulsory military service. Moreover, they point to the harmful effect of such political decisions on the role and place of the military in the society, the capabilities for the execution of its missions and the formulation of military doctrine, and finally, on the preservation of authentic Serbian strategic culture (Starčević & Blagojević, 2020).

Apart from Kier, Berger (1996) endeavours in his work to determine the specificities of "political-military culture" of Japan and Germany which is manifested in the perception of national security, armed forces as institution and the use of force in international relations. Therefore, this is a concept whose content fully expresses the analogy with strategic culture. The central hypothesis of Bergers analysis of strategic culture in Germany and Japan implies that historical experience and its interpretation by political actors influence the shaping of beliefs and values that make them restrained regarding the use of force. For example, the question of the role of armed forces proved to be a key element of strategic culture of Germany in the period before, during and after the Cold War. Inclusion of Germany in multilateral missions with the allies after the Cold War entailed previous redefining of strategic culture in terms of the role of the armed forces (Kesić, 2019). Apart from emphasising civil-military relations, as one of dependent variables within the strategic culture concept, empirical studies have shown on the example of militant states that this element emerges as the backbone of

strategic culture. At the same time, this implies that, during the redefining of strategic culture, the issue of civil-military relations is imposed as its corner stone.

Studies into strategic culture include the analysis and identification of characteristic ideational, normative elements and behaviour patterns. Meyer (2006) founds his study of strategic culture on normative elements that can be presented on a scale depending on the values. The first dimension consists of legitimate objectives of the use of force; it directly stems from national identity and it defines the structure, culture and capabilities of armed forces. The second dimension is manifested in the way armed forces are used, whether the force is used exclusively restrictively, for example for the defence against an aggression, or it is legitimate to use it against other states, offensively. The third dimension is defined by beliefs about the way of ensuring survival in international relations, either through making alliances or by restraining from such policy. Finally, the last dimension expresses the degree to which political and military elites are conditioned by internal and external authorisation to use armed forces. Research studies oriented towards analysing normative framework of strategic culture offer a fruitful ground for the study of civil-military relations. Namely, normative elements mostly reflect beliefs, notions and positions regarding the role and missions of armed forces, conditions and ways of the use of armed forces in foreign policy, as well as responsibilities of political and military elites.

Final Considerations

The formative period of civil-military relations has established research agenda in that field, which was predominantly reduced to empirical studies from which generalisations were drawn, without the concretisation of theoretical starting points of such studies, and consequently, the inclusion of feedback results of the research into the theoretical framework. The reasons for the absence of theoretical borders of civil-military relations hide, both in pioneer studies that have laid foundations and basic guidelines for research, and the lack of interest of key actors, political subjects and military elites in theoretical issues. Poorly set research agenda has permanently isolated civil-military relations from theoretical debates in political science and international relations, which has reflected on hampered theoretical modernisation of the field. The Huntington's capital work has articulated basic theoretical principles of the field which predetermined research agenda in the period of the Cold War, and years that followed its end. Because of that, Huntington's viewpoint enjoyed a special status for a long time, being treated as a universal programme for solving all dilemmas characteristic for civil-military relations. However, the end of the Cold War brought about completely new challenges and dilemmas that were impossible to respond from the viewpoint of the classical school of civil-military relations. First of all, a need has emerged to expand the research agenda beyond the issue of civil control and power struggle between civil and military sectors. Therefore, Huntington's viewpoint became a stumbling block in the evolution of civil-military relations, preventing the field to free itself from the anachronistic perspective and narrowly focused research agenda.

As the theoretical foundations of civil-military relations were rudimentary, it was necessary to change the perspective of the field and redirect attention towards its

theoretical composition. Overcoming the problem of the absence of theoretical borders of civil-military relations demanded opening to new paradigms of the constructivists, normativists and representatives of critical theory. In other terms, it was necessary to overcome the problem of theoretical isolation of civil-military relations, analysing them through the prism of newer sociological theories, as well as theories of political science and international relations. Inclusion of new theoretical paradigms in the analysis of civil-military relations enabled the creation of a new perspective which marked the separation from traditional approach oriented towards the issue of civil control. In this new perspective of civil-military relations, the research agenda was expanded; the centre of attention became new concepts and research questions, and new actors who are recognised as relevant subject in the sphere of those relations.

