



punjab geographer

A JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF
PUNJAB GEOGRAPHERS, INDIA

VOLUME 3

OCTOBER 2007



INDO-NEPAL OPEN BORDER: IS THERE NEED TO REVIEW THE FRIENDSHIP

Vinod K. Bhardwaj
Mrs Geeta Sharma

Abstract

The present research paper is concerned with the events, to be seen with the eyes of mutual friendship, between India and Nepal and to conclude about the Indo-Nepal border and its current status. The relevance of the open border between India and Nepal from economic and trade points of view is another aspect of relationship, which is being practiced under the "India and Nepal: Trade and Transit Treaty-1950" and the other consecutive mutual agreements between the two governments. But the utility of this open border to the public, living either side to the border, is different from the aforesaid. In the last decade of political paradigm in Nepal it is tried by some anti Indian minds to articulate minor problems to the level that they are propagated as major issues between India and Nepal. Border dispute, regularisation of the border; Mahakali Hydro Power dispute etc. are some of them. It is also a fact that the magnitude of the people, crossing the border daily, weekly and seasonally, is more from Nepal than India, which states that Nepal is benefited more through this border than India. The opinion of the borderians, stated in this paper, is based on field survey conducted in the border areas of Uttarakhand. Majority of the respondents are in favour to maintain the status quo at the border. They discarded to get it converted into restricted or liberalised; however the proposal to start registration system was appreciated by them. There is need of bilateral efforts to strengthen the friendly environment between India and Nepal.

Introduction

The Indo-Nepal border is an open international border. The people of India and Nepal are allowed to move across the border freely, without any passport or visa. However, Nepal has recently imposed the necessity of passport to Indians, who travels through airways. This is just for the sake of safety and nothing else. According to the "Peace and Friendship Treaty- 1950" between India and Nepal, the two countries were granted many privileges for the welfare of their public. It is a joint responsibility of the two countries to serve security interest mutually and to co-operate

each other in various matters such as socio-economic and infrastructural development alongwith trade and commerce. The early post-independent phase of the mutual relations between the two countries was smooth and fruitful for both but after dominance of the communists in Nepal there is fear of disobeying the aforesaid treaty. Besides, the Maoists themselves posed threat to Indians living in Nepal, whereas there is no such threat to Nepalese in India. Prior to April, 2006 the entire border area of India and Nepal remained under the shadow of the Maoists' fear, which was further exaggerated by the Naxalites of India.

This situation has tentatively normalised after the decline of the Nepalese monarchy, because the Maoists have joined the main political stream, however this intermittent peace may not be longer. Here it is important to quote that despite cultural similarity throughout the border, there is successive increase in the number of grievances, more of Nepalese and lesser of India. This changing environment is neither in favour of Nepal nor in India. This paper is a part of a Post Doctoral Research Fellowship of the University Grants Commission of India. Efforts have been made to cover varying aspects of the Indo-Nepal open border and its associated issues along with feasibility of borderless South Asia in series of papers under the project. This paper based on the responses of the borderian of Uttarakhand is one of them.

Objectives

Major objectives of the study are to know:

1. Magnitude of the people crossing the border:
 - a. Daily
 - b. Weekly
 - c. Seasonally
 - d. Annually/occasionally
2. Reasons for crossing the border.
3. Impacts of the open border on
4. Misuse of the border, if any, and
5. Is there any need to change the present status of the border,
6. If yes, then nature of change.

Methodology

Both primary and secondary data are collected for this work. In order to present a systematic analysis of the information district was decided as unit for interpretation. The primary data are generated through field survey by conducting interviews as well as discussions. This paper is analysed on the basis of the public opinion / response, obtained from

149 respondents of Nainital (43), Pithoragargh (27), Champawat (19) and Udham Singh Nagar (60) districts of Uttarakhand state. An introductory profile of the respondents is given in Annexure- 1. This survey was conducted only in Indian side of Indo-Nepal border on April 15-23, 2006. The following conditions were laid down to select a person as respondent in public opinion survey:

1. Age – respondent's age was decided not to be less than 30 years.
2. Stay duration – Minimum stay of 20 years, or frequently visiting the area for last 20 years.
3. Known to border crossing impacts.
4. Should not be a member of any political party.
5. Must be engage in some economic activity.

