



Human security - a study in the intellectual perceptions and cognitive developments of the concept

Abdelhadi Kherbouche

University of Blida 02 (Algeria)

abdelhadi.kherbouche@gmail.com

Abstract ;

The rapid transformations of the era of globalization have led to a shift in the substantive concepts of security, as well as an expansion of its dimensions and levels. This has been accompanied by a divergence of opinions among most thinkers regarding the study of the security problem as a structure capable of being restructured and achieving a comprehensive scientific approach. Therefore, the concept of human security stands out as one of the most prominent attempts to contain new security threats in the context of globalization. This means that the concept of human security emerged as a result of the transformation in the nature of threats, which now affect all levels of security: from individual security to national security, and even global security, as well as the shift of threats from national borders to within the state itself. Accordingly, this article will attempt to explore the intellectual frameworks of the concept of human security, examining the intellectual and institutional perspectives that have been put forward, and tracing the developmental trajectory and stages of this concept

Article info

Received

December 19, 2025

Accepted

May 22, 2026

Keyword:

- ✓ *security*
- ✓ *Human security*
- ✓ *Concept*
- ✓ *Intellectual perceptions*



Introduction

With One of the outcomes of the end of the Cold War was the introduction of changes to many concepts, including the concept of security. The latter's usage connotations have evolved to become more complex and interconnected. New agenda items have been added thru the nature of the threat, whether physical violence or any non-military violence, as well as the subject concerned with the threat, whether the state or the individual.

All of these have made the human being the unit of analysis in new security studies: security equals human, or human equals security. The discussion has now shifted to the concept of human security, and thus human security has become the hallmark of all types of research on non-military threats that affect the security of individuals, groups, and societies, The reason for this is that the threat is no longer limited to what comes from outside the state, but it may also originate from within the state's borders due to ethnic conflicts and disputes. Additionally, the risks to human security and various sources of threats have become more impactful on freedom and more fear-inducing than military threats.

The state may be unable to contain, predict, or control them, such as diseases and epidemics, poverty, terrorism, and crime, which affect individuals in both rich and poor countries alike.

Axis One- The Concept of Security and the Limits of its Intersection With Related Concepts

It should be noted at the outset that the concept of security is not easily defined, nor is it universally agreed upon, much like many other concepts and terms that lack a precise definition. On this point, we find one of the leading figures in security, Barry Buzan, commenting that security is a broad, complex, and difficult concept to define, and its defining characteristic is that it is controversial or disputed. Therefore, he makes it a point to distinguish between the term "defense," which is generally agreed to have military connotations, and "security," which pertains to the internal affairs of states and is therefore insufficient to fully grasp the meaning of security.

Based on the foregoing, there is a relative consensus in international relations on defining security as a state in which danger and threat are absent. This is based on Barry Buzan's definition that security is a state of continuous freedom

from threat. Here, an important question must be raised: How is freedom from threat achieved? How is security maintained? And who should be free from threat? The answer will be multifaceted, especially since the concept of security does not have the same meaning for a state, a people, a company, or a gang. It varies according to place and time. Therefore, its definition must encompass at least three things: first, the political context of the concept; second, its various dimensions; and finally, the ambiguity and differences associated with its application in international relations.

Arabic and foreign linguistic studies and dictionaries have addressed the word "security," equating it with tranquility or the opposite of fear, and sometimes equating it with the avoidance of danger. Its use is usually related to liberation from danger, invasion, or fear. These terms do not have a single meaning or connotation; each has its own specific implications, distinct from the others. Kenneth Booth and Nicholas Wheeler described this process of liberation, stating that individuals and groups cannot achieve stable security unless they refrain from depriving others of it. This is achieved when security is viewed as a process of liberation.

One of the characteristics of the concept of security is change. It is a changing reality according to the circumstances of time and place, in

accordance with internal and external considerations. The concept of security is not a rigid concept, but rather a dynamic concept that develops with the development of circumstances, and is closely linked to local, regional and international conditions, data and factors. Security is a complex, dynamic, and dynamic state that is not characterized by rigidity.

Security is also a relative, not an absolute, reality. This relativity arises from the continuous pursuit by states to increase their power, which, in turn, increases their sense of insecurity rather than fostering greater security. States do not simply achieve balance; rather, they constantly strive for dominance due to fear and a lack of trust in international relations, thus creating a vicious cycle of increasing power.

