Chapter I

BORDER, BORDER MANAGEMENT AND NATIONAL SECURITY:

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Frontiers or borders between states are institutions and processes. They are established by political decisions and regulated by legal texts. The frontier is the basic political institution: no rule, economic, social or political body in any complex society could be structured without them. The questions, which troubled political philosophers about all the institutions, may be inquired about the frontiers. Are they needed? How can they be justified? The answers vary in different historical periods; different kinds of frontier existed before the modern nation states, and other kinds will emerge after its demise (Anderson 1997: 1-11).

All political authorities and jurisdictions have physical limits and, where the limits are located, the purposes they serve, influence the lives of all people separated by frontiers or borders. Contemporary borders are not simply lines on maps. The unproblematic givens of political life, where one jurisdiction or political authority ends and another begins. They are central to understanding political life. Examining the justifications of frontiers raises crucial questions concerning citizenship, identity, political loyalty, exclusion, inclusion and the ends of the state. The broad impact of frontiers is rarely analysed by historians and social scientists (Anderson 1997: 27).

State, the most important and most powerful political institution of the world, is the sole protector of its fellow citizens. The shadow of the state falls upon almost every human activity. From education to economic management, from social welfare to sanitation, and from domestic order to external defence, the state shapes and controls, and where it does not shape or control it regulates, supervises, authorizes or proscribes. Even those aspects of life usually thought of as personal or private are ultimately subject to the authority of the state. The state is a territorial association. The jurisdiction of the state is geographically defined, and it encompasses all those who live within the state’s borders, whether they are citizens or noncitizens. On the international stage, the state is therefore regarded as an autonomous entity. The world consists of a mosaic of several disparate nation-states and the relations among them. Each nation-state is defined, separated and determined by the international borders or boundaries (Heywood 2003; Goodwin and Pettit 1997; Hay, Lister and Marsh 2006: 85-102, 1-10, 21-20 & 248-261).
The nature of border relationships is crucial to determining the quality of the overall relationship between member states in the international system. This would be impossible to achieve without mutually acceptable relations, including diplomatic relationships between states. International boundaries separate the territorial limits of adjacent states. International law recognizes that the possession of a land mass is fundamental to the bases of national power. The size and richness in resources of the national land mass determines in large measure a state's power in relation to other states. In order to secure the maximum benefits from their land masses as bases of power, international law seeks to protect states in their territorial integrity and independence of decision.

International law protects boundaries as the juridical separating lines of territorial integrity and exclusive control. Boundaries become, therefore, the visible limits of the bases of power of a nation. Sovereign control over territory has long been considered the quintessential feature of modern statehood. No issue is more likely to stimulate nationalist sentiments or lead to violent interstate conflict than disputes over territory. The sudden emergence of territorial disputes in Europe after the end of the Cold War raises a number of questions. Where overall do they exist? Why do they exist? How severe are those disputes? What are the consequences of those disputes? Are they likely to result in wars? How can be they resolved?

One of the four important characteristics of nation-states is its territory, over which it exercises its complete sovereignty. Territorial sovereignty is absolutely guarded by states, and nothing is allowed to interfere in the exercise of this right. Frontiers boundary or borders, as it is inextricably linked with the state system, separates the area subject to different political control or sovereignty. The relations between two neighbouring nation-states are largely depends on this boundary system. The relations “reach their most critical stage in the form of problems relating to territory. Boundary disputes, conflicting claim to newly discover land and invasions by expanding nations into territory of weaker neighbours have been evident among the causes of war (Hill 1976: 3).
Border, Boundary and Frontier

(a) Origin

Frontier or boundary making has been a constantly repeated activity in the course of human history, but the characteristics of frontiers have varied considerably over time. Frontiers between states in post-reformation Europe more and resembled one another and became rooted, as institutions, in a common fund of ideas. Ideas of sovereignty, exclusive control over contiguous territory, the nation-states and the juridical equality of states in an international society regulated by a voluntary acceptance of international law regulated in the spread of a common understanding of the frontiers of states (Murthy 1978: 9).

Certain periods have, in retrospect, made significant contributions to the ideas on which modern states frontiers are based—the Roman empire for notions of territoriality, ‘the universalistic’ doctrines of the Middle Ages which offered an alternative project to the hardened frontiers of the states which emerged in Europe from the fifteenth century onwards, the development of the frontiers of France which prefigured those of the other European notions of the frontier after the colonizing of lands in other continents, and the challenges to the frontier of the sovereign state in the post-second world war international system. These landmarks in the history of frontiers mark an evolution in terms of stability of frontiers and the complexity of frontier functions (Anderson 1997: 12).

(b) Concepts

Political geographers believe that the three terms ‘frontier’, ‘border’ and ‘boundary’ treat as synonymous, while retaining a profoundly persistent conception that all three are linear. Thus it is accustomed to be thought of a ‘frontier’ as an enforceable boundary line or border. This not only marks the territorial limits of a particular state’s authority but also divides that state peacefully from its neighbouring states (Power and Standen 1999: 13).

Although in common speech the term ‘frontier’, ‘border’ and ‘boundary’ are used interchangeably, there is a marked distinction among the three (Presscott 1987).¹ Frontier,

¹ There is of course a technical difference between boundary and border, although both are often used interchangeably. While boundary refers to the lines separating two state-systems, the adjacent areas, which
border and boundary have meant different meaning to different people. ‘Frontier’ has been used to signify a frontier line without width and precisely marking a state’s external limits. It was also meant a frontier zone of varying width, of areas beyond and within, along the line. The utilization of the word frontier as covering lines, zones and land and both for a state by itself as well as contiguous states, has become so entrenched in practice that it seems best to accept it as an all-purpose word.

Although it is now widely accepted that each frontier is intrinsically unique so defies simpler categorization, there have been various attempts to classify so-called ‘frontiers’. As early as 1907 Lord Curzon distinguished between ‘frontiers of separation’ and ‘frontiers of contact’ (Paasi and Newman 1998: 186-207), a contrast that geographers subsequently developed. From the later Middle Age onwards, however, a growing concept of territorial sovereignty conferred a more territorial definition upon political borders. This gradually heightened the importance of the boundaries of the kingdoms the expense of other divisions; local, pacific boundaries eventually merged with militarized state frontier defence into a single concept of sovereign divisions between states (Paasi and Newman 1998: 186-207).

There is a preliminary matter of vocabulary used by political geographers about three words are in common use—‘Frontier’, ‘Boundary’ and ‘Border’ (Paasi and Newman 2003: 109-137)—and a fourth term—‘march’—which are applied to these outer limits. ‘Frontier’ is a word with the widest meaning, although it’s original meaning was military—the zone in which one faced the enemy. In contemporary usage, it can mean the precise line at which jurisdictions meet, usually demarcated and controlled by customs, police and military personnel. ‘Frontier’ can also be referred to a region, as in the description of Alsace as the frontier region between France and Germany. In this sense it is the equivalent of the archaic ‘march’. Even more broadly, ‘frontier’ is used in specific cases to refer to the moving zone of settlement in the interior of a continent and was used in this sense in Turner’s famous classic, The Frontier in American History (Turner 1996).

