

“Security Community” in the Context of Nontraditional Security*

By Wang Jianglei

Abstract: Abstract: In essence, all communities in the sense of politics are security communities, while security communities in the sense of international politics are an epitome of communities in the former general sense. In a traditional security concept, security simply means national security, and a security community mainly refers to a state union aiming at military security between different countries, but such a route has been denied by the prominent emergence of nontraditional security issues and the demands of safeguard concerned. A security community in the context of nontraditional security is based on both survival and development security, and is more extensive and more complicated in terms of its goals, contents and measures. Thus, the author thinks it a return to a community in the sense of politics, which has shown some renewal and breakthrough in the understanding and practices concerning the issues of communities.

Operative words: community, security community, traditional security, nontraditional security

Community and Security Community

1. Community

Community is a word of extensive connotations, which can refer to groups or organizations at all levels that exist in a society and are formed on the basis of subjective or objective common characteristics, and it includes both spontaneous commune organizations of small sizes, and political organizations at higher levels, and even states and nations, i.e., national community. It can refer to both a formal community and a formless one¹. No matter what types, sizes or levels they involve, these communities are the same in their fundamental pursuit: “Seeking safety in an insecure world.”²

This proposition contains two presuppositions that we have to deal with: whose safety and what safety, in other words, whoever always expects to seek for what kind of security by means of the constitution of various communities? The first question seems to be easy to answer, that is, the safety of human beings. But more closely looking into it, one will find it merely an obscure

*This article is a research result for the NTS-Asia Research Fellowships Project 2007; here the author would like to show her heartfelt thanks to The Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies of Asia (NTS-Asia) at the Nanyang Technological University for its kind patronage.

¹ See Zygmunt Bauman (Britain), *Community*, translated by Ouyang Jinggen, published by Jiangsu People's Publishing House, Phoenix Publishing and Media Group, 2nd ed., Apr. 2007, p. 1.

² This expression comes from book title *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, see note 1.

answer because the subject of safety varies as with different communities. A social consortium safeguards the security of its members, a state guarantees the security of its citizens, and a regional international organization assures the security of its state members within the region. Take traditional security and nontraditional security for examples. The formal one cares for the security of the state and that of some people, while what a nontraditional security is concerned with is the security of the globe, the society and all the human beings.

The second issue involves the contents of security. In essence, security involves two fundamental aspects: the security of survival and that of development. That has indirectly replied to another question implicitly contained in the proposition: why do people constitute a variety of communities? That is a fundamental question in the field of politics, to which many insightful people all over the world at all times have given their wonderful analyses. Among these thinkers the most prominent was Aristotle, who asserted that “human beings in essence are a kind of political animals” who instinctively pursue a life in a community, that is, to form a family by integrating with opposite sexes, to organize families into a village, and then to set up a city state with villages³. In comparison, Thomas Hobbes analyzed human beings’ innate greed and their fear of death in their nature, pointing out that only if they choose a life in a community where the public rights are available could they avoid the natural state of wolves between human beings, and could they be guaranteed with the security of survival and development⁴. In compliance with the idea of Aristotle, Mr. Liang Qichao thought that human beings are predestined to live a community life, and that communities upgrade in terms of their levels, from a small group to a larger one, from a clan tribe to a state, and from a state to a state combination. It was based on such an understanding that Liang Qichao had an optimistic attitude towards the newly arising League of Nations at his days, but meanwhile he had also acutely noticed some deadly problems in the League, but he viewed the League as a first step for the human races to go towards a higher level of an organizational life⁵.

So, it can be seen that the institution of a community means an instinctive requirement of

³ Aristotle, *Volume of Politics, Selected Works of Aristotle*, translated by Yan Yi and Qin Dianhua, Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 1999, p. 6.

⁴ See Thomas Hobbes, *The Elements of Law, Natural and Political*, Part 1, Chapter 9, Section 21; *Leviathan*, Translated by Li Sifu and Li Tingbi, Commercial Press, 1995, pp. 94-132.

