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INTRODUCTION

Agreements are one of the main instruments of diplomacy. Diplomacy in world politics refers to a communications process between international actors that seeks through negotiations to resolve conflict short of war. This process has been refined, institutionalized, and professionalized over many centuries. (Barston, 1997). After Second World War, many new countries emerged with various new conflicts of border, political, structural and diplomatic nature. Diplomatic relations based on agreements and meetings have been the main solution of these types of conflicts. In other words diplomacy can be defined as a means of cooperation in world politics.

In the traditional system, diplomacy was organized largely on a bilateral basis and usually undertaken in secrecy. When the two states developed a relationship of mutual importance, it became normal to exchange permanent embassies on a state-to-state basis. Unless one state forced the other to accept a position, mutual agreement was the means of achieving a settlement of any disputes. (Baylis and Smith, 2005)

In the post-war years, there has been considerable growth of interest in the alternative strategies available to reduce international tensions when the normal diplomacy has failed. Montville has described such activities as “Track two Diplomacy”. Until recently, the exploration of the concept as concentrated on the major international conflicts and wars. He defines track two diplomacy as ‘unofficial, informal interaction between representatives of adversary groups or nations which aims to develop strategies and create an environment which could contribute to the resolution of their conflicts.(Murry and Neill, 1992)

In modern context, the main cause of these conflicts is borders. Borders are one of the principal elements or mechanisms that build bilateral or multilateral relations between
nations. With the advent of the modern nation state system, borders have attained a more permanent stature than yester years.

Recognition of demarcated territories among nations gives rise to borders that politically provide legitimacy between two or more countries for opening avenues of interdependence based on political and cultural assimilation. Borders are also made as "frontiers of settlements" that based on negotiations and precautions to decrease hostilities and to build relations of confidence. The moment this recognition is shrouded by misunderstandings and misperceptions, it gives birth to frequent conflictual situations between nations.

Frontier and Boundaries

The two terms, Frontiers and Boundaries are often used interchangeably in the non-geographical literature. In political geography, however, the two carry distinct connotations and cannot, therefore, be used a synonyms (Merry, and Neill, 1992). Boundaries are classified as International boundaries, state boundaries, district boundaries, village boundaries etc. All are invisible lines but are the most visible features on the political maps and they appear on maps as thin lines that mark the limits of sovereignty. In other words, boundaries are invisible lines, but their effects are often visible on the landscape. In criticism of 'boundary as a bond,' Holdich says- "I need not again insist that boundaries are not set up in this world of human ambitions and land hunger for the purpose of assimilating the people on either side or of providing them with suitable accommodation for meeting one another."(Sinha and Ray, 1995). Instead the purpose of these boundaries is separating sovereign states politically, culturally and economically to avoid confrontation wars. As Lord Curzon argues, "Frontiers are indeed the razor's edge on which hang suspended the modern issues of war or peace or life or death to nations." (Sinha and Ray, 1995). Actually, frontiers are the zone of change from one national core to another and sometimes no change is visible—similar across the boundary, but the similarity of the zone does not eliminate the presence of boundaries and its effects.
Origin and Evolution of the terms

Generally, the words 'frontier' and 'boundary' are used interchangeably through they have well defined meaning. Its evolution was seen in the early history of mankind. Boundaries and frontiers can be seen in the Roman and Greek civilizations also.

**Frontier**

Etymologically, the word 'frontier' suggests that which is —"infront". It has been derived from a Latin word-'Frons'- meaning "foreland" - that which is forehead of anything be it material or spiritual. Hence, it was not an abstract term or line but on the contrary designated as an arena which was part of whole, specifically that part which comes ahead of the hinterland. Hence termed as' foreland ' or' borderland' or 'march'. (Adhikari, 2002). The meaning of this term is different in every country like in Russian ‘ukraina’, in French ‘marche’ and in German it is called ‘mark’. Frontiers may consist of uninhabited or sparsely populated areas of marginal utility at the current level of technology so that the states on either side of the frontier, may not feel the need to define the precise aerial limits of their political jurisdiction. Etymologically, “Frontier” implied the region that lay “in front”, i.e., ahead of the ecumence, on its margins. As civilizations advanced, frontiers between pairs of ecumence became meeting place of different ways of physical survival as well as different concepts of good life, and hence, increasingly political (ideological) in character. (Murray, and Neill, 1991).

Frontier has been perceived as the' forerunner of the advancing State, able to integrate territory and its population. In this zone populations may mix freely, external relations are not subject to state monopoly. According to the British Association Geographical Glossary committee, frontiers can be defined as, “A border region, zone, or tract, which forms belt of separation, contact or transition between political units". (Sinha and Ray, 1995. Hence, it is not a legal, political or intellectual concept. It does not mark a definite limit or end of a political unit.
Classification of Frontiers

Many attempts have been made to classify frontiers. Some of the most important classifications are mention here. According to Rimier there are four types of criteria for classification of frontiers. (Sinha and Ray, 1995).

A. In relation to the sovereign territory of the state.

(a) **Political Frontiers**: These exist when "the state lacks 'de jure' boundaries and 'de facto' limit of state advances with advance of its frontiers" eg. the expansion of Russian state into Kazakhstan and Soviet Central Asia was associated with political frontiers. (Sinha and Ray, 1995).

