

How the Migration of Scientific Elites on the National Security of Iran

Dr. Najleh Khandagh^{1*}, Siavash Mohammad Rezaei²

¹Associate Professor Tarbiat Modares University Tehran, Iran

²Master of Political Science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

*Corresponding Author

Dr. Najleh Khandagh

Article History

Received: 07.09.2021

Accepted: 12.10.2021

Published: 25.10.2021

Abstract: Scientific elites, as an indicator of human capital in the field of social capital, are the factors that, by playing the dual role of facilitator and transformer, cause the crystallization and change of social capital components in the field of national security. Each of the security discourses examines the field of security from a specific perspective, but none of them have assessed the agency and the effectiveness of the scientific elite in removing lasting national security. The aim of this research in the first step is to find a discourse among security discourses that has the greatest potential for the crystallization of the existential nature of elites and in the second step, measuring how the existence or non-existence of elites affects the metaphor of sustainable national security, explaining how this relates to a theoretical and theoretical perspective is a matter that has been addressed in this article by citing library sources and by analytical-descriptive method.

Keywords: Security, Elite, Immigration, Bari Buzan, Copenhagen School.

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1980s, when coherence has dominated security theories, each has explored the components of security from a different perspective, Perspectives such as realism and idealism, with a negative view of security over time, were the dominant discourse in this area, but the atmosphere of the Cold War, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it caused soft components to play a greater role in explaining security perspectives than ever before. Among the new security discourses that had a more positive view of security, such as the English school of international relations theory, Paris and Wales, the Copenhagen School expanded the concept of security into five political, economic, social, military and environmental areas, with he entered the field with the index of social security. This school was the only discourse among contemporary schools that by involving personal security in the form of social security, was able to provide the ground for the introduction of components other than the strict military components for security researchers, including the need for Recognition of the elites, especially the scientific elites, their position and how their presence or absence affects sustainable national security, which should be said to be a neglected debate among the debates in this field. Scientific elites, as of human capital, which are especially components of social capital, have a general and complete role in this field. Regarding the nature of the existence of elites, such as the field of security, both negative and positive views in the form of classical and contemporary views have been rigidly theorized in periods of history. In classical discourse, people like Bourdieu, who saw the opportunity for capital as an elite factor, or, like Pareto, who defined elite as the monopoly of exceptional qualities, viewed the field from a negative angle. Human societies, by moving from the culture of patrimonialism and feudalism to existentialism, were able to move from a negative view to a positive discourse (Keller, 1991, 20). The view considered in this research is a document of the country's strategic document on elite affairs (approved by the 248th session of the Supreme Council of the Cultural Revolution, September 2012), which has a positive view of the elite:

An elite refers to a prominent and efficient person who has a significant impact on the creation and development of science, technology, art, literature, culture and management of the country within the framework of Islamic values, as well as his activities based on intelligence, creativity, motivation and innate abilities. Acquired expertise, expertise and capability, on the other hand, accelerate the progress and advancement of the country (National Elite Foundation, 2012).

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Now, with an independent variable such as national security and a dependent variable such as the scientific elite, there is a need to explain this relationship, which we have addressed in this article, because development is a multidimensional process and today as a platform for welfare and the comfort of the people of any society is considered. The evolution of this process depends on indicators whose core is based on human and then social development (Goodars Vand Chegini, 2015, 216-237). This development, if developed, will not be sustainable unless it is in the context of security. Regarding the nature of elites and how they affect social and political components, the thinkers are looking at areas such as the economic consequences of brain drain, globalization and migration of elites, and that elites can be very effective in guiding the country's diplomacy and getting strategic codes according to Mahmoud Sari al-Qalam and also in the field of security, discourses such as moderation and security of the Islamic Republic, which provide a meta-discourse view of the discourse of the Islamic Revolution or, like Mr. Eftekhari, who has looked at security from a structural point of view, they have conducted research in a way that their argument starts from the lack of transparency in the field of security and ends with the discourse of studying security from a strategic point of view. In the meantime, what has been ignored in various sources is how to explain the role of human capital components, especially scientific elites, on security components, which this study tries to explain such an issue.

RESEARCH FINDING

In order to explain the issue accurately, it is necessary to discuss several issues.

1. Security theories.
2. Elites.
3. Migration or migration metaphor.
4. Combining the above three concepts and explaining the relationship and impact of elite migration on national security.

1. Security theories

In this section, it is tried to briefly review security theories, to determine the capacities and contexts of each theory, and finally to determine the theory that has the greatest potential in explaining this relationship, is specified as the analysis framework. Because the scope of this relationship is to have a suitable context for the connection of elite migration with national security.

What is security? *Walter Lippmann*: Every nation is secure to the extent that it does not have to give up its core values if it does not resort to war, and if it is challenged, it can maintain it by winning wars.

Penelope Hartland-Tanberg: National security means the ability of a nation to successfully pursue its national interests, anywhere in the world as they see them.

Frank Ann Trager and F. Van Simoni: National security is the part of government policy that aims to create national and international political conditions to protect or expand vital national values against existing and potential enemies.

Michael H.H. Lou: National security includes defense policy as well as government civilian actions to ensure its full capacity to survive in order to exert influence and achieve domestic and international goals.

