

A Security Effective Structure for National Defense in the 21st Century

Qiuomars Yazdanpanah Dero

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Geography, University of Tehran, Iran
(kyazdanpanah@ut.ac.ir)

(Received: 30 Aug. 2017 Accepted: 19 Apr. 2018)

Abstract

In accordance with human necessities and deep attention into security, research studies have today become an irrefutable necessity in this area. It is noted that traditional concepts of this important issue have changed, as a result of occurring various events in the past, particularly in the 20th century; so that security is no more limited to protecting human beings against individual and collective dangers. Because geopolitics is the science of studying power relations in the political arena, the main actors in this field are the national constituencies determining the international equilibrium. In this context, competition for power through the strengthening of development indicators among different countries has been taken into consideration, through the geopolitical weight and the bargaining power to increase national security and, of course, security. Therefore, this research pursues two goals in relation to security and geopolitics: First, an analytical approach, on the views of academics, from the 1980s to the 20th century and to achieve motivation for the study of its fundamental concepts and the effect of geopolitics on these issues. Second, geopolitical approaches to security, related to the beginning of the 1990's up until now; and their assumptions, with emphasizing on future and geo-strategy. In this research, it is emphasized that geographically disrupted governments lose their territorial integrity, which results in them not being able to redefine national symbols according to global accelerated developments and floating identities.

Keywords: divine inspiration, geopolitics, human geopolitics, security, strategy.

Introduction

In the current era, many of the strategic concepts that have influenced the understanding of the interrelationships of nations and states have changed due to the emergence of emerging trends in relations between nations and the state and the collapse of many traditional patterns. The process has led to an increase in government security spending to maintain the status quo and eliminate all kinds of threats. In these circumstances, two issues have been found to play a role in defining the national security horizons of the countries.

First: The role of geopolitics in the maintenance of territorial security.

Second: Geopolitical understanding with a realistic attitude in the formulation of a national security document for countries

In this paper, while concentrating on these two fundamental issues, the global upheavals and major geopolitical changes have been examined. Geopolitical condition in contemporary world has been influenced by various and complex behaviors, having occurred in past periods (Ashley, 1987: 12). These kinds of events make the destiny of billions of humans and other living beings a complex security condition during the past 70 years. It must be said that the most important mental disturbance of human society is security and its disturbing factors, during the last 120 years. Geopolitical and geo-strategical facts, being studied among 10 supposed cycles, in 6 continents, shall be considered, as a result of the sovereignty process of security and its dangers.

On the other hand, the strong predominance of great powers, on the geopolitical ten cycles, throughout the world, especially its effect on their inference from human security (both national and international security), and its relation with the geopolitical power of countries, political disabilities and incorrect

understandings from change-based processes, make it difficult to do research on security and make a valid and scientific judgment. make a valid and scientific judgment. Toward the beginning of 21st century, (like the 20th century), security and related issues are very important for researchers and thinkers. According to its necessity and the special condition of the contemporary world, it may be forcedly obtained as a common concept. Today, the fundamental problem of security concepts and its related dangers is neglecting the benefits of permanent security, by those countries that have stable geographical territories (being approved on the political map of world).

Research Methodology

The research method in this paper, based on the explanations presented, is a research and analytical type that is the result of specialized experiments, which has been analyzed using this descriptive method. Therefore, all classifications of recent decades are the result of neglecting security basis; according to this base, all powers and governments should follow related rules, compatible to the requests of the people, living in their territory. However, the lack of a collective understanding or historical beneficial inferences prevents from global agreements about security concepts.

For a correct understanding of security, it is necessary to know it, because succeeding is obtained, under the protection of enough security. Security is ushered in peace and human focusing on other needs and problems. To the same extent, insecurity is considered as an important preventive factor against humans. Hans Morgenthau, an American-German theorist and professor of international relation and political science has emphasized on power and peace, among different concepts of security, explaining that “security is not only indicator of fundamental methods and powers of nation and

government, but, it is motive of double internal-external approaches” (Morgenthau, 1973: 138).

Combining these two concepts shall enable us to recognize the structure and content of security; “it means in long-term analytical apprehension, security is between dispute and peaces including great concepts of security. In this theory, political and mental split are not transparent, in security concept and security hurts are indicated in national and regional derisions” (Hertz, 1951). Now, it cannot be possible to neglect this theory. Importantly, unlike human mental and technical developments, security is considered as an under-developing concept. These inferences have a special meaning, from a theoretical point of view and a different one, from a scientific view. Governments are always interested in security issues. Undoubtedly, security is a key concept in international relations. Toward the beginning of the 1950's, (the world suffered from intolerable problems of two world wars and security puzzles), John Hertz doubted states methods, in performing security. He warned about dangerous counter- security behaviors of big government, by criticizing the security condition of the world (Hertz, 1950).

