David Hume and the Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations: From the Balance of Power to Comprehensive Security

David Hume et l'évolution du concept de sécurité dans les relations internationales : de l'équilibre des puissances à la sécurité globale

Dr. Meriem Zekri*[1], University of Tlemcen**,** Faculty of Law and Political Science**,** Department of Political Science, Algeria

Email: meriem.zekri@univ-tlemcen.dz

Dr Feyza Sahraoui[2], University of Tlemcen, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Political Science, Algeria

Email: sahraoui.fayza@univ-tlemcen.dz

Dr Messaoudi Fatima Zahra[3], University of Tlemcen, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Political Science, Algeria

Email: fatima-zahra.messaoudi@univ-tlemcen.dz

Dr Mohamed Samir Ayed[4], University of Tlemcen, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Political Science, Algeria

Email: Mohammedsamir.ayad@gmail.com

Dr Sidi Mohammed Mekkaoui[5], University of Tlemcen, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Political Science, Algeria

Email: sidimohammed.mekkaoui@univ-tlemcen.dz

Received: *01/06/2026* ***Accepted:*** *01/09/2026* ***Published:*** *03/10/2026*

Abstract:

This study examines the intellectual evolution of the concept of security in international relations, with particular attention to David Hume's contribution to the understanding of the balance of power and its relationship to security. Hume's 1752 essay *Of the Balance of Power* provides an important intellectual reference for examining the historical roots of balance-of-power thinking and its subsequent relevance to realist approaches to international security. The study then traces the transformation of the security concept from its traditional state-centered and predominantly military understanding toward broader conceptions that emerged particularly after the end of the Cold War. It examines the perspectives of realism and neo-realism, liberalism and neo-liberalism, constructivism, and critical approaches, highlighting their different interpretations of security and its referent objects. The study also analyzes the emergence of human security, societal security, and comprehensive or global security in response to the growing importance of non-military threats, including environmental degradation, economic instability, migration, terrorism, health crises, food insecurity, and other transnational challenges. The study concludes that the evolution of security reflects both the enduring importance of power and balance-of-power considerations and the increasing multidimensionality of contemporary security. Consequently, understanding contemporary security requires connecting its historical intellectual foundations with the broader human,

societal, environmental, and global dimensions that characterize the contemporary international system.

Keywords: David Hume; balance of power; international security; human security; global security.

Résumé:

Cette étude examine l'évolution intellectuelle du concept de sécurité dans les relations internationales, en accordant une attention particulière à la contribution de David Hume à la compréhension de l'équilibre des puissances et de son rapport avec la sécurité. L'essai de Hume publié en 1752, *Of the Balance of Power*, constitue une référence intellectuelle importante pour examiner les racines historiques de la pensée relative à l'équilibre des puissances et sa pertinence ultérieure pour les approches réalistes de la sécurité internationale. L'étude retrace ensuite la transformation du concept de sécurité, passant de sa conception traditionnelle, centrée sur l'État et principalement fondée sur la dimension militaire, à des conceptions plus larges apparues notamment après la fin de la guerre froide. Elle examine les perspectives du réalisme et du néoréalisme, du libéralisme et du néolibéralisme, du constructivisme ainsi que des approches critiques, en mettant en évidence leurs différentes interprétations de la sécurité et de ses référents. L'étude analyse également l'émergence de la sécurité humaine, de la sécurité sociétale et de la sécurité globale ou comprehensive, en réponse à l'importance croissante des menaces non militaires, notamment la dégradation de l'environnement, l'instabilité économique, les migrations, le terrorisme, les crises sanitaires, l'insécurité alimentaire et d'autres défis transnationaux. L'étude conclut que l'évolution du concept de sécurité reflète à la fois l'importance persistante de la puissance et des considérations liées à l'équilibre des puissances, ainsi que la dimension de plus en plus multidimensionnelle de la sécurité contemporaine. Par conséquent, la compréhension de la sécurité contemporaine nécessite de mettre en relation ses fondements intellectuels historiques avec les dimensions humaine, sociétale, environnementale et globale qui caractérisent le système international contemporain.

Mots-clés: David Hume ; équilibre des puissances ; sécurité internationale ; sécurité humaine ; sécurité globale.

Introduction :

For Francis Fukuyama, the end of the Cold War was seen as the victory of democracy and capitalism. It signified the end of history, as the world entered its final stage with the triumph of the United States and its allies over the Soviet Union and the communist bloc. Consequently, global security became endangered due to the demise of the balance of power system, with one pole dominating and potentially leading to its tyranny. This led to attempts of separation from other parties, resulting in global instability.

As a result, the world has become similar to the beginning of history, necessitating researchers in the field of international relations to reconsider their perceptions of the security concept. This led also Stephen Walt to describe the post-Cold War era as the renaissance of security studies.