National Defense College of Canada: National security means maintaining a way of life acceptable to all people, in accordance with the legitimate needs and aspirations of citizens. This includes liberation from military aggression or pressure, internal overthrow, and the destruction of political, economic, and social values that are essential to the quality of life (Salehnia, Bakhtia, 2018,255-277).

According to the views and definitions of the above, it is said that the security of mental, relative, fluid, is transformed, irreversible and extensive (Rabiee, 2004, 435), which, as a result of such a nature, is a vague image of it over time, therefore, its theorizing is associated with several dilemmas. Security has multiple domains, such as individual, group, professional, social, regional and global domain that challenges the value-security components of other areas in each of these areas, because mainly directed toward the desired situation. The end of the Cold War is as a milestone of classical and contemporary theories, a point that the index of hard security aspects is not prominent and soft aspects have highlighted it. The origin of security schools is the United States and the European schools criticize most of these schools (Tabatabaei, Fathi, 2014, 6-42). The focus of American schools is liberal, new liberal and conservative ideologies that have been organized under titles such as realism, structuralism and the theory of global order. The main origins of the security schools, in terms of the spirit of evolution, go back to the school of realism, and subsequently, the school of idealism was theorized against this school, and finally, with the end of the Cold War He entered politics and with the intensification of economic and political developments, the theory of world order also appeared (Salimi, 2005, 19-43).

1-1 School of Realism

From the point of view of realist discourse, governments have the ability to implement and make decisions, both domestically and regionally and internationally, and according to this discourse, what determines the type of government capability and policy is the anarchic atmosphere of the international system, on the other hand, realists always prefer order and security to freedom and justice, and tyranny to chaos and disorder (Snyder, 2011, 125-156). The sum of the above two propositions cause governments to surpass each other in gaining power and its requirements at any cost. This contest for the best position of power creates an insecure environment, because no government is confident of its security, and therefore sensitive to the realities of power, the existence of power-building structures and tools, and any attempt to dominate those tools, structures and institutions. They do not give up, because increasing power weakens power or other powers, in other words, increases the insecurity and increases tensions in the international environment (Trachtenberg, 2003, 156-194). In this discourse, because it is the ability to implement and make decisions with government officials, therefore, intra-structural and organizational interests are considered more by governments than social, cultural, etc. Governments are the main provider of security for themselves and the inhabitants of their geographical area, where all the components are confined to the same interests and are organized and have an identity, so governments are ahead of each other in the accumulation of knowledge and military power. In this discourse, the threats are more of a foreign type, so military solutions have a special priority. This discourse is known as the security riddle, a riddle that is reduced or threatened by increasing the security factor, the security of other parts, which results in the spread of regional or international insecurity (Booth, 2007, 48-133). Behind such a process, there will be a lack of confidence and, as a result, the cultivation of negative and threatening perceptions of these activists towards each other, which will result in nothing but war and conflict (Collins, Weinel, Evans, 2010, 185-201).

1-2 Idealists

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a discourse other than realism entered the field of international relations. Liberalism introduced a discourse of will, authority, and freedom. Numerous and different approaches to national security and the model of liberalism were designed by thinkers in this field, including: democratic peace (idealistic discourse), functionalism, neo-functionalism, interdependence and institutionalism.

1. Liberal Internationalists or proponents of democratic peace argue that the deeper the process of democratization in countries, the deeper the prospect of peace and security, given the possibility of controlling and eliminating war between liberal democratic governments.
2. Transnationalism argue that relations between non-state actors go beyond state relations and make relations between states peaceful.
3. Functionalists and neo-functionalists see the development of economic-technical cooperation as a prelude to understanding and political cooperation.
4. Theorists of communication theories consider the increase of social exchanges between individuals as the basis for integration and the formation of security communities.
5. Institutionalism, the development of international institutions or regimes is seen as curbing the expansionist and militant behavior of governments. (Mushirzadeh, 2006, 225-294)

Realism has a strong belief in the algebra and immutability of things in nature and the principles governing international relations, which is identified by the focus on two factors, namely the origin of human defects or the anarchic atmosphere of the international system. But liberalism, unlike realism, believes that the possibility of change in order to reduce conflicts and achieve a comprehensive peace, according to the teachings below. Stein and Al. Petiford, there is an explained:

1. Human beings are rational, and their rationality may act as a tool for the ability to shape and pursue interests, or as an ability to understand moral principles and to live by the rule of law.
2. Individual freedom must be valued more than anything else
3. Human nature is positive and progressive. Therefore, it is possible to change the conditions of international relations for the better. Humans can act as agents for change.
4. The notion of separation between domestic and international territory is distorted. Phenomena such as interdependence make the boundaries between states increasingly permeable and may even merge the boundaries between the domestic and the international realm, so that a universal human community is realized (Ibid, 225-249).

Examining the above materials, it can be said that liberalism has a more open view than realism. Liberals believe in the value of the individual and individual freedom, as well as individual institutions, and especially in their emphasis on the economy, that security is a concept beyond the external threat of war. Security has a multiple meaning and with the formation of developments such as: development of democratization, development of trade and international economic cooperation, technological developments and the expansion of international institutions and their increasing influence in foreign and even domestic policy of countries, a better ground will be provided to reduce conflict.