Changing Strategy

The intersection of military, political, social, technological and economic issues in our world is constantly creating a more complex environment for both military and political strategic policy and thought. Even the most dedicated members with the hardest working staff cannot fully keep up with the range of problems around the world. Although, there are no exact results from performed studies, this necessary need is elevated even further. According to this necessity, a changing strategy needs to obtain a security structure by 2020. As a result of the strong predominance of competitors, it is anticipated we have a strategically desired environment in the short-term, in

comparison to the Cold-War era (Rubert, 2002: 32). But, presenting assertion is not so valid; in long-terms. Therefore, it is not possible to recognize the future or rely on security prerequisite; but it is not a desired reason for explaining any neglect about the responsibilities and tasks of countries. Today, most countries are interested in the operational meaning of competition (as a necessity for development) and they invest in this area to preserve their security (Rubert, 2002: 29).

Therefore, when the national will and charter of governments and nations have been organized on the basis of clear competitions, thus security system structures, having the best cooperation with them, shall be transparently harmonized, in order to fight against extreme ideologies and terrorism (Howard, 1964: 41). The emergence of this reasonable and realist unity shall prevent unclear and unilateral motives. This process is strategically equal to making security rules in the 21st century. It is possible to declare the following cases, for explanation of the above-mentioned scenarios.

1. Changing the conditions and models of common, uncommon and nuclear wars, under technological, cultural, political and economical developments, and leading wars into electronic, invisible and unguessable ones.
2. Efforts in the governorate area, including the surrounding area, to dominate the wealth and geographic capacities and effective resources, and take care of the looting and unilateral commerce and the emergence of colonialism.
3. The collective strengthening of informational systems and increasing the capacity and effectiveness of central networks, being linked into inconsistent operator systems.
4. Recognition of the state's probable opposing people who want to decrease the national power of countries and their financial developments, for example, Emperors and

superpower behaviors during the last three decades.

5. Developments, related to civil wars, against demographics approaches and explaining human-characteristics, developing urban regions and civil importance, from political, financial, cultural points of view and human attractive centers.

Multi-national developments in serious and transparent fighting against organized crimes, narcotics smuggling, decreasing natural resources, genocides, human smuggling (having replaced slave-dealing in colonial governments) and ungovernable iniquities (Waltz, 1996: 243).

Of course, these strategies have been performed, for more than three decades in the permanent developmental and national security strategies of several countries, such as the US, France and Britain. According to the above-mentioned reasoning, it is concluded that all security issues are considerable, in present and short time (Neill, 1963: 168-242). Also, the changing characteristics of wars, the changing international power balance and the competitive practices increase complexity of security systems (expandable, beyond common military issues, and the existence of common concerns and objectives and mutual interests).

What is the main point?

When the Senate presented its final opinion about the defensive military structure of the US in 1997, it found out that strengthening the army and considering military power is not sufficient, for solving problems, being against world security (Hobbes, 1968: 77). Organizing the main security challenges by the state and the way of solving this undesirable situation is the only hope. In the case of being successful in solving these problems, it is possible to present necessary answers, to the following questions:

1. What is the role of dynamic technological and strategic changes, for increasing military power and high security capacities, in the future?
2. Which regions and world approaches shall be more controlled, to ensure that changes are not becoming a matter of surprise and not seeing its effects in an amazing system?
3. Is the creation of opportunities with minimal challenges in war different from obtaining needed capacities?
4. As, the future is almost vague, in contrast to existing different political-security approaches, how is it possible to guarantee being flexible and quick, in order to be compatible with time changes? What is the geopolitical role of time, in this process?
5. How shall states obtain the necessary ability, for responsibility against tests' probabilities and investing for making a safe future?
6. For strengthening national security institutions, acting beyond the defensive organizations of each country, what changes are performed, in order to better recognize these probabilities and preventing the occurrence of future challenges?

Nations and racial minorities have a key role, in the above-mentioned process. In contrast, the process of presenting suggestions and analysis being related into Fourth World, attacking colonizing emperors, modern governments and their present sovereignty in more than 5000 nations are investigable. The exact consideration of the meaning and usage of some important political terms, for apprehending this geopolitical view (being changed, in comparison to past periods), existing identifier institutions, such as nations, governments, nation-based governments, people and racial minority groups are

necessary, because, during recent decades, these words have been extremely misused. Thus, misusing these terms shall result in altering identification, geography and wars (Weitz, 2006: 186). Those issues, being related to immigrants and refugees, massacres and violation of human rights, in addition to destroying the environment are becoming the most important geopolitical issues during these times.

