

INSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNITY OF SECURITY

Sebastian BLENDEA

Associate Professor of the University "Constantin Brancusi" from Tg-Jiu, ROMANIA

E-mail: sebib2005@yahoo.com

Abstract: In interpreting institution of the community security in its contemporary form is called the constructivist concept which assumes that the identity of and participants in international relations should not be predetermined, but are defined in the interaction with the other actors. Other security institutions such as the balance of power, collective security and security systems, rooted in a rationalist conception of states, sovereign actors that define and pursue their goals in a conscious manner. Addressing security community institution aims at defining the concept, presentation differences from the other security institutions, tracing how these communities develop, the major criticism against the functioning of specific mechanisms.

Keywords: the community of security, balance of power, collective security, system security, international security.

Community of security concept was introduced in the early 50s is best known for his contribution Karl Deutsch, through a book published in 1957, describing it as different as possible participants in international relations thanks to maintain peaceful relations of trust between them. This concept refers to relations between individuals, but relations between political entities. The term designates "a group of actors who harbor such a genuine belief that community will not fight each other physically, but will resolve disputes in an otherwise" [1].

Unlike other security institutions dedicated to controlling how military dispute resolution, community security institution assumes that its members do not support the idea of using any violence between them. In his view Deutsch exist two types of security community: on the one hand are amalgamated, developing a form of joint governance (cause of the occurrence of the federal states) and, on the other hand are pluralistic, whose component units retain total independence from one another, being ruled outbreak of war between them. Deutsch and his colleagues say that such a form of aggregation can be achieved through integration, ie the achievement of a "sense of community" by establishing institutions and practices stable and peaceful resolution of problems. Among the items proposed by the team led by Deutsch for measuring the degree of integration of states include social communication, increased mobility of persons, or of economic transactions ties between people across borders. Being written during the Cold War, Deutsch's book identifies a security community as consisting of the countries along the northern shores of the Atlantic and the North Sea and their immediate neighbors, but to the exclusion of those in vintage Soviet hegemony.

Community of Security does not exclude that they may not come into conflict on various subjects such as diplomatic, economic, etc. The fundamental difference to community safety from other security institutions is that those who compose reject violence conviction of its arguments using force to resolve disputes between them. Noteworthy is the fact that war is ruled by members of a community security only in relations between them, and not to third parties - in dealing with them, logic states assigned to specific reports an environment where its survival is problematic.

Changes in the Cold War made the security community's approach to be completely abandoned Deutsch in academic literature in the field for nearly 40 years. The concept was revived in the 90s, especially through the work of Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett considers that, in its pluralistic security community designates "a transnational composed of sovereign states whose people maintain peaceful expectations based on changes" [2]. Taking as its starting point the work of Deutsch, her community identifies two forms of security depending on the nature of relations between sovereign States members: community "poorly connected" and communities "closely connected". For the existence of weakly connected it requires only compliance with the above definition. For those closely connected must meet two additional conditions for them to exist: to have both forms of mutual assistance in building common arrangements for security and a system of rules to constitute some form of joint governance by giving for the mutual benefit to some attributes of sovereignty. The most obvious is the European Union.

Adler and Barnett used three conditions to identify security community "closely connected" namely:

- members should share identities, values and meanings;
- constituents they must maintain a variety of direct relations;
- community partners is based on knowledge of interaction - which in the long term, lead to common interests, reciprocal obligations, responsibility and even altruism.

If in his Deutsch, members of a community security are the states that compose Adler and Barnett believes that although former members of such groups are states, in reality, companies are those who compose it, and ultimately even individuals. According to her definition of "peoples" are those who harbor beliefs and the security community is built on a transnational level. It says so in the alternative, that building trust is not a rational process at the discretion of an institution instrumental, as the state, but of a much larger body with a rich emotional life like company. No state redefines its identity but society in which they lived.

In relation to other institutions of international security, the security community makes the least appeal to the rationality of actors. The fundamental explanation for the establishment of community security does not lie in how the state identifies its interests and is negotiating with other political entities but in a sense of trust, which makes the formulation of his behavior and interests of others. Also, there are differences between the security community and international security and other institutions in which the time frame in which they develop. A security community develops into a much longer time than a balance of power, a collective security system or a security system.