The central significance of ideational elements within the constructivist paradigm enables theoretical foundations of civil-military relations in the spirit that satisfies the requirement for a new perspective and research agenda. Constructivism emphasises ideational elements, a specific set of beliefs, values and notions that shape the identity, interests and behaviour of states. In relation to ideational elements that shape the meaning and understanding of the world, the constructivist research agenda encompassed specific ideational and normative elements that determine the identity of states in the field of defence and security policy. For the purpose of determining these ideational elements, research studies rely on strategic culture concept, as an analytical tool that includes civil-military relations as one of dependent variables. The possibility of considering the role and place of armed forces in a state makes the strategic culture concept a fruitful analytical framework of those relations. Observed through the prism of strategic culture, civil-military relations can be analysed as a product of unique ideational elements of national culture, tradition and history of one social community, and as a product of discursive practices of political and military elites. In the framework of the first approach, civil-military relations are determined by a set of beliefs, values, notions and positions that find their origin in the entirety of cultural elements. The second approach links the origin of civil-military relations to the public discourse, through which social elites strive to reinforce certain notions and positions of public opinion regarding the role and place of the military in a state. Overall, the study of strategic culture enables overcoming anachronistic perspective of civil-military relations, offering and innovative theoretical and analytical framework that enables opening research agenda for new questions and subjects.

Literature

[1] Berger, T. U. (1996). Norms, Identity, and National Security in Germany and Japan. In: Katzenstein, P.J. (ed.). The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics. Columbia University Press.

[2] Biehl, H., Giegerich, B. & Jonas, A. (eds.). Strategic Cultures in Europe: Security and Defence Policies Across the Continent. Springer.

[3] Blagojević, V. (2019). Strateška kultura - studija slučaja - Srbija. *Vojno delo*, *71*(8), 93-117. https://doi.org/10.5937/vojdelo1908093V

[4] Bland, D. L. (1999). A unified theory of civil-military relations. *Armed Forces & Society*, *26*(1), 7-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X9902600102

[5] Booth, K. (1990). 'The Concept of Strategic Culture Affirmed. in: Jacobsen, C. G. Strategic Power: USA/USSR. Palgrave Macmillan.

[6] Bruneau, C. T. (2012). Impediments to accurate conceptualization of civil-military relations. In: Brunaeau, T. C. & Matei, C. F. (eds.). The Routledge handbook of civil-military relations. Routledge.

[7] Croissant, A., & Kuehn, D. (2011). introduction: new perspectives on civil-military relations. *European political science*, *10*, 131-136. https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2011.1

[8] Farrell, T. (2002). Constructivist security studies: Portrait of a research program. *International Studies Review*, 49-72. https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.t01-1-00252

[9] Feaver, P. D. (1999). Civil-military relations. *Annual review of political science*, *2*(1), 211-241. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.211

[10] Feaver, P. D. (2003). Armed servants: Agency, oversight, and civil-military relations. Harvard University Press.

[11] Forster, A. (2002). New civil-military relations and its research agendas. *Connections*, *1*(2), 71-88. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26322938

[12] Freistein, K. (2011). An introduction to the analysis of discourse in civil-military relations research. *European political science*, *10*, 167-175. https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2011.5

[13] Glenn, J. (2009). Realism versus strategic culture: Competition and collaboration? *International studies review*, *11*(3), 523-551. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2009.00872.x

[14] Hansen, L. (2006). Security as Practice: Discourse Analayis and the Bosnian War. Routledge.

[15] Hantington, S. P. (2004). Vojnik i država. Centar za studije Jugoistočne Evrope, Fakultet političkih nauka, Diplomatska akademija.

[16] Hopf, T. (2002). Social construction of international politics: identities & foreign policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999. Cornell University Press.

[17] Jackson, R. & Sørensen, G. (2003). Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches. Oxford University Press.

[18] Kesić, D. (2019). Strateška kultura Nemačke u posthladnoratovskom periodu. *Nacionalni interes*, 39 (3), 206-207. http://dx.doi.org/10.22182/ni.3932020.8

[19] Kier, E. (1996). Culture and French Military doctrine before World War II. In: Katzenstein, P.J. (ed.). The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics. Columbia University Press.

[20] Klein, B. S. (1988). Hegemony and strategic culture: American power projection and alliance defence politics. *Review of international studies*, *14*(2), 133-148. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021050011335X

[21] Kupchan, C. A. (1994). The Vulnerability of Empire. Cornell University Press.