Not far removed from the above context, we find that security is also characterized as a complex concept, encompassing several meanings that are simultaneously ambiguous and clear, truthful and misleading. There is a narrow concept of security and a broad one. The former includes measures to protect individuals within the state against potential dangers and to create conditions that satisfy their basic and supplementary needs. The broad concept of security, however, encompasses everything that achieves the political independence of the state, the integrity of its territory, and

ensures internal political, economic, and social stability.

The definition of security arises from numerous variables, particularly time and place. Changes in location alter the concept of security, as do changes in time. However, what remains constant in the definition of security is irrationality, which translates into an age-old feeling of fear. If we apply this to the distinction between what exists and what appears to exist in the realm of security—or more precisely, the distinction between being threatened and feeling threatened—the intricate relationship between rationality and irrationality becomes even more complex.

On the other hand, there is the concept of hard security and soft security. Hard security is characterized by its military nature and is usually shaped by the balance of power between states. Soft security, on the other hand, encompasses all non-military challenges facing states, such as health challenges, civil crime, refugees, extremism, and terrorism. These are all indirect challenges of a complex nature, where the security of individuals intersects with the security of the state and society. This phenomenon may be geographically widespread and transnational, extending its influence to other regions, and may even be a global phenomenon.

The concept of soft security can transform into hard security if addressed

with military means, such as when challenges escalate into threats requiring military force for control. Conversely, hard security can become soft security if diplomacy and negotiations intervene. Therefore, these two concepts represent an interconnected relationship that must be considered within a holistic framework that acknowledges the interplay between internal and external security determinants.

Regarding the limits of the intersection of the concept of security with related concepts, the overall point that can be made is that this concept intersects with the three most represented concepts of threat, risk, and challenge, and ambiguity arises between what constitutes a threat, what constitutes a risk, and what constitutes a challenge, and determining the meaning of each of these concepts, and how each of them can be placed within the hierarchy of concerns.

In its strategic sense, a threat means that the conflict of national interests and goals reaches a stage where a peaceful solution cannot be found that provides states with a minimum level of political, economic, social, and military security, in contrast to their inability to counterbalance external pressures. This compels the conflicting parties to resort to the use of military force, thereby endangering the national security of other parties.

In addition, the threat may be physical or economic, and it may affect traditional security, based on the principle that the more intense the perception, the more severe the state of insecurity. Therefore, the threat is a result of our interpretation of observed situations, and thus the threat is determined by this interpretation, contrary to what can be assessed. The threat arises from a set of multidimensional and diverse causes and kinetic factors that are always complex and dynamic, making them capable of generating new causes that transform the nature of the threat.

As for risks, they are based on mathematical probabilities. There are also risk factors, which are elements that can increase or decrease the probability of a risk occurring. Therefore, risks are always relative because individuals interpret many things as risks to themselves. Risks are socially real if they are interpreted as real, whether material or not. Consequently, risks cannot be summarized as simply the result of realized losses, as they contain a fundamental component: the future. This future is represented by the extension of expected losses in the present over the future, coupled with a lack of confidence.

Risks are related to the future, and therefore to predicting losses that have not yet occurred but threaten to occur. As such, risks target a future whose course must be changed. Risks may arise

according to the emergence of a set of variables that may produce reasons for their transformation into a threat. Thus, a threat is a primary result of the transformation of risks.

Finally, challenges are those problems, difficulties, or dangers that confront a state and hinder or impede its progress, forming an obstacle to achieving its security, stability, and vital national and shared interests. These challenges are difficult to avoid or ignore, and may begin or end with the disappearance of the reasons that caused the state to reach the level of the challenge itself, without reaching the level of threats, at which point a balance is achieved between the two sides. However, reaching this stage of balance takes longer than the time required to address the threat.

Challenges can take many forms and fall under the umbrella of soft security, while threats fall under the umbrella of hard security. The difference between the two lies in the fact that a threat may be direct, involving the use of military force or the threat thereof, and its impact on security is immediate. A challenge, on the other hand, leads, in the medium or long term, to direct harm to national, regional, or global security.

The degree and nature of threats vary, as threats can be categorized into several types. The first is actual threats, meaning exposure to imminent danger resulting from the actual use of military force or the

serious threat of its use. The second is potential threats, meaning the existence of real reasons for exposure to threats without reaching the stage of using military force to resolve the problem. The third is latent threats, meaning the existence of the causes of the threat without any visible manifestations on the surface. Finally, there are perceived threats, meaning those threats that do not appear at the present stage, but a future outlook on the form and nature of international and regional transformations and developments may indicate the possibility of their emergence on the scene to varying degrees.

