

Journal of Peace Studies

A Peer-Reviewed Quarterly



Journal Homepage: <https://www.icpsnet.org/journal-of-peace-studies>

'Silent Fences' and Securitised Corridors: Infrastructural Violence and Environmental Insecurity along CPEC

Avdhesh Singh, Research Scholar, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

To cite this article: Singh, A. (2026), "'Silent Fences' and Securitised Corridors: Infrastructural Violence and Environmental Insecurity along CPEC", *Journal of Peace Studies*, Vol 33, Issue 2, 3-19, April – June 2026. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.21862732](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21862732)



© 2026 Published by Centre for Peace Studies (CPS), New Delhi



Published: 30 June 2026



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Vol. 33, Issue 2, April – June 2026



'Silent Fences' and Securitised Corridors: Infrastructural Violence and Environmental Insecurity along CPEC

Avdhesh Singh*

Abstract

This article examines the Silent Fence phenomenon as a distinct conceptual sub type of infrastructural violence, describing how border infrastructure, particularly security fencing, can inadvertently transform ecological systems into zones of heightened environmental insecurity and conflict. It is proposed not merely as a metaphor, but as an analytically operational category that captures the slow, cumulative, and often invisible harms produced by securitised linear border infrastructures. The study analyses how ostensibly defensive structures disrupt transboundary ecosystems, alter access to natural resources, and fuel localised grievances. Drawing on the strategic implications of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), a project involving a pledged \$62 billion investment and significant securitisation, it argues that such infrastructural violence, while aiming to mitigate traditional security threats, often exacerbates non-traditional ones, leading to resource-based conflicts and contributing to the radicalisation of marginalised communities. This analysis moves beyond conventional understandings of state security and offers a set of policy recommendations for a more conflict-sensitive and environmentally conscious approach to border management, advocating for models that prioritise both national stability and ecological integrity in volatile regions.

Keywords: *Silent Fence, Infrastructural Violence, Border Securitisation, Environmental Insecurity, Political Ecology, Slow Violence.*

* Avdhesh Singh, Research Scholar, Centre for the Studies of the Americas, JNU, New Delhi.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21862732



1. Introduction

The modern nation-state, often defined by its territorial integrity, frequently employs physical barriers to delineate its sovereignty, control movement and mitigate perceived security threats. The pervasive reliance on physical boundaries, symbolising geopolitical aspirations and defensive postures, is reflected by the fact that an estimated 70 border walls and fences have been built globally since 1991, compared to just 15 during the Cold War era.¹ However, the proliferation of such border infrastructure in the 21st century has introduced a complex set of unintended consequences, particularly in ecologically sensitive and politically volatile regions. While primarily erected to address conventional security concerns, such as deterring cross-border militancy, illegal migration, or smuggling, these barriers rarely exist in isolation. They intersect with pre-existing social, economic and environmental dynamics, often exacerbating vulnerabilities and creating new forms of conflict. This article argues that this pervasive erection of border fences manifests a phenomenon termed the Silent Fence. It is a specific form of infrastructural violence in which securitised linear infrastructures silently reconfigure

environmental and social landscapes, leading to increased insecurity and, paradoxically, new avenues for conflict. Unlike broader notions of slow or structural violence, which may encompass diffuse historical and institutional harms, the Silent Fence refers to the material, spatially bounded, and policy driven impacts of security infrastructures that fragment ecosystems, re order access to resources, and militarise everyday life along borders. Conceptually, it is positioned as a sub type of infrastructural violence that foregrounds how border security projects translate into layered ecological degradation and lived experiences of exclusion over time.

The concept of "Silent Fence" extends beyond a mere physical barrier; it represents a comprehensive system of control that reconfigures human-environment interactions, disrupts traditional livelihoods, and alters the delicate balance of ecosystems. Unlike the immediate violence of armed conflict, the violence inherent in it is often slow, structural, and insidious, manifesting as resource scarcity, habitat fragmentation, and the erosion of community resilience. Such a form of infrastructural violence, though not overtly aggressive, has profound and often irreversible impacts on local populations and natural systems,

laying the groundwork for future disputes. Analytically, the article traces a clear causal chain through which the Silent Fence operates: the erection and expansion of securitised border infrastructure produces environmental degradation (through habitat fragmentation, disrupted water flows, and ecological enclosure), which in turn undermines livelihoods and socio economic stability for border communities. These livelihood disruptions foster grievances and perceptions of injustice, creating fertile ground for various forms of contention, including localised disputes, insurgency and radicalisation directed at both the state and its emblematic infrastructures like economic corridors.