⁵ See Liang Qichao, *A Preface to Comments on League of Nations, and Remarks on League of Nations*, in *Impressions from My European Journey*, 10th volume part from *Complete Works of Liang Qi-chao*, Beijing Publishing House, 1999.

human survivals. Through a community, people seek for their sense of security, for their protection of security, and for the development of themselves. In other words, a community is a shelter for people to survive, a means of development and a basis of sense of security. So, in the sense of politics, all communities are those of security in essence, and a security community in the sense of international politics is an epitome of such communities in this general sense. For long, security has been regarded as the security of states, and a security community has been used to refer to a state combination that aims at military security between states.

2. Security Community

Security Community as a concept of international politics was first put forward by Richard W. Van Wagenen⁶, for whom the fundamental focus was military security and national security. In academia, the researches of security communities are mainly focused on two stages: the researches by Karl W. Deutsch and others who methodologically embraced behaviorism from the 1950s to the 1970s, and the researches by constructivists such as Emanuel Adler since 1990s⁷.

According to Deutsch, a security community is a group for integration, whose members are convinced that those in the group will not injure each other through forces, and that they will resolve disputes by other means instead⁸. In his book *Political Community and the North Atlantic Areas*, Deutsch points out that a community necessarily entails two preconditions: one is the consistency of their major values (including the political ideas such as constitutionalism and democracy and the economic concept such as liberal economy); and the other is common reactivity (such as the common sympathy and commitment, the common “we” feeling, the common confidence and consideration, the minimum partial identity of self-image and interests, the ability to predict each other’s actions and perform activities correspondingly). Particularly, the availability of common communications and exchanges is a reliable measure to realize a security community.

Deutsch’s theory of security community had been left aside for long because of the Cold War.

⁶ Richard W. Van Wagenen, *Research in the International Organization Field: Some Notes on a Possible Focus*, Princeton, N. J: Center for Research on World Political Institution, 1952, pp. 10-11.

⁷ Deutsch divides security communities into the types of the integrated and the multiple, while Adler and B Arnett view them as a loose type and a condense type. Due to the limited length, this article is more focused on security communities themselves instead of their detailed classification, but it involves the concept of pluralistic security community anyhow.

⁸ Karl W. Deutsch and Sidney A. Burrell, et al, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Areas: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957, pp. 5-6.

After the Cold War, constructivists Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett published their co-authored work *Security Community* in 1998, in which they re-defined the concept “security community”, thinking that it refers to “a multi-state region consisting of sovereignties, within which people have their reliable expectation towards some peaceful transformation. According to these two, a pluralistic security community is characterized with the following three aspects: 1. Its members share the same identity, values and intentions; 2. Its members enjoy many direct contacts and interactions between each other; and 3. Such a community shows some reciprocity that is produced in face-to-face contacts and manifested through somewhat long-termed benefits and altruism⁹.

Adler and his fellow thinkers figure out that a security community goes through three progressive stages during its development: the stage of initiation, the stage of rising, and the stage of maturity. Each stage has its own characteristics of development, in particular, a security community in its mature stage is notable in the following 11 aspects: multilateralism, no establishment of borders, the changes of military plans (that is, no worst military assumption between each other, no imaginary enemy of each other in any military activities), a common definition of threats, the existence of context and languages within the community, co-operational security (applied against internal security problems), collective security (used against external security threats), profound military integration, policy co-operations against internal threats, freely floating populations, the institutionalization of authorities, political forms at various points of views, and so forth¹⁰.

Barry Buzan brought forward a “security complex” concept similar with a security community, which is defined as a set of countries, whose major security perception as well as advantages and disadvantages are related, and whose national security problems cannot be rationally analyzed or resolved unless they stay afar from each other.”¹¹ Some other scholars argue that the differences between a security community and a security complex lies in that the latter involve both a region where there has already been a security community (such as the North Atlantic Areas) and that where there is not any security community yet (such as the South Asia

⁹ Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, “A Framework for the Study of Security Communities,” in Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, eds, *Security Communities*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 30-35.

¹⁰ Ibid, pp. 49-58.

