

The Qualitative Relation between the Geographical Environment and the National Security

Hossein Asarian Nejad- Associate Professor, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran

Mohsen Rostami*- MA Student of Political Geography, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Leila Modabber- MA Student of Mmanagement, Police University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 23/03/2012

Accepted: 16/08/2013

Abstract

Understanding the security environment, as one of the issues of security geography, has attracted the attention of scientific and political circles. Since the main topic of geo-security, i.e. reviewing and studying the international relations and links among the security factors of environment on the local, national, regional and global scale, has a close similarity to the subjects being studied in the national security, particularly at national, regional and international levels. This has resulted in ambiguity regarding the essential reason of the two sciences of national security and geography and their relation with each other and the common and specific concepts and issues of these two among the students and researchers. The main question of the present paper is as follows: "what is the main reason for the similarity between geography and national security?" In addition to this question, there are other questions including:

A- What is the relation among geography, national security and geopolitics?

B- What are their specific and common concepts?

C- What are the methodological similarities and differences between these two sciences?

In the present paper, efforts have been made to answer the given questions through comparative method. Based on the achieved results, the main reason for the similarity between geography and national security is studying the key concept of country and government in both sciences. Among the present discussions in the protection geography of national security, the study of relations among the political units is more similar to the study of security. In terms of methodology, the concepts of "scale" and "analysis level" have the pivotal role in classifying the information, limitation and the range of variables. In terms of ideological schools and methodology, there are also some interesting similarities and differences among the two sciences which will be discussed in this paper.

Keywords: Security geography, National security, Security environment, Geopolitics, Country, Analysis level.

* E-mail: mohsen13621340@yahoo.com

Introduction

Development of the human science guarantees more awareness of the relation among the elements of any totality of the science within itself and also its place and relation with other neighboring sciences.

Taking a look at the perception process, it becomes evident that human can have an appropriate perception of a science branch when he can find its place and relation with at least its neighboring sciences if not in all sciences.

The two sciences of geography and national security are among the majors with common and sometimes blurred boundaries and other branches of political sciences. With regard to the young age of both sciences compared to the politics of marking the boundaries and their places and the relation between their concepts and methods and the politics has a considerable effect on better understanding, learning, and perceiving the subjects, concepts and questions of these two sciences.

Concept of Security

The term of security includes all aspects of human life as a general concept and is interrelated to survival of body and preserve of life and human being.

In fact, security guarantees the survival of human and animate beings .

Space: is the spatial/ temporal volume of activities which human performs to dominate environment and to continue his survival; in other words, the socio-economic space which reflects the whole being of human societies(Eta'at & Moussavi, 2012: 70)

National power

Since wars are determinative in international relations and victories or failures set an index for power assessment, national power is historically intermixed with military capabilities. To assess the national power of a country, only one element may not be relied. (Mohammadian, Heidari & Gahlibaf, 2012: 82)

Methodology

The method of the present study is a descriptive-analytical one in which the

data have been gathered through statistical resources, books, essays and research reports.

Statement of the Problem

One of the interesting methods in clarifying and understanding the phenomena, is the process of comparison between these phenomena and subjects. Logically, a minimal commonality among the subjects being studied is the necessary condition for possibility of the comparison process (Naghizade, 2003). Comparison of the geo-security and national security is the result of common concepts and subjects and a very close similarity in the classification and arrangement of information in terms of methodology. Of course, there is very high similarity and relation between the national security and geopolitics as the subset of geography that it has been called national security geography (Broden & Sheli, 2005: 15). But, due to misunderstanding of security geography as an independent university major, the geography and national security are compared with each other in this paper.

For all individuals who have studied and researched these two scientific fields, dealing with common concepts and subjects is typical, however, understanding the classification and separation of the common and specific concepts of these two sciences would not be a simple task. While studying the literature of these two fields, the geographers and experts in the international relation face many concepts which are familiar to them. Obviously, there are strong links between the realistic and idealistic confrontation in the national security and there are some differences between the spatial multidimensionality and the human-centered approach in the geo-security. And as the pessimism of realistic approach reflects the deterministic links of threatenism, the optimism of the idealistic perspective is reflected in faith in fundamental peace and magnanimity of human security. These are explicitly expressed in most of the environmental institutionalism school. (Muir, 2000: 268)

The central concepts used in these two sciences do not have any specific

boundaries in terms of meaning and implication system or in terms of similarity and application, and in most cases they are interchangeably used without considering their differences. Meanwhile, we can refer to the concepts including security sociology, global security, national security system, global security system, international security system, regional security systems, securitization, local security, remaining securitized, country, national government, scale, analysis level, security policy, security environment, power security, economic security and cultural security.

Some fundamental questions regarding the relation, boundary, difference and commonality of these two sciences are expressed among their students and researchers, some of which include:

- 1- What is the boundary between these two sciences or the difference between geography and national security?
- 2- What are their common and specific concepts?
- 3- What is the relation among geography, national security and security environment?
- 4- What do the methodological concepts of "scale" and "analysis level" mean?

The main question

The main question is, in fact, the center of any survey. Raising the main question would result in a focus on the research process and appropriate organization of the research. Our main question in the present survey is as follows: what is the main reason for the similarity and closeness of geography and national security? Which factor, concept or subject has resulted in ambiguity of boundaries in these two sciences? Does this similarity result from the subject, methodology, concepts or ideologies? Ultimately, does the similarity of these two sciences result from the university background and their evolutionary trend? The two last questions stem from the main question.