The data are organised in the form of tables to facilitate the discussion.

Study Area

The present study is focused on 4 districts of Uttarakhand state, namely Udham Singh Nagar, Nainital, Champawat and Pithoragarh, lying in the three distinct physiographical zones i.e. mountains, hills and *terai*.

Review of Open Border Practice in the World

On the basis of the available sources it is clear that the border issues are very complicated. The developed economies wish to penetrate into the developing ones in order to capture their market on one hand, and not to allow their progress by posing their own conditions on the other. USA-Mexico and USA-Canada are the two open borders, directly related with USA. The length of the USA-Canada border is 8,891 Km. (including 2477 Km. with Alaska and the small patches of the marine boundary such as Pacific, Atlantic and Arctic coasts and the Great Lakes region)¹

and that of the USA-Mexico border is 3141 Km.² The USA-Canada border is the largest common border in the world, whereas the USA-Mexico border is frequently crossed border in the world. As per estimations the highest number of people (350 million) crosses the USA-Mexico border every year.

Another latest successful example of the open border practice in the world is the European Union. The origin of the EU was basically through a Regional Economic Agreement (The Treaty of Paris-1951) among six member states (France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg and Western Germany)³. This number has now grown to 27 members. The union came into existence on 7th Feb. 1992. The member states entertain their own identity alongwith sharing of intra- union flow of human beings and products. Here it is not a model of Borderlessness, rather it is an example of conditional open borders. Success of this practice lies in the socio-cultural and politico-economic homogeneity of the region, especially among the member states. The origin of the union was basically to promote regional prosperity through mutual co-operation. This may also be seen as a reaction of downfall of the USSR. Because it was realised that unless there is counter force in Europe (a substitute of the USSR) American intervention might penetrate into the region with more intensity. Another reason for its emergence was to keep distance from Russia, as many of its member states became independent after the disintegration of the former USSR.

Briefly it may be inferred that whatsoever are the reasons, the open borders are in practice just because of; (i) common geographic factors, (ii) lack of territorial disputes, (iii) commonness in politico-economic conditions, (iv) common goal of development and (v) no external interference or disturbance.

In case of the South Asian region all the aforesaid characteristics are extremely opposite. There is neither geographical identity nor socio-cultural commonness in the region. Politico-economic disparities further exaggerate the rift among the member states of the SAARC. There are a number of bilateral and multilateral issues, prevailing in the South Asia. Moreover, rivalry attitude of some of the capable neighbouring states is responsible for the ever unrest in the region. Obviously, in this situation there is even no remote possibility of mutual trust.

Emergence of SAARC could also be seen as a need to promote regional co-operation through strengthening trust, increasing intra-regional trade, and addressing common threats altogether. But the earlier phase was not as successful as it was supposed to be. Without blaming any of party it is a common observation that the Association for Regional Co-operation was smoothly acting/performing non-cooperation. As a result seriousness of the bilateral issues has increased. Internationalisation of bilateral issues and their foreign based backing has further exaggerated their amplitude.

The Indo-Nepal Border

The Indo-Nepal border, which is 1751 Km long⁴, was jointly demarcated on December 8, 1816 by the British (the Indian rulers) and the contemporary Nepalese government, through *Sugauli Treaty*, which was further amended in 1860⁵. The soul of the treaty and the need of the open border were further acknowledged by the independent India in 1950, when the treaty of "*Peace and Friendship*" was commenced between the two governments. The treaty has 10 articles, in which the article 7 allows the people of both the nations to move across the border freely, to reside, own property, trading and commerce etc. in the other country⁶.

Passing the age of about 160 years, the border remained unchanged and also almost disputeless.