Axis Two- Stages of Development of Security Studies

Five major stages can be identified in the development of security studies, beginning with the golden age, which was in the pre-Cold War period, passing through the decline during the 1960s, then the revival stage starting in the 1970s, as well as the post-Cold War stage, and ending with the post-September 11, 2001 stage. The following is a detailed explanation of each stage separately.

A- The Golden Age of Security Studies:

Before the First and Second World Wars, security studies were the domain of a few scholars and specialists in military and strategic affairs. As a field of knowledge, it was closely linked to strategic studies, and most academic work during this period focused on diplomacy and the

military. After the Second World War, security studies underwent a qualitative transformation, particularly with the contributions of the realist school. The Cold War environment and the dominance of realist politics in international relations created a favorable environment for this school to monopolize the field of knowledge.

The disasters resulting from the First and Second World Wars confirmed that the phenomenon of war is of such importance that it is too big to be left as a matter for generals and strategists. The entry of civilians as a party in the equation of wars and their direct impact on its negative results, especially after the Second World War, which claimed more than 50 million lives, most of them civilians, in addition to the emergence of nuclear weapons as a new factor in the power relations between countries, prompted the extension of important research work in this field.

The catastrophic consequences of the potential use of these destructive weapons in wars led to discussions in that era focusing on the risks arising from the use of these weapons or the threat of their use. Many theories emerged that sought to solve this dilemma, the most important of which were the theory of deterrence, arms control, the role of solidarity wars, alternative strategies, and other theories.

However, the difficulty in obtaining security information, which is represented

by defense secrets and its ambiguity in many cases, has resulted in a number of critical studies and analyses that are less scientifically reliable and less dependent on empirical field aspects, which has led researchers to adopt more inferential research techniques such as game theory and others, all of which have revolved almost around the concept of the balance of power, such as nuclear deterrence theory.

Some researchers have also tried to focus on the role of perceptions and beliefs in predicting the outbreak of war, and some of them have gone so far as to emphasize that knowledge is what influences the decision - such as approving the first strike - and they have neglected the role of diplomacy and the political roots of conflicts. These theories are in part a result of the researchers adopting a methodology that is particularly related to the idea of the rational actor, which explains the theories that emerged in that era, especially deterrence, with psychological factors, bureaucratic factors, and political factors as determinants of political action, which is the decision.

B- The Decline of Security Studies:

With the beginning of the 1960s, security studies experienced a decline. Interest in the Cold War waned, particularly among Americans, who were preoccupied with the Vietnam War. Generally, the most important factors contributing to the

decline of security studies during this period can be summarized into four main points. The first was the decline in the focus on central issues, including the military programs of the two opposing superpowers. Consequently, many theories, such as nuclear deterrence, lost their relevance. Similarly, discussions about the strategic doctrines of the two powers diminished. This period witnessed the emergence of new concepts and methodological research tools.

The second of these factors is the abandonment by a number of researchers in strategic and security affairs in the United States of America of their academic jobs to become government advisors or join think tanks. The third factor is the Vietnam War and its consequences, and the shock that the United States of America received, which generated doubts about the credibility of scientific research in this strategic and security field, which led to a decline in the attractiveness of this field in the eyes of academics and researchers.

The last of these factors is the détente between the two superpowers, which played a role in the loss of legitimacy of security studies during that period. The decline of the American economic position increased interest in international political economy issues more than strategic issues. New paradigms such as interdependence shifted the attention of researchers towards other research

programs, and even researchers who continued to be interested in security studies relied more on the application of systems theory in analyzing national security problems, especially in the field of decision-making, and neglected purely strategic issues.

C- The stage of reviving security studies: This stage began approximately in the middle of the seventies of the last century, coinciding with the end of the Vietnam War. In this regard, we find Stephen Walt putting forward five main factors that played a role in reviving security studies at the international level; the first of which was the contribution of the end of the Vietnam War in allowing students and researchers to study national security issues without rejecting them, as it reduced doubts about the theories produced by academic departments, and it encouraged correcting the shortcomings of the United States of America at the level of defense and foreign policy, as many young researchers were interested in studying what happened during this war and the catastrophic mistakes.

Secondly, the end of the détente between the Eastern and Western poles contributed to the renewed interest in security studies due to the deterioration of relations between the two poles in the seventies and eighties of the last century. In addition, this event contributed to the interest of American public opinion in the international situation of the United States

of America after the revolution in Iran, the crisis situation in Nicaragua, the signing of the SALT II agreement, and the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and also in Africa. All of these factors helped to make security studies a priority at the academic and popular level. Moreover, the Reagan administration reinforced the sense of fears because the national security policy was reckless and provocative.