The central and peripheral hypotheses

Hypothesis is a possible answer to the central research questions. In order to answer the peripheral questions resulting from the central question, some peripheral hypotheses are formulated. Based on the previous statement, the research hypotheses include:

"The essential reason of security geography" is forming and developing a model for protecting "a modern government" as a country. Geography and national security use the two models of "methodology" "scale" and "analysis level" for study and research, respectively. Some present ideologies in these two sciences are similar to each other. With regard to the pivotal concept of "the nation-based government" as a country, which is the main topic of study in these two sciences, some common subjects, as well as the specific ones, are being studied in these two sciences.

Research method

It is necessary to mention that research method of this survey is comparative, analytic and descriptive, and the experimental method can also be added to them.

Research literature of developing the security geography

Emergence of security geography as a university major is a 20th century phenomenon. However, it seems that the thinkers and authors have talked and written on these sciences from long time ago without referring directly to the titles of these sciences in their ideas and articles.

With regard to the writings of Herodotus, Haner, Mc Yovel, Hegel, Agustin and Thomas Dakin, it can be implied that these authors have written their environmental-security observations without being aware of such independent branch under the name of geographical and human fundamentals (Mirheidar, 2001: 5). Gradually, as the territorial government system resulting from the Westphalia contract (1648) the national government system resulting from the France revolution became globalized, the great German geographer, Fredrick Rutzel officially introduced the geography with this policy-based branch as a university major all over the

world. In his speeches at university, he tried to introduce the geography as a scientific major resulting from the national security. He claimed a set of theoretical rules. His university speeches were followed by his substitutes and the chair of national security environment were institutionalized in universities. (Lakust & Jiblen, 1989)

Emergence of security geography in Germany, which gained unity and solidarity later than the Western Europe countries and concerned the German thinkers and connoisseurs at least for a decade, directed the theories and thoughts which were formulated in order to improve the national security, expansionism, war and global dominance. Later, development of this knowledge yielded a considerable influence.

From realism perspective, the political geography is scientifically different from the modern security geography. In past times, it was inferred from the relation between geography and security that the natural geography, as a source, has a key role in forming different social, cultural and political national security systems. In other words, the geographical determinism attitude dominated the studies of this branch. But, nowadays, the security geography as the science of studying the place is taken into consideration together with all the human, natural, cultural, political and economic features on different scales. The concept of place is more than a geographical position on the map (Muir, 2000). Place is a domain on local, national, regional and international scales and is the result of interaction between human and his surrounding environment in gaining the sense of security and peace. With regard to what was mentioned above, the security geography can be defined as the state of organizing an environmental security into one or several layers and certain area as one of the elements of institution or system.

On the other hand, with regard to the difference between the security geography and the security of geographical environment, and their high applications which are often wrong and used interchangeably, it would be desirable to obviate the present ambiguities as well as stating a brief history of these two sciences.

What is stated under the name of security geography or the relation between security and environment since the ancient Greece is indeed the same concept as geo-security. Of course, there is no consensus among the experts on who invented the concept of security geography for the first time. Moyer has regarded Alfred Mahan as the father of security geography (Muir, 2000: 365). Mojtahedzade has named Alexi Dotokwil, the 19th century French sociologist as the inventor of this concept (Mojtahedzade, 2002: 134). Thus, in most articles, Fredric Rutzel has been referred to as the creator of the security environment science and it seems that what he meant by geo-security is the same as the security environment of human, however, Rudolf Kjellen has been introduced as the inventor of this concept.

During the 20th century, security geography has passed difficult periods. Based on the Agino & Dolbi classification, the time period since the emergence of this science till the end of Second World War can be called contractive security (environmental determinism), i.e. geography as an independent variable formed a tough security. This period has been named as the compulsory security era. Since 1945 till 1991 was called the threat-centered security era of the cold war. At this time, the security geography was inactive and silent at universities, but it was still applied by the powerful global decision-makers at international stage.

Inactivity of geopolitics during the mid-years in the second half of the 20th century which was the result of parallelism the security geography with the compulsory security approach and Germany Monopolism lead to the activation of security geography science during 1950s and 1960s. Emphasizing on the concept of security environment, the American Geographer Richard Hartson tried to separate the fate of security geography from geopolitics (as a rejected and war-seeking science) according to the perspective of realism. What Hartson meant by the security geography was revival of the human geography tradition and the institutionalism school and the emphasis on the importance of national security (country) was regarded as the most central place-centered scale in the geo-security studies. While, the subject of geopolitics is studying the international relations and links

among the spaces on local, national, regional or international scales. The security geography which was introduced by Hartson focused on the study of national security interconnections of political, economic, cultural and social areas inside and outside the boundaries of country as the highest organization unit of political geography. Hartson exerted all his efforts to depoliticize the political geography and the result was emergence of a neutral political geography which justified the existing situation.

In those years, the American idealist geographer Isa Bauman distinguished the geopolitics from security geography and introduces it as a forged science. Some of the geographers like Alexander believed that all the valuable geopolitical cases can be found in the geo-security. In this respect, Pandez believed that geopolitics is the same as global viewpoints of geo-security.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, as the result of political, social, international changes including the emergence of new players at the international security stage, the independence-seeker councils in the third world countries, outbreak of middle east war and emergence university student's movement in Paris (1968), the increasing gap between North and South and development of decolonization trend, the security geography and some elements of geopolitics entered the field of university studies. Meanwhile, Cohen's efforts were very effective. At the national security stage, the use of security geography by American secretary of state Henri Kissinger made this word famous. According to Kissinger, the concept of geo-security, not the traditional meaning, was considered equal to the realistic security policy.