The term ‘border’ can be applied to a zone, usually a narrow one, or it can be the line of demarcation—the border between England and Scotland is both. The word ‘boundary’
is always used to refer to the line of delimitation or demarcation and is thus the narrowest of the three terms (Power and Standen 1999: 13-14). ‘Border’ has had a history similar to frontier has been an equal all-embracing term and can now be accepted as the synonym of frontier. One can use it more specifically as borderline, border zone, borderland, and etc. Unlike the above two terms, ‘Boundary’ has a fairly well accepted meaning. It is a line without width, often having endured the process of demarcation and thus the equivalent of the ‘frontier line’. If its status has to be indicated, one may qualify it as ‘demarcated boundary’, ‘undemarcated boundary’ etc (Sharma 1989; Sharma 1976; Murthy 1978: 1-6, 12, 17).

Boundary represents the line of physical contact between states and affords opportunities for cooperation and discord. Boundaries are the frameworks of the nation. At this juncture, it would be pertinent to note, the definition of boundary, frontier and border and more particularly, the distinction between the three. V Adami, an outstanding scholar defined boundary as “that line which marks the limits of the region within which the state can exercise its own sovereign rights (Adami 1927).” A frontier on the other hand signifies a zone or region having width as well as length, where as a border denotes a line (Kristof 1959: 269-271).

More than hundreds of boundary disputes at present, throughout the world have always been threats to a peaceful world order. Territorial disputes are the most irritating aspects of relations among nations. Thousands of war has been fought on this account since the inception of the nation-state system. The boundary and the adjacent territory called ‘border’ forms, the epidermis of this organism and provide protection and allow exchanges to occur. In this regard, Thomas Holdich is very clear when he stated that, “a frontier is but a vague and indefinite term until the boundary sets a hedge between it and the frontier of a neighbouring state (Holdich 1916: 1-10).”

(c) Border or Boundary Disputes

There is continuing misconception among scholars in regard to distinction between disputes concerning international borders and the acquisition of territory. The confusion stems from the fact that issues and policies regarding the two types of disputes are, in their external manifestation, very much alike, and viewed from this angle, there might not
appear any realistic distinction between the two. More broadly conceived both boundary and territorial questions are indeed part of the larger questions of territorial sovereignty (Holdich 1916: 7).

Both types of disputes entail comparable set of claims and counter-claims and legal policies. Whether it be a boundary issue or a territorial issue, one state, in a typical manner, would asserts that (1) it has been exercising sovereignty and jurisdiction in the disputed area; (2) that there are certain valid international treaties to govern the location of boundary; (3) that there are certain distinctive natural and geographical features of the contested boundary or territory endowed with legal sanction; (4) that is the legal inheritor of the boundaries or territories of the predecessor state; and (5) that the adversary state has employed coercion against it as a unilateral method to realise its boundary or territorial claims and so on (Jones 1945).

Boundary disputes arise when two (or more) adjacent governments (states) contend about the line to be drawn between their respective territorial domains. In such cases it is common ground that both (or more) states have lawful claims to adjacent territory. The real question to be decided is how this territory can be divided between/among them. There is an implicit understanding that both sides have claim to adjacent territory, but what is contested is the actual location of the boundary. On the other hand, a territorial dispute arises when one state seeks to supersede or eliminate another in relation to a particular land area.

In terms of detailed application of legal rules and policies, it has been found that while territorial questions involve traditional rules regarding modes of acquisitions of title (e.g., discovery, occupation, conquest, cession or prescription), the boundary questions involve those rules which are relevant to specifying functions performed in the fixation and maintenance of boundaries (e.g., determination, delimitation, demarcation and administration) though in particular instances, traditional rules about "title" may also become relevant. At the same time it must be understood that there is no absolute dichotomy between boundary dispute and territorial dispute. To some extend both are inseparable and interdependent, but there is some chances for them to overlap in specific situations (Jones 1945).
Fredrick Ratzal, a German Geographer asserts political balance between countries is to a large extent depends on the characteristics of border between them (Ratzal 1923). Spykman, an American geo-strategist and political scientist also supports Ratzal’s notion when he says, “boundary changes will be indications of a shift in the balance of forces caused either by an increase in driving force on one side of the frontier or by a decrease in resistance on the other (Spykman 1942).”

From this point of view boundary can be summed up (Spykman 1942a: 436-438):

(a) As the area within which the growth and decline of state is organised;
(b) As a dynamic feature when fixed it witness a temporary halt in political expansion;
(c) As a temporary line where opposed power of neighbouring states is neutralised; and
(d) As a line of power equilibrium.

Although one may argue that since 1945 most of the changes in the balance of power between adjoining states have not been accompanied by any changes in the position of international boundaries rather have been affected by ideological, economic and military factors. It is not worth denying that Great Britain lost most of its colonies with relatively decline in its power and erstwhile Soviet Union disintegrated into pieces with the lose of its super power status (Shalma 1976).

(e) Procedures of Border or Boundary Making

Therefore, fixing of a boundary line involves a four-fold procedure. Stephen Jones, who has called boundaries as the functional features of the face of earth, has provided the four-fold functional classification as follows (Jones 1945; Murty 1978: 6-7):

(i) *Allocation*-It is a process, which refers to political decision on the distribution of territory. It is the initial stage when decision regarding political settlement is made.

(ii) *Delimitation*-The process of delimitation entails specifying of the general criteria for the location of the boundary line and its detailed description in a treaty, an arbitral award, or a boundary commission’s report. As such, the term delimitation refers to all the proceedings associated with the choice of a specific boundary site and definition, with or without map, in the formal instrument.

(iii) *Demarcation*-The process of demarcation involves the actual relation of the criteria of delimitation to the ground. Thus, it amounts to identification of the delimited line
in the landscape, erection of the pillars, monuments and buoys or other visible features to mark the line, and the maintenance of the boundary markings.

(iv) **Administration** - This function is concerned with the regulation of the activities in relation to the line so demarcated. It involves bulk of problems that come up with people passing back and forth, especially the regulation of various small problems associated with existence and maintenance of the boundary.

(f) **Methods of Resolving Border Disputes**

It would be necessary to discuss briefly the principal types of procedures available for resolving such conflicts. The first and perhaps the oldest method of course war. Recourse to war by either party to solve a border dispute would depend upon a number of factors—the strategic and economic value of the territory in question and the relative armed strength available on each side etc. Among the peaceful methods of resolving border disputes are bilateral negotiations, the use of good offices and by another power to resolve the matter. The third method is mediation, where in a third party is requested to resolve the dispute. However, it doesn’t involve any commitment in advance to accept the recommendations of mediating power and in this it differs from arbitration and judicial settlement (Simmons 2002: 829-856).

Arbitration refers to the submission of dispute to an arbitration to be determined according to the principles of international law. It differs from judicial settlement (submission to the international court) in what the choice of arbitrators is to some extent within the control of the individual parties. Judicial settlement, i.e., submission an international judicial body for decision is another procedure available for the resolution of border disputes. Finally, attempts to resolve a dispute may be made by a collective organization (regional or international), for example the United. But, the most reliable/relevant method is to strengthening of land borders or to manage the border properly (Sengupta 2002: 23-29).