¹¹ See Barry Buzan (Britain), *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, translated by Zhu Ning, Zhejiang People’s Publishing House, 2003, p. 16.

areas). Within a security community, the possibility to resolve disputes with military forces has been excluded thanks to the positive association and common identity between its members, but within a security complex which is in lack of any security community, what play decisive roles are still contests and rivalry despite frequent close security interactions¹².

Amitav Acharya, an expert of ASEAN security issues, continues both Adler and Barnett's constructivist point of view, thinking that the core concept of a security community views international relationships as a course of learning from each other and forming a common identity driven by bargaining, interaction and socialization. According to Acharya, the possibility to view transformations as a largely peaceful course just rests in the "understanding and identity" between the actors within a community. Such a course explains why states can develop more profound mutual dependence and "we" feeling and finally lead to the resolution of their disputes without through military forces. International relationships can be re-conceptualized as "a world society of a political community, including social groups, the course of political communications, compulsory measures, and the submission to the most popular practices"¹³.

In a summary, the security community advocated by Deutsch and his supporters is based on a shared long-term paramount interest, that is, states avoid wars. For Deutsch and his supporters, a security community is essentially characterized with "non-wars", and its major target is not to deter or counteract a certain common threat, but to develop some common interest of the actors in a peaceful and steady country. In other words, to guarantee traditionally political and military security is the major momentum and fundamental goal for the establishment of Deutsch's security community.

As with Adler and Michael Barnett, comparatively, to intensify mutual identity and eliminate military conflicts are still a fundamental way and an important goal for the establishment of a security community, and traditionally political and military security is still the fundamental considerations when sovereign states conduct co-operations and compromises. But going further than Deutsch, both Adler and Barnett stress that the awareness of a certain common threat awakens a desire based on a security community, enriching Deutsch's "we" feeling from the point

¹² Mohammed Ayoob, "From Regional System to Regional Society: Exploring Key Variables in the Construction of Regional Order," *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 53, 3 1999, p. 250.

¹³ See Amitav Acharya (Canada), *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*; translated by Wang Zhengyi and Feng Huaixin, Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2004, p. 2.

of constructivism. Barry Buzan's security complex is an expansion of security contents after the Cold War, a theoretical response to and a manifestation of both the expanded security connotations and the diversity theory of pluralistic maintenance levels after the Cold War. Amitav's contribution rests on his breaking through the limitation of early security community theory that was simply applied on the Western developed regions. According to Amitav, the way that ASEAN has chosen is quite different from that of Deutsch's security community. The regional co-operation within ASEAN is performed in a situation in which no functional mutual dependency and actions are available, and ASEAN as a community comes first from concepts instead of the mutual actions and dependency of politics, strategy and functionality. On the other hand, the ASEAN way, that is, the sociological way used for consultancy, which is coherent, informal and flexibly institutional, has denied the precise integration requirement by a traditional security community, and provided a theoretical point to understand and analyze the peaceful transformation of international relationships.

From Deutsch to Adler and Michael Barnett, and then to Amitav, we have noticed that the researches about security communities have extended from NATO to other regions in the West, and then to the regions outside the West in terms of ranges; and as with security goals and contents, they have been spread from simple military security or political security to the fields of economy, trade and even to the peaceful transformation in the international community. That is, the connotations and functions of a security community have unnoticeably changed as the connotations and extensions of security have, and the context of researches is gradually changing from traditional security to non-traditional one.

Transformation of context: From Traditional Security to Non-traditional Security

A constructivist security community mainly aims at fundamentally changing state behaviors, transcending a world of secure competition and wars, and establishing a pluralistic security community by means of collective identity, and thus transforming the present international system into a "world society", making states guided by "trust regulations and common criteria" to shake off security dilemma and create a real peaceful system¹⁴. Although the constructivist discussions have changed the context of the researches of security communities¹⁵, undoubtedly it would be

¹⁴ Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, Spring 1992, pp. 391-425.