Nation and Racial Character

The word nation usually refers to a territory and a geographical boundary habituated by a collective group of humans, and according to the identification of its inhabitants (cultural effectiveness of geography; Rubert, 2002: 54-55). Therefore, a nation is considered a cultural territory being made by human gathering. These people harmonized themselves, as an important symbol, on the basis of origin, history, social systems institutions, organizations, ideology, language, territory and most importantly, religion. One who is born in a special nation, such as Kurd, Bask or Tibet, belongs to that national character, because by immigrating into Tibet, the immigrant shall not have Tibetan nationality; also by Learning Basaki Language, the learner is not considered a Basaki citizen (Smith, 2002: 264). To have a basic nationality, we need to die in Basque, not to immigrate to this region, nor to learn their losses. Therefore, we can define it as: A nation has a home culture and people who have this culture. In addition, a nation is considered as an identifier. For example, even if Spain does not recognize all other Catalonian states, Catalonia continues to defend its entity. The entity of nations is old and historical and has existed during times. For this reason, a special day is considered the day for the emergence of these nations (Libicki, 1995: 57).

Since arriving, first humans into a geographical region or continent, there have been 5000 to 8000 nations, having

different shapes and extents. Then, they formed unified nations, by clear identification. Therefore, organization a nation, having defined social identification, is the result of the self-thinking of people, having a collective historical territory. As, nobody leave his territory, resources and identification, voluntary, so, a nation is considered as the most resistant organization (Martin, 1983: 6-63). The maximum territories of continents, islands, coasts and continental shelf's water are claimed and used by nations for a long time.

People

Like nations, the term 'people' is a self-definition. A group of people is distinct from other nations. It always considers itself higher than a nation. People, having collective histories, geographical territories, racial relations, cultural relations, languages, religious relations, ideologies, economical basis and enough population, maintain their collective identification. Therefore, each defined people, having a defined territory, is considered a nation (Anderson, 1999: 86).

Governments and racial groups

Modern government is the result of European, foreign colonization, and deriding colonizing Emperors into new and smaller parts and colonization (Williams, 2003: 41). They have gradually included most geographical regions. Government means centralized political regime, in political, international and legal boundaries. This regime is recognized by other government and international institutions. Moreover, this structure uses a civil bureaucracy process, for the purpose of establishing a government. This process include social institutions and laws, each part has a unified language, national economy, territorial sovereignty and having pre-dominance, on all resources, money, flag and sometime, a unified religion. This regime is available, by sovereignty to nations and people, having different models (Libicki, 1995: 32-37).

Government is a legal essence, born on a special day and endowing a new international identification into all people of its territory; for example, the Soviet Union of Russia, Bangladesh, Yugoslavia, etc. The discovery of "America" neglected for its exact naming. One way of dealing with this process is *Force*, which is the use of a military or law enforcement capacity to achieve some objective. It is the actual use of strength and should not be equated with either strength or power *per se*. Using force unwisely or unsuccessfully can diminish one's power and strength. By the same token, using it effectively can enhance power. Force is an instrument of power just as a tool or some other device would be, but unlike institutional instruments like the armed forces, its use in action is what distinguishes it from static instruments of strength like military capacity. Thus, force should be understood narrowly as an applied instrument of coercion. To the extent of the breakdown of the state- the feminine and costly nations- would be greatly reduced.

In 1960, Macicito Riocargo, nation's citizens slept as Nicaragua's people woke up the next morning, as the Honduras nation! Because the international court of justice passed a judgment about the quarrel of two countries' territories, so, their territories were changed. In the process of emerging governments, it shall not be neglected that illegal states governed dissatisfied nations, in different countries, then, they built new histories and geographies in these regions, in order to justify their expansionism (Dewitt, 1994: 8). They were confronted with all national claims, in special territories, including country, people and resources. Their main aim is creating an incorrect image indicating the sovereignty of government on the nation. Today, a government defines itself as powers being independent from the will of the people. They don't confront the nation, as far as possible, although, their feeling is compulsory. On the national level, governments define themselves, as people's servant and even, disapprove their rough

behaviors and explain their movements, on the basis of maintaining territorial integrity and establishing national security or providing national benefits (Booth, 1979: 40). Sometimes, maximum violations of human right are performed by these governments against the people. On the other hand, by controlling universities, journalists, media publicity tools and the affiliation of various people into government, they want them to act, think and write, according to their orders. Also, they want them to tolerate against the independence of some special groups (Nye, 1975: 19).