However, the concept of border security has undergone a sea change with the growing vulnerability of not only land borders but also of the coastline and air space. In response to the gradual expansion and strengthening of security so far, mainly among what has long been perceived as a sensitive land border. The transgressor is already on the lookout
for the soft gaps. The transgressors, with unprecedented money power, access to the latest technology, organizational strength, maneuverability and scope for strategic alliances with other like-minded groups, can select their threat of action for surprise strikes (MRP 2001-2002: 24-34).

**Border Management**

Throughout history, large and small states have constructed walls and fortifications to manage their national security. A rapidly changing internal security environment and external linkages suggests that border management is not simply a matter of policing along the border. There is a growing realization now that border management must broadly include a comprehensive package which involves defending the border in times of war, securing the border in times of peace, ensuring that there are no unauthorized movements of humans, taking steps against smuggling of small arms, explosives, narcotics and other kinds of contraband items, using sophisticated technological devices to supplement human efforts to these ends, coordinate intelligence inputs from various agencies and ensuring the socio-economic development of the border areas. Therefore, the management of (international) borders becomes essential (Anderson 1997).

The proper management of international border is vitally important for national security. In addition to the problem, which are common to all the borders, as each border has a variety of problems which need to be appropriately and specifically addressed these problems has become aggravated in recent times with policies of cross border terrorism, along with its intense hostile anti-national propaganda designed to mislead and sway the loyalties of border population. The management of borders presents many challenges of various kinds with several dimensions (RGMNS 2000; FSR 2000). The terrorist attack on the US on September 11, 2001 and the Afghanistan and Iraq war thereafter have radically changed the border management and security environment facing countries. This would call for a reassessment for policies on a number of issues and several of these pertain to the management of international borders (Godbole 2001: 4442-4444).
(a) Concept

The term “Border Management” implies to manage the international borders from internal and external threats. It is a function of a country’s external and internal situations. Their interplay environments are changing at an incredibly fast pace, with developments in nuclear weapons and missiles, WMDs, increasing cross-border terrorism, the emergence of non-state actors, the growth of Islamic fundamentalism, the narcotic arms nexus, illegal migration and left wing extremism, gravely impact upon the national security of the country. In a broad sense, According to the Group of Ministers Report, Government of India, “the border management must be interpreted in its widest sense and should imply co-ordination and concerted action by political leadership and administrative, diplomatic, security, intelligence, legal, regulatory and economic agencies of the country to secure the frontiers and sub-serve the best interests of the country (Godbole 2001: 4442-4444).” Prakash Singh, a former Director General, Border Security Force (BSF) has also defined “border management as a fluid concept in the sense that the level of security arrangements along a particular border would depend upon the political relations, the economic linkages, the ethno-religious ties between people across the borders and the configuration of the border itself” (Singh 2001; Singh 2002: 11, 57-70).

However, the concept of border security has changed in the era of Globalization. Globalization argues for economic integration and interdependence which lead to more open borders and more harmonious cross-border relations. But, the way traditional border control is being implemented and managed is affecting the benefits of openness of border and significantly affects the promotion of socio-cultural relations and economic integration. Therefore, Peter Andreas has strongly argued that the meaning and significance of state borders, as well as their geographical location can change drastically over space and time. The nations are now coming closer, trade barriers are getting lowered. However, people are moving across international frontiers for a variety of reasons such as normal reasons, reasons forced by political circumstances, and the economic reasons. In any case there are a lot of movements across the national borders (Andreas 2003: 3-7).

There was one school of thought which some time back gave a projection that this process may gradually lead to the disappearance of the nation-states. But that has not
happened and the nation-stats, as Peter Drucker has observed, is going to survive. However, that will be a different kind of nation-state with a different financial management, with a different concept of international relations, etc (Drucker 1997: 159-171). But, the exact cross border management would depend upon the kind of political and economic relations with the neighboring countries and the religious or ethnic ties between the people across the borders. There are areas where no arrangements are required like the US-Canada border for example. But there are borders where intensive vigilance is required as India has along the Pakistan and Bangladesh border because of cross border terrorism and the illegal human waves that keep on trying to cross the border for better opportunities here, something similar to what the Mexicans try to do across the American border (Drucker 1997: 159-171).

(b) Globalization and Border Management

Furthermore, “borderless world” is a phrase often associated with economic integration under the banner of globalization. The proponents of economic cooperation argue that economic integration can be prompted even among states in conflict, and can eventually overcome political antagonism (Ohmae 1990). As Raja Mohan emphasised, “borders … need not necessarily remain as political barriers. They need to be transformed into zones of economic cooperation among regions that once were part of the same cultural and political space.” The border as a boundary marker is a political construct, entailing intrinsic tension against “natural” connectivity in terms of typology as well as the movement of people. Nevertheless, the political significance of borders remains as strong or even stronger today as the “illegality” of people’s movement has become a relentless concern of governments (Mohan 2003: 269).

Against such a backdrop, to what extent can economic cooperation or the creation of “a borderless world” mitigate the tensions arising out of the existence of borders? According to Saskia Sassen, at the global level, there are currently two contradictory forces transforming the meanings of nation-states. One is economic globalization, which denationalizes politics (Sassen 1996). In other words, many states outwardly argue that border controls should be liberalised to allow capital, information and services to flow freely. But in reality, they often keep to themselves the right to exercise stricter border
controls in the name of sovereign authority over the flow of migrants of refugees. As Murayama questioned how states can adopt such apparently contradictory policy stances over borders? What are the effects of these self-contradictory approaches on political and economic relations between states and among people who share the borders (Murayama 2006: 1351-1359)?

Border management/control—the effort to restrict territorial access—has long been a core state activity (Anderson 1997). As territorially demarcated institutions, states have always imposed entry barriers, whether to deter armies, tax trade and protect domestic producers, or keep out perceived “undesirables.” All states monopolize the right to determine who and what is granted legitimate territorial access (Krasner 1995; Huntington 1973: 268, 333-368). But there is significant historical variation in border control priorities. Although military defense and economic regulation have traditionally been central border concerns, in many places states are retooling and reconfiguring their border regulatory apparatus to prioritize policing. Thus, rather than simply eroding, as is often assumed, the importance of territoriality is persisting—but with a shift in emphasis (Sack 1986: 19). In many cases, more intensive border law enforcement is accompanying the demilitarization and economic liberalization of borders.

The intensification of border controls in recent years is evident in sharply rising law enforcement budgets; new and more invasive laws; the development of more sophisticated surveillance and information technologies; stricter visa regimes and more technologically advanced and forgery-resistant travel documents; enhanced cooperation with source and transit countries and a greater extension of tracking and control mechanisms beyond the point of entry (i.e., a “thickening” of borders and the creation of buffer zones); and in some places, growing use of military and intelligence hardware, personnel, and expertise for policing tasks. The importance of policing territorial access is also evident in the rising prominence of law enforcement in international diplomacy and in the policy discourse about borders, with many states formally promoting policing from the traditional status of “low politics” to the “high politics” of security. These border changes are most apparent in the advanced industrialised regions of the world,

2 Territory is “the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographical area.”
especially the United States and the European Union (EU), and have been substantially reinforced and accelerated by the policy response to the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 (Andreas 2003: 78-111).