(b) **Settlement Frontiers**: The frontiers which mark stages in the expansion of the state ecumene within pre-existing 'de jure' boundaries eg. The colonization of the interior of Australia involved the advancement of settlement frontier within territory already claimed. Settlement frontiers are of three types viz; (1) Primary settlement frontiers: They mark the forehead of advancing colonization and immediately disappear when the legal limits of the state are reached. (2) Secondary settlement frontiers: Just like the above, these frontiers also expand but the unattractive areas are ignored and by passed. In these secondary settled frontiers areas the stage of subsequent colonization is marked. (3) Hollow settlements frontiers: This type of frontiers was seen in Latin America, where a consolidation of settlement did not always occur in the wake of frontier advance. Rather, the crude and speculative exhaustion of frontier resources led to exhaustion of and minerals and the result was the retreat of settlement from colonized area to new frontier.

B. In relation to the indigenous population of the frontier zone.

Two major sub-divisions are-(a) Inclusive frontiers (b) Exclusive frontiers.

(a) **Inclusive frontiers**: "These are associated with the assimilation of indigenous populations in areas over which the frontier passes". (Sinha and Ray, 1995)

(b) **Exclusive frontiers**: These are also associated with the assimilation of indigenous population in areas over which they pass. The former type includes the Roman, Arab and Spanish American frontiers, while the resistance to assimilation was evident in North
American, Australian and Boer frontiers. The resistance can come from either the indigenous population or the colonists. In the so-called Soviet Union (not now), the Siberian natives showed a great readiness to mix with Great Russian colonist than did the Moslems of Soviet Central Asia, whose religion opposed mixing. (Sinha, and Ray, 1995).

C. **In relation to the degree of frontier advance.** It can be subdivided into two categories

(a) **Dynamic frontiers:** As the world suggests that they are in motion and involve the continuous colonization of new territory.

(b) **Static frontiers:** When the advancement is obstructed; be it physical or human, it becomes a static frontier.

D. **In relation to the degree of trans-frontier contact.** The frontier can be divided into two categories, (a) **Contact frontiers:** These frontiers act as a zone of contact. For example, the British settlers in South Africa were unaware of the formation of aggressive Zulu state in the north. The stabilization of a frontier may be in areas, which facilitate interaction, which may be political or cultural. (b) **Separation frontiers:** These include zones of difficult terrain and areas of scarce population. In these zones the risk of war by potential enemies are minimum. According to Hartshorne, such zones of separation had a static aspect because it is an area of difficulty and low population.

**Boundary**

Etymologically, the word 'boundary' immediately indicates well-established limits of a given political unit. The ancient empires delimited their state not by boundaries but by zones. (Sinha, and Ray,, 1995). Few walls were constructed for the purpose of defence e.g. The Great Wall of China, the Roman walls, Hadrian's Wall in north England etc. But in the modern period, due to sophisticated techniques,' modern electronic lines, are playing important roles and act as a sort of boundary that does not coincide with the territorial lines on a map. Actually, they are very real political boundaries eg.3300 mile long Defence early warning line. Not all areas of the earth have developed uniformly. In some areas, indefinite zonal division is seen in the form of dashed lines across the map. It simply indicates that boundary exists some where in that area. On the other hand some boundaries appear as lines on a map but in practice it is ignored. According to Kristof:"Boundaries bind together an area
and people which lie under one sovereign Government and law and integrated only administratively and economically but by means of a state idea or creed". (Sinha, and Ray, , 1995).

Boundaries have been described as being linear, hence can be defined as interfaces between adjacent state sovereignties, intersecting the surface of the earth as radial plains from its center. The demarcations of the boundaries are performed by a group of representatives of all sides-surveyors, protection units and other experts. In some cases the demarcation is easy while in other cases minor changes are made that are deemed expeditions.

The discussion of the role of boundaries has been closely connected *with* the ideas of territory, territoriality and sovereignty. Geographers in particular seem to understand boundaries as expressions or manifestations of the territoriality of states. They have been particularly interested in land boundaries and the border, landscapes of states-the areas in which these political processes have received most concrete territorial or geographical expressions. (Newmen and Passi, 1988). However, state boundaries are equally social, political and discursive constructs, not just static naturalized categories located between states. Boundaries and their meanings are historically contingent, and they are part of the production and institutionalization of territories and territoriality. Even if they are always more or less arbitrary lines between territorial entities, they may also have deep symbolic, cultural, historical and religious, often contested, meanings for social communities. They manifest themselves in numerous social, political, and cultural practices. (Newmen and Passi, 1988). It is this meaning, which has come to dominate the contemporary understanding of boundaries.

The language used when discussing boundaries is also changing. The ideas related to borders, boundaries, borderlands, border-crossings and transgressions of borders that the representatives of various disciplines use are increasingly employed in a metaphoric sense so that they do not inevitably refer to the material spaces with which geographers typically deal. (Newmen David and Passi, 1988). Hence, new conceptualizations and representations of space have emerged within cultural studies, differing from those which political geographers traditionally created in their accounts of boundaries, many which are, any way, explicit representations of space, scale, and culture.
The earliest discussions of territorial boundaries by academic geographers date back to Ratzel's treatment of the organic state, and are followed by such classics as Lord Curzon's impartial treatise on boundaries and Holdich's study of political frontiers and boundary making. Boundaries and borders were initially conceived as being no more than lines separating sovereign territories, while frontiers were assumed to constitute the area in proximity to the border whose internal development were affected by the existence of the line. The political frontier was differentiated from the settlement frontiers, the former affected by the existence of the international boundaries, the latter constituting the, as yet, uninhabited region lying within the state territory. Boundaries are made for limitation the territory of a state called Delimitation.