The increasing dependency of Southern or so called Third World countries to Northern developed and industrialized ones, along with the emergence of new variables like environmental factors and the threats they pose to humanity, has transformed almost the entire concept of security. It has expanded from its narrow definition to a much broader one.

Consequently, and therefore the main challenge remained facing the thinkers and researchers in the field of security studies revolved around answering a set of questions, namely:

1. What is security?

2. Whose security is it? Is it for the state, the group, or the individual?

1. Concept of Security: Despite the utmost importance of the concept of security and its widespread use, it is difficult to define a single concept for national or international security, as well as security. The concept of security is very ancient. If we refer to the Muslim's Quranic text, we find the term "security" mentioned hundreds of times and in various forms but with a very high frequency. The reason for this is that it is the substance from which faith is derived.

Originally, security is the tranquility resulting from trust in God, which is faith, as well as trust in others, leading to peace of mind. If we exclude the concepts of faith, trust, and security, which prevail in the Quranic text, the word "security" alone appears five times in this form and seven times in the form of "secure." Three of them mention security in contrast to fear, as in the verse: "Let them worship the Lord of this House, Who has fed them, [saving them] from hunger and made them safe [saving them] from fear" (Quran: 106:2-4).

And His saying: "And let them exchange what they have of fear for security" (Quran: 24:55).

From the perspective of the British Encyclopedia, security means protecting the nation from the danger of foreign domination.

In Henry Kissinger's view, it is defined as the actions through which society seeks to preserve its right to exist.

Robert McNamara, former US Secretary of Defense and prominent strategic thinker, defined security in his book as: "The Essence of Security" and as "the development and progress, whether economic, social, or political, under guaranteed protection." He, further elaborated, stating: "True security for a state arises from its profound self-reliance on the resources that threaten its various capabilities and confrontations, to provide an opportunity for the development of those capabilities in all fields, whether in the present or the future."

Arnold Wolfers defined it as "the absence of threat to acquired values" objectively, and in its subjective aspect, it is the absence of fear that any of these values may be compromised.

Here, we also see that Wolfers mentioned security in contrast to fear, as stated in the Holy Quran and as we have seen above.

Consequently, a comprehensive concept of security can be given, stating that it is the ability of a state to use its internal and external resources, both economic and military, in various sectors to confront the dangers that threaten it from within and outside, in both peacetime and wartime, while maintaining this action in the present and the future.

2- Dimensions of Security: Due to the comprehensiveness of the concept of security, which aims to address and push away threats and different dimensions of the state to the extent that guarantees a decent and stable life for its individuals, which aids the development and progress of the State, several dimensions of the concept of security can be inferred, as follows:

A- Political Dimension: It involves preserving the political entity and political stability of the State.

B- Economic Dimension: It is about providing a suitable climate to meet the needs of the people and providing appropriate frameworks for their progress and prosperity.

C- Social Dimension: It aims to achieve security, stability, and reassurance for the society, both for individuals and groups, and to develop a sense of belonging and loyalty.

D- Environmental Dimension: It is about achieving security against environmental hazards and preserving them from waste and pollution.

E- Ideological Dimension: It is the ability to maintain belief systems and ensure the security of thoughts, customs, and traditions from foreign and corrupt cultures, in particular.

3- Levels of Security: There are three levels of analysis in security studies, which are as follows:

- Individual: It is the protection of the individual from any dangers that threaten their life, property, or family, and working towards their well-being.
- State: Its protection from any external or internal dangers, which is expressed as national or homeland security, according to different terminology, meaning the assurance of national sovereignty.
- Group or Society: Its protection from any dangers that undermine its identity, culture, beliefs, or even the truths it believes in.

The following table illustrates this:

Table No: 01 Security Analysis Levels

Security Subject	Threatened Values
State	Sovereignty
Group (Society)	Identity
Individuals	Survival and well-being

Source: Conceptualizing Security - Research Program in Community Security - Adel Zeggar[1]

In addition to the fourth level of analysis added by researchers, which is "Global Security" or "Comprehensive Security," which concerns individuals all over the world. This perspective is based on the critical viewpoint of the "Copenhagen School" of peace studies led by the thinker "Barry Buzan."

Through the levels of analysis of security studies, the perspectives of international relations, whether interpretive or critical, have divided into multiple conceptualizations of security due to their different readings of the transformations that international relations have witnessed after World War II and the new changes in the international system after the end of the Cold War. This is a result of intensified conflicts among **them** over imposing a specific conception of security. The traditionalists (realists, neo-realists, and liberals) tried to maintain

[1] Adel Zougar, « Rethinking the concept of security," Research program on community security, http://www.geocities.com/AdelZEggargh/links.html, p. 12.

the traditional and narrow concept of security regarding state security. They preferred to introduce only formal and superficial modifications to the concept. Meanwhile, the critical perspective represented by critical studies, especially the Copenhagen School, sought to provide a new concept to the nature of security by making an epistemological rupture with the traditional concept and, from that point, a new formulation of the concept from an alternative and different level of analysis, which is the societal analysis of the security concept had emerged.