The third factor is the ease of access to information, particularly regarding defense secrets, especially in the United States, which has experienced a degree of transparency in this area. This is due to several factors, notably the Watergate scandal and the Vietnam War, which led to increased public pressure in the US demanding transparency about the details of the war and the scandals that accompanied it. Furthermore, the US Congress became deeply involved in and focused on security and defense issues. The fourth factor is the emergence of numerous journals and magazines specializing in security studies and the ease of publishing in them. The fifth and final factor is financial support, as many institutions and large corporations, particularly those based in the United States, now support research centers.

D- Security Studies After the Cold War: Since the end of the Cold War, the literature of security studies has witnessed a special activity, resulting in a debate between three main schools: the

traditionalists who continued to focus on the military factor, the expansionists who seek to broaden the scope of research interest in security studies to other non-military topics, and finally the critical security studies trend, which focuses its interests on reconceptualizing security.

Security studies after the Cold War began to witness a separation from strategic studies, especially with the research presented by Barry Buzan, who laid the foundations of security studies as a distinct field of knowledge from strategic studies. Since that time, security studies have been dealing with new non-military threats to security such as internal poverty, education crises, environmental degradation, global poverty, and other non-military issues. This led the American Association to call in its final report at its seventy-ninth session for a review of American national security. As a result, security studies began to raise three critical issues for traditional security studies based on the military dimension. These issues are security as an end, the means of achieving security, and finally, internal matters and security.

Later, the September 11, 2001 attacks constituted a crucial turning point and had a significant impact on the research program in security studies. These studies were directed towards new areas, and at this point, we find that Amitav Acharya identified five major fundamental issues: The first relates to new threats and new

wars against terrorism. The second relates to the form and nature of the international system, which is a unipolar system with attempts by international parties to move it towards multipolarity. The third relates to an issue raised by Samuel Huntington and later Francis Fukuyama, which is the clash of cultures, which will turn into a clash of civilizations due to the revival of identity issues and the emphasis on the role of cultures. The fourth relates to the endeavor of democratization and achieving international security. As for the fifth and last, it relates to a new issue of security, which is the issue of human security, which has become a cornerstone of national security.

Axis Three- Academic Definitions of Human Security

The concept of human security was accompanied by many definitions upon its emergence, ranging from doctrinal to institutional. We will address them as follows:

A- Jurisprudential definitions of human security:

- MahbubulHaq's definition of human security means the security of people instead of the security of the land, the security of individuals instead of nations, security thru development rather than weapons, and the security of individuals everywhere.

- As for Amitay Acharia's definition: "Human security consists of three dimensions: freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom from suffering in times of conflict."

- There is the definition by Wosanj Kim and Tak Hwan: "Human security is based on the idea that providing basic needs for individuals is a fundamental condition for societies, and without achieving human security, national security cannot be realized." And human security means liberation from human suffering arising from natural disasters that are man-made at the local, regional, and global levels. It also includes the political, military, economic, social, and environmental fields. We observe from the definition of thinkers Kim and Hyun that human security is a prerequisite for achieving national security.

- As for Sadoko Ogata's definition: Achieving human security requires the inclusion of the excluded. It focuses on the existence of sufficient trust among the largest possible group of individuals in their future, sufficient trust that they can indeed think about the next day, the next week, and the next year. Therefore, their protection and empowerment are matters related to providing real opportunities for individuals to live in peace and dignity, which enhance human security.

- As for Lioud Aksord, he defines human security in 1996 as the protection of individuals from threats, whether

accompanied by violence or not. It is a situation characterized by the absence of violations of individuals' fundamental rights to their security and life. It is a worldview that starts from the individual, and like other security policies, it means protection.

- As for Caroline Thomas, human security, according to her, essentially consists of the fact that achieving human security refers to the state of meeting individuals' material needs in addition to achieving human dignity. Human security cannot be fragmented and cannot be achieved by one individual or one group at the expense of another group, and although the material dimensions constitute the essence of human security, in addition to that, human security is shaped by non-material dimensions.

- As for Kofi Annan's definition in 2000 in the Millenium Project, where the former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented a comprehensive definition of the concept of human security during the introduction of the Millenium Project as follows: "Human security in its comprehensive sense means more than the absence of armed violence; it includes human rights, good governance, the right to access education and healthcare opportunities, and ensuring that every individual has the opportunity and ability to meet their own needs.

Every step in this direction is a step toward reducing poverty, achieving

economic growth, and preventing conflicts. Achieving freedom from want and freedom from fear, and ensuring that future generations inherit a natural and healthy environment, these are the interconnected pillars for achieving human security and thus national security."