During the British period, people emigrated from India and settled into the terai of Nepal, whereas the emigration from independent India was economically oriented. The magnitude of this later phase of migration was more in the early decades and later on it decreased gradually. The main reasons, behind the decrease in magnitude of emigration from India, were the politics of the contemporary government of Nepal. On the other hand the history of emigrants from Nepal to India is as old as the origin of these states. During British period, the Nepalese soldiers called "*Gurukhas*" were recruited in Indian Army, who fought against Indian Regimes. The *Gurukhas*, who fought here, ultimately settled down in India and became Indian citizen. Now this fact itself shows mass Nepalese emigration to India. Darjeeling, Sikkim, Dehradun, Pithoragarh, Tanakpur etc. are the areas having dominance of the population of Nepalese origin.

There are 22 routes⁷, agreed for entrance between India and Nepal, are as follows:

S. No. Post along the Indo-Nepal border

- 1 Sukhia Pokhari- Pashupati Nagar
- 2 Naxallbari—Kakerbhitta
- 3 Galgalia-Bhadrapur
- 4 Jogbani-Birat Nagar
- 5 Bhimnagar-Setobandhe
- 6 Kunauli-Rajbiraj
- 7 Jayanagar-Janakpur-Siraha
- 8 Birtamod (Sursand)-Jaleswar
- 9 Sonabarsa-Malangwa
- 10 Bairgania-Gaur
- 11 Raxaul-Birgunj
- 12 Nautanwa-Bhairahawa
- 13 Khunwa-Taulihawa
- 14 Barhni-Krishnanagar
- 15 Jarwa-Koliabas

- 16 Nepalganj Road- Nepalganj
- 17 Katemiyaghat-Rajapur
- 18 Tikonia-Sati (Kailali)-Prithvipur
- 19 Gauriphanta-Dhangadhi
- 20 B a n b a s a - M a h e n d r a N a g a r
- 21 Jhulaghat (Pithoragarh)—Mahakali
- 22 Dharchula (Pithoragarh)—Darchula

Issues and Responses

Initially opening of this border by the British was a part of their power and security strategy. Just after independence, continuation of this open border was; (i) to continue friendly relations, established by the British, (ii) political compulsion due to China factor, (iii) common socio-cultural factor, and (iv) mutual socio-economic relations among the people of India and Nepal. The socio-cultural characteristics of the people, living either side to the border, are so identical that the border seems to be unnecessary or imposed division of the people. Here, it does not mean that the Nepalese land belong to India. But it simply states that this sort of common attributes are favourable for the borderless practices. However, one positive aspect of Indo-Nepal bilateral relations is that none of the two countries internationalise their any issue, even did not invite third party intervention. The new democratic government in Nepal may try to strengthen relations with India as there is no monarchical interference at present The government itself will decide the relations in the new political inning. There are ample opportunities/ reasons to continue the present status of the Indo-Nepal border.

Diversified responses were obtained from the respondents during the survey. Major diversification was found on the basis of the physiographic divisions. The people of Pithoragarh and Champawat districts were clearly advocating in favour of the Nepalese workers. Their argument was that these labours

are honest, dedicated, hard working, available on lower wages and serve for a longer duration. So the contribution of these people in the hilly economy is acknowledgeable. When they were asked about the Indian labours, working across the border their response was quite logistic. They said that in mountainous and hilly areas of India are more prosperous and so more economic opportunities are available in India than in Nepal. Therefore, the direction of the labour movement is from Nepal to India in the higher altitudes. Hence, there was no chance to verify about reciprocate behaviour.

When the Nepalese respondents were asked about the aforesaid points they were out rightly in favour of the current status of the border. They said that their most of the needs, personal, social or economic, whatsoever, are fulfilled from adjacent Indian areas. Though they were hardly able to speak loudly because of the Maoist influence, but their over all inclination was towards sustaining the openness of the border. When they were asked about the reciprocate behaviour with Indians in Nepal, they did not answer. However, the cordial relations between the Indians and Nepalese in the two districts are appreciable.