Therefore, the concept of security will be included according to each major perspective in international relations that has focused on security studies, whether traditional or modern (critical).

Firstly: Classical and Traditional Perspectives: They are represented by realism, liberalism, and idealism.

A - Realism and Neo-realism: The concept of security dates back to a very ancient period in realist thought. It exists in all schools that form this realist trend (classical realism, neo-realism, defensive realism, liberal realism, and hegemonic realism) and among all thinkers and theorists affiliated to this trend, from Thucydides to Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, passing by Nicholas Spykman and Raymond Aron, with their various common ideas and principles, such as power, hegemony, national interest, and national security.

"Realist thought dates in fact back **to ancient times** repetition !!!, to ancient Greece and China, where it is found in the roots of the theory established by Thucydides on security and power. Thucydides drew inspiration from the war between Athens and Sparta and the attempts of each city-state to defend its security in what ~~is~~ was known as the Peloponnesian War. He said, 'The establishment of standards of justice depends on the type of power that supports them. In reality, the strong do what their power enables them to do, while the weak can only accept what they cannot refuse.' The concept of security based on providing advice to the ruler and safeguarding his survival and using power to preserve and enhance his interests and those of his state and maintain its security, especially in times of war, is also found in the writings of the Chinese strategist Sun Tzu. The concept of security and the unification of the state is also present in the thinking of Machiavelli in his book 'The Prince,' where he lived in a situation similar to that of China during the time of Sun Tzu. Machiavelli advised the prince to prioritize power and security above all else. The concept of security also appeared in the thinking of Hobbes, who considered wars and conflicts between states as inevitable, and therefore the presence of a cunning ruler or 'the Leviathan' is necessary to establish order and end the inherent chaos of human nature, where man is considered a wolf to his fellow man. Hence, the necessity of the perpetuity of conflict between states, and power is the only way to end these conflicts.

This historical perspective by ancient thinkers has influenced the realist conception of international relations. The view that applies to the individual does apply to international relations in the same way since there is no strong man in the international system (the Leviathan or the dragon), and consequently, the international system in which states interact without a superior authority becomes chaotic. States intervene in constant conflicts for power and the preservation of their national security against external threats, according to the realist perspective.

Therefore, the concept of national security associated with the state is the most traditional concept, as realists represent the most defensive approach in terms of considering security the sole responsibility of the state. According to Kenneth Waltz, a prominent figure in neorealism: 'Under anarchy, security is the primary goal, but only when the survival and

continuity of states are guaranteed will they pursue other goals, such as tranquility, profit, and power.'

Thus, the realist approach in international relations is limited to the boundaries of national security as the main actor, if not the only one, in international relations, defending against any external military threat or threats to its regional integrity, sovereignty, political stability, or national interests. In pursuit of these interests, the use of military force is considered a fundamental tool for achieving security, and the relationship with others becomes a zero-sum game where there must be a winner and a loser.

The realist perspective of security has prevailed since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and the emergence of the nation-state until our present time, despite the emergence of new assumptions about the security equation in international relations.

Therefore, it is necessary to outline the principles and foundations of realist thought as they serve as determinants for analyzing their concept of security. They are as follows:

1. The international system is in a state of anarchy, and there is no shared central authority that can resolve conflictual relations between States.

2. States seek to develop their military capabilities to defend themselves or to influence others, and as a result, war cannot be avoided; it is necessary.

3. Lack of trust among States, and national interest takes precedence over other interests.

4. The stability or instability of the system is determined by the division of capabilities among states, especially military capabilities, as well as the ability to achieve a balance of power among the major powers. Thus, the structure of the international system determines states' behavior.

5. The State is the sole actor in international relations.

The statement by K-Waltz confirms: "States always compete for prosperity, security, and competition always leads to conflict" .[2]

Therefore, power remains a fundamental and central indicator for achieving security in traditional realism: "Power is the ability to use any means to maintain the current situation, not to change it, and it is the minimum goal of any power"[3]

As for defensive realists, led by Stephen Walt, Jack Snyder, and Stephen Van Evera, they believe that following and continuing cautious strategies are the ones that include better security. Therefore, they believe that states want security and achieve it before achieving power. Hence, they must enter into agreements and diplomatic relations, especially with major powers such as the United States, to achieve their security . Gradually, this compensates (balance of power) with (balance of deterrence), which leads to reducing the security dilemma. However, this action does not lead to the final and absolute resolution of conflicts, but only relative, as there is a crisis of trust between states, especially between the great power and other states, which always leads to a state of mistrust, especially with failed states.[4] Therefore, defensive realism preferred cooperative strategies to reduce errors in the perceptions and calculations of