For example, in *Atlas Barchina*, Tibet is not considered as a territory, being occupied by China, although, they say Tibet is an occupied territory, by China. Therefore, not only is Tibet not regarded as a territory; being attacked in 1950, but the Chinese people claim Tibet is the final product of the central power of China. Also, it is under the strong control of Beijing, being occupied after the attacks of 1959 and became as an independent region, for managing territories in 1965 (by permission of the central state of China). In *A historical map, from china*, written by Cat Chipoul, it is stated that throughout China, millions of people live, being from 51 different nations. Most of them live in boundaries, being important for security of China needs in their loyalty and cooperation of this people and being assured from dangers (Jervis, 1976: 36). Also, they are interested in this territory, because, China develops humanity cooperative societies and social properties, being considered by government, among those who live such as native hunters, cattle men or farmers (Huntington, 1996: 81). It tries to educate people and increases their ability in enjoying from the potential of an agricultural economy. Therefore, it is possible to extract an interpretation of Fourth World, from this statement. "Hun" developed china, for controlling, dividing and separating more than 150 non-Hun nations and their tribes. Several nations are derided in territorial regions and being under the sovereignty of

China, India, the Soviet Union, Vietnam, Brema, Mongolia and other states. The Hun mission was the use of military forces and experts of political sciences, in order to force nations to accept the right of citizenship and the sovereignty of Beijing. As a result, Hun used all cooperation, for replacing non-Hun economy and society, to being successful in the internal field of China, for example, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tibet, Oyqour, Tajic, Mayo, Lessio, lahur and exploiting these countries.

However, we should not neglect a secrecy quarrel and ideology. It is the attempts of some states, for destroying history and geography of people, being under the sovereignty of them. New names for people, establishing new states and making new maps and history is part of this. These new texts are created on the basis of these special aims. For example, for re-teaching lessons, to different groups in schools and universities and supplying news, for media (not meant to take pleasure). The main aim is increasing the problems, differences, and racism of nations.

Although the focus of states is having a collective nation, but throughout the world 95% of 197 countries are multi-nationalities. They are the combination of people and different territories, being sometimes occupied, without their satisfaction (Keegan, 1986: 44). These states captured the sovereignty of 5000 nations, or probably all continents, 40% of oceans and even space. In comparison to nations, their states are new and have emerged in different sizes, such as Naoro, with a population of 10,000 people, Belize Bahamas, with population of 200,000 people, Indonesia, having an area of 300 miles, 13700 islands and 250 nations. It is considered as the fourth populous country of the world. A nation-base government is very rare. Lower than 5% of states are nation-based governments, throughout the world. When the major part of the population includes people who have collective identifications, territories and governments, being recognized, internationally.

Therefore, Iceland and Portugal are nation-based governments. Most states are considered, as multi-nationality ones, such as Nigeria, Ethiopia and India, having 45, 90 and 350 nations, respectively. States have tried to change nations, by performing various plans of making nations on the basis of political, cultural, regional, developmental and educational combinations (Morgenthau, 1973: 5). They try to create unity, by developing collective institutions, for example flags, national anthems, histories and geographical plans of schools and great national universities. For realizing this aim, all states have institutions, such as schools, university and media, with the aim of making history and collective geographical plans. Also, they produce a collective past and place for people.

When Italy was the first union in 19th century, Azeglio, the Italian nationalist politician, declared we have built Italy, now, it is necessary to grow up the Italian people. To understand the subject, you can consider the combination of the following in the table below and notice the above issues.

In most cases, nation-making has been performed by destroying nations (Table 1).

Government-making techniques include new concepts, for description of all nations, government and people. For example, as a state emerges, it is performed, by war, expansionism, occupation, colonialism or separating big states (Gray, 1988: 20). It is possible, that they are surrounded with new terms. Paying attention into each reason for the emergence of states indicates a lack of effect of human role in making these concepts and bases (Gray, 1981: 25; such as building territories in civilization-forced parts, being the result of separating identifications and nations). The result of this process, especially in the 20th century, has been false identification, being emerged by institutions of central government (Gray, 1999). The effect of these identifications on national one, including culture, family

and language. This event occurred in the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and national identification of Russia, Ukraine, Slovakia and Bosnia (Frono & Baklarz, 1999: 37).