This study examines border securitisation measures, including extensive fencing, that are implemented in the context of large-scale economic corridors and development projects. These measures, ostensibly for protection, invariably bisect ecosystems, block wildlife migratory routes, and restrict traditional access to vital resources for indigenous communities. As such, this article primarily explores the multifaceted ways in which border securitisation contributes to environmental insecurity and, in turn, reshapes conflict landscapes. By examining the socio-ecological

consequences of the securitised development of the China–Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), it seeks to understand how border fences inadvertently generate new environmental vulnerabilities and social grievances and the mechanisms by which these environmental insecurities translate into localised or broader conflicts. It further explores what policy alternatives can foster a more conflict-sensitive and ecologically sustainable approach to border management in such contexts. It demonstrates that fragmenting landscapes and dislocating communities cannot achieve true peace and security, but rather through integrated approaches that recognise the intrinsic linkages between human well-being, ecological health, and regional stability.

2. Conceptual Framework: “Silent Fence” as Infrastructural Violence

The Silent Fence is proposed here as a bordered, security-centric sub-type of infrastructural violence that crystallises when linear security installations at or around borders generate layered ecological and socio-political harms under the justificatory discourse of national defence. This usage builds on Rodgers and O'Neill's account of infrastructural violence, in which

built systems produce harm, exclusion and unequal exposure to suffering through both their presence and their absence,² and on Nixon's concept of slow violence as gradual, out-of-sight, attritional harm dispersed across time and space.³ While slow violence captures incremental, often unseen harms unfolding over long-time horizons, and structural violence points to the patterned inequalities embedded in social and political orders, infrastructural violence foregrounds the role of material systems and built environments in producing harm.

The "Silent Fence" requires a conceptual departure from traditional security paradigms that view borders primarily as lines on a map, or fences as simple deterrents. Instead, this framework positions border infrastructure as an active agent in the production of insecurity. This concept refers to the slow, structural, and often imperceptible harm inflicted upon populations and environments through the design, implementation, and neglect of material infrastructure. It operates not through explosive force but through systemic degradation, exclusion and deprivation.

Conventional security studies have historically prioritised state survival, military power, and territorial defence, in which border

fences are perceived as rational, defensive measures to protect national interests against external threats. However, critical security studies argue that this narrow focus neglects the broader range of threats to human well-being, including those stemming from environmental degradation, resource scarcity, and social injustice. As such, the Silent Fence embodies this critical perspective by highlighting how seemingly benign infrastructures can exacerbate environmental vulnerabilities. It includes habitat fragmentation, in which fences bisect natural ecosystems, disrupting animal migration patterns and overall biodiversity across regions. Such disruptions can harm various species by destroying ecosystems which could in turn affect essential ecological services such as water purification and pollination, which are vital for human survival. For example, fences along international borders have been documented to severely impact the migration routes of large mammals, such as antelopes in Central Asia and bears in North America, leading to their population decline and genetic isolation.⁴

Furthermore, these barriers often cut off communities from traditional livelihood resources like water sources, grazing lands, and forests. This forced deprivation can lead to competition over shrinking resources,

fostering resentment and potential conflict between communities or with state authorities. Finally, the act of fencing off vast swathes of land could result in the formation of an "ecological enclosure," in which communal or traditional lands are rendered inaccessible, privatised, or militarised, thereby dispossessing locals of their ancestral territories and resources, violating their rights and eroding their traditional ecological knowledge.

To fully grasp this phenomenon, it requires the integration of a political ecology approach which emphasises that environmental issues are not merely natural phenomena but are deeply intertwined with power relations, economic structures, and political decisions. From this perspective, border fences are not neutral structures but products of specific political agendas, often driven by securitisation narratives that legitimise land appropriation, resource control, and the marginalisation of particular population segments. The construction of border fences often reframes certain ecological assets as security concerns, transforming them into contested resources controlled in the name of national security, with significant consequences for downstream communities. For instance, the strategic importance of transboundary rivers can be re

interpreted through a security lens, leading to unilateral control measures that restrict water access for downstream populations.