¹⁵ Zheng Xianwu thinks that constructivism has played significant role in four aspects in the emergence of the new

difficult to fulfill such goal in the context of traditional security, just as John J. Mearsheimer has criticized, for realists, it is a fruitless job to regulate states with common criteria¹⁶. So, to the thinking of the author, the awareness of security itself is a basic prerequisite to construct a security community as well as its common criteria and collective identity.

Security is an obscure concept. Walter Lippmann, an American columnist, first employed the expression “national security”¹⁷, and since then, the concept of security has been viewed the same as national security. Such a security idea centered on states is no more than the traditional security in question. In such a security idea focused on both military security and political security, the major values are targeted on territory security and sovereignty security; and power, military affairs, military forces and wars become the core manifestation of security, which guarantee the freedom from the survival threat caused by wars. At this point, we think that nontraditional security is “all the freedom from the survival threats caused by factors except military forces”¹⁸. Such security is distinct in two aspects: one is that sovereignty border has been broken, and the threats upon sovereignty have transformed to be those upon survival; and the other is that the fields of security have been enlarged, from military and political security to all the fields related to national, human and social security.

In the opinion of the author, the nontraditional security concept is a dynamic one, which shows the real changes of security and the development of security theories, and it is a change responding to the transformation of the globalizing world, a theoretical reflection and a realistic concern differing from traditional security and occurring due to the fierce threats and dangers upon states and human society as a whole that are generated outside military and political fields.

context that has changed the researches of “security community”: 1. The social construction of “security community”, that is, a “security community” means a course of social construction, and the practices to avoid wars mainly come from interaction, socialization, criteria and the establishment of identity; 2. It pays more attention to the role of international organizations and institution, which have played a crucial role in the socialized process that leads to peaceful behaviors between states; 3. The constructivist “security community” has transcended the material forces that change international politics; material forces are still important, but other factors such as ideas, cultures and identity between actions are playing crucial role in their interactions with foreign policies; 4. It has surpassed both the geographical boundary centered on Europe and the USA and the theoretical model about freedom, democracy and mutual dependency, so it is possible to establish a “security community” even in a third world where democracy lacks and mutual economic dependency is at a lower degree. See Zheng Xianwu, “Theoretical Research of ‘Security Community’”, *Modern International Relationships*, Issue 2, 2004.

¹⁶ Jhon Mearsheimer, “The False Promise of International Institutions”, quoted from the *World Order: Structure, Mechanism and Model* by Pan Zhongqi, Shanghai People’s Publishing House, 1st ed., Dec. 2004, p. 316.

¹⁷ Zi Zhongyun, chief ed., *Researches of International Political Theories in China*, Shanghai People’s Publishing House, 1998, pp. 151-152.

¹⁸ Yu Xiaofeng, Pan Yihe and Wang Jiangli, *Outline of Nontraditional Security*, Zhejiang People’s Publishing House, Nov. 2006, p. 52.

The occurrence of nontraditional security as a category has emphasized such a fact: on the one hand, most of increasing survival threats comes from outside the fields of wars and military affairs, and it is difficult to cover all these new changes with the traditional security concept; on the other hand, there is no absolutely clear limit between nontraditional security and traditional one, which are often interwoven with each other.

With the progress of globalization, human survival and development has been exposed to a lot of nontraditional threats, such as nuclear proliferation, terrorism, environmental deterioration, ecological crisis, epidemical diseases, emigrating refugees, multinational crimes, drug smuggling, computer hackers, and racial and tribal conflicts. Among these problems, some have gone a long way, only that they have not resulted in any pervasive threats in the long past, and in addition, they are often mixed with traditional security and stayed behind. But once they emerge as a security problem after a security course, a more extensive view will be required to deal with these issues of different fields. Not only that each field is a realm of security words of diversified values (sovereignty, wealth, identity, sustainability and so forth), but that each field has its own actions, targets, momentum and contradictions, and has to be comprehended in its own terminology¹⁹.