Cross Border Movement

The public response, obtained through the survey reveals that more people cross the border in the *terai* region than the Hills.

Similarly, majority is of the people coming from Nepal to India than from India to Nepal. In the Table 1 first three categories of the movers; daily, weekly and seasonally across the border clearly indicate the magnitude and direction of movement. In these three categories more people move from Nepal to India than those from India to Nepal. In last and fourth category i.e. annual, more people cross from India to Nepal than from Nepal to India, but these people are basically residents of Nepal, who annually move to their home town. Likewise, the people, who are coming annually from Nepal to India, are Indians, coming to their home towns annually. Therefore all these categories clearly indicate that the number of the beneficiaries from this border is more of Nepalese than Indians (Table1).

Cause / Reason for Crossing the Border

It was equally important to know that “Is there any difference in cause / reason of movement across the border from both the sides?” Knowing the reasons of the movement it was found that certainly there are some common causes for the cross border movement from both sides, however the cause-wise magnitude of movement is clearly different. Cause / reason-wise and duration-wise movement, across the border are:

(a) Daily movement

It is noted that among the daily movers

Table1
Uttarakhand: Cross Border Movement along Indo-Nepal Border (Number of Persons)

Duration	Daily	Weekly	Seasonally	Annual	
Origin From	Hilly areas along the border				
	from Nepal	1300 - 1500	4000 - 5000	35000 - 40000	6000 – 7000
	from India	400 - 500	900 - 1000	7000 - 8000	20000- 25000
	Terai area along the border				
	from Nepal	4000 - 5000	8000 - 8500	125000-150000	10000-20000
	from India	1800 - 2500	3300 - 4000	50000 - 75000	45000 - 50000

Source: Based on the field survey.

Table 2
Uttarakhand: Causes-wise daily movement across the Indo-Nepal Border
(Respondents in percentage)

Causes of movement	Terai Region		Hills & Mountains	
	From India	from Nepal	from India	from Nepal
Domestic	6	17	4	19
Daily needs	9	8	3	18
Education	0	9	0	7
Health Facili	0	5	0	4
Commercial	13	10	16	9
Labour	17	31	19	25
Social	21	5	26	6
Tourism & Religious	23	6	17	1
Others	11	9	15	11

Source: Based on the field survey.

the majority of them are coming to India for labour purpose followed by the people coming for their daily needs and domestic purpose. On the other hand the majority of the people, going from India to Nepal are tourists followed by the people going for social purpose and also for commercial and labour purposes respectively (Table 2).

Some of the reasons for crossing the border are: Marketing (domestic goods,

garments, provisions from India; electronic goods and Chinese domestic goods from Nepal), labour, social relations, social functions, educational facility, health facility, services, repairing facility, tailoring facility, transport business, other business and economic deals.

(b) Weekly movement

The people, who are moving across the border after a week, have a few less reasons

Table 3
Uttarakhand: Causes-wise Weekly Movement across Indo-Nepal Border
(Respondents in percentage)

Causes of movement	Terai Region		Hills & Mountains	
	From India	from Nepal	from India	from Nepal
Domestic	3	22	2	17
Service /Job	18	21	20	27
Commercial	37	18	30	18
Labour	4	2	2	0
Social	5	9	13	9
Tourism & Religious	26	17	20	17
Entertainment	1	3	0	2
Others	6	8	13	20

Source: Based on the field survey.

Table 4
Uttarakhand: Causes of Seasonal Movement across Indo- Nepal Border
(Respondents in percentage)

Causes of movement	Terai Region		Hills & Mountains	
	From India	from Nepal	from India	from Nepal
Agro labour	6	37	0	39
Indus. Labour	32	15	7	4
Other labour	27	23	33	28
Petty business	12	0	16	1
Tourism & Religious	17	11	26	2
Others	6	14	18	6

Source: Based on the field survey.

than those crossing the border daily. However, the magnitude of weekly movement is more than daily cross border movement (Table 3). The reasons for this movement are different for those, who enter from Nepal, however they are still the same for the Indians, going into Nepal. People, coming from Nepal are mainly from service / job class, who weekly migrate across the border. More people cross to India than going to Nepal. Higher magnitude of this movement suggests that most of the people engaged in this movement are Indians working in Nepal. However, most of them are Nepalese, who have settled in India, but still working in Nepal. It is worth mentioning that the people, who migrate for commercial purpose, dominate

among the weekly migrants, especially among the Indians (Table 3). Same is the case for tourists.