**Delimitation:** The progress made in the adoption of an exact terminology in the important sector of determination of boundaries has however, been limited. Delimitation and demarcation are still words which are tossed about carelessly and are disputed. This instance was the most evident during the 1960 Sino-Indian boundary discussion and at least a clarification of the issues is required. The most authoritative dictionary of the English language gives the connotation of the word "delimit" as "to mark or determine the limits of; to define, as a limit or boundary" and of "delimitation" as "delimitation of a limit or boundary, especially of the frontier of a territory". To "delineate" is "to trace out by lines; trace the outlines of, as on a chart or map". "Demarcation" is dealt with exhaustively. It is "the action of making the boundary or limits of something, or of marking it off from something else; delimitation; separation". (Murty, 1983).

Boundaries are the lines of political zones. Generally, the boundaries of the nations are demarcated on the ground and based on geographical, cultural, historical and political factors. The boundaries unite an area and the people under one sovereign government. The boundaries are the limits within which the municipal law takes effect and proves effective barriers to social, political, economical cultural exchange. The boundary is a meeting place of two socio-political bodies each having it's particular "interest", "structure", and "ideology". The American scholar Stephen B. Jones (Geographer Yale University) proposed two kinds of boundaries. (Sali, 1983).
(1) Natural (Physiographic Boundaries)

(i) Water Boundaries: ------ River Boundaries, lake Boundaries, Ocean Boundaries,
(ii) Desert Boundaries, Marshes Boundaries, Swamps Boundaries and Forests Boundaries.
(iii) Mountains and Hills Boundaries.

(2) Artificial: --- All the man made boundaries can be taken under it. e.g. Great Wall of China and Suez Cannel.

Classification of Boundaries

The problem regarding boundaries is that, there are about as many classifications as there are boundaries and most of them are based on physical and cultural features hence categorization is difficult. Though political geographers seem to have had a pre-occupation with boundary studies, the morphological, genetic and generic aspects of boundaries have virtually monopolized attention at the expense of more significant functional studies. A number of schemes for boundary classification have been suggested. Generally boundaries have been classified in respect of their locational relationship to physical or cultural landscape.

According to De Blij the classification of boundaries can be grouped from then point of view of their static characteristics for instance, their correspondence to physiographic features, their separation of ethnic regions, their straightness and so forth. This type of classification is basically descriptive one. It utilizes the morphological approach. Boundaries can be classified on the basis of culture also. Such type of classification is known as the genetic classification of boundaries.

Morphogenetic Classification. (Adhikari, 2002) Physiographic boundaries: under it come Rivers, Lakes and ocean boundaries. Desert, Marshes, Swamps and forests. Mountain and Hill boundaries. For example the political boundaries of the world are not straight. They zigzagly followed the physiographic feature like the boundary between Spain and France in Europe,
the USA-Mexican boundary in America, the Zambia-south Rhodesian boundary in Africa, Indo-China, India and North West Pakistan, China and Mongolia in Asia.

(a) **Anthropogeographical boundaries.** (Adhikari, 2002): these boundaries are anthropogeography in nature which follows ethnic, linguistic, religious or other cultural elements as dividing lines. To find out such boundaries, a political map should be placed as an overlay over the cultural maps. In some cases political boundaries are seen to coincide with the cultural elements viz; language, religion race etc. such boundaries are a feature of the post-first world war period. During that period a number of boundaries in central and Eastern Europe were readjusted on the basis of language. Evidence of religious contrasts is witnessed across the Indo-Pak and Indo-Bangladesh boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbours. A number of African states were established on the basis of ethnic factors. The states Mexico boundary also belongs to this category. In some cases anthropogeography boundaries coincide with physical boundaries e.g. The boundary along Spain and France along the Pyrenees. One finds several cultural contrasts across this border. In this case history played an important role.

(b) **Geometrical boundaries:** (Adhikari, 2002). In the absence of clearly determined natural features, boundaries are drawn in geometric terms i.e. straight lines which follow the parallels or lines of longitudes.

**Difference between Frontiers and Boundaries**

Boundaries are lines demarcating the outer limits of territory under the sovereign jurisdiction of a nation-state, Frontiers, on the other hand, are zones of varying width, separating the ecumenism(fully developed and politically and economically integrated parts) of a given pair of states.

(1) **Difference in meaning:** One can easily chalk out the difference e.g. In French the word frontier means 'frontiere; and the word boundary means 'limit'. In Italian language, the former means 'frontiera' and the latter means 'confined'. Thus the word boundary indicates the legal limits of the state. (Adhikari, 2002).
(2) **Spatial difference:** Boundaries have been loosely described as being linear while, frontiers in contrast, are zonal. As vertical interfaces, boundaries have no horizontal extent but frontiers contain various geographical features and may be marked even if the concerned frontier has advanced, receded or contracted. (Sinha and Ray, 1995).