3-1 English school of international relations theory

There is a branch of thought in this security school, one focusing on the preferences of the state institution (pluralists) and the other on the individual (solidarityists), but both embracing the international community, which embodies values and rules. (Bellamy, 2010) Pluralists see the need to establish international order in the face of state security, support for sovereignty, and respect for the principle of non-interference. Hadley Bull and Jackson are the founders of this school of thought. Bull believes that in the absence of international conflict, security preferences are a prerequisite for pursuing justice within state borders. Hadley Bull considers elements such as the balance of power, international law, diplomacy, war, and the existence of great powers necessary to maintain international order, and the overemphasis on political values causes instability, it causes instability and the spread of insecurity by the government to the citizens. (Ghavam, Fatemi Nejad, 2008, 179-206) But Jackson's views take a step further in this area, arguing that world politics is based on a global treaty, which is the foundation of a pluralistic society and lies between Machiavelli's power politics and Kant's human society. This theory, focusing on the principle of sovereignty, territorial integrity of states and the principle of non-interference, believes that security has no instrumental nature but has a moral nature, and in the absence of this moral principle, other goals such as economic, cultural and environmental security cannot be achieved. In contrast to pluralists, solidarityists refer more to the security of individuals. Nicholas Wheeler and Linklater are among the thinkers who lead this movement. While looking at government agency, Wheeler argues that by insisting on upholding government sovereignty, critical points are being made about non-compliance with governments' moral obligations to citizens, which will lead to insecurity. But this is not the case with Linklater, he introduces the individual as a constructive factor in the international community, not governments, and in the category of security, the basis is defined as the individual (Ebrahimi, Zamanian, 2010, 1-22). What can be said is that the English school of international relations theory has shown a more pluralistic face than the realist and liberal schools, because it has made the reference both the institution of the state and the individual.

1-4 Welsh School

As stated above, with the entry of the English school of international relations theory and its two dominant branches, the basis for the entry of critical schools was laid. Critical schools refer to schools that do not look at security issues from a military and agency perspective, but remove the government from its traditional position and do not limit the security authority only to the interests of the government, hence, they base it on another reference such as people and individuality. The Welsh School is one of the most important of these schools. (Booth, 1991, 313-326) According to Ashley and Walker, this school has transgressed arbitrarily, solve impossible problems, and been able to build and disseminate new ways of recognizing and implementing policy (Ibrahimi, 2014, 7-30). The origins of this school go back to the article Security and Liberation of Ken Booth, which was published in 1991, in which security was synonymous with liberation and thus provided a new explanation of security. Booth was not alone in this, and Richard Wayne Jones was instrumental in strengthening this school. The incident took place at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, later known as the School of Liberation Realism. According to this school, security is a derivative concept and theorizes about the philosophical worldview and individual political theory in this field, namely security, which in this regard can also take on different components and structures.

The Welsh school is trying to politicize security, to prevent the events from being a toy in the hands of the government under the name of security. The politicization of security causes it to change from an ultimate goal to a tool, a tool that is aimed at achieving deeper goals. The Wales School believes that if security remains in a special and monopolized environment, the rules, norms and social institutions of states will allow for political violence and create a protected environment for inhumane treatment of individuals without prosecution and punishment of perpetrators. This school has moved beyond their traditional identity, which was based on conflicts of interest, and has entered the field of human rights, which is a transnational field, by presenting a public discourse. The Wales School has established a link between security and international instruments such as the Charter of Human Rights, eliminated conflicts of interest, and established a discourse of peace and liberation (Aradau, 2004, 388-41). Therefore, from the perspective of this critical school, security can be defined as a field for the evolution of values, the legitimacy of claims related to knowledge and the production and reproduction of forms of collective identity in a transnational and international structure (Williams, Krause, 2002).

1-5 School of Paris

Two theorists, Didier Bigu and Jeff Hoyzmanz inspired by French sociology, especially the meta-structuralism ideas of Bourdieu and Foucault, who themselves were epistemologically influenced by the independence of Nietzsche's truth, they became the designers and inventors of this theory, believing that our security is between life and death (Huysmans, 1998, 226-255).

This school is designed based on three main components: knowledge, agents and the field; Among these three factors, field is the turning point of the mentioned factors, because according to the laws of physics-field, because the magnetic field is a space field in which the behavior of particles inside is explained according to the nature of that field.

(Jamshidia, Worship, 2017, 1-32). According to this model, the performance of each factor in relation to environmental conditions and characteristics is explained, For example, an individual in a sporting environment exhibits an action different from being in an artistic environment. The actor is fixed, but it is the rules and regulations of the field that explain the type of action of the actor. According to Bourdieu, the structural field is not ineffective, but a space with special rules and regulations in which actors act by accepting those rules. Therefore, the field was introduced as a separate social space that consisted of distinct and independent situations, in other words, the field is a network of objective and real relations between situations (Huysmans, 2006, 200-245). In this field, actors act with different power and knowledge, which, regardless of the type of field, mainly has three characteristics: first, that security experts are active in the field of power, Second, this field of power creates the field of domination; Thirdly, the atmosphere of this field, with the presence of actors with different knowledge and identities, is the center of the conflict, who are mostly unaware of the end of their actions, and It may even cause the actor to perish. In short, this school seeks to take security out of the realm of subjectivity and to explain it in a more pragmatic way in the form of discourse.