Thru this definition, we notice that it focuses on two main aspects in its definition of human security: freedom from fear and freedom from want. Freedom from fear is a politically oriented action during wars and conflicts, while freedom from want is the protection of individuals from poverty, economic deprivation, and healthcare.

B- Institutional Definitions of Human Security

The emergence of the concept of human security remained an independent concept until the United Nations Development Program issued its Human Development Report in 1994, where it provided an extensive definition of human security and addressed the patterns of threats facing the world today, which hinder development. According to the report, human security is defined as freedom from fear and freedom from want. The report also presented seven variables, which are: economic security, political security, military security, environmental security, health security, community security, and personal security. Additionally, the report identified the fundamental characteristics of human security, which revolve around

the global dimension, human-centeredness, interconnectedness, and early prevention. It also acknowledged the necessity of the correlation between an individual's physical security and their protection.

- The African Union defines human security according to its charter as the security of the individual related to meeting their basic needs. It also includes providing the necessary social, economic, political, environmental, and cultural conditions for the individual's survival, preserving their dignity, protecting and respecting human rights, ensuring good governance, and guaranteeing opportunities and choices for all individuals to achieve their full development.

From the above, the most important observations and conclusions from the academic and institutional definitions of human security can be noted as follows:

- All definitions agree that the individual in human security is the central unit of analysis and the transition to a comprehensive vision imposed by the globalization of security.
- All definitions agree that the sources of threats are multiple and complex, making it extremely difficult to provide a comprehensive definition of the term.
- There is integration and harmony between human security and national

security, as they are complementary; the state is the means and the individual is the end and the goal.

Axis Four - From State Security to Human Security: Theoretical Developments of the Concept of Human Security

Undoubtedly, the concept of security is no longer as simple as it once was. Due to advancements in knowledge, it has become a complex, multi-dimensional, and multi-layered concept. This intellectual development has, in turn, led to a parallel evolution of the concept at the theoretical level, making it essential to establish theoretical frameworks capable of keeping pace with the rapid pace of events and providing explanations for them.

Therefore, this section will address the traditional theoretical developments of the concept of human security, primarily represented by realism and neorealism. It will then examine the expansion of this concept specifically within the Copenhagen School.

A- State Security First: Realism and the Concept of Security

Realism aims to understand the actors and factors influencing each other. Therefore, the theory is fundamentally based on studying international relations from the perspective of power as a tool for analysis and interpretation. Thucydides, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Thomas Hobbes

stand out as prominent thinkers who influenced and contributed to the formation of this school of thought. Hans Morgenthau is also considered one of the most important theorists of realist thought.

Realism relies on a holistic, overarching analysis that focuses on systemic interpretations of the international system and its patterns of interaction as a level of analysis and interpretation of international phenomena. Thus, it does not analyze the internal environment of society and its various interactions, but rather interprets the behavior of states within the international system, not their behavior as isolated entities. It posits that the instinctive drive that motivates humankind is the struggle for power in order to survive, confront challenges, and assert oneself, a pursuit that ceases only with death.

Furthermore, it never addressed the concept of what international relations should be, a point Machiavelli touched upon in his book "The Prince," arguing that those who neglect the present in order to focus on the future inevitably destroy themselves rather than preserve themselves. He also emphasized that a state's capabilities play a crucial role in determining the outcome of international conflicts and its ability to influence others, provided that the state understands that power is not solely a military matter, but also encompasses variables such as the level of technological development,

population, natural and geographical factors, as well as the form of government and political and ideological leadership.

Realism stems from the principle of parity and similarity in the foreign policies of certain states that are close and similar within the international system, despite the differences and variations in the components of their internal environments, including the value system of their societies. It posits that the values and beliefs prevalent in a state cannot be universally applied, and even if applied, they are always subject to specific circumstances and conditions. On this basis, the behavior of other states can be evaluated. The starting point for realists is the pursuit of power by states for survival, with self-reliance considered the only way to guarantee the state's continuity.

Realists also believe that a set of constant factors plays a major role in shaping international behavior. A state's geographical location influences its capabilities and foreign policy orientations. This means that geography makes some states more vulnerable to invasion than others, while some states occupy more strategically important locations due to easier access to waterways and the nature of their borders, which are more defensible. Geographical location also influences a state's ability to mobilize its resources to confront other states.