[22] Lambert, A. (2011). From civil-military relations towards security sector govern-ance. *European political science*, *10*(2), 157-166. https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2011.4

[23] Lantis, J. S. (2002). Strategic culture and national security policy. *International studies review*, *4*(3), 87-113. https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.t01-1-00266

[24] Lord, C. (1985). American strategic culture. *Comparative Strategy*, *5*(3), 269-293. https://doi.org/10.1080/01495938508402693

[25] Matei, C. F. (2012). A new conceptualization of civil–military relations. In: Bruneau, C. T. & Matei, C. F. (eds.),The Routledge handbook of civil-military relations. Routledge.

[26] Meyer, O. C. (2006). The quest for a European strategic culture: changing norms on security and defence in the European Union. Palgrave Macmillan.

[27] Price, R., & Reus-Smit, C. (1998). Dangerous liaisons? Critical international theory and constructivism. *European journal of international relations*, *4*(3), 259-294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066198004003001

[28] Snyder, J. L. (1977). The Soviet strategic culture: Implications for limited nuclear operations.The RAND Corporation.

[29] Starčević, S., & Blagojević, S. (2020). Uloga služenja vojnog roka u razvoju srpske strateške kulture. *Vojno delo*, *72*(4), 85-104. https://doi.org/10.5937/vojdelo2004085S

[30] Travis, D. S. (2017). Saving Samuel Huntington and the need for pragmat-ic civil–military relations. *Armed Forces & Society*, *43*(3), 395-414. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X16667287

[31] Wendt, A. (1996). Identity and Structural Change in International Politics. In: Lapid, Y., & Kratochwil, F. V (eds.). The return of culture and identity in IR theory. Lynne Rienner Publishing Inc.

S u m m a r y

The classical school of civil-military relations, established in the Cold War period, takes armed forces as the subject of its research, i.e. the problem of the strengthening of their power and political involvement. Research agenda of the classic theory of civil-military relations was mostly limited to empirical-descriptive studies, while theoretical starting points of such studies was rudimentary. The end of the Cold War brought about new challenges and questions, conditioning the need for theoretic grounds and expansion of research agenda of civil-military relations. Consequently, the subject of this paper encompasses the overview of the evolution of the theoretical framework and research agenda of civil-military relations, starting from the classical theory towards theoretical paradigms of the constructivists. The representation of the evolution of theoretical principles of civil-military relations guides the achievement of the primary aim of this paper which is the establishment of civil-military relations on the principles of constructivism and strategic culture, as a fruitful analytical framework for the study of those relations as a dependent variable. In this paper, the method used is the overview of academic literature to achieve a systematic insight into relevant theoretical positions of the author which thematise strategic culture and civil-military

relations on the principles of Constructivism. Theoretical foundation of civil-military relations within constructivist paradigm enables the creation of a new perspective and expansion of research agenda.

Modern constructivism stresses the significance of ideational elements from national level for the construction and shaping of state identity. On the grounds of such principles, a group of authors founded their studies on a concept of strategic culture, striving to identify a characteristic set of ideational elements that shape nation's approach to the use of power, war and policy of national security. An integral segment of this set of ideational elements consists of beliefs, notions and positions on the role and place of the military in a state. Having the said in mind, modern constructivism and the aforementioned concept of strategic culture based on modern constructivism represent a fruitful research programme of civil-military relations. Apart from modern constructivism, strategic culture concept has found its foothold in the trajectory of "firm" constructivism. The base of strategic culture within this trajectory of constructivism consists of political ideologies which reinforce certain perspectives of national identity, setting parameters of internal and foreign political activity. Discursive construction of national identity by means of political ideology encompasses the defining role and missions of armed forces in a state, which, in synergy with constructed notions about enemies, legitimises the use of armed force. The analysis of political discourse enables discovering diverse notions, positions and beliefs within a society regarding the role and position of the military in society. At the same time, in that process it is possible to discover key points of dispute that define political discourse regarding civil-military relations. The said studies underlined the importance of the analysis of discourse in strategic culture studies, which is reflected in the field of civil-military relations that are treated as one of dependent variables. Therefore, two basic perspectives of strategic culture study have been singled out that determine the way of shaping civil-military relations as a dependent variable. In concrete terms, civil-military relations can be analysed as a product of unique ideational elements of national culture, tradition and history of a nation, and as a product of discursive practices of political and military elites. Overall, the study of strategic culture enables overcoming anachronistic perspective of civil-military relations, offering and innovative theoretical and analytical framework that enables opening research agenda for new questions and subjects.

Key words: *civil-military relations, strategic culture, constructivism, ideational elements, discourse.*