(3) **In terms of orientation:** The frontier is outer-orientated because its "main attention is directed towards the outlying areas of a state." On the other hand, the boundary is inner-oriented," created and maintained by the will of the central Government. It has no life of its own... Boundary stones are not the boundary itself.... It is the mediated will of the people, abstracted and generalized in the national law, subjected to the tests of international law; it is far removed from the changing desire and aspirations of the inhabitants of the borderland". (Adhikari, 2002).

(4) **In terms of force:** The frontier is a manifestation of centrifugal force whereas boundaries are subject to centripetal force. (Adhikari, 2002).

(5) **The frontier is an integrating factor:** The frontier is an integrating factor. It is a zone of transition from the sphere of one way of life to another. It provides an excellent opportunity for mutual interpenetration and sway. The boundary is on the contrary, a separating factor." (Sinha and Ray It is the boundary that impinges on life...few natural obstacles restrict the movement of persons, things and even ideas as do the boundaries of some states"(Jones). The boundary separates the sovereign political units from one another.

(6) **Frontiers are transitions between geographical regions:** Frontiers are transition between geographical regions, while boundaries purely political in origin and function. Hence frontiers are natural and boundaries are artificial. (All demarcating lines are artificial because they are man made) (Sinha and Ray, 1995).

(7) **Frontiers are representatives of politically unstable states:** Frontiers are representatives of politically instable state. They are a characteristic of Rudimentary socio-political relations marked by lawlessness. The boundary is infact the outer line of effective control exercised by
central government." The boundary of the state is determined according to the principle of effectiveness, which plays an important part in international law. (Sinha and Ray, 1995)

(8) Both frontier and boundaries are manifestations of socio-economic forces: Both of them are manifestations of socio-economic forces and are subjective. The frontiers are the result of adhoc solutions and movements, while the boundaries are fixed and enforced through a more rational and centrally coordinated effort after a popular choice. (Adhikari, 2002).

(9) A frontier is a phenomenon of history: The frontier is a phenomenon of history, and boundary is a phenomenon of present times.

(10) A frontier is immovable: Finally, a frontier is immovable but may lose its importance and change its character with time. On the other hand, the boundaries are by no means immovable. During the first and second world wars with the shift of balance of powers the location of boundaries also shifted. (Sinha and Ray, 1995).

BORDER:
Border is an outer part of the edge and the limit of a country or state. Mutual recognition of demarcated territories within nations gives rise or birth to borders; a border that has politically provided legitimacy between two or more countries opening avenues of interdependence based on political and cultural amelioration. Borders are also made as "frontiers of settlements"; settlements based on negotiations and precautions to decrease hostilities and to build relations of confidence, which later provide that frontier, a politico-legitimate character. Borders are one of the principal elements or mechanism that built bilateral or multilateral relations between nations. With the advent of the modern state system, borders have attained a more permanent stature than yester years. The moment this recognition are shrouded by misunderstandings and misperceptions, then it gives birth to frequent conflictual situations between nations.
Types of border

There are several different types of border:

- **Natural borders** are those that follow natural geographic features, such as rivers, mountain ranges, estuaries and the like. Examples include much of the border between the United States and Mexico which follows the Rio Grande and the border between France and Spain which follows the Pyrenees mountain range. (Murtty, 1986).

- **Geometric borders** (also known as a straight-line border) are those that are formed either by straight lines drawn on a map or nautical chart or by lines that follow the curves of latitude. During the scramble for Africa in the nineteenth century, the European powers divided much of Africa by using arbitrary straight lines drawn on a map, sometimes following longitudes and latitudes, with no regard to topography or extant tribal territories. International borders in the Middle East and North America are also often based on such geometry. It was Bowman who once summed up the role of cartographic evidence in boundary disputes by saying that boundary making is the job of the cartographer and boundary marking that of the statesman. (Murtty, 1986).

- **Cultural Borders:** The terms "border" and "boundary" are physical in origin. The original imagery is not quite abandoned and is even intentionally played out when the terms are used in reference to culture. Cultural border and boundary often connote the border and boundary of a nation, a state or tribal communities, which are clearly identifiable markers. Cultural Borders mean more than boundaries and are often the meeting points of different peoples and cultures. Studying border issues requires attention to interdisciplinary issues and approaches. In an age where globalization has increased economic interactions and integration, increased the ability of terrorists to operate transnational, increased mobility of migrants, the greater ease with which disease may spread globally, and the greater contact of different cultures. (Lineae, 2005).

Cultural borders are those that follow or approximate the boundaries between the homelands of different ethnicities, language groups and other cultural communities. They often date from
before the modern era, and can often be the result of successive military struggles over the centuries. Many international borders in Asia more or less follow such cultural divisions, including the border between India and China. (http://www.w3.org/1999/xhtml). In simple words it can be said that a cultural boundary refers to the presence of some kind of cultural difference cultural boundaries are characteristic of all human societies, traditional as well as modern. A border is a social construct that is political in origin. Across a border power is exercised, as in the political border between two nations. (http://www.edchange.org/multicultural/papers/heewon.html).

