

## Chapter 5

# Leadership, Governance, and Public Policy in Strategic Studies\*

---

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287818187.05>

**Desiderio López Niño**

Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto"

**Abstract:** This chapter examines the relational strategic State, seen as an organization of organizations that unites a network of stakeholders to address collective needs. The traits of strategic leadership are identified to understand the motivations behind decisions in security-related areas, decisions that come from analyzing various threats and are linked to the processes of formulating and implementing public policies. To do this, the interactions among the concepts of State, strategic leadership, governance, decision-making, and public policies derived from strategic studies are explored. This knowledge requires the use of theories and methods from social sciences, creating a multidisciplinary field with its own identity. This approach helps strengthen democracy, address social needs, and improve public management, promoting more effective decision-making aimed at ensuring human security and dignity.

**Keywords:** State; strategic studies; governance; strategic leadership; public policy; security

---

\* Book chapter derived from the research project entitled *Conceptualization of Contemporary Strategic Studies* conducted by the Masa Crítica Research Group at the Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto." This group is recognized and categorized as A1 by MinCiencias (code COL0123247). The views and results in this chapter belong to the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the participating institutions.

### Desiderio López Niño

PhD in Administration, Universidad de Celaya, Mexico. Master's in Public Management, ITESEM, Mexico. Specialization in International Cooperation and Project Management for Development, Universidad Externado de Colombia. Bachelor's in Economics, Universidad de América, Colombia. Scholar of the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies. Academic Manager of the Doctorate in Strategic Studies, Security, and Defense, Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto," Colombia.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3797-0249> - Email: [desiderio.lopez@esdeg.edu.co](mailto:desiderio.lopez@esdeg.edu.co)

**APA Citation:** López-Niño, D. (2025). Leadership, Governance, and Public Policy in Strategic Studies. In A. Serrano Cuervo (Ed.), *Conceptualizing Contemporary Strategic Studies as Multidisciplinary Input* (pp. 123-142). Sello Editorial ESDEG.  
<https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287818187.05>

## **CONCEPTUALIZING CONTEMPORARY STRATEGIC STUDIES AS MULTIDISCIPLINARY INPUT**

Print ISBN: 978-628-7818-17-0

Digital ISBN: 978-628-7818-18-7

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287818187>

### **Security and Defense Collection**

Sello Editorial ESDEG

Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto"

Bogotá D.C., Colombia

2025



## Introduction

Leadership has been a subject of interest within the social sciences since their inception, especially for scholars focused on organizations, including the State. Various analyses have identified “symbolic actions” used by leaders in their efforts to “create meaning” for both their own actions and those of the organization, aiming for these meanings to support the consensual achievement of collective goals through governance mechanisms. This chapter addresses some of these topics by examining the fundamental elements that underpin leadership in security programs developed within the framework of strategic studies. It is possible to categorize the behaviors of leaders who design and implement both strategies and public policies related to security, which often go beyond the military scope to include insights from various disciplines whose theories form the epistemic foundation of strategic studies.

Similarly, it helps clarify the polysemic use of the concept of strategy by analyzing how leaders realize their strategic thinking through the design and dissemination of public policies in the security field. This process is examined by considering the interaction between grand strategy and national strategies across the political, economic, and military spheres to achieve national objectives (Lykke, 1989), integrating them into a security policy that aims to create well-being scenarios for the nation. These conceptual frameworks form a theoretical and practical foundation that allows for the identification of relevant knowledge categories for strategic leaders, consultants, public policymakers, and multidisciplinary academics interested in advancing strategic studies in security and defense. In particular, it aims to fill theoretical gaps and question the paradoxes and contradictions caused by the reckless use of the term “strategy,” which, on many occasions, has disregarded the syntax and semantics typical of

conceptual language (Ostrom, 2015). It thus seeks to highlight the arbitrary and even capricious use of the word “strategy” in writings on security.

The field of strategic studies employs various theoretical and conceptual tools from traditional military policy. However, since the post-Cold War era, concepts from economic sciences and humanities have also been incorporated, all centered around the common pivot: the State. While the State remains a key actor, it is no longer the only one. Non-state actors, transnational economic groups, and both national and international organizations now participate in the current landscape, each with its own interests and strategic approaches. This diversity of actors can lead to conflicts that require strategic leaders to adopt mechanisms such as governance principles to reach consensual decisions aimed at ensuring security levels that promote well-being and prosperity.

