

From Securitization to Collaborative Governance: Digital and Ecological Risks along the Belt and Road Evidence from China–Malaysia and China–Vietnam Cooperation

Yannan Wang

Sichuan University of Media and Communications, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Abstract: Against the backdrop of intensifying great-power competition and profound adjustments in global governance structures, non-traditional security issues such as digital security and ecological security have increasingly emerged as critical constraints on cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Existing studies tend to focus on risk identification and response strategies, while paying insufficient attention to how these issues are constructed as security concerns in specific contexts and whether securitization can subsequently evolve toward forms of collaborative governance. Drawing on securitization theory and integrating perspectives from cooperative security and collaborative governance, this article develops an analytical framework that traces the transition from securitization to collaborative governance. Through case studies of Malaysia's digital sovereignty disputes and Vietnam's ecological security concerns, the article systematically examines the construction mechanisms and governance trajectories of non-traditional security risks along the BRI. The findings show that digital sovereignty and ecological security risks do not arise solely from objective threats, but are progressively securitized through discursive practices and institutional processes shaped by the interaction of international structures and domestic political-social factors. Different issue areas exhibit distinct securitization pathways in terms of securitizing actors, modes of risk perception, and institutional consequences, which can be summarized as two ideal types: technology-sovereignty securitization and environment-survival securitization. Moreover, securitization does not necessarily lead to the breakdown of cooperation; instead, it reshapes the conditions and modalities of cooperation through heightened governance prudence and institutional complexity. Under

certain conditions, the introduction of multi-actor collaborative governance mechanisms can facilitate the desecuritization of non-traditional security issues and provide more stable expectations for cooperation under the BRI. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the relationship between non-traditional security, development, and governance, and offers analytically grounded insights into non-traditional security cooperation under the Belt and Road Initiative.

Keywords: Belt and Road Initiative; Non-traditional Security; Collaborative Governance; Digital Sovereignty; Ecological Security

1. The Emergence of Non-Traditional Security Issues and the Definition of the Research Problem

1.1 Research Background and Problem Formulation

With the deepening of globalization and the restructuring of power within the international system, the scope and substance of security issues have continuously expanded. The traditional security paradigm centered on military threats is no longer sufficient to explain contemporary sources of risk in international relations. Against this backdrop, non-traditional security issues such as digital security and ecological security have become increasingly significant variables shaping national development and regional stability. In particular, amid intensifying great-power competition, issues originally characterized by technical expertise and developmental logic—such as technological choices and environmental risks—are increasingly embedded in geopolitical narratives and imbued with meanings related to national security and sovereignty. Contemporary security studies

emphasize the political and institutional construction of non-traditional security issues rather than treating them as mere reflections of objective threats, a core premise of securitization theory [1].

As a major platform through which China participates deeply in global governance and regional cooperation, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) promotes infrastructure connectivity and socioeconomic development across participating countries, while simultaneously operating within an increasingly complex security environment. Existing studies generally agree that the security challenges faced by the BRI have shifted from traditional security risks toward non-traditional security domains, with digital sovereignty disputes and ecological conflicts standing out prominently. Such risks are rarely driven solely by objective threats; instead, they are often amplified and institutionalized through the combined effects of external intervention, domestic political competition, and discursive construction, thereby exerting tangible impacts on project implementation.

However, much of the existing literature on BRI-related non-traditional security issues focuses on risk typologies, policy responses, or project-level governance challenges. Relatively little attention has been paid to how these risks are securitized within specific international and domestic contexts, or whether securitization leaves room for a subsequent shift toward cooperative governance. As a result, many analyses remain confined to a static “risk–response” framework, limiting their ability to explain why similar issues follow divergent trajectories across different countries.

Against this background, this article raises the following core questions: How are digital sovereignty and ecological security issues along the Belt and Road constructed as security concerns under conditions of great-power competition? What external and internal factors shape these securitization processes? Furthermore, once securitization has taken place, is it possible to design institutional and multi-actor governance arrangements that enable the desecuritization of risks? Addressing these questions not only deepens understanding of the mechanisms underlying BRI-related non-traditional security risks, but also carries important practical implications for advancing cooperation[2].