However, borders have traditionally been viewed first and foremost in military terms. The vast majority of interstate wars, after all, have historically been about territorial defense and conquest (Keegan 1993). Early geopolitical thinking stressed the centrality of territorial competition and acquisition (Biersteker 2002: 157-175). Classic geopolitical analysis fits comfortably within a realist theoretical framework, with its emphasis on interstate conflict over territory (Mearsheimer 2001). In the view of Robert Gilpin, states have always had “the conquest of territory in order to advance economic, security, and other interests” as a principal goal (Gilpin 1981: 23). Not surprisingly, the influence of realism is most evident in security studies, which has overwhelmingly focused on strategies of war making and war preparation. As Stephen Walt puts it, “The main focus of security studies is easy to identify... it is the phenomenon of war (Walt 1991: 212-213).” In the realist conception of security, threats are external and military based, and the actors are rational unitary states. Borders are strategic lines to be militarily defended or breached. State survival is based on the deterrent function of borders against military incursions by other states. The realist view of borders and territorial security thus is fundamentally about interstate rather than transnational relations (Waltz 1979; Krasner 1995: 257-279).³

There are obvious historical reasons for this military-focused worldview. As Charles Tilly and others have documented, the modern state was created as a war machine: States made war and war made states (Tilly 1992). Yet state making is a continuous process. Major interstate military conflicts have greatly diminished, and borders are rarely contested militarily. There has been a sharp downturn in the use of force to alter interstate boundaries. This astonishing border trend is partly the result of growing international respect for what Mark Zacher calls the “territorial integrity norm (Zacher 2002: 215-250).” Consequently, the traditional military function of borders has become much less important than in the past.

³ This is especially true of neorealism, see Kenneth N Waltz. For a rare realist analysis of transnational relations, see Stephen D Krasner.
Challenging realism, globalists point not only to the declining military relevance of borders but also to the border-blurring effects of "globalization", generally characterized as an intensification of interdependence and cross-border interactions (Guiraudon and Lahav 2000: 163-195). Indeed, some scholars consider the supposed declining importance of borders as part of the very definition of globalization (Cohen 2001: 81). Major transformations—the internationalization of production, the liberalization of trade, the mobility of finance, and advances in transportation and communication technology—are viewed by globalists as key indicators of border erosion. Since the 1970s, many scholars have argued that these technological and economic changes facilitate and encourage growing cross-border linkages between societal actors and diminish the primacy of traditional security concerns (Keohane and Nye 1971). Whether celebrated or bemoaned, a popular view is that the state is bowing to global market forces and pressures from non-state actors. In the liberal variant of this globalist perspective, more pacific "trading states" are replacing traditional "warfare states," with economic exchange prioritized over territorial conquest (Rosecrance 1986).

Globalists therefore see borders as increasingly blurred and open, becoming bridges for commercial transactions rather than economic barriers and fortified military lines. Global economic transformations seem to confirm this. Encouraged by economic liberalization, for example, the volume of world trade in goods and services has increased by more than 39 percent between 1995 and 2001 (IMF 2002: 195). Tariff barriers have declined dramatically. The eroding economic importance of borders is part of what one scholar calls the "unbundling" of territoriality (Ruggie 1993: 139-174). Another observer suggests that globalization is about "de-bordering the world of states (Blatter 2001: 175-209)." James Rosenau sums up the globalist conventional wisdom:

The close links between territory and the state are breaking down.... In the political realm... authority is simultaneously being relocated upward toward supranational entities, sideward toward transnational organizations and social movements, and downward toward subnational groups and communities....These shifting tendencies are diminishing the

---

4 The term "globalists" is similarly used by Virginie Guiraudon and Gallya Lahav to refer to scholars who view borders as declining in relevance in an increasingly interdependent and integrated world.

5 For example, Edward S Cohen defines globalization as "a set of economic, cultural, and technological processes that are reducing the significance of territorial boundaries in shaping the conditions of life of persons and societies."
competence and effectiveness of states and rendering their borders more porous and less meaningful (Paul 2000: 8)."

One upbeat market liberal even argues that a "borderless world" is on the horizon, and that dynamic cross-border regions are becoming more important than states. This perspective stresses the benign, appeasing effects of interdependence and globalization. It also assumes that this necessarily leads to the rollback of the regulatory state and an erosion of borders and territorial controls. Although the traditional military and economic functions of borders have indeed declined, the use of border controls to police the clandestine side of globalization has expanded. Globalization may be about tearing down economic borders, as globalists emphasize, but it has also created more border policing work for the state (Sassen 1996).

Therefore, it is perhaps only a slight exaggeration to say that relations between two countries begins and ends at their border. Indeed the degree of harmony or conflict in the relationship increasingly depends on how the border and border-control matters are politically managed. While the post-9/11 security context has created new frictions about border control, it has also presented a new opportunity to reconceptualise the border and border controls. The political challenge for policy makers in both the sides of the border is to creatively harness and channel the heightened border-security attention and anxiety in a manner that promotes greater cross-border cooperation and a more national approach to border control. The alternative—a unilateral hardening of the border-line—would probably do more to deter legitimate trade and travel than to prevent terrorism.

The most promising approach to border management is to "de-border" traditional borders—that is, to move more inspection and control functions beyond the physical border itself. A number of policy measures can help to moderate if not entirely avert a clash between economic and security imperatives at the border. Successful implementation of these measures, however, ultimately will require not only more resources and cooperation but also a fundamental shift in the way policy makers and publics of respective countries think about border control/management. The worry is traditional border controls has become a new kind of trade barrier—a security tariff that replaces the economic tariffs of old. The tightening of security arrangements and the
custom checking can make unnecessary delays and traffic jams which will cause huge economic lose (Andreas 2006:64-68).

The global economy’s movement toward more open societies and liberalised economies facilitate the movement of products and workers. Unfortunately, it also expedites passage for terrorists, small arms, drugs, illegal migrants, and disease. The obvious solution to the challenge of filtering the bad from the good might seem to be increased funding for border controls. On the face of it, such an investment would appear logical. Stopping threats at the frontier is better than trying to cope with them once inside the country. Custom officials also have the strongest legal authority for inspecting and searching people and goods. Accordingly, if there are more people and goods to police, there should be more agents and security forces along the border to do so (Flynn 2000: 57-68).

But efforts to strengthen regulatory, enforcement, and security operations at busy borders may result worse than in cure the disease. Such endeavours place movements on a collision course with easy trade, which is key to the sustained expansion and integration of the global economy. Most successful enterprises need to move workers and products quickly, reliably, and affordably around the planet. Delays associated with intensified inspections along borders undermine the competitiveness of exports by raising transaction costs. Overseas buyers are likely to avoid ports where there is heightened risk that products will arrive damaged, spoiled, or late. However, rapid and hassle-free immigration controls are essential to both global business and tourism (Flynn 2000: 66-68).