As Terry Terriff has pointed out, most nontraditional security issues are not centered on states, and they are characteristic of multinational or sub-national, therefore one cannot simply analyze them through a security theory centered on states, or cope with the challenges of nontraditional security issues with traditional safeguard policies. Instead, one should rather employ non-military measures to resolve them²⁰. Indeed, nontraditional security issues have directly threatened the survival security of the whole human race and the security of the whole planet, and they are not only multinational, global, all people involved and pertinent, but also mutually influential, aroused and interwoven. These threats are what a single state is facing alone but cannot cope with through its sole strength, and they have to be dealt with by means of multinational multilateral co-operation, all people's involvement and comprehensive governance at all levels through the globe. In such a situation, the concept of traditional security reveals its serious insufficiency and limitations in terms of its maintenance, systems and measures, which show that the idea of traditional security cannot be viewed as a guide for the maintenance of non-traditional security.

¹⁹ Barry Buzan , et al, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, translated by Zhu Ning, Zhejiang People's Publishing House, 2003, p.260.

²⁰ Terry Terriff, *Security Studies Today*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999, pp. 117-118.

Instead, the values of security will have to be re-oriented in a globally visual field to surpass the traditional state-centeredness security position, and to establish a new concept of security of broader visual field such as “human security”, “common security” and “global security”. In other words, the dangerous traditional security idea that “you are safe but I am not” or “you are not safe but I am” should be replaced with an optimized situation in which “you are safe and I am, too”²¹, and thus form a new concept of security in which all share the same destiny.

In an article titled “Borders, Context and Models in the Maintenance of Nontraditional Security”, the co-authors have systematically compared traditional security and nontraditional security through a form²². The essential differences between traditional security and nontraditional security rest on the following: 1. Security goals and focuses have changed. Nontraditional security is based on human and social security, transcending the traditional security that is centered on national security, and the visual field of security has turned from national security to the higher levels and broader ranges such as human and global security; 2. Security subjects have become pluralistic. Threats not only come from states, but more from multiple non-state domestic and foreign behaviors and even from some obscure sources; meanwhile, sole state power is no longer sufficient to maintain security, and many non-state actors at all levels are needed to cope with problems together; 3. Due to the significant changes in the above-mentioned aspects, the maintenance of nontraditional security cannot be performed by means of self-support or alliance any longer, which is usually applied for traditional security. Rather, more others’ support, common support, dialogues and co-operations are required. So, the transformation from traditional security to nontraditional security is not only a development of security concept, an advancement of security researches, but also a revolution of security thought. Especially, the change of security concept and the transference of security focus are epochal, and what they call for is a world politics that values common security and global security, a survival philosophy that stresses class ethics and global ethnics.

Community or security community is an essential way for human survival, and an important way to maintain security, whose fundamental goal is to guarantee security and sustain

²¹ See Yu Xiaofeng, “From Dangerous Condition to Optimized Co-existence—Security Concept in an Extensive Sense and the Value Orientation of Nontraditional Security Strategy,” *World Economy and Politics*, No. 2, 2001, pp. 8-13.

²² See Yu Xiaofeng and Wang Jiangli, “Borders, Context and Models in the Maintenance of Nontraditional Security,” *World Economy and Politics*, No. 11, pp. 55-61.

development, but differ communities apparently differ each other in different security context in terms of tasks and functions. In the context of traditional security, security researches are mainly focused on wars as phenomena²³, what they face are always the issues of “wars and peace”, and a security community is a significant way to avoid wars and guarantee sovereignty and territory security. Essentially a community is against wars or for peace, and its subjects of security are states or state leagues, in other words, it is about the security of some people and some region, and what it forms is a circling security maintenance route of “war—peace—unsustainable security—new war”²⁴. With the idea of traditional security, any states and the security community that they set up to guarantee their own security have to constantly develop their military power so that they can achieve transient peace and security in a rivalry state by means of strong military pressures, or take an initiative of peace and security through wars. What such security maintenance can bring about is stronger feeling of insecurity, and thus security contests become inevitable, all the states and their security communities in the world have to conduct arms races round after round, and the world will fall in a desperate “security dilemma”. That can be best illustrated by the two World Wars and the Cold War.