1-6 Copenhagen School

Unlike previous discourses, in this school, the government is not the main player in society and has involved society in how it manages socially, both in terms of domestic concerns and the international system. Buzan, who is the main theorist of this school, increases security with a realistic view by transferring government representation to social institutions. In this view, he weakens the negative view and strengthens the positive view, which he divides into four groups. Economic, political, social and environmental are divided, among which social security is defined as a key area. Some critics have argued with Buzan that as security increases, governments may expand their security issues and goals in times of emergency; in response to these critics, Buzan responds: "The best way to prevent the spread of the concept of security is to take issues out of the realm of security." Now the question that arises here is how to distinguish security cases from Non security? Buzan proposes two criteria for it: first, in the positive view of the Copenhagen School, the security condition of a factor depends on whether or not that factor poses a threat to citizens, and second, it is outside the written laws of the country in a way that it cannot be controlled or restrained by legal standards. Another question is what solution does the Copenhagen School offer to solve the security? Buzan believes that instead of thinking about how to resolve the crisis, we should focus on how to create the crisis, in the sense that if the process of the crisis is investigated, it can be prevented. (Walters, 2016, 20-7) For the Copenhagen school, building security is a political issue, security is not an explicable phenomenon, but is built through a process and by activists, Security-making indicates a kind of necessity or directional choice to solve a problem, and security-making is different from the concept of positive security in concept and structure, in other words, this school considers national security as the center of gravity of security by indexing the agency of the national government. (National government is a sign of nation-state, not state-nation) In view of the above, it can be said that social security is more important than other areas of security. In this category, society plays a more fundamental role than the government in determining which is a security or insecurity issue, and the government acts merely as an agent. The best role of the government is to be able to bring security issues and problems into the political and then the social sphere, and also to prevent interaction, that is, the entry of social, economic and environmental issues into the political and security spheres, because the cost of handling In the social sphere it is less than the political sphere and finally less than the security sphere. Entering issues in the field of security, increases the cost and also causes neglect of organization and development in other sectors, a system that enters the process of consuming resources for internal security needs and destruction from within, that is, instead of spending its internal forces and resources on development, spends on things that are of security importance, and because the multiplicity and areas of security increase from a negative perspective. Therefore, with increasing costs, the system suffers from internal collapse due to lack of resources in the midterm and long term.

2. Elites

Who are the elites? And what are their characteristics? This term is a concept that has been associated with many changes since its inception in the 19th century. To better understand this concept, it may be possible to divide it into two main periods, the first period which carries "classical views", such as Mosca (1896), Pareto (1916), Michels (1911) and the second period the cause of "contemporary views". It is itself divided into two sub-periods, "functionalist approach" and "critical perspective". The main thinkers of this school Perry (1969/2005), Dai (2002), Dogan (2003), Heigley, De Koon, & Smart (1979), Hoffmann-Lang (1992), Christiansen, Müller, and Togby (2001), and Golbrandson(2002), Mills with "Ruling Elites" (1993) and Dai (1995) , The last three thinkers are related to critical theory. The difference between the two general above views is more than that one pays attention to the agency and negativity of the elite, because Bourdieu considers having capital to be the agent of the elite, or, like Pareto, who defines having exceptional and unique characteristics as the cause of elitism. (Classic view) But in the two tendencies of the contemporary view, more emphasis has been placed on agreement (functionalism) or contradiction (critical). Experts from the functionalist point of view include Carl Mannheim. In his view, the elites are divided into three groups: the "organizational and political" elites, the "intellectual and artistic" elites, and the "religious and moral" elites (Hartman, 2007, 22) or Susan Clare, who has gone a step further and looked at the elites from a structural point of view, as she believes that "The requirements of modern industrial societies are such that the number and importance of elites is

beyond the ruling class and aristocracy"(Keller, 1991, 20). Mills is one of the of the Critical perspective thinker, Mills describes the American political, military, and economic elite, the elites in this regard are those whose decisions have major consequences for the community and the international system. Mills defines this elite as the real centers of power and introduces other institutions such as religious and academic centers as their functions (Mills, 2009, 87-25).

According to the strategic document of the country in the affairs of the elites, according to the approval of the 248th session of the Supreme Council of the Islamic Cultural Revolution of Iran, in September 2012, the elite refers to a prominent and efficient person in creating and expanding science, technology, art, literature, culture and management. The framework of Islamic values has a significant impact also, his activities based on intelligence, creativity, motivation and innate abilities on the one hand being an expert, expertise and capability on the other hand, will accelerate the progress and promotion of the country.(National Elite Foundation, 2012) The above definition is cited in this study, because the course of globalization and determinism in the unity of economy, technology, communication and even the type of social culture, has caused the positive aspect of the elite to have a special focus. And any nation-state that can be more successful by having more elites and the harmony of the elites with the masses will be the standard-bearer of this synthesis, and this is an implication of a kind of global governance.