This passage discusses the State as an organization of organizations and explores the governance mechanisms employed by strategic leaders, based on the theories of organizations and decisions, which form the foundation of economic and administrative sciences (Simon, 2011). These theoretical tools are used in developing public policies as a specific outcome of strategic studies, aiming to reduce threats by designing force-oriented actions supported by the authority granted through institutions, with the goal of achieving political objectives. When talking about force in this context, it refers to relationships among States as well as concepts like power, position, ideology, or wealth (Bueno, 2018).

## The State, Organization of Organizations, in Strategic Studies

It is common to assert that the modern State emerged in 1648 with the Peace Treaties of Westphalia. Without delving into whether the term “State” corresponds to a modern concept used retrospectively, it can be accepted that it is a legal-political organization that carries out government functions (Koselleck, 2021). Linked to the concepts of “sovereignty,” as Jean Bodin explains, and derived from the idea of “nation,” the State is structured within the triad proposed by Rousseau: power (government), territory, and people (nation), in a strictly political sense. Therefore, it becomes an active subject with its own will, an organism, and the organization where society is formed as a people constituting a State (Koselleck, 2021, p. 132). In this context, the State is an organization.

The literature on the State is broad and varied, with input from numerous disciplines and interdisciplinary methods. The concept has developed alongside human history and has become rooted in political theory, law, and sociology. In this chapter, it is examined from the viewpoint of organizational studies and political economy, using an institutionalist approach. The work of Bob Jessop (2021) is revisited, as he discusses elements such as decision-making, relationships between different parts of the State, state officials, and other agents—categories that form part of the epistemic framework of strategic studies.

The State can be seen as a complex system of institutions, organizations, and interactions involved in exercising leadership and implementing decisions (Jessop, 2021, p. 55). These organizations work together, build consensus, and mobilize economic resources based on the achievement of national objectives, within the framework of a grand strategy, which is considered the highest level of analysis in strategic studies (Duyvesteyn & Worrall, 2017).

The grand strategy, seen as a higher level within strategic studies, requires an analysis based on power because of the importance of a nation as a key element of the State. Traditionally, the elements of the State have been limited to the three legal criteria proposed by Georg Jellinek (2017). However, Bob Jessop (2021) introduces a fourth dynamic element: "legitimation through state projects" (p. 38). The role of States in the global context involves developing a strategic plan that, within the framework of globalization, helps the world align with national values and interests (Balzacq & Krebs, 2021).

Some might think that grand strategy is only for great powers because of its ability to project global influence; however, it is a task that all States should undertake, especially when resources are limited. It becomes crucial to rely on the foundational principles of politics and economics to guide strategic planning, ensuring resources are allocated properly based on national objectives.

The tendency to achieve these objectives requires the State to function as a unified entity, as a strong organization with persistent goals (Jellinek, 2017). Once the strategy is established, various individuals work together toward a common goal, connected by a bond that enables collective action until the strategy is realized through the power of teamwork.

Bourdieu (2012) argues that the State is an unprecedented organization: a collection of resources that enables its holders to define what is legal and what is not, issuing orders supported by official force. While he considers it authoritative and exclusive, he also emphasizes its organizational nature, describing it as an

administrative complex. This aspect highlights the central role the State plays in strategic studies, especially regarding the relationship among force, power, and objectives—fundamental elements in crafting a grand strategy.

Authors such as Max Weber have argued that the monopoly of violence by the State is legitimate (Bobbio, 2016). From this statement, it can be argued that the State, conceived as an organization of organizations, requires coordinating multiple institutions and developing processes related to implementing force actions, not only in the military field but also in the economic sector. An example of this is economic integration agreements—legal acts with significant impact that affect various population sectors in the signatory States. Some sectors may be harmed by the loss of market segments before the entry of new bidders, while others, especially consumers, can benefit through a wider range of options and a better cost-benefit ratio. These agreements are fundamental institutions in strategic studies since they seek to promote cooperation among regional States or blocs to meet the needs of their populations and build scenarios of peaceful coexistence.

