



Geopolitics and Strategic Importance of Mountainous Regions: An Analytical Approach in the Context of International Relations, Security, and Military Strategy

Ayten Heydarli ✉ 

Department of Political Science and International Relations, Western Caspian University, Baku, Azerbaijan

Abstract. Geographical elements have long been considered among the most important factors influencing state strategy in international relations. But it is important to note that mountainous regions have mostly been described as either geographical barriers or regions that are difficult to traverse during military campaigns. In this paper, we present a fresh outlook on mountainous regions by examining them not just as passive geographical elements but also as active geostrategic elements that influence the state's security policy and military-strategic position. The research finds new conceptual frameworks, such as "vertical sovereignty," the "mountain security paradox," and "space-time strategic asymmetry." We also use historical-analytical, theoretical-conceptual, comparative-analytical, and empirical methods; the research shows that mountainous regions are not merely defensive lines but essential components of strategic resilience and asymmetric power balance in modern international relations.

Keywords: mountainous areas, geopolitics, security, military strategy, international relations

Received: 07.05.2026 **Accepted:** 16.06.2026 **Published:** 23.06.2026

<https://doi.org/10.54414/PCYB6294>

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee: The Research Journal of Mountains: Biodiversity, Landscapes and Cultures, Western Caspian University, Baku, Azerbaijan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Spatial factors have long been regarded as one of the principal determinants shaping state behaviour in international relations. Traditional schools of geopolitics have primarily focused on maritime access, plains, and transportation infrastructure as the main sources of state power, while comparatively little attention has been paid to mountainous regions. Mountains have been largely depicted in the existing body of literature as either a natural boundary of states or as a geographical feature that hinders military movements (Mackinder, 1904; Ratzel, 1897).

Recent studies have increasingly approached this issue from a broader geostrategic perspective. This study argues that, within the contemporary international security environment, mountainous regions perform a far more complex and strategic role than has traditionally been assumed. The paper contends that mountainous regions should not be treated as passive geographical entities but as active geostrategic spaces that impact the state's security system and strategic actions. Mountains are not only used as a platform for defense or operational action but also as a determinant that fundamentally shapes a state's sovereignty, strategic security concerns, and even temporal planning (Kaplan, 2012; Dalby, 2002).

Geography is one of the most important factors that continues to influence the actions of states in international relations. More specifically, mountainous border areas create a specific environment that directly impacts the security and military plans of states. In addition to their role as barriers, mountains are important determinants of political-strategic decisions. High-altitude terrain and mountain passes provide



significant strategic advantages by strengthening defensive positions while, in some cases, limiting effective state control and creating opportunities for non-state actors.

The conduct of military activities in mountainous areas is associated with considerable logistical and strategic challenges. Strategic issues such as time management, logistics, and relations with the local population become important in mountainous areas. In a broader context, mountains can affect the balance of power in a region and the allocation of strategic advantage. The strategic and geostrategic significance of mountainous areas has increased in modern conflict, thus emphasizing the need to assess mountainous areas not only as geographical features but also as essential components of complex security and military strategy frameworks.

2. Mountainous Areas as Geostrategic Spaces

Previous studies suggest that in geostrategic concepts, space is not only a territory on the map but a social and strategic construct in which the relationship of power is created (Agnew, 2003). Compared with plains, mountainous regions are characterized by a more complex manifestation of state sovereignty. While the border on the plain is considered a horizontal line, sovereignty in mountainous regions has a vertical aspect. In this regard, the concept of “vertical sovereignty” can be introduced (Haggett, 2001). Vertical sovereignty is the focus of the state not only on its land territory but also on highlands, passes, and control points.

Mountains both shield and endanger the state. This can be explained by the “mountain security paradox,” whereby mountains are a positive factor in defense, but they are a negative factor in the control of peripheral regions by the central authority (Brunet-Jailly, 2012). In addition, mountainous regions influence the diplomatic and strategic actions of states, especially in border areas. For instance, in the South Caucasus, mountainous borders have had a considerable impact on the security and military strategies of Armenia and Azerbaijan (Cornell, 2001). Therefore, mountains have both geographic and diplomatic-strategic importance.