3. Elite migration

The International Organization for Migration defines migration and forced migration as:

Immigration: The act of leaving or leaving a country with a view to settling in another country.

Forced migration: The dynamics of a population in which the element of coercion, including threats to life and livelihood, may be due to natural or human factors.

The above definitions say two things: first, migration is a physical act and second, the cause of migration that occurs due to a natural or human necessity, but what is not seen in the above definitions is a metaphor of migration. Elites who are unable to migrate physically due to socio-political contractions usually migrate in the form of two faces, the first face, self-censorship and identity change in the elite, in which case the elite person ceases to exist and He tries to transform himself into a common and mass person, so he gives up his existential nature and assumes a populist personality that is, it breaks from within. The second face transmits self-censorship from its identity and existence to anger and coercion towards society, in other words, it acquires a negative and militant identity towards its society. This kind of elitism is the most dangerous aspect of society. Authoritarian and totalitarian countries that suffer from the disease of rentierism over time usually have manifestations of all three forms of migration towards the elites (physical departure of the elite, self-censorship and change of identity from the elite and violence with the society of origin).

4. The Impact of Immigration / Absence of Elites on Iran's National Security

The migration or absence of elites has a negative impact on the national security of the country from two perspectives, the first view depends on the effect it has on social capital and the second view the power of social capital weakens national security:

Ratio of social capital and national security

In explaining this concern, what we can say from the theories of the Copenhagen School as a first step is the index of social security among other areas of security, relative to national security (Buzan, 2018, 191-220). Now social security can be effective in the development of national security when its social capital can lead the society to convergence and growth to achieve common interests by creating related, dynamic and convergent networks (Arneil, 2006, 4-5). If we define social capital, which is responsible for managing relationships and interactions in society, as a platform, human capital, which is an indicator for enhancing the abilities of individuals, can be defined as one of the most important actors in this scene. On the other hand, the elites also play a role following the set of human capital, as a leader, and in the context of social capital, as a facilitator (Arneil, 2006, 4-5). If we define social capital, which is responsible for managing relationships and interactions in society, as a platform, human capital, which is an indicator for enhancing the abilities of individuals, can be defined as one of the most important actors in this scene (Ahn, 2003, 143-176). Now, if we can analyze the components influencing social capital, we have in fact been able to explain the role of the elites in creating sustainable national security.

The division of countries in the field of security is generally divided into two types, countries that have a security structure, such as developed and democratic countries, and countries that do not have such a structure, such as the Soviet Union under Stalin. The countries of the first constituency have Specific and codified laws in terms of actors and the scope of their influence and role, under what laws and regulations they should bring issues into the realm of politics or security. But the second type of countries, which do not have a clear and codified structure and are in a way full-fledged mobilization governments, bring most of the ordinary political issues into the realm of security. The reason for this is that providing security gives those in power many opportunities to suppress the opposition in line with their

goals. One way for these countries is to keep the issue at stake for security, because this ambiguity puts the security actor in a better position than other actors in order to increase the survival rate of his power and sovereignty. The second type of operation of this type of closed and unstructured governments is the multiplicity of security issues, and the purpose of creating this multiplicity is to facilitate the security process or approach to its favorite and strategic issues (Buzan, 2018, 65-59) In this, structure has a key role, the structure implicitly indicates the existence of several areas that, while the rules and practices of each section are separate and unique, which also requires its own expertise and knowledge, are all components of a puzzle that are inside the puzzle. Sometimes it has a property separate from its own existential and independent state. The presence of the country's elites as scientists and experts in various fields or holders of working capital, in how and how the formation, explanation, rotation and operation of units, both independently and dependently, is very colorful. The elites cause the concerns of each field to be fully scientifically identified and studied, and the solutions to solve them to be properly explained, for example, the concerns of the field of economics are different from the environment, and each requires its own specialization. In the absence of elite expertise, it is obvious that the work of discernment and deliberation about it will not have the desired perfection, and sometimes it has been seen that it has been treated with prejudice. The workflow of each field is done in relation to the prevailing science in that field, and in addition, how to combine puzzles is a separate science that is exclusively in the hands of the elites of that field. The result is that the elites must enter different domains according to their competence in order to improve the performance, if the elites influence the social spheres, these spheres, both as a whole, will have similar patterns of rotation, and this will lead to the promotion of the social sphere, that is, the rotation of elites in the system.

