

“The Impact of Geographical Division and Power Politics in Nationalism”

By
Eshrad Ahmed
ID: 22163018
M.A.in English
Brac University

A thesis is submitted to Department of English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of M.A. in English

Department of English

Brac University

December 2023

© 2023, Brac University

All rights reserved.

Declaration

I do hereby declare that this thesis report, submitted to the Department of English at Brac University, is an original work of mine. I have completed this paper for the accomplishment of the course entitled as “Dissertation” (Course Code ENG 698) in the program of M.A. in English. I have been asked to do thorough research on “**The Impact of Geographical Division and Power Politics in Nationalism**” under the supervision of Dr. Sayeed Noman (Assistant Professor), Department of English, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, BRAC University.

Name: Eshrad Ahmed
ID: 22163018
M.A. in English
Department of English
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
BRAC University

Approval

This thesis or project titled “The Impact of Geographical Division and Power Politics in Nationalism” submitted by Eshrad Ahmed, ID 22163018. A postgraduate student of Fall 2023 has been accepted as satisfactory in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of M.A. in English on 9th January 2024.

Examining Committee:

Supervisor
(Member)

Dr. Sayeed Noman
Assiatant Professor
Department of English
Brac University

Program Coordinator
(Member)

External Expert Examiner
(Member)

Department Head
(Chair)

Dr. Ferdous Azim
Head, Department of English
BRAC University

Ethics Statement

I, the author of the paper admit that this thesis is an original work which took almost 6 months to complete. Also, I carried my ethics and morality to be honest and non biased while writing the paper. Moreover, I was completely honest while researching for this paper. Therefore, my readers can have trust on my findings because no false information has been ued here. Thank You

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction	2
Literature Review.....	3-14
Research Questions.....	14
Theoretical Framework	15-16
Data Collection.....	16
Critical Analysis.....	17-32
Findings.....	32-33
Limitations.....	34
Conclusion	35
Works Cited Pages.....	36-37

Abstract

Nationalism is a broader discourse and to provide a particular definition of nationalism is tough. Although a number of researches have already been published on nationalism and its relative terms and theories. Yet in this paper, I am going to discuss the impact of geographical division on nationalism referring to the conflict of Pak- India, Mexico – US border and Russia's exercise of power politics on its neighboring countries. Moreover, I have found the geographical borders do not act as boundaries only, but it has social, political and cultural effects. On the other hand, Russia set a noticeable example of practicing power politics after its attack on Ukraine based on the recent published literature. The broader objective of this research is to find out how partition and exercise of political power hamper nation's peace and create problems in people's lives. My claim is, although the creation of border introduces a new diaspora and opportunity for political monopoly, it also creates chaos in national life. However, war is by no means the solution to solving international issues. Moving beyond Hall's idea of cultural diaspora, this paper is trying to see how nationalism incorporates the idea of immigration and diaspora and building up criticisms against American vision of migrant people. Thus, I have selected six texts as my primary sources and also included a number of secondary research-works to strength my claim. Using 'Power Transition Theory' and 'Democratic Peace Theory' along with multiple scholars' arguments this paper is determined to acknowledge the negative impact of border- division and war in particular nationalist discourse.

Keywords: Nationalism, War, Ukraine, Russia, Syria, Border, Politics, Kashmir, India and Pakistan.

Introduction

The concept of borders is inevitably limited by the fact that it is always built on lines (Goettlich 207). But the creation of border lines is not limited to geographical division only; but it divides people, friends, government, institutions and provides a right of sovereignty building up their infrastructure to the new states. On the other hand, war eventually affects the peace and security of international borders and as a by-product of war, the increase of refugee crisis (in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, and Central America) largely hits the nationalist discourse of sheltering countries (Akyildiz 78). Therefore, my paper undertakes the consequences of geographical division and power politics on nationalism. Particularly, the discussion of geographical division is focused on the U.S.A- Mexico and Kashmir border. Whereas, the discussion of power politics¹ is centered on Russian political policy behind causes in Ukraine and Syria. Meanwhile, this research is not intended to build any connection between borders and wars, instead it is going to analyze how the division of lands creates separation between people. Also, this study urges that war is not the only solution to solve disagreements but there are many more ways to solve conflicts peacefully. Based on the above statement, this essay is divided into two parts. The first part will talk about the border division and how it creates problems between sovereign nations and the second part will discuss Russia's exercise for power by invading neighboring countries does not make it a powerful nation. Instead, these war actions are causing economical degradation inside their

¹ Power politics refers to political action by a person or group which is intended to increase their power or influence on other people, nation or community.

territory. Henceforth, the Putin government has to make excuses or throw false accusations on Muslim community to console the common people.

Literature Review

The geographical borders between two nations not only divide their lands but also change their national identity, government, political framework and state structure. According to political science, a state must fulfill four major criteria to be known as an independent nation. 1. Sovereignty, 2. government, 3. people, 4. land or territory. Again, it must have its separate border areas controlled by its own government. However, researcher Fink points out that the borders of a newly created state can be classified in two levels- 1. Physical, 2. Intellectual. She explains that the physical border forces the state- government to extend its authority within the territory to fulfill the citizen's needs (90). Because they need to establish and develop their power around the country to direct it in a particular order. Also, the government has to co-operate with the judicial and empirical authority to create an independent nation (Fink 91). Since, a government can't run a country solitary; it needs social structure, law, economic facilities and other companions to build up a nation. So, they need to make a collaborative network with the other larger organizations and segments for the sake of the nation.

Moreover, the government needs to ensure the licit existence of the newly created state with particular borders and take necessary steps to protect its citizens' rights; as well as maintain the normal supplies of goods (Fink 91). For this reason, they need to develop international relations with other nations especially with the neighboring countries for trade,

business, communication, food supply, development, import-export of goods and many more. The goal of this initiative is to earn money and increase the country's foreign reserve. For example, Bangladesh shares a good bonding with India because our country is largely dependent upon India for food, raw materials, vegetables, meat, spices, business, economy and so on. Our nation's import- export sector is also largely dependent on India. Therefore, Bangladesh has to maintain an obvious international alliance with India.

After the physical constraints of borders, we are moving to the intellectual level. The intellectual level of a state border presents a need for national identity for citizens to justify their political independence (Fink 91). For instance, the people with Bangladeshi nationalism can only take part in its internal political movements and ask for their rights. Moreover, Fink also identifies that the nature of the new state and its institutional structure are set to maintain the state- society relationship (92). For example, after the independence of Bangladesh in 1971, its citizens are known as Bengali which means that their mother tongue will be Bengali and the new state's official language will also be Bengali. Furthermore, their educational institutions and curriculum will be designed and taught mainly in Bengali. Because they are politically independent now and no need to practice Urdu (Pakistan's native language) in their territory. The state- society bond will now grow and develop based on Bengali language.