This approach to the role of the State in strategic studies goes beyond traditional academic analysis of security and defense, which usually focus on political-legal perspectives. British scholar Bob Jessop stresses that the State is a complex organization that produces social relations. Beyond its structure, the importance of the “idea of the State” prevailing in each era and context is notable. Using the strategic-relational approach (SRA), his analysis emphasizes the role of economic strategies, state projects, and hegemonic visions as elements that mobilize the State, seen as a dynamic entity. This view aligns with what Duyvesteyn and Worrall (2017) suggest, advocating for a renewal of strategy studies to move past rationalist interpretations. According to them, strategy should be understood as a dynamic behavior, not just as a mix of goals, means, and methods, but also guided by rationality, intuition, experience, and imagination of various strategic leaders—both state and non-state—from different cultural, economic, feminist, and social backgrounds.

Strategy, understood as behavior, is at the core of strategic studies and closely relates to organization theory. Since the State is the main actor in this area, it can be seen as an organization of organizations: the larger system that functions as a central coordinating entity (March & Simon, 1961).

The scope of public interventions covered by strategic studies has broadened, leading to increased social complexity and interdependence among multiple organizations, characterized by more dispersed knowledge (Roth, 2023). In this

context, the State can be seen as an organization of organizations and serves as a key linchpin within strategic studies in the fields of security and defense. These areas of knowledge maintain a close connection with the analysis of the international system, in which the State remains the central focus.

Mariana Mazzucato (2021) argues that the State remains the most entrepreneurial organization. From her perspective, the State and other sectors of a nation should not be seen as enemies, but as partners in a symbiotic relationship where everyone can benefit. Therefore, it is crucial to build collaboration networks in which strategic leaders of different sectors understand each other's interests and create favorable conditions to strengthen governance processes. This will enable informed decision-making based on results obtained through scientific methods typical of strategic studies.

## Strategic Leadership, Governance, and Decision-Making

Strategic studies require leaders who can identify both new threats and those that remain in the security field, regardless of the rhetoric they use to present themselves. For this, a broad, deep, and long-term observation is necessary, as Gastón Berger states, along with the ability to interpret contexts from new perspectives and in collaboration with other actors (Godet, n.d.). This new perspective must be distinctive, avoiding traditional reasoning or arguments influenced by particular interests.

In this regard, a strategic leader must incorporate the changes outlined in the fields of strategic studies, which are no longer limited to the military domain but now include economic, political, and diplomatic dimensions. As Captain Aznar (2018) points out, strategic leadership involves the ability to make decisions, manage complex issues, put people at the center of the organization, build consensus, and incorporate an intellectual component. That is, the strategic leader fosters cognitive processes within the organization aimed at developing a shared vision of the future and crafting strategies aligned with that vision.

We should distinguish between a leader and a strategic leader. The former, according to Aznar (2018), is a soul tuner, and that is an art difficult to rationalize, because it cannot be science (p. 19). On the other hand, the strategic leader focuses on developing cognitive processes, creating analytical frameworks, and generating knowledge that allows the organization to be aligned with the principles

of strategic studies. Historically, knowledge has been associated with rationality (Haynie et al., 2010), and strategic leaders aim to validate their decisions through rational exercise.

Rationality is commonly understood as the mental process of constructing a convincing argument and communicating it to persuade others, as well as the ability to evaluate and accept arguments presented by others (Mercier & Sperber, 2011). Strategic leaders typically act based on this concept, while rationality is generally viewed as the most effective way to make decisions (Martínez, 2015), which can help gain greater acceptance of the strategic choices derived from strategic studies.

However, evidence indicates that this type of rationality can cause epistemic distortions because human reasoning is susceptible to misinformation (Mercier & Sperber, 2011). Leaders, often skilled in arguments, do not necessarily seek the truth but aim to build arguments that support their own positions (Evans, 2002). This motivated reasoning can distort attitudes and reinforce false beliefs, challenging the philosophical tradition that viewed reasoning as the capacity that helped the mind go beyond mere perception, habit, and instinct (Gaubeca, 2007). In this context, decision-making is influenced by irrational prejudices resulting from inference processes (Kahneman, 2016).