A true security community is more than against wars or for peace, and what a security community in the traditional security mechanism brings about is not true security or peace, but even worse rivalry and insecurity. According to the true intentions of communities, a security community should pursue multiple security based on the fundamental connotations of survival and development, therefore, the emergence and disposal of many nontraditional security issues have apparently laid some realistic cognitive demands to the security communities in the concept of traditional security that mainly aims at non-wars, and as an important way to guarantee security, the nontraditional security has pushed security communities back to the original intentions of communities while it expands the concept of security to the survival fields apart from military and political security.

New Connotations of a Security Community

Contemporarily, diversified multilateral co-operation is the only choice to cope with the threats of nontraditional security, while a multiple security community is more an important way

²³ Stephen M. Walt, “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly* 35, No. 2.

²⁴ See Yu Xiaofeng and Lin Guozhi, “On the Essence and Ethical Dimension of ‘Nontraditional Security’,” *Zhejiang University Transaction*, No. 11, 2006.

to guarantee nontraditional security. Like a security community in the concept of traditional security, a security community in the context of nontraditional security has the same fundamental kernel as a security: “we” feeling, collective identity, mutual dependency and co-operation. But with the expanded connotations of security, a nontraditional security community has greatly gone beyond the meaning of a traditional security community in terms of goals, subjects and measures, involving some new connotations that are more extensive and complex.

1. Maintenance Goals: Survival Security and Development Security

The concept of traditional security is centered on states, and it is designed to safeguard national, political and military security. A security community in such a context is established through the mutual trust and collective identity in terms of military affairs between members, and the security that it pursues is simply domestic or partial safety, which not only does not eliminate or relieve any security dilemma, but even possibly worsens such situation sometimes. The confrontation between NATO and Warsaw Treaty Organization during Cold War is just a perfect example. Such security community shows an obvious demand of security maintenance in some regions and states (the West and the East, as well as the USA. and Soviet) during some period (the Cold War). But with the end of the Cold War and the emergence of many nontraditional security issues, a security community designed against wars and for peace has become far insufficient to satisfy the real demands of multiple security maintenances.

Nontraditional security issues have rigorously challenged the whole human race with the question of survival or death, and the whole planet has become a blue lifeboat, and people on the small fragile boat have become a fate community which is crucial to their final destiny, so co-operation against nontraditional threats has become the only realistic rational choice. Therefore, the major focus of security researches in the context of nontraditional security is “non-war” phenomena, or to say, what it faces is the security issues of “harmony and development” of “non-military forces”, and the concerned core values lie in the security of human beings and the society. In such a context, the goal and range of a security community has gone beyond the previous dimension that is intended for any military or political security. Such a security community is fundamentally based on and intended for the sustainable peaceful benign development of the whole human society, and what it pursues is no longer merely the security of nations, regions and some people, but that of the globe, the whole international community, the

whole human race. So, a security community in the context of nontraditional security has to overcome the limitations centered on nations or even human beings, and the security goals of such a community is no longer merely the avoiding of wars or military threats, or the security of some countries or regional territories. Instead, what it pursues is fundamental survival and development, the fate from each individual to the globe as a whole, and the peace and harmony of the world society.

Nontraditional threats have resulted in an unprecedented upswing of the “we” feeling (common awareness) of the human beings, and the intensified feeling of an integrated fate has greatly deepened mutual dependency, enlarged the possibility of common co-operation and the establishment of self-constraints, so the human awareness of communities is awakening in the efforts for nontraditional security²⁵. From this point of view, the emerging issues of nontraditional security are a kind of coercing force, which compels human beings to reflect over themselves and inspires the awakening of class awareness. Such coerce has become an external condition for the formation of security community in the new context; on the other hand, to establish a security community of more extensive contents at multiple levels has become a necessary way for the human society to get out of “security dilemma”, cope with a variety of nontraditional threats, and pursue a harmonious world of “optimized co-existence”.