However, after the independence in 1971, Bangladesh faced many physical level challenges (Fink 96). For instance- poor governance, graft, famine, security issues and more. Similarly, on an intellectual level, it faces political dilemmas over and over again about defining a national narrative and identity (Fink 97). The Bangladesh Awami League is

interested in going with Bengali nationalism whereas BNP shows interest to proceed with the concept of Bangladeshi nationalism. This confusion is also influenced by certain grand narratives like religion, history, culture, political philosophy and elements like geography, territorial position, ethnicity and more. Fink also says- the confusion over national identity: whether Bangladesh should be defined by religion, multiculturalism or territorial position and these debates are often raised after the positions taken by the political parties in power (107). But critics agreed that the state is sufficiently young (born in 1971) and still has enough opportunities to build up an undisputed national identity for its people (Fink108). Though for formal and written documents, we are recognized as Bangladeshi citizens in both national and international context. Therefore, this debate over national identity (whether Bengali or Bangladeshi) exists mainly within our political backdrop.

Noureen Chowdhury Fink also argues this conflict over national identity creates a base for political violence in Bangladesh (92). She also points out that the role of religion in politics always raises a debate among Bangladeshis because of clashing views of major political actors (Fink 98). The argument occurs not only because of their different political ideologies but also the parties' continuous effort to prove themselves right. For instance, the Bangladesh Awami League decided to go with the principles of secular nationalism at the beginning; whereas president Zia propagated a religious brand of nationalism, imposing an Islamic identity to make Bangladeshis distinct from West Bengal people. Under his leadership, "Bismillah-ir-Rahman-ir-Rahim" (In the name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the Merciful) was included at the beginning of the constitution and the principle of secularism was cleverly replaced by dominating religious views. In addition, the BNP supporters are

more visibly connected to Islamic political parties; (i.e. Jamaat- e Islami, NeezaM -E- Islami) and are accused as “anti-liberation party” (Fink 96) by the ruling group. Again, General Ershad, declared Islam as the state religion of Bangladesh in 1988. We experienced, political parties often choose the road of violence (ex. hartals, street agitations, protests, assassinations, bombs, explosives) and attacked the opponent group for power. Eventually, the common people became the victims of this aggression. But these kinds of attacks on civilians under the name of rejoinder and remonstrance bring no good result; instead it generates fear among common people and they eventually lose the hope of effective political changes to come in the country.

Meanwhile, political analyst Maneeza Hossain, argues that the political parties have created a “fictionalized- monolithic Islam” in Bangladesh for power and financial profit (Fink 104). I argue that the original Islamic religious views are completely different from the customized one. Believe it or not, this capitalist- monolithic Islam is circulating our psychological thoughts. Under the name of cultural radicalization, scholar Fink states that both physical and intellectual levels of borders are challenged and the religious majority group is being prioritized with an intention to divide people (103).

On the other hand, Mostafa and Subedi jointly published a research paper where they claim that Bangladesh represents the characteristics of competitive authoritarianism. They show that the current government deliberately bypassed the parliament while the opposition parties are technically sidelined which weakened the democracy and parliamentary process of the country (Mostafa and Subedi 2). I argue that the way the BAL (Bangladesh Awami League) has suppressed the dissenting voices through manipulating elections has resulted the

absence of an active political opposition. This indicates that Bangladesh is moving toward a one-party system. In the meantime, the authoritarian regime of the BAL has also been institutionalized and they technically took control of authorization power (i.e. election commission, parliament, central bank) and deliberately hiding the truth of dollar reserve shortage from the media. This signals that Bangladesh is becoming a competitive authoritarian state (Mostafa and Subedi 3); which contains both democratic elements and authoritarianism side by side. To define, competitive authoritarianism provides an authoritarian leader with the legitimacy who can dominate others living within a democratic framework; but eventually fails to fulfill the conventional (minimum) requirement of democracy (Mostafa and Subedi 4). Ironically, the common people or substantive leaders can't question or demand a fair election, because the definition of fair election is decided by the ruling group. According to Levitsky and Way, what actually matters for democracy is an open competition and should have enough space for political oppositions to criticize, judge and talk about the government's decisions (522). There should be scope for open political discussions in the parliament, media, research, academia as well. But recent world research and media reports found that the notion of violence is increasingly normalized and is used as a means of resolving conflictual political ideologies in Bangladesh (Fink 97). For instance, the active political leaders of the opposing group were arrested and put into jail in November 2023 before the national election to dominate their election and political involvement. But there is less scope for the opposition supporters and party members to protest as the police and defense forces are active on roads to block them.

Moreover, in competitive authoritarian regimes, as Levitsky and Way argue that formal democratic institutions are not entirely eliminated, rather these institutions are used to manipulate the mass and the authoritarian rulers to continue their legitimacy and exercise unlimited power (519). Again, Mostafa and Subedi raise three very important points about competitive authoritarianism in Bangladesh. One, they claim this concept emerged out of the authoritarian rulers' struggle for political survival (4). The Awami League was already kicked out from the political field after 1975 by the military government. But they came back to rule again in 2009. They also know that fair elections are not possible here and once they leave power, it is really difficult to come back to rule. Now, BNP is in the dominant position and really struggling to be recognized as an active political party in the parliament. Second point is, the parties need to legitimize their power from below and they can't avoid the election (Mostafa and Subedi 5). So, they are using the media platforms to legitimize their throne. Moreover, Bangladeshi political parties are often seen to utilize mass emotions and concepts like liberation, patronization and religion to legitimate their power. In this case, they are using newspapers and other electronic and social platforms as a medium to influence the audience. For example, allowing the publishing of words like ognisontrasi, shadhinota birodhi in print media to give the opponent a villainous role. Third point is, they do not hesitate to weaponize religion Islam to expand political patronage and competitive authoritarian regime (Mostafa and Subedi 5). The ruling group presents the opponents as unfit and religiously biased to the media. But the truth is, no party in Bangladesh has left the opportunity to utilize religion Islam as a political weapon.

Furthermore, for the 2024 election, the government decides to direct the vote under the interim government. From a critical point of view, this is the same concept BNP once wanted to apply during the election in 2006. But that time they were forced to hand over the power to the provisional government (which is mainly controlled by the Army force). After two years, the provisional government announced the national election in 2009. In that election, Awami League won with a huge number of votes. But after getting the power, ironically, they are applying the same concept for more than a decade and announcing the national election to be directed under the party government. As Rounaq Jahan points out, Bangladeshi politicians have become autocratic in behavior and major law and administrative institutes lost their autonomy and become politicized. As a result, a number of violent political actors emerged creating unrest in society (Fink 96). A recent UN research found that both political parties were equal to calling hartals and strikes on road and kindled buses and other public transports to cause fear among people. Also, many incidents of destructiveness and deaths are recorded because of political unrest in the whole country. But after the continuous announcement of hartals in 2015 by the BNP, the effectiveness of these types of political strikes became less for the mass.