Moreover, the benefits of securitised borders frequently accrue to central governments or powerful economic actors, while marginalised border communities disproportionately bear the environmental and social costs. This unequal distribution of harm can fuel grievances and create fertile ground for resistance or recruitment into non state armed groups. As Nancy Peluso (1992) argues, conflicts over environmental resources are rarely solely about scarcity; they are more often about access and control, reflecting pre existing power imbalances. As such, the justification for building a Silent Fence often relies on narratives of external threats, which serve to legitimise state actions even when they result in substantial environmental and social disruption for local populations. Understanding these narratives is crucial for dissecting the underlying politics of border securitisation.

3. Case Study: Economic Corridors and Border Fencing – Socio-Ecological Impacts

The implementation of large-scale economic corridors, while promising developmental benefits, has often necessitated significant securitisation

measures, including extensive border fencing, particularly in remote and sensitive regions. These security measures, while intended to protect investments and personnel from perceived threats, introduce a range of environmental and social impacts that exemplify the "Silent Fence" phenomenon.

3.1. Context of Securitised Development: The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC)

The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), the flagship project of China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), illustrates how development and security have become deeply intertwined. Backed by investments of approximately US\$62 billion,⁵ the corridor links Gwadar Port with Xinjiang through an extensive network of transport, energy and industrial infrastructure. However, from its inception, the project has been shaped by persistent security concerns, and, consequently, Pakistan has expanded its military deployments and protective infrastructure to secure CPEC assets and Chinese personnel.

This security architecture reflects a longer tradition in Pakistan's strategic outlook. As Malla and Behuria (2025) argue, the state's emphasis on external threats,

particularly from India, has consistently outweighed economic priorities, reinforcing a security-oriented model of governance.⁶ Large infrastructure projects have consequently been planned and implemented within this framework, where security considerations accompany development at every stage.

CPEC also provides a concrete setting for examining the Silent Fence. Fences, checkpoints, surveillance systems and military installations are not merely protective measures; they reshape ecological systems, mobility patterns, and local political economies. The resulting changes produce new forms of insecurity that extend well beyond conventional security concerns. Through this lens, CPEC's security architecture exemplifies how it restructures ecological flows, patterns of access and local political economies in ways that generate new insecurities.

As the corridor passes through geographically diverse and politically sensitive regions, it has necessitated extensive security deployments and the construction of physical barriers. As a result, and as indicated by several reports, Pakistan has established a large number of security checkpoints, dedicated CPEC security divisions

within the Pakistani military, and erected extensive fencing, particularly in sensitive regions such as Balochistan and along parts of the route through Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.⁷ Within this strategy, Pakistan has also established a dedicated Special Security Division (SSD) of around 15,000 personnel, comprising approximately 9,000 army troops and 6,000 members of the civil armed forces, to protect CPEC infrastructure and Chinese nationals. Although the total length of CPEC-related fencing has not been publicly disclosed, Pakistan's broader investment in border securitisation is reflected in its defence budget of roughly US\$10 billion in 2024.⁸ These measures are intended to counter attacks by armed groups, including the Balochistan Liberation Army (BLA) and Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), illustrating how infrastructure development has become inseparable from militarised territorial control.

3.2. Environmental Disruptions and Ecological Impacts

The security infrastructure built around CPEC has altered landscapes across several ecologically sensitive regions in Pakistan with checkpoints, barriers, and fortified installations concentrated along strategic routes, including the Karakoram Highway

through Khunjerab National Park in Gilgit-Baltistan and the East Bay Expressway in Gwadar.⁹ While intended to secure infrastructure, these interventions fragment habitats and interrupt wildlife movement across previously connected ecosystems, leading to isolated populations and potential declines in biodiversity.