Table 1. Lexicology of nation-making and changing Fourth World

Lexicology of nation-building, by those states, destroying	Changing Fourth World
A nation group	An invader state, people and territory
People	A nation, being deprived of everything, except language
Nation	A governmental people built directly
Nation-building	The ideal of a multi-nation state
Political combination	Building a state by destroying a nation
Governmental economy	State invading
Economic development	
Combination	The occupation and plundering of resources
Industrial farmers	The systematic plunder of nations
Separatist	Rationalism
Rebels	Destroying a nation
Terrorists	Unknown people of an unknown nation
National liberality	A big group of national-pacifism people
National security	A small group of national-pacifism people
National benefits	Colonialism, by non-European people
A ethnologist group	Military occupation of the nation by the state
A new concept	Benefits of the state

Source: (Yazdan Panah Dero, 1394 [2015 A.D])

We are genius people on the earth; we are protector of the earth and having no minority, among our nations or throughout the earth. Everybody should know the terminology, since it is very important. It is important for you, how they appear among others. If you are changing your name, you can understand its importance. Therefore, it is necessary to remind ourselves as a unified nation (Leon, 2003: 53). Understanding this issue is better provided in the Emerging Issues presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Some differences between states and nations

	Nation	State
Definition	Having a collective culture and nation, recognized territory, having people with determined identification and collective ideals	A civil and military power, distinct from various people and bounded, built by war and territorial development
Word origin	Nation-nation native	Foreign affairs Makaila
Field	Cultural	Political-military
Combination of population	A recognized nation	Multi-nations
Origin	Historical-evolutional	Possibility for determining History and planning
Recognition	Self-identification of teaching in culture	By other states and the aching of schools and media
Membership	Cultural relation	Citizenship
Attachment	Cultural and territorial	Ideal, law, compulsion
Group movement	Nationalism (recognition and defending from territory)	Patriotism
Atage 11: Making a probable reason for denying problems	-Society-This is the enemy: state is the protector of people. -Appearing enemy in intentional media -what has occurred, not determined by state	
Stage 12: Retiring civilians, from crime against military movements (food, information, shelter)	-Movement of civilian in governmental base. -Deviling the nation in occupied regions by state. -Replacing governmental bases, far from international parts. -pointing into governmental bases, as economic developments and society	
Stage 13: Developing strategy (plan and performance)	-Remitting Leaders and their forces -Providing an agenda, by motto of we are accompanied, with you -Permitting for new confronts -Military upgrading, by more helicopters and better Communication. -Detaining traditional military forces, from smaller guerrilla ones, seeking the destroying of national forces	
Stage 14: Recalling for taking vote on legitimation of their occupation	-It occurs when state have movements in occupied nations. -It is a referendum with UN supervision.	

	Nation	State
Stage 15: Resolving ten years weak tolerance		-States means a heavy military occupation -Tolerance against economic bleeding, by 3 strategies: 1. Continuance of the destroying by the state for keeping a big army in region 2. Destroying all economic enjoyments of state from resources. 3. Internal and external policy, benefits of state, from developing international investments.

Source: (Yazdan Panah Dero, 1394 [2015 A.D])

This suggestion explains that no nation relinquishes its autonomy, voluntary, thus the making of government is performed by passing legal and military Levels. Therefore, in case of studying what is happening between states and nations (for example, reciprocal relations among 191 states and 5000 or more nations), this article shall apprehend the present phenomenon, as a geographical-historical process (Wolfers, 1962: 150). This subject is a powerful ability for defending nations and considering the toppling and emerging government. For example, during defensive wars (1981-1982), against Nicaragua state, Ciskito Sarasota and Yamata taken up arms and operated several fourth world war, including Cotoli against Bereme (1948), Eritrea against Ethiopia (1961-1991), west Papua against Indonesia (1962), east Timor against Indonesia (1975), and Saharawi republic against Morocco (1975).

Quarrels of Nation-based Governments

These kinds of governments have indicated two unavoidable forces, in order to confront bilateral disputes. Governments have reacted to these quarrels, on the basis of their expanded military forces, expansionist ideologies, economy and national and international supporting network, but the reaction of nations is in accordance with their geographical- historical tolerance, being stabilized by permanent inventions and territorial and nobility- base culture. After geographical quarrels, the Cold War and the toppling of the Soviet Union, super-powers learned it is

necessary they suppress other regions, in order to stabilizing their condition (Wolfers, 1962). For example, some nations are seeking to save themselves from the sovereignty of governments, having emerged by illegal force. Via these movements, quarrels emerged in the 1990's and lasted into the third millennium (Dodds & Atkinson, 2000: 34). Investigating recent quarrels and dependence wars in some regions of the world shall be realized during the next two decades (at the end of 2030). Of course, the long way of liberalism shall cost the murdering of several hundred thousand people and the forced migration of millions.

States have made international rules and voted on them, in international organizations (such as the U.N.); this subject is not strange. But, the question is why do states and governments not follow these international contracts, unless, they are settled, under pressure? For example, in accordance with the amendment of Geneva Convention on the 12th of August, 1994, (All members of UN vote affirmatively), the states are obliged to keep citizenship rights of their population (Brodie, 1973: 90). Why do these countries have difficulty, in order to obtain legal freedoms and citizenship security and they are forced to coordinate themselves, on the basis of these rules? These questions indicate deep security concerns of these nations against governments' behavior in the future.