Community security is based on a common identity component members and involves a profound transformation of their interests. The theory states that the security community interests

and identities are co-constitutive both at the level of individual actors and to the community so that community safety is much more likely to survive long periods of time indefinite.

The merit of Deutsch and his team was that raised the possibility of institutionalizing relations that exclude violence between sovereign actors, identifying empirically - and not just normative and prescriptive - an international community non-warrior. On the other hand, lack the most important of Deutsch's approach is unidentified mechanisms which build belief reach community members to refrain from using force in their relations. Adler and Barnett responded to this problem by explaining the formation of a security community as an evolutionary process in three stages. The first phase refers to the appearance of conditions favorable security community, change known international social environment (technological, demographic, economic, environmental, etc.) which affects the perception and interpretation of reality. The second phase includes factors likely to lead to the development of mutual trust and a collective identity. Finally, the third step relates to the formation of conditions necessary for peaceful change, by building trust and common identity, because ultimately they are generally recognized.

As for the institutionalization of community safety, it is noted that, typically, this is done on the skeleton of mechanisms originally built on a different approach. One example of the many ways it is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), originally a political-military alliance, built under US leadership to protect Western Europe against Soviet expansionism. The links between its members were not necessarily the best, as evidenced by the history of Greek-Turkish relations. After the Cold War and the disappearance of the Soviet threat, NATO member states had to identify a new role for NATO. Receiving membership applications from new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe, Alliance leaders arrived in a position to define their requirements. In this sense, we can say that in 1995, when these criteria have been defined, the Alliance was explicitly security community: of the five conditions for accession only one referred directly to the quality of the military apparatus of the future members, the rest designed to ensure compatibility with their identity value-participating Member already considered democracies. It should be noted, however, that NATO has become a security community, but it has not abandoned the vocation of political-military alliance, but broadened it, natural fact, since ultimately a community of security concerns war. Thus, they remained unchanged mutual collective defense arrangements, consultation procedures, military facilities etc.

We can consider that there is a fundamental difference between just looking at NATO alliance and consider as a security community. That difference is that in the second aspect emphasis on trust between its members, based on fundamental beliefs and practices similar, and not just reaction in case of aggression against one of the participants. NATO Member States concern not only allies but, first, that states which have a relationship of mutual trust. When there are differences of position on important issues, they are overcome by joint efforts, based on the relationship of mutual trust.

What attracted towards NATO new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe are mainly:

- security guarantees that NATO attaches to its members as the alliance;
- attractions of this organization of stable, strong and prosperous states.

NATO launched the Partnership for Peace program these countries, institutional capacity building mutual trust among prospective members, but also between them and the older allies. It must be emphasized that this program does not give any warranty on becoming a member of NATO and that to him were not invited to participate only states seeking to become members of

NATO, but against all those who wished to contribute, after the Cold War, to overcome suspicions in the euro-Atlantic area.

To define the practices of international organizations that aim to fundamentally overcome fear and mutual distrust, Emanuel Adler uses the phrase "model of building security communities." In his view, building a security community is a long process of socialization, learning the rules and practices to comply with them etc. The ultimate objective of the whole endeavor is to reach a level of trust that make it impossible for the use of violence in resolving disputes. For the existence of community safety requires that mutual perceptions of the companies to be good. On the basis of such perceptions, people may develop attitudes that support the development of a common identity. Developing a sense of identity among many people is certainly easier if they participate in a common culture. From this point of view may be a promising example Latin America. Companies in this region are united by history, language, religion, mentalities etc. and generating unit projects are supported by the existence of international organizations that advocate for common goals - for example, Mercosur, the Andean Community or Organization of American States. If the common cultural elements are relatively few conditions for the emergence and development of a community security are much tougher. Thus, the Association of South-East Asia (Association of South-East Asian Nations-ASEAN) is currently in the best case, a simple intergovernmental economic organization, but, at least for now, can not contribute into greatly to the development of a common identity of its members.