In short, virtually all of the imperatives that have made border control a critical mission for states in the past remain operative today. What is different now is that commercial and social patterns of interaction are becoming more dynamic, organic and transnational. As such, the traditional means at states’ disposal are proving insufficient to enforce the many national and international rules and to advance important security and public policy interests. Absent a follow-on act, the late-twentieth-century triumph of capitalist markets and democratic institutions may prove short-lived.

The growing crisis of border control suggests that global economic activity risks becoming like the robber-baron capitalism of the nineteenth-century. In that era, the
private sector tried to avoid responsibility for the negative effects of its commercial activities. At the same time, public institutions were unable to keep up with the scope, pace, and complexity of the public-policy challenges spawned by the implications of the commercial explosion. The result was massive economic dislocation. History will repeat itself unless the major beneficiaries of our increasingly open global society take responsibility for the welfare of a free and stable international system (Flynn 2000: 67).

The more developed countries need to go through a similar dramatic shift in the way they respond to the influx of illegal economic immigrants and asylum seekers. Inducements or punishments for immigrant’s countries of origin are not working to stem the flows, nor are stiffer border-control measures, sanctions on employers, or harsher penalties for the illegals themselves. If it is not possible to restrict illegal immigration effectively, then governments (in the developed countries) must turn to policies that will integrate migrants into their new homes in ways that will minimize the social costs and maximize the economic benefits. Governments should also assist immigrants in settling throughout a country, to avoid depressing wages in any one region. Greater development support should be extended to the illegal migrant’s countries of origin to alleviate the poor economic conditions that propel emigration. And for the less developed countries, there is really no option but to shift toward a Diaspora model (Bhagwati 2003: 98-104).

(c) Changing the Meaning and Definition of Border Management

The existence of regional organizations and the way they function for regional interests have changed the meaning and definition of border and border management. Enlargement of the European Union, for example, involves not only an expanded circle of EU members, but also a new delineation of outsiders. The dismantling of the Iron Curtain since 1989 has seen many of Russia’s former allies in Central and Eastern Europe drift westward in orientation. NATO expansion began a process of formalizing this shift, but the induction of eight former communist countries into the European Union in May 2004 was a definitive step in ‘reigning’ Europe’s post-Cold War configuration (DeBardeleben 2005: 1-22).

Surely this configuration of Europe does not imply the erection of the Iron Curtain, separating EU members from outsiders. Russia, Ukrain, and other European neighbours
of the expanded EU are no longer autarkic, isolationist nations. By opening of the world in economic, political and cultural sphere, these non-EU Europeans have acquired preamble borders. Information flows freely since restrictions on travel have been lifted and firms are free to seek markets and suppliers around the globe. But if not an Iron Curtain, what type of boundary and border controls the new EU member states loosen with other EU member states. The border between the EU and its eastern neighbours represents not simply a barrier, but also an opportunity for contact. However, the diversity of relations between the EU and its ‘near abroad’ is manifold and complex, so undoubtedly the nature of its external borders with these neighbours will also be varied and differentiated (DeBardeleben 2005: 1-22).

If one is to adopt a working definition of borders, one may borrow from Stefano Bartolini who uses the concept to denote the outlines of political-administratively organized territories defined in geographical terms. In this context ‘frontiers’ are the linear borders or physical barriers that used to be accompanied by central repressive and extractive agencies, such as immigration, customs, and even exchange controls. The concept of ‘frontiers’ is associated with ‘hard’ or bold physical borders. A country can have ‘soft’ or open borders with one country and ‘hard’, deterring borders with another (Bartolini 2005 and DeBardeleben 2005). Also, as Olga Potemkina points out, borders can have open and closed characteristics at the same time. For instance, a country may have a liberal visa policy but persist on strict border controls. It is tempting to suggest that the EU should have ‘hard’ external borders and ‘soft’ or no internal borders. But that is not possible for a number of reasons that need to be investigated (Neuwahl 2005: 23-41).

The world is moving towards greater interdependence and globalization—two terms which are often vague and could mean different things to different people. Despite the vagueness of these terms, they, nevertheless, reflect on how the world is moving along or ought to move along in the present century. The most evident form of interdependence and globalization is the greater interconnectedness among nations in cross-border movements of commodities, assets, goods, people, labour, financial flows, services and communications. Even a simply atomistic discussion of the contemporary flows of
economic and non-economic indicators is sufficient to indicate that national political borders are no longer sufficient to describe such activities.

A vivid illustration of this new dimension is the institutional primacy of the transnational/multinational corporations (TNCs and MNCs) in many countries of the world. Clearly, greater independence and globalization imply that borders are increasingly ‘vanishing’ or that the economic landscape is becoming ‘borderless’ although this may not literally mean the absence of such boundary impediments. In this context, the basic formative processes and conditions, impacts and implications of the ‘vanishing borders’ from the late 1980s through the mid-1990s deserve greater attention (Boon-Thong and Bahrin 1998: 3-14).

The world is, indeed, seeing a higher level of globalization and interdependence which is the result of several factors. Such as chief among which are the increasing liberalization of markets worldwide, the achievement of the Uruguay Round and other multilateral agreements throughout the world, falling tariffs, the dismantling of non-tariff barriers, greater financial integration, and technological change that have facilitated information transmission. Meanwhile, the growing order of global interdependence which marked largely by the dynamics of industrial capitalism is very often more complex and profound than expected. Consequently, the practices and principles of embedded statist are stretched and challenged by the growing global interdependence.

Working on the basis of international interactions and interdependencies that are immediately observable, spatial scientists, international economists, and geographers have been fascinated by the fact that borders that traditionally describe the geography of countries may be no longer relevant to explain geographical phenomena. That borders can be excised from spatial analysis, usher in a new dimension of geographical perspective that is both challenging and new. Certainly, this is a major paradigm shift in the *modus operandi* in the geographers’ analytical horizon. It is obvious that globalization and interconnectedness are more than fashionable semantics, for hey hints at the increasing significance of the external context for many issues that were formerly deemed to be national issues or deemed to be amenable to local or national resolution. Now, it appears that a single nation state no longer exerts an influence on the many
activities that are external or international in origin. The presence of transnational corporations is one good example (Boon-Thong and Bahrin 1998: 3-14).

Though the death of the nation-state has been predicted by a number of academic writers, and on the face of it, their arguments are quite convincing. It is common ground that the present system of nation-states will change in form and function largely in response to the powerful impulses collectively known as globalization. On the other hand, current trends hardly seem to justify the view that the state is on the way out, to be replaced by alternative regional and global political structures. Of course, it might be a very good thing if the end of the state was in sight because of the widespread misery created by the promotion of state nationalism, but that is a rather different issue (Blake 1998: 247-256).