Simon (1989) argues that the classical theory of rationality does not recognize that the same facts can be interpreted differently by different people, nor that these pursue diverse purposes that go beyond the maximization of utility. In this regard, Simon (2011, pp. 129-131) points out three characteristics of rationality:

- It is limited because people have restricted abilities to process and analyze all available information, which constrains strategic thinking.
- It is substantive because it guides selecting the most effective way to reach an objective, which can result in automating the strategy.
- It is procedural because it uses methods that avoid overly complex calculations, seeking satisfactory solutions, which can create discrepancies between the results of strategic studies and the public policies that are implemented.

An additional example of rationality's limitations is confirmation bias: leaders often look for arguments and evidence that support their own approaches, ignoring or rejecting those that oppose them (Mercier & Sperber, 2011). This bias hinders the development of governance, which is a crucial element in strategic studies. Paradoxically, many leaders rely on intuition as a form of knowledge in

decision-making; they articulate reasons but make decisions based on intuition (Hanlon, 2011).

The study of strategic leadership, therefore, involves analyzing human behavior, which requires incorporating approaches from psychology (Simon, 1955, p. 508). Understanding this behavior means not only examining how rationality is exercised or how decisions are made but also identifying the features that characterize the interaction among knowledge, behavior, and decision-making. In this context, intuition emerges as a key factor that influences decision-making within organizations (Estrada, 2008).

Watts and Williams, as cited in Hanlon (2011), discuss intuition as a valid source of knowledge and emphasize the importance of distinguishing between knowing something rationally and knowing it intuitively. They also suggest that the environment or context influences the intuitive processing performed by strategic leaders. What feels natural or intuitive in a given situation is not universal, as different cultural experiences lead to varying intuitions about the meaning of situations. Additionally, new behaviors become intuitive as skills are developed (Kahneman & Tversky, 2012).

Since intuition plays a significant role in leadership behavior, particularly in decision-making and governance development, it is important to consider its properties, as proposed by Khatri and Ng (2000).

- Intuition operates subconsciously. It exists along a spectrum between consciousness and the subconscious. The facts, knowledge, and experiences stored in the subconscious are utilized by intuition, especially when forming defense policies.
- Intuition is intricate. Thanks to the balance between quantitative and qualitative factors, it can go beyond the limits of purely rational analysis. This intricacy also creates challenges in building networks between government officials and non-government actors.
- Intuition is quick. It condenses years of experience into decisions made in seconds. In strategic settings, it enables the combination of learned behavior patterns and produces courses of action instantly.
- Intuition is not the same as emotion. Emotional states like anxiety, anger, fear, or illusions can disrupt the ability to notice subtle messages that emerge intuitively. A clear mind helps in better interpreting complex interactions within the state apparatus.

- Intuition generates arguments. These result from intuitive inference processes that connect premises and conclusions. When a conclusion is accepted based on an argument that is intuitively strong, it is an epistemic decision made at the individual level (Mercier & Sperber, 2011).

In short, intuition does not make strategic leaders irrational; rather, it is based on a deep understanding of situations. It is a complex phenomenon rooted in the knowledge stored in the leader's subconscious. Intuition is positively linked to the quality of strategic decisions. In this regard, Khatri and Ng (2000) note that intuitive synthesis is more suitable for strategic decisions than for daily (or routine) operations.

When a strategic leader faces a new decision, they can use self-questioning techniques by relating the current situation to past experiences. This process expands their range of action options by activating previous knowledge, experience, and intuition, helping them develop a set of potential strategic approaches (Haynie et al., 2010). Experience, grounded in cognitive activity, serves as a channel through which they access memories, intuitions, and past emotions, which are used as resources to create meaning around a strategy (Flavell, 1987). This experience forms a collection of cognitive and emotional resources that enhance the leader's knowledge and can influence the development of strategies aimed at reaching specific goals (Haynie et al., 2010).

