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The concept of security would never age in the passage of time, for security ties have automatically been established ever since man has felt he has existed and that others have also existed. These ties will persist so long as man survives. At times it will be manifested in cooperation, at others, in confrontation.

This concept has an enormous spectrum. The more it is explored, the greater are its unknowns. It could be viewed from the vantage point of philosophy as well as the standpoint of politics. The concept is studied in both religions and schools of thought, it is a material as well as a spiritual concept. Besides, security for Muslims does not bring into mind only a political concept. The term "faith" (Iman), in our culture, makes one recall light, love and kindness—"Iman's" root is "Amniat" (security)—a holy term. Hence, we view it from several perspectives in our study group.

1. In the Holy Qur'an, using new methods from Islamic point of view, with help of computer.
2. From philosophical standpoints.
3. From social points of view.
4. From the angle of politics, especially international relations and international law.

Time is too short here to tackle the problem from the first three perspectives. It only suffices to embark on the fourth route, i.e., politics and international law and international relations. First let me stress here that we never regard development as an independent
topic, but ties between development and security automatically come to the fore, once security is viewed through the four aforementioned angles.

In studying security in the fourth way, two methods have been utilized. First, common methods in political science and secondly, an innovative method which I call "logical sequence". Let me explain the method and its results.

First we give a definition of the concept in question—"security" or "development". Results are attained quickly if the definition is perfect, while getting results will be a lengthier process and unreliable if other kinds of definition such as drawing analytical, descriptive and agreement-based definitions are utilized. Using the Holy Qur'an, arriving at perfective definitions is easily possible, while it is not so in the realm of humanities. For most social sciences concepts are compound ones—those which result from the connection between two or more concepts, vs. "independent, nominal" concepts. For instance, woman, man and child are nominal concepts but the concept of father is a compound one. Political scientists do not define their selected concepts such as security and development carefully, for they do not heed these subtleties. In our method, a definition is required at any rate, a definition which could be produced from the common denominator of all definitions presented so far. We derived the security definitions first, and then, placed the most compound definition in the middle, while we juxtaposed other definitions with respect to it. Thus a spectrum was formed, one extreme of which was legal definition and the other was political definition. The main terms of each definition formed the common denominator. Our ultimate observation was that a general common denominator may not be derived from all definitions, for a spectrum is formed from the juxtaposition (overlapping) of all definitions, since all their units do not fully overlap. There are units from the two extremes which are very far from each other; hence they cannot have a common denominator. For instance, the three following definitions exhibit the degree of overlap amongst them. Numbers one and three form two extremes of a spectrum.

1—Security is a state in which the probability of war approaches zero, and that each country's pursuit of national interest would not collide with that of other countries.

2—It is a condition in which the balance of power prevails and states' interference in each other's domestic affairs is minimized.
3—It is a position whereby power forming elements are employed in preserving political independence.

The first and second definitions overlap in "the probability of war approaching zero" and "the balance of power".

The second and third definitions overlap in the "minimization of interference" and "the preservation of political independence".

These were of course examples, while there are closer definitions. This example shows the different and the opposite natures of overlapping definition. We did not separate the definitions of international lawyers and political scientists, for many of the former have a legal mentality and many of the latter define issues on the basis of international politics. Hence many political scientists have put forth a legalistic definition of "politics", and vice versa.

The two following definitions are the common denominators after some 300 security definitions are juxtaposed. One has a fully legal nature, while the other has a political one. They overlap in one aspect, however, which attests to the proximity of these two disciplines.

The legal definition of security is as follows: a situation where threats against territorial integrity and national interests are minimized. In our method (logical sequence), the selected definitions are divided into plain units if they are compound. For instance, the legal definition of security is divisible into "territorial integrity" and "political independence". This is the first stage of our method.

In the second stage, one has to probe which factors can guarantee or threaten security logically, disregarding external realities. These factors are all subjective and hypothetical. All efforts should center on recognizing the above factors, at this stage, using all logical and mathematical methods. It is desirable if there is a discussion by several pundits here, for written sources come to little avail here. To identify the threatening and stabilizing factors, we have had more than 2000 hours of discussion.

The first part of the first definition "territorial integrity" is theoretically threatened by three factors:

1) Invasion
2) Annexation
3) Partition

The second part "political independence" is only threatened by one factor, i.e., "interference". We now look at external realities,
Tens of other factors may be cited which threaten security such as "war, aggression, political crisis, a history of opposition, disturbance in the balance of power, terrorism, environmental decay, population growth, limited resources, chemical weapons proliferation etc."

On the one hand, neither of the said factors are regarded as to threaten security in our method, and on the other, no one underestimates the grave threat inherent in the above factors. Is it exaggerated to claim that war and aggression do not directly threaten security?

The third stage of our method is to define the hypothetical subsets in the definition and thus go on until all discovered external realities restore their status in the method. For instance in the next move, 15 factors threatening security have gained their position in the method such as: War, aggression, preventive actions, the history of conflicts, political and economic interest of different governments. In this method the following aspects have to be noticed:

1—External relations have been considered.
2—The position of each defining elements and its relations with other elements is clearly examined.
3—In case of any contradictions among the defining elements we can determine their nature and arrange them accordingly. For example, if one has legal nature all its sub-sets are also arranged and deal with according to their legal status.
4—Perhaps the most important thing about this method is the fact that constant and changing factor in a certain definition could be well separated and noticed, for instance, development is a changing factor in the legal definition of "security", thus, the development of one country does not necessarily and directly threaten the security of the other one. If only our definition of development is not contrary to the spirit of international system, but if our definition of development would be "gaining so much power to change the world order" we have made a mistake right there since the constant factors of this one are contradictory to the one used in legal definition of "security".

There have been many different definitions of development for the last two decades with an overall trend toward an economic nature, though some tend to be mostly political ones. Perhaps by keeping
these definitions we come up to the conclusion that development is materialization of conditions under which the rate of growth of national product could reach an average of cent percent. It should be mentioned that none of the developing countries which were able to reach that rate were recognised as a developed one.

The reason is that a third category which we refer to as "international" system was not considered in the above mentioned comparison. So in order to define the development properly we must recognize what are the perspectives and dimensions of international system. It seems that the international system is like a sea where all the rivers could eventually reach. Unfortunately not many definitions have been made to give a thorough and clear vision as to what the international system is, but, generally they indicate that present international system is "a combination of international institutions, more than 161 states protecting their own national interests and number of multi-national corporations, all seeking an unidentified prosperity in terms of economic factors and progress.

Considering the afore-mentioned definition it seems the following factors might threaten the present international system.

1—A sudden change in nature of some powers (like a new alliance coming to the surface)

2—The efforts to attain economic progress turn into a deviated form or an ideological system without economic priorities and tries to extend itself as a hegemonic system.

3—A new and unconceived technology appears in the international power theatre.