But, the states' views against the above-mentioned process is interesting. According to the state, terrorists just act against governments. It means, any people reaction is equal to terrorism today (Rothschild, 1984: 83). In Table 3, we can better understand the conditions ahead based on the arguments presented above.

Table 3. People destruction, being resulted from fighting states against nations

	State against nation	97
Wars, 1993	State against state	1
	State against rebels	15

	Nation against nation	6
	Nation against rebels	3
	Total	122
Time average of wars (1945-1995)	State against state	2.8
	State against nation	10.2
Immigrants (1993)	Public and national immigrants, being recognized by high com missionary of UN immigrants	18,000,000
	Public and national immigrants, not being recognized high com missionary of UN immigrants	18,000,000
	Total	36,000,000
Massacres	Massacre of national people, 1945-1993	
	Total	81% of massacre

Source: (Yazdan Panah Dero, 1394 [2015 A.D])

Therefore, it seems international rules, during the 20th century, are not responsive to security process in the present time (Flint, 2006: 19).

Without new international rules and related policies, most parts of the world are just spectators of these events. Also, from a geo-strategic point of view, this process is considered as a deep geopolitical hole, because, legal claims of nations and their just objections are unified with rebellions and any objection against government, being considered as a security disorder, shall be suppressed, severely. It means the suppressing of the sovereignty of government-nations and making deep national cracks (Farindon, 1989: 111). This problem shall result in increasing available disputes, racial severity and strengthening religious discrepancies and finally, the internal collapse and emergence of separatist movements. Even when confronting these conditions, governments shall not be able to control or manage them, therefore, they go with the stream and their collapsing becomes possible.

Collapsing Governments

More than 90% of governments, having existed before the deep changes of the 20th century, have collapsed, as a result of mobilities in this century, also, some modern governments and their countries seem to be on a gradual collapse course (Baldwin, 1995: 51). In 1945, there were 72 states and colonies but in 1993, this number increased to 191 states.

They were formed, by colonizing collapsing European states (In Africa, south and south east Asia, the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, the collapse of the Soviet Union of Russia, Yugoslav, Slovakia and Ethiopia). Collapsing and toppling has been considered as a natural part of the life cycle of these governments. Today, the number of countries is 197, with the formation of south Sudan. Of course, most states are vacillating, during the present era. Also, expansionist emperors, governed rebellious nations, shall expand, by either law or geography. Political and economic costs shall be higher than outputs and emperors are forced to incur higher costs for keeping themselves in powerful positions. For example, if one person fights against government with AK-47 rifle and 500 magazines, the invader state shall react to him, by buying \$1/2m mi-25 helicopter, so that \$4000 is just the cost for several hours of flight time (Klein, 1988: 74).

The unbalanced distribution of environmental-biological variety and their centralization in some regions are considered as geographical characteristics. Biologists have recognized 12 environmental-biological various states, including 60-70% of this variety, throughout the world (Dalby, 2000: 4). But, the Fourth World's view needs re-thinking about these changes (Buzan et al., 1990: 9). Table 4 illustrates one of the most influential environmental phenomena in the geopolitical process of change.

Table 4. Coexistence and biological variety and nations

Various environmental- biological states	The number of occupied nations
Australia	250
Brazil	210
china	150
Colombia	60
Ecuador	35
India	380
Indonesia	670
Madagascar	20
Malaysia	20
Mexico	240
Peru	65
Zaire	210

Source: (Yazdan Panah Dero, 1394 [2015 A.D])

From the First and Second World's points of view, 231 nations (46% of the world) and all environmental variety are changed into 12 governments) for the purpose of centralizing sovereignty and enjoyment. From the Fourth World's views, states are expansionist and destroying nations and nature (Toynbee, 1965: 18). Central governments, including special states (from Australia to Zaire) have experienced destroying nations. There are high culture, environmental variety and some regions not being considered as a state because of their lack of sovereignty.

'Environmental variety treaty' was signed, by almost 150, countries, like the US, in earth summit, in Rio-de-Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992 and 1993, in order to provide expansionist plans and upgrading management and keeping the world's environmental resources.

Note, these aims are very important and valid; but most treaties and agreements are concluded without consulting with any nation. According to them lands and oceans includes most expansive environmental variety; their culture is knowledge and experiences of keeping biological varieties. Also, their people (nation) preserves this biological variety. The First and Second World's point of views is that states make decisions, for using

and maintaining biological-environmental variety, resulting in their needs to their nations. In contrast, the view of the Fourth world is that this kind of variety in national territory should be managed for the enjoyment of nations (Waltz & Kenneth, 1962: 63). This means that environmental variety does not belong to states, so that it shall not be destroyed by its expansionist usage.