Recent research on strategic leadership shows that a leader's skills and decisions depend not only on acquiring specific technical knowledge but also on internalizing emotional meanings associated with that knowledge (Castro et al., 2016, p. 516). Traditionally, psychology has studied emotions as "subjective mental feelings" (Kaufman, 1999, p. 138). Kaufman also emphasizes that emotions are fundamentally cognitive in origin, as they arise in response to internal or external changes that impact an individual's goals, such as the emergence of a threat to the safety of a society, a nation, or a group of nations.

Therefore, various social science disciplines have incorporated the study of emotions, drawing on concepts from psychology and developing them from different viewpoints. The contributions of Mintzberg et al. (2013) in the organizational field, Tirole (2017) and Thaler and Sunstein (2018) in economics, and Elster (2010) in sociology stand out. Emotions are present both in cultural interpretive frameworks and in the objective elements that organizations shape (Robbins & Judge, 2013; Simon, 2011), thus integrating into the epistemic framework that supports strategic studies focused on designing economic, diplomatic, or social policies.

Given the multidisciplinary nature of studying emotions and their vital role in the organizational context—especially in decision-making within strategic

studies—authors like Mintzberg et al. (2013) and Simon (2011) highlight the importance of moving beyond a dichotomy between reason and emotion. Instead of viewing them as opposites, they suggest recognizing the significance of emotions in human interaction and distancing them from solely biological explanations (Cruz, 2012). In this vein, Damasio (2018) contends that emotion and reason form a valuable combination. A multidisciplinary approach to this relationship in strategic leaders is crucial for understanding decision-making processes and building governance-oriented consensus, both in developing strategic studies and in creating public policies based on their outcomes.

In a study on strategic decisions in international businesses, which forms part of the geoeconomy within strategic studies, Musso and Francioni (2012) demonstrated that a leader's preferences for a foreign country might be influenced by instincts toward certain markets. Likewise, some political cultures or regimes can lead to rejection, resulting in market choices based more on subjective perceptions than on thorough technical planning. This shows that emotional motivation significantly influences the formation of economic blocs, as well as political and military alliances in the international system.

There are elements that underpin leadership and are expressed within the scope of strategic studies. At times, components such as reason, intuition, experience, emotions, and feelings come to the forefront, forming categories of leader behavior responsible for designing and developing strategies. These elements enable the creation of governance through consensus-based decisions aimed at addressing threats to security across various areas: military, political, diplomatic, and economic, all of which are typical domains within strategic studies.

It should be noted that the term governance in Latin America is usually used as a synonym for "governability." However, in this text, the definition proposed by Hufty (2011, p. 408) is adopted, who sees it as an "analytical framework for non-hierarchical coordination systems." From this perspective, three main characteristics are identified: 1) decision-making actors and places are multiple and diverse; 2) the relationships among actors are horizontal rather than vertical; and 3) interactions are self-regulated (p. 408).

This view of "modern governance" recognizes that the State is not the only actor involved in decision-making about actions derived from strategic studies. These decisions also come from local, national, and international entities, along with networks of both state officials and non-state actors. Together, these leaders decide on key issues like defense policy, strategic planning in geopolitical and geoeconomic areas, and civil-military relations.

## Public Policy as the Materialization of Strategic Studies

One of the defining features of strategic studies is its focus on contributing to the development of public policies (Bueno, 2018). This author argues that strategic studies provide important knowledge because they have historically been closely connected to advising decision makers. However, this relationship has caused tension between those who believe that strategy experts should serve government policies and those who oppose this involvement (Gray, 2010). Some scholars argue that the goal of security studies is specifically to create policies that enable security (Lebow, 1987), while others support an iterative process in which theory and practice mutually inform and reinforce each other (Baylis & Wirtz, 2018, p. 2). In any case, the outcomes of strategic studies must influence the development of public policies to improve security policies and enhance strategic thinking (Bueno, 2018).

Strategic studies stand out from other fields because of their interdisciplinary nature and their ability to create what Ostrom (2015) calls an “arena” where analysis, empiricism, and the arts and sciences come together (Wæver & Buzan, 2018). Their goal is to produce reliable scientific knowledge to inform public policy decisions. This is clear, for instance, in processes like setting guidelines for technological innovation in nuclear weapons, acquiring a new fleet of aircraft, or negotiating a trade agreement between China and Colombia.

