



IRANIAN NATIONAL SECURITY FROM A STRUCTURAL POINT OF VIEW

Ebrahim ABDOLI AMNADI

Department of Management, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.

ABSTRACT

Security is one of the key concepts in the field of International Relations. This article in National Security Studies scholars examine the constructivist school. Constructivism as a method to the study of international politics is named. Many theorists of international issues, the approach to the structure of the language, postmodern political theory, critical theory, literary criticism, cultural studies and media are known. The traditional conception of national security includes all the threats which endangered national security or national unit puts foreign origin and nature of the military. Unlike traditional security concept, the new harvest, the main aspect to be dealt with, the internal aspects of security and civilian attitudes (more economical) to security. It seems that these two dimensions are increasingly in place will achieve excellence in domestic and international political processes. In the coming years, highlighting their role and the role of foreign and military factors will fade. The first study to examine issues related to the theory of constructivism and discussed the concept of national security and in the end the role of the theory of constructivism and Security of the Islamic Republic been paid.

Keywords: Security, National, Structural Point

INTRODUCTION

The concept of national security has multiple fundamentals. Thus various definitions have been given for it. The general category of security can be referred to as the feeling of freedom and escape of fear or "sense of safety" which refers to physical and psychological security, and causes the independence of the vote of a nation and government and the ability to deal with the interference of foreigners and foreign forces in the domestic affairs. (Barentt, 1999)

Arnold Wolfers, in his classic analysis of the notion of national security, tells that national security is based on the idea of national interests and in principle, indicates a shift in attention from welfare to security in the field of national interests. he says: "A nation has the degree of security that if it wants to avoid war, this will not cause the expense of defeating its fundamental values, and if it is engaged in a war, it will be able to preserve the values by success in that war. "(Carlsnaes, 1992)

From this point of view, by a hardware interpreting of national security, first, foreign threats are seen as more prior and more important than internal threats. Second, the international system, in this view, has more power over the country's security than the domestic environment. Thirdly, this approach with a diminishing and partial view, defines security in the frame of the national boundaries. (Henning, 1999)

In the new definition of national security, considering the changes that have taken place in the domestic and international environment and the challenges posed by globalization, localization and internationalization of issues such as AIDS, drugs, the environment, economic recession, the

advent of the atomic bomb, and etc., has been adjusted the concept of national security and reviews it by the software view. As a result of that, national security in addition to examining the threat, the use and control of the military includes prioritizing the environmental, economic, political and cultural threats. Some of these threats, unlike in the past, get ambiguous in form and nature and also by the appearance of interdependence and the growing interconnectedness of nations, security threats gain a global form and nature. Therefore, according to this approach, firstly, military threats will lose their priority and importance and secondly, the impact of the domestic environment on the international environment at least will be balanced. Thirdly, this approach considers the realm and area in a comprehensive view, so the threats are presented in both internally and internationally format. (Moshirzadeh. 2010)

CONTEXT:

Since the beginning of human life, the issue of security has always been one of the most important goals of societies and political systems. The history of the emergence of the concept of security until the seventeenth century and the beginning of a new mode of the governance in the form of Independent nation-states. But the beginning of the scientific study of this concept should be sought in the years after the First and Second World Wars (Valipour Zorumi, 2004).

With the victory of the Islamic Revolution and formation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, security considerations have changed dramatically. In the new system, different definitions of man, state, and international system were presented that were completely different from the past. Accordingly, the security foundations of the country have undergone a lot of transformation. As such, it can be said that the Islamic Republic of Iran's national security is the establishment of order and stability, which requires a lack of fear and threat to the preservation of territorial integrity, the maintenance of the system and its dependent currency, the preservation of citizenship rights and the maintenance of rational relations with the world, in order to secure and ensure sustainable development of Iran (Hormozi, 2006).

Structuralism is positioned in the "middle" of the naturalistic, positivist, and post-structuralists in terms of meta-analysis. From the point of discussing about the content topics of international relations in the "middle", this theory is divided into two main sections: realism and liberalism. This theory focuses on the content issues of international relations in the "middle" of the two main sectors, namely, realism and liberalism. Structuralists believe their approach can be a kind of moderate solution that takes on some of the features of global politics that play a pivotal role in neo-realism and neoliberalism, and form rationalism with each other. The reactionary approach consider the actors' actions and identities, and therefore structuralism is also worth paying attention to. Three of the main supporters of this view are Kratochwil, Onuf and Wendt (Biylis and Smith, 2004).

Structural security studies in international relations begin their work with the rationalist conception critique of neo-neoliberals and neoliberals. The notion of constructive thinkers is that the decisions and positions of the actors are based on an understanding that gain while engaging with others. According to Nicolas Onuf, the ahead world is a global world that we build, not that has own irreplaceable rules. We are the ones who control the world. (Onuf, 1998) The assumptions of constructive infrastructure make it different from global politics. Since structures and actors are formed interrelated, the behavior of the state is unpredictable in the face of a different distribution of power or anarchy. The beforehand use of an asset to the



government is unreliable, because the actors have multiple identities and these identities represent different interests. Since both material power and discourse, regular behavior over time will be a result of material and economic power, which will be coordinated with the structures of ideology, social procedures, institutional norms and interstellar networks (Hopf, 1998: 199).