It is particularly true for the Himalayan region, through which a major component of CPEC traverses, supporting endangered species, including the snow leopard and several migratory bird populations. Linear infrastructure and associated fencing restrict migration routes, isolate wildlife populations, and reduce genetic exchange, increasing the risk of long-term biodiversity loss.¹⁰ Habitat fragmentation also weakens ecosystem services that local communities depend upon, including watershed protection and pollination, as trivial as it may seem to non-specialists.

Security infrastructure affects ecosystems in ways that extend beyond physical barriers, including increased traffic, permanent security outposts, artificial lighting, and continuous patrols that disturb wildlife behaviour and degrade fragile habitats. A WWF-Pakistan baseline assessment found that infrastructure crossing the Hindu

Kush–Karakoram–Himalaya region, including the Karakoram Highway and the Gilgit-Shandur Road, has fragmented the natural habitat of the vulnerable snow leopard. Subsequent research identifies CPEC-related habitat degradation as an increasing threat across Gilgit-Baltistan and adjoining areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.¹¹

In addition, the resulting environmental disruption affects access to essential natural resources, with such barriers altering traditional routes to grazing areas and water sources, while construction activities modify drainage patterns and local hydrology. These barriers can exacerbate drought conditions in some areas while creating unnatural wetlands in others, profoundly impacting local flora and fauna. Along the northern section of the corridor, unregulated construction, rock blasting, and heavy vehicle movement have damaged irrigation channels, disrupted drinking water supplies, disturbed river systems, and increased the risk of glacial lake outburst floods.¹² These changes have intensified local water insecurity in a region that supplies a substantial share of the Indus basin.

Such disruptions contribute to a broader sense of environmental insecurity among local populations, as their natural surroundings, on

which they depend for sustenance and cultural heritage, are visibly altered and degraded. The long-term ecological consequences extend beyond immediate physical impacts, leading to cascading effects that can permanently alter regional ecosystems, reducing their resilience to climate change and other environmental stressors. As such, when all these factors are analysed together, it becomes evident how the Silent Fence operates ecologically as a system of infrastructural violence that fragments habitats and re orders the distribution of environmental risks and benefits along the corridor.

3.3. Social and Livelihood Consequences

These infrastructure-driven environmental changes have translated directly into social and economic disruption for communities living along the corridor, particularly many indigenous and rural communities that rely on seasonal grazing, farming, and fishing, as well as access to common resources that have historically remained accessible. The extensive security infrastructure has either narrowed or could do so, which can render access to ancestral grazing grounds, seasonal pastures, or critical foraging areas that have been utilised for generations, limited and consequently making traditional

livelihoods increasingly difficult to sustain. For example, pastoral communities depend on open landscapes for their herds, and fences can severely limit their ability to sustain their livestock, forcing a shift away from traditional practices or leading to economic hardship.

On the other hand, a parallel dynamic has unfolded along the corridor in the Gwadar region, where construction of the CPEC East Bay Expressway has severed long-established access routes between fishing communities and the Arabian Sea, their principal source of livelihood. The project also introduced extensive security checkpoints, prompting repeated protests from local Baloch people against excessive securitisation of their land.¹³ The effects extend beyond economic activity. Restrictions on movement alter daily routines, weaken traditional patterns of resource sharing, and increase dependence on state-controlled access. In this sense, the Silent Fence is experienced not only through physical barriers but through the gradual reorganisation of everyday life.

Security zones have also generated displacement and recurring disputes over land acquisition. The proposal to fence Gwadar city in 2020, followed by *the "Gwadar Ko Haq*

Do" ("Give Gwadar its Rights") movement beginning in November 2021, reflected growing public opposition to restrictions on mobility and access to the sea. Fishing families, women, and students demanded the removal of excessive checkpoints and restoration of customary rights.¹⁴ Such impositions frequently erode social cohesion, as community members are dislocated, and traditional governance structures are undermined. Tensions between communities, or between communities and state authorities, can arise as access to increasingly scarce resources becomes a point of contention, and historical ties to the land are severed.

As noted by Malla & Behuria (2025), Pakistan's aid dependency and debt burden (exceeding \$100 billion) have amplified economic fragility, leading to high inflation (30 per cent in 2023) and unemployment (8 per cent).¹⁵ This economic distress, coupled with grievances over land and resources, contributes significantly to social unrest and can push disillusioned youth towards militancy.¹⁶ The grievances arising from environmental and social impacts related to securitised development can similarly contribute to widespread local discontent, fostering resentment and a sense of injustice among affected populations.