The link between international organizations and developing a shared sense of identity can be studied following the evolution of Romanian-Hungarian relations. These relationships were kept under control during the Second World War, mainly due to Soviet hegemony within which evolved together. With the weakening and then the end of Soviet domination was seen a sharp cooling of relations between the two countries. Looking for some international mechanisms through which to pursue the objectives of security, both countries have addressed NATO, calling joining this organization. In relation to these requests, the attitude of the organization North Atlantic was quite clear: two states can be accepted only if they solve their differences both between themselves and with other neighbors, insisting that future members not generate tensions within Alliance. The pressure applied by the Alliance to rethink the bilateral relations between Romania and Hungary took effect. Both states became NATO members maintain better relationships today than ever in history. Despite increasingly close relations official at the social level there is still enough evidence on the existence of mutual suspicions. It is certain that a war between the two countries is now unthinkable, which is in the spirit of this institution.

The most important criticism to the community of security theory can be divided into two categories:

- critics who say that assumption is not necessary to explain the feelings of identity non-warrior existence of groups of states, which is realistic enough arguments and liberal order;
- criticism aimed constructivist foundations of this theory.

Community of security is defined as a group of countries that exclude, between them, the military means to resolve a dispute. Given that all actors within the same anarchic system evolves, it asked the question: Why do some states resort to violent means in the settlement of disputes and others do not? One of the most common explanations for the occurrence of wars is no central authority capable of imposing order in the world. The anarchy of the international

system is not sufficient for a perpetual confrontation interstate. Barry Buzan says there are a wide variety of anarchic state, which occupies an axis with "anarchy immature" at one end and "mature anarchy" on the other end. In anarchy immature no state recognizes only its own legitimacy, relations between actors is a constant struggle. Anarchy mature requires states to strong, well-defined legitimacy and identity. These qualities provide stability of the international system of states, the peaceful relations between these actors [3].

An explanation similar to lack of conflicts between actors Sovereign offers Alexander Wendt it considering the nature anarchic international system does not condemn Member violence and that relations between states are given of how they interpret the external environment, ie how they see anarchy, being able to speak several "culture of anarchy". The existence of a culture of non-violent anarchy does not imply common interests and identities defining a security community [4]. Although the two views are different, they are similar in that it explains the lack of wars between states in the attitude of actors: the feeling of community is not a prerequisite to study international relations nonviolent. Amid this anarchy the possibility that war would impose the necessity to build a hypothesis that questions the existence of the only clear security community considered so far, the democracies stable, economically developed, the postwar period. Countries engaged in a global security system led by the United States had a similar level of development. In reconsidering the role of a major war was a nuclear factor, in that every state in the system to be considered threatened by a worsening of relations between the two superpowers and that drew attention to the irrational use of nuclear weapons. Also in the era under discussion - characterized by tremendous technological advances and trade links multiple - war is usually considered an undertaking economically unprofitable. It is evident that the capitalist democracies discussed any possibility of military involvement of the state is careful when. On the rejection of the war between these democracies thrive is common European cultural fund, including its political dimension, and the sharing of fears of the expansion of communist ideology. That in time, this attitude has been adopted by other countries (most of central and eastern Europe) is not contrary to the general explanation. These countries have already joined the logic even when changing conditions described bipolarity: inside a liberal democracy; outdoors, attending a security system led by the United States.

Criticism of the theory of communities of security, mainly liberal and realistic essence, that the existence of groups of states that have renounced the use of force undoubtedly between them does not necessarily presuppose the development of common interests and identities. Those criticisms have the disadvantage that it eliminates too many variables (ultimately not be assumed development of relations between countries without taking into account the inter-depth, especially in the context of globalization). Criticisms theory security communities, targeting its constructivist foundations, refer to the fact that the origins of community members rules and common identities and how they are built, remain quite confusing. There is no convincing explanations about the different rules for ranking members of that community, have not researched enough situations where these conflicts, their temporal stability, which can change the way [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] Deutsch, W. Karl, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1957, p. 5.
- [2] Adler, Emanuel, Barnett, Michael ,*Security Communities*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 30.
- [3] Buzan, Barry, *People, states, and fear: The national security problem in international Relations*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton, 1983, pp.93-101.
- [4] Wendt, Alexander, *Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power Politics*, International Organization, vol. 46 (2), 1992, pp. 391-425.
- [5] Kowert, Paul, Legro, Jeffrey, „*Norms, Identity and Their Limits: A Theoretical Reprise*”, in Peter Katzenstein, (ed.)*The culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1996, pp. 451-497.