[2] B. Buzan, « Rethinking security after the cold war, » Cooperation and Conflict, vol. 32, 1997, p. 10.
[3] C. Brown, Understanding international relations, New York: Palgrave Publishers, 2001, p. 45.
[4] G. Rose, « Neo-classical realism and theories of foreign policy, » World Politics, vol. 51, 1998, p. 152.

states and decision-makers, at the expense of escalating the arms race and gaining more power using the term "common security" .[5]

As for realists who rely on the centrality of the state, including Fareed Zakaria and William Wohlforth, they attribute the state of security or insecurity to the perceptions of decision-makers as well as internal issues, whether related to public opinion or political institutions. In their view, in similar matters and issues, it is found that states do not make the same decisions regarding a specific issue. From this, this current of realism concluded that decision-makers and internal issues play a role in making a different decision than another state, which makes security issues unregulated, and therefore it is not possible to speak of absolute security .[6]

Despite all the changes that the international system has witnessed in its strategic-security aspect after the end of the Cold War, the new realists and traditional realists, especially those who dominate the literature of security studies, categorically reject the redefinition of another concept of security outside its narrow framework associated with military power, state survival, and sovereignty. As Stephan Walt expressed: "The field of security studies after the Cold War must remain primarily concerned with the phenomenon of war, studying threats and the use and monitoring of power" .[7]

This change in the perception of security and attempts to expand it is considered an irresponsible act politically, despite acknowledging that there are some non-military dangers and threats that may directly or indirectly affect individual or state security. However, they do not want to involve them within the framework of security studies because, in their opinion, this only complicates the task of security analysts in their search for appropriate solutions to the "military" threats that actually threaten security.

Thus, the recent changes and transformations that have affected international relations do not change anything in the priority of military and political issues in security studies.

Liberalism and particularly the New Liberalism have provided a new interpretation of security and a new approach based on institutionalism. The latter was confirmed with the end of the Cold War, especially when many American decision-makers became convinced that international relations had become highly interconnected. Former enemies in the communist camp have become allies today, leading President Clinton to expand the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) based on previous justifications.

The key principles of the liberal perspective that help understand security approaches are as follows:

1. Conflict intensity between states can be reduced by adopting a new logic of cooperation and convergence, seeking to find common values among them.

2. Cooperation between states is achieved through the establishment of institutions and organizations that work towards cooperation, security, and reducing threats.

3. Promoting democratic values and reducing military constraints, as democracies rarely engage in conflicts among themselves, and conflicts mostly occur between democracies and non-democratic states.

---

[5] J.-J. Roche, Theory of security, Paris: Montchrestien Editions, 2002, p. 88.
[6] G. Rose, op. cit., p. 160.
[7] B. Buzan, op. cit., p. 12.

4. Promoting trade and liberal values, such as open borders, free exchange, and developing a global capital network. This interdependence ensures security as each party is concerned about its economic interests, leading to prosperity for states, peoples, and all actors in the international system, thereby achieving globalization.

Therefore, the use of international institutions and organizations such as NATO or the United Nations, according to R. Keohane, reduces conflicts and wars because they represent collective and cooperative efforts for the entire group of states in the international system. Even the Group of Eight (G8) believes that it will gradually transform into an institution that creates security and peace in the world.

Sharing values and standards between developed countries, especially those with a liberal culture, which is the result of an educational exchange process among elites within countries, will create a transnational elite instead of national elites.

The security dilemma for new liberals is the lack of communication and information among parties and actors, leading to a crisis of trust and fear between states, including major powers. Therefore, communication between states through these institutions and organizations is necessary, central, and important for achieving security.

Regarding thinkers such as R. Keohane and J. Nye, who developed the theory of "complex interdependence" and introduced the concept of "compound interdependence," security is achieved for states or in the international system due to the complexity of economic and trade relations and their strong interconnection between states. This makes withdrawal and retreat impossible, as they would lead to loss. It also creates a form of collective action against any power that rebels against another state with interests intertwined with other states, thus deterring states leaning towards war instead of diplomatic action.

Moreover, J. Nye urges States, especially the superpower (the United States), to reduce the use of force in their dealings and rely instead on soft power, which encompasses cultural and economic influence for global dissemination. Soft power achieves peace and security at a lower cost than hard power, which refers to military force.

Neo-liberals or proponents of international and local enlightenment view consider political systems, especially totalitarian regimes, as a threat to the security of their peoples in terms of corruption, bribery, misappropriation of public funds, power monopolization, and violence against their people. They also consider them a threat to the security of the global system, as in the case of failed states. One of the key thinkers of this liberal trend is E.A. Kolodezie, Edward Claudezy.