2. Subjects of Maintenance: Broad Fields and Various Forms

Traditional security always involves fewer actors to safeguard, and states take the major responsibility to safeguard security. In guaranteeing security, states are often taken as units to tell friends from enemies, and co-operative state members usually conduct collective defense or seek for group security by means of leagues. They value measures such as deterrent and containment to restrict any potential rivals, but they are always trapped in the “security dilemma” full of suspicions, distrust and hostile, and thus the so-called peace simply means some intervals of contests between hegemonic powers. In face of nontraditional issues, however, individual states or stage groups cannot solely play an important role in safeguard the new security any more. Nontraditional security issues are usually global and most of them take place in the common fields of human beings, so to safeguard nontraditional security has to involve more public interests from

²⁵ Zhu Feng, “Nontraditional Security: A Call for Awareness of Human Community,” *Liaowang News Weekly*, January 23, 2006.

a global position, but a government is naturally unable to think or act from a global position, to be specific, it is because a nation-state is restricted by its borders. In contrast, some non-governmental subject of behaviors such as enterprises or civic social organizations may take a truer global point of view sometimes, as with environmental issues, for instance²⁶. Non-governmental actors can be some source of security threats while they can play an important role in guaranteeing security²⁷, and thus leave us in such a dilemma: on the one hand, a nation-state does not fit into the present objective demands any more, and on the other hand, it is in an urgent need to establish a global community²⁸.

Obviously it is a chemical dream to set up a global community in the near future, but it can be an objective reality to develop a situation of multiple actors by greatly increasing the numbers of actors involved in the nontraditional security. In terms of its contents and safeguarding actors, a nontraditional security community has surpassed the previous goal against wars and the previous ways for military alliance and rivalry, and it has expanded from politics, military affairs and ideology to a variety of other fields such as economy, society, culture and ecological environment; and in terms of its forms, it has developed into many organizational forms at different levels, which vary from as small as individuals' groups to as large as global community. A rising security model of "development—harmony-sustainable security—sustainable development" is to be formed²⁹. Here we divide the actors of nontraditional security into five levels: individual, regional (including domestic), national, international and global. Correspondingly, apart from states, some multiple security communities at various levels have been formed, and the earth is the largest human security community. Specifically, besides states, the most representative security communities and their safeguarding ranges at the present as the following: civic society and global governance at individual and global levels, whose main representatives are non-governmental organizations (both domestic and international); international governance at regional and international levels, whose representatives are a variety of international organizations between

²⁶ Inge Kaul et al, ed., *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization*, Zhang Chunbo and Gao Jing trans., People's Publish House, 2006, p. 26.

²⁷ See *New Threats and New Actors in International Security*, edited by Elke Krahmman, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 3

²⁸ Melvin Gurtov (USA), *Global Politics in the Human Interests*, translated by Jia Zongyi, Xinhua Press, 2000, p. 11.

²⁹ See Yu Xiaofeng and Lin Guozhi, "On the Essence and Ethical Dimension of 'Nontraditional Security'," *Zhejiang University Transaction*, No. 11, 2006.

governments.

From this point, the emerging issues and guarantee of nontraditional security not only bring about a revolution in the field of security, but a radical transformation of international systems. Or does it also predict a historical change of ways in which the human race seeks for their own survival manners? If so, it will surpass the state-centered survival idea since Simon Weil, evolving towards a global view and an earth concern which are more extensive and more individualized. During this process, a security community in the new sense will play an important part, and it is just as Mark W. Zacher has observed, the worrisome point in the present world is not the declination of states as some principal actors in a world system, but whether these states can become aware that they have to make concerted efforts to manage well this multiple world where all factors are dependent to each other³⁰.