(c) Seasonal movement

It is interesting to note that the flow of cross border movement is in favour of agricultural labour from Nepal to India while more non- agricultural labour cross the border seasonally from India to Nepal (Table 4). Similarly, more people cross border from India to Nepal for tourism and religious purposes both from terai and mountainous regions. Almost one- sided flow from India to Nepal was observed in case of people crossing for business (Table 4).

Table 5
Uttarakhand: Causes of Annual Movement across Indo-Nepal Border
(Respondents in percentage)

Causes of movement	Terai Region		Hills & Mountains	
	From India	from Nepal	from India	from Nepal
Business	22	45	37	32
Service class	13	20	9	17
Military	0	19	0	35
Industrial labours	49	4	26	6
Others	16	12	10	28

Source: Based on the field survey.

(d) Annual Movement

Annual movement across the border reveals that industrial labour cross from India to Nepal on annual basis on the other hand, movement of agricultural labour from Nepal to India is altogether missing. It is interesting to note that in the terai region 45 per cent respondents cross from Nepal to India for business while counter flow from India to Nepal is only 22 per cent (Table 5). However, in mountainous region more people cross from India to Nepal than vice-versa. One sided annual movement from India to Nepal is noticed in case of military personals (Table 5). It is associated with soldiers returning to their homes in Nepal on annual leave. This flow is more intensive in hilly areas than in the terai region.

Impact of Open Border

So far as the impact of the open border is concerned it has been equally acknowledged by most of the Indians as well as Nepalese respondents that the current status of the border is very essential for social and economic development of the region. One important notable fact is that the market development in the area, which is, of course, a part of its economic development, is very peculiar. Number of shops in the area are openly selling foreign goods without any restriction. In fact this is a most growing business in the area. It is an attraction for tourists too. Although it is mostly illegal and an adverse impact of the border, yet it is a contribution of the open border in the economic development of the area. On social issues the hilly respondents have straight opposite view than the terai respondents. Both Indians and Nepalese are cordial and co-operative in Indian hills whereas these two groups are neither co-operative nor friendly in the terai, areas except the businessmen. In terai, the shadow of the social conflicts between the

hilly people and the terai people may clearly be observed. Moreover the Nepalese, who enter in India for their economic purpose, have different attitude of social behaviour than those who are living in Nepal. Social exploitation of the Indian community is commonly raised by many of the Indian respondents during the survey. No direct acknowledgement of smuggling or women and child trafficking have been made by respondents, however it is indirectly pointed out silently.

Opinion about the Status of Border

Prime objective of the survey was to find out that what people think about the current status of this border. It is clear from the above narrations that neither the Indians nor the Nepalese are in favour of change in the status of the border. Even keeping the security issue in mind there was hardly any change in opinion of the hilly respondents. They say that there is no infiltration through hills. Their argument, that being less inhibited any stranger, entering into the area, may easily be identified, is logistic but the possibility of illegal entry is easier and safe through this area. Therefore, insecurity through this area can not be denied. Earlier the hills and mountainous areas in Nepal were under the influence of Maoists, whose fear was clearly visualised during the survey at Dharchula and even in Pithoragarh. The Indian hills were their dens, which was obviously due to this open border.