Despite the fact that liberals and new liberals have involved non-state actors in an attempt to expand security (conceptually and practically), such as armed groups, conflicts between different ethnic or religious groups, and non-governmental institutions and organizations belonging to society

Secondly: Modern Perspectives: They are represented by the Constructivist perspective and the Critical perspective.

A. Constructivist Perspective: This perspective, or constructivist theory, emerged with the writings of Alexander Wendt, Nicolas Onuf, and Emanuel Adler in the mid-1980s to the early 1990s, especially with the collapse of the former Soviet-led communist camp.

Alexander Wendt wrote in 1992 that security is not a deterministic issue, but rather a matter of perception, and that decision-makers are the ones who construct this perception and make material aspects real, where wars and conflicts become necessary in international relations.

Therefore, the security dilemma, le dilème de sécurité, is not a fatal phenomenon, but rather a mental representation and conceptualization. Thus, it can be reconstructed in favor of security and peace, instead of narrow interests, wars, and conflicts. According to Wendt, the goal of security is what states want to achieve and do, not the actual reality, "la sécurité c'est bien ce que les États veulent en faire."

Thus, there is not one truth but multiple types of truth in society, the State, and the international system.

The arguments of the constructivist perspective about security can be summarized in three main points, as follows:

1. The structures of the international system are social constructions, and international anarchy and the pursuit of power are formed by decision-makers, not objective facts. Therefore, states shape their environment based on their perceptions. Chaos is not an objective given but a self-integrated formation and construction that states have incorporated into their behaviors since the Westphalia Treaty.

2. Material conditions, such as military and economic power, are not the sole determinants of security. There are other factors such as values, cultural norms, ideologies, and identities that can shape the identity of the international system in the future.

3. Achieving stability, reducing wars and conflicts, and establishing security are achievable if there is a change in thinking among states and decision-makers.

From this perspective, constructivists have unleashed optimism regarding the shape and nature of the international system, believing that there is no eternal conflict and competition among great powers for power. They cite the example of the former Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev (1985-1990), who peacefully ended the Cold War by choosing not to use force and competition. This change in his thinking had an impact on the behavior of the Soviet state.

Therefore, constructivism examines various topics such as identity, political discourse, cultural values, facts, and the perceptions of decision-makers. All these variables, in their view, lead to a change in the international situation from a conflictual state to a peaceful one, if there is a transformation in the reality of these variables.

The creation of security communities, communautés de sécurité, as mentioned by Emanuel Adler, to contain conflicts through State and non-State actors, as well as governmental and non-governmental actors, can be achieved through the formation...

Culture of Collective Security: Changing the prevailing culture and discourse on security (Realist discourse).

The "Copenhagen School," led by British thinker Barry Buzan, director of the Peace Research Institute, has analyzed the concept of security in a new formulation. It states that the military sector, although important in defining the concept of security, is not the only sector. There are several sectors through which the concept of security can be defined, such as the political sector (states, international organizations, the international community), the economic sector (global market systems and energy security), and the sector that Barry Buzan focuses on, which is the social sector (nations, cultures, ideologies, religions, human rights). It is also

known as "societal security" or "sécuritésociétale." Additionally, the environmental sector is important. All these sectors are essential for security, particularly in the post-Cold War era.

According to Barry Buzan, the State is not the only subject for understanding security behavior at the regional and international levels. However, he and Ole Weaver reject any change that may shift the level of security from the State to the individual or to the global system. Societal security (security of migrants, cultural security, identity) remains constantly linked to the State.

As for the question of who and what should be secured, Barry Buzan states "collectivities" without specifying which collectivities are meant. Therefore, the goal of societal security cannot be definitively determined: whether it is collectivities, identities, or collective identity that needs to be constructed.

Because he speaks about a group of collectivities, sometimes referring to the impoverished groups in the Third World, which contribute to insecurity in the international system due to the imbalance between developed and poor countries. At other times, he talks about marginalized groups in poor countries due to the arbitrariness of the governing regimes. He also discusses groups that seek to build their own identity in countries where these groups are a minority. Hence, societal security can be discussed in various forms, according to Barry Buzan, but they all revolve around respecting human rights in all its forms (physical, cultural, religious, identity, etc.).

From this point, it can be consequently deduced that constructive arguments have brought about a revolution in the field of theorizing in international relations, especially in the field of security studies, by introducing new variables to understand state behavior. These arguments have given a social dimension, especially to international relations. Moreover, security is the result of a political construction (inter-subjective), i.e., not objective. The international system is characterized by chaos, but they only distinguish between different forms of chaos.

Mature and Immature Chaos in Accordance with International Regions.

In underdeveloped regions, there is an immature chaos prevailing, while in developed regions, there is a mature chaos. However, they forget or overlook that the source of chaos is essentially the advanced major powers, as they are the ones who possess and create power.