If the elites influence the social spheres, these spheres, both as a whole, will have similar patterns of rotation, and this will lead to the promotion of the social sphere. A security actor is an individual, group, institution, or class that uses arguments to make arguments. In order to take the issue out of the scope of laws and public view, and by giving urgency to it, to free itself from the shackles of civil, social and political procedures. The stronger the persuasive power of the audience in question, the sooner and more acute the security issue. There is a danger lurking in the community, as the existence of this persuasive power in securing causes the actor's face to be relied on too much, and therefore the security actor to be placed in a privileged position, followed by the audience who has the right to judge and as a result, the audience that has the right to judge in securing will be marginalized.(Ibid,77) The audience, as stated above, is the decision-makers and arbitrators in the field of security, and in international democratic principles they are the ones who have the power, and it is the security actors who are allowed to act on the capacity and awareness of their audience. With the dominance of elites in the social field, collective wisdom increases due to the fertility of modernity by adapting the patterns of social micro-tradition, in which the existence of elites plays an important role in its development. The elites with the knowledge that they give to the society according to their science and field during the process of social events and processes, the capacity of collective wisdom in the field of society is gradually increasing, so security activists are forced to express their arguments theoretically. Give more and stronger citations in the field of civil and human rights, which in turn reduces the diversity of existential threats in the system. Collective wisdom is the only field in which power is inherent, neither acquired, nor given nor taken by anyone, but closed and totalitarian countries, by keeping collective consciousness low, try take advantage it as a tool in Use it for their own purposes. The third element is security analysts who play a key role in securing social concerns. Analysts basically analyze events from their point of view and show their urgencies and consequences in order to clarify the collective wisdom, but in essence, they are on the elite front of society, which, if they play the right role, it increases the capacity of reason of society, but closed systems, which are reluctant to do so, select these analysts from among their approved ones and do not allow other thinkers to enter the field to play such a role, therefore, the same local analysts help the society to convince the audience in line with the goals of the security actors, which will eventually lead to a decrease in the level of collective wisdom in the hands of security activists. The security approach mentioned above is precisely the result of the superiority of the security actor and security analyst, and the qualitative and quantitative sum of these security approaches also indicates the sufficient capacity of the security audience. Countries in which the role of national identity is more colorful and the cause of the unity of the people of that country is their common cultural and historical values, usually in these countries, It is nations that build governments in line with their common identity treasures, elites, by playing a key role in creating and maintaining a sense of nationalism, extend social wisdom to all social and public angles, and this leads to the integration of the elites with the public sphere, in other words, ordinary people. The concept of elitism is not inherent but finds meaning in contrast to the general concept of people and is the result of synthesis between these two strata, in such a way that the nature and evolution of each depends on the other's existence and finds identity. So if the root is the nation, the result is a strong government. Here is a quote from Mr. Huntington, a political scientist on the clash of civilizations: The clash of civilizations establishes the identity of nations, because it is a framework in which principles are legitimized and valued, and at the heart of which one achieves an interpretation of events.(Ibid, 71) In contrast, some governments or governments start building nations in the direction of the desired ideologies, without considering or including the symbols of the collective and historical identity of the people, according to the teachings of the same ideology and because security thinker are defined by security issues, so with the departure of national identity concerns, as mentioned above, the actor in the context of his ideology takes the top position and marginalizes the audience, which is the result of a weak government, and this weakness of the government causes the issues to go out of the social and political sphere

and into the security sphere. According to Buzan, in security research, the goal and criterion is not to make more security issues, but to reduce security issues. Increases government fragility in the face of internal and external challenges. More challenge means more costs and dealings, and the system is gradually moving away from political and civilian priorities and into the military realm of security. The military sphere, if it does not have the support of other security spheres as a support, due to entering the sphere of deterrence and competition, with the increase in cost in relation to income, the system gradually enters the cycle of selfishness and extinction from within. Which collapses after passing the point of no return. Chipman has a very valuable say in this category:

"Civilian aspects of security may take more time than strategists, but the need for individuals, nations, or unions to provide, deploy, engage, or withdraw troops must continue to be the main focus of strategic analysts' research.« (Mousavi Rad, 2015, 40-85), the result is that we must distance ourselves from the central government and rely on the root of identity and use the state structure only as a tool, in the national interest. The general structure of governments, especially weak ones with little public relations, in this way, security issues are taken out of the case and brought closer to the institutional state, because if a security concern is institutionalized, it gains a lot of power. Explaining it to audiences at a lower cost and energy also has such legitimacy that security itself lacks it. But what is the solution? Barry Buzan and his colleagues believe that "it is only in the cultural context of society, through our participation in political action, that we can contribute to the issue of security or not, and this is quite different from the reality of the threat as a security problem" (Buzan, 2018, 75) Elites in the role of an evolving layer take imperfect and traditional definitions from the heart of society and redefine it based on their inherent and scientific understanding and genius, break hegemonic monopolies and define a new nature of possession. Elites are constantly redefining the components of the old silence to the dynamic components of the present and sometimes the future. Life and wealth lose their former singular meaning and find a face of collective dynamism and coexistence, the costs of having health and freedom will decrease with this collective interaction, and the options of having social status will increase. This is the evolution of human life, lives that were once defined as individual and sometimes ethnic necessities, which today are read in the form of national and transnational equivalents. National security is a cultural concept and model with the dominance of political and military spheres as a key concept in political culture. Personal security, regardless of what kind of impact people have on other areas, especially social security, is instinctual and sometimes with the help of science they strive to maintain it, but the weakness of these measures is that, in open and democratic societies The national significance of which is more prominent in them is the result of three areas of personal security, individual security and government security in the direction of social security. Because if weak states go hand in hand with weak nations with weak or small national cultures, in the turmoil of civilizations, Huntington says, they may experience widespread and fragile political and security disruptions to social security, although they may. These calls are unwanted and accidental. Social threats enter the realm of security when these social conflicts become inter-state conflicts or pave the way for the disintegration of the country. The index of social security is recorded in the security of identity, this identity by the management that governments apply to it may start from the form of ethnic and linguistic identity and expand to transnational identities. Governments are successful in blurring the boundaries between government and social identity without any gaps or contradictions, such as Japan.