1.2 Research Significance

At the theoretical level, this study seeks to integrate securitization theory with the concepts of cooperative security and common security, thereby moving beyond analytical frameworks that treat non-traditional security issues as objective risks. By introducing an analytical pathway from securitization to collaborative governance, the paper emphasizes the malleability of non-traditional security issues: their security attributes are not fixed, but contingent upon discursive construction, institutional choices, and governance arrangements. This perspective extends the explanatory scope of securitization theory into development-related and non-traditional security domains and offers a mid-level theoretical tool for understanding the interaction between security and development.

At the practical level, by examining Malaysia’s digital sovereignty disputes and Vietnam’s ecological security concerns, this article systematically analyzes how securitization affects specific Belt and Road cooperation projects and proposes collaborative governance pathways in response. The findings offer policy-relevant insights for China and partner countries seeking to build more inclusive and sustainable cooperation mechanisms in the areas of digital development and ecological governance.

1.3 Research Design and Methodology

This study follows a research design that proceeds from theoretical construction to case analysis, comparative synthesis, and pathway design. First, it reviews the literature on securitization theory, cooperative security, and collaborative governance to establish an analytical framework. Second, it conducts in-depth analyses of the Malaysia and Vietnam cases to uncover the securitization mechanisms underlying digital sovereignty and ecological security issues. Third, it employs comparative analysis to identify commonalities and differences across cases. Finally, drawing on both theoretical and empirical findings, it proposes institutionalized pathways for collaborative governance.

Methodologically, the study adopts qualitative approaches, including literature review, case study, and comparative analysis, supplemented by policy document analysis and secondary data

sources to enhance explanatory depth and analytical robustness.

2. An Integrated Analytical Framework: From Securitization to Collaborative Governance

2.1 Securitization Theory: The Constructive Logic of Non-Traditional Security Risks

Originally developed by the Copenhagen School, securitization theory posits that security is not a simple reflection of objective threats, but rather a socially constructed process achieved through discourse, practice, and institutional arrangements. Once an issue is successfully framed as a security threat, relevant actors can justify extraordinary measures beyond normal political procedures. This theoretical perspective provides a powerful analytical tool for understanding the politicization and institutionalization of non-traditional security issues.

In the non-traditional security domain, securitization is rarely driven by a single actor. Instead, it emerges from interactions among external great powers, host-country governments, interest groups, and public opinion. External actors employ discursive framing and rule-setting mechanisms to link specific technological or environmental issues to national security and sovereignty, while domestic political structures and policy preferences determine whether such narratives are internalized and translated into concrete policy actions. Securitization thus constitutes a compound mechanism embedded within both international structures and domestic politics.

Building on existing securitization scholarship, this study emphasizes two points. First, the securitization of non-traditional security issues is highly context-dependent. Second, securitization is not necessarily irreversible, nor does it inevitably lead to confrontation or exclusion.

2.2 Cooperative Security and Collaborative Governance: Pathways beyond Securitization

The concepts of cooperative security and common security stress that security outcomes are not inherently zero-sum and can be achieved through cooperative mechanisms and institutional arrangements. In the non-traditional security domain, where risks are transnational and exhibit public-goods characteristics, unilateral or exclusionary security strategies

often prove ineffective in the long run and may instead exacerbate distrust and security dilemmas.

Collaborative governance theory provides an operational framework for translating cooperative security principles into practice. It emphasizes the joint participation of multiple actors within institutionalized arrangements, facilitating effective public problem-solving through information sharing, interest coordination, and responsibility-sharing. Incorporating collaborative governance into non-traditional security research enables a shift from “threat response” to “risk management,” thereby mitigating the exclusionary effects of securitization discourse.

This article argues that collaborative governance is not simply the opposite of securitization, but rather a potential evolutionary pathway for securitized issues under specific conditions. Its realization depends on the technical re-framing of issues, the establishment of multi-actor participation mechanisms, and the gradual accumulation of institutional trust.