Mountains are not only physical barriers but also geostrategic spaces that influence state decision-making. The concept of *vertical sovereignty* emphasizes that states must exercise effective control not only over territorial boundaries but also over highlands, mountain passes, and other strategic elevations. Although mountains strengthen state borders, they may simultaneously reduce central authority over peripheral areas, creating a security paradox that requires comprehensive long-term strategic planning. Mountain passes and mountainous areas enhance diplomatic flexibility. Mountainous regions also need a special mechanism to monitor and control the actions of non-state actors. Mountains are also responsible for shaping the security culture of a state. Military activities and defense strategies in mountainous regions require longer-term planning. Border posts and strategic sites in highlands improve a state's influence in the region. Mountainous regions face geographical obstacles that increase logistical difficulties, which require modifications in military strategy. Each peak and pass is a strategic location for both offense and defense.

Because of these features, mountain ranges are very important areas from the perspective of international security. They also represent geostrategic balancing elements that determine the state's diplomatic and military strategies. The strategic importance of mountainous areas differs from one region to another, but they always affect the balance of power and defense. The control of these areas is maintained not only by military means but also by relations with the local population and social policies, forcing states to build their strategies on both military and social foundations. Mountain ranges increase the possibilities of asymmetric power in border conflicts. Military activities in mountainous areas are often extended over time, which accelerates resource depletion. These areas are usually considered the standards for both the state's defense policy and strategic resilience in international relations. Additionally, mountainous areas represent complex geostrategic factors influencing both state security and military strategy.



3. Strategic Significance of Mountainous Areas and State Power

Mountainous regions expand the notion of state power beyond the traditional boundaries of measurement. Although power in the plains is essentially grounded in speed, technology, and mass maneuvers, in mountainous regions, it is based on endurance, control, and the time factor (Van Evera, 1999). Mountain ranges are strategic buffer zones that prevent attacks while at the same time extending conflicts and draining the resources of the enemy. This particular feature of mountain ranges turns them into instruments of asymmetric power, thereby changing the principles of balance in international relations

Mountain passes and high ground in mountainous terrain increase the strategic strength of a state. For instance, the border disputes between China and India in the Himalayan region are directly affected by the mountainous terrain, thereby having a profound effect on the military strategy of both countries (Kaplan, 2010).

Mountains upset traditional concepts of state power and require new strategic challenges. Unlike the plains, in mountainous areas, military superiority is not just a matter of numbers and technology. Endurance, positional advantage, and time management are the decisive factors. Mountainous areas are strategic buffers that prevent attacks and wars. This allows states to create asymmetric strategies, as war exhausts the enemy's resources and gives a temporal advantage to the defenders. Highlands and mountain passes are areas that easily allow the creation of strategic positions, which are advantageous for both offense and defense. Mountains are not just geographical obstacles but geostrategic tools that increase the state's power and influence. Asymmetric offensive and defensive strategies are more easily implemented in mountainous areas. Military logistics and resource transportation are more complicated in these areas, requiring strategic thinking. States need to optimally use both technological and human resources. Strategic passes in mountainous areas are of great importance in regional and international politics and are important factors in border conflict analysis.

The mountainous environment is a complex space that combines defense and diplomacy strategies. Relations with local populations and social policies are taken into account in strategic planning. Mountainous regions are also crucial for the preservation of international security balance. Each mountain and pass is an additional factor that enhances the strategic superiority of the state. Therefore, mountains are not only geographical features but geostrategic spaces that reshape the scale and character of state power.