Structuralists believe that as an architecture without a set of norms and procedures does not matter, anarchy is meaningless as the main structural component of the mainstream of international relations. In the absence of a set of meaningful norms and actions, neither anarchy nor the distribution of abilities cannot make states form the structure of an international social system (Hopf, 1998: 200).

Finally, it can be stated that the structuralist approach to security studies faces two methodological problems: one is the proof of the ontology of norms, and the other showing the effect of norms on behavioral outcomes. The first problem arises from the ontologically status that structuralists face in unobservable objects. The structuralists consider the norms as visible. Social actions and practices may be seen directly, but common beliefs that involve it are not visible. So, how can we know that these common beliefs exist? According to Farrell, structuralism faces two dilemmas: one is the lack of war between liberal democracies and the other, the pattern of the development of the global system. The norms of reconciliation and the cooperation of liberal democracies hinder conflicts of interest and violent encounters. Of course, liberal institutions and principles are important here too, as these principles are the same (Farrell, 2002: 80).

CONCLUSION:

A definite definition of security and the conceptualization of national security in the Islamic Republic of Iran has a particular importance, without regard for indigenous religious doctrines and cultures. In other words, a new narrative of the concept and components of security should be provided with a re-perspective of the Islamic heritage. And beyond that, the explanation of the conceptual boundaries of national security with other concepts, the identification of facilities and environmental constraints, and the achievement of the theoretical and practical aspects of effective and optimal national security should be considered in the ranks of the country's primary needs. Currently, Islamic Iran is undergoing a very sensitive period of political and economic development, and with its enormous revolution there have been widespread intellectual and theoretical challenges in the field of thought, conceptualization and theorizing in the fields of social and political sciences. It deserves the concept of security and how it relates to concepts; Such as justice, liberty, political participation, etc., based on rich Islamic culture. However, valuable research has been done in this regard; but national studies of the concept of national security continue to be inadequate and require extensive research. The emphasis of the Supreme Leader on national unity and national security as the biggest slogan of the current year is a good opportunity to mobilize national capabilities to address this issue. Although a number of factors can be raised about the concept of national security especially in the Islamic Republic of Iran, their explanation requires a thorough and comprehensive examination; but in summary, you can put three things:

A. *The ambiguity and spread of the concept of national security*



The new concept of national security, as compared with its classical and traditional concept, has become increasingly conceptualized. If in the classical sense of national security, the preservation of the borders of the country was considered by foreign forces and security was defined more precisely by the lack of it. At present, national security does not merely cover military territory; It also covers all political, economic, commercial, cultural, social and other areas. This has increased the variables involved in national security and the complexity of it, more and more. So that its understanding is largely due to the recognition of many concepts in other fields.

B. Conceptual weakness in other concepts

Since the concept of national security is meaningful in terms of concepts such as justice, liberty and political affiliation, the effects of the conceptual weakness of these concepts can also be found in the conception of the concept of national security. For example, in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the conceptual boundaries of national security with the concepts of political development and civil liberties have not been clearly and obviously defined. This has led political development to prevent the achievement of national security in some cases, or try to maintain order and security to make a limiting factor for political development. In this case, the consideration of any relationship between these concepts requires the study of their conceptual constraints and the elimination of the ambiguities as far as possible.

C. Perceptual and mental state of national security

Although the objective areas of national security are recognizable; But it also involves sensory, mental and perceptual. This state is often shaped by the experiences of the individual's life or a group of human beings. This attribute, which is to a certain extent caused the inconstancy, relativeity and fluidity of the conceptual boundaries of national security, is also probably the most important limitation factor in its conceptualization.

References

- Barentt, M. (1999). "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 5-39.
- Biyliis and Smith, (2004). *Theory of International Politics*, New York: Random House.
- Carlsnaes, W. (1992). "The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis", *International Studies Quarterly*, 36: 245-270.
- Farrel, T. (2002) "Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of Research Program" *International Studies Review*, 4, 1: 49-72.
- Henning, B. and ed. (1999). "Norms and Foreign Policy: Constructive Foreign Policy Theory", *International Politics*, 34.
- Hopf, T. (1998). "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, 23, 1: 171-200.
- Hormozi, (2006), "The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relation Theory", *International Organization*, Vol. 17, No. 9.



- Moshirzadeh, Homeira (2010), "Domestic Ideational Sources of Iran's Foreign Policy", Iranian Review of Foreign Affairs, No.1, Vol. 153-192.
- Onuf, N. (1998). "The New Culture of Security Studies", International Studies Review, 42, pp. 122-134.
- Ruggie, J.G. (1998). Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization. London & New York, Rutledge.
- Unut, Nicholas (1989). A World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Valipour Zorumi (2004). "The State as Person in International Theory", Review of International Studies, Vol. 30.