2.3 Analytical Framework: Tracing the Transition from Securitization to Collaborative Governance

Based on the above theoretical discussions, this study constructs an integrated analytical framework consisting of three core components. First, it identifies securitizing actors and their discursive strategies to examine how non-traditional security issues are framed as security threats. Second, it analyzes amplification mechanisms operating within domestic political contexts and international structures. Third, it explores the conditions under which collaborative governance can facilitate the desecuritization of risks [3,4].

This framework seeks to move beyond single-case explanations and offers a transferable analytical tool for understanding the generation and governance of non-traditional security risks along the Belt and Road.

3. The Securitization of Digital Sovereignty in Malaysia

3.1 Issue Background: The Politicization of Technological Cooperation and Sovereignty Concerns

Within the framework of Belt and Road digital cooperation, Malaysia was once regarded as a

key partner for China in advancing digital infrastructure development and digital economy collaboration. Early cooperation focused primarily on telecommunications networks, smart city initiatives, and related digital industry investments. These projects were largely framed in developmental and technical terms, aimed at improving infrastructure capacity and facilitating industrial upgrading.

However, as global competition over digital technologies has intensified—particularly against the backdrop of deepening Sino–U.S. strategic rivalry—digital infrastructure has increasingly been embedded within geopolitical narratives. As a result, digital technologies have come to be viewed not merely as tools for efficiency or development, but as strategic assets linked to data control, technological dependence, and national security.

For Malaysia, digital infrastructure thus came to be redefined as a domain potentially affecting national sovereignty and strategic autonomy [5]. This structural transformation of the international environment provided the political conditions for the subsequent securitization of digital cooperation [6].

3.2 Securitizing Actors: Interaction among External Discourses, Domestic Politics, and Expert Narratives

The securitization of digital sovereignty in Malaysia did not result from the actions of a single actor, but rather from the interaction of multiple securitizing agents. First, external major powers employed security-oriented discourse to directly associate specific digital technology choices with national security risks, emphasizing potential threats such as technological “backdoors,” data leakage, and strategic dependency. These narratives were disseminated through diplomatic statements, policy documents, and international media, shaping Malaysia’s domestic policy debate.

Second, domestic political actors in Malaysia played a critical mediating role. In a context of political competition and policy divergence, digital sovereignty gradually became an issue with strong mobilizational value. Different political factions selectively appropriated external security narratives and incorporated them into domestic political struggles, thereby reinforcing the security framing of digital cooperation.

Third, some local experts and media outlets, in

discussing technological risks, tended to present digital security issues in a decontextualized manner, simplifying complex governance challenges into generalized national security threats. This mode of narration amplified public perceptions of uncertainty surrounding digital cooperation and provided a societal foundation for the diffusion of securitization discourse.

3.3 Institutional Consequences of Securitization: Policy Prudence and Cycles of Uncertainty

As digital sovereignty was successfully securitized, its effects gradually extended from the discursive level to institutional and policy practices. Malaysia’s policy orientation toward digital infrastructure cooperation became increasingly cautious, as reflected in prolonged project approval procedures, stricter regulatory standards, and the imposition of additional restrictive conditions on foreign technology participation. These institutional changes were not triggered by isolated security incidents, but rather represented the cumulative institutionalization of securitization logic.

At the same time, securitization objectively intensified policy uncertainty. On the one hand, the government sought to balance attracting foreign investment with safeguarding sovereignty and autonomy. On the other hand, the persistence of security discourse rendered policy adjustments more susceptible to public opinion pressures and changes in the external political environment. This uncertainty, in turn, reinforced securitized perceptions of digital cooperation risks, forming a self-reinforcing feedback loop.

3.4 Prospects for Desecuritization: Collaborative Governance as an Institutional Exit

Despite the evident securitization of digital sovereignty in Malaysia, this does not imply the inevitable contraction of digital cooperation. Rather, the case suggests that under certain conditions, collaborative governance mechanisms can provide a realistic pathway toward desecuritization.