Bari Buzan has a key statement in this regard that we mention exactly: "In the context of international security analysis, a key element of society is the ideas and practices that identify individuals as members of a social group. Society is consolidated by identity, that is, the perception that co-existents and individuals have of themselves and unite them as members of a community. These identities are distinct from, but intertwined with, openly political organizations associated with the government. » Iran's multiethnic and multicultural society is inherently prone to disintegration. If national identity is not defined as an indicator, if the government wants to create another alternative to national identity as a link between current ideas and practices within the country, it will be successful in its policy as long as its importance is higher than the importance of its national identity. If the government bases its political and sovereign life only in this way, it will face the risk of collapse if it does not succeed.

Now the question is why national identity is the best platform for collective solidarity in Iran, national identity is an identity that can be cited because its organization has been established over time, through various events and with the presence of all ethnic groups, its deficiency or credibility It is legitimate with relatives and ideas, so to legitimize it, it is not necessary to have large advertising forums and spend huge expenses. On the other hand, this identity, which is a set of historical experiences, is specific to these people and borders, but other alternative components may have connections and activities outside the borders, the ideological components and ethnic prejudices that develop in the shadow of the nation-state in the context of society may give rise to separatist and terrorist activities inside and outside the country, like ethnic views in Iran, as the situation of Turks, Kurds and Arabs, which opens the door to foreign threats in the social sphere, The performance of elites regarding the incompatibility of national culture with ideological and ethnic prejudices is defined in such a way that by defining and explaining the components of national identity, they keep it alive and effective as national identities of social ideas and procedures. The popular political organizations, which are the main indicator of the border of social security, do not contradict the identity of the government. The government is strong in

the context of national identity and has a strong connection with current identities in the context of its society. Another important point made at the Copenhagen School is that elites who are supporters of identity in the field if they are subjected to policies such as forced migration or killing and imprisonment in a way that they cannot do what they should. In other words, to be caught in the policy of eradication, identity is seriously endangered, because the threat of the supporters of identity is a threat to the identity itself. Policies to undermine the social identity of elites have devastating effects on the level of consciousness of individuals in society, which in turn increases development costs. In addition to the policy of eradication, which is mainly implemented by closed and totalitarian governments, if we add the problems of unemployment and delinquency to the components of this spectrum, it must be said that society with all its areas, especially social security, will fall into the abyss. Wrong, because the security of the individual, which is the basis of other areas of security, is seriously threatened, and this is where the next gap occurs, as society faces the threat of forced migration of elites and the lack of elites increases the cost of competition regional and becomes international. There is an indisputable point in the policy of national unity, which is the interaction between the elite and the common people. Some governments, in line with their own interests, other identities, such as ideological and ethnic identities, are influenced by national identity, and instead use the media and the educational system to try to de-nationalize and create a new nation with a new identity. In other words, if a nation is a collection of different identities from different groups that have formed a new group under the influence of ideological theories, the existing national identity will be vulnerable to the re-expression of racial and cultural differences and inequalities. This vulnerability itself has become a threat to the security and survival of that nation-state. The existence of elites frees the culture and identity of the society from a dry and structural state, which is a kind of cultural habit, and gives it the capacity to be fluid and dynamic. Societies such as Iranian society, whose national identity is tied to certain cultural habits, will have a weak position against any homogenizing culture such as Western cultures, and they will act as a threatening factor. Therefore, the conclusion that only the provision of personal security, strength and fluidity of culture and national identity must be observed so that social security is not threatened and endangered, and as explained above, the elites have a key role in estimating this purpose, as for the second view, the absence of heterogeneous elites towards the ruling ideology causes the monopoly of the ruling elites, in other words, in the shadow of such a rule, society slips towards state capitalism or fascism (Bashirieh, 2003, 155-148). The existence of elites from any discourse spectrum causes the fluidity of society, which is the product of this fluidity in socio-political models and institutions such as the existence of trust between the people and the institution of government, the expansion of national norms, the institutionalization of political socialization and the development of popular participation networks and the above factors together contribute to the stability of national security (Ahn, 2003, 89-123).