3.4. Linkages to Conflict Dynamics

The socio-ecological effects of securitised infrastructure have important implications for conflict dynamics as environmental degradation, restricted access to resources, and declining livelihoods increase competition over land and water, particularly in already fragile regions. Where external infrastructure overrides established systems of resource management, routine disputes can become politically charged. As political ecology scholarship suggests, conflicts are shaped less by resource scarcity alone than by struggles over access, control, and distribution.¹⁷ But the security infrastructure changes each of these relationships by redefining who can use resources, where movement is permitted, and which communities bear the costs of development. Friction between local populations and state authorities often follows, especially where restrictions are perceived as arbitrary or exclusionary.

The perceptions of dispossession and marginalisation due to large-scale infrastructural projects and their associated securitisation also provide opportunities for insurgent mobilisation. Armed groups frequently portray large infrastructure projects as instruments of exploitation, using displacement,

environmental damage, and unequal development to strengthen local support. This has been evident in the discourses of ethnic Baloch nationalist armed groups like Balochistan Liberation Army (BLA) which have consistently characterised CPEC as emblematic of resource exploitation by the Pakistani government. As a result, over the last more than a decade, there have been multiple attacks by Baloch groups targeting CPEC infrastructure, including Gwadar port, energy infrastructure, among others, besides Chinese nationals working on such projects. Moreover, as Malla and Behuria (2025) highlight, Pakistan's long-standing reliance on militant proxies have produced unintended consequences as groups like Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan turned against the state, which have also reflected in attacks against the CPEC infrastructure, including Chinese nationals, in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa over the years.¹⁸

This demonstrates a direct link between grievances, even if initially socio-environmental, and the rise of militancy. The construction of the "Silent Fence," paradoxically, contributes to the very insecurity it was designed to mitigate, by fostering new forms of conflict rooted in environmental degradation and social grievances, thereby creating a self-perpetuating cycle of violence

and instability. As such, the CPEC context demonstrates the causal pathway developed in this study's conceptual framework. The securitised borders and corridor infrastructures (the Silent Fence) trigger environmental degradation and livelihood disruption, which feed into grievances and political mobilisation that can escalate into insurgency and radicalisation. Rather than treating conflict as an external threat to development, it therefore suggests that the institutions and infrastructures created to secure development may themselves become part of the conditions that sustain insecurity.

4. Policy Recommendations: Towards a Conflict- Sensitive and "Green Security" Approach

The "Silent Fence" demonstrates that border security and infrastructure development cannot be assessed only through a military lens, as security measures that ignore ecological systems and local livelihoods often create new sources of instability, undermining the objectives they are intended to achieve. In such a context, a conflict-sensitive "green security" framework offers an alternative by integrating environmental protection, community participation, and long-term conflict

prevention into infrastructure planning. Although the CPEC case informs these recommendations, they can be equally relevant to other border regions, including India, where strategic infrastructure is expanding across environmentally sensitive and socially complex landscapes.

4.1. Integrated Environmental and Security Assessments

Environmental and security planning should be integrated into a single decision-making process rather than conducted in parallel. This requires mandating comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Social Impact Assessments (SIAs) that explicitly account for the transboundary and long-term socio-ecological effects of border infrastructure. These assessments should be undertaken by independent institutions, incorporate local consultation, and remain publicly accessible wherever security considerations permit. For instance, incorporating socio-economic indicators alongside ecological metrics and including disaggregated data on vulnerable groups can provide a more holistic understanding of potential impacts. Integrating such assessments into the initial planning phases, rather than conducting them as post hoc formalities, enables proactive

identification of potential conflicts and environmental harms. The benefits of such integrated assessments are manifold: they can reduce future financial costs associated with environmental remediation or conflict management, enhance the legitimacy of projects by incorporating local concerns, and build trust between state authorities and affected communities. Such a proactive approach ultimately leads to more sustainable and peaceful development outcomes.