ECONOMIC THEORY OF BORDER

Trade Theory

Trade is natural economic activity and is a transaction of goods/products or exchange of things of the purpose of earning and meeting needs. It is a flow of commodities from producers to consumers and producers to producers, which takes place between person human groups and countries. If such exchange of goods is done among neighboring countries beyond international borders or in the vicinity of it by the people living there, it is known as cross-country trade or border trade.

Trade is bound to occur or develop between two neighboring countries or borders and through it with the countries beyond, for both the countries lies on the periphery of the respective country far from the main land or production centers. Owing to proximity and social cultural and ethnical relations, the economic linkages and dependability develop automatically for the mutual benefit of the people of the borders. Such trading activities have been traditionally going on in most of the border areas of the neighboring countries of the world. Various physical, political and environmental conditions of the neighboring countries or borders, however, govern or decide the intensity, volume and the nature of the cross-country or cross-border trade. (Hussain, 2002).

A spatial impact of integration might be released by international factor movement or trade. Trade theory is an essential element of integration theory, which focuses on the economic
impact of trade liberalization. Integration theory as a separate string of economic theory goes back to *Viner* (1950) and was originally based on the neo-classical trade model. At the beginning of the 1980s, new trade theory has emerged and strongly influenced integration theory since that time. Unlike traditional models, more recent trade models incorporate economies of scale and monopolistic competition. In trade models national borders constitute tariff or non-tariff hindrances to trade. (Annekatrin and Silvia, 2002).

**New Economic Geography**

The new economic geography (NEG) deals with the distribution of economic activities across space and explains regional disparities by entirely endogenous location decisions. The first new economic geography model, the so-called core-periphery model was developed by Paul Krugman. In the course of time, Krugman and other authors modified the seminal framework in various respects and developed a wide variety of eight NEG models. These models have in common a combination of elements of traditional regional science and new trade theory. Krugman himself considers a NEG model as a location model that is meant to be comprehensible to trade theorists. Like traditional location models, the NEG originated as a merely static theory. But NEG models, in contrast to location models in the line of *Losch*, are general equilibrium models.

With regard to the spatial impact of integration, two results of new economic geography models are highly relevant:

- Reduction of international trade costs as well as liberalization of cross-border labor movement affect the balance of centripetal and centrifugal forces on an international level. Thus, integration might alter the distribution of population, production factors and firms among countries.

- Reduction of international trade costs affects the balance of centripetal and centrifugal forces on a national level since foreign markets gain importance for buyers and suppliers. Thus integration might alter the distribution of population, production factors and firms within countries.
Border: Features of Exchange

Do territorial disputes have a constant effect on trade over time? One possibility is that as long as government does not act forcibly to stake their claim, economic actors become adjusted to the ambient level of uncertainty and develop economic links to the best of their ability under the tenuous circumstances. However, border disputes have led to serious opportunity costs. Far from living in a "borderless" world, we live for the most part in a well-bordered world. Of course, once territorial disputes turn violent the human suffering and the costs associated with the use of military force mount and potentially create humanitarian crises that far outweigh the economic considerations.

The states try to resolve their disputes peacefully. There is an overwhelming view of legal scholars that the underline principles laid down by the United Nations Charter should be applied to all the interstate disputes. These are: negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement.

Borders define geographic boundaries of political entities or legal jurisdictions, such as governments, states or sub national administrative divisions. They may foster the setting up of buffer zones.

In the past many borders were not clearly defined lines, but were neutral zones called marchlands. This has been reflected in recent times with the neutral zones that were set up along part of Saudi Arabia's borders with Kuwait and Iraq (however, these zones no longer exist). In modern times the concept of a marchland has been replaced by that of the clearly defined and demarcated border. (http://www.w3.org/1999/xhtml).

For the purposes of border control, airports and seaports are also classified as borders. Most countries have some form of border control to restrict or limit the movement of people, animals and goods into or out of the country. In order to cross borders people need passports and visas or other appropriate forms of identification. To stay or work within a country's
borders aliens (foreign persons) may need special immigration documents or permits that authorize them to do so.

Moving goods across a border often requires the payment of excise tax, often collected by customs officials. Animals (and occasionally human beings) moving across borders may need to go into quarantine to prevent the spread of exotic or infectious diseases. Most countries prohibit carrying illegal drugs or endangered animals across their borders. Moving goods, animals or people illegally across a border, without declaring them, seeking permission, or deliberately evading official inspection counts as smuggling. (http:/www.w3.org/1999/xhtml).

There are various causes of cross border exchanges like inward investment in terms of industry, Property development, Tourism, Promotion of export sales, education, health and service sector, Youth and Education Programme etc.

According to Stephen Krasner and Harold Brown national security is defined as maintaining the political territorial integrity of the state ignores many other deeply held goals pursued by states. In a broader sense national security can be defined to include not only the core objectives but a number of other values as well, some of which are economic. Economic well-being has become a basic goal of all political units in the last part of the twentieth century. For the less developed countries economic growth is usually a fundamental objective. (Muthiah, 1987).

**Borderless world: arguments vs. counter arguments**

Unsettled borders are potentially costly to governments. Much has been said in recent years about the value of 'soft' borders in maintaining good relations between neighboring states and creating borderland prosperity.