Strategic studies have the flexibility and tools needed to respond to new challenges in security and defense. However, turning these into public policies requires a more structured and significant relationship between the two fields (Duyvesteyn & Worrall, 2017). This relationship has developed in cycles since the second postwar period, especially in a context where supranational states and institutions have heavily influenced the design of economic and social policies. These new public programs have led to a deeper understanding of the State's role, which goes beyond traditional legal and administrative analysis by incorporating theories and methods from political science, economics, and other social disciplines. All of this has helped shape the field of public policy studies and opens the possibility of building scientific bridges with strategic studies.

This profile, however, presents identity challenges, partly due to the multiple meanings of the concept of “policy,” which has led to various theoretical traits and dimensions, as well as difficulties in defining public policy. These tensions pose a significant challenge to integrating both fields. The issue becomes even more

complex in Spanish-speaking countries, such as Latin America, where the term "política" is used interchangeably to refer to different phenomena. Unlike English, which makes a clear distinction between *politics* (related to the behavior and interests of political actors) and *policy* (concerning decisions to address social needs), Spanish lacks that clear linguistic separation.

Despite this conceptual and grammatical challenge, progress has been achieved in Latin America in linking strategic studies with public policy analysis through both theoretical and empirical approaches. An example is the definition of public policy proposed by Luis F. Aguilar (2009), who describes it as a set (sequence, system, cycle) of actions, structured intentionally and causally, aimed at achieving objectives deemed valuable for society (p. 14). This definition emphasizes the use of the term "causal," which indicates a connection between knowledge and policy, and shows the approach bridging strategic studies and the field of public policies.

Already in 1996, Aguilar recognized causality as one of the core properties of public policy, along with institutional, decisional, and behavioral components. This concept of causality highlights that all public policies aim not only to produce results but also to respond to specific situations identified through analytical processes, an area where strategic studies offer valuable contributions. In this regard, the epistemic framework of strategic studies provides theoretical and methodological foundations for designing public policies in security and defense.

Based on the theoretical foundation, four dimensions related to coercion are identified: 1) remote, 2) immediate, 3) individual behavior, and 4) behavior environment. From these dimensions, the American political scientist Theodore J. Lowi developed a typology that describes interactions among these dimensions, resulting in four types of public policies (Jaime et al., 2013):

- Distributive policies: Coercion is minimal and targeted at individuals, specifically at certain sectors. An example is the construction of security facilities in a particular region of a country. This type of policy distributes resources without creating obvious conflicts among sectors and can support economic growth.
- Regulatory policies: Coercion is immediate and directed at individuals. A typical example is the laws that regulate the purchase, possession, and transportation of firearms by civilians. These policies often create social and political tensions.
- Constitutional policies: Coercion targets the environment, but its implementation is unlikely. An example is declaring states of emergency during a pandemic.

- Redistributive policies: Coercion also impacts the environment, but with immediate likelihood. An example is the well-being programs for active military members, which some sectors see as preferential treatment.

This classification shows that public policies requiring immediate coercion often create tensions among different social groups, which can lead to internal conflicts. This reflects Harold Lasswell's view, the founder of policy science, who emphasized the importance of aligning scientific knowledge with decision-making to prevent it from being driven solely by group preferences. According to Lasswell, as cited in Jaime et al. (2013), political processes should be rooted in strategic studies that ensure rigor in public decisions. In the 1950s, Lasswell initiated a program to deepen understanding of public affairs and foster greater integration of knowledge about the increasing complexity of security issues.

To achieve this rigor, it is essential that both strategic studies and public policy analysis are supported by theories, methods, and models from various social science disciplines, including psychology, because human behavior plays a crucial role in decision-making processes. In this context, it is important to process as much information as possible to provide the data necessary for the analytical frameworks used in strategic intelligence.

Jaime et al. (2013) define policy sciences (public policy analysis) as the set of disciplines responsible for explaining the processes of policy preparation and implementation, as well as for gathering data and creating relevant interpretations (p. 70). These explanations and interpretations must stem from analyzing the results of strategic studies across various thematic fields, such as geoeconomics, defense economy, energy geopolitics, economic warfare, nuclear weapons, or terrorism.