The view of the respondents of the terai was different from those of hills. They are quite aware of security threats to India through this border. They added that there is no threat from Nepalese but possibility of illegal entrance does always stand along this border. Moreover, they seem to be in fear of increase in organized crimes along the border. Therefore, majority of the people in the terai accept the need of change in the status of the border from security point of

Table 6
Uttarakhand: Response about the Change in the Present Status of the Border

Respondents	Place	YES	NO	Neutral	Total
Indians	Terai	34	8	6	48
	Hills	9	32	5	46
	Total	43	40	11	94
Nepalese	Terai	4	19	3	26
	Hills	1	21	7	29
	Total	5	40	10	55
Total		48	80	21	149
Total Respondents = 149		Indians = 94		Nepalese = 55	

Source: Based on the field survey.

view, however they refused to change it into restricted border. Nepalese were least concerned about the question of security threats to India through this border. Their own interest of economic security being at priority either they were neutral or refused from the need of any change. (Table 6)

The respondents, belonging to the business community, were not in favour of any restriction along this border but they agreed to apply registration system at entry points along this border in order to avoid illegal entries and to strengthen vigilance. In response to the question of the proposed mode / type of change in the border most of the respondents were in favour of identity card based checking of the people, moving across the border, but they opposed passport-visa system. Registration system was opted as second mode of security check along the border. It was also suggested

that the habitants of the border area must be excluded from the registration process. They may be issued a special identity card with one time investigation and on that basis they must be allowed to move across the border. (Table 7)

Observations

1. The Nepalese migration to the Indian border zone is the consequence of the lack of economic resources / livelihood which forces the habitants to emigrate. This is a most common practice in hilly and mountainous areas of Nepal.
2. The Nepalese emigration to India is different from that of Indian emigration to Nepal, because most of the Nepali immigrants coming in India, wish to settle down here and it is a sort of permanent migration, whereas, those who are going from India to Nepal, are basically business

Table 7
Uttarakhand: Respondents' View about the Change in the Status of the Border

Respondents	Restricted	Semi- restricted			More open	Total
		Registration	Identity card	Total		
Indian	0	19	24	43	Nil	43
Nepalese	0	0	3	3	2	5
Total	0	19	27	46	2	48

Source: Based on the field survey.

oriented people and hence, are not permanent migrants. Lack of resources, low productivity, less agro-land, lack of employment opportunities, low wages etc. are some of the reasons for emigration from Nepal. In contrast to these push factors, the economic opportunities in India act as pull factor which attract more people from neighbouring countries, particularly from Nepal. Indo-Nepal open border is an accelerating factor. The statistics published by the government of Nepal regarding the people of Indian origin in Nepal and also the people of Nepalese origin living in India are enough to prove the fact.

3. Besides the natural / economic factors, other social factors, such as relations across the border and marriages also motivate cross border movement. These factors in fact appreciated the regional shifting of population from mountains and hills to the terai which is already more populous, whereas the exploitation, social discrimination, theft, loot and ill-treatment with the people of Indian origin in tarai of Nepal are some of the push factors, which have caused the beginning of retreat (returning) of Indians from Nepal.
4. Labourers from India are required in Nepal for industry, tailoring, building construction, carpet industry and biri manufacturing, whereas the Nepalese labour on the other hand is equally required to work as domestic servant, servants in private offices, security guards, agricultural labour etc. It is worth mentioning that the apple farming in Himachal Pradesh is more dependent on Nepalese labour than local labour. The seasonal labour required either in India or in Nepal is mostly employed on contract basis either through contractors or through local people.
5. The areas either side of the border are densely populated because on the Indian side, both Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are over populous states, where lack of employment opportunities and excess of labourers are the reasons for emigration. On the other hand the terai of Nepal is having almost 50 per cent of the population of the country alone whereas its geographical area is only 17 per cent. In this region, excess of economic immigrants from hills and mountains have settled down which later on move outward as emigrant to India. Majority among the habitants on both sides of the border are residing in rural areas.
6. Presently, the innocent society is being targeted by the expanding political terrorism globally. India, being a developing / emerging economic power and due to some other political reasons, is in the hit list of various international terrorists' organisations. In this situation this border is very unsafe, because the unwanted and anti-Indian people can enter into India through Nepal.
7. Smuggling, which is another severe problem, being faced by India, is also dominant through this border⁸. Drugs, gold, electronic items, Chinese goods, Korean and Taiwanese cloths etc. are some of the common articles being smuggled. There is no official acknowledgement about smuggling but sufficient indirect sources are reporting about this type of dealings. Even in news papers such news are published.
8. Illegal migration from Bangladesh to Nepal is taking place through India. Infiltration along Indo-Nepal border⁹ is becoming a dominant practice, which is harmful for India from social and security points of view. This border is relatively a safe route for militants to enter and exit from India. Few such cases have also been identified by