The 1980s should be regarded as the scientific prosperity of security geography. This prosperity occurred in different courses.

- Human-centered geo-security: this branch was introduced under the influence of Neo-narcissism together with the works and theories of some geographers including David Harvey, Peter Taylor and Edward Suja. According to these experts, the security geography should focus on the social and economic needs in its analyses.

- Critical security environment: this branch was introduced under the influence of the critical theory in the national security in the wake of criticizing the positivist approach. In the recent years, after some ups and downs and providing different definition, this branch has focused on the global security issues, particularly in the environmental field.

- Post-modern security geography: some experts in the field of security environment have questioned the philosophical basis of Mackinder (traditional) geography and put their faith in realism. In post-realism, the reality has lost its reference as an independent phenomenon outside the mind and is recognized as a variable dependent on the human's mentality through mind and educational system and under the influence of the previous science.

Emergence of national security as a university major is an early 20th century phenomenon just like the geo-security. But this does not mean that no article has been written and nothing has been said regarding the subjects of this scientific branch. In the articles remained from Agustin, Mc yovel, Biken, Habez, Roso, Grotius, Cant, Hegel and Marx, some topic which are nowadays considered in the field of national security are discussed as the political sciences. In the past, the relevant texts were summarized among the political units at the level of governors and authorities, and at the level of political units in the framework of political-military civilizations.

The necessity of negating the threat as the territorial government after the Westphalia contract (1648), its continuance during the 17th and 18th centuries, the France revolution (1789) and introduction of the national security concept to the world which resulted in the establishment of national territorial government, gave a new form to the national security articles and papers which we can see its developed form today.

There is no consensus regarding the exact time of national security emergence as a university major. Some experts have considered this time to be after the First World War (Behzadi 1973, Rangar 2003, Seifzade 1989). For example, the establishment of Wilson chair in Abris Twis at Wills University has been regarded as the international environment security.

Some others refer its emergence as a university major to the post-second world war years. (Sarialghalam, 2001: 23)

However, apart from the extensive disagreements, the terrible massacres of dictatorial regimes resulted in new studies in order to prevent from resorting to violence and respect legally to human beings, which were cohesively introduced to the world after the Second World War. Unlike the security geography which is rooted among the unsatisfied nations from the international security system, the birth place of national security as a university major was in the Liberal countries which were among the democracy winners.

The common section and main topic of security geography studies and national security and international relations:

The country, as a geographical-political unit, is considered as the common section, center and the reference unit of security geography and national security studies. Country is referred to an environment which has certain interests in the international environment in terms of protection and is governed by a security source called government. Three factors of aspirations, objectives and interests of national security and secure survival and life is necessary for each country (Alibabayi, 2004). Thus, the country has close relation with the concept of security authority. Although the country includes the government and the government is part of the constructive factors of country, in most countries these concepts are used interchangeably in the texts related to security. This has led to difficulty in their precise and accurate understanding. In other words, part of this difficulty has been created as the result of inaccurate linguistic application and imprecise translation of Latin texts. From the perspective of semiology, the country and government are sometimes denotation and connotation of each other and sometimes are some denotations which have their own connotation.

Although the country is a key concept in the security geography and national security, any of these sciences consider this concept according to their own perspective and use it to clarify other phenomena and subjects.

A- The governmental boundaries in terms of security geography

The interests of national security are the best form of organizing the space and the security dimension. According to Moyer, the security interests of any country indicate the climax of political-geographical development (Muir, 2000: 83). The concept of governance, as a certain scale for space, is intertwined with the concept of boundary. Without the boundaries, there will be no governance. A territory should have national security and political boundaries so that the process of establishing territory as the basis of security geography would be completed and the integrity and dependence of the territory would be something more than land (the discussion regarding the land undermines the internal relation of government with the territory, since people do not live on water), but the range and depth of boundaries can be different. In today's modern world, the political boundaries are usually considered as some thin lines on the map in a way that the spatial expansion of any country is accurately determined. The government is complete up to the boundaries and then it is vanished. The assumption, according to which the precise boundaries are part of the nature of country, combines the historical features with the substantive ones. The boundaries have different types which are divided into political, military, security groups. Or they can be classified as visible, invisible, objective, subjective (perceptual) boundaries. Each of these boundaries has its own effect and separates the three pivots and the powers. The governments usually combine their subjective (perceptual) boundaries with the territorial ones and hence form their interests (Vant, 2005: 279). From the perspective of scale, the national government scale has been the most efficient scale in terms of management and analysis of political and international issues during the recent four centuries. But the national security interests have been important in the security geography. Other concepts and topics being discussed in this science including the needs of nation, national identity, national solidarity, patriotism, government, the surrounding center, political security, development of interests, protection of territorial integrity, prevention from the enemy's penetration, democracy and free election are defined in relation

to and comparison with the concept of country. According to Hartshorne, the concept of national security interests is the main concept and the basic discussion among other concepts and subjects being studied in the geo-security. (Mojtahedzade, 2002: 32)

In the wake of France revolution and introduction of the "nation" concept by the Europe to the world, a deep link was gradually formed between the nation and the country. As the result of their combination, the concept of national government was formed. Since at that time it was assumed that any nation should form and support its government inside its territorial boundaries, the words "nation" or "national" were considered as equal to the country or government, and the reforms in national and international security were the result of such inference. But in the world of realities, the boundaries of countries do not match the songs of a territory belonged to a nation. In other words, the concepts of nation and country are apart from each other and the term "national government" does not indicate a national government in a certain territorial framework. (Muir, 2000: 83 & Mirheidar, 2001: 131)

A nation is defined based on the culture, religion, language and nationality. On the other hand, country is a political unit. The national government or country is indeed the result of territorial and political merging of country and nation. Understanding the difference of nation and country is a critical issue in perception of most international conflicts.