CONCLUSION

With the emergence of social security from the perspective of the Copenhagen School, elites act as a conductive layer between social, political, and economic factors and concerns by playing the dual role of facilitator and transformer, the result of such a nature is the reduction of security concerns and their redefinition in the lower social spheres. The entry of concerns into this area has put issues in the abyss of collective choice, which in turn increases collective wisdom and social participation and reduces the costs of institutional management in the country. The result of such actions and sometimes interactions between elites and the masses in the context of society, in forms such as building trust, deepening individual and collective identity, increasing participation and political socialization, all of which play a vital role in creating and sustaining national. What is important here is to ensure the stagnation of the elites in society; the stagnation of the elites in societies depends entirely on a number of factors, including the consolidation and persuasion of their economic problems, as well as the assertion of their identity, it totally depends in the shadow of the elite. The policy of the operating states must be such as to guarantee this stagnation. If the dynamism of the elites does not lead to the development of collective wisdom, society will be caught in the circle of fascist thinking, which is a kind of domination of the negative view of security and elite, which will result in nothing but the death of the dynamics of the masses and social movements. The prioritization of personal interests in the form of racial or ideological discourses, the face of social security concerns, and the slogans of democracy for the democratization of the masses are strengthened. The result is that the elites, especially the scientific elites, are the turning point of society. If they are guided properly, the result will be an increase in collective interaction and the dynamism of the masses. Society and its falling into the trap of totalitarianism will not have an institution or even an individual. The result is that the elites, especially the scientific elites, are the turning point of society. If they are guided properly, the result will be an increase in collective interaction and the dynamism of the masses. Society and its falling into the trap of totalitarianism will not have an institution or even an individual. The result will be nothing but the collapse of society and its falling into the trap of institutional and even individual totalitarianism.

REFERENCES

- Salehnia, A., & Bakhtyari, H. (2018). Prioritization of National Security Threats in the Islamic Republic of Iran through Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). *Strategic Studies of public policy*, 8(27), 255-277.

- Tabatabai, S. M., & Fathi, M. J. (2014). The Evolution of the Concept of Security in NATO after the Cold War Based on the Copenhagen School, *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies of Public Policy (Strategic Studies of Globalization)*, 5(14).
- Salimi, H. (2005). Virtual Government, Aggressive Realism, International System, Foreign Policy, *Quarterly Journal of Public Law Research*, 7(17).
- Moshizadeh, H., & Vaseizadeh, N. (2018). International social capital: trust, participation and networks in international society. *political quarterly*, 48(1), 175-195.
- Qawam, S. A., & Fatemi Nejad, S. A. (2008). The English School as a Pluralist Theory: Explaining the Concepts of the International System, the International Community and the International Community, *Encyclopedia of Law and Politics*, No. 8
- Ebrahimi, S., & Zamanian, R. (2010). Semantics from the Perspective of the English School in International Relations. *Journal of Public Law Research*, 12(3), 1-22.
- Ebrahimi, N. (2014). A Comparative Study of Security in the Concept of recent Security Schools, *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies*, 17(4).
- Jamshidiha, G. H., & Parastesh, S. H. (2007). The dialectic of character and field in Bourdieu's theory of action, *Social Science Quarterly*, No. 30.
- Montazaran, J. (2016). Studying the issue of elite migration as a national security challenge and presenting solutions to solve it in the vision document of development and progress of the Islamic Republic, 9th Congress of Pioneers of Progress.
- Buzan, B. (2015). *People of States and Fear*, Fifth Edition, Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Mills, Ch. W., & Mowlana, H. (2009). *Power Elites*, Institute of Western Studies, Written Culture.
- National Elite Foundation. (11/7/2012). The country's strategic document on elite affairs (signed by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad), High Secretariat of the Cultural Revolution Council.
- Mousavi Rad, S. H., & Ghodsian, H. (2015). Analysis of Elite Migration and the Impact of Deterrent Policies Using System Dynamics, *Strategic Management Research*.
- Bashirieh, H. (2003). *Political Science Education*, University of Tehran.
- Goodarzvand, C. M. (2015). Sustainable Development; Indicators and policies. *World Politics Quarterly*, 4(2).
- Rabiee, A. (2004). *Development and Security Concerns (National Security Studies: An Introduction to National Security Theories in the Third World)*, Political and International Studies, Tehran.
- Arneil, B. (2006). *Diverse communities: The problem with social capital*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ahn, T. K. (2003). *Foundations of social capital*. (No:302 F6).
- Hartmann, M. (2007). *The sociology of elites* (p. 24). London: Routledge.
- Huysmans, J. (1998). The question of the limit: Desecuritization and the aesthetics of horror in political realism. *Millennium*, 27(3).
- Krause, K., & Williams, M. C. (1996). Broadening the agenda of security studies: Politics and methods. *Mershon international studies review*, 40(Supplement_2), 229-254.
- Aradau, C. (2004). Security and the democratic scene: Desecuritization and emancipation. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7(4), 388-413.
- Booth, K. (1991). *Theory of world security (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)*, Cambridge University Press.
- Bellamy, A. J. (2010). *Global politics and the responsibility to protect: from words to deeds*, Routledge.
- Collins, H., Weinel, M., & Evans, R. (2010). The politics and policy of the Third Wave: new technologies and society. *Critical policy studies*, 4(2), 185-201.
- Booth, K. (2007). *Theory of world security (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)*, Cambridge University Press.
- Trachtenberg, M. (2003). *The Question of Realism: A Historian's View*, University of Colombia, Los Angeles, 13(1).
- Snyder, J. (2011). *Religion and international relations theory*. Columbia University Press.
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Routledge.
- Keller, S. I. (1991). *Beyond the ruling class: Strategic elites in modern society*. Transaction Publishers.

CITATION: Najleh Khandagh & Siavash Mohammad Rezaei (2021). How the Migration of Scientific Elites on the National Security of Iran. *South Asian Res J Human Soc Sci*, 3(5): 374-383.