4.2. Prioritising Community Engagement and Resource Sharing

Border communities should be treated as stakeholders rather than as passive recipients of security policies to mitigate the negative impacts of "Silent Fences." Consultation needs to extend beyond procedural hearings to sustained engagement throughout project planning and implementation, drawing on local knowledge of ecosystems, seasonal migration, and resource management to improve infrastructure designs and reduce unintended social and environmental impacts. Mechanisms for equitable resource sharing, including fair compensation for lost livelihoods or land, and benefit-sharing from the economic projects themselves, must be developed and implemented to

ensure a more equitable distribution of resources. This could involve establishing local peace committees or resource management councils that include diverse community leaders, women, and youth, empowering them in decision-making processes regarding border infrastructure and resource use. Studies by the World Bank have consistently shown that projects with higher levels of local participation tend to have better development outcomes and greater sustainability.¹⁹ This approach not only addresses grievances but also acknowledges the rights and well-being of the populations most affected by these large-scale projects, fostering a sense of ownership and reducing the propensity for conflict.

4.3. Promoting Ecological Corridors and Wildlife- Friendly Design

Security infrastructure should minimise ecological disruption wherever operationally feasible, as wildlife crossings, underpasses, overpasses, and carefully planned fence alignments can maintain habitat connectivity while meeting security requirements. Critical breeding grounds, migration corridors, and environmentally sensitive areas should receive particular attention during route selection. For example, some sections

of the U.S.-Mexico border fence have incorporated wildlife corridors, demonstrating a potential compromise between security and ecological concerns.²⁰

Technological alternatives also deserve greater consideration, as remote sensing, drones, smart surveillance systems, and sensor networks can reduce dependence on continuous physical barriers in selected locations without compromising operational effectiveness. These measures lower ecological costs while improving the long-term resilience of landscapes that support both biodiversity and local livelihoods. Investing in these “green infrastructure” solutions, though potentially more costly upfront, can avert high environmental and social costs in the future, aligning economic development with ecological sustainability.

4.4. Strengthening Regional Cooperation on Environmental Security

As several environmental consequences of border infrastructure extend across national boundaries, they therefore require regional cooperative measures, since shared river basins, mountain ecosystems, forests, and wildlife habitats cannot be effectively managed through unilateral policies

alone. Bilateral and regional mechanisms for environmental monitoring, data sharing, disaster preparedness, and resource management would strengthen both ecological resilience and regional stability. For instance, as debates surrounding the Bhutan-China boundary demonstrate, environmental and resource management increasingly intersect with geopolitical negotiations,²¹ thereby underscoring the need for diplomatic engagement that integrates environmental concerns into broader geopolitical discussions. It could include joint environmental monitoring bodies, shared data platforms on climate change impacts, and cooperative conservation efforts that can build trust and shared interest among nations, even those with historical rivalries. These kinds of initiatives can transform potential environmental flashpoints into opportunities for cooperation, fostering a more stable and peaceful regional environment.

4.5. Addressing Root Causes of Conflict and Insecurity

Physical barriers cannot substitute for policies that address the conditions from which insecurity emerges, and they require recognition that security fences are often symptomatic of deeper socio-economic and political grievances. It

is vital to invest in equitable development, social justice, and good governance to address the underlying drivers of instability. This means implementing transparent land acquisition policies that respect human rights, investing in education, healthcare, and economic opportunities for marginalised communities, and ensuring accountability for human rights abuses associated with large-scale development projects. For example, Pakistan's reliance on IMF bailouts and its challenges with stagnant exports underscore deep structural economic weaknesses that contribute to social unrest.²² By mitigating economic disparities and political exclusion, the allure of extremist narratives, which often capitalise on existing grievances and the perception of injustice, can be significantly reduced. This holistic approach to peacebuilding, which extends beyond mere military solutions, recognises that genuine and lasting security rests on a foundation of justice, equity, and sustainable human well-being.

5. Conclusion

The concept of the "Silent Fence" draws attention to an overlooked consequence of border securitisation: the capacity of security infrastructure to reshape ecological systems, local livelihoods, and patterns of conflict.