First, at the issue-framing level, re-technicalizing and rule-based handling of digital cooperation can help dilute highly abstract security narratives. Establishing clear and operational governance arrangements for data management, cybersecurity, and technical standards can

transform sovereignty anxieties into concrete governance challenges, thereby reducing the political mobilization space of security discourse.

Second, at the institutional level, the introduction of multi-actor collaborative governance mechanisms can enhance transparency and trust. For instance, joint technical evaluation platforms, mechanisms for local technical participation, and cooperative data governance frameworks can provide host countries with substantive participation and institutional guarantees, directly addressing core sovereignty concerns.

Finally, at the interactional level, sustained institutionalized dialogue and joint knowledge production can mitigate the one-directional influence of external security narratives. Collaborative governance does not deny the existence of risks; rather, through institutional design, it converts potential security conflicts into manageable cooperative risks, providing stable expectations for digital cooperation.

4. The Securitization of Ecological Security in Vietnam

4.1 Issue Background: Structural Tensions between Infrastructure Development and Ecological Risk

Within the Belt and Road framework, Vietnam's participation in infrastructure cooperation has primarily focused on energy development, transportation, and related supporting facilities. While such projects offer significant developmental benefits in terms of infrastructure improvement and regional connectivity, they inevitably generate tensions with ecological protection objectives—particularly regarding water resource utilization, ecosystem preservation, and community livelihoods [7].

Unlike digital cooperation, ecological security issues are characterized by high perceptibility and strong local embeddedness. Their impacts are directly felt in specific regions and communities, making them more likely to attract social attention and intervention by non-governmental organizations, local communities, and the media. In Vietnam's political and social context, ecological protection has long been regarded as an important component of governance legitimacy. Consequently, when infrastructure cooperation becomes associated with ecological risks, it

readily acquires the conditions necessary for securitization.

4.2 Securitizing Actors: Risk Narratives Driven by Social Forces

The securitization of ecological security in Vietnam exhibits a distinct actor configuration compared with the digital sovereignty case. Rather than being primarily elite-driven, the Vietnamese case features strong participation by social actors. Local environmental organizations, community groups, scholars, and media outlets consistently emphasized the potential ecological damage, cross-border environmental impacts, and long-term irreversible risks associated with infrastructure projects, elevating what were initially development trade-offs into matters of national ecological security and social stability.

These actors did not directly challenge national development strategies; instead, they linked ecological risks to broader values such as food security, public health, and intergenerational justice, thereby enhancing the political legitimacy of ecological security narratives. External environmental discourses and international environmental governance norms further provided cognitive resources for domestic securitization, embedding ecological risks within a broader global environmental security framework [8].

4.3 Effects of Securitization: Institutionalization through Project Adjustment and Governance Pressure

As ecological security discourse expanded, Vietnam's policy orientation toward related cooperation projects gradually shifted. Environmental impact assessment standards were significantly raised, approval procedures became more complex, and some projects were delayed, scaled down, or required technical modification. This process reflects the translation of ecological security concerns from social discourse into institutional practice.

However, securitization did not fully disrupt cooperation. Instead, it redefined cooperation conditions by raising governance thresholds. On the one hand, the government responded to social concerns and reinforced its environmental governance image. On the other hand, institutionalized environmental requirements increased uncertainty and made projects more vulnerable to public opinion and policy fluctuations. This tension constitutes a key

structural factor sustaining the securitization of ecological security in Vietnam.

4.4 Governance Space for Collaboration: From Confrontational Oversight to Institutionalized Participation

Despite the pronounced securitization of ecological security, Vietnam's governance practices also reveal potential space for a shift toward collaborative governance. Given the multi-level and multi-actor nature of ecological issues, effective governance depends heavily on information transparency and public participation. In some projects, mechanisms such as community consultation, third-party environmental assessment, and cross-border environmental cooperation platforms have helped transform confrontational security narratives into institutionalized risk management processes.