B- Country from national security perspective

From the perspective of territorial government, the main topic and factor is the national security (Behzadi, 1973). So, three main subjects have been always taken into consideration in the national security: 1- government, country and its emergence course, 2- understanding the objectives and interests of national security of countries at the international stage, 3- analysis of the means of protecting the national interests and objectives.

The national security is considered as one of the main objectives of political regimes and societies. Establishment and maintenance of security

and then increase of solidarity and development of national interests have always been important for the political leaders and governors of countries. So, to fulfill this task it is necessary to take different measures. One of these measures is to detect the threats and factors of destroying security. Among the most important requirements of present conditions in the country, is realistic understanding of the society, changes, opportunities, capacities, national threats and the concerns which we face today. It is only through realistic understanding of the conditions that we can tactfully try to solve the problem of societies and use the opportunities to deepen the course of developing and supporting the national security of the country.

The national security is of paramount importance and has very complicated, widespread and various concepts. The national security is defined as society's protection against the damage to institutions and the fundamental values (Peterson, 1985: 57). In other definition, the security means protection of society and its internal values and institutions against the internal and external threats, or means some threats which interrupt the survival of citizenship systems and regimes and the social lifestyle and threaten their entities (Gharib, 1999: 102). Security is not the only objective of the national units. The countries pursue some other objectives along with their security goals. Among them is "the development-based objectives". Combination of the security objectives and the development-based goals forms the national objectives of a country (Alinaghi, 2002:319).

The national security dates back to the establishment of national governments in the 17th century (Haftendorn, 1991: 6). In a not faraway past, the traditional meaning of national security included gaining and maintaining the military power. In other words, accessing a higher military power was the dominant model of national security and the entity of the countries was supported by a strong army and superior military power. This concept gained more importance in the late 20th century due to the great political and social changes, in a way that along with the economic and international trade growth and also the progress in science and technology, the attitude of politicians towards the national security was changed, and in

addition to the military dimension, it included the economic, political and social ones. Based on this change, the national security of each country was fulfilled when it was superior in economic, political and social dimensions as well as having the military capabilities (Klans, 1971). On this account, "the power of a country to protect the internal values against the external threats" was set as the basis of national security definition (Basiri, 2001: 166). So, the national security is based on the disturbed international system rather than being affected by the internal affairs of country. This attitude toward the security was gradually changed. Along with the external threats, the internal sources of security gained particular importance in its different dimensions. According to most experts, some threats including the identity crisis, legitimacy crisis, poverty, deprivation, and social-economic inequalities, etc, are stated along with the military threats and are even considered more important (Ranjbar, 2002: 66). According to the article 176 of the Islamic Republic of Iran's constitution, the duties of supreme national security council include supporting the national interests and protecting the Islamic Revolution and the territorial integrity and the national governance, so the "supreme national security council" with headship of the president to perform the following tasks:

- Determining the military-security policies of country in the framework of general policies determined by the Supreme Leader;
- Coordinating the political, intelligence, social, cultural, and economic activities in relation to the general military-security tactics;
- Using the material and spiritual facilities of the country in order to confront the internal and external threats

So in most national security texts, the concept of government is used to indicate the player and main reference of national security. Of course, what is meant by government here is the general form of government's activities, not the cabinet. The government is the basis and criteria of theorizing in this scientific branch. In other words, the theory of national security which is based on the separation of internal and external environment and a government which has sovereignty is rooted in the concept of national

security interests. Other key concepts in this major including the national security, international security and the global security system are defined in relation to the concept of government.

The difference between security geography and national security regarding the concept of government has resulted in the emergence of two separate methods in classifying the information and analysis of data which is known as the analysis level in the national security and as scale in the security geography.

Through comparing the method of applying the concept of government in the geo-security and national security, it seems that the government is not only the sovereignty, but also a territory which has population together with the national sovereignty and its own society. In other words, the government in the international relations is the same as country in the geopolitics.

Comparison between the two methodological methods of geographical scale and analysis level in the security geography and national security

The two methodological methods of geographical scale and analysis level have considerable effect, whether explicit or implicit, on the attitudes, thoughts and analysis of phenomena, issues and realities in the security geography and national security. This is rooted in human's effort to understand the reality. In each scientific-research domain, it is necessary to select an appropriate methodology to collect, classify and analyze the information. The experts and thinkers in each domain refer to a particular orientation of the methodological discussions based on the requirement of the research subject and relying on their scientific records and experiences. Among the most important analysis criteria in the methodological discussions, we can refer to the geographical scale and analysis level in geo-security and national security, respectively.

A- Geographical scale

The concept of scale in geography has two meanings. The scale, in its first meaning, is a concept in cartography and map-reading sciences which

indicates the relation between the distance of two points on the map and their real distance on the ground (Encyclopedia of Gitashenasi, 1997). In this concept, the scale is represented in form of a fractional number with a division line according to the measurement units. They are known as fractional scale.