This approach facilitates a better understanding of both the actions taken and decisions made in the field of security, as well as the processes of policy formulation and implementation, along with their results. This understanding is based on knowledge of the interactions among key concepts such as State, strategic leadership, governance, decision-making, and public policies, derived from strategic studies. The level of knowledge gained will depend on the epistemic matrix and the methodologies used, aiming to establish a multidisciplinary field with its own identity, capable of contributing to strengthening democracy, addressing social needs, and improving organizational processes—ultimately enhancing decision-making quality and effectively promoting human dignity.

## Conclusions

Strategic studies are the scientific approach aimed at identifying suitable tools to reduce security threats. The central element supporting these studies is the State, although it differs from the concept of the State in the Modern Age. While the ideas of Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Locke were innovative for their time, today, a State that guarantees life, property, and freedom is needed, one that encourages the participation of various actors and promotes transparency in expressing private interests. This helps to identify common points to build consensus and direct state actions toward effective responses to security demands. Such a State is seen as an organization of organizations, which does not represent the interests of a party in particular but seeks to achieve the goals of all involved.

Although the influence of certain leaders in shaping the epistemic framework of strategic studies cannot be ignored, it is crucial to recognize different types of knowledge. This includes not only the rationality of strategic leaders who develop action plans against threats, but also the knowledge gained from beliefs and intuitions formed through accumulated experience and the use of innovative methods. Such knowledge enables collaborative problem-solving, the creation of governance conditions, and the autonomous and coordinated resolution of research processes in strategy. Additionally, decisions should be informed by structured analytical tools, like game theory, which has proven its ability to identify strategies in scenarios involving repeated interactions. In this context, it is inappropriate to continue making security decisions based solely on subjective criteria.

The results of strategic studies support the development of public policies. To ensure consistency between the two areas, it is crucial to maintain methodological and epistemic rigor so that the theories and methods used are compatible and do not produce false relationships between strategic findings and policy foundations. It should not be permitted to draw links among premises that lack a logical connection to the conclusions.

To align theory and practice in designing and implementing lines of action, it is important to clarify the interactions between the researcher and the analyzed policy, as well as between the policy and its beneficiaries. This involves identifying the analytical concepts and categories that arise from both the policy analysis and its interactions with involved actors.

Furthermore, it is crucial to explain the methodological tools used in each policy study. These tools should, on one hand, align with the theoretical framework

supporting the analysis and, on the other, enable the identification of elements that form the context and environment of the policy. This is important to correct any distortions that could hinder proper understanding.

This approach allows for implementing public policies that strictly align with the outcomes of strategic studies, excluding individual or group interests that try to impose their views as essential criteria in shaping those policies.

## References

- Aguilar, L. F. (2009). Marco para el análisis de las políticas públicas. In F. V. Mariñez & C. Garza (Eds.), *Política pública y democracia en América Latina*. Editorial Porrúa.
- Aznar, F. (2018). *Repensando el liderazgo estratégico*. Sílex Ediciones.
- Balzacq, T., & Krebs, R. (2021). The enduring appeal of grand strategy. In T. Balzacq & R. Krebs (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grand strategy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198840299.013.47>
- Baylis, J., & Wirtz, J. J. (2018). Introduction. In J. Baylis, J. J. Wirtz, & C. Gray (Eds.), *Strategy in the contemporary world* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hepl/9780198807100.001.0001>
- Bobbio, N. (2016). *Estado, gobierno y sociedad: Por una teoría general de la política*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bourdieu, P. (2012). *Sobre el Estado*. Editorial Anagrama.
- Bueno, A. (2018). De los estudios estratégicos: Conceptualización y evolución de un campo de estudio. *Revista de Estudios en Seguridad Internacional*, 4(1), 237–256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18847/1.7.14>
- Castro, L., Castro, M., & Morales, J. (2016). *Metodología de las ciencias sociales* (3th ed.). Tecnos.
- Cruz, A. (2012). La razón de las emociones: Formación social, política y cultural de las emociones. *Eleuthera*, 6(1), 64–80.
- Damasio, A. (2018). *El error de Descartes: La emoción, la razón y el cerebro humano* (1st ed.). Editorial Destino.
- Duyvesteyn, I., & Worrall, J. E. (2017). Global strategic studies: A manifesto. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 40(3), 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2016.1269228>
- Elster, J. (2010). *La explicación del comportamiento social* (1st ed.). Gedisa Editorial.
- Estrada, F. (2008). Economía y racionalidad de las organizaciones: los aportes de Herbert A. Simon. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 31, 84–103. <https://doi.org/10.7440/res31.2008.06>
- Evans, J. (2002). Logic and human reasoning: An assessment of the deduction paradigm. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(6), 978–996. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.978>
- Flavell, J. (1987). Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition. In F. Weinert & R. Kluwe (Eds.), *Metacognition, motivation, and understanding*. Erlbaum.
- Gaubeca, L. (2007). *Teoría del conocimiento* (1st ed.). Publicaciones Cruz.
- Godet, P. M. (n.d.). *Prospectiva estratégica: Problemas y métodos*.
- Gray, C. (2010). *The strategy bridge: Theory for practice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199579662.001.0001>
- Hanlon, P. (2011). *The role of intuition in strategic decision making: How managers rationalize intuition*. <http://arrow.dit.ie/buschgracon/6/>