However, the reality in many parts of the world is that borders are hardening rather than softening as states seek to protect their populations from perceived external threats. (http://www.ibru.dur.ac.uk/conferences/bmiw/index.html). They may even stand in the way of regional economic integration. Whether or not foreign relations come to blows, there is no denying that such disputes can be costly in terms of human life, military expenditures, and
lost trade when conflicts become hot. In deed, disputing the border is a costly drag on bilateral trade. The possibility of trade diversion to a third party is there. But such diversion is not likely to absorb all of the potential conflict between disputants. However, the central problem brought about by the disputed borders is that it involves tremendous economic opportunity costs.

It is largely, if not exclusively, at the hands of the high priests of economic globalization that the imagery of 'a borderless world' has been crafted. Their central argument is that the organization of production and exchange, in the contemporary world, pays little attention to borders of states since both have now "shifted" to global form. Corporations base various elements of production at a number of sites around the world and compete in a global market. Capital is highly mobile and financial markets transfer prodigious volumes around the globe on a daily basis. In this context, it becomes increasingly irrelevant to think in terms of distinct national economies. If borders no longer cage anything in, they become analytically superfluous. (Clark, 2000).

Nature of Border Conflicts (Spiege and Waltz, 1971).

Conflict is defined as configuration of position or action or both, resulting from the intersection in the value achievement spaces of reciprocally significant actors who are separated by functional distance. Border is also a reason behind conflicts. The basic reasons behind this type of conflicts are, Spontaneous changes in the relationship between two countries, Spontaneous loss of natural resources, Spontaneous reduction of functional distance to a consensually tenable level, and cross-border distribution of ethnic groups. Some other reasons of border conflicts are clash of cultures, a disharmony of interests, a disparity of perception- all of which result in the inability of the parties to accept separately and together the environment they live in. the immediate context of any conflict is created by the attributes and the interaction of the parties. (Spiege and Waltz, 1971).

Most of the states have some kind of disputes with their neighbors due to various reasons like low levels of technology in the comparison of neighboring nation, contention on ethnic rather
than resource issues and if the neighboring country is the members of opposing blocs rather than same bloc.

This is either related to land borders or sea boundary. In essence, disputes are territorial in nature. A border dispute is defined as a violent or nonviolent conflict between two primary national antagonists over the demarcation of their shared boundary. The border dispute itself must be over the demarcation of a territorial boundary between two bordering states, or of a land area between their borders of questionable ownership. (Harvey and Thomas, 2005).

The border dispute is essentially the manifestation of the competition among the nations-states for territorial supremacy and natural resources. This dynamic stems from the realist approach to international relations.\(^1\) The border as already mentioned is also the manifestation of the territoriality principle-the cornerstone of the Westphalian nation-state system. There are lots of causes of the border disputes.

**The colonial legacy of border conflicts:** The colonial policies played an important role in some cases. The traditional modes of explaining the territorial disputes are in terms of rational-strategic and economic interests and changing power relations. But the normative and emotional elements are not less significant. Some experts argue that the power-political perspective is misleading as it gives too much emphasis upon the dynamics of power.\(^2\)

**State's quest for power and supremacy:** According to realist paradigm territorial disputes arise mainly because of power-political interests and favorably power relations. A realist understanding of territorial disputes stresses the territorial claims occur for selfish reasons. Realists nevertheless believe that power drive usually finds geographical expressions. Territory is seen as a fundamental power base providing important strategic and economic

\(^1\) The interstate politics has characterized by the omnipotent struggle for survival and the strategy of self-help. The purpose of statecraft is national survival, in a hostile environment—an anarchic international system. Towards this end, no means is more important than the acquisition of power and territory, and no principle is more important than self-help. Realists thus perceive politics primarily as a conflictual interaction. Ashley J. Tellis, "Reconstructing Political Realism: The Long March to Scientific Theory", *Security Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, Winter 1997, p. 3.

\(^2\) Ibid.
benefits to states. Gilpin points out that changing power relation in the international system usually results in territorial distribution.

**Territorial disputes:** According to Welch, disputes over territory are among the issue that might be expected to trigger a sense of injustice most often in international affairs. In normative explanation of territorial disputes holds that territorial claims are often motivated by the sense that a piece of territory rightly belongs to 'us' rather than by strategic or economic values. Border disputes are often based on views of history. In general the frequency of border dispute is highest between nations that have:

- Roughly equal levels of power;
- A relatively low or low levels of technology;
- Contention on ethnic rather than resource issues; and
- Members of opposing blocs rather than same bloc.

Border conflicts are too harmful for both the nations indulging in conflicts. Due to these disputes, an arm race and power imbalance will be occurring in the region, a threat of third party intervention will occur. These conflicts will weaken the economies of both the nations and a political instability will take rise in indulging countries. These conflicts are solved by agreements, negotiations and treaties.

**Agreement:** Agreements are formal acceptance of an accredited diplomat by a receiving (host) government. (Cathal,) This is a most common instrument of solving conflicts from early period. It was not until 1961, however, that a general agreement about the legal bases of diplomatic relations was arrived at and codified into a treaty. This agreement was principally fulfilled by the arrival of large number of new, post colonial; states that had no experience of the essentially *de facto* rules operated the older states system. It was also partly the consequence of deliberate breaches of those rules, which had occurred during the early cold war. (Keith and Richard, 1995). Agreements, which are designated for achieving peace called peace agreements. Peace agreements can be classified in three forms.