It seems probably, therefore, on present evidence that the state will survive as the basic building block for political arrangements far into the next century. It would of course be foolish to suggest that the state will endure for ever, since it is a relatively recent phenomenon, created primarily from the experience of Europe. The nature, shape, and function of the state will, however, evolve in future more radically than in the past. In most part of the world state economies will be dominated by their membership of a major trading bloc, and a wide range of tasks and duties formerly undertaken by state governments, will have been taken over by international organizations. At the same time, states will return a variety of functions of importance to the everyday lives of their citizens (Blake 1998: 247-256).

However, there are three different but interconnected approaches as scholars argues would be the most efficient alternative to the traditional approach to border management and would be more cooperative with the globalised world. Those approaches are (1) unilateral border management; (2) bilateral border management; and (3) multilateral border management. Unilateral border management means managing borders of an individual country by its own effort i.e., Russia, China, India, etc. Bilateral border management implies a bilateral arrangement between two neighbouring countries for their mutual benefits i.e., “smart border” between US and Canada. The multilateral or integrated border management which means a collective action plan among more than two countries for their mutual benefits i.e., EU and NAFTA.
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The inescapable predicament facing border control strategies is the massive volume of cross-border trade and travel requires that borders function not simply as barriers against CTAs (Clandestine Transnational Actors), but as filters that do not impede legitimate border crossings. Rather than giving up any pretence of controlling borders, or simply shutting down borders in the name of security and accepting the astronomical costs, USA is ambitiously trying to have it both ways: Create borders that perform as better security barriers and as efficient economic bridges at the same time. This goal is articulated in the "smart borders" agreement between Canada and the United States, signed in December 2001. This is a thirty-point action plan designed to enhance security of the shared border while facilitating the legitimate flow of people and goods. According to George W Bush, "This great and peaceful border must be open to business, must be open to people—and it is got to be closed to terrorists and criminals (Millar 2002; WH 2002)."

Secondly, multilateral or Integrated Border Management (IBM) is the organization and supervision of border agency activities to meet the common challenge of facilitating the movement of legitimate people and goods while maintaining secure borders and meeting national legal requirements. It covers two areas; domestic integration between government agencies within one country or customs union and international integration between neighboring countries. Both require interagency cooperation, parallel processing, and coordination at ports, harbors, and land border points of entry for an optimal collective efficiency of these border institutions. For the second category, neighboring or contracting national authorities must also cooperate with one another to align border-crossing facilities and procedures (IBM 2000).

In times marked by trends as diverse as economic globalisation, international migration as well as fear of terrorism and organised crime, the efficient handling of borders has become an issue of political priority, in the EU and across the world. Modern economy-oriented states have to rely on a flourishing trade and offer a comfortable degree of security to their citizens. The formula commonly chosen in combining these two objectives is that of ‘integrated border management’, which represents the delicate attempt to marry security concerns with trade facilitation.

6 The agreement partly extended to Mexico in the Spring of 2002 and became Canada-US-Mexico Smart-Border Agreement.
IBM rules are spread across a number of legal and administrative instruments. They represent a multi-layered compilation of provisions, with only the basic ones found in formal legal texts such as the Treaty on the European Community or the Schengen instruments of 1985-90, while much of the rest has been adopted through informal arrangements, e.g. the *Common Manual* on external borders adopted by the Schengen Executive Committee and the *Catalogue of Best Practices* drawn up by the Working Party on Schengen Evaluation. Further elements that make the IBM mechanism work practically are found in bilateral/multilateral arrangements among individual member states or between them and third countries. Another dimension of the IBM mechanism is some measures from the Schengen tool set are directly border-related and some are concern to the internal territory, but are still crucial to enhancing border efficiency (Hobbing 2005: 1-24).

Thirdly, as a free trade area, NAFTA argues for the relatively unrestricted movement of people, goods, and services across the borders between the United States, Mexico, and Canada. Although the proponents of NAFTA emphasise positive economic outcomes for the three partners, the dependence of those outcomes on open borders inevitably brings with it the prospect of greater opportunities for transnational criminal activities in general and narco-trafficking in particular. Meanwhile, the war on drugs in NAFTA is facing a big dilemma in managing the free flow of goods and people while limiting the free flow of illegal substances and criminals. Cooperation between the member states differs strikingly, with smooth cooperation along the northern border between the United States and Canada and a troubling lack of cooperation along the US-Mexico. The different patterns in cooperation among policy makers and law enforcement agencies are largely attributable to mutual perceptions and nationalism in all three countries (Cottam and Marenin 2005: 5-37).

However, according to Peter Andreas, the politically tricky challenge is to tap heightened attention and concern over border security in a manner that promotes rather than poisons cross-border cooperation (Andreas 2006: 64-68). But the cross-border transportation and communications networks used by terrorists are also the arteries of a highly integrated and interdependent economy and to national security (Andreas 2003: 3-7). Therefore, linkages between internal security landscape and external environment
have made the issue of border management a critical component of national security strategy. Illegal and trans-border migration has become one of the most serious facilitator of threats to national security in this globalized world. Terrorism, insurgencies and small arms proliferation along with the concept of self-determination, sub-nationalism, ethnonationalism, insurgency movement and several other non-military threats has made the task worsen (Sahni 2002; Ramana 2002: 39-112, 99-126). The terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001 and the Afghanistan and Iraq wars along with the Kargil and parliament attacks in India thereafter have radically changed the task of border management and the national security environment facing countries (Godbole 2001: 4442-4444).

**Security, Border Security and National Security**

National security concerns are defined by a dynamic global security environment and the perception that a region is of particular global security interest. These are varied and complex. The meaning of the concept 'national security' can be understood from the objectives it carries. Those are such as: (1) defending the country’s borders as defined by law and enshrined in the Constitution; (2) protecting the lives and property of its citizens against war, terrorism, nuclear threats and other militant activities; (3) protecting the country from instability and religious and other forms of radicalism and extremism emanating from neighbouring states; (4) securing the country against the use or the threat of use of weapons of mass destruction; (5) development of material, equipment and technologies that have a bearing on national security, particularly its defence preparedness through indigenous research, development and production, inter-alia to overcome restrictions on the transfer of such items; (6) promoting further co-operation and understanding with neighbouring countries and implementing mutually agreed confidence-building measures; and (7) pursuing security and strategic dialogues with major powers and key partners (Security Environment 2007).

The concept of national security which plays a vital role in formulating the domestic and foreign policy and development of a nation and its fellow citizens is, of contemporary origin, particularly by the United State of America (Buzan 1988: 14). It though concerns with national states and their units of the international relations date
back to the Augsburg Peace Treaty (16th Century) (Barro and Mcleary2005; Raitt 1983: 145-156, 1331-1370) and Treaty (Peace) of Westphalia (middle of the 17th Century) (Osiander 2001; Gross 1948: 251-287, 20-41). While the words 'national and 'security', and their foreign language counterparts, are both hoary terms, they have not been used together until quite recently. The context in which these two words were married arose during World War II. Prior to that America was far from the marginal actor in world affairs, as security strategists think (McLaurin 1988: 252). The English poet Matthew Arnold once wrote of "wandering between two worlds, "one dead, and the other powerless to be born (Giddings 1986)." For 45 years the United States pursued a national security strategy focused on one goal: containing Soviet Union. But with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Empire, the doctrine of containment has become a victim of its own success (Farrell 1970: 107-117).