B - Critical Perspective: It contains several currents, including the Barry Buzan current, as we saw in the constructive perspective. It is also considered part of the critical approach, in addition to the "New Marxists" (les Neo-marxists) and feminist approach or feminist theory. Some important books in this perspective are Ken Booth, Jim George, Ann Tickner, and James Der Derian, most of whom are British authors.

As for their key principles in their perception of international relations, the international system, as well as the concept of international and local security, they are as follows:

1. They adopt a structural approach, where comprehensive economic and social forces determine real security and its development, rather than states unconditionally.

2. Non-military challenges have a major and fundamental role in achieving security, including traditional military threats. After the Cold War, sources of threat and security have shifted to economic chaos, social identity crises, environmental disasters, as well as health and educational issues, which all pose threats to human security, to use the expression "human insecurity."

3. The discourse and action towards achieving security should be positive rather than negative. Therefore, there should be a change in individuals' perceptions and consciousness, as well as abandoning military structures and developing mechanisms of peace and security. This can be accomplished through interactions between groups, communities, and nations, thereby establishing and creating new standards and values for security through interconnected individuals and groups across nations.

4. Theory is both a justificatory tool and a tool for transformation and change in security policies, as stated by the critical thinker Robert Cox: "Theory always acts for someone and for a specific purpose."

Thus, the critical perspective complements the constructive perspective, as they are two sides of the same coin, especially since their concept of security is an expanded concept that does not rely solely on military power but also on new variables that have emerged after the Cold War, such as environmental factors, human rights, identities, migration, diseases, and others.

Regarding the feminist approach, the thinker Ann Tickner studied the role of men in destabilizing the security system due to their selfish and self-centered perceptions and the lack of gender justice. This led to the monopolization of theorizing in international relations in favor of men, resulting in wars, conflicts, and insecurity in the international system. Therefore, the feminist theory seeks a new discourse represented by women in international relations, allowing for new visions and perspectives that are more peaceful and secure due to women's nature of being peace-loving and averse to wars and destruction, as it primarily affects them (i.e., women).

Based on these theoretical foundations, it can be concluded that the critics attempted to reshape and rearrange the global order in a way that guarantees support for peace and strengthens governmental and non-governmental organizations advocating for human rights and economic development. However, in their belief, this requires a reevaluation of the prioritization of the state as a reference for security. Therefore, the critical approach aims to redefine the concept of security and international relations within a global ethical framework.

New Applications of Security: These new applications have emerged as a result of the aforementioned reasons, which were produced by the end of the Cold War, such as poverty, illegal migration, diseases, natural disasters, and underdevelopment in different countries, leading to the emergence of new concepts of security, the most prominent of which are humanitarian security and global (comprehensive) security.

First: Humanitarian Security: "Human Security" considers the individual as the reference and fundamental subject of security. However, the critical question raised by the critical perspective is why the transition from the state level to the humanitarian (individual) level of security? Here, critics believe that the decline in the state's capacity in the current circumstances, i.e., in the era of globalization, to confront the challenges posed by globalization, is the main reason for this shift from the state level to the individual level in the analysis.

Moreover, the flow of migration from the South to the North leads to the creation of new social tensions, resulting in growing shocks within countries and societies. Both Corbridge

and Agnew believe that the state is becoming a means of domination and a tool of threat to protect individuals and government institutions in rich areas (Tames Zones) from the influx and anger of deprived and impoverished areas (Wild Zones).[8] This makes the individual vulnerable to threats, and the concept of humanitarian security branches out into several branches, the most important of which are:

1. Economic and Social Human Security: It includes food security and all forms of protection against unemployment, hunger, and disease.

2. Cultural Human Security: It includes the protection of diverse cultures and the right of every citizen to enjoy them and the right to education .[9]

3. Civil and Political Human Security: It includes all civil and political human rights that ensure a sense of security.

4. Biological Human Security: Ensures a clean environment, and all these categories of human security intersect at three levels:

- Individual level
- National group level
- International level

As for the factors that have led to the increased interest in the concept of humanitarian security, they can be summarized as follows:

1. The development of principles and standards that have strengthened and enhanced the system of individual rights.

2. The rapid rise, especially after the Cold War, of democratic values and culture.

3. The increasing influence of non-governmental international organizations (NGOs).

4. The role of media and communication, especially during humanitarian crises, genocides, and systematic violations of individual rights.

5. The impact of some countries like Canada in redefining international humanitarian intervention, especially in 2001, by introducing a new concept of the responsibility to protect.[10]

6. International economic transformations that have reduced the role and intervention of the state and its power.

7. The shift from wars between states to wars within states, which leads to the problem of minorities and identities, especially in poor countries.

8. The weakness and bankruptcy of states, especially in the Third World, and their inability to bear their responsibilities towards their peoples and protect them.