In the second concept, scale is a spatial and multidimensional unit which can be used in analysis of the geographical issues. In this concept, scale indicates the divisions of spatial units which are replete with interests, institutions and human societies. Each layer has its own specific coordinates and features in different political, economic, social and cultural areas. The concept of scale in security geography represents the organized national security interests in different dimensions and layers of that space. From this perspective, the security geography analysis and researches are conducted on local, national, regional and international scales. One of the new units for analyzing and collecting data in geo-security is the scale of security environment threats (Huntington, 1993). Of course, according to some other experts, the scale of threats is naturally considered as one of the forms of the environmental security organizations on local, regional and global scales (Agnew, 1998: 119-122). However, for each of the above four scales, there is a spatial security organization which is proportional to its protection and analysis level. Some of the examples include:

- 1- The scale of geographical and security division at the local level.
- 2- The scale of national environment threats.
- 3- The scale of national security objectives and interests.
- 4- The scale of protection and security against the threat.
- 5- The scale of security needs.
- 6- The scale of security institutionalization and organization.

In his book "Security Geography" (1985-1989), Peter Taylor has formally entered the concept of geographical scale to the security geography literature for the first time while trying to match the global security institutionalization theory of Valrashtein (1979) (Mirheidar, 1997). The concept of geographical scale is not apart from the needs, the performance

of human security and the social-political trends. Any geographical scale indicates a particular kind of activity, and at the same time, any institutionalized activity is performed in its particular scale. The human activities performed on different scales of ethnic and identity inclinations and conflicts, territorial dependence-seeking clashes, economic competitions, environmental issues, etc, have some dialectic effects on each other. So, some activities relevant to the scale of protecting the national security may have local effects. The term "think globally, act locally" is one of the dialectic processes. For example regarding the threats which are the result of globalization, the national and security interests at the local and global levels and the crisis management or protection of interests should be addressed (Johnson, Taylor & Warts, 2005).

With regard to the above statements, it was evident using the concept of geographical scale as a method in classifying different kinds of environmental security organization, the dimensions, space and activities of government, and the needs of power institutions and human has a significant role geo-security analyses and researches and it should be applied in any research and analysis of multidimensional activities of human and government institution in geography dimension and its scales and theories.

B- Analysis level

Application of analysis level is deeply rooted in the way we contemplate the reality. One of the most important orientations in the methodological discussions, particularly in the national security domain, is the analysis level. Analysis level means the level which makes us look at the issues from the perspective of a system or model. This model directs the recognition, description, analysis and finally interpretation of the human dominating the environment and also their results (Seifzade, 1999: 41). The experts believe that this effect influences the nature of environmental cognition. For example, if the analysis level of security environment is human-based, then the issues of national security domain should be looked upon from the perspective of individual reference, and the governments will seriously

become neo-liberal. Conversely, if the issues are interpreted from the perspective of global institutionalization reference, then the national governments and the structural decisions will be neglected and they will be regarded as a function of international global security necessities. Sometimes the mere emphasis on any of the analysis levels will bring lots of problems to the researcher and will reduce the scientific solidarity of the research subject. In order to avoid such difficulties, it is better to study the national security variables from different perspectives and dimensions and attend to all the three analysis levels (Ghavam, 2001: 14).

The discussions regarding the analysis level have influenced the conflicts and discussions relevant to the national security in more than three past decades (Buzan, 1994; Onuf, 1995). The discussion in this regard is not accepted by the public, but those theoreticians who are interested in the functionalist, hierarchical or systematic strategies, use this method in order to understand the realities, particularly the relations among the systems and their constructing units (Little, 2000: 69). According to some authors, human is the central analysis level (Allport, 1945: 43). From this perspective, other analysis levels including the government and region are the abstract layers. Any layer can be located within other layer. The reverse can also be true, i.e. any larger level can entail smaller layers.

The analysis levels do not have any innate value by themselves; rather, they only represent a particular model of the relations among the layers. The analysis levels are the epistemological references which indicate where the results and clarifications are placed; they are not the source of clarification by nature. (Little, 2000: 69)

In reviewing the national security domain, five common and known analysis levels in the researches are taken into consideration. From bottom to top or specific to general, these analysis levels include:

- 1- The most fundamental, human-based analysis level is present in the security sciences. The theories relevant to the decisions of idealistic security level are located at this layer.
- 2- The institution-based analysis level which is the distance between the

individual unit and the government unit, including the organized groups, political parties, lobbies, bureaucracy, etc.

3- The society, which means a solid community of the identities which consists of several groups of individuals and has sufficient unity and homogeneity. This community has dependence and decision-making power and is totally distinguishable.

4- The regional analysis level, which indicates the regional security models. The regional levels have territorial unity and homogeneity.

5- The global and international level is the highest and most abstract unit of security environment analysis, above which there is no other analysis level. The global system is more than its component units and is the result of interaction among the other four analysis levels. In terms of scale, nowadays the global security involves the entire world but in the past, this analysis level included separate and somehow irrelevant systems with different dimensions in terms of space and dimension.

Among these five analysis levels, Waltz believes the three analysis levels of human, institution, and world, and Singer assumes the two analysis levels of government and region to be of paramount importance in the national security theories and analyses. Some researchers like Hanrider believe that the analysis levels in the security environment totally include human, society and the government institution which are not completely separated and have some relations with each other.

The ideologies and methodologies of security geography:

1- The environmental determinism school

The emergence of security geography has a close relation to the determinism schools of Hatzel, Mc Yovel, Fredrick, and Rutzle. The environmental determinism as a school has two main origins in the threat geography. First is the dualism of the relation of human's need to security and negating the environmental threat in Mcyovel's ideas. The second origin is the ideas and opinions of Herbert Spenser, the result of which was the social Lamarckism and legitimizing the authority, imperialistic and

ambitious thoughts toward other nations.