4. Security Challenges in Mountainous Areas

The mountainous terrain is conducive to non-state actors because of the lack of state control (Fearon & Laitin, 2003). This offers strategic advantages to separatist movements, armed groups, and terrorist outfits. Security in mountainous terrain is a complex phenomenon that involves military, social, and economic considerations. Logistics, communication, and local population relations are essential for security. Therefore, the definition of security in mountainous terrain is much more complex than mere defense. Mountains are often corridors where the state has limited control, and non-state actors, including separatists and armed groups, enjoy greater flexibility. Topography makes military planning difficult, and dominance is not solely dependent on technology and numbers; time and position management are critical.

Security is not only dependent on military factors but also on social and economic elements. Interaction with the local population, winning their loyalty, and support are fundamental determinants. Mountainous terrain logistics and supply chains are major security challenges. Every mountain and narrow pass is of prime importance to security. Countries are forced to develop sophisticated intelligence and information networks. Air transport and drones provide novel security features, but their efficiency is not possible in mountainous regions. Mountain passes along the borders in mountainous regions are of prime significance for both legal and illegal purposes. The location of non-state actors can weaken a state's defensive position, leading to the formation of new security structures. Surveillance systems need to be strengthened to avoid



any incidents. Although new technology provides military superiority, its efficiency in mountainous regions is still limited. Therefore, asymmetric security policies are adopted. Mountains are a source of strength for defense but limit the control of the state, leading to a paradox that requires long-term strategic planning.

Strategic locations in mountains determine regional policies. Mountains are of prime importance in the global balance of power. Military missions in mountains are protracted, and resources are depleted quickly, compelling states to formulate contingency plans. Security is maintained not only by military power but also by diplomatic and economic policies. The complexity of border conflicts heightens security threats. Local population intelligence and cooperation are crucial for mission success. Mountainous region infrastructure protection is a vital security component. Every mountainous location offers strategic superiority for defense and offense. Non-state actors' locations may be military and political challenges for states. Mountainous regions also include humanitarian and environmental issues that influence security. States must formulate comprehensive security policies, taking into account these considerations. Integrating military technology with local knowledge multiplies strategic superiority. Security policies in mountainous regions must be dynamic and flexible. Military, police, and intelligence agencies must coordinate to control borders. Non-state actors' behavior is a crucial indicator in security analysis. Military missions are inherently unpredictable and demand innovative tactical solutions. Spatial and temporal considerations are vital in planning military missions. Mountain passes are both a source of threats and opportunities. States should build infrastructure in mountainous areas. Intelligence and information are key to success in operations, and the movement of non-state actors increases security threats. Operational plans must incorporate both short-term and long-term goals. Technological and strategic advancements are essential for security. The mountainous terrain enhances the strategic power of a state, utilizing both human resources and local knowledge as strategic instruments. Security can be guaranteed by both state and regional/international efforts. Asymmetric security strategies are successfully applied in modern-day scenarios. Military and security planning in mountainous areas should be multidisciplinary, incorporating geostrategic and local social aspects into decision-making.

5. Military Strategy in Mountainous Regions: Space-Time Asymmetry

The hallmark of mountain warfare is the space-time asymmetry in military strategy. Mountain warfare involves protracted time periods and positional defense, which are not beneficial in plain warfare but are instead crucial in mountain warfare (Boot, 2002). Mountain warfare military strategy is not only about passive defense but also facilitates active defense and asymmetric offensive attacks. This aspect calls for a paradigm shift in the importance of technology in modern warfare. Advanced technology may not produce the desired results in mountain warfare, thus challenging traditional notions of military dominance (Echevarria, 2007).

Mountain warfare does not involve swift attacks; instead, it involves long-term positional dominance. Mountain warfare restricts the speed of combat and combat maneuverability. The space-time asymmetry in mountain warfare is a critical factor in operational strategy. Every hill is of immense strategic and surveillance importance, and mountain passes change offensive and defensive strategies. Resource deployment in mountainous regions involves protracted periods, making it difficult to plan operations. Weather and terrain often affect the pace of combat. Technological application could be less effective, and experience is essential. Asymmetric attacks and guerrilla tactics are more successful in mountainous terrain. Defensive positions must be extensive and strong, and military command must display flexibility in decision-making. The strategic value of heights must be taken into account in long-term planning. Military bases in mountainous regions are essential, and intelligence and information gathering are vital for success.