Consequently, Fink argues that the whole political system of Bangladesh shifted into “winner take all policy” (97) where the opposition parties practically have no role in the parliament. Critics also argued that Bangladesh became a one- party ruled country and the ruling party is technically practicing autocracy. According to the constitution, it is a democratic country, but people are afraid of talking and sharing their political opinions in front of the news -media because of active controversial laws. Also, they confine themselves

from writing critical posts on social media because of the 57 amendments which were forcefully passed in the parliament in 2018. Although after several efforts and protests, the controversial laws have not been withdrawn yet and the democracy within People's Republic of Bangladesh is interrupted and polluted.

However, our present government is also using social media and communication systems (mobile calling or SMS system) to manipulate the mass. For example, mobile phone users have already received messages from sim companies mentioning a comparison between the 2006 political era and present time to show what the developments are done by the current government. Moreover, they are also using social media i.e. Facebook and their party's verified pages to post posters (glorify the Awami regime), photos of major projects (inaugurated during their rule), advertisements, videos on behalf of the current government. But the social media users do not keep quiet this time. They are also posting about the negative sides (ignored by the supporters and members of Awami League) i.e. price hiking, traffic jam, poor garbage management, water blockage problem, pollution, slow transportation in Dhaka and questioning the current government regime. But the government choose to remain silent and not taking actions against these adverse because it will certainly hamper their self- glorified image before the election in Jan 7, 2024. Inversely, the government has decided to inaugurate big projects like Dhaka elevated expressway (total cost 1,1 billion US dollars), Cox Bazar rail station, kalshi flyover; Karnofulli tunnel, the metro-rail (from Agargaon to Motijheel section), The third terminal of Dhaka International Airport within Oct- Dec 2023 to show (visible) developments done by them to the people. In other words, to manipulate the mass in favor of them.

Besides the internal political conflicts, nations have to deal with international disputes and frictions as well. Basically, a border is a real or artificial line that separates geographic areas between two or more countries. But in “The other side of silence”, Urvashi Butalia argues that a border is more than a land division. It divides people, contains historical-political significance and has different stories on a subjective level to tell (5). Take the example of Kashmir border, who will take the control of the state either India or Pakistan is still undecided since the partition of 1947. Both sides have their own stories, logics and claims but on the flip side, they are ignoring the effect of the dispute on the citizens. Even in 2018, an attack happened in Jammu- Kashmir regarding the border control issue. Thousands of people died and were injured. Therefore, it is one of the major reasons for India- Pakistan political conflict and hatred. India does not delay to drag the issue in other fields beyond politics for example sports, film industry, media and so on. For instance, showing political reasons, India refused to play Asia Cup 2023 in Pakistan and instead urged them to play in Sri- Lanka. So, the ACC had to arrange the tournament in a hybrid model. Similarly, Pakistani actors- actresses are banned from Bollywood after the 2018 Kashmir attack. From visible evidence, we can say India holds the dominating position. On the contrary, the Afghan- Pakistan border also raises conflict over Pashtun ownership. Pashtuns or Pathans are a large group of people living in North-Eastern Afghanistan and Eastern Pakistan. Originally, this area was first interrupted by the British when they were establishing colonies in South Asia and it was a part of their victory in the great game of colonization (Fink 103). This particular area is now situated near the Pakistan – Afghanistan border and the community living in this area, urged to be recognized as an independent state but none of Pakistan or

Afghanistan agreed to leave the control of the state. Similarly, chaos occurs in Sri Lanka border, Chittagong hill tracts and Assam border in India. So, the existence of borders is never fixed. It can change with the emergence of new state or territory or fall of the old states (i.e. Berlin wall in Germany, East and West Germany) or the dismissal of any particular boundary line.

Nonetheless, in “This Land is Our Land: An Immigrant’s Manifesto” (written by Suketu Mehta) the author tries to find out the reasons that influence people to migrate from global South to Global North. He is really sympathetic to the immigrants. As a balanced researcher one needs to understand the political, economic, social, cultural and other factors that motivate the migrants to move to another country (Akyildiz 77). As there are multiple reasons and migration is a continuous process since the beginning of civilization. One of the major causes of migration is to lead a better life. Also, it needs a lot of sacrifices and adjustments to settle in a new country. The satisfactory fact is, not everyone views immigrants as burdens because by living in another country (which is not their birth nation) they contribute to the economy; sell their labor, knowledge, research and understanding of things to earn money. In light of this, the key to understanding the migrant’s mentality is employment and family security (Mehta 8). On the contrary, it is also true that rich country people are disturbed about the migration process. Mehta claims in the first chapter, “These days, a great many people in the rich countries complain loudly about migration from the poor ones” (3). Their government even introduced barriers and policies with an aim to stop migrants and refugees from entering their territory (9). But unfortunately, can’t stop non-native people from migrating into their state. For example, the reason for crossing the sea

with heavy risks for Africans to enter Europe is to begin a new life. Henceforth, Mehta emphasizes a humane approach to migration and says: “I am not calling for open borders. I am calling for open hearts” (29)

Moreover, the critical stance toward hybridity exposes the unequal and conflictual relationship between the host and migrants or the colonizers and colonized people and the tension between and within them (Marotta 1). The immigrants actually working really hard, selling their labor, paying higher taxes; but still are ignored by the host community. Besides, the right-wing- politicians, journalists, and dissatisfied citizens often seek opportunity to blame their societal problems on them. They are falsely portrayed as a threat to the receiving society. So, Mehta does not lose the opportunity to question the double standards of Western colonialism and immigration policies. Similarly, Myanmar and India portray their colonial-like attitude towards the Rohingya and Kashmiris, (Akyildiz 79). But Bangladesh set a different example by allowing Rohingyas to stay in their land.

However, the association of diaspora and migration with trauma is ignored by the classical model of diaspora. Also, they miss the difference of how diasporic people are presented in diverse communities. For example, the Portuguese consider Brazilians close to ‘them’ due to linguistic, historical and cultural reasons. But Eastern Europeans stereotype the Africans and believe that they may be related to crime or organized mafia (a common stereotype boosted by the mass media); which is certainly a by-product of the media’s coverage (Faustino 17-18). Media has a high influence to shape mass thought and people start to view things and judge others through media lenses which certainly brings negative consequences in society. Again, the host country people miss the point that injustice is

produced and maintained by institutions, social structures and moral power systems. Only in the European Union, it is estimated that there are 8 million illegal immigrants living in Europe. So, there will be more people around the world living as immigrants without proper documentation. But the influential media still presents the diasporic people as ‘other’ and natives as ‘Us’. Because of this biased representation, immigrants are not often considered as humans but a product of ignorance and domination.