Therefore, Friedrich Hegel considers the state an objective reality with an existence separate from the existence and personality of its citizens. The state has its own standards, which are higher and different from those of its citizens. One of the state's primary duties is self-preservation, even if the individual has the moral right to sacrifice themselves in defense of a moral principle. The state cannot prioritize a moral stance over a successful political one. Its interests toward one another expand through increasing relative power internally and maximizing national interests to the greatest extent possible. This constitutes a mechanism known as the balance of power, which operates to prevent any single state from becoming the sole dominant power.

The issue here relates to the ability of the political leader to achieve his country's goals without exposing it to foreign danger, given that the international environment differs from the domestic environment in its lack of control and common standards of political behavior. Therefore, we see that the standards that govern the international structure are not the same as those that govern the local environment of a single state. Here, realism sees that each state has its own values, values, and beliefs that act as a motive and incentive that justifies the national interest and places it above all considerations. There is also the absence of a common culture among the

components of the international community, the latter of which is characterized by chaos and the absence of a central authority to manage it.

B- The Copenhagen School and the concept of expanded security

The pioneers of this school of thought are credited with developing and expanding the concept of security, most notably Barry Buzan, who opened up fields beyond the military sector. Buzan's studies of security were not limited to describing it as a phenomenon but were analytical and interpretive. He emphasized that expanding security is an imperative due to the emergence of new and objective threats to Western societies. In the third edition of his book, *People, States, and Fear*, published in 1991, he clarified the sectoral logic that governs security productions, while continuing to argue that the idea of security is a continuation of existence with the potential for threats.

Barry Buzan employed certain realist principles, such as considering the state as the central unit of analysis, while focusing on human groups and societal security. He argued that security is the very reason states are founded, and that the state is no longer the sole point of reference for understanding and interpreting security phenomena at the regional and global levels. The point of reference changes with the specific security sector under study and is influenced by five factors and domains. Accordingly, Buzan presented

five security sectors, emphasizing the activities of each to provide a clearer understanding of national security and the nature of threats within each sector.

- **New Security Sectors:** Barry Buzan identified these sectors as follows:

- **Military Security:** This encompasses the state's military capabilities at both the defensive and offensive levels. The offensive level lies in its ability to deter various attacks that could jeopardize its survival. Military threats stem from military activities directed against the state.

- **Political Security:** This relates to attacks against the stability of systems within the state and is primarily directed against the government, its institutions, and the ideologies it represents.

- **Environmental Security:** This concerns the preservation of the environment and nature as a fundamental variable element of life and a source of threat.

- **Economic Security:** This includes how resources and wealth are acquired.

- **Social Security:** This relates to threats against national, social, and value-based identity.

It is noteworthy that these sectors are interconnected and cannot be separated. Each one is intertwined with the others

through a strong network of links, each complementing the others.

- **Securitization:** This is one of the contributions of the Copenhagen School, spearheaded by one of its pioneers, Ole Weber. It differs entirely from the traditional understanding of securitization. Weber's approach is quite different; he considered security to be a discursive act, and securitization to be essentially the politicization of a given issue. According to him, discourse is a means of directing public opinion by framing it as a security issue, thereby constructing a subjective understanding.

Ole Weber, John Galtung, and other pioneers of the school added terms like "more mature anarchy," in which states recognize the extreme dangers inherent in continuing intense competition in the nuclear world. The school used the methodology of speech acts to determine and assess whether a threat constitutes a security risk, whether military or otherwise. According to Weber, through speech and discourse theory, security can be considered an act. In this case, security is irrelevant as a reference point to something concrete. However, uttering the word "security" requires political representation and the guarantee of the right to use the necessary means to control the outcomes. This allows for a behavioral definition of security rather than a contractual one.

In other words, securitization is a pragmatic linguistic construct practiced by an elite, based on the premise of a threat to the material and moral survival of an individual, group, state, or identity. This premise aims to legitimize the means used to secure the threatened entity from the dangers it faces.

- The Regional Security Complex According to Barry Buzan

Security has become inextricably linked to the external dimensions of the region. It is difficult to understand the security of a single state without considering its neighbors, especially given the complexity and interconnectedness of contemporary problems and the region in which these states are located. This involves studying units within systems characterized by geographically proximate states. Security here is understood according to the friend-enemy relationship and focuses on the shared threats facing this group of states, whose security cannot exist in isolation from one another, given their shared perception of a particular threat.

Based on this, thinkers of this school link the study of threats to a focus on the quality of threat management using distinct methods, and on the threats that exist and endanger states and societies. This is done within the five sectors of security, according to the following levels of analysis: the international system, subsystems, units, subunits, and individuals.