Therefore, most conflicts have become internal, between groups and individuals, rather than between states. Statistics indicate that out of the 61 conflicts witnessed in the 1990s,

---

[8] H. Viau, "Critical theory and the concept of security in international relations," Research note, CEPESS, University of Quebec in Montreal, 1999, http://www.er.upama/nobel/cepes/note8, p. 14.
[9] T. Al-Bakoush, "The link between humanitarian security and human rights," Arab Journal of Human Rights, vol. 10, 2003, p. 166.
[10] O. Richmond, "Broadening concepts of security in the post-cold war era: Implications for the EU and Mediterranean region," 2000, http://www.ac.uk/eis/eme/publications/26March2000, p. 22.

approximately 58 of them were internal conflicts, accounting for about 95% and 90% of the victims of these conflicts were civilians, women, and children, not military personnel.

Based on this, the concept of humanitarian security, according to the United Nations Development Report for 1994 can only be achieved through achieving interdependent peace and by following the liberal approach through expanding global mutual dependence.

Table No: 02 – Barry Buzan's Five Sectors of Security Framework

Sector	Primary Object / Unit of Analysis	Main Threats & Hazards	Key Reference / Source
1. Military Security	State Sovereignty & Territorial Integrity	Armed Aggression, Invasion, Military Escalation	Traditional Realism / K.Waltz
2. Political Security	Organizational Stability, Regimes & Ideologies	Political Instability, Sovereignty Threats, Corruption	Liberalism & Institutionalism
3. Economic Security	Financial Markets, Resources & Trade Networks	Poverty, Market Collapse, Energy Crises	Complex Interdependence (R. Keohane & J. Nye)
4. Societal Security	Collective Identity, Culture & Human Rights	Migration Influx, Ethnic Conflict, Cultural Assimilation	Copenhagen School (B.Buzan & O. Wæver)
5. Environmental Security	Ecosystem, Planetary Health & Human Survival	Climate Change, Pollution, Ozone Depletion, Disasters	Brandt Commission & UNDP Reports

Secondly: Global Security

Comprehensive Security: Comprehensive security has its roots in the Palme Committee's 1982 report on the arms race between the superpowers and its impact on human life in general, whether rich or poor. This was followed by the Brandt Commission's report on international development in 1983, which highlighted the relationship between security and development.

It concluded that widening the gap between rich and poor countries would lead to injustice, famines, and insecurity in the global system. his title points toward a genealogical study tracing how "security" has been redefined across different theoretical waves in IR — one of the field's most contested and elastic concepts.

1. The Classical Stage (Traditional Realism)

Security here is tied to state survival and military power, governed by the logic of the balance of power as a mechanism to prevent hegemonic domination. This is precisely where David Hume becomes relevant. In his 1752 essay Of the Balance of Power, Hume argued that the maxim of preserving the balance of power is founded so much on common sense and

obvious reasoning that it is impossible it could altogether have escaped antiquity — pointing to examples in Greek and Roman politics where this logic was already at work.

David Hume:

This Humean point is analytically useful because it:

Shows that "security through balance of power" is not a purely Westphalian or modern invention, but has deeper intellectual roots.

Supports later structural-realist arguments (e.g., Waltz) linking security to systemic anarchy — Hume essentially anticipates the "self-help" logic centuries before Neorealism formalized it.

2. The Expansion Stage (Post–Cold War)

The concept shifts from narrow "national/military security" toward Human Security, especially after the UNDP's 1994 Human Development Report, incorporating economic, environmental, and societal dimensions (the Copenhagen School's securitization theory — Buzan and Wæver).

3. The Contemporary Stage

Further broadening includes cybersecurity, climate security, and health security (notably reinforced by the COVID-19 pandemic).

How to use the Hume quote in the article specifically:

It works well in the introduction or in a section on the intellectual roots of the concept — establishing that the pursuit of "security" through power-balancing is a long-standing political instinct, before the article pivots to how the concept later expanded beyond military terms.

Conclusion:

The evolution of the concept of security in international relations reflects a fundamental transformation from a traditional, state-centered and predominantly military understanding of security toward a broader and more comprehensive conception that encompasses political, economic, social, environmental, health, food, and human dimensions. This transformation has been driven by the changing nature of international threats and by the increasing interdependence of states and societies.

The analysis of the intellectual and theoretical development of security demonstrates that security can no longer be understood exclusively in terms of the survival of the state and the protection of its territorial integrity. Although traditional approaches, particularly realism and neo-realism, continue to emphasize state power, military capabilities, and the balance of power, subsequent approaches have expanded the analytical scope of security. In this context, the intellectual contribution of David Hume is particularly relevant to the historical development of security thinking, especially through his analysis of the balance of power in *Of the Balance of Power* (1752), which can be regarded as an important intellectual antecedent to later realist approaches linking security to the distribution of power.