Meanwhile, we can’t ignore the effect of war on diasporic people because millions of Syrians born or living in exile as a result of the ongoing conflict has dramatically increased the number of people from Syria with no nationality. In this regard, Syrian nationality law has been criticized for containing discriminatory provisions and failing to address the risk of statelessness (DABDOUB 2). Nevertheless, the responsibility of colonialism in creating such discrimination has been largely overlooked in the classical model of diaspora and non-nationality. One decade after the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War, a critical and historical analysis reveals the hidden colonial legacies of Syrian citizenship by highlighting the responsibility of European colonial powers in introducing “gender-based discrimination in domestic legislation, rendering Kurds and Palestinians stateless, and creating the practice of arbitrary denationalization” (DABDOUB 6). Although the current academic literature has clearly identified and criticized the flaws and problems in Syrian nationality law. Yet, Syria can’t overpower the influence of colonialism and Western imperialism in their national structure (DABDOUB 8). Hence, the Syrian leaders and political powers need to reshape the whole nationalist framework substantively.

However, war is neither an expected reaction to occur but Tilly argues, war is an organizational phenomenon from which the state derived its administrative machinery” (HUTCHINSON 2). Military interventions on other nations can be a solid way to show the military power of the attacker nation. So, Russia is causing wars to Ukraine and Syria to show its military power and higher status in global political competition. But the already established powerful nations are not ready to sacrifice their position and leave space for Russia. Still, war is happening between Russia and Ukraine; Israel and Palestine; Russia and Syria; Iraq and Iran. Though war is not a solution of inter-nations’ problems, it only creates chaos in society. But the powerful nations are not ready to accept the fact. Take the examples of the 1st and 2nd World War, Vietnam war or Cold war between the Soviet Union and the USA. Does it bring any positive changes in society? No. Rather it creates trauma, psychological anxiety among the citizens.

Thus, the border is not a mere division of lands rather it has certain social, cultural and political impact on people. It is ironic but true that borders are responsible for dividing people, friends, relatives, couples and siblings based on imaginary lines. Also, borders are a symbol of effective power. But can’t refrain from causing problems in certain nationalist discourses. Consider the Kashmir border as an example. On the contrary, causing war with an excuse to save borders but ultimately make it a medium of exercising power politics never brings good results. Rather it only causes destruction, kills people and produces frustration among the mass. Hence, my paper argues that borders can create division but people can transform it into unity. Moreover, causing war is not the ultimate solution to show power. But the political leaders can complete the deals peacefully by sitting formally together.

Research Questions:

1. How does the creation of borders divide people and create chaos in nationalist discourse?
2. Does causing war in Syria and Ukraine prove Russia a powerful country? Why or why not?

Theoretical Framework

For this paper, I am using concepts of ‘Democratic Peace Theory’ and ‘Power Transition Theory’ to discuss Russian practice of power politics and reasons behind invading Syria and Ukraine. On the other hand, to analyze how the creation of borders creates conflicts and problems, I am referring to two arguments from two jointly published papers. Noel Parker and Nick Vaughan-Williams in their (2018) jointly published paper argues that borders are linked with violence, force, and the deployment of a logic of exceptionalism” (586). On the contrary, in a 2010 published research, two scholars Alexander Diener and Joshua Hagen view borders as social constructions (3). Both of the views go against the general demonstration of borders as a line of protection. So, based on their arguments I am going to discuss how the division of the geographical border creates political chaos between India- Pakistan nations and hampering the security on the US- Mexico border.

On the contrary, power transition theory claims that the fall of a dominant great power and the rise of an ascendant challenger often causes war. I am going to adjust this claim referring

to the conflict between Russia- Ukraine and Russia- West. Again, democratic peace theory contradicts the battle ideology and claims that war between democratic countries is impossible which got huge recognition among 1980s Western researchers (D'ANIERI 15). However, going against this theory, my paper claims that war can be caused in democratic frameworks too.

Data Collection and Methodology

For this thesis paper, I have taken six primary texts; three are on border conflict and two are written on Russia's military intervention in Syria and one recent text is on Ukraine and Russia war. The texts are- 1. "The Russian Military Intervention in Syria" by Ohannes Geukjian, 2. "Putin's War in Syria" by Anna Broschevkaya, 3. "Ukraine and Russia" by Paul D'Anieri , 4. "Kashmir at the Crossroads: Inside a 21st-Century Conflict" by Sumantra Bose, 5. Neither Settlers nor Immigrants by Mahmood Mamdani and 6. The Far Away Brothers: Two Teenage Immigrants Making a Life in America written by Lauren Markham. Beside these texts, I am also using other secondary resources, articles, books, and papers to complete my paper. Moreover, I am determined to contribute in nationalist research discourse as a non-native distant researcher. For this paper, I am using qualitative research methodology to analyze representation of border conflict and Russian military interventions in recent-published literature.

Critical Analysis

The conception of borders is certainly limited by the fact that it is always built on lines (Göttlich 207). Often these boundaries are fabricated either on imaginary straight lines directly or connected with the other linear border lines. My paper supports the claim that these imaginary lines are technically dividing the nations and people. Because the “specification of borders as precise lines by no means eliminates the complexity of borderlands' ' (Göttlich 207); rather it creates the opportunity for certain authorities to develop a monopoly and control inside the border area as well as to manipulate the mass.

Besides, the creation of specific borders emphasizes concepts like migration and diaspora to include in literature. Basically, when a group of people willingly or forcefully migrated to another country by crossing their own border, they are known as diasporic people. Famous cultural theorist Stuart Hall categorizes diasporic people exclusively based on cultural terms and views diaspora as an experience of productive cultural identity. But he misses the point that cultural identity is already interfered with by national consciousness (Gui 5). Therefore, diaspora also became a part of national identity. To elaborate, in spite of living in an independent country, it is expected that the diasporic people will be titled and marginalized. Hall also argues that cultural identity defines who people are; but there are multiple disagreements that occurred against his claim because from nationalist perspective, there are other terms like migration, diaspora and cultural hybridity which help to define people’s identity. So, it is very difficult to define (diasporic) people’s identity based on their culture and ethnicity only.

However, after 1947, there are only two types of diasporic people who migrate to Britain from South Asia. But after the independence in 1971, the country Bangladesh formed

and a new diaspora arrived. Although the term Bangladeshi diaspora was not mainly occurred because of forceful migration or exile; (like Afghani or Palestine diaspora)² but it arises due to the creation of a new state along with the definite border (Kalra et al 19). Yet, the children born in diasporic Bangladeshi families abroad, will be raised in a different cultural environment than their parents. Hence, their national identity and understanding of the nation will surely be different from their previous generation.