3. Guarantee Measures: Various Actors and Diversified Governance

Traditional security is mainly achieved by means of self-support, determent, alliance, group security and so on, which is characterized with independence and exclusiveness. But for nontraditional security in comparison, actors vary according to its different contents, and the ways of governance involve multiple levels. More often than not, nontraditional security employs ways such as others' support, common support, dialogues, communications, co-operations and so forth, characteristic of relevancy, dependency and penetration. Due to the expansion of the security connotations mentioned above, the number of security communities concerning different security subjects has apparently increased; one after another, previously trivial political issues has now become significant security ones concerning human survival and development, and security communities have extended their contents from military and political security to broader fields such economic, ecological, social and cultural security. Such security concept abundant of contents is characterized with multiple factors and levels in terms of maintenance manners and measures. Besides regional security communities, we can also call the multiple-level non-governmental actors of nontraditional security as security communities. For examples, we can say EU, NATO and ASEAN are some security communities because they play their parts for the security of their state members in many aspects such as politics, economy, military affairs and

³⁰ James N. Rosenau, chief ed., *Governance Without Government*, translated by Zhang Shengjun and Liu Xiaolin, Jiangxi People's Publishing House, 2001, p. 71.

environment, meanwhile, we can also call NGOs such as Greenpeace and Amnesty International as security communities, for they have made prominent contributions to the protection of environment and human rights. Doing so might leave the concept “security community” excessively extensive, but it has truly reflected the status quo of security maintenance in the context of nontraditional security. The very reason is that in the context of nontraditional security, non-military security communities are dominant. Just as Ole Waever has pointed out, a “complete security community” should be a “military and non-military security community”, and the latter trait simply shows the evolving direction of security communities³¹. While from the point of ecological security, non-governmental actors such as Greenpeace completely accord with the fundamental qualities of a security community, and comply with the two important conditions for the establishment of a security community: the “we” feeling (common awareness) and the steady platform of practices (institutional arrangement).

The multiplicity of actors and the pluralistic levels of governance indicate that the surviving manners of human beings are surpassing state systems, transforming towards broader comprehensive governance. More and more Chinese and overseas scholars have come to the same consensus. As both Stanley Hoffmann and William McNeill have pointed out, a world government does not fit into the present century, but all seems to be developing towards such a direction. And also, Carl Kaysen thinks that, to realize some orders, it is no longer an utopian pursuit to set up a world system different from before on a securer and more humanitarian basis, but some necessary efforts to achieve some necessary goals³². Around this topic, people have done much many research work, including Jürgen Habermas’s discussion on Postnational Constellation³³, Alexander Wendt’s reasoning about World State³⁴, and Zhao Tingyang’s analysis of “tianxia” (world) concept³⁵. It is in this sense that we affirm that the maintenance of nontraditional security will change the direction of the whole world.

Summary

³¹ Ole Weaver, “Insecurity, Security, and Asecurity in the West European Non-war Security,” in *Security Communities*, p. 104.

³² James N. Rosenau, chief ed., *Governance Without Government*, translated by Zhang Shengjun and Liu Xiaolin, Jiangxi People’s Publishing House, 2001, pp. 70-71

³³ Jürgen Habermas, *The Postnational Constellation*, translated by Cao Weidong, Shanghai People’s Publishing House, 2002. Part 2, Post-national Constellation.

³⁴ Alexander Wendt, “Why a World State Is Inevitable: Teleology and the Logic of Anarchy”, translated by Qin Yaqing, *World Economy and Politics*, No. 11, 2003.

³⁵ See Zhao Tingyang, *A World Without World View*, China Renming University Press, 2003, “Tianxia System: Empire and World System.”

Ever since the Westphalian Treaty , sovereignty systems have always been dominant in human survival and development, and states function as the most important and the most prominent communities, so national security has become the most important or even the only security goal for a related security community to guarantee, but such formula will be broken down by the prominence of nontraditional security. The goal, measures and manners of traditional security have met with more and more challenges, the meaning and range of security communities have completely extended from individuals under states to the globe above the states, greatly breaking through the visual fields of security communities centered on states. Having surpassed traditional security communities centered on states and targeted on military and political security, nontraditional security communities involve more complicated and more extensive connotations, what they stress are the security of survival, development, the human race and the earth. Thus, the author thinks that security communities in the context of nontraditional security mean a return to the communities in the sense of politics, showing the renewal and breakthrough of human race in its comprehension and practices concerning the issues of communities. This article simply takes an ought-to point to discuss security communities in the context of nontraditional security, of course, and there are still many researches to do concerning the conditions, manners, ways and difficulties in establishing security communities.