In this context, collaborative governance does not weaken environmental protection standards; rather, it institutionalizes participation, enabling diverse actors to articulate concerns and share responsibilities within a rule-based framework. This governance pathway reduces political confrontation, enhances social legitimacy, and provides more stable institutional expectations for infrastructure cooperation [9].

The Vietnamese case demonstrates that when ecological risks are embedded within collaborative governance frameworks, their security attributes do not disappear entirely but are reconfigured within manageable institutional structures—offering valuable insights into desecuritization under the BRI.

5. Comparative Analysis: Divergences and Convergences in the Securitization Pathways of Non-Traditional Security Issues

5.1 Comparing Securitizing Actors: State-Led Versus Societally Driven Dynamics

A comparison between Malaysia's digital sovereignty issue and Vietnam's ecological security issue demonstrates that the securitization of non-traditional security concerns does not follow a single, uniform model. Rather, specific securitization pathways are largely shaped by the configuration of securitizing actors and the patterns of interaction among them.

In the Malaysian case, securitization has primarily been driven by the convergence of

external great-power discourses and domestic political forces. State elites and policy debates occupy a central position in issue construction, while direct mobilization at the societal level remains relatively limited. As a highly technical and specialized issue, digital sovereignty derives its security salience largely from elite interpretation and discursive amplification, rather than from broad-based public experience. By contrast, the securitization of ecological security in Vietnam exhibits a pronounced societally driven character. Domestic environmental organizations, local communities, and media actors have generated sustained risk narratives that elevated ecological concerns to the level of widespread public attention and gradually exerted pressure on policymaking processes. In this context, the state is not the sole initiator of securitization; instead, it institutionalizes ecological risks largely in response to societal concerns. This contrast indicates that both the number of securitizing actors and the distribution of power among them exert a profound influence on the direction and intensity of issue evolution.

5.2 Comparing Risk Perceptions: Abstract Sovereignty Risks Versus Localized Survival Risks

Significant differences are also evident in the types of risk perception associated with the two cases. In Malaysia's digital sovereignty debate, perceived risks primarily revolve around data control, technological dependence, and strategic autonomy. These risks are characterized by high levels of uncertainty and abstraction, and their potential consequences are often temporally distant and difficult to observe directly. As a result, public perception of such risks remains limited, and securitization relies heavily on interpretive frameworks provided by political elites and expert communities.

In contrast, ecological security risks in Vietnam are closely linked to water resources, land use, and local livelihoods, rendering them highly tangible and directly perceptible. The consequences of environmental degradation can be readily translated into concrete concerns such as rising living costs or declining environmental quality, thereby facilitating social resonance and collective mobilization. These differences in risk perception fundamentally shape the discursive strategies and mobilization mechanisms required in the securitization process.

5.3 Comparing Securitization Outcomes: Policy Caution Versus Governance Complexity

At the level of securitization outcomes, neither case resulted in a complete rupture of cooperative relations. Instead, both cases are marked by substantial adjustments in cooperation conditions and governance arrangements. In the digital cooperation domain, Malaysia adopted a more cautious policy orientation by strengthening regulatory oversight and extending approval procedures in response to sovereignty-related security concerns. While these measures slowed the pace of cooperation, they did not bring cooperation to a halt.

Vietnam's adjustments in the ecological security domain are more evident in the growing complexity of governance arrangements. Higher environmental assessment standards and the institutionalization of public participation mechanisms have increased transparency in project implementation, but they have also raised institutional costs and coordination challenges. In this sense, securitization does not merely restrict cooperation; rather, it reshapes the operational logic of cooperation through institutionalized requirements. The dynamic nature of securitization pathways and their feedback effects on governance institutions constitute a critical issue in contemporary securitization research [10].

5.4 Comparing Conditions for Collaborative Governance: The Applicability of Desecuritization Pathways

Although both types of issues exhibit potential space for desecuritization, the conditions for achieving collaborative governance differ substantially. In the field of digital sovereignty, desecuritization hinges on the clarification of technical rules and the enhancement of institutional transparency. By transforming abstract sovereignty anxieties into operational governance problems, the political mobilization potential of security discourse can be reduced.