security forces of Nepal and India¹⁰. Growing militancy along this border is a serious matter which has attracted both the Indian and Nepalese Governments to be alert and to safeguard the territory. Growing/expanding ISI network along this border¹¹ is of course the main cause, of growing militancy and internal separatist's activities.

Conclusion

On the basis of above discussion, it is concluded that majority of the respondents were in favour to continue the current status of the border. Neither Indians nor Nepalese are in favour of any kind of change in its current status. Both the Indians and the Nepalese residing in the mountains and hilly areas are living symbiotically and hence they depend on each other. Contribution of Nepalese labours in the economic development in Indian side is appreciably acknowledged. Their contribution is specially quoted in agriculture and in market oriented labours. Unlike hills the respondents in the terai refuse to accept any specific contribution of Nepalese in local socio-economic spheres. However, they do accept that market oriented development of the area is because of the Nepalese who are the main consumers / users of the facilities. Tourism is another reason of booming in market economy of the area, which is also due to the open border.

Despite positive contribution of the Indo-Nepal border and the demand of regularization of the border from Nepal side the bond of friendly relations between the two nations is still in a co-operative phase. However, besides the socio-economic implications of the border there are some sensitive issues, important from humanitarian and national' points of view. The two aspects socio-cultural and economic needs of border areas and the social behaviour as well as

national security can not be compared altogether.

In brief, the soul of the open border is favourable for the citizens in order to strengthen socio-economic relations and to develop cultures, but the recent practices are no more favourable to India and therefore some review steps to check illegal trade, illegal migration and security measures are now necessary for both nations. Some of the check measures being felt useful for effective border management are:

- Both India and Nepal should understand the benefits of the open border. There is need to safeguard the mutual interests of both. For this Nepal should especially be cautious. Nepal should not allow any anti- Indian element to use its land against India. For mutual and effective trust joint vigilance may be started along the border to check infiltration as well as smuggling.
- Registration system for the tourists going across at the entrance posts should be started. Registration must be compulsory for all those who cross the border. However, the residents of the border area may be excluded from their daily and repeated entry.
- It is essential to understand the needs of the people, habituating along the border area. People of mountainous Nepal depend more on India and less on Nepal for their daily as well as casual needs. In this situation people from Kathmandu may easily loud their voice to restrict/ regularise the border without considering the life of the borderians but these people can never propose this sort of ideas. Therefore there is a need to strengthen the bond of healthy relations more in order to make peaceful and harmonious living of the people.
- India and Nepal should develop local market for the borderians as well as for

tourists. The market must have the products of both India and Nepal but not of any third country. This will help to facilitate the habitants on one hand and to accelerate economic growth of the area on the other hand. This effort may increase the economic benefits of the open border.

- The tenure of the border security personals must not be more than 03 months. If a company of security personals is deputed there, then each soldier must be posted in rotation but their tenure on the border post must not exceed 03 months. It is noted during the visit of the border area that some of the security personals themselves are motivating factor for illegal trade across the border.