Moreover, Stuart Hall considers diasporic consciousness as a part of identity construction and reproduction (Kalra et al. 33). But he misses the point of the conscious marginalization process influenced by certain diaspora. Again, the idea of nativism and belonging arrives along with immigration and diaspora and creates a difference between those who are historically marginalized and people who migrated due to contemporary issues (i.e. war, forcefully exile, globalization and many more) (Kalra et al. 33). To elaborate the claim, consider the example of the Black community who are marginalized in America for a long time (originally known as African -American and are immigrants in the USA from different parts of Africa). Also, the newly migrated non-natives people (i.e. Muslims from Afghanistan, Syrian or Iranian or Korea) are already sidelined from mainstream American society, mainly because of their religious identity. Yet the Black community doesn't waste the opportunity to double marginalized the newly migrated people in America.

² Afghani and Palestine diaspora are mainly influenced and forced by war and genocide.

Although today, almost a “quarter of a billion people “live “in a country other than the one they were born in” (Mehta 4). They accept a self- willing diaspora to lead a better life. They travel, do jobs, earn their livelihood and send the money to their family in their homeland. In fact, they are helping to increase the foreign reserve of their birth- countries and also lessen the burden of unemployment of their government. Therefore, diaspora is neither an alienated term nor forcefully included within nationalism discourse. Rather it also operates within the framework of nation-states (Kalra et al.34). But it is true that the diasporic people are highly marginalized in America. Also, it has become completely appropriate to stereotype and discriminate against individuals because of being an immigrant. In 2012, Basik in one of his research highlights that there is an ethical difference between the idea of equality and the acceptance of international inequality that exists within the minds of people of wealthy nation- states. On one side, the citizens claim for equality for all; but on the flip side, they prefer to discriminate against the incomers. That is why, the information of birth- country and country of immigration are given preference to identify who are settlers and who are natives in America. To analyze the status of American young immigrants, Lauren Markham conducted a research for almost 10 years. After researching American immigrants’ students for 10 years, Lauren Markham wrote “The Far away Brothers”. This text is a good example of border chaos and uncertainty of an immigrant's life in the United States of America. It is a story of twin brothers, who lived in rural El Salvador and dreamed of going to the USA after passing the Mexican border to pay off their family debt and live a good life. This book reflects the uncertainty and danger that exists in the US- Mexico border area. This illegal immigration process is one of the reasons to develop chaos within USA and

Mexico nationalist discourse. Besides people, products, goods and drugs are also supplied through the border which is hampering the national security of both the countries.

As we read from Markham's writing that during crossing the border, the Flores both faced uncertainty and difficulties. After reaching the USA, the reality haunts them and they find life abroad is not as dreamy as it seems from a distance. The twins are forced to become separated from the mainstream community and are bound to be admitted in a school established for immigrants. The Flores brothers even faced problems in admitting School at the beginning (Markham 97). This incident highlights that the American natives and political power are really conscious about the native and non- native identification. That's the reason they set separate institutions, job offers, and residential areas for the immigrants to stay. In this way, the line of difference between the American settlers and immigrants will never demise. The author of the book found Auckland International High School had opened in August 2007 as part of a network of Public Schools designed for newly arrived immigrant students in America. The school was a mirror of migration where students from China, Burma, Mexico, Nepal, Afghanistan and Iraq are taught together (Markham 98) and reflects the true scenario of the so- called American dream. There are strange hierarchies within school and the author calls it unfair because the immigrant kids with cases got more support than the kids with no cases or came with their parents (Markham 99).

But Suketu Mehta considers the immigrants not a burden as heroes. The immigrants struggle to settle abroad, face many challenges, ready to sacrifice their dream, making them "ordinary, everyday heroes" (Mehta 29). But besides marginalization, the non- natives have to face alienation, separation, discrimination and often struggle to settle down. Let's take the

example of the Flores brothers who has to cut off later classes to go on jobs. Also, they need to send money to their home to pay off the loan (Markham 158). Life in America is not easy for new- comers. As we saw Ernesto thinks- “now I know how hard it is to make money but Raul staying in El Salvador imagines his brother with nice clothes, a car, products of brand Nikes” (Markham 28). This example refers to the fact that reality is a few times harder than the imagination.

Yet, diaspora can be a good sector to exercise political power by showing sympathy towards immigrants in public. For instance, America itself never says it won't allow immigrant people in front of the media or banned incomers constitutionally because they need cheap labors, but they have already made strict laws, discriminate the migrated people socially, politically and force them to remain marginalized within the American society. Another example is, in 2019, the Bangladesh government decided to shelter Rohingya refugees with a purpose to demonstrate a positive political image in front of the world-media. Ironically with time, the Myanmar immigrants has become a burden on a small country like Bangladesh and producing threats for the native Bangladeshis; particularly in Cox Bazar. Moreover, despite several attempts, the Rohingya issue has not been solved yet.

However, Indian- born Ugandan professor Mahmood Mamdani in his book “Neither Settlers nor Immigrants” states that the modern state is associated with tolerance (1). It is a political construction. The modern citizens and government think that they can live in peace within a society if they grow tolerance within themselves. Here tolerance means to show impartiality for people of different religion, culture, ethnicity, race and language. Mamdani also argues that this regime of tolerance developed “the structure of the nation-state by

defining the relation between the national majority and minority” (2). But in colonial rules, there was no native majority but they are considered as minority people under the leadership of a colonizer elite (Mamdani 3). So, the explorers became the authority. Remember, the state will never be seen in the eyes of the minority people but the powerful, rich, elite people will represent the society. Basically, the distinction of majority and minority groups are inspired by the colonizers. The only possibility is when the political system will be decolonized; the identity of majority and minority group will be unoccupied and we will be able to reach towards equity (Mamdani 17). To understand the term of decolonization of the political community, Professor Mamdani takes example of South Africa because when South Africans decided to throw off racial segregation and replaced with non-racial democracy; they first started with restructuring their political system and made it non-biased and impartial for all (17).

Nevertheless, the idea of settlers or immigrants does not contain similar meaning for all. For instance, South Sudanese people have learned to consider themselves as tribal because tribes have political influence in Sudan and Zionist Jews (being refugees in Afghanistan) have learned to consider themselves as natives of Palestine to get “exclusive rights to the land of Afghanistan” (Mamdani 20). On the contrary, Americans are proud as immigrants because once they were colonized by Europe but ultimately, they managed to create a new nation by themselves (Mamdani 21). America was ruled under European parliament until the 1700s. Then the representatives decided they would no longer stay under European rule and would create their own state. Although America’s point of view for immigrants is not praiseworthy at all. The native Americans think that they will decide the

place for immigrants and make rules and this dominating strategy makes them ignorant about humanity.