(A) Security

(i) Ancient Age

'Security' as a thought has been surviving over time immemorial since the human species started living on this earth. It has been felt with the word 'insecurity', insecure and threat to the life, liberty, and property for which justice has been realised for security. The selfish and narrow interests of the human being created the state of anarchy and insecurity in the society (Darwin 2001). According to Darwin, survival of the fittest was the method of life and the only principle of life and security. He is secure who has the muscle power and the strategy of defence. In the pre-societal stage when the man was moving and living in the jungle and the caves it was insecure everywhere and nobody was secured because every time there was someone stronger than another. There was

7 The Peace of Augsburg was a treaty signed between Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, and the forces of the Schmalkaldic League on September 25, 1555 at the city of Augsburg, Germany. The Peace of Augsburg officially ended the Schmalkaldic Wars between the Holy Roman Empire and France. This allowed for German princes to select either Lutheranism or Catholicism. Also, it gave way to a grace period in which families had the right to move to different regions of their desired religion.

8 The Peace of Westphalia refers to the pair of treaties (the Treaty of Münster and the Treaty of Osnabrück) signed in October and May 1648 which ended both the Thirty Years' War and the Eighty Years' War. The treaties were signed on October 24 and May 15, 1648 and involved the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand III, the other German princes, Spain, France, Sweden and representatives from the Dutch republic. The texts of the two treaties are largely identical and deal with the internal affairs of the Holy Roman Empire.
always threat to their lives, liberty and property. No civil government and no political authority were there to provide security to the man, his life and property (Darwin 2001).

In ancient time Kautilya in his treaty on the *Arthasastra* emphasised on the statecraft of power. His principles of development and prosperity were based on the strategies of national security. The five principles of negotiation with the enemy he gave were main strategies to save the country from the external and internal threats and also to prevail upon the enemy (Ramaswami 1962: 109-140). Machiavelli, the author of *The Prince*, and Sun Tzu, the author of *The Art of War*, gave the similar view on the strategies of national security and state power. Their whole theory and strategies are revolves around 'Power', for which they gave absolute and enormous power and authority to the sovereign to reign the state (Gilbert 1954; Marshall 1939: 38-48, 154-156).

Aristotle and Plato, two giants and remembered as God fathers of political science wrote their philosophy to make the people civilized and to make them realise how their lives, liberty and property is under threat. They realised that there is anarchy because the man is unconscious and unaware of his civil and political rights and responsibilities. Their Doctrine was based on social justice. In their ‘Ideal States’ they gave certain responsibilities to the ruler to rule the state according to certain law vested in the citizens. Aristotle gave the citizen the right of revolution if the ruler is despotic and incapable to rule and provided security to his fellow citizens. Plato opposed the private property and suggested to abolish them for the communism of families and properties while Aristotle strongly supported the private property and said private property is the ingredient necessity and inevitable for the development of human personality and should be protected by the state. Both of them strongly advocated for the social justice and social security for the poor people and argued for parliamentary democracy (McClelland 1996; Heywood 2004: 30-55).

(ii) Medieval Age

In the early civil, social and political society the contractualists gave a gigantic theory of the origin of the state. Theories of all the three thinkers—Thomas Hobbes, John Lock and Jean J Rousseau—narrated on the principle of individual’s right, liberty, and property, for which they evolved the concept ‘sovereignty’ (Morris 1999: 219-238).
According to Hobbes in the pre-political society when there was no authority and the human nature was nasty, brutish and short and everywhere there was anarchy. It was for the self interest everything was insecure in the society (Kavka 1983; Williams 2006: 291-310). Locke, on the other hand, gave a different view of the state of nature and human nature and said the state of nature was civil and the human was moral and sober and wanted to be civilised human beings (Friend 2006). And, Rousseau gave a balance and mixed view of both the earlier authors. He started with the Locke’s Individualism and liberalism and reached with the absolutism of Hobbes (Noone 1970; Ripstein 1970: 696-708, 219-238). While Hobbes gave absolute power to the sovereign, Locke gave liberal power with the parliamentary government, but Rousseau gave liberal power to his sovereign to come to power but after coming to the power he should be the sovereign absolutely. The Social contract theory was base on the security of individuals’ lives, rights, liberty and the property which could be safeguarded by a nation-state only.

(iii) Modern Age

As nations search for a new direction, the national interests have been changed and the threats to national security have also been renewed. Analysts have identified a host of new threats: the budget and trade deficits, the stagnation of wages in the face of global economic competition, and the degradation of the environment. However, military security has not been vanished as a key element of national security, but it has certainly declined in importance relates to the issue of economic, energy, and environmental security (Romm 1993: 1-8).

The significance of national security has increasingly shifted from the protection of territories to encompass other national values. Morton Berkowitz and PG Booke defined “national security as the ability of a nation to protect its internal values from external threats (Berkowitz and Booke 1968: 40-42).” Walter Lippman argues, “A nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victor in such a war (Wolfer 1962: 147-66).” K Subrahmanyam, an Indian specialist of security and defence studies, has (defined) this to say: “national security does not merely mean safeguarding territorial integrity. It means also ensuring that the country is industrialised rapidly and has a
cohesive egalitarian and technological society. Anything that comes in the way of this, development internally or externally, is a threat to (India's) national security" (Subrahmanyam 1972: VII). Subrahmanyam's definition, though made with reference to India, stands as a generalization for the vast majority of third world states.

In common parlance, concept of security is usually narrowly identified with military preponderance. Recently, the concept has undergone a qualitative change. Besides military security, the concept of security includes political, economic, environmental and socio-psychological aspects of security. In the present context, it is not possible to maintain security solely through military preponderance. The objective of security now has been all round development focusing national attention on political and economic power. The latter, in particular, in the context of developing countries, is an essential ingredient of security (McNamara 1966: 212-213).

Classical theories analysed security from normative, qualitative and value-judgment point of view. This approach was adopted by most of the scholars until scientific approach made its appearance. It nourished two important streams of thought: realism and idealism, which contributed greatly to the understanding of the nature, determinants and dynamics of the concept (national) security. Liberal and neo-liberal theories are two Post-World War II developments.

(B) National Security

(i) Realist Approach

Realism, which is the prime mover of the security paradigm, emerges out of the individuals fear psychosis that others are trying to destroy him for which he must take protective measures (Hertz 1951: 18). This approach is developed under the basic assumption that rivalry and strife among nations continue in some form or the other. As it emphasises on the struggle for power or the context for powers, most of the nations revolve around this power paradigm for protect their national security. They adopt various means like balance of power, deterrence and alliances, for effective check of the contest for power.
The best exposition of this theory of international politics has been given by Hans J. Morgenthau. Security is the prime concern in his theory. He says, "International politics like all politics is a struggle for power. Whatever may be the ultimate aim of international politics, power is always supreme" (Morgenthau 1946: 101). According to Quincy Wright, since World War II, nationalism and state sovereignty and security overshadowed internationalism and world community (Wright 1954: 126-127). Hedley Bull critically reviewed one of the strategic exports, Noel Barker, for his theory of collective security. In the 1980s, he became concerned about the defence policies of super powers and stressed more on armaments than arms control to enhance their (national) security (Bull 1995; Kupchan and Kupchan 1995; Dunne 1996: 52-61, 91-107).