References

1. Canada-United States Border : ["http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadaâ€¦United_States_border"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canada%20United_States_border)
2. United States-Mexico Border : ["http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_S tatesâ€¦Mexico_border"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States%20Mexico_border)
3. European Union , http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union#History
4. Department of Border management, Ministry of Home Affairs: *Length of Indian Land Borders*, Govt. of India New Delhi, p 1.
5. Kanskar, Vidya Bir Singh (2001): "Nepal-India Open Border: Nature, Pattern and Socio-cultural Implications", in Ramakant and B. C. Upreti (Ed.) *India and Nepal : Aspects of Interdependent Relations*, Kalinga Publications, Delhi, p. 4
6. Jha, Hari Bans (2000): "Nepal Me Terai Samuday avm Rashtriya Ekta", *Center for Economic and Technical Studies (CETS)*, Jawlakhel, Kathmandu, Nepal. p. 32
7. Kanskar, Vidya Bir Singh(2001): "*Nepal-India Open Border: Prospects, Problems and Challenges*", A research paper presented in a series of national seminars, organized by the Institute of Foreign Affaires and FES in Nepalganj, Birganj, Biratnagar and Kathmandu, Nepal, p. 16.
8. Kathmandu Post News Service (2003): "Nepal-India Informal Trade Alarming" *Kathmandu Post* – A daily news paper from Kathmandu, May 07, 2003,
9. Tribune News Service (2000): "Infiltration Continues Along Indo-Nepal Border" *The Tribune* - A daily news paper, Chandigarh Nov. 3, 2000.
10. Mehta, Ashok K.(2001): "Problem of Terrorism and Other Illegal Activities on Indo-Nepal Border : Issues in Effective Border Management", in Ramakant and B. C. Upreti (Ed.), *India and Nepal : Aspects of Interdependent Relations*, Kalinga Publications, Delhi, pp. 19-25.
11. Tribune News Service (2006): "ISI Activities on Rise on Indo-Nepal Border Bihar Government Alerted", *The Tribune* - A daily news paper, Chandigarh July 14, 2006

Dr. Vinod K. Bhardwaj,
Lecturer in Geography,
Govt. P.G. College, Chimanpura (Shahpura),
Jaipur (Rajasthan)
and
Mrs. Geeta Sharma,
Research Scholar,
Department of Geography,
University of Rajasthan, Jaipur

Anexure-1

Uttarakhand: Details of the Respondents (Survey dates: April 15- 23, 2006)

Content / Area	Udham Singh Nagar	Nainital	Champ-tawa	Pithora-garh	Total
(A) No. of Sample units	60	43	19	27	149
(B) Structure of Sample units					
	Place of residence				
1. Indians	38	25	13	18	94
(a) Original habitants	11	08	05	07	31
(b) Migrants : Indian plains	17	11	04	05	37
(i) U. P.	07	04	02	03	16
(ii) Bihar	03	01	01	01	06
(iii) Punjab	05	03	00	00	08
(iv) Hariyana	01	01	00	00	02
(v) Others	01	02	01	01	05
(c) Migrants : Indian hills	10	06	04	06	26
(i) Within state	07	05	04	04	20
(ii) Out side state	03	01	00	02	06
2. International migrants	22	18	06	09	55
(a) Nepal	22	18	06	09	55
	Ecological zone of residence				
1. People from hills	19	22	14	20	75
(a) Indian hills	10	14	09	13	46
(i) Original habitants	00	08	05	07	20
(ii) Migrated	10	06	04	06	26
- Within state	07	05	04	04	20
- Out side state	03	01	00	02	06
(b) International migrants	09	08	05	07	29
(i) Nepal	09	08	05	07	29
2. People from Terai / Plains	41	21	05	07	74
(a) Indian plains	28	11	04	05	48
(i) Original habitants	11	00	00	00	11
(ii) Migrated	17	11	04	05	37
- Within state	00	00	00	00	00
- Out side state	17	11	04	05	37
(b) International migrants	13	10	01	02	26
(i) Nepal	13	10	01	02	26

Source : Based on the survey of Uttarakhand conducted on April 15-23,2006. This survey was a part of the Post Doctoral Project, entitled "Mutual Relationship along Open International Border: A case of Indo-Nepal Border", awarded by the UGC, New Delhi, under the Post Doctoral Research Award Scheme to the author.