In the ecological security domain, collaborative governance relies more heavily on the institutionalization of societal participation mechanisms. Through community consultations, third-party assessments, and transnational environmental cooperation platforms, confrontational risk narratives can be converted into sustained processes of risk management.

These findings suggest that collaborative governance is not a universal template but rather a context-dependent governance pathway that must be designed in accordance with issue characteristics and social structures.

5.5 Summary: A Typological Understanding of Securitization in Non-Traditional Security Issues

The comparative analysis suggests that the securitization of non-traditional security issues under the Belt and Road Initiative can be broadly categorized into two types: a technology–sovereignty pathway dominated by state and elite discourse, and an environment–livelihood pathway driven by societal forces. These two pathways differ systematically in actor configurations, risk perceptions, and institutional consequences, yet they share a critical commonality: securitization is not inherently irreversible, nor does it necessarily lead to confrontation.

By introducing collaborative governance mechanisms and reintegrating securitized issues into institutionalized risk management frameworks, it is possible to mitigate the security dilemma associated with non-traditional security challenges. This comparative analysis provides an empirical foundation for identifying broader patterns in Belt and Road non-traditional security governance.

6. Conclusions and Theoretical Implications

6.1 Main Findings

Drawing on securitization theory and integrating perspectives from cooperative security and collaborative governance, this study systematically examines the emergence mechanisms and governance pathways of non-traditional security issues in the context of the Belt and Road Initiative. Through case studies and comparative analysis of Malaysia's digital sovereignty issue and Vietnam's ecological security issue, several key conclusions are reached.

First, non-traditional security risks under the Belt and Road Initiative do not arise solely from objective threats. Rather, they are progressively securitized through discursive construction and institutional practices by multiple actors operating within specific international structures and domestic political–social contexts. Both digital sovereignty and ecological security

exhibit strong socially constructed characteristics that cannot be understood outside their contextual settings.

Second, different types of non-traditional security issues follow distinct securitization pathways. Due to their high level of technical complexity and abstraction, digital sovereignty issues are more likely to be constructed as national security concerns through interactions between external great-power discourses and domestic elite politics. Ecological security issues, by contrast, owing to their localized and perceptible nature, are more likely to be securitized through societal mobilization. These pathway differences directly shape the intensity, durability, and institutional consequences of securitization.

Third, securitization does not inevitably lead to the suspension of Belt and Road cooperation. Instead, it reshapes cooperation conditions and operational logic through policy caution and governance complexity. In both cases examined, cooperation projects continued to varying degrees, albeit with significant changes in implementation modalities, regulatory requirements, and institutional costs.

Finally, this study finds that securitization is not necessarily irreversible. Under specific conditions, the introduction of collaborative governance mechanisms and the reintegration of security issues into institutionalized risk management frameworks can attenuate the exclusionary effects of security discourse and provide more stable expectations for cooperation.

6.2 Theoretical Implications: Rethinking Securitization, Development, and Governance

At the theoretical level, this study contributes several insights to the application and extension of securitization theory. First, securitization should not be understood solely in terms of discursive success or failure; rather, it constitutes a dynamic process encompassing discursive construction, institutionalization, and governance feedback. Extending analytical attention to post-securitization institutional evolution enables a more comprehensive understanding of the long-term effects of non-traditional security issues.

Second, the typological comparison conducted in this study demonstrates that non-traditional security issues are not homogeneous. Their securitization pathways and desecuritization

potential are highly contingent upon modes of risk perception and actor configurations. This finding addresses a limitation in existing securitization research, which has tended to underemphasize contextual variation in development- and technology-related issues.

Third, incorporating collaborative governance into securitization analysis helps transcend the binary logic of “security versus confrontation.” Collaborative governance does not deny the legitimacy of security concerns; instead, it seeks to transform potential conflicts into manageable cooperative risks through institutional design, thereby offering a governance-oriented extension of securitization theory.