The mountainous terrain limits the use of modern technology, thus underlining the need for local knowledge. Logistics play a crucial role in sustaining a strategic advantage, and resource constraints may impair the sustainability of operations. Defense strategies must factor in possible asymmetric strikes. High



ground is vital for both offense and defense. Mountainous terrain operations are protracted, offering a temporal advantage to the defender, and the attacker must factor in resource exhaustion. Border posts are of strategic value, and aerial reconnaissance, including drones, helps in operational planning. To succeed, operations must be coordinated not only among the military but also among the local population. Tactical intentions can fluctuate rapidly, and the attacker may need a long time to cover short distances.

Position control needs both physical presence and intelligence gathering. The imbalance between offense and defense directly affects battle results. Defense tactics need to achieve a balance between strength and mobility. Loss of position in mountainous terrain is a strategic setback. Operational planning needs to take into account the constantly changing air and ground conditions. Mountainous terrain is conducive to asymmetric operations, where small forces can achieve a big advantage. Long-term defense in such regions increases state resilience. Space and time asymmetry is a strategic advantage for both offense and defense. Military strategy in mountainous terrain needs a multidisciplinary approach.

6. Consequences of the Mountain Factor in Regional Settings

The geostrategic significance of mountains differs in various settings:

- Caucasus region: Mountains accentuate ethnic and political divisions, leading to prolonged border conflicts (Cornell, 2001).
- Himalayan region: In the India-China-Pakistan setting, mountains facilitate prolonged strategic confrontations (Kaplan, 2010).
- Afghanistan: Mountains have turned into strategic traps for great powers (Grau, 2006).
- Andes and South America: Mountains restrict state power and improve the status of non-state actors.

These examples illustrate that mountainous regions are not only local factors but also global geostrategic variables that directly affect the international security system. Mountains are strategic and geostrategic factors in regional politics. In the Caucasus, mountains directly affect state security policies, extend border conflicts, and restrict diplomatic possibilities. Strategic passes and mountainous terrain offer strategic advantages, as in the Armenia-Azerbaijan border conflict. In the Himalayas, mountainous terrain in the China-India border area provides a strategic opportunity for long-term confrontation, with military presence and mountainous terrain offering a great advantage. Mountainous terrain extends conflicts. In Afghanistan, mountains have become strategic traps for international powers, necessitating complex long-term strategies. Mountains make non-state actors strong and reduce state power. In the Andes, local factors and terrain shape the security balance. Mountains are not only physical obstacles but also regional factors of influence and power. Military, diplomatic, and economic factors are closely interwoven in the strategic planning of mountainous regions. In the Himalayan and Afghan regions, mountains impede operational speed and efficiency, whereas in the Caucasus region, mountains directly influence the balance of interstate power. Mountains influence both defense strategy and international relations in a regional setting. Mountains are vital for states to gain strategic superiority and improve diplomatic flexibility. Hence, mountainous regions are identified as crucial strategic and geostrategic factors, rather than simple geographical features.

7. Conclusion

Mountainous regions are not secondary geographical features in international relations. They are fundamental geostrategic regions that define a state's security culture, military strategy, and sovereignty concept. Mountains change not only the size but also the character of power in the modern international system.



The geopolitical and strategic study of mountainous regions provides new perspectives on international relations theory and alternative approaches in security studies (Kaplan, 2012; Van Evera, 1999). Mountains cannot be considered secondary geographical features; they have a vital role in defining security and military strategies. The mountainous environment changes defense and attack capabilities, which demand strategies based on time and space management. The idea of vertical sovereignty is vital to ensure state control in mountainous areas. Mountains enhance or constrain diplomatic capabilities, forcing states to adopt long-term strategies and asymmetric approaches. They extend border disputes and change the power balance in the regions. In regions like the Caucasus, Himalayas, and Afghanistan, the role of mountains shapes the future of conflicts. Mountains offer ideal conditions to non-state actors and are difficult to control by states, and hence, a complete security strategy is required. Every mountain and pass offers an advantage.