(1) **Pre-Negotiation Agreements:** Parties move from violent forms of addressing the conflict when they perceive that they can potentially gain more at the table than they can away from it.
However, often, from the point of moving towards the negotiating table, the process is one of 'Trial and Error" for each actor and the process is characterized by stops and starts, progress and break down. The pre-negotiation stage typically revolves around who is going to negotiate and with what status. Often pre-negotiation agreements are not inclusive but form bilateral agreements between some of the players. (Cherestine, 2000).

(2) Framework or Substantive Agreements: These tend to be more inclusive of the main groups involved in waging the war by military means. Their emergence is often marked by a *handshake moment*, signifying a 'historical compromise' between enemies. These types of agreements begin to set out a framework for resolving the substantive issues of the dispute. (Cherestine, 2000).

(3) Implementation Agreements: These types of agreements begin to take forward and develop aspects of the framework, fleshing out their details. By their Nature these agreements involve new negotiations and in practice often see a measure of renegotiation as parties’ tests whether they can claw back concessions made at an earlier stage. These agreements typically include all of the parties to the framework agreement. Sometimes these agreements are not documented, and sometimes agreement takes other forms, such as agreed legislation. (Cherestine, 2000).

**Bilateral Agreement:** Each and all agreement is signed by two or multiple actors. When an arrangement, dispute, interaction or treaty, between just two states or actors is signed is called bilateral agreement. (Nolan, 1668-69).

**Treaty:** An instrument by which one or more states solve their controversies or coordinate their activities.³ Abiding written agreement between or among states, or with other international personalities, enumerating rules and establishing mutual and binding rights and obligations under international law. Treaties may, but need not, establish ad hoc or even permanent mechanisms for resolving disputes. They always require consent, with the rare but

³ How to improve the diplomatic simulation at Diplomacy Casus Foederis Diplomacy Diplomatic Simulation Ambassadors Europe 1914 Treaties Agreement Available in http://www.casusfoederis.org/diplomacy-uk.htm
notable exception of a diktat they may and do cover virtually any subject, from the usual concerns with security and commerce to migratory bird protection and long term disposition of the mineral resources of the moon, treaties are created and undergo adoption by a four step process; *negotiations, signature, ratification, and finally, entry into force*. Subsequently they may or may not be offered for registration. When points of disagreement arise, they are addressed by one or more of these *methods of interpretation*: grammatical, historical, logical, restrictive, and systematic. Nomenclature used for treaties is varied but of minor consequence.

There are two important distinctions among treaties:

(1) Treaties are "executed" or "executory". The first are precise and have an agreed time frame or specific object in view, and once there is a designated task and is completed the passage into history. The second are not time bound, govern ongoing transactions, and may anticipate and accommodate future conditions and developments.

(2) Treaties are self-executing or non-self-executing. The first do not require implementing legislation to take effect in domestic law; the second do but note, if signed and notified, but not implemented, the failure to implement domestically does not absolve the state concerned from incurring an international dereliction. Lastly, treaties may be terminated (abrogated) in a variety of ways:

(a) Fundamentally altered circumstances, which render them moot.

(b) In accordance with terms of the treaty itself, such as completing the objective in view or reaching a specified date for termination. (Nolan, 1688-1689).

(c) Mutual consent,

(d) Violation

(e) War, and

(f) Extinction of one of the parties, though even in this extreme case certain obligations and rights may accrue to the successor state. The most recent codification of treaty procedures was the Vienna convention on the law of treaties. (Nolan, 1688-1689). The most significant advance in rulemaking has been the innovation of the multilateral treaty and formalization of international law. This has been one of the major achievements of the European society of
states. Prior to the treaty of Westphalia (1648), international treaties were negotiated bilaterally and covered a limited range of subject. (Robert, 1983).

**Treaty State:** A state, which has adhered to a given multilateral treaty, as in "China has a direct interest in (such and such matter) because it is a treaty power." (Nolan, 1690).

**India and China:**

Historical records show that the Sino-Indian relations can be traced back to 2nd century B.C. Two famous Chinese Buddhist monks Fa Hien and Huen Tsang visited India to learn the Buddhist scriptures, and the Indian monk Budhi-Darma came to China to preach and established the Chan sect. Touching briefly on the principal strands in this vast panoramic yet strangely fascinating, story of the India china relations. It may be noted that the beginning go back to the first decade of the present century- to all that followed the return, from Lhasa, of the victorious British Commissioner, Colonel Francis Younghusband. (Mehra, 1974). It gives penetration to British India in making military, diplomatic and trade relations with Tibet and reducing effects of china. British India after getting an agreement signed with Russia in 1907 was able to reduce influence of Russia in Asia. The October 1911 Revolution cause a great downfall in the power and presence of China in Asian Continent. (Mehra, 1974). Due to this downfall British India try to demark its borders. For this reason it called on a conference at Simla in 1914 which was attended by representatives of British Indian Government, Tibetan Government and Chinese Government. The main issue in this conference was demarcation of Indo-Tibet-China border. The border which was demarked by this conference was called Mc Mahon Line. During the Second World War China fought a war of Resistance against Japan, the Indian National Congress sent a medical team to China headed by Dr. Kotnis who devoted his life to the liberation cause of the Chinese people. (http://chinaembacy.org.in/eng/).