New inferences from the global environment, being one of the best ways of preserving environmental variety in the world, support from human rights, as well as territory and their autonomy. Next, developments in maintaining the environment is obtained by assuring national autonomy (Handel, 1981: 11).

National Autonomy

National autonomy is almost a new term, being included in the field of political geography. Most regions, following this process, are placed in geostrategic territories, for example: Syria-Egypt-Iraq-Afghanistan. Regions, such as the Balkan Peninsula, experienced this process, and have a geostrategic effect from a geopolitical perspective. The regions, being occupied and having no autonomy, experience deep security problems, for example African countries, like the horn of Africa (Rumsfeld, 1997: 3). On the other hand autonomy either on the native level or the regional one is receivable, not payable. Today, these regions are seeking to obtain it, by relying on economic and political forces as well as military dependence. Of course, this geostrategic process has occurred in some territories, such as Taiwan, Hong Kong and Tibet, and several shall experience it in the future. Also, it is not accompanied by good will of states and governments. Today, there is an expansive order among movements being performed for obtaining national autonomy. Several nations perform different autonomous movements in their territories, which are indicated in the following table (Clausewitz, 1976: 40-42). The symbol of the independence movements in the geopolitical environment of specific regions of the world can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Nations introduce their autonomy in most autonomous regions

Southern land of Canada	Inoveet Nonavoot
North Canada	People of Tennis village
Greenland	Inoveet, In Calapet Nanat
YabTi-Nasba (North-Nicaragua).	Miscito
Caraeeb Coast of Panama	Cona in Conabala
North Lousan of Philippine	Bontog and other nations of corvilra
North-India	Naga in Nagaland
North. Spain	Catalans, in Catalonia
North-Spain	People of faro Islands
Denmark	Baskies in ozkedi
France	Couroses in Couros Island

Source: (Yazdan Panah Dero, 1394 [2015 A.D])

Although, some nations have been autonomous during the past three decades (1980-2010), such as Ukraine, Latonia and Estonia, but being autonomous from other countries is mostly related to self-governing, making other political systems and confederacy, including old states, new ones and nations (Dalby, 1990: 64).

Meanwhile, new states make some challenges against the common affairs of non-native people. It is possible that these challenges remain for several generations, such as the karima peninsula events (Dalby, 2002: 43).

Therefore, it is necessary to apprehend the new political architecture of global development. The most effective factors are the cultural boundaries of countries. It is a geopolitical fact that states have changed, but nations shall remain (Waltz & Kenneth, 1979: 12).

Conclusion

The first point that can be emphasized is this fundamental argument, by which the other topics discussed in the conclusion is justified, is to prove that the transformational processes in the state system of nations is based on geopolitical facts that were

presented in the formulation of the problem in the introduction section of the article. This article proves that today's world is a world of unrest and that humanity suffers from endless geopolitical turmoil.

The most effective conclusion of this article is that regarding this issue, security and health are considered as the two main basis for humans; so that he/she is prevented from suffering any illness and insecurity, but he/she is not able to apprehend these two precious blessings.

This divine inspiration is regarded as the main motive for considering this important issue. Thus organizing human security and those dangers that threaten it, on the one hand, and developing the effects of this concept in quick geopolitical time, on the other, are the two axis of this bilateral read in this article (Keohane, 1984: 53). In addition to the discussion, we have found a series of fundamental changes in the structure of global security and the governments and nations in the near future and this separation and analysis presented in this paper and the probability of the emergence of new patterns of nation-states have been examined.

Military confrontation with strong powers is not the only solution for obtaining success in simultaneous wars. The main subject is the prediction of military powers, in order to prevent future wars (Howard, 1977: 62). Shall they be successful in these wars? In parallel with this direction, military forces should be ready in the short-term because confronting with competitors needs special and unique skills in defending the national security. In theory, these issues are very accepted and desirable, but in practice, and according to events that have occurred in this era, they are different from the theoretical nature of the above-mentioned discussions; so that behaviors produce stress, rather than security (Luciani, 1988: 153-173).

The conclusion of the analysis of the research is that global security trends represent a geopolitical fact, which the emergence of different geopolitical orders in many parts of the world is unthinkable and out of reach. As it was raised the process itself will have implications for humanity.