Among other realist thinkers, Arnold Wolfers emphasised on the concept of national security and critically analysed the many-dimensional complexities of this concept. He characterised security is an ambiguous symbol and at one point he argues that it does not have any precise meaning (Buzan 1989; Anderson 1997: 4).

(ii) Neo-Realistic Approach

Neo-realism, on the other hand, is a synthesis between classical realism and elements of various critics of realism. Modern neo-realists emphasized on international system and the structure than the nation-state in their analysis of power paradigm. Kenneth Waltz’s structural realism reflected that in the structure of international system, states, though important, are not the only actors. It is obvious that national interest is the prime concern of the states in taking important decisions including decisions on national security. But this self-help attitude of the states shatters the fabric of the system (Waltz 1979: 93-97). Waltz argued that this anarchy was a lesser evil than the hierarchical structure, such as collective security, world government, which regulated balance of power but often favoured the powerful nations (Waltz 2000; Waltz 1988: 5-41, 615-628).

Neo-realists like Robert Gilpin would seek a terrain away from the realists’ obsession with power. Even he substantially modifies the realists’ overall conceptual position of the state. He would call the state a ‘coalition of coalitions’ rather than a unitary actor as was
emphasised in earlier times and even go to the extent of banishing the concept of state from the realm of conceptual possibilities” (Gilpin 1981: 18-19, 35, 177).

(iii) Liberalistic Approach

According to Barry Buzan, who analysed the concept of security holistically, viewed security is a complex combination of individual, national and international security, which he considers as three levels in his analysis of security paradigm. He emphasises on social threats that are intertwined in human environment with unavoidable social, political and economic consequences. Freedom is the most important factor that regulates the social security of a man. To overcome the threats that spring up from freedom and to maintain adequate level of security against social threats, people seek the mechanism of the state. In his opinion, national security depends upon the relationship between the nation and the state. They can be military, political, economic and even ecological. In the same way they can be averted by a variety of means among which military power may not be always considered as the most important one (Buzan 1988: 24-92).

According to Buzan, the two major systems, which constitute the security environment of the state, are: international political system and international economic system, which he characterises as ‘anarchical’. He calls these arrangements as ‘security complexes’. He defines “security complex” as a group of states whose primary security concern link together with their national securities so closely that their individual security cannot be considered in isolation of the overall security arrangements (Buzan 1991: 445).

(iv) Neo-Liberalist Approach

Neoliberalism, on the other hand, defines “security” in broad terms, often arguing that factors such as health, welfare, and environmental issues need to be included in institution-building efforts, whether passive (non-interventionist) or active (interventionist). Thompson points out that the literature on “declinism” (the idea that nation-states have declined in importance as actors) is a fundamental underpinning of neoliberalism (Thompson 1989). This theory, according to Keohane & Nye, is based on the complex spillover effects possible for change toward world governance (by norms, rules, processes, and institutions) when one-dimensional militaristic solutions are
abandoned and reliance is, instead, placed upon the possibilities when other actors are involved, like international organizations, transnational organizations, NGOs (non-governmental organizations), and MNCs (multinational corporations) (Keohane and Nye 2000).

The concept of security has been analysed by many scholars through ‘rational’ approaches, which includes various models. Models could be mutually contradictory also. While some of the models advocate for building up of arms to secure peace, some others emphasize on complete disarmament. Some argued in favour of perpetuating conflict at a low scale, others may stand for attempting decisions at a domestic level to preempt conflict. Deterrence and arms control is one of the most important theoretical concept of security, in which one party tries to influence the behaviour of another in a desired direction. It rests directly upon threats, sanctions or deprivation (Williams 1975; Singer 1962: 69, 172). The security experts have also come up with concepts like ‘Humanitarian Security’ and ‘Security Communities’. Humanitarian Security concerns inter-state relations, contracts among the people of various states for good relations, mutual trust and understanding and rational solution to the problems of the world (Deutsch 1957).

(v) Idealistic Approach

The concept security got a new dimension by the exponents of idealism who regard realists view of ‘power politics’ as a ‘passing phase of history’. The idealists outrightly reject the idea of the realists and visualised a new order free from ‘power politics’, morality and violence’. The basic objective of this theory is to look after the interests of various groups, nation and ensure the welfare of the entire humankind. In the year 1795, Codercet wrote *Treaties*, which elaborated the main ideas of idealism in international politics. He visualised a new world order free from war, violence, inequality, and tyranny and based on peace, amity and mutual cooperation. Kant, Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi and Woodrow Wilson are some chief exponents joined the movement later (McAinsh 1986: 517-18).
(vi) Modern Approach

As discussed above, besides military security, there are other areas—economic, environmental and societal—in which security threats are perceived. In the present world, particularly after the end of the cold war, these relatively newer sectors have assumed much significance (Buzan 1997: 5-28). Post-structuralists have also stressed on the expansion of this concept of security. It is argued by Ole Weaver that the security is a discursive practice, so the concept of security cannot be confined to military domain (Hansen 1997: 369-397).

Firstly, economic security. The third world countries are more economically insecure than the developed nations. These countries are unable to meet the needs of the people as they have been exploited by the center (developed countries) (center-periphery model). The periphery occupies a weak position in global market whose prices, trade, finance and technical evolution are controlled by the center. Besides the economic insecurity of the Third World, economic crises have been faced by developing nations. Secondly, the environmental security, which is called the ‘ultimate security issue’, has broadened the security agenda further. A wide range of problems and issues are included within the environmental security agenda: disruption of the eco-systems which include climate change, bio-diversity, deforestation, disertification and other forms of erosion, depletion of the ozone layer and various kinds of pollution. Thirdly, the societal security is the most prominent issue in the present world. It is about threats and vulnerabilities that affect patterns of communal identities and culture (Buzan 1988: 121). There are many problems can be included into this e.g., migration, horizontal competition and vertical competition where people lose their identity and de-population, whether by plague, war, famine, natural catastrophe or policies of extermination (Buzan 1988). Thirdly, Political security, is about relationships of rule and recognition, and concerns the organizational stability of states or other systems of governance, and the ideologies that give them legitimacy. Under a liberal system of international relations state sovereignty—the classical focus of national security—remains a central issue, but is threatened primarily from non-military directions. International economic regimes and international society more broadly, can be existentially threatened by things that undermine the rules, norms and institutions that constitute them (Waever 1993; Buzan, Waever and Wilde 1998).
Since independent India is facing numerous challenges to its national security through the borders. All of the Indian border are artificial and created in 1947 with the partition of the subcontinent. The border with Bangladesh is a very unique for its origin and nature. The historical and the cultural ties made family relations and the movement of the people obvious. Due to these cross-border relations the border has become vulnerable and several kinds of security problems are been arising. These security problems are numerous and different in nature—socio-cultural, economic political and also ecological—which are going to be discussed in the subsequent chapters.