“Immigrants to the United States till are determined by the places from which they came and we intern are determined by them whether by choice by necessity or both; but they are also Americans just ask the Flores twins” (Markham 234)

Lauren Markham strictly announces in her novel that the immigrants are not outsiders but a part of America (234). Also, it is very hard to stay in isolation despite living in a developed nation like America. To my argument, if the incomers are contributing to the economy and willing to sell their labor, there is no point to separate them from the mainstream society only because of their birth nation, religious or national identity.

While talking about nation- state and national identity, the idea of border genuinely incorporates in the discussion. You can have a unique national identity if you are born and living in a sovereign -bordered state. In 2012, Noel Parker and Nick Vaughan-Williams on their paper questions the notions of border. Normally, borders are portrayed as the line of protection and security but they point out borders are linked with violence, force, and the deployment of a logic of exceptionalism” (586). On the contrary, in a 2010 published research, two scholars Alexander Diener and Joshua Hagen views borders as social constructions (3). That means, geographical borders are not natural or sovereign rather negotiable and unstable. Moreover, there are several borders around the world which become a matter of dispute between states. Jammu- Kashmir is situated on such a disputed border. Fundamentally, the Kashmir conflict is a byproduct of 1947 Pak- India partition and became a medium of violence for a long time. Again, the partition violence cost the brutal deaths of

hundreds or thousands of Hindus, Muslims and sikhs people and made millions of refugees. Plus, the conflict over ownership of Kashmir caused enmity and two India -Pakistan wars in less than 20 years in 1947 to 48 and again in 1965 (Bose 2). Also, another attack happened in 2018 in the same border over the control and ownership issues.

Furthermore, a number of literature are written and published on the Kashmir dispute. “Kashmir at the Crossroads” is a book written in 2021 by Sumantra Bose, an Indian political scientist and professor; where the readers can see the image of social, cultural and religious conflict in Jammu- Kashmir. This book reflects a well- explained scenario of chaos, marginalization, influence of Indian Hindu community and central political authority in Kashmir border. It also reflects how this particular border becomes a matter of political unrest, religious conflict and social anxiety between India and Pakistan which is pretty similar to my first research question. The text begins with the brief history of Pakistan- India dispute over Kashmir. The author researches on people living in valleys of Kashmir and found that the Indian government and political authority also marginalized the Kashmir community. He mentions one quote from Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s speech where he says- “The anti- Bharat and political opposition group can take advantage of the adverse situation and create a negative image of the country in front of the world. That is why he requested the media to play a responsive role to maintain the positive image of India” (290). Through his speech, the Indian prime minister indirectly asks for media help to clear the image of India about the dispute, which summons that the media should hide or unpublish some news to save the nation's image. An Indian newspaper commented that the government bureaucrats and security officials have powers to decide what news is fake or Anti- National

(Bose 228). After the 2018 attack, they even managed to present a remake and clear picture of Jammu-Kashmir border through journalists and media.

Nonetheless, the author witnesses that, skipping the eyes of the media, the local powerful politicians are forcing people to leave from the Southern Valley. He saw a young couple with small children saying- “How can they suddenly make us homeless in the middle of winter?” (Bose 237). A long-standing theory of Hindu Nationalist discourse is- “Muslim man make a habit of seducing and marrying Hindu women in order to convert them to Islam” (Bose 288). They do not hesitate to include religion as an excuse to maintain the conflict between India and Pakistan. So, the author found Hindu- Muslim union in India is highly controversial and combative. Particularly, it is a scenario of the Indian portion of Kashmir valley. We can assume, Pakistan does the same with the Hindu people in their area of Kashmir. I mean, the nature of brutality eradicates the line of border.

Thus, creation of borders often produces conflict and dispute over lands because of religion, language and cultural differences; which also increase the rate of diaspora and refugees. Stuart Hall tries to view diaspora an example of exclusive cultural identity but the incorporation of nationalism makes the term more complicated. Moreover, the role of media on border issues can't be ignored. Also, creation and separation of geographical borders is not limited to mere lines only, but it is a medium of violence, dissension and disagreements. By dividing people into majority settlers and minority immigrants; one nation can sustain its control. However, the spread of globalization may not able to solve the border discord at once, but it can be a way to unite people leaving the chaos behind.

Although in a broader sense, border, nationalism and control; all are connected to power and wars are caused with a view to either achieve or seize power. In 2022, after Russia announced the war in Ukraine, American political science and public policy professor Paul D'ANIERI states that Russia is trying to be a great power (21). He has been researching the former Soviet Union for a long time focusing on political movements of Ukraine and Russia. He also published a book titled "Ukraine and Russia in 2023, to analyze Russia's intention and purpose of invading Ukraine. In the early morning of February 24, 2022, Russia attacked Ukraine along four axes with over 150.000 soldiers backed by aircraft, missiles, drones, artillery and armor (D' ANIERI 1). The author in his book tries to find out whether the invasion on Ukraine is actually worthy for Russia to prove it powerful or not. He also argues that it is a move of the Russian government to prove themselves globally a powerful state because they were not satisfied with the regional power (D' ANIERI 23).

On the other hand, Russia has a quest to regain its former great power status and its control over its neighboring countries. But Ukraine was determined to remain an independent and sovereign nation (D'ANIERI 2). Without reclaiming Ukraine's control, Russia can't neither be a regional hegemon nor a great power. Besides, Ukraine is hampering Russia's national interest of becoming a globally powerful state. This is the reason the Putin government decided to officially attack Ukraine. Moreover, the Russian government expected the USA and other already established global powers to be afraid of Russia after the attack. As the power transition theory claims that the fall of a dominant great power and the rise of an ascendant challenger often causes war. So, Russia is throwing a challenge towards the USA and the West; the already established dominant powers by using military power and

violence. But the scenario alternates when the USA went in opposition to Russia and decided to help and support Ukraine. At this point, Russia lost its one- sided domination in the Ukraine war.

Meanwhile, it is already admitted that war between Russia and Ukraine is actually mirroring the philosophical and political conflict that exists between Russia and the West (D'ANIERI 2). Russia wants to dominate its neighboring countries with an aim to be known as the most powerful nation in the world; whereas the West suggests to go with democracy and maintain a good relation with international organizations. Paul also argues that whether anyone like it or not, Ukraine and the West are destined to be in conflict with Russia for upcoming years as well (11). The conflict is about maintaining democracy in Ukraine. As democratic peace theory suggests, war between democratic countries is impossible. Plus, the spread of democracy would create an expanding region where war was no longer possible. This theory received great academic attention from the 1980s onward among Western academicians (D'ANIERI 15). But today's scenario alternates the ideology and emphasizes that war can be caused in democratic nations too. Also, to avail democracy is not enough to stop war and violence between nations because the competition for power and the wish to control others is still active among big powerful countries.