While such infrastructure is often presented as an indispensable tool for national security, its long-term environmental and social consequences can inadvertently destabilise fragile regions, fuel grievances, and contribute to the very conflicts they aim to prevent. The structural violence inflicted through habitat fragmentation, resource disruption, and community displacement may be silent in its immediate manifestation, but its impacts resonate deeply within affected landscapes and populations, creating new vulnerabilities and exacerbating existing tensions.

This article argues for a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of security, one that transcends traditional state-centric notions to encompass both human and environmental well-being. Using a political ecology perspective, it shows how border securitisation, through seemingly neutral infrastructure, can become an instrument of control, exclusion, and environmental degradation. The case of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor illustrates how securitised infrastructure can produce unintended socio-ecological consequences that reinforce the very grievances security measures seek to contain. In this context, the conflict, therefore, emerges not simply from pre-existing instability but also from the institutional and material

arrangements created in the name of security. These findings support a broader understanding of security that extends beyond territorial defence to encompass ecological resilience, equitable access to resources, and the well-being of affected communities. Environmental sustainability and human security should therefore be treated as integral components of border governance rather than secondary considerations addressed after infrastructure is built. The Silent Fence therefore represents more than a metaphor for hidden environmental costs. It provides a framework for examining how security infrastructure can simultaneously protect states while producing new ecological and social vulnerabilities.

Nevertheless, the proposed green security framework offers one

pathway towards this objective by foregrounding ecological integrity and genuine community participation at all stages of border management and infrastructure development, moving beyond a purely top-down, securitised paradigm. By ensuring that physical barriers accommodate wildlife, that communities retain access to vital resources, and that grievances are addressed through transparent and participatory mechanisms, states can transition from a logic of reactive securitisation to one of proactive, inclusive, and ecologically responsible peacebuilding. While the discussion has focused on CPEC, the underlying dynamics are relevant to border regions across South Asia and elsewhere, where expanding infrastructure increasingly intersects with fragile ecosystems and contested political spaces. ■

References

1. Walters, W. (2011), "Border Walls: An Introduction", *European Journal of Social Theory*, 14(3), p. 249-257.
2. Rodgers, D. and O'Neill, B. (2012), "Infrastructural Violence: Introduction to the Special Issue", *Ethnography*, 13(4), p. 401-412.
3. Nixon, R. (2011), *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
4. Mallory, M.J. and Flesch, A.D. (2019), "Impact of Border Fences on Wildlife: A Global Review", *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 17(5), p. 293-300.

5. Malla, M. W. and Behuria, A. (2025), "Foreign Policy of Pakistan: A Case of Misplaced Priorities", *Journal of Peace Studies*, 32(1), p.22-46.
6. Malla and Behuria, "Foreign Policy of Pakistan", p. 22-46.
7. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (2026), "Pakistan Creates Special Security Unit To Protect Chinese Citizens Amid A Rise In Attacks", [Online], Available at: <https://www.rferl.org/a/china-pakistan-cpec-police-terrorism-attack-worker-infrastructure/33643164.html> (Accessed 27 May 2026).
8. Malla and Behuria, "Foreign Policy of Pakistan", p. 22-46.
9. Baloch, B. (2018), "Gwadar fishermen protest against construction of CPEC's project enters 12th day", *Dawn*, 28 December.
10. WWF-Pakistan (2022), "Snow Leopard Conservation in Pakistan: A Summary", [Online], Available at: [WWF-Pakistan official reports].
11. Ahmad, S., Nabi, G., Hacker, C.E., Strelnikov, I.I. and Luan, X. (2022), "Increasing Threats to Snow Leopard Survival in Pakistan", *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 818798; see also WWF-Pakistan, *Building Ecological and Sustainable Transport/Linear Infrastructure for Snow Leopards (BEAST) baseline study*, reported in *The Express Tribune*, 5 April 2024 (Accessed 27 May 2026).
12. 'Climate Crisis and CPEC: Addressing the environmental fallout for Gilgit-Baltistan', *The Express Tribune*, 15 September 2024; and Khan, W. et al. (2024), "Study of Land Surface Changes ... along the CPEC Route in Gilgit-Baltistan", *Sustainability*, 16(23), 10311.
13. The People's Map of Global China (2022), "Gwadar Port and Free Zone", [Online], Available at: <https://thepeoplesmap.net/project/gwadar-port-and-free-zone/> (Accessed 27 May 2026); and "CPEC and Gwadar fishermen", *Daily Times*, 18 March 2019.
14. Baloch, S.M. and Ali, M. (2021), "Gwadar Protests Highlight CPEC's Achilles' Heel", *The Diplomat*, 16 December, [Online], Available at: <https://thediplomat.com/2021/12/gwadar-protests-highlight-cpecs-achilles-heel/> (Accessed 27 May 2026).
15. Malla and Behuria, "Foreign Policy of Pakistan"
16. Ibid.