Conducting military operations in mountains is more complex than in other regions. Weather and terrain conditions impact the success of operations, and logistics and resource mobilization are big challenges. Asymmetric attacks are more effective in mountainous areas. The defense lines have to be long and strong. The mountainous terrain forces states to take a multidisciplinary approach to military planning. Security is not only ensured by military means but also by diplomatic, economic, and social instruments. Interaction with the local population is an essential part of planning. Passes are sources of threats as well as opportunities. Intelligence and reconnaissance missions offer a critical advantage. The mountain terrain demands perfect synchronization of military resources, technology, and human capabilities. Operations may be extended, and resource depletion may be hastened, necessitating the need for contingency planning. Mountains provide a balance between offense and defense from a strategic perspective. Dominating and securing mountain heights provides long-term strategic sustainability. Border disputes in mountainous regions provide an integration of diplomatic and military strategies. Decision-making is complex and multi-dimensional. Strategic security planning needs to take into account local, regional, and global considerations. The mountainous terrain requires the application of asymmetric power, which enhances the strategic position of a state. Military superiority is not only measured in terms of quantity and quality but also in terms of time and space superiority. Long-term operational planning in mountainous terrain needs to take into account military, diplomatic, and social factors. Strategic decision-making includes both defensive and offensive intentions.

Mountain heights and passes are of prime strategic importance. Mountainous terrain requires a paradigm shift in military and strategic planning, which emphasizes flexibility and agility. These areas shape the power dynamic in international relations. Mountains raise the level of complexity of regional conflicts. Security policies need to be flexible and adaptive. Mountains are essential parameters for strategic planning. They pose challenges and opportunities for non-state actors. Countries need to develop long-term strategies to secure borders and strategic locations. Military dominance in mountains is both offensive and defensive. Mountainous regions have a direct impact on international policy and politics. It requires multidisciplinary and quick decision-making. The mountainous environment reshapes the scale and character of state power. Therefore, mountainous regions in international relations need to be defined not only as geographical but also as strategic, military, and geostrategic factors.

References

1. Agnew, J. A. (2003). *Geopolitics: Re-visioning world politics*. Psychology press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2647591>
2. Boot, M. (2002). *The savage wars of peace: Small wars and the rise of American power*. Basic Books (AZ).
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3093332>
3. Brunet-Jailly, E. (Ed.). (2012). *Borderlands: Comparing border security in North America and Europe*. Routledge.
4. Cornell, S. E. (2001). Small nations and great powers. *Journal of Energy Literature*, 7, 76-76.



- <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203988879>
5. Dalby, S. (2002). *Environmental security*. University of Minnesota Press
 6. Echevarria II, A. J., & Echevarria, A. J. (2007). *Clausewitz and contemporary war*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199231911.001.0001>
 7. Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. *American political science review*, 97(1), 75-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055403000534>
 8. Grau, L. W. (2006). *The bear went over the mountain: Soviet combat tactics in Afghanistan*. Foreign Military Studies Office.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/120707>
 9. Haggett, P. (2001). *Geography: a global synthesis*. Pearson Education.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/eg.303.0283a>
 10. Kaplan, R. D., & Pruden, J. (2010). *Monsoon: The Indian Ocean and the future of American power*. New York: Random House.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2012.01575.x>
 11. Kaplan, Robert D. 2012. *The Revenge of Geography*. New York: Random House.
 12. Kalyvas, S. N. (2006). *The logic of violence in civil war*. Cambridge University Press.
 13. Mackinder, H. J. (1904). The geographical pivot of history. Royal Geographical Society.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1775498>
 14. Ratzel, F. (1897). *Politische geographie*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
 15. Rossos, A. (2013). *Macedonia and the Macedonians: a history*. Hoover Institution Press.
 16. Van Evera, S. (1999). *Causes of war: Power and the roots of conflict*. Cornell University Press.