Again, the media and press have an important role to represent war in front of the world. During the Liberation War, the world media largely worked in support of Bangladesh to get independence in 1971 which created extra pressure on the Pakistanis. They also published news about the Ukrainian war and the famous media sources also collected people's opinions and brought them in front of the world leaders. While press around the

world said that Russia had invaded Ukraine, but Ukrainians and their supporters stressed that the invasion had actually begun 8 years earlier in 2014, when Russia seized Crimea and attacked Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts, a war which killed over 13000 people (D' ANIERI 1). Although ironically, Ukraine's independence in 1991 took place without bloodshed. (D' ANIERI 1) but it was never out of risk of being seized. The dispute is not limited to the war but has a large consequence to face. In 2014, Russia invaded and seized parts of Ukrainian territory which brought Russia and the West in a position of a New Cold War (D' ANIERI 12). And in 2022, when Russia escalated the war dramatically, targeting civilians and calling for the destruction of the Ukrainian state, its ultimate objective was to become a global - dominant power. But social identity theory claims that the USA and the other dominant power are not ready to accept degradation in their status and not ready to accord Russia as a great power due to its revisionist movement in Ukraine (D' ANIERI 122). So, Russia's goal behind directing military operations in Ukraine stumbled after the reaction of the USA and the other dominant power states went against them.

Moreover, one does not need to see Russia's desire to control Ukraine as a legitimate interest, as some authors do to acknowledge that Russia considered the loss of Ukraine to be intolerable (D'ANIERI 7). Because Ukraine is Russia's main oil supplier. Plus, Russia has signed a contract with Israel to supply oil and the two countries are in the process of finalizing a free trade agreement too (D'ANIERI.7). But Russia had to face a great loss or bear a huge cost on oil imports if they defeated the war or lost control of Ukraine.

Besides Ukraine, Russia is also directing military operations in Syria. Critically we can say, agreeing with Treisman, that these interventions are parts of Putin's wish to recreate

the Soviet Union. Anna Borshchevskaya, a former analyst of the U.S. army and senior fellow of Washington Institute wrote a book titled "Putin's War in Syria" where she blames the autocrat nature of Putin's government behind creating political unrest among Russia's neighboring nations. Also, it is hampering international peace, she added. She brought reference of Catherin The Great who famously said- I have no better way to defend my borders than to extend them. (Borshchevskaya 12). Putin the populist is using the same philosophy to extend his power internationally. Yet, he has to deal with great economic decline while directing two wars but he is using the possession of Crimea to build public support for his political party (D'ANIERI 6). He explains to the mass that Crimea is a part of Russia now and we are on a mission to extend our area. Actually, he is doing this to hide the truth of Russian national economic degradation and showing the progress of land extension. The Russian national media helps the president in his mission. The Putin government has to invest a lot in wars and the Russian capitalists and elite groups financially support him; instead, battle operations create a non- fillable shortage in foreign reserves. According to 'World Media Report', this economic decline mainly happened in Russia because America seized its investments and stopped all kinds of transactions with Russia after the Ukraine war started.

Still, Russia and Putin didn't stop their combat and continue their military operation in Syria as well. The main excuse behind attacking Syria as they concluded- Syrian and Muslims are terrorists. So, the Russian Army has to kill them. After the Council vote, Putin announced the intervention to the public and claimed if the Russian army didn't kill the terrorists in Syria, they would eventually return to their home countries including Russia and

would become a threat for Russian nationalism (Borshchevskaya 89). Though Russia has already controlled and interfered in Syria internal matters, they were not satisfied. So, the Putin government decided to direct an intervention in Syria.

Moreover, Russia used a status-seeking strategy in Ukraine and Syria to recover recognition of its status as a global- superpower and to restore, as much as possible, since the established global powers are not ready to vacate their position and leave space for Putin's Russia. Therefore, the Putin government decided to attack the weak neighboring counties to regain their control in certain portions in their surroundings. American University of Beirut's (AUB) Professor Ohanes Geukijian wrote a book titled " Russian Military Intervention in Syria " where he argues that Russia lost its great influence after the fall of Soviet Union (Geukhan 81). But the country is determined to regain its power. The serial civil war in Syria represents an opportunity for Russia to exercise power politics and seek status consistency and enhancement (Geukijian 24). Again, status- inconsistent powers are subdivided into overachievers and underachievers. status overachievers receive status- power recognition but do not have the ability to act as expected but the underachievers have the ability to act as major powers but do not receive recognition from other states (Geukjian 14). This definition considers Russia as an underachiever nation. According to Putin, the purpose of modernization was to make Russia great. His vision of Russia earned him the support of statist and national restorationists. (Geukjian 51). Also, Putin followed Primakov's policy of neither rejecting the West nor denying the importance of Russia's historic greatness. In her constructivist analysis Magda Leichichtiva argued that Russia under Putin sent mixed messages to the west. On the one hand showing willingness to collaborate, while on the other

hand, showing rather unscrupulous pragmatism in the pursuit of national interest (Geukijian 58). In spite of this dual position, the Russian conflict with Western Nations has not been solved yet. But Putin is trying to make his base strong by taking help from status- consistent powerful nations and indirectly asking to support their movement by sending mixed messages to the West.

Nonetheless, energy is a tool for both modernization and international influence. So, Putin sought to use Russia's energy and diplomatic resources to diversify and strengthen the Russian economy and Global political influence. As Tsygankov argues, Russia has the “capacity as a global intermediary by coordinating its production with other important energy producers and offering its expertise to build energy infrastructure across the world” (Geukijian 58). Globally, Russia is willing to set itself as a maker of new rules and is articulating its concerns with international organizations to gain support from them. But after the attack on Ukraine, the international organizations took back their consent from Russia. A recent example can be- the UN (United Nations) refused to add Russia as a member- state again because this nation is violating humanity in Ukraine.

The more political understanding of violence can be glimpsed in Walter Benjamin’s distinction between law-making and law-preserving violence. Law-preserving violence is a response to crime which claims to dispense criminal justice. Whereas law-making violence is fundamentally political (Mamdani 16). Even Russia introduces new laws to justify its battle in Ukraine. Also, to avoid mass criticism, Russia and Putin's government makes it legal to attack Ukraine and Syria. Hiding the actual truth of exercising power politics, the President

states excuses like Syrian and Muslims are terrorists and harmful for Russia and it is really fair to adjoin Crimea and overall Ukraine.