In the early 1950s, China and India enjoyed amicable contacts. The two countries established diplomatic relations on April 1, 1950 and India was one of the first non-socialist countries to establish diplomatic relations with China. In 1954, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai and Indian
Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru exchanged visits. The two leaders jointly initiated the famous Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Premier Zhou paid another visit to India in 1956. In the mid-1950s, a slogan "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai", which means the Indian and Chinese peoples were brothers, was known to every household.

India and China, two large Asian countries, sharing a border of approximately 3,800 km, with a combined population of over two and a half billion, make up the world's one-third population. The two countries, for the last fifty years and more, are plagued with misunderstandings concerning border disputes. Such disputes have taken shape due to the change of frequent world political order in the last hundred years.

During the early part of the twentieth century, neither India nor China, were countries independent enough to take decisions on their own, rather such decisions were made and taken by major colonial and imperial powers. They took their decisions, giving less heed to history and traditions, paying more attention to economy, political and the terms "border" and "boundary" are physical in origin. The original imagery is not quite abandoned and is even intentionally played out when the terms are used in reference to culture.

Despite their wariness, India and China will increasingly be pressed by circumstances on the ground to address their bilateral problems across the Himalayan frontier. Many of the long-lasting problems between the two nations are centered on the Himalayas- these include the boundary disputes which are not solved by Simla agreement, at another level, each side nurse's huge political grievances that are its right to operate across the Himalayas have been severally curtailed by the other. India is concerned that its traditional cultural and trading links with Tibet has snapped under Chinese control. China, on the other hand, believes that India prevents it from establishing full intercourse with the kingdoms on the southern side of the Himalayas, such as Nepal and Bhutan. Deepening this sense of injury has been the proclaimed

---

4 Peaceful principles of co-existence or Panchsheel, contains the following five principles:
- Peaceful co-existence
- Respect for each others' territorial integrity
- Non-interference in internal affairs
- Non-aggression
- Economic development
loss of territories as well as the notions of buffer states and spheres of influence. (Raja Mohan, 2003).

Cultural border and boundary often connote the border and boundary of a nation, a state or a tribal community, which are clearly identifiable markers of strategic gains. The Sino-India border dispute is similarly a child of such attempts of redefining territories between nations. The basic dispute between India and China regarding borders has its origins in the Trilateral Agreement signed in Simla in the year 1914. This was entirely a border agreement, clearly demarcating the status of Tibet, in relation to China. The plenipotentiaries of British India signed these agreements under McMahon. British India and Tibet ratified the treaty but China initiated it, however due to various circumstances that emerged, that prompted it not to ratify.

Sino-Indian border is 2500 spread from Kashmir to Tallu of Arunachal Pradesh in north-west, where the borders of China, India and Burma merge. This demarcation of border is divided into three sectors: Western Sector, Middle Sector and Eastern Sector

**Brief History of India-China Relations after 1947**

After independence in 1947 for the first time Jawaharlal Nehru visited China in October 1954 and was said to have been amazed by the "tremendous emotional response" from the Chinese people. He also met Mao Zedong for the first and last time. Under Nehru and his doctrine of Panchsheel (five principles of co-existence), Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai was the mantra of India-China ties. From 1959, ties became strained with border skirmishes and discovery of a Chinese road in Aksai chin. That year, the Dalai Lama fled from Tibet to India further worsening relations.

In 1960, Chou En-lai visited India. He proposed to Nehru that China would relinquish claim on Aksai chin if India gave up claim on Arunachal Pradesh. India rejected the proposal. In October 1962, the war broke out and Chinese troops entered deep into India.
In 1970s, relations languished with China supplying conventional weapons as well as nuclear arms in 1976 to Pakistan. However, in 1976 there was a restoration of ambassadorial ties.

Later in 1980s, there was a thaw with Chinese foreign minister Huang Hua visiting India in 1981. Though there were few rounds of border talks between 1981 and 1987, tension remained. In 1988, Rajiv Gandhi became the first Indian Prime Minister to visit China since 1954. He met Deng Xiaoping, Zch Rongji and other leaders resulting in the formation of working groups for negotiating the border issue and promoting trade. The Panchsheel doctrine was resurrected.

In 1990s, ties steadily improved with Chinese Premier Li Peng visiting India in May 1992 followed by President Jiang Zemin in 1996. In between, Prime Minister Narasimha Rao visited Beijing and signed the Agreement on the maintenance of Peace and Tranquility along the Line of Actual Control on India-China border. Relations nose-dived after the Pokhran blast in 1998, when Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee cited a Chinese threat as a reason.

Post-2000, Vajpayee's visit to Beijing in June 2003 and an earlier visit to China by President K.R.Narayanan paved the way for better relations. A Declarations on Principles for Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation was jointly issued in 2003. Later in 2005 and 2006 Chinese Premier and President visited India and joint declaration on border were signed and 2008 Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited China.

"China is our important and largest neighbor involving our economic and security interests. Both of us decided to dealing the final settlement of the boundary issue for the need to reinforce friendly relations. A number of confidence measures are now in place along the line of control sustain Ned friendship between India and China will lay a durable foundation for a peaceful and prosperous Asia" (Gujral, 2003).