6.3 Practical Implications for Belt and Road Non-Traditional Security Governance

From a policy perspective, the findings offer several implications for addressing non-traditional security risks under the Belt and Road Initiative. First, in digital cooperation and infrastructure development, greater attention should be paid to host countries’ subjective perceptions of sovereignty and ecological risks. Risk communication and institutional transparency should be incorporated as preconditions in cooperation design to prevent premature or excessive securitization.

Second, the construction of multi-actor collaborative governance mechanisms should be promoted by incorporating local technical experts, community representatives, and third-party assessment institutions. Such arrangements enhance the social legitimacy and institutional resilience of cooperation projects while reducing uncertainty-related costs.

Finally, in an increasingly complex global governance environment, Belt and Road cooperation should prioritize rule coordination and institutional alignment. Sustained institutionalized dialogue can help mitigate the unilateral impact of external security discourses and create favorable conditions for long-term cooperation on non-traditional security issues.

6.4 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite its efforts to provide systematic theoretical and empirical analysis, this study has several limitations. First, due to constraints related to scope and data availability, only two cases are examined. Future research could test and refine the proposed typological framework

by incorporating additional countries and issue areas.

Second, this study relies primarily on qualitative methods and lacks quantitative support for capturing the dynamic evolution of securitization processes. Subsequent research could integrate text analysis, public opinion data, or systematic comparisons of policy change to enhance robustness.

Finally, as digital technologies and ecological governance continue to evolve, the manifestations and governance mechanisms of non-traditional security risks will also change. Longitudinal studies tracking the interaction between securitization and collaborative governance would further deepen understanding of Belt and Road non-traditional security challenges.

Funding Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Key Research Base of Humanities and Social Sciences in Higher Education Institutions of the Sichuan Provincial Department of Education, the Center for Studies of China's Neighboring Countries, and Fudan University Press.

Project title: Non-Traditional Security Risks Along the Belt and Road and the Construction of a Community of Shared Destiny with China's Neighboring Countries. (Project No. 25ZBGJ-B014).

References

- [1] Silva, C. C. V. (2024). Securitization theory and its empirical application: a literature review. *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, 32(2), e019.
- [2] Quah, E.; Tan, J. R.; Nursultan, I. A Comparative Analysis of the Belt and Road Initiative with Other Global and Regional Infrastructure Initiatives: Prospects and Challenges. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 2025, 18(6):338.1-27
- [3] Zhu, X.; Hu, S.; Li, Z.; Wu, J. A System Dynamics Framework for Port Resilience Enhancement Along Maritime Silk Road: Insights from ESG Governance. *Systems* 2025, 13(8):719.
- [4] Valentine Y., Trihartono A., & Sunarko B. S. (2025). Environmental Security in Belt and Road Initiative Green Development Coalition (BRIGC): A Study of Pakistan, Kenya, and Indonesia. *The Journal of Indonesia Sustainable Development Planning*, 6(2): 239–253,
- [5] Paudel, P. (2025). The Rise of China's Digital Silk Road in ASEAN Countries. *Realism: Law Review*, 3(2):70–94
- [6] Bunnak, P., Song, N., Chen, X., & Thomson, R. (2024). A governance perspective on China's belt and road initiative: A case study of the Sino-Thai railway project. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 17(3), 421–440.
- [7] Yang, F. & Li, J. (2024). A Review of Renewable Energy Investment in Belt and Road Initiative Countries: A Bibliometric Analysis Perspective. *Energies*, 17(19): 4900.1-24
- [8] Securing Local Effects in Globalization through Multi-level Governance: Evidence from Steering the New Silk Road. *Chinese Political Science Review* 2025, 10:101–122.
- [9] Wu, J.; Li, Y.; Zhang, H.; et al. Development status, trends, and prospects of cybersecurity strategies and methodologies. *Engineering Sciences (in Chinese)*, 2025, 27(4): 14–27.
- [10]Schulhof, V., Hartley, K., Rabe, W., & Kostka, G. (2025). Conceptualizing sustainability in China's Belt and Road Initiative: A longitudinal analysis of scholarship (2013–2024). *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 212, 107891.