The result of Habes' thoughts was the separation of the dominant and wise human as the known subject (sub) from the external world and the natural environment as recognition (obj). The geography, as the knowledge of understanding the relation of powerful human and the security environment, is defined according to this deduction. Through generalizing the ideas of Habes and Lamarck to the domain of power and its geography, it was assumed that the selection of governors is placed at a lower level than the requirements of natural geography (Moyer, 2000: 317). The elements of this school are indirectly taken into consideration by Aristotle and Montesquieu, but the German geographer Fredrick Rutzle introduced a scientific theory and based on that theory stated the theory of vital space. This theory was regarded as the basis of German geo-security school which later resulted in the Second World War. In fact, it can be stated that the security conditions of German which was the result of expansive weaknesses and limitations of its power, and also the opinions of the German philosopher, Hegel, has had a considerable effect on the development of this security school, which was fulfilled with emergence of Hitler.

In terms of methodology, the environmental determinism school has tried to introduce some general rules and causal and simple models for clarifying and predicting the multidimensional and multi-spatial trends. According to Rutzle, a potent government, as the highest organized security unit in the power space, needs multidimensional attention towards its environment in order to grow and develop just like a living thing. So in his opinion, the main stimulus for the governments' behaviors includes the inclination and need to protection of the territorial integrity, dependence, and development of national security interests. Rutzel has introduced this theory based on continuance (case studies) and the philosophical and analytical ideas.

2- School of possibilism and need obviation

The environmental determinism was seriously criticized in the third decade of 20th century. Giving their own ideas, some geographers such as Harlen Baruz and Carl Saver criticized the environmental determinism school. Then, with regard to the necessity of addressing the humans' security needs which was rooted in the internal situation of France and the foreign policies of this country at the end of First World War, the possibilism strategy was introduced to the geography by Lucian Four in 1922. But the most popular representative of this school of thought is the French geographer Vidal Dolablash (Shokuei, 1999: 246). In the framework of the relation between human's need and the environment, this school emphasizes on the idea that the nature encourages the human to fulfill his needs. In fact, the main topic of this school of thought is the security of human's selection in fulfilling his basic needs.

From the perspective of security geography, the school of possibilism was in full disagreement with the determinism school. According to this school, war and development of colonial imperialism and the organic growth of countries' security interests outside their national boundaries meant to ignore the capabilities of human beings and human societies, and in fact the environmental determinism tries to justify the violence and power-seeking security policies through resorting to the scientific statements.

In terms of methodology, the school of possibilism rejected the experimental introduction of general and world-wide rules. According to the experts of this school, any geographical region as a section of place and spatial dimension is the result of interaction among its own cultural, natural, political and economic trends. So due to the spatial differences, there are no similar regions in terms of their security needs and any region is the result of a unique process of human and social needs. According to the experts of this school, the geographers should focus their studies on the regions which need democracy and individual security rights. This meant that the security theories cannot be stated in this geographical school like the experimental

sciences (Johnson, 1988: 82).

3- The multidimensionality school

The geographical studies in the framework of possibilism school reached its pinnacle in the works of Richard Hartson. According to Hartson, the field of security was extensive in the spatial studies of geography and this science was responsible for studying the unique security in terms of differentiation with the surrounding geography and the internal interrelation.

The quantitative revolution and the development of experimental method in 1950s and 1960s affected the measurement of some indices in security geography. Emergence of multidimensionality school and using the experimental research methods in the security studies were the result of such process. In fact, the geography entered the environmental security studies through the permanent work of Fredcourt Shifter as understanding of the layers' arrangement in vertical and horizontal and spatial dimensions of phenomena. In his article "innovations in geography", Shifter introduces the geography as a science which should search for widespread and place-based rules. His article, which was prepared to reject Hartshorn's ideas, entered the logical positivism to the studies of geographical space engineering (Shokuei, 1999: 196). Prevalence of multidimensional methodology in geography coincided with the security engineering or, in other words, the security functionalism. It will be discussed later.

Shifter wrote such a geographical article to state this central issue that mere consideration of geography as the chorology science (innovation science in space and line and region) with the help of certain monograph writing method has removed this science from the set of other sciences. According to Shifter, the time geography was classified as the sciences which focus on studying the arrangement of the dominant space on the phenomena not on the phenomena themselves (Shokuei, 1999: 190).

This attitude led to a situation in which the spatial science school of multidimensionality methodology dominated the security geography in during 1950s and 1960s. The researchers and students tried hard to collect

statistics, numbers, structure models and geometric models in order to clarify and explain the cause and effect relations among the security geography phenomena. Emergence of basic questions in the mind of experts regarding the capability of the multidimensional and spatial method of arranging the security phenomena in geography for clarifying the issues and answering to the questions resulted in some new methodological schools of thought and philosophy in the national security decision-makings.

4- Structuralism

Following the emergence and stabilization of this school of thought and the methodology of multidimensional attitude towards the security environment and using the logical positivism, the structural security-based thought in geography entered the competition field. Following the ideas of the "school of security discourse ", the structuralism was first entered by the French geographer Leo Strauss to the geography (Ahmadi, 2001: 17). The structuralists believe that that the needs and behavior of human beings are predetermined by the environmental structures which are not under the control of human beings.