References

- Anderson, M. (1999). *Territory and State Formation in a Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ashley, R.K. (1987). The Geopolitics of Geopolitical Space: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Politics. *Alternatives*, 12(4): 403-434.
- Baldwin, D. (1995). Security Studies and End of the Cold War. *World Politics*. 48(1): 117-141.
- Klein, B.S. (1988). Hegemony and Strategic Culture: American Power Projection and Alliance Defence Politics. *Review of International Studies*, 14(2): 133-148.
- Brodie, B. (1973). *War and Politics*. New York: McMillan.
- Booth, K. (1979). *Strategy and Ethnocentrism*. London: Croom Helm.
- Buzan, B.; Kelstrup, M.; Lemaitre, P.; Tromer, E. & Wæver, O. (1990). *The European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post Cold War Era*. London: Pinter.
- Clausewitz, C. . (1976). *On War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dalby, S. (2002). *Geopolitical Change and Contemporary Security Studies: Contextualizing the Human Secretary Agenda. Working Paper*. Item 168. Institute of International Relations, The University of British Columbia.
- Dalby, S. (2000). *Geopolitical Change and Contemporary Security Studies: Contextualizing the Human Secretary Agenda. Working Paper. No.30*. Institute of International Relations, The University of British Columbia.
- Dalby, S. (1990). *Creating the Second Cold War: The Discourse of Politics*. London: Pinter.
- Dewitt, D. (1994). Common, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Security. *The Pacific Review*. 7(1): 1-15.

- Dodds, K. & Atkinson, D. (2000). *Geopolitical Tradition*. London: Routledge.
- Rothschild, E. (1984). *SIPRI Yearbook 1984: Armament Disarmament and International Security*. London: Taylor and Francis, Routledge.
- Farindon, H. (1989). *Strategic Geography*. London: Routtodaye.
- Flint, C (2006). *Introduction to Geography*. London: Geography Compass.
- Frono, R. & Baklarz, R. (1999). The art of information warfare: Insight into the Knowledge Warrior Philosophy. U.S.A: Universal Publishers.
- Gray, C.S. (1999) Strategic Culture as Context: The First Generation of Theory Strikes Back, *Review of International Studies* 25.
- Gray, C.S. (1988). The Geopolitics of Superpower. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Gray, C.S. (1981). National Styles in Strategy: the American Example. *International Security*, 6(2): 83-85.
- Handel, M. (1981). *Weak States in the International System*. London: Cass.
- Hertz, J.H. (1951). *Political Realism and Political Idealism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hertz, J.H. (1950). Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*. 2(2): 159-170.
- Hobbes, Th. (1968). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Howard, M. (1964) Military power and international order. *International Affairs*. 40(3): 397-408.
- Howard, M. (1977). *The Anarchical Society*. London: Macmillan.
- Huntington, S.P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone.
- Jervis, R. (1976). Perception and Misperceptions in International Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keegan, D. (1986). Interaction and communication, (Chapter 6, pp.89). In Keegan, D., *The foundations of distance education*. Kent, UK. Croom Helm.
- Keohane, R.O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Leon, P.B. (2003). *Political Ideologies*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.

- Luciani, G. (1988). The Economic Content of Security. *Journal of Public Policy*, 8(2): 151-173.
- Martin, L. (1983). Can There be National Security in an Insecure Age? *Encounter*. 31(350): 11-19.
- Libicki, M.C. (1995). *What is Information Warfare?* Washington D.C.: National Defense University.
- Morgenthau, H. (1973). *Politics among Nations*. New York: Knof.
- Neill, W.M. (1963). *The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nye, J.S. (1975). *Reflections on the Economics and Politics of International Economic Organizations*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Rubert, S. (2002). *War amongst the People*. London.
- Rumsfeld, D. (June 3, 1997). *Statement of Principles*. Project for the new American Century. Retrieved on 4 Feb. 2015 from: http://rightweb.irc-online.org/images/uploads/PNAC_Statement_of_Principles.pdf.
- Smith, N. (2002). New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. *Antipode*. 34(3): 427-450.
- Toynbee, A.J. (1965). *A study of History*. vol. 1. (abr. D. C. Somervell). New York: Dell.
- Waltz, S.M. (1996). *Revolution and War*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, S.M. & Kenneth, N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley. 16871p.
- Waltz, S.M. & Kenneth, N. (1962). Periodical Literature of International Law and Relations. *The American Political Science Review*, 56(2): 331-340.
- Weitz, R. (2006). Averting a new Great Game in Central Asia. *The Washington Quarterly*. 29(3): 155-167.
- Williams, M. (2003). Words, Image, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4): 511-531.
- Wolfers, A. (1962). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol. In Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (147-165). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Yazdan Panah Dero, K. (1394 [2015 A.D]). *Sāxtār-e nazari-e amniat va že'opoletik [geopolitical], bā ta'kid bar že'oesterateži [geostrategy]* [In Persian: Theoretical Structure of Security and Geopolitics with Emphasis on Geostrategy]. Tehran: Tehran University Press.