However, Russia's interventions in Ukraine and Syria to compete with the USA and the West make it neither powerful nor great. But their steps are resulting in censuses and instability around the world. As a consequence, the oil price is rising, the import- export business is highly hampering and global security is at stake now. It is only Russian power who think that causing war will bring them status- consistency and they will achieve a globally- dominant position; but actually, invading wars in Ukraine and Syria is ruining the Russian political image and people started to doubt their position about humanity.

Findings and Discussion

After the research I found, the border and marginalization of diasporic people originally started during the colonization period. The British and European colonizers annexed a large part of the whole world and their framework of majority- minority discrimination is still impacting the colonized states' nationalist discourse. Mamdani argues that "the colonization of settlers and immigrants is a product of the same false histories that teach natives to behave as natives" (25). The code of behavior is also created by the colonizers to prove themselves the masters and the colonized natives are the servers.

But the spread of globalization technically tries to erase border division and replace with hybrid identity. In this way, people won't belong to only a particular state but they can ask for legal citizenship of any country in the world. On the contrary, hybrid identity

presupposes a set of essentialized, root-oriented identities – white (colonizer) and black (colonized) or host and immigrant – that come together to form a fixed, unified hybrid self (Marotta 1). Even extension of globalization failed to erase the racial or major- minor discriminations within the nation- states.

After 2004, there was no doubt that there was a competition between Russia and the west over Ukraine (D'ANIERI 103). But to my understanding, wars are never the ultimate solution to any problem. Instead, the political leaders in power can sit together in a discussion and make deals between two or more nations to maintain peace. Obviously, there will be disagreements, differences in belief, political ideology (Like Russia and Ukraine), social structures between nations. But it does not mean one nation needs to invest military power, money and attack other nations and kill the citizens. Remember that, wars only kill people and diminish peace. It also causes lands, billion- dollar establishments, projects and property to be destroyed in a few seconds. Overall, battles create unrest and mental stress in human lives. The world already witnessed³ that wars won't bring good results, instead create more conflicts and destruction. Therefore, it is our duty to act as intelligent beings to prevent wars and destruction for maintaining peace and harmony around the world.

Limitations and Further Research Scope

³ The World War 1 happened from 1914-1918,
The World War 2 happened from 1939-1945
The Cold War occurred from 1947-1991
The Vietnam War occurred from 1955-1975

This paper obviously has limitations. Nationalism is a broad and complex discourse. Yet this paper only focuses on two issues- border- complexity and war, is a result of political conflict. Again, the first issue, this paper is focusing on the effect of illegal immigration on US- Mexico border and Pak- India dispute over Kashmir border. Particularly, it stresses on Indian point of view over Kashmir issue. On the contrary, for the second issue, this paper analyzes Russian war in Ukraine and Syria as an exposure of political power. Although this is a work of a non- native researcher based on selected published literature and certainly limited. There are more scopes for the future researchers to interview the war survivors or work with the print media articles. Thus, this paper opens a door for the following researchers to work on border or war or both issues as a third-party investigator or analyzer.

Conclusion

To conclude, Unmaking the permanence of political identities began with the recognition that they are neither natural nor consistent but they were invented by the politicians in power and are reinforced by those who mobilize them in a bid for power (Mamdani 35). Therefore, we should work for a better unified world. Also, it is possible to erase the line between majority and minority groups and treat them equally by living within a nation- state. Moreover, we have already identified that creation of borders has already developed a lot of chaos and often resulted in international disputes or wars. Although battles do not make a nation or its government powerful but to kill people, bring extinction, unexpected transition in social- political life, increase diaspora or forceful exaltation and

make people homeless. My paper strongly supports the point of building a humanistic world instead of competing for power or status consistency. Therefore, the main goal of powerful nations and international organizations should be to develop peace and harmony in political discourses; because weapons or forceful military operations never end up with virtuous aftermath.

Thus, the geographical division between nations and exercise of power politics even of a single country has significant influence in overall national and international discourse.

Works Cited

Akyildiz, Sevkett Hylton . Suketu Mehta, This Land Is Our Land: An Immigrant's Manifesto. Vol. 2, no. 1, 2022, pp. 77–79.

Aslam's the Golden Legend. Vol. 5, no. 1, 2021, pp. 131–143.

Borshchevskaya, Anna. Putin's War in Syria. Bloomsbury Publishing, 4 Nov. 2021.

Bose, Sumantra. Kashmir at the Crossroads: Inside a 21st-Century Conflict. New Haven, Yale University Press, 2021.

Childs, Erica Chito. "Critical Mixed Race in Global Perspective: An Introduction." vol. 39, no. 4, 2018, pp. 379–381.

DABDOUB, MALAK BENSLAMA. COLONIAL LEGACIES in SYRIAN

NATIONALITY LAW and the RISK of STATELESSNESS. Vol. 3, no. 1, 2021, pp. 6–32.

D'Anieri, Paul. Ukraine and Russia. Cambridge University Press, 23 Mar. 2023.

Durand, Olivia Irena. "New Russia" and the Legacies of Settler Colonialism in Southern Ukraine. Vol. 4, 2022, pp. 58–75.

Fink, Naureen Chowdhury. On the Borderlines: Politics, Religion and Violence in Bangladesh. 2013, pp. 91–111.

Geukjian, Ohannes. The Russian Military Intervention in Syria. Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2022.

Goettlich, Kerry. The Rise of Linear Borders in World Politics. Vol. 25, no. 1, 2019, pp. 203–228.

HUTCHINSON, JOHN. Nationalism and War a Review of the Literature. Vol. 4, 2019, pp. 1–14.

Vulović, Marina, and Emilia Palonen. "Nationalism, Populism or Peopleism? Clarifying the Distinction through a Two-Dimensional Lens." Nations and Nationalism, 14 Dec. 2022, pp. 546–561.

Ifzal , Muhammad Owais , et al. A Critique of the Misuse of Religious Discourse in South-Asia in

Lee, Peter T. Using Cultural Hybridity as an Analytic Lens for Missiological Research. Vol. 50, no. 1, 2022, pp. 48–62.

Kalra, Virinder, et al. *Diaspora and Hybridity*. SAGE, 20 Sept. 2005.

Mahmood Mamdani. *Neither Settler nor Native: The Making and Unmaking of Permanent Minorities*. South Africa, Wits University Press, 2021.

Markham, Lauren. *The Far Away Brothers: Two Teenage Immigrants Making a Life in America; Adapted for Young Adults*. New York, Ember, 2020.

Marotta, Vince. “Cultural Hybridity.” *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, 22 Oct. 2020, pp. 1–4.

Mostofa , Shafi M. D. , and D. B. Subedi. *Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism in Bangladesh*. 2020, pp. 1–29.

Mostofa, Shafi Md. “Understanding Islamist Militancy in Bangladesh.” 7 May 2021, pp. 1-16.