Thus, the structuralism has deeply affected the security needs of human, the security institutions and the environmental security which results from the efforts of Emil Durkheim, Talkot Barsonz, Beronisela and Malinowski(Shokuei, 2003: 154). Emil Durkheim had an organic attitude toward the power generating institutions and regarded the society as a being and a system in the time and space (the same). Parsons believed in striving for the security needs and their fulfillment in a system. The English sociologist and one of the most famous theoreticians of the west, Antony Gidenz, disagreed with the excessive emphasis on the role of structure and believed in the balanced duality of structure and the need to human security and the role of each one in the processes of generating social power. In 1970, Louie Altoser and Balibar referred to the concept of structures in the security process of dominance. Supporting the structural security, Altoset believed that the security principles and bases have a significant role in

environmental organization and setting the geographical behaviors (Ibid: 155).

In the early 1970s, the structural security thought gained lots of supporters among the security environment discussions and geographers. First, the radical geographers began to theorize under the influence of Altoseri's structuralism. From the perspective of structural security, this question is first raised that "what are the roles of security and how does it work? And what is the role of political, social, economic and cultural structures in forming the rules of national security? The structuralist security environment resulted in the radical geography in developed countries in response to the security crises including Vietnam War and the conflicts of the urban suburbanites. The purpose of this radical geography was to create structural changes at the time of environmental justice in favor of the suburbanite groups and the southern countries (Mirheidar, 1997). Publication of some works like "the urban environment and justice" by David Harvey and "security is city" by Manuel Castles were in this respect. Peter Taylor and his influential writing "geography and security" (1985-1989), with emphasis on the global theory of Valrashtein (the structure of global security) had an important role in development of the structuralist security geography in the framework local, national, and global scales.

5- The school of environmentalist human

In a general outlook, the school of environmentalist human is a school in geography which includes the mental benefactions of idealism, existentialism, macrocosm, fascism, and behaviorism with the suffix of geography.

6- The School of critical security

The critical theory has been a very effective school of thought in the area of scientific and college attempts. However, it was not until the recent years that its effect on the security geography became evident (Bilis, 2004: 481). The critical theory was created out of the written works of Frankfort. This

school consisted of a group of skilled thinkers who began to cooperate in 1920s and 1930s. The well-known figures of the first generation of this school included Frankfurt, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse. The next generation of this school used the works of these thinkers and developed the school through applying important and innovative methods. The most renowned thinker was Jürgen Habermas who is regarded as the most prominent theoretician of the critical school.

The critical theoreticians have formulated some of their most important theories through reviewing the meaning of liberation (previous: 483). According to the first critical theoreticians, the liberation should be understood as reconciliation with the nature. The ecological security, with the stated meaning, has consistency with some parts of the peace movements and the contemporary green movements. In fact, the critical theory of Frankfurt school emphasizes the idealistic security movements through adding the social ideological factors. (Shokuei, 2003: 257).

Under the influence of the critical theory, the critical security regards the insecurities of natural environment and the difficult human life as the result of the insecurities of environmental elements and sources and lack of distribution and inappropriate application. This has paved the way for constant exploitation of nature and natural sources by the capitalist powers through technology. From the perspective of security geography, the geographical exploitation has provided a ground for the security exploitation.

In the field of ecology, the critical school of thought is known as "critical geography". Rather than focusing on the effects of natural geography factors on the establishment of national security which were important to the military theoreticians, this approach emphasizes on the role of governors, political experts and generally the inferences and images the elites have about their environment and that how these attitudes affect the interpretation of geographical environment (Muir, 2000: 2).

In the first decade of critical security inference from the natural geography, there was no difference between the modern geography and

critical security in the university circle, but with the increase of written literature and the mental productions of experts, the ambiguity between these two schools of thought was somehow obviated.

Conclusion

In the present paper, efforts were made to provide a general outlook and a brief comparison between the national security and geography. In this comparison, we emphasized the key concepts of national security, its analysis level and scale as the methodology of environmental power and its required security, understanding and analyzing the relations among the phenomena and trends, and finally a brief introduction to the schools of thought and methodology of these two majors, content comparison, and the time inferiority and superiority among them. With regard to the above points, the result of the present article can be summarized as follows:

- 1- The Westphalia contract in 17th century resulted in the establishment of national security thought as it is today. The environment and its security obligations at the national level, as we know today, are the result of the above contract. Previously, the geography was related to security but there was nothing as security geography. The imperialisms and nations had also some relations, but there was no nation to be followed by the national government and environmental security.
- 2- In the late first half of 20th century, the security geography was introduced to the university studies as a scientific major, while in the next decade and in 1970s, the national security was recognized as a university major.
- 3- With regard to the time superiority of establishment of security geography as a university major compared to the national security interests and regarding the fact that the national interests (government) was the most important topic of security geography studies and the existing relations among them was the subject of national security studies, it can be concluded that the security geography is the basis for establishment of central concepts in the national security interests.

4- The common interests of geography and national security mean the country or government. The country (government) is a social organization based on the land, the aim of which is creating, protecting and defending the social conditions and central values. The most central, important values include security, freedom, order, justice and welfare. Other central concepts in security geography including the boundary, territory, governance, domain, security system, threats of war environment, analysis level, identity, interests, and national security can be defined in relation to the concept of country.

5- Although the political unit which was established after the Westphalia contract is called "country" in security geography and "government" in national security, it should be stated that the government is the same as country.

6- The territory and domain are the common points of other component factors of country (government). The country (government) has an internal relation with the territory. There will be no government without a territory.

7- Attending to the "indices" in security geography and the "analysis level" in national security is important in any research and survey and in fact, this will clarify the framework, limit and range of the relations among the variables. The reason of similarity among some scale hierarchy and the analysis level is the same as the common point of geography and national security in the concept of country or government and its spatiality.