Axis Five- Cognitive Developments of the Concept of Human Security

The concept of human and individual security was revived in many societies after the end of the Cold War, by the United Nations program in its 1994 Human Development Report. It represented an acknowledgment of the priority of individuals, as the individual joined the community and then the state to increase their share of security, in exchange for giving up part of their freedom.

Although the concept of human security is relatively new, the ideas that defined its content are old. This is clearly evident thru the establishment of organizations that sought to maintain international peace and security, emphasizing the necessity of expanding basic human needs. This was reflected in the charters of these organizations and affirmed by representatives of various countries, as highlighted by the U.S. Secretary of State regarding the San Francisco Conference in 1945, where he stated that the battle for peace must be fought on two fronts: the first front is security, which means freedom from fear, and the second is the economic front, which means freedom from want. The founders of the United Nations system based some of their ideas on the premise that the primary source of wars lies in economic and social disturbances.

The concept of human security can be traced back to the establishment of the International Committee of the Red Cross in 1940, and the concept was later embodied in the establishment of the United Nations within the framework of the organization's general principles and those outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions. The concept was also embodied in the context of the international movement and the International Criminal Court to punish individuals for their violations of humanitarian rules against other humans. During the Cold War, the concept of human security was introduced in the research and work of some specialized committees thru various international conferences.

A- The first phase:

The concept of human security developed within the framework of the relationship between security and development, including the Roman Club reports from the 1970s, which issued a series of reports under the title "The Global Problem." These reports emphasized that the problems faced by people, whether in rich or poor countries, must be taken into consideration, as they reflect on humans at all levels. These reports were represented by a working paper titled "The Limits to Growth" from 1972. According to Dr. IdrisAtiyah, these reports were noted for their pessimistic

finding appropriate means and solutions to meet the current needs of individuals without compromising the needs of future generations, and on developing a sustainable development strategy aimed at achieving harmony between humans and the environment to prevent environmental disasters. Concurrently with these reports, some countries emerged calling for a reduction in military spending and the allocation of part of the saved resources from developing countries to be spent on development and improving people's conditions and security. France was the first country to call for a reconsideration of military spending policies, proposing in 1995 that a quarter of the resources directed toward financing arms programs and operations be allocated to create an international fund dedicated to development.

In addition, the concept of human security was introduced in the work of some independent committees concerned with disarmament and security issues, known as the "Bamli Committee," chaired by Olf Bamli, which issued its first report in 1982 titled "Common Security." The contributions of this committee focused on security issues and problems related to human security, such as poverty, the absence of social justice, and economic deprivation, which were referred to as human security issues. The report proposed tools to achieve and ensure human security, embody democracy locally and globally, respect human rights,

and achieve economic development and environmental security.

The international conference on the relationship between armament and development was held in Paris in 1986, where the main goal of the conference was to emphasize the necessity of directing attention to spending on development to achieve human welfare instead of spending on armament. It was confirmed once again that neglecting human security in the world has begun to undermine many governing systems in different countries. It was found that countries cannot emerge from crises thru armament but rather thru development and meeting the essential needs of people to increase their sense of security.

However, the work and research of these aforementioned committees did not reach the level of deepening the concept of human security; rather, they were limited to discussing and raising issues related to security threats. Thus, these works formed the roots and initial nucleus for the crystallization of the concept of human security, which was officially adopted by the United Nations in the Human Development Report issued under the United Nations Development Program in 1994.

Conclusion:

The research objective of this study was to highlight the various intellectual conceptions of human security and the

cognitive developments it has undergone. It became clear from the foregoing that the concept of human security, as an intellectual and cognitive framework, has experienced a radical transformation and a qualitative shift in political thought and international relations. It has successfully shifted the focus from state security, based on sovereignty, borders, and military power, to individual security, based on protecting human dignity and meeting basic needs. The most prominent features of this intellectual and cognitive development can be summarized in the following points:

- **Expanding the concept:** Moving from a narrow military perspective to a comprehensive seven-dimensional framework (economic, nutritional, health, environmental, personal, social, and political).
- **Developmental integration:** The organic link between security and development; there can be no security without development that protects people, and no sustainable development without a safe and stable environment.
- **Shifting from deterrence to prevention:** Focusing on addressing the root causes of crises (such as poverty, ignorance, and epidemics) rather than merely managing their violent consequences.
- **The Globalization of Threats:** The growing awareness that modern threats (such as climate change and transboundary pandemics) cannot be addressed through individual sovereignty alone, but rather through shared international solidarity.

In conclusion, it is undeniable that human security is no longer a mere intellectual exercise or a theoretical ethical approach, but has become a strategic imperative and an essential practical framework for formulating public policies. Therefore, any attempt to envision the future of this concept necessitates that the international community develop new mechanisms for global governance that transcend narrow national interests and place humanity as the ultimate goal and the fundamental means of achieving international peace and security.

References:

- Abdel Nour Ben Antar, The Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations, International Politics, Volume 40, Issue 160, April 2005.
- Alex Machlod, "des etudes de security de structuctirisme dominante au constructivisme critique", cultures et conflits, n° 54, été 2004.
- Barry Buzan, Rethinking Security After the Cold War, Cooperation and Conflict, Vol 32, No 01, March 1997.
- Barry Buzan, people states and fear, agenda for international security

- studies in the post-cold war era, 2^{ed} edition, congman, 1991.
- Charles Philippe David et Jean Jacques Roche, Théories de la Sécurité : Définition, Approches et Concepts de la Sécurité Internationale, Paris : Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 2^{ème} édition, 2006.
 - David Baldwin, Security Studies and the End of the Cold War, World Politics, No 48, Octobre 1995.
 - Dario Battistella, Theories des relations internationales, 2^{ème} édition, Paris : presses des sciences po, 2006.
 - Houssine Belkhirat, Security in International Relations: Theoretical Approaches, Algeria: Wamda Publishing, Distribution and Translation House, First Edition, First Semester 2024.
 - Idris Attia, Notebooks on International Security Studies: From the Classical Approach to New Trends, Algeria: Dar Al-Umma for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, 2021 Edition.
 - Idris Attia, Security Engineering Applications in Algeria's African Policy , Algeria: Dar Al-Umma, 2019.
 - James Doughty, Robert Plestengraf, trans. Walid Abdel-Hay, Conflicting Theories in International Relations, 1st ed. Kuwait: Kazma Publishing and Distribution, 1985.
 - Jean Jacques Roche, Theories des relations international, 5^{ème} édition, Paris : Monchrestien, 2004.
 - Khadija Arafa Muhammad Amin, "Human Security and its Application in the Arab and International Reality", 1st ed., Riyadh: Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, 2002.
 - Khadija Arafa Muhammad Al-Amin, "The Concept of Human Security," International Center for Future Studies, Issue 13, Year 2, January 2007.
 - Lloyd Axword, "la sécurité humaine: la sécurité des individus dans un monde en mutation", politique étrangere, n 2, 1999.
 - Lloyd Axworthy, Human security safety for people in a changing word, Canada: ministry of foreign affairs, april 1999.
 - Martin Griffiths, Terry O'Callaghan, Key Concepts in International Relations, trans. Gulf Research Center, UAE: Gulf Research Center, 2008.
 - Mohamed Hafez Al-Rahwan, Planning to Confront Crises and Disasters and Combat Terrorism, Egypt: Hala Publishing and Distribution, 2006.
 - Mohammed Abdel Salam, Regional Security Arrangements in the Post-September 11, 2001 Era, Strategic Papers, Thirteenth Year, Volume 13, Issue 127, February 2003.
 - Mohammed Al-Akhdar Karam, Preventive Diplomacy between the Texts of the Charter and the Peace Agenda, Arab Journal of Political Science, Issue 14, Spring 2007.
 - Mohamed Ahmed Ali Al-Adawi, Human Security and the Human Rights System: A Study in Concepts and Interrelationships, Assiut University, Security Media Center, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, 2017.

- Musa al-Zughbi, Studies in Strategic Thought, Damascus: Arab Union Publications, 2001.
- Saliha Kababi, "Security Studies Between the Traditional and Modern Trends," Journal of Human Sciences, No. 38, Algeria, 2012.
- Samir Qatt, Theories of Security in International Relations - Concepts and Approaches - Algeria: Ali Bin Zaid Printing and Publishing House, First Edition, First Quarter 2016.
- Steven Walt, The Renaissance of Security Studies, Internationale Studies Quartly, Vol. 35, No 2, Jun 1991.
- Sulaiman Abdullah Al-Harbi, The Concept of Security: Its Levels, Forms and Threats – A Theoretical Study of Concepts and Frameworks, Arab Journal of Political Science, Issue 19, Summer 2008.
- Thierry Balzacq, Qu'est-ce que la sécurité nationale ?, la revue internationale et stratégique, N 52, Hiver 2003-2004.
- Ulrich Beck, La Société du Risque : Sur la Voie d'une Autre Modernité, Paris : Editions Flammarion, 2001
- .Youssef Nassif Hitti, Theory in International Relations, 1st ed. Beirut: Arab Book House, 1985.