-
17. Peluso, N.L. (1992), *Rich Forests, Poor People: Forest Access and Control in Java*. University of California Press.
 18. Malla and Behuria, "Foreign Policy of Pakistan", p.22-46.
 19. World Bank (2021), "Community-Driven Development: From Concept to Practice".
 20. Flesch, A.D., et al. (2010), "Impact of Border Walls on Wildlife: The Case of the U.S.–Mexico Border", *Conservation Biology*, 24(3), p. 632-637.
 21. .Nayak, N.R. (2025), "Bhutan - China Boundary Dispute: Evaluating the Impact of a New Roadmap", *Journal of Peace Studies*, 32(1), p. 3-21.
 22. Malla and Behuria, "Foreign Policy of Pakistan"

Journal of Peace Studies



FOUNDING EDITOR
LATE PROF. RIYAZ PUNJABI

ADVISORY BOARD

SALEEM KIDWAI
SANDRA DESTRADE
RENÉ WADLOW
G BALACHANDRAN
PRAFULLA PRUSTY

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOOR AHMAD BABA
AJAY DARSHAN BEHERA
SMRUTI S PATTANAIK
P.V. RAMANA
RAJESH KHARAT
UTTAM SINHA

EDITOR

ASHOK BEHURIA

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

MOHMAD WASEEM MALLA

ASSISTANT EDITOR

PRATEEK JOSHI

DESIGN

BRINDA DATTA

PRINTED & PUBLISHED BY

SHEIKH KHALID JEhangIR
Centre for Peace Studies

Printed at:

A.M. Offsetters
Kotla Mubarakpur, New Delhi
PIN- 110 003, TEL: 2463 2395

Office Address:
157/9, Block 4, Second Floor,
Kishangarh, Vasant Kunj,
New Delhi-110070

Regd. Address:
C-11 Jangpura Extension
New Delhi – 110 014
Tel: (91-11) 49989230, +91-9810317972
<http://www.icpsnet.org>
Emails: cpsndjps@gmail.com;
jps@icpsnet.org

SUBSCRIPTION

In India

This Copy	Rs 350,00
Annual (Individual)	Rs. 1400.00
(Institutional)	Rs. 2000.00

Overseas (Air Mail)

This Copy:	S\$ 15.00
	K£ 11.00
Annual:	S\$ 60.00
	K£ 44.00

Note for readers and subscribers

We are happy to inform you that from January 2009 we have introduced the system of peer review of articles to ensure quality of publications and improve the scholarly value of our journal. We have a renowned group of scholars and academicians associated with our Centre and they are helping us in this process. We are grateful to them for their kind support and cooperation.

We would request our readers and subscribers to take note of these changes and we would, as ever, encourage them to send in research articles for publication to us. The manuscripts of research papers submitted for publication should be neatly typed in double space and the length of the papers should be ideally between 3,000-5000 words including the references. They should contain an abstract and a short introduction of the author. The authors should use Harvard Manual Style for their references. The articles can be sent to us in an electronic format, preferably Ms Word. For detailed guidelines they may send their queries to us in the following address.

Journal of Peace Studies Research Section

Emails: cpsndjps@gmail.com, jps@icpsnet.org

Registered with the Registrar of Newspapers
RNI No. 57199/93



CENTRE FOR PEACE STUDIES

C-11, Jangpura Extension,
New Delhi – 110 014, INDIA

Tel: (91-11) 49989230, +91-9560126157, 9810317972

Websites: <http://www.icpsnet.org> (Main),
www.icpsorg.com (Kashmir chapter)

Emails: cpsndjps@gmail.com, jps@icpsnet.org