- Haynie, J. M., Shepherd, D., Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P. c. (2010). A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.10.001>
- Hufty, M. (2011). Investigating policy processes: The Governance Analytical Framework (GAF). In U. Wiesmann & H. Hurni (Eds.), *Research for sustainable development: Foundations, experiences, and perspectives* (pp. 403–424). Geographica Bernensia.
- Jaime, F. M., Dufour, G., Alessandro, M., & Amaya, P. (2013). *Introducción al análisis de políticas públicas*. Universidad Nacional Arturo Jauretche.
- Jellinek, G. (2017). *Teoría general del Estado*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Jessop, B. (2021). *El Estado: pasado, presente y futuro* (J. Monedero, Ed.). Libros de la Catarata.
- Kahneman, D. (2016). Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *The American Economic Review*, 93(5), 1449–1475. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282803322655392>
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (2012). Elecciones, valores y marcos. In *Pensar rápido, pensar despacio* (pp. 554–581). Random House Mondadori.
- Kaufman, B. E. (1999). Emotional arousal as a source of bounded rationality. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 38(2), 135–144. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681\(99\)00002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(99)00002-5)
- Khatri, N., & Ng, H. A. (2000). The role of intuition in strategic decision making. *Human Relations*, 53(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700531004>
- Koselleck, R. (2021). *El concepto de Estado y otros ensayos*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Lebow, R. (1987). A research agenda for peace and security studies. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 20, 252–257. <https://doi.org/10.2307/419163>
- Lykke Jr., A. F. (1989). Defining military strategy. *Military Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/23qswwnf>
- March, J., & Simon, H. (1961). *Teoría de la organización*. Ediciones Ariel.
- Martínez, M. (2015). *Epistemología y metodología cualitativa en las ciencias sociales*. Editorial Trillas. <https://doi.org/10.15658/CESMAG15.05060206>
- Mazzucato, M. (2021). *El Estado emprendedor*. RBA Libros.
- Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34(2), 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x10000968>
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (2013). *Safari a la estrategia*. Ediciones Granica.
- Musso, F., & Francioni, B. (2012). The influence of decision-maker characteristics on the international strategic decision-making process: An SME perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1002>
- Ostrom, E. (2015). *Comprender la diversidad institucional*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2013). *Comportamiento organizacional*. Pearson.

- Roth, A.-N. (2023). *Políticas públicas: Formulación, implementación y evaluación* (15th ed.). Ediciones Aurora.
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
- Simon, H. A. (1989). Los procesos racionales en las cuestiones sociales. In *Naturaleza y límites de la razón humana* (pp. 97–137). McGraw-Hill.
- Simon, H. A. (2011). *El comportamiento administrativo* (4th ed.). Errepar.
- Thaler, R., & Sunstein, C. (2018). *Un pequeño empujón*. Penguin Random House.
- Tirole, J. (2017). *La economía del bien común*. Penguin Random House.
- Wæver, O., & Buzan, B. (2018). After the return to theory: The past, present, and future of security studies. In A. Collins (Ed.), *Contemporary security studies* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hepl/9780198804109.003.0028>