8- Geography and national security have passed similar periods in terms of schools of thought and methodology. 1- The traditional periods until the mid-1950; 2- the governance periods of positivism method in 1960s and 1970; 3- the emergence period of the post-positivism schools of thoughts in 1980s and 1990s.

9- Ultimately, it can be stated that security geography is part of the secure environment which has close similarity to the national security in terms of concepts and subjects. The main topic of security geography is the study of international relations among the places on the local, national, regional, and global security scales. The topics and subjects of security geography,

particularly on national, regional, and global scales have close similarity to the topics and issues of security at national, regional, and international levels.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to appreciate all people who did their best in order to improve the present research.



References

- Aghew, John (1998), *Geopolitics: revising world politics*, London, Routledge.
- Ahmadi, Babak (2001), *the structure and hermeneutics*, Tehran, Gam-e-Nouv[in Persian].
- Bilis, John & Stiu Smith (2004), *globalization of politics, the international relation in the modern era*, Tehran, Abrar cultural institution of international studies and researches, Contemporary Tehran[in Persian].
- Black, Jeremy (1997), *Mps and politics*, Chicago University Press.
- Bozorgi, Vahid (2003), *the new attitudes in the international relations: interpretation, postmodernism, the critical theory*, Tehran, Nye Publication[in Persian].
- Broden, Ketlin & Fred, Sheli (2004), *the widespread geopolitics*, translated by Alireza Farshchi and Hamidreza Rahnama, Tehran, the University of Commandership and the Islamic revolutionary Guards corps[in Persian].
- Buzan, Barry, and Richard Little (2000), *International system in world history: Remarking the study of international relations*, Oxford University Press.
- Dalby, Simon (2005), *critique and contemporary geopolitics*, A lecture presented to Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran.
- Eta'at, Javad and Moussavi, Seyedeh Zahra(2012), *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1- Spring 2012[in Persian].
- Griffiths, Martin (1999), *fifty key thinkers in international relations*, London, Routledge.
- Hafeznia, Mohamadreza, and Kavianirar, Morad (2004), *the new horizons in geography*, Tehran, SAMT Publication[in Persian].
- Hamidinia, Hossein (2002), *Comparison between geography and national security in terms of methodology and content*, Tehran University, Geography department, the thesis of geopolitics, M.A[in Persian].
- Hepel, Lesli (1991), *renovation of geography*, translated by Dare Mirheidar, *Journal of political and economic information*, 47-48.
- Jackson, Robert , and George Sorenson (2004), *an introduction to the national security*, translated by Mehdi zakerian, Ahmad Taghizade, and Hassan Saeed Kolahi, Tehran, Mizan Publication[in Persian].
- Johnson, R.G, Peter Taylor and Michel B. Watts (2004), *the change geography*, translated by Nasrin Nourian, Tehran, the University of Commandership and the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps[in Persian].
- Linklater, Andrew (2000), *international relations: critical concepts in political science*, vol. II, London, Routledge.
- Locust, Ubetris Gepeln (2000), *the factors and thoughts in geography*, translated by Ali Ferasati, Tehran, Amen Publication[in Persian].
- Loro, Pascal, and Franswa Twal (2002), *Geopolitical keys*, translated by Hassan Sadugh Vanini, Tehran, Publication of Shahid Beheshti Universiti[in Persian].
- Mirheidar, Dorreh (1997), *the new thoughts and attitudes in geopolitics*, the cultural-scientific journal of Science Academy, Tehran, publication of science academy of Islamic Republic of Iran, no 6 & 7, fourth year[in Persian].
- Mirheidar, Dorreh, *Geopolitics: a new definition*, *Journal of geographical researches*, Razavi

Publication, no 51, 13th year[in Persian].

- Mojtahedzade, Pirouz (2003), geography and politics, Tehran, SAMT Publication[in Persian].
- Molayi, Alireza (2003), a review on geopolitical texts, Tehran, Publication of Imam Bagher University[in Persian].
- Mohammadian, H; Heidari, MH; Gahlibaf, MB (2012), *Geopolitics Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring 2012[in Persian].
- Muir, Richard (2000), an introduction to geopolitics, translated by Dorreh Mirheidar, Tehran, Publication of the Armed Forces' Geographical Organization[in Persian].
- Otuathail, Gearoid (1996), *Critical Geopolitics*, London, Routledge.
- Otuathail, Gearoid, Simon Dalby, Puel Routledge (1998), *geopolitics reader*, London, Routledge.
- Prescott, G.R.V (1979), the new inclinations in geography, translated by Dare Mirheidar, Tehran, Publication of Tehran University[in Persian].
- Ranger, N.G (2003), the international relations, the political theory and global order: beyond the theory of international relations, Tehran, office of political and international studies of Foreign Ministry.
- Reynolds, P. A (1971), "An introduction to international relations", Massachosettes, Schenkman publishing company, Inc.
- Sarialghalam, Mahmoud (2001), the research method in the political sciences and international relations, Tehran, Farzan Ruz Publiation[in Persian].
- Shokuei, Hossein, (1999), first edition, Tehran, Gitashenasi Publication[in Persian].
- Shokuei, Hossein, (1999), the new thought in geography philosophy, Second edition: environmental philosophies and geographical schools, Tehran, Gitashenasi Publication[in Persian].
- Johnson, Arild, Holt (1997), *Geography: the history and concepts: Schools, philosophy, and methodology*, translated by Jalal Tabrizi, Tehran, Seir-o-Siahat Publication[in Persian].