The post-Cold War period further accelerated this conceptual transformation. The emergence of human security, comprehensive security, and global security approaches demonstrated that contemporary threats frequently transcend national borders and cannot be effectively addressed by individual states acting alone. Environmental degradation, climate

change, pandemics, food insecurity, transnational organized crime, terrorism, cyber threats, and economic crises illustrate the increasingly multidimensional character of contemporary security.

The role of international organizations, particularly the United Nations, has consequently become increasingly important in promoting collective responses to these challenges. International initiatives and reports, including the 1987 Brundtland Report, the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report, and subsequent international efforts toward comprehensive governance and sustainable development, contributed to broadening the security agenda and linking security with human well-being and sustainable development.

Results:

1. The concept of security has undergone a significant conceptual transformation**,** moving from a predominantly military and state-centered conception toward a multidimensional approach that incorporates human, economic, environmental, health, food, societal, and cyber dimensions.
2. The balance of power remains an important component of security thinking**,** and David Hume's discussion of the balance of power in *Of the Balance of Power* (1752) provides an important intellectual antecedent to later realist interpretations of international security.
3. Contemporary security threats are increasingly transnational and interconnected**,** meaning that many of them cannot be effectively addressed through unilateral national policies and require cooperation among states and international and non-governmental organizations.
4. The United Nations and other international institutions have contributed to the expansion of the global security agenda**,** particularly by connecting security with sustainable development, human rights, environmental protection, food security, and human well-being.

Recommendations:

1. Strengthen international cooperation through multilateral mechanisms capable of addressing transnational security threats, particularly climate change, pandemics, food insecurity, terrorism, and cyber threats.
2. Adopt a comprehensive approach to security policies that combines traditional national security with human, economic, environmental, health, food, and societal security.
3. Enhance the capacity of international and regional organizations to anticipate emerging threats, coordinate collective responses, and support states facing complex and transnational security challenges.
4. Integrate security and sustainable development policies by ensuring that economic and development strategies take into account their potential implications for social stability, human security, environmental sustainability, and international peace.

Future Perspectives:

1. The digital transformation of international relations is likely to further expand the concept of security through the growing importance of cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, critical digital infrastructure, and information security.
2. Climate and environmental security will increasingly occupy a central position in security studies as climate change, water scarcity, environmental degradation, and resource competition generate new security challenges.

3. Global health and food security are expected to become increasingly interconnected with international security, particularly in light of pandemics, supply-chain disruptions, population growth, and geopolitical crises.
4. Future security studies are likely to adopt increasingly interdisciplinary approaches**,** bringing together international relations, law, political science, economics, environmental studies, technology, and sociology in order to better understand the complex and interconnected nature of contemporary security threats.

In conclusion, the evolution of the concept of security reflects the transformation of the international system itself. Security is no longer limited to the protection of states against military threats; rather, it increasingly encompasses the protection of individuals, societies, institutions, and the global environment. Consequently, addressing contemporary security challenges requires a combination of national capacities, international cooperation, effective global governance, and a comprehensive understanding of the diverse dimensions of security.

References:

1. Al-Bakoush, T. (2003). The link between humanitarian security and human rights. Arab Journal of Human Rights, 10, 164-172.
2. Yamamura, T. (Translation: Zougar, A.). (n.d.). The concept of security in international relations theory. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.com/AdelZEggargh/links.html
3. Hajar, A. (2002). The new Mediterranean policy of the European Union.Master's thesis, Batna University.
4. Zougar, A. (n.d.). Rethinking the concept of security.Research program on community security. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.com/AdelZEggargh/links.html
5. Hussein, Z. (n.d.). National security. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.com/AdelZEggargh/links.html
6. Aouda, J. (2005). International system: Theories and issues. Minya: Dar Al-Huda Publishing and Distribution.
7. Khadija, A. (n.d.). The concept of humanitarian security. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.com/AdelZEggargh/links.html
8. Brown, C. (2001). Understanding international relations. New York: Palgrave Publishers.
9. Buzan, B. (1977). Rethinking security after the cold war. Cooperation and Conflict, 32, 7-15.
10. Rose, G. (1988). Neo-classical realism and theories of foreign policy.World Politics, 51, 144-172.
11. Joubert, J.-P. (2001). History of ideas in international relations from neo-realism to the present day.Institute of Political Studies.
12. Roche, J.-J. (2004). Theory of international relations.Paris: Montchrestien Editions.
13. Roche, J.-J. (2002). Theory of security. Paris: Montchrestien Editions.
14. Richmond, O. (2000). Broadening concepts of security in the post-cold war era: Implications for the EU and Mediterranean region. Retrieved from http://www.ac.uk/eis/eme/publications/26March2000
15. Viau, H. (1999). Critical theory and the concept of security in international relations.Research note, CEPESS, University of Quebec in Montreal. Retrieved from http://www.er.upama/nobel/